

REV-00

**SELF-LEARNING
MATERIAL**



MA POLITICAL SCIENCE

MPS 101- POLITICAL THEORY

w.e.f Academic Session: 2023-24



**CENTRE FOR DISTANCE AND ONLINE EDUCATION
UNIVERSITY OF SCIENCE & TECHNOLOGY MEGHALAYA**

nirf India Ranking-2023 (151-200)

Accredited 'A' Grade by NAAC

Techno City, 9th Mile, Baridua, Ri-Bhoi, Meghalaya, 793101

SELF-LEARNING MATERIAL

MA Political Science

MPS-101

POLITICAL THEORY

Academic Session : 2023-24



Centre for Distance and Online Education
UNIVERSITY OF SCIENCE & TECHNOLOGY MEGHALAYA

Accredited 'A' Grade by NAAC

Self Learning Material
Center for Distance and Online Education
University of Science and Technology Meghalaya

First Edition
Print Jan 2024
© CDOE - USTM

Edited by: Dr. Himashree Patowary & Dr. Md Nazeer Hussain

This book is a distance education module comprising of collection of learning material for students of Center for Distance and Online Education, University of Science and Technology Meghalaya, 9th Mile G S Rd, Ri Bhoi, Meghalaya 793101.

Printed and Published on behalf of Center for Distance and Online Education, University of Science and Technology Meghalaya by Publication Cell, University of Science and Technology Meghalaya – 793101

TABLE OF CONTENTS

CHAPTER	TITLE	PAGE NO.
CHAPTER 1	INTRODUCTION 1.1 POLITICAL THEORY: MEANING AND SIGNIFICANCE 1.2 APPROACHES: NORMATIVE AND EMPIRICAL, TRADITIONAL AND MODERN 1.3 DECLINE AND RESURGENCE OF POLITICAL THEORY	4-26
CHAPTER 2	STATE 2.1 STATE: CONCEPT, ELEMENTS AND ORIGIN 2.2 DIFFERENT PERSPECTIVE 2.3 GLOBALISATION AND STATE SOVEREIGNTY	27-45
CHAPTER 3	MAJOR CONCEPTS IN POLITICAL THEORY 3.1 LIBERTY 3.2 EQUALITY 3.3 JUSTICE	46-68
CHAPTER 4	DEMOCRACY 4.1 CONCEPTS AND FEATURES 4.2 CONDITIONS FOR SUCCESS OF DEMOCRACY 4.3 THEORIES OF DEMOCRACY	69-89

CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

LEARNING OUTCOME: After going through this lesson, students will be able to-

- **Know the meaning and definition of Political Theory**
- **Understand the nature, characteristics and significance of political theory**
- **Major approaches of Political Theory**

1.1 POLITICAL THEORY: MEANING AND SIGNIFICANCE

What is Theory?

The meaning of political theory necessitates the meaning of theory: to know what political theory really is to know, first, what is theory? Originating from the Greek word “theoria”, theory means or at least, may mean a well-focussed mental look taken at something in a state of contemplation with the intention to grasp or understand it. Arnold Brecht (“What is Theory?”) refers to both the broad and the narrow meaning of the word “theory”. In the broader sense, he says, theory means “A thinker’s entire teaching on a subject”, including the description of facts, his explanation, his conception of history, his value-judgements, and the proposals of goals, policies and principles. In the narrow sense, he says, theory means “explanatory” thought only or at least primarily. In his book, Political Theory, Brecht uses theory in the narrow sense, saying, “... explaining is the function of theory.” Thus, for him, theory means a proposition or a set of propositions designed to explain something with reference to data or inter-relations not directly observed or not otherwise manifest. Theory has to be scientific, without the quantum of science, it is unthinkable. But theory, without science or say philosophy, is as meaningless as it is, without science. Theory is a combination of elements characteristic of both science and philosophy. Theory is not practice, because doing too needs thinking. Theory involves a theoretical frame which practice really lacks. Theory is not merely ‘description’ because “describing” is only a part of “thinking”, its other parts, for example, include “discovering”, “determining”, “augmenting”, “explaining” and “framing” a phenomenon. Theory is not hypothesis, for hypothesis denotes a tentative assumption of facts, and, therefore, lacks what theory really has, “definiteness”.

Theory is not philosophy because while theory is about “something”, philosophy is about “everything”. Theory is not thought because it is a thought about thought, and not an entire thought itself. There is, indeed, much that is common between theory and reason, for both have a claim on being scientific, yet theory looks beyond reason, beyond science.

Theory, we may sum up with Karl Deutsch (The Nerves of Government, 1963), attempts to explain, order and relate disjointed data, identifies what is relevant and, therefore, points out what is missing in any phenomenon; predicts on the basis of observable facts. Theory is a

guide to practice, adds much to what is merely description, clarifies hypothesis, and as a part of philosophy, explains an issue which meets the requirements of both reason and vision.

MEANING

Political theory is one of the core areas in Political Science. From ancient Greece to the present, the history of political theory has dealt with fundamental and perennial ideas of Political Science. Political theory reflects upon political phenomenon, processes and institutions and on actual political behaviour by subjecting it to philosophical or ethical criterion. Weinstein considers political theory as an activity which involves posing questions, developing responses to those questions and creating imaginative perspectives on the public life of human beings. It has been probing into questions like: nature and purpose of the state; why one should prefer a kind of state than the other; what the political organization aims at; by what criteria its ends, its methods and its achievements should be judged; what is the relation between state and the individual. Political theory has been engaged in these age old questions from Plato onwards because it is concerned with the fate of man which depends upon his ability to create a kind of political community in which rulers and ruled are united in the pursuit of common good. It is not necessary that political theory can provide answers to all questions but it can at least tell us how one should go about the solution. Political theory is the categorization of social thought by a group or by the persuasion or beliefs of a geo-political mass. Many political theories are founded as critiques toward existing political, economic and social conditions of the theorist's time. Political theory can also be considered as a critical tradition of discourse that provides a reflection on collective life, the uses of collective power, and resources within a collectivity. The emphasis of political theory changes over time.

There are many different elements that create the foundation for theoretical analysis towards political science. Since the ancient Greek period, political theory analyzes and interprets the foundations of political life and evaluates its principles, concepts and institutions. Political theory is the study of the concepts and principles that people use to describe, explain, and evaluate political events and institutions. It seeks to understand, explain and analyse the political phenomena and prescribe ways and means to rectify the shortcomings.

Political theory is a complex subject. Numerous political theorists are engaged in this field. Because of the diversity and changes in the socio-economic circumstances, there have been substantial changes in both the subject matter of political theory and the methods of studying it. For the purpose of study, political theory is divided into distinct streams such as classical, modern and empirical. Classical political theory was dominated by philosophy and dealt with the description, explanation, prescription and evaluation of the political phenomena. However, empirical political theory claimed to be a science and has been primarily concerned with the description and explanation of the political reality. On the other hand, contemporary political theory has tried to blend the theoretical and practical aspects.

POLITICAL THEORY: DEFINITION

In common parlance, political theory is "...a body of knowledge related to the phenomenon of the state." While 'political' refers to 'matters of public concern', 'theory' refers to 'a systematic knowledge'. Political theory can be defined as the discipline which aims to explain, justify or criticize the disposition of power in society. It delineates the balance of power between states, groups and individuals. Different scholars have defined it in the following ways:

- David Held opines that political theory is a "...network of concepts and generalizations about political life involving ideas, assumptions and statements about the nature, purpose and key features of government, state and society, and about the political capabilities of human beings."
- According to Francis W. Coker, "...a branch of political science concerned chiefly with the ideas of past and present political thinkers and the doctrines and proposals of political movements and group discussion of the proper scope of governmental action ... has usually been regarded as a proper part of political theory."
- David Peritz considers political theory as "...a tradition of thinking about the nature of political power; the conditions for its just and unjust use; the rights of individuals, minorities, and majorities; and the nature and bounds of political community. Rather than tackling pressing political problems one at a time, political theorists seek systematic solutions in overall visions of just societies or comprehensive diagnoses of the roots of oppression and domination in existent political orders."
- Andrew Hacker defines it as "...a combination of a disinterested search for the principles of good state and good society on the one hand, and a disinterested search for knowledge of political and social reality on the other."
- George Catlin says, "political theory includes political science and political philosophy....It is concerned with means; political philosophy is concerned with the end or final value, when man asks what is the national good or what is good society."
- John Plamentaz defines it as "...the analysis and clarification of the vocabulary of politics and the critical examination, verification and justification of the concepts employed in political argument."

In brief, political theory by referring to the comprehensive definition given by Gould and Kolb who say that it is 'a sub-field of political science which includes:

- political philosophy – a moral theory of politics and a historical study of political ideas;
- a scientific criterion;
- a linguistic analysis of political ideas, and;
- the discovery and systematic development of generalizations about political behaviour.

On the basis of the above definitions, it can be concluded that political theory is concerned with the study of the phenomena of the state both in philosophical as well as empirical terms. It not only involves explanation, description and prescription regarding the state and political institutions but also evaluation of their moral philosophical purpose. It is not only concerned with what the state is but also what it ought to be. Weinstein considers political theory as an activity. How do you understand this? 2. Political theory is divided into distinct streams such as classical, modern and empirical. Elaborate. 3. How Gould and Kolb defined political theory?

POLITICAL THEORY: NATURE

Political theory is the study of the phenomena of the state both from philosophical as well as empirical points of view. In this context, certain similar terms are also used such as political thought, political philosophy, and political science. Although all of them are concerned with explaining the political phenomena, yet political theory is distinct from them. The distinction of political theory from other terms, as discussed by Biju P.R, has been mentioned as follows:

POLITICAL THEORY AND POLITICAL THOUGHT

It is generally believed that political thought is the general thought comprising of theories and values of all those persons or a section of the community who think and write on the day-to-day activities, policies and decisions of the state, and which has a bearing on our present living. These persons can be philosophers, writers, journalists, poets, political commentators etc. Political thought has no 'fixed' form and can be in the form of treatise, speeches, political commentaries etc.

What is important about political thought is that it is 'time bound' since the policies and programmes of the governments change from time to time. Thus, Greek thought or Roman thought of ancient period or the political thought of the medieval ages exist today. Political theory, on the other hand, is the systematic speculation of a particular writer who talks specifically about the phenomena of the state. This speculation is based on certain hypothesis which may or may not be valid and may be open to criticism. Theory provides a model of explanation of political reality as is understood by the writer. As such there can be different political theories of the same period. Also, political theory is based on certain discipline – be it philosophy, history, economics or sociology. And lastly, since the task of theory is not only to explain the political reality but also to change it or to resist change, political theory can be conservative, critical or revolutionary. According to Barker, while political thought is the immanent philosophy of a whole age, political theory is the speculation of a particular thinker. While political thought is implicit and immersed in the stream of vital action, political theory is explicit and may be detached from the political reality of a particular period.

POLITICAL THEORY AND POLITICAL PHILOSOPHY

Philosophy is called 'science of wisdom'. This wisdom can be about this world, man or God. This wisdom is all-inclusive and tries to explain everything. When this wisdom is applied to

the study of political phenomena or the state, it is called political philosophy. Political philosophy belongs to the category of normative political theory. It is concerned with not only explaining what 'is' but also what 'ought' to be. Political philosophy is not concerned with contemporary issues but with certain universal issues in the political life of man such as nature and purpose of the political organisation, basis of political authority, nature of rights, liberty, equality, justice etc.

The distinction between political philosophy and political theory is explained by the fact that whereas a political philosopher is a political theorist, but a political theorist may not necessarily be a political philosopher. Though theory deals with the same issues as political philosophy, it can explain them both from philosophical as well as empirical points of view. In other words, while political philosophy is abstract or speculative, political theory can be both normative and empirical.

A political theorist is as much interested in explaining the nature and purpose of the state as in describing the realities of political behaviour, the actual relations between state and citizens, and the role of power in the society. As has been pointed out by Arnold Brecht, philosophical explanations are theories too, but they are non-scientific. Political theory is concerned both with political institutions and the ideas and aspirations that form the basis of those institutions. However, we must not forget that though we can analytically distinguish between philosophy and theory, yet if political theory is separated from political philosophy, its meaning will appear distorted and it will prove barren and irrelevant. Theory must be supplemented by philosophy.

POLITICAL THEORY AND POLITICAL SCIENCE

As a discipline, political science is much more comprehensive and includes different forms of speculation in politics such as political thought, political theory, political philosophy, political ideology, institutional or structural framework, comparative politics, public administration, international law and organizations etc. With the rise of political science as a separate discipline, political theory was made one of its subfields. However, when used specifically with emphasis on 'science' as distinct from 'theory', political science refers to the study of politics by the use of Scientific methods in contrast to political philosophy, which is free to follow intuition. Political theory when opposed to political philosophy is political science.

Political science is concerned with describing and explaining the realities of political behaviour, generalizations about man and political institutions on empirical evidence, and the role of power in the society. Political theory, on the other hand, is not only concerned about the behavioural study of the political phenomena from empirical point of view but also prescribing the goals which states, governments, societies and citizens ought to pursue. Political theory also aims to generalize about the right conduct in the political life and about the legitimate use of power. Thus, political theory is neither pure thought, nor philosophy, nor science. While it draws heavily from all of them, yet it is distinct from them. Contemporary political theory is trying to attempt a synthesis between political philosophy and political science.

CHARACTERISTICS OF POLITICAL THEORY

Main characteristics of political theory as discussed by Biju have been given as below: 1. Political theory is an intellectual and moral creation of man. It is the speculation of a single individual who is attempting to offer us a theoretical explanation of the political reality i.e. the phenomena of the state. Every theory by its very nature is an explanation, built upon certain hypothesis which may be valid or not and which are always open to criticism.

Thus, political theory is a number of attempts made by thinkers from Plato onwards to unravel the mysteries of man's political life. They have given numerous modes of explanations that may or may not convince human beings. An attempt to seek the truth as the thinker sees it and it is usually expressed through a treatise such as Plato's Republic, Aristotle's Politics, Machiavelli's Prince, Hobbes' Leviathan and John Rawls' A Theory of Justice. 2. Political theory contains an explanation of man, society and history. It probes the nature of man and society: how a society is made up and how it works; what are the important elements; what are the sources of conflict in the society and how they can be resolved. 3. Political theory is discipline based. It means that though the phenomena which the theorist seeks to explain remains the same i.e. the state. Thus we are confronted by a variety of political theories, each distinguished by a discipline on which it is based. 4. Political theory not only comprehends and explains the social and political reality but is also actively engaged in hastening the process of history. The task of political theory is not only to understand and explain but also to devise ways and means to change the society. As Laski put it, the task is not merely one of description of what it is but also a prescription of what ought to be. Thus, political theory recommends agencies of action as well as means of reform, revolution or conservation. It contains programmes that embody both ends and means. Political theory plays a double role: to understand society and to suggest how to remove the imperfections.

It also includes political ideology. Ideology in simple language means a system of beliefs, values and ideals by which people allow themselves to be governed. We find a number of ideologies in the modern world such as liberalism, Marxism, socialism etc. All political theories from Plato to date reflect a distinct ideology of the writer. Political theory in the form of political ideology includes a system of political values, institutions and practices, which a society has adopted as its ideal. For example, all political theories adopted by Western Europe and America have been dominated by liberalism and the theories accepted by China and erstwhile USSR were influenced by a particular brand of Marxism.

Each brand of theory or ideology in this sense claims for itself the attributes of universality and compels others to accept it, leading to what is generally known as 'ideological conflicts'. In brief, political theory is associated with the explanation and evaluation of the political phenomena. These phenomena can be examined as a statement of ideas and ideals, as an agent of socio-economic change, and as an ideology. The nature of political theory can also be understood from the kind of issues it has been grappling Greek period.

Different political issues have been dominant in different epochs. Classical political theory was primarily concerned with the search for a perfect political order. As such it analyzed the basic issues of political theory such as the nature and purpose of the state, basis of political authority, the problem of political obligation and political disobedience. It was more concerned with what the state ought to be i.e. the ideal state. The rise of modern nation-state and the industrial revolution gave birth to a new kind of society, economy and polity. Modern political theory starts from individualism and made liberty of the individual as the basic issue. Hence it was concerned with issues like rights, liberty, equality, property and justice for the individual, how to create a state based upon individual consent, and a right to change the government. At one time, it also became important to explain the interrelation between one concept and the other such as liberty and equality, justice and liberty, equality and property. Empirical political theory shifted the emphasis from concepts to the political behaviour of man. It invented a number of new issues largely borrowed from other social sciences. These were authority, legitimacy, elite, party, group, political system and With the resurgence of value-based political theory, there is once again an emphasis on the issues of freedom, equality and justice. Apart from them, some new issues have come to dominate the scene such as feminism, multiculturalism, environmentalism, ecology, post-colonialism, post-modernism, community and subalternism.

SIGNIFICANCE OF POLITICAL THEORY

The significance of political theory can be derived from the purpose that it serves or supposed to serve and the task performed by it. The significance of political theory can be discussed as following:-

1. Political theory is a form of all embracing system of values which a society adopts as its ideal with a view to understand the political reality and, if necessary, to change it. It involves speculation at higher level about the nature of good life, the political institutions appropriate for its realization, to what end the state is directed and how it should be constituted to achieve those ends. The significance of political theory lies in providing the moral criteria that ought to be used to judge the ethical worth of a political state and to propose alternative political arrangements and practices likely to meet the moral standards.
2. The importance of political theory lies in providing a description of the political phenomena; a non-scientific and a scientific explanation; proposals for the selection of political goals and political action, and; moral judgment. The fundamental question facing human beings has been 'how to live together'. Politics is an activity engaged with the management of the collective affairs of society.
3. The significance of theory lies in evolving various doctrines and approaches regarding the nature and purpose of the state, the bases of political authority, vision of an ideal state, best form of government, relations between the state and the individual and basic issues such as rights, liberty, equality, property and justice. Again what has become important in our times is to explain the interrelation between one concept and another such as the relationship between liberty and equality, equality and property, justice and property. This is as important

as peace, order, harmony, stability and unity in the society. In fact peace and harmony in the society very much depends upon how we interpret and implement the values of liberty, equality and justice.

4. In the contemporary times, states face a number of problems such as poverty, over-population, corruption, racial and ethnic tensions, environment pollution, conflicts among individuals, groups as well as nations. The task of political theory is to study and analyse more profoundly than others, the immediate and potential problems of political life of the society and to supply the practical politician with an alternative course of action, the consequences of which have been fully thought of. It helps us to understand the nature of the socio-economic system and its problems like poverty, violence, corruption, and ethnicity. Since the task of political theory is not only to understand and explain the social reality but also to change it, political theory helps us to evolve ways and means to change society either through reform or revolution. When political theory performs its function well, it is one of the most important weapons of struggle for the advancement of humanity. To imbibe people with correct theories may make them choose their goals and means correctly so as to avoid the roads that end in disappointment.

1.2 APPROACHES TO POLITICAL THEORY

In the study of social sciences the approaches are extremely important because they help us in identifying the problems for our study and deciding on the appropriate data to be used. A care must however, be taken to differentiate between an approach and method, another term which is frequently used by the social scientists. It must be made clear that the two terms are not synonyms. Method can be defined as a particular manner or technique to carry out something. It suggests a systematic course of action that helps procure trustworthy body of knowledge about a particular issue or phenomenon and draw conclusions thereon.

There are quite a few methods that are applied in the study of social sciences such as Deductive Method, Inductive Method, Comparative Method, Scientific Method and so on. An approach, in contrast, is a broader term that takes hold of the method i.e. how to study or inquire along with bringing into focus the relevant data i.e. what to study for the purpose of understanding the particular phenomenon.

In the words of Vernon Van Dyke: "An approach consists of criteria of selection criteria employed in selecting the problems or questions to consider and in selecting the data to bring to bear, it consists of standards governing the inclusion and exclusion of questions and data." Furthermore, distinguishing between a method and an approach Dyke indicates: "In brief, approaches consist of criteria for selecting problems and relevant data, whereas methods are procedures for getting and utilizing data." It must also be added that an approach brings along its method too. This cannot be always true about a method because a method is not usually committed to a particular approach. In other words an approach suggests its own method while the vice versa is not true. For instance, behavioural approach is linked to scientific method and normative approach has association with philosophical method.

Meaning of Approach:

From the days of ancient Greek political thought scholars, philosophers and political scientists have analysed, investigated various types of political issues and incidents from the standpoint of their own perspective and on the basis of the study they have arrived at conclusions and prescribed recommendations.

This has inevitably led to the emergence of a number of approaches to the study of political science. Now we shall first of all try to analyse various aspects of each approach but before that we shall define approach.

We have already noted Van Dyke's points on another issue. According to Van Dyke the word "approach is defined to denote the criteria employed in selecting the questions to ask and the data to consider in political inquiry".

In the opinion of Van Dyke, approach means criteria. A criterion is used to explain or analyse the political questions and data. Since the questions and data are very great in number and varied in nature each political scientist or philosopher analyses them in his own way by applying his own standpoint and method.

In physical or chemical science there exists an agreed method and more or less all researchers and scientists apply those agreed methods. But there is hardly any place of broad based agreement in political science as to the method and approach.

Another aspect of approach is methods employed by political science for its study cannot be distinguished from the methods used by other branches of social science. So also the approaches of political science are not different from other approaches. However, this general observation is not hundred percent correct. Sometimes the approaches employed by political scientists differ in content from the approaches used by other social scientists. Thus variety of approaches for the study of political science is a central aspect of the subject.

Again from the past history of political science we gather the idea that at different periods different approaches have gained importance. In other words, the rise and fall in the importance of approaches is a noticeable characteristic.

Approach, we can say, is a scientific way of studying a subject. The students will have to analyse and categorize data, facts, events, problems etc. The point to note is that they cannot do it unscientifically or proceed haphazardly. To be precise, for a balanced and effective analysis and promising investigation analysts must proceed in a systematic way and for that purpose the students or analysts must apply a method or criterion and we call it approach.

Therefore, approach is a way to analyse a subject or what may suitably be called a discipline. It is believed by many that the application of an approach considerably enhances the importance and credibility of the analysis as well as discipline. So without an approach the analysis of the subject may not be in a position to receive wide support from the readers and also their credence.

Classification of Approaches:

The approaches employed by political scientists for the study of politics have been classified by Wasby in the following way: one classification may be based on fact-value problem. This leads to the division of classification into normative approach and empirical approach.

The other classification is based on the objective of study of political science. That is, in this approach the political scientists want to stress the specific purposes of studying and investigating politics. This broad group can again be subdivided into philosophical, ideological, institutional and structural approaches.

Some scholars are of opinion that Wasby-proposed classification of approaches is generally traditional in nature. Modern political scientists have made a broad classification of the approaches. On the one hand there is normative approach which to some extent liberal bias and on the other hand Marxist approach.

In the second half of the last century a large number of political scientists of America and later on other countries began to analyse political issues, incidents and behaviour from the standpoint of behaviour (particularly the political behaviour) of the individuals. David Easton championed this approach. In formal language it is called behaviouralism or political behaviour and after very few years this behaviouralism landed on post-behaviouralism. Recently some scholars have attempted to analyse political science in a feminist way and it is called feminist approach.

Traditional Approach

The traditional approach is value based and lays emphasis on the inclusion of values to the study of political phenomena. The adherents of this approach believe that the study of political science should not be based on facts alone since facts and values are closely related to each other. Since the days of Plato and Aristotle „the great issues of politics“ have revolved around normative orientations. Accordingly there are a large number of traditional approaches like legal approach, philosophical approach, historical approach, institutional approach etc. Philosophical approach to the study of political science could be traced in the writings of ancient philosophers like Plato and Aristotle. Leo Strauss who was one of the ardent supporters of this approach believed that “the philosophy is the quest for wisdom and political philosophy is the attempt truly to know about the nature of political things and the right or good political order.” This approach lays stress on ethical and normative study of politics and is idealistic in nature. It deals with the problems of nature and function of state, issues of citizenship, rights and duties etc. Historical approach believes that political phenomena could be understood better with the help of historical factors like age, place, situations etc.

Political thinkers like Machiavelli, Sabine and Dunning believe that politics and history are intricately related and the study of politics always should have a historical perspective. Sabine is of the view that Political Science should include all those subjects which have been discussed in the writings of different political thinkers from the time of Plato. Every past is

linked with the present and thus the historical analysis provides a chronological order of every political phenomenon. Institutional approach lays stress on the study of political institutions and structures like executive, legislature, judiciary, political parties, interests groups etc.

Among the ancient thinkers Aristotle is an important contributor to this approach while the modern thinkers include James Bryce, Bentley, Walter Bagehot, Harold Laski, etc. Legal approach regards state as the creator and enforcer of law and deals with legal institutions, and processes. Its advocates include Cicero, Jean Bodin, Thomas Hobbes, Jeremy Bentham, John Austin, Dicey and Sir Henry Maine. Based on the definition of traditional approach to political issues, the following features of traditional approach could be deduced:

Accent on large questions: the issues of larger concern such as how the authority should be organised, what should be the criteria for citizenship, what should be the functions of state etc. are the subject matter of traditional approach and appear with greater degree of regularity.

Normative overtone: normative orientation or statement of preferences (value questions) occurs frequently in traditional thinking. The traditional thinkers as such do not make a distinction between political and ethical questions. Therefore thinkers like Plato have raised questions like what should be the size of state, what should be an ideal state etc.

Philosophical orientation: an important feature of traditional political thought has been its philosophical orientation. In the words of Wasby, “the philosophical approach takes in all aspects of man’s political activities and has as its goal a statement of underlying principles concerning those activities”. Actual political activities have often been judged against ideals postulated as ‘state of nature’, natural law, ideal polity and so on. Plato’s Republic and Hobbes Leviathan will always be remembered as treatise which searched for deeper general principles underlying the actual political activities.

Legal institutional bias: formal aspects of government such as constitution, the organs of government, the laws of election and so on have been the concern of traditional political thought. The institutional approach has legal orientation as emphasis is placed on laws, rules and regulations that determine the structure and processes of governmental institutions.

Thus, traditional approach with all its intrinsic feature has made tremendous contribution to the understanding of political problems. Even now political researchers adhere to traditional approach for understanding issues of government and politics which shows significance of traditional approach.

Modern Approaches

The modern approaches are fact based and lay emphasis on the factual study of political phenomenon to arrive at scientific and definite conclusions. The modern approaches include sociological approach, economic approach, psychological approach, quantitative approach, simulation approach, system approach, behavioural approach, Marxian approach etc.

Modern Approaches

Normative methods generally refer to the traditional methods of inquiry to the phenomena of politics and are not merely concerned with “what is” but “what ought to be” issues in politics. Its focus is on the analysis of institution as the basic unit of study. However with the advent of industrialisation and behavioural revolution in the field of political science, emphasis shifted from the study “what ought to” to “what is”. Today political scientists are more interested in analysing how people behave in matters related to the state and government.

A new movement was ushered in by a group of political scientists in America who were not satisfied with the traditional approach to the analysis of government and state as they felt that tremendous exploration had occurred in other social sciences like sociology, psychology anthropology etc. which when applied to the political issues could render new insights. They now collect data relating to actual political happenings. Statistical information coupled with the actual behaviours of men, individually and collectively, may help the political scientists in arriving at definite conclusions and predicting things correctly in political matters. The quantitative or statistical method, the systems approach or simulation approach in political science base their inquiry on scientific data and as such are known as modern or empirical method.

Behavioural Approach

Until the middle of the 20th century, political science was primarily concerned with qualitative questions which had a philosophical, legalistic and descriptive orientation. The discipline was in fact transformed by the behavioural revolution in the 1950s which laid stress on scientific and empirical approach to the understanding of political phenomena. The revolution got an impetus with the establishment of the journal *Experimental Study of Politics* in 1970s. The central focus of behavioralism is its emphasis on the study of political behaviour which refers to acts, attitudes, preferences and expectations of man in political context. In the words of Barrow, “behavioralism’s main methodological claim was that uniformities in political behaviour could be discovered and expressed as generalizations but such generalizations must be testable by reference to observable political behaviours such as voting, public opinion or decision making”.

The main characteristics of behavioural revolution has been summed up as following –

- It rejects political institutions as the basic unit for research and identifies the behaviour of individuals in political situations as the basic unit of analysis
- Identifies social sciences as behavioural sciences and emphasises the unity of political science with the other social sciences
- Advocates the utilization and development of more precise techniques of observing, classifying and measuring data and urges the use of statistical or quantitative formulation wherever possible
- Defines the construction of systematic, empirical theory as the goal of political sciences.

The intellectual foundations of behavioralism have been summed up by David Easton as regularities, verification, technique, quantification, values, systematisation, pure science and integration. Behaviouralism has been criticised on a number of grounds some which may be summed up as

- The movement has been criticized for its dependence on techniques and methods ignoring the subject matter.
- The advocates of this approach were wrong when they said that human beings behave in similar ways in similar circumstances.
- Besides, it is a difficult task to study human behaviour and to get a definite result.
- Most of the political phenomena are unquantifiable. Therefore it is always difficult to use scientific method in the study of Political Science.
- Moreover, the researcher being a human being is not always value neutral as believed by the behaviouralists. Behaviouralism is not to be looked as a complete dissociation with the traditional thinking. In fact it is a protest against and an extension and enrichment of the traditionalist stance in political science. The goals of behavioural research have been set as understanding, describing, analysing and if possible predicting political phenomena.

Post- Behaviouralism

David Easton coined the term Post-Behaviouralism in his Presidential Address at the 65th Annual Meeting of the American Political Science Association in 1969. In fact Easton was one of the key figures of behavioural revolution. Post-behavioralism claimed that despite the fact that behaviouralism claimed to be value free there was a tendency in it towards social preservation and status-quo rather than social change. Therefore the new movement led stress on action and relevance. Three key tenets of the post behavioural movement were:

- It challenged the view of behaviouralists that research has to be value neutral and stressed that values should not be totally neglected. Unlike natural sciences generalizations can't be made in the field of social sciences because study of men in the social context was a complicated affair.
- Post behaviouralism claimed that behaviouralists stress on observable and measurable phenomena meant that too much emphasis was being placed on easily studied trivial issues at the expense of more important topics. Easton himself declared that he felt dissatisfied with the research made under the impact of behaviouralist movement as it looked more of Mathematics than Political Science which had lost touch with the reality and the contemporary world.
- Post behaviouralism stressed that research should have relevance to the society and that intellectuals have a positive role to play. The new movement believed that the use of scientific tools in political science could be beneficial only when it is able to solve the various

problems confronting society. It criticised behaviouralism for ignoring the realities of society while laying too much emphasis on techniques.

However it needs to be stressed that post-behaviouralism was a continuation of the behavioural movement as it recognised the contributions of behaviouralism in the realm of political science. By making use of different techniques and methods post-behaviouralism try to overcome the drawbacks of behaviouralism and make the study of political science more relevant to the society.

Structural-Functional Approach

The structural-functional theory postulates that political systems are comprised of various structures that are relatively uniform in the sense that they are found in most political systems throughout the world. The theory asserts that each of these structures has a particular function that supports the establishment of an orderly, stable system of governance within which individuals and other societal structures fulfil roles of their own. Typical political structures include: legislative bodies, courts, bureaucratic organizations, executive bodies, and political parties.

Structural functionalism became popular around 1960 when it became clear that ways of studying U.S. and European politics were not useful in studying newly independent countries, and that a new approach was needed. Structural functionalists try to do find out the function a given structure (guerrilla movement, political party, election, etc.) does within a political system (of country x)? Almond claimed that certain political functions existed in all political systems. On the input side he listed these functions as: political socialization, political interest articulation, political interest aggregation, and political communication. The output functions included rulemaking, rule implementation, and rule adjudication. Other basic functions of all political systems included the conversion process, basic pattern maintenance, and various capabilities (distributive, symbolic, etc.). Structural functionalists argued that all political systems, including Third World systems, could most fruitfully be studied and compared on the basis of how differing structures performed these functions in the various political systems.

In nutshell, it can be argued that political theory is a never ending dialogue. Speculation on politics will continue because it relates to the life and values by which men live and die. The goal of theory is to enhance our understanding of the social reality and create conditions for good life. In this context, both classical and empirical theories need to be synthesized. Political theory cannot be based purely either on philosophy or science. All issues raised by philosophy must be examined within modes of inquiry at empirical level. Conversely, the normative issues raised by political science cannot be evaded. For example, the meaning of justice, equality or freedom cannot be explained by science. Similarly, the problems of our times

- whether they are racial and ethnic tensions and bigotry, overpopulation, unemployment, decaying cities, corruption, conflicts between the nations

- are such that we need every available brain to work for their solution. While the political scientists produce more comprehensive explanation of how and why things happen in the world of politics, the task of political philosopher is to relate this knowledge with the big problems of mankind and to inquire into how these can help in enhancing liberty, equality, justice and fraternity in the society and among the peoples so as to create conditions for good life.

1.3 DECLINE AND RESURGENCE: DEBATE IN POLITICAL THEORY

In 1939, George H. Sabine in his article, “What is Political Theory” announced political theory as a “subject of perennial concern”. The Post Second World War era witnessed professional maturation of 'Political Science' as a discipline. The high point in the enthusiasm for a ‘science of politics’ came in the 1950s and 1960s in the United States and in the form of behaviouralism emphasis was given on the studies of only the observable and measurable behaviour of human being. Despite the prominence that political theory had acquired through the ages seemed to be coming to an end. Although political theory was flourishing in the 1950s and 1960s, yet it was declared dead or in terminal decline during this period. Most of the political scientists of the 1950s and 1960s did not provide the modern age with a coherent conception of its needs and prescribe how we should live. They considered political theory primarily as a contemplative, reflective and explanatory enquiry concerned to understand rather than to prescribe. Since their writings did not confirm to their critics' narrow standards of what constituted true political philosophy, the latter predictably pronounced the discipline dead. Scholars such as David Easton, Alfred Cobban and Dante Germino declared political theory to be declining. Other two scholars Peter Laslett and Robert A. Dahl declared political theory as already dead. While Reimer saw it to be in the doghouse. The main thrust of their argument was that they associated political theory with political philosophy as Easton points out theory “lives parasitically on ideas a century old and what is more discouraging, we see little prospect of the development of new political synthesis. Its genesis had been synthesized in the background of a school called logical positivism known as Vienna Circle.

The Vienna Circle laid stress on experience as a mode of knowledge construction. However, there is a lack of unanimity among the scholars regarding the causes of the decline of political theory. According to Sonu Trivedi, a variety of reasons such as ignorance of the range of writings, behaviouralist triumphalism, and thinkers’ philosophically engagement with history of ideas were attributed for the decline of political theory. Views of different scholars regarding the decline of political theory have been discussed as following:-

DECLINE OF POLITICAL THEORY: VARIOUS VIEWS

DAVID EASTON’S VIEWS:

David Easton in his article “The Decline of Modern Political Theory” had identified the following reasons for the decline of political theory:

Historicism:

David Easton considered contemporary political scientists for the decline of political theory. According to Easton, they had been too busy analyzing political thoughts of the earlier centuries and tracing the political philosophy of individual political thinkers to the peculiar circumstances that existed in their times. This kind of historical analysis has played a major part in destroying the species of mental activity that has prevailed in literate civilizations and which emerges out of universal human needs. Hence, according to Easton historicism may be regarded as the major cause for the decline of political theory. Easton argued that writers like George H. Sabine, C.L. Wayper, A.J. Carlyle, R.W. Carlyle, William Dunning, McIlwain, Allen, and Lindsay have taken the subject very close to the discipline of history. A deep study of their works reveals that they have been motivated less by an interest in analyzing and formulating new value theory than in retailing information about the meaning, internal consistency, and historical development of contemporary and past political values. Easton was not satisfied with the contributions of those who subscribe to the way of historical analysis. They did not use the history of values as a device to stimulate their own thoughts on a possible creative redefinition of political goals. They used the history merely to understand the factual condition which gave rise to particular ideology of system or values.

It was this historical approach which managed to crush life out of the value theory.

Moral Relativism:

Growth of the relativistic attitude towards values or moral relativism was also responsible for the decline of political theory. David Easton accused David Hume and Max Weber of having relativistic attitude towards 'values'. They neglected what consequences they have for the 'facts.' A political scientist who is sensitive towards social problems, construct values and not transplant them. Such a decline of interest in creative values and the consequent growth of moral relativism could be traced to the circumstances prevailing in Europe in 19th and early 20th centuries. Till the Russian revolution of 1917, capitalism, and democracy were the accepted and cherished values of the western European politics. Like the Russian Revolution which challenged the existing values, the rise of Fascism and Nazism also conflicted with the prevailing values. A deep conflict thus began between the existing values and the emerging new values and the conflict evoked a deep response from the political theorists. However, even in such a critical state of things, the political theorists failed to subject the old values to critical analysis and imaginative reconstruction. Easton stressed on the reviving critical theory which once again shall act as a bridge between the needs of society and the knowledge of social sciences. In Easton's view, it is not only the neglect of values theory but also the indifference of casual systematic or the empirically- oriented theory about political behaviour which has led to the decline of political theory.

Confusion between Science and Theory:

David Easton accused that the use of both science and theory in a wrong way by the political scientists was also responsible for the decline of political theory. They confused science with theory and forgot that theory goes beyond science. It is one thing to apply the scientific method to research problem and quite another to evolve a theory of the research done. Any

attempt to accumulate facts and to use them to evolve alternative mechanism process is not likely to lead by itself to the constitution of a scientific theory unless one identifies the major variables of political life and establish their relationship with each other.

The traditionalists and the behaviouralists have both been engaged for too long in the controversy whether what ought to be is more important than what is or vice versa and whether insight alone is necessary for a proper understanding of politics or observation of the concrete political phenomena. The behaviouralists have unanimously advocated the importance of what is, but they have hardly cared to find out why or how it is so. It is here, that the role of theory comes in.

Hyper-factualism: -

Easton stresses that hyper-factualism is another cause for the decline of political theory. Bryce is generally charged with overstressing hyperfactualism. But in his earlier work he had not neglected theory. He had advocated that the study of facts was meant to “lead up to the establishment of conclusions and the mastery of principles and unless it does this, it has no scientific values”. But as he proceeds with his later work, and tried to reformulate theory to give it an empirical orientation, theory became subordinate to the accumulation of facts. There came a time when it was almost lost from sight. Easton accepted the need of fact in theory in order to make a scientific theory, but it is hyper-factualism which becomes a malady.

ALFRED COBBAN’S VIEWS

Alfred Cobban observed the following external and internal factors that led to the decline of political theory:-

• External Factors:

Like David Easton, Alfred Cobban also argued that political theory was on the decline. He said that there has been an intellectual tradition, extending over some 2500 years of constant interaction between ideas and institutions. But no such synthesis has appeared since the end of the eighteenth century. In past also, political thought had ceased to exist during the hey-day of the Roman Empire. Cobban is apprehensive that the conditions of the contemporary world are reminiscent of the imperial Roman society and there is a great danger that the springs of meaningful and original political thought might get dried up in the desert of modern civilization.

Cobban observed that the creation of a huge military complex, the size of a giant bureaucratic machine and irresistible increase in state intervention were inhibiting political thinking in the contemporary period. He argued that the totalitarian control exercised by the party elite was hostile to the growth of political theory in the communist countries. According to him the communist regimes are as repressive as any military machine and suppressed political dissent with an iron hand. Cobban thought that the situation in the western countries is not also qualitatively different. The dominant political idea in these countries is that of democracy but there are very few political theorists of democracy today. Political thinkers of 19th and 20th

century did not make any serious efforts to develop the theory of democracy to suit the new requirements.

• **Internal Condition of the Discipline:**

Cobban feels that the internal condition in the discipline of Political Science is also partly responsible in the quality of political thought. He attributes the decline in political theory to absence of ethical purpose among the contemporary practitioners of the discipline. Classical political philosophers like Hobbes, Spinoza, Locke, Rousseau, Burke, Bentham, Mills, and Marx wrote with a clear objective in their mind and subscribed to certain ethical values. Cobban asserts that political theory from Plato to Marx was a branch of ethics and suggests that the decline of contemporary political theory is due to its historical and scientific approach which emphasizes the concept of a value free objectivist and empirical political science. Further, the existing exponents of the scientific methods in political science have insisted that the methods of natural science could be applied in absolute terms to the study of political phenomena as well. They forget that political theory has to cope with questions which the empirical methods of the physical sciences, with all its emphasis on exactness and verifiability, are unable to answer. A political scientist should be morally involved if he wants to contribute effectively to a discourse on politics. Political philosophy is dead and Cobban feels that empiricist and positivists have contributed a great deal to its extinction.

DANTE GERMINO'S VIEWS:

Dante Germino in his book *Beyond Ideology: The Revival of Political Theory* discovered 'ideological reductionism' as the cause of decline of political theory. Germino opined that political theory was on the decline during greater part of the 19th and 20th century. He attributed this decline to positivism in earlier period and to ideology or the prevalence of political ideologies, culminating in Marxism in the later period. However, he believes that political theory is now again in ascendancy. According to him, traditional political theory is undergoing a noteworthy resurgence in the recent times. Its eclipse during the last 150 years was due to inimical intellectual forces and political movements of the time on the one hand, and the craze for science on the other. He believes that even during the heydays of positivism, philosophical currents of resistance were evident in the writings of Benedetto Croce, Henri Bergson, Julien Bevda, Max Scheler and others. This was followed by the partial survival of political theory in the elitist school of which Guido Dorso was the chief proponent. Above all, a full-fledged revival of political theory was taking place in Michael Oakeshott, Hannah Arendt, Bertrand and de Journal, Leo Strauss and Eric Vogelín.

RESURGENCE OF POLITICAL THEORY

In 1950s and 1960s the political theory is in a state of decline. The reason for this was the influence of historical approach, logical positivism, Marxism, hyper-factualism, growth of constitutional law, empirical political Sociology, on the minds of political thinkers. Nevertheless, Isaiah Berlin says that political theory is neither dead nor in the state of decline. Berlin challenges that there can never be any one kind of society and if even such a society exist the society's goals would always carry different and incomplete meanings to different

persons in different situations. Thus he says that there cannot be an age without political philosophy. Berlin argued that as long as rational curiosity existed political theory would not die nor disappear.

George H. Sabine also opined that “if political theory is systematic, disciplined investigation of political problems, then it is difficult to say that political theory was dead in 1950s and 1960s.” According to him, political theory was alive in the works of Arendt, Oakeshott, Leo Strauss, John Rawls, Robert Nozick, Herbert Marcuse and Eric Vogelín, etc.

Hannah Arendt rejected the idea of hidden and anonymous forces in history. Like other leading scholars in the revival of political theory, Arendt also pointed to the essential incompatibility between ideology and political theory. She was aware of the loss of human experience in the modern world and desired a need to recover a sense of dignity and responsible freedom in human action, seeing it as a basis for the revival of political theory. Oakeshott also stressed that philosophy served truth which was not determined by its historical setting. He wrote two books named *Introduction to Leviathan* (1946) and *On Rationalism* (1962). American scholar John Rawls also authored two books “Justice Directorate of Distance Education, University of Jammu, M.A. Political Science, Semester II, Political Theory 35 as Fairness” (1957) and “A Theory of Justice”(1971). These were the important works on the revival of political theory. Hannah Arendt also has written a book “On human Conditions”(1958). This book is considered more important than “Theory of Justice” by John Rawls. Karl Popper wrote a book “Open Society and Its Enemies”. In this book Popper characterizes democracy as welfare society, enlightened society and made other modifications in it. He criticized communism and called Plato, Hegel and Marx as enemies of open society. Berlin has also written three books “Two Concepts of Liberty” (1958), “Does Political Theory Still Exist”(1962) and “Concepts and Categories”(1978). He accepted that the absence of commanding work and critical dimension that led to the declaration that political Theory was dead or dying. Further, in 1974, Robert Nozick wrote “Anarchy, State and Utopia” and rejuvenated political theory. This rejuvenation has been a return to the true tradition of the classics in which normative analysis uses empirical findings. Since 1970s similar approaches are being made by theorists in analysis and democracy. Since then political theory including critical political theory has been alive and has been using scientific politics to achieve progress. Thus political theory has not been killed by empirical analysis but has helped to progress better.

The following new themes have surfaced during the resurgence of political theory:-

- **Communitarians:** Theorists such as Michael Walzer, Michael Sandel, Alistair MacIntyre and Charles Taylor belong to this school. They reject the liberal conception of individuated self and hold that self is part of social relations in which he/she is embedded.
- **Post-Modernism:** It got genesis in the writings of Jacques Derrida, Michel Foucault, Jean-Francois Lyotard. These scholars attacked the universalistic foundations of political theory and stress on decentered, fragmented nature of human experience. Identity and culture are the prominent aspects on which postmodernists have emphasized.

- **Multiculturalism:** Scholars like Will Kymlicka, I.M. Young and Bhikhu Parekh have laid stress on the attribute of culture as context of experience and human well-being. They blame the contemporary political theory of being culture biased and neglecting the concerns of different cultural groups. As such they have favoured-a regime of group differentiated right to address discrimination meted out to cultural identities as well as the ambit of democracy. Will Kymlicka's "Multicultural Citizenship" and Bhikhu Parekh's "Rethinking Multiculturalism" are important works on multiculturalism.
- **Feminism:** The theorists of this school have attacked the alleged neutrality of public sphere. Instead, they locate structures of power that symbolize power of men over women. It neglects the aspect of gender and results in subjugation of women.
- **Environmentalism:** The theorists of this school have attacked the notion of progress that has led to depletion of flora and fauna over the years. Instead they place ecological components at the centre of political theory and emphasize its importance over other animate objects.

Thus, in brief, it can be argued that in 1950s and 1960s, factors such as historicism, hyper-factualism, moral relativism and ideological reductionism led to the decline of political theory. However, in 1970s onwards, works of scholars like Machel Oakeshott, Robert Nozick, Eric Vogelin, Hannah Arendt, John Rawls, F.W. Hayek, Isaiah Berlin, Bhikhu Parekh and Karl Popper revived the political theory.

LEO STRAUSS AND POLITICAL PHILOSOPHY

Leo Strauss, Professor of Political Science at the University of Chicago, whose death in October 1973 was a great loss to political philosophy, is one of the most outstanding contemporary theorists and staunch critic of the behaviouralist approach. His impact on American philosophy and political science has been very great. In Chicago, there are a large number of political scientists who regard it as their privilege to be considered his disciples. In a way, he is the founder of a school of thought which believes in taking the study of political philosophers in particular, very seriously. His approach is objective and scientific. He takes interest in ancient political thought because he is deeply aware of the crisis of the modern civilization, and hopes that the crisis of our time may enable us to understand ancient political thought in "an untraditional or fresh manner". Strauss also criticizes the view that all political theory is ideological in character, reflecting a given socio-economic interest. A political thinker who is not a philosopher may be interested in a specific order or policy but "the political philosopher is primarily interested in, or attached to, the truth". With characteristic modesty, Strauss calls himself as principally a historian whose chief objective is to present the political thought of the great philosophers as they "intended it to be understood". His primary work in the field of political science lies in the study and reinterpretation of the political teachings of masters of political thought – Plato, Aristotle, Thucydides, Machiavelli, Hobbes and Locke – but he has done it in the faith that his was necessary preliminary effort before the actual rebirth of political theory could take place. The classical political theory, in his view, can place a model of what a political theory ought to be

before the political theorists of today. Leo Strauss is one of the important philosophers who seriously criticized raw empiricism of Behaviouralists. He did not accept the appropriation of political science by the empiricists and the operationally minded such as Dahl. Strauss defended the “old political science” against the new political science.

The new political science studied the “sub-political” in an effort to find what was “susceptible of being analyzed.” The concern with the observable “sub-political” came at the expense, however, of “genuine wholes” such as the common good. Thus, the new practitioners dominating the discipline, for instance, had chosen to replace the public interest with the interest group.

Instead of understanding human activities in terms of political activities, which Strauss would regard as the highest, most distinctively human type of activity, the political science deals with the political as a function of the sub-political. While claiming itself as value neutral, the behavioural political science, Strauss believes, is committed to an implicit value judgement in favour of society grounded on “permissive egalitarianism” and promotes a creed which can be called “democratism”. It “puts a premium on observations which can be made with the utmost frequency and, therefore, by people of the meanest capacity. Thus, it frequently culminates in observations made by people who are not intelligent about people who are not intelligent”.

Strauss argues that just as modern philosophy begins with an over-inflated sense of reason that privileges theory over practice and ends with a radical historicism that denies any meaning to reason outside of history, so too, modern political philosophy begins with the attempt to make the human being part of nature as defined by science and ends by denying any notion of nature all together. Strauss makes a clear distinction between political theory and political philosophy and believes that they are both part of political thought. Political theory according to Strauss, is “the attempt truly to know the nature of political things”. Philosophy is the “quest for wisdom” or “quest for universal knowledge, for knowledge of the whole”. Political thought extends to both political theory and political philosophy. Strauss believes that values are an indispensable part of political philosophy, and cannot be excluded from the study of politics. All political action aims at either preservation or change, and is guided by some thought or evaluation of what is better and what is worse.

A political scientist is expected to possess more than opinion. He must possess knowledge, knowledge of the good – of the good life or the good society. If there is a distinctive politics in Strauss’s writings, it concerns almost exclusively what could be called the politics of philosophy. Political philosophy meant for him not merely the philosophical treatment of politics, but the political treatment of philosophy. Strauss once declared his writings to be a contribution to the study of the “sociology of philosophy,” by which he meant the study of philosophers as a class. What distinguishes all philosophers as a class from all non-philosophers is an intransigent desire to know, to know things from their roots or by their first principles.

It is precisely because philosophy is radical that politics must be moderate. Accordingly, Strauss saw a permanent and virtually intractable conflict between the needs of society and the requirements of philosophy. Philosophy understood as the search for knowledge is based on the desire to replace opinion about all things with knowledge of all things. This desire to replace opinion with knowledge would always put philosophy at odds with the inherited customs, beliefs, and dogmas that shape and sustain social life. The politics of philosophy consists of the philosopher's twin needs to show a respect—a decent respect—for the opinions and beliefs that sustain the collective life of society and at the same time to address and recruit new members into the ranks of the potential philosophers. Strauss does not reject modern science, but he does object to the philosophical conclusion that “scientific knowledge is the highest form of knowledge” because this “implies a depreciation of pre-scientific knowledge.” Strauss reads the history of modern philosophy as beginning with the elevation of all knowledge to science, or theory, and as concluding with the devaluation of all knowledge to history, or practice. In Strauss's words: “the root of all modern darkness from the seventeenth century on is the obscuring of the difference between theory and praxis, an obscuring that first leads to a reduction of praxis to theory (this is the meaning of so-called [modern] rationalism) and then, in retaliation, to the rejection of theory in the name of praxis that is no longer intelligible as praxis”. Strauss is highly critical of the artificial distinction which is now made between political science and political philosophy.

“Originally”, he writes, “political philosophy was identical with political science and it was the all-embracing study of human affairs. To-day, we find it cut into pieces which behave as if they were parts of a worm”. The distinction between philosophy and science cannot be applied to the study of human affairs. There cannot be a non-philosophical political science or a non-scientific political philosophy. By emphasizing the historical aspects of political science too much, the historicists have divorced it from its scientific character and, by stressing the scientific character out of all proportion, those who advocate the scientific aspect of political science have tried to take away the very essence from it. At the heart of Strauss' life's work was an examination of the profound tension in the Western tradition between reason, or the philosophical life, and revelation, or the religious life.

While classical political philosophy and the Bible agree in significant measure about the content of morality and the mix of moral virtues, they differed, he argued, about whether the moral life culminated in devotion to the free exercise of human reason or in loving obedience to the one God. Restoring an appreciation of this tension and living the tension, Strauss contended, was crucial to the continued vitality of the West. By respecting the competing truths contained in the two principal roots of Western civilization, Strauss exhibited decidedly more of the true liberal spirit than those who denounce him in the name of liberalism. Strauss also provided powerful support for constitutional democracy through his unorthodox, spirited, and multi-layered readings of Greek political philosophy. The classics, he showed, furnished weighty arguments for limited government, representation of the people's interests in a regime that constrained popular will, and the indispensable role of education in the formation of responsible citizens. The liberal education once built around the Great Books that Strauss championed and practiced also nourished the liberal spirit. It

involved not the inculcation of a doctrine but the cultivation of an understanding of the material and moral preconditions of freedom, and of the political moderation that secures them. Indeed, study of the invigorating debate among the best minds across the centuries about what justice requires and what nobility demands itself provides a powerful lesson of moderation.

During the 1950s and 1960s, there was strong perception among the significant section of the Political Scientists that political theory is on the verge of extinction. Some of the scholars like Alfred Cobban has alleged that political theory is in decline. Cobban's writings obviously captured the mood of a sizeable body of political scientists, who infact declared the death of political theory. But this perception is seriously in error and that its continued acceptance only obscures the fact that an extensive and significant effort is being made at the present time to restore political theory as a tradition of inquiry. In reality, what Cobban has described as a decline in political theory is actually a crisis in positivist political science. He has chronicled the inevitable demise of political theory within the positivist universe of discourse, where the “fact-value” dichotomy reigns as dogma. The Cobban position fails to recognize that political theory is an experiential science of right order in human society and that theory can never be redeemed or intellectually legitimized by indulgence in subjective “value” speculation.

Only by virtue of the recovery of a sound ontology and an adequate epistemology will political theory be able to flourish as it once did; this will require an abandonment of the physicalist interpretation of experience that has for decades been dominant in political science. Such a major philosophical reconstruction is now under way in Political Science discipline and already has produced sufficiently significant results to warrant the judgment that we may now be entering a period that will witness the renaissance of political theory in the grand manner. Leo Strauss with his philosophical approach is one of the scholars who contributed to the revival of political philosophy/theory.

CHECK YOUR PROGRESS

1. What is Political Theory?
2. What are the major approaches of Political Theory?
3. What do you mean by Decline and Resurgence of Political Theory.

CHAPTER 2

STATE

LEARNING OUTCOME: After going through this lesson, students will be able to -

- **Know the meaning and definition of the state**
- **Understand different theories regarding the origin of the state**
- **Comprehend Globalisation and its impacts on the state**

2.1 STATE: CONCEPT, ELEMENT AND ORIGIN

The concept of the State has figured as the central theme of traditional political theory. R.G. Gettel defined political science as 'the science of the state', while J.W. Garner claimed that 'political science begins and ends with state'. In modern political theory, the significance of the concept of the state has been fluctuating. It is significant that though some sort of political organizations have existed since ancient times, such as, Greek City States and the Roman Empire, yet the concept of the 'state' as such is comparatively modern. Machiavelli expressed his idea as, "the power which has authority over man". This was an important idea because it describes the nature of the State, not the end of the State. According to Weber, a famous German sociologist, "A State is a human community that successfully claims the monopoly of the legitimate use of physical force within a given territory".'

The Greeks used the term polis or city to express their concept of the state. Their state was in fact a city-state and the term was true enough, but the development of the country-state, as Sidgwick calls it, demands a more comprehensive term. The Romans used civitas, but they spoke also of status reipublica and res publica which carried with it the idea of public welfare. The modern term "State" was probably derived from 'status' through the adoption of the term by Teutonic peoples. Machiavelli in *Il Principe* (1523) is credited with introducing the term into modern political science, and during the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries the term found its way in different forms into the languages of modern Europe.

Similarly, R.M. MacIver and C.H. Page have pointed out: 'The state is distinguished from all other associations by its exclusive investment with the final power of coercion'. R.M. MacIver points out that it embraces the whole of people in a specific territory and it has the special function of maintaining social order. Frederick M. Watkins defines the state as 'a geographically delimited segment of human society united by common obedience to a single sovereign'. Geoffrey K. Roberts define the state as - a territorial area in which a population is governed by a set of political authorities, and which successfully claims the compliance of the citizenry for its laws, and is able to secure such compliance by its monopolistic control of legitimate force'.

Men who live together in small groups under fairly primitive conditions of life may manage without any institution that it is appropriate to call a "State"; but as soon as human societies get beyond this stage "the State"; but as soon as human societies get beyond this stage "the State" emerges as an apparently necessary instrument for holding them together. There were "City States" in Ancient Greece and Medieval Italy and Germany: the Ancient Empires of Egypt, Persia and Babylon were based on "States" as much as the British empire is today. There have been "States" at every stage of civilization except the most rudimentary.'

Etymologically the term is an abstract one which has reference to that which is fixed or established. Thus one speaks of the "state" of a man's health, of his mind, or of his economic condition. The etymological connotation does not therefore correspond to the meaning of the word as a term of political science. Unfortunately, like many other words of common usage in the literature of political science and law, it is used in various senses. Thus it is often employed as a synonym of nation, society, country, government etc. It is very commonly employed also to express the idea of the collective action of the society, through the agency of the government. For example, when one talks about "state management", "state regulation", "state aid", etc. one actually uses the word state for government. Again, in some countries having the federal system of the government, such as the United States (and the German Empire of 1871-1918), the term is used to designate both the federation as a whole and the component members constituting it. It is regrettable that neither the English, nor the German, nor the French language contains a suitable term by which the component members of federal unions may be appropriately designated. They are not, strictly speaking, "states" nor yet are they mere provinces or administrative districts, at least not in the American, Canadian, or Australian federal unions.

Likewise, the use of the terms "state" and "government" as if the two things were identical, has produced equal confusion and often misunderstanding. In fact they represent widely different concepts and upon the recognition of the distinction between them depends the true understanding of some of the most fundamental questions of political science. The state is the politically organized "person" or entity for the promotion of common ends and the satisfaction of common needs while the government is the collective name for the agency, magistracy, or organization through which the will of the state is formulated, expressed, and realized. The government is an essential organ or agency of the state, but it is no more the state itself than the board of directors of a corporation is itself the corporation.

As used in political science, the word state means a community or society politically organized under one independent government within a definite territory[^] and subject to no outside control. There can be no community without the people to form one, and no common life without some definite piece of territory to live in. When people live a collective life, they fulfil the meaning of Aristotle's famous phrase, "Man is a social animal", and when they live a settled life on a definite territory to realize the purpose of collective living, they fulfil the meaning of Aristotle's second famous phrase, "Man is a political animal". The people are bound by rules of common behaviour and their violation is accompanied by punishment. That is the state. Society meets man's companionship, the state solves the problem created by such companionship. Therefore, the state is some form of association with some special

characteristics, particularly that of its territorial connection and of its use offeree. It is charged with the duty to maintain those conditions of life for which the state came into existence and for which it continues to exist.

Therefore, the state is a natural, a necessary, and an universal institution. It is natural because it is rooted in the reality of human nature. It is necessary because, according to Aristotle, "The state comes into existence originating in the bare needs of life and continuing in existence for the sake of good life". Man needs the state to satisfy his diverse needs and to be what he desires to be. Without the state he cannot rise to the full stature of his personality. In fact, in the absence of such a controlling and regulating authority, society can not be held together and there will be disorder and anarchy. What food means to the human body the state means to man. Both are indispensable for his existence and development. The state has existed whenever and wherever man has lived in an organized society."

DEFINITIONS

Despite the differences of opinion about the meaning and definition of the state which fairly represents some common aspects about the state. As preliminary definition of the state, we may therefore say that wherever there can be discovered in any community of men a supreme authority exercising a control over the social actions of individuals and groups of individuals, and itself subject to no such regulation, there we have a state. The definition given by Holland is that : "A state is a numerous assemblage of human beings generally occupying a certain territory amongst whom the will of the majority, or of an ascertainable class of persons, is by the strength of such a majority or class, made to prevail against any of their who oppose it".

Ihering defines the state as "the form of a regulated and assured exercise of the compulsory force of society". According to Lasson, "the state is a community of men which possesses an organized authority as the highest source of all force". John W. Burgess defines the state as a "particular portion of mankind viewed as an organized unit". Hall viewing the state primarily as a concept of international law, says, "The marks of an independent state are that the community constituting it is permanently established for a political end, that it possesses a defined territory, and that it is independent of external control". Bluntschli says, "The state is the politically organized people of a definite territory". Esmein, regarding it from the point of view of the jurist, defines the state as "the juridical personification of a nation". Carre de Malberg defines the state concretely as "a community of men fixed on a territory which is their own and possessing an organization from which results, for the group envisaged in its relations with its members, a superior power of action, of command, and of coercion." White defined the state as a "political community of free citizens occupying a territory of defined boundaries, and organized under a government sanctioned and limited by a written constitution and established by the consent of the governed". Phillimore, an authority on international law, considered the state to be, for his purposes "a people permanently occupying a fixed territory, bound together by common laws, habits and customs into one body politic, exercising through the medium of an organized government independent

sovereignty and control over all persons and things within its boundaries, capable of making war and peace and entering into all international relations with the communities of the globe".

Garner adds another definition of the state in the following terms: "The state as a concept of political science and public law, is a community of persons more or less numerous, permanently occupying a definite portion of territory, independent or nearly so, of external control, and possessing an organized government to which the great body of inhabitants render habitual obedience". W. W. Willoughby considers it to be "a group of human individuals viewed as an organized corporate community over which exists a ruling authority which is recognized as the source of commands legally and, in general, ethically, binding upon the individuals composing the community". According to Woodrow Wilson "it is the people organized for law within a definite territory".

MacIver defines state as "an association which, acting through law as promulgated by a government endowed to this end with coercive power maintains within a community territorially demarcated the universal external conditions of social order". According to Gilchrist, "the state is a concept of political science and a moral reality which exists where a number of people living on a definite territory, are unified under a government, which in internal matters is the organ for expressing their sovereignty and in external matters is independent of other Governments".

It may be summed up as "a state is a political association with effective dominion over a geographic area. It usually includes the set of institutions that claim the authority to make the rules that govern the people of the society in that territory, though its status as a state often in part on being recognized by a number of other states as having internal and external sovereignty over it. In sociology and political science, the state is normally identified with these institutions: in Max Weber's influential definition, it is that organization that has a "monopoly on the legitimate use of physical force within a given territory", which may include the armed forces, civil service or state bureaucracy, courts and police.

THEORIES OF THE ORIGIN OF THE STATE:

The Theory of Divine Origin:

This theory holds that the state was created directly and deliberately by God. Man has not been the major factor in its creation, although the state has been made for man.^{1^} It was His will that men should live in the world in a state of political society and He sent His deputy to rule over them. The ruler is a divinely appointed agent and he is responsible for his actions to God alone.

As the ruler is the deputy of God, obedience to him is held to be a religious duty and resistance a sin. The advocates of the Divine Origin theory place the ruler above the people as well law. Nothing on earth can limit his will and restrict his power. His word is law and his actions are always just and benevolent. The theory that the state and its authority has a divine origin and sanction finds unequivocal support in the scriptures of almost all religions in the world. In the Mahabharata, it is recounted that the people approached God and requested him

to grant them a ruler who should save them from the anarchy and chaos prevailing in the state of nature. In the Bible it is stated: Let every soul be subject unto the higher powers. For there is no power but of God; the powers that be are ordained of God". Thus, God is the source of royal powers. The ruler is the agent of God on earth.

The Force Theory:

There is an old saying that 'war begat the king', and true to this maxim, the theory of force emphasizes the origin of the state in the subordination of the weak to the strong. The advocates of the theory argue that man, apart from being a social animal, is quarrelsome by nature. There is also lust for power in him. Both these desires prompt him to exhibit his strength. Craving for power and desire for self assertion are, according to the exponents of this theory, the two primary instincts of man. In his behaviour and actions man is governed by these twin forces.

The physically strong man attacked, captured and enslaved the weak. The successful man began to exercise his sway over a sizeable section and this led to the emergence of clans and tribes. Jenks, an exponent of this theory, says, "Historically speaking, there is not the slightest difficulty in proving that all political communities of the modern type owe their existence to successful warfare.

Once the state came into existence, it was necessary to use force to hold down the power-impulses of men inside and of other states outside. The continued existence of the state, according to the advocates of this theory, demands permanent employment of force for maintaining internal order and external security. Hence force is the basis of the state. Bosanquet says, "The state is Necessarily force".

The Social Contract Theory:

Whereas the theory of divine origin of the state postulates the deliberate creation of the state by God, the social contract theory holds that man deliberately created the state in the form of a social contract. Men got together and agreed upon a contract establishing the state. Hobbes, Locke and Rousseau are among those who discussed at length the social contract theory.

Thomas Hobbes, an English political thinker, in his attempt to justify the British Monarchy conceived of the state as originating in this manner. He described the period before states arose as a "state of nature" in which men lived like beasts in the jungle. In his word life in a state of nature was "solitary, poor, nasty, brutish and short". Such a life was too precarious. With man set against man, with might making right and the strong are the only effective law, some sort of government, Hobbes said was a necessity.

To make life bearable, man created government and ultimately the state. Men got together and contracted among themselves to vest in some sovereign, ruler or king the authority necessary to bring order out of the chaos in which they lived.

According to Hobbe's theory, the ruler to whom all authority was given was not a party to the contract. In a sense, the king was above the law. John Locke also wrote about the state of

nature, but in contrast to Hobbes he did not believe that men necessarily lived brutish lives in this natural condition. Yet there was enough uncertainty to make life difficult and enough injustice to make it tragic. Thus again according to Locke, men decided to contract with one another to guarantee their rights more effectively.

Rousseau likewise did not look upon the state of nature as bad. In his view, natural man, unencumbered with the trappings of civilization and the accoutrements of government, lived in idyllic life. Although, life in a state of nature might be theoretically superior, nevertheless it eventually became obvious to man that government was necessary. Men are not equal in energy or intelligence. Inevitably any natural state, without the restraining influences of government, will change capriciously with the ambitions of the various strong men. Ultimately, life in such a state of nature proved to be inconvenient and troublesome. Thus, like Hobbes and Locke, Rousseau presumes that a general contract evolving all men was made to establish government and the state for the advantage of all.

Sometimes the Mayflower compact (1620) is given as an example of a social contract. In the terms of the Mayflower compact the signers solemnly and mutually in the presence of God, and one of another, covenant and combining ourselves together into a civil body politic, for our better ordering and preservation and furtherance of the ends aforesaid; and by virtue hereof to enact, constitute and frame such just and equal laws, ordinances, acts, constitutions and offices, from time to time, as shall be thought most meet and convenient for the general good of the colonies, unto which we promise all due submission and obedience.

The Evolutionary Theory:

This theory considers the state neither as a divine institution nor as a deliberate human contrivance, it sees the state coming into existence as the result of natural evolution. 'The proposition that the state is a product of history', says J.W. Burgess, means that it is a gradual and continuous development of human society out of a grossly imperfect beginning through crude but improving forms of manifestation towards a perfect and universal organization of mankind.

In the early society, kinship was the first and strongest bond; and government, as W. Wilson points out, must have begun in clearly defined family discipline. Such discipline would scarcely be possible among races in which blood-relationship was subject to profound confusion and in which family organization, therefore, had, no clear basis of authority on which to rest. Common worship was another element in the welding together of families and tribes. This worship evolved from primitive animism to ancestor-worship. When ancestor-worship became the prevailing form of religion, religion was inseparably linked with kinship for, at the family or the communal altar, the worshipper did homage to the great dead of his family or group and craved protection and guidance.

War and migration were important influences in the origin of the state. The demands of constant warfare often led to the rise of permanent leadership. When a tribe was threatened by danger or involved in war, it was driven by necessity to appoint a leader. The continuity of war conduced to the permanence of leadership. Further, war and conquest helped to give the

mark of territoriality to the state. And, finally, political consciousness. As Wilson says, in origin government was spontaneous, natural, twin-born with man and the family; Aristotle was simply stating a fact when he said man is by nature a political animal! The need for order and security is an ever-present factor; man knows instinctively that he can develop the best of which he is capable only by some form of political organization.

States are of course today much bigger than they used to be, much stronger, certainly more complex. State also accepts more responsibilities and thus affect the individual more markedly than did their earlier counterparts.

2.2 DIFFERENT PERSPECTIVE OF STATE

Liberal Views of the State

The philosophy of the liberal state is the free individual who has not yet become a member of a society and the political community which developed into a state. Liberal philosophers believe that the state is an artificial body created by the free wills of individuals and therefore its most fundamental objective is to promote the interest of individuals in terms of individual rights.

The liberal state is an organization in which the state is regarded as a means to realize an end, but is not an end in itself. Therefore, the state cannot be absolute or unlimited in its powers. The power of state or sovereignty is subject to basic limitations.

The first and foremost limitation on the power of the state is the primary objective for which it is claimed to have been created by individuals. In the liberal theory, this objective is the promotion of security, life, liberty and property of the individuals. The liberal theory maintains that the state should confine itself to the minimal functions of enforcing law and order, defense from external aggression, and some limited regulatory powers in the socio-economic and cultural fields. In short, the essence of the liberal state was to hold together the *laissez-faire* and a democratic state."

When one defines the liberal state to be politically democratic, one should understand that it refers not only to the electoral process, but also to other important aspects. The first is the granting of individual rights: the right to freedom of expression and right to property. The second important principle associated with the liberal state is the rule of law. The rule of law implies that all citizens are equal before law, and that nobody, individual or institution, including the governmental ones, exercise state power except according to the existing law. In a liberal system without any written constitution such as the U.K., this means the law enacted by the parliament or bodies authorized to do so by the parliament, is supreme. In those liberal systems with written constitutions, such as in the U.S.A. or India, this means the rule of constitutional law. All laws must operate according to the provisions of the constitutions.

The earlier classical liberal theory defined the state as a minimal state, and excluded from its jurisdiction large areas of life, in the individual and the economic field. Towards the close of the 19th century and early part of the 20th century, liberalism was forced to revise this

position, and to accommodate extensive regulatory functions in the field of economic activities. This has led to what is known as the welfare state. The increasing democratization of the liberal state through the extension of adult franchise compelled the state to initiate policies of significant intervention in the economy. It also meant transferring resources from the more wealthy to the less wealthy through the means of taxation and state subsidy. Unlike the minimal state, which was the original form of the liberal state, the welfare state was called upon to make public welfare as one of its concerns.

The Marxist State:

The Marxian idea about the state is diametrically opposite to the classical Greek view. To the Greeks the state is a natural and necessary institution. It is natural as it is rooted in the primary instincts of man; it is necessary as it continues in existence for the good life. Contrarily, the Marxian view commonly known as the exploitation theory defines the state as an artificial construction based on force.

The state, in Marxian Theory, is a product of society at a certain stage of development. "The state" as Engels wrote "has not existed from all eternity. There have been societies that did without it, that had no conception of the state and state power. At a certain stage of economic development, which was necessarily bound up with the cleavage of society into classes, the state became a necessity owing to cleavage". The state, therefore, has no high moral purpose to serve. It is merely a deliberately created organization of the possessing class for its protection against the non possessing.

Mahatma Gandhi's Views on State

Gandhi's concept of state is regarded as a new notion. He described in his own attitude to develop the political thought. Liberalism, idealism, individualism and philosophical anarchism- all are included in his thought. In a conventional way, Gandhiji was not a political philosopher such as Plato and Aristotle. After focusing the real problematic area of human beings, he has been giving his thought that we can apply in our society. He applied the universal truth in every human beings. The notion of state has been widely explained in different way by Gandhiji.

The universal truth of Gandhi to describe the notion of state, it represents violence in concentrated and organized form. Gandhiji was one of the important scholars in Indian modern political era. His social and political thoughts played significant roles in Indian politics, Indian social reformation & Indian developmental process. He considered himself as a humanitarian. He was influenced by spiritual notion. He thought state will be harmful institution when state's power is growing. State can reduce the personality of human beings. According to him, man has soul, but state is a soulless machine. So state can apply the power of violence. State damages individual responsibility and personality. Natural human behavior is also damaged due to the increasing role of state. Due to the complex structure of State and its functions state can't develop human morality. Every individual has own thinking power, this institution damages individual's freedom.

According to Gandhi state is an interventionist to take the decision of Individual. Individual is more depended on state, because state is higher decision making body. Individual is dependent to state's functions. Thus individual is not capable to imagine his life without state. Mechanical functions are conducted by state in a systematic way, state can not tolerate individual's own view. State acts as ruler to govern the whole society as a soulless institution. State denies emotion and motivation of individual.

State can apply the power of threat to require the loyalty. Thus state is a well-organized form of violence. The existence of state depends on violence. State not only applies physical force but also wants a repression in terms of socio-economic sphere of society. Gandhi's whole philosophy is the struggle of non-violence and to focus on how every individual enjoys their rights and dignity. So he was unable to support the state.

State is abstract institution. It has the direct involvement to use the force. State can use the violence through the implementation of law, rules and regulations. State does not use of force continuously. State can apply the force, as any person does not claim directly. According to Gandhiji the formation of state is to implement force. Gandhiji had opposed the power of state-sovereignty. He believed that well organized form is power.

State can apply violence through various perspectives:

1. through the declaration of war.
2. through the punishment system
3. through the exploitative economic system

Gandhiji was facing aggressive role from the western countries. He denied the importance of parliamentary form of government. The spoil of wealth, apply of power and formation of ideology were the main reasons behind the war. From the ancient period man has been following this policy. So Gandhiji considered both terms modern civilization and violence are complementary to each other. He strongly argued that these two terms should be repealed. Punishment or threat of punishment may apply the state to the individuals, but natural or congenital loyalty does not come from the individual.

Gandhiji criticized the notion of state. Individuals generally are self-conscious and ethical conscious. So they are unable to adjust such as unethical institution like state. Man has to image alternative social structure system instead of state. Generally Gandhiji admitted the positive role of state before 1920s, after 1920s he totally denied the state roles. From the philosophy of Non-violence and History, Gandhiji was led to conceive of stateless non-violence democracy. He held that the state is rooted in violence and so is essentially an instrument of oppression and exploitation. The state employs force, and its existence cannot be morally justified, by the use of violence the state hinders progress by destroying individuality of the individual.

Gandhiji had clearly differentiate state and society. Actually he embodied absolute personal freedom. After concerning the necessity of social control, he emphasized on personal liberty

to reach in peak level of state. He condemned the absolute power and responsibility of state. Though state has a legal power, but people possess the de-facto sovereign power. Gandhiji has been giving more importance to individual freedom but he concerned on necessity of social control. He supported the interdependence on individual and state relations.

The two opposite tendencies have been focusing in his political thought. Mixture of idealism and realism can be described in Gandhi's political thought. He was a political anarchist in a sense of idealism in other sense he was a realist. He was a anarchist from the idealism perspective. He was supported by enlightened anarchy. Everyone is ruler to each other. Individual knows what is wrong or right. Gandhiji propounded there is no any political power in ideal state, because there is no any existence of state. When we consider Gandhiji was a realist theorist - he consciously indicated individual's ideal life is not implemented totally. His absolute goal was to create a stateless society, but he does not totally neglect political power like other anarchist theorist.

He believed there are few matters in society which is implemented without the influence of political power. He supported the limited government. He supported Thoreau's views- the best government is, who govern the least. He handed over the power to government is limited. He opposed the centralization process of government. He correctly supported the views on decentralization of government. Decentralization process should be geographical, territorial and technological. He supported the self-rule at panchayat level. Gandhiji does not totally deny the existence of state system. He viewed that it is a symbol of violence. State is the main obstacle to the development process of Individuals. He wanted to form a state-less society in future in India, where there will be no any existence of violence.

Gandhiji's views on ideal political system- there is neither any use of violence, nor of any oppression policy, only hasnon-violence method which will be applied in society. Contemporary social and political thoughts were described by Gandhiji as injustice, opposing the centralized power but did not want to abolish total state-system. We get some similarities between Marx's and Gandhiji's perceptions:

1. Gandhi and Marx both described state as repression institution.
2. Both were focusing on hate as an institution.
3. Gandhiji agree to abolish of state to create stateless system, other side Marx said state is a well-organized form of violence.
4. Both discuss state as an irreconcilable institution.

Some dissimilarities between the two political thinkers:

1. Marx discussed on interest of class. There are two classes-capitalist and bourgeoisie. Gandhiji opposed the institution of state.
2. Marx was materialist, in other words, Gandhiji was a spiritualist.

3. Non-violence, satya, trusteeship, are some important principles of Gandhiji: class struggle, historical materialism, dialectical materialism, theory of surplus value, dictatorship of proletariat are the basic tenets of Karl Marx.

Gandhian concept of state is very important in 21st century. Actually he is the worshipper of non-violence and personal freedom. He proposed the limited rule and stateless society. Gandhiji believes in pluralistic society. He focusses on religious harmony. He knows how to people get unite. He follows rationalism. His Ramrajya is an Ideal not is a symbol. Ram is the symbol of peace and morality. Everyone respects to each other and loves to each other. But it is a question how is it possible? Sometimes we may say he is a utopian thinker, but his thought is superior. He has amazing personality. Every individual enjoys his/her rights- these rights based on morality, ethics and norms. He does not mean state's role as an interventionist. We see the how political parties are influencing to citizens or governmental policies to impose the rules to the people. Gandhian concept of state has been discussed by academicians, political thinkers, research scholars. There are various conflicts like religious groups, class, ethnic, tribal - these all may unite after the influence of Gandhian views. His idea of communal unity, removal of untouchability, creation of village industries, basic education, overall development of women, economic equality among the peoples – all are not only given the priority in India but also must be needed in all over world.

Opposing the use of mass destruction weapons, experiment relating the nuclear weapons, are very important ideas of Gandhiji. He claims to use of limited natural resource and then upcoming generation will be benefited. That is why, he is the supporter of sustainable development. Excessive use of machine industries, gorgeous life style of man- he opposed this type of behavior. He is supporter of anti-pollution environment. No doubt M.K. Gandhi, one of the valuable thinkers and well-known personalities in the world. He focuses the creation of ideal society -based on love, truth, non violence, self rule, individual's rights.

Quoting Bhikhu Parekh's word 'although he was profoundly influenced by Hinduism, Christianity and Jainism, his religious thought cut across all of them and was in a class by itself, belief in God was obviously its basis.' Basically Gandhi's views on contemporary social, political and economic issues were focused on liberal term where individual get their priviledges from the state-less society.

ELEMENTS AND NECESSITY OF THE STATE

Elements of State:

A State stands identified with its four absolutely essential elements:

1. Population:

State is a community of persons. It is a human political institution. Without a population there can be no State. Population can be more or less but it has to be there. There are States with very small populations like Switzerland, Canada and others, and there are States like China, India and others, with very large populations.

The people living in the State are the citizens of the State. They enjoy rights and freedom as citizens as well as perform several duties towards the State. When citizens of another State are living in the territory of the State, they are called aliens. All the persons, citizens as well as aliens, who are living in the territory of the State are duty bound to obey the state laws and policies. The State exercises supreme authority over them through its government.

There is no definite limit for the size of population essential for a State. However, it is recognised that the population should be neither too large nor very small. It has to be within a reasonable limit. It should be determined on the basis of the size of the territory of the State, the available resources, the standard of living expected and needs of defence, production of goods and supplies. India has a very large and fast growing population and there is every need to check population growth. It is essential for enhancing the ability of India to register a high level of sustainable development.

2. Territory:

Territory is the second essential element of the State. State is a territorial unit. Definite territory is its essential component.

A State cannot exist in the air or at sea. It is essentially a territorial State. The size of the territory of a State can be big or small; nevertheless it has to be a definite, well-marked portion of territory.

States like Russia, Canada, U.S.A., India, China, Brazil and some others are large sized states whereas Nepal, Bhutan, Sri Lanka, Maldives, Switzerland, Togo, Brundi and many others are States with small territories. The whole territory of the state is under the sovereignty or supreme power of the State. All persons, organisations, associations, institutions and places located within its territory are under the sovereign jurisdiction of the State.

Further, it must be noted that the territory of the state includes not only the land but also, rivers, lakes, canals inland seas if any, a portion of coastal sea—territorial waters or maritime belt, continental shelf, mountains, hills and all other land features along with the air space above the territory.

The territory of the state can also include some islands located in the sea. For example Anadaman & Nicobar and Daman and Diu are parts of India. State exercises sovereignty over all parts of its territory. Ships of the State are its floating parts and Aero-planes are its flying parts. Even a States can lease out its territory to another State e.g. India has given on lease the Teen Bigha corridor to Bangladesh.

3. Government:

Government is the organisation or machinery or agency or magistracy of the State which makes, implements, enforces and adjudicates the laws of the state. Government is the third essential element of the State. The state exercises its sovereign power through its government. This sometimes creates the impression that there is no difference between the State and Government. However it must be clearly noted that government is just one element

of the State. It is the agent or the working agency of the State. Sovereignty belongs to the State; the government only uses it on behalf of the State.

Each government has three organs:

- (1) Legislature—which formulates the will of State i.e. performs law-making functions;
- (2) Executive— enforces and implements the laws i.e. performs the law-application functions; and
- (3) Judiciary—which applies the laws to specific cases and settles the disputes i.e. performs adjudication functions.

Government as a whole is the instrument through which the sovereign power of the State gets used. In ancient times, the King used to perform all functions of the government and all powers of governance stood centralized in his hands. Gradually, however, the powers of King got decentralized and these came to be exercised by these three organs of the government: Legislature, Executive and Judiciary.

Each of these three organs of the government carries out its assigned functions. Independence of Judiciary is also a settled rule. The relationship between the Legislature and Executive is defined by law and it corresponds to the adopted form of government. In a Parliamentary form of government, like the one which is working in India and Britain, the legislature and executive are closely related and the latter is collectively responsible before the former.

In the Presidential form, as is in operation in the U.S.A., the legislature and executive are two independent and separate organs with stable and fixed tenures, and the executive is not responsible to legislature. It is directly responsible to the people.

Government is an essential element of State. However it keeps on changing after regular intervals. Further, Government can be of any form—Monarchy or Aristocracy or Dictatorship or Democracy. It can be either Parliamentary or Presidential or both. It can be Unitary or Federal or of mixture of these two in its organisation and working. In contemporary times every civilized State has a democratic representative, responsible transparent and accountable government.

4. Sovereignty:

Sovereignty is the most exclusive element of State. State alone possesses sovereignty. Without sovereignty no state can exist. Some institutions can have the first three elements (Population Territory and Government) but not sovereignty.

State has the exclusive title and prerogative to exercise supreme power over all its people and territory. In fact, Sovereignty is the basis on which the State regulates all aspects of the life of the people living in its territory.

As the supreme power of the State, Sovereignty has two dimensions: Internal Sovereignty and External Sovereignty.

(i) Internal Sovereignty:

It means the power of the State to order and regulate the activities of all the people, groups and institutions which are at work within its territory. All these institutions always act in accordance with the laws of the State. The State can punish them for every violation of any of its laws.

(ii) External Sovereignty:

It means complete independence of the State from external control. It also means the full freedom of the State to participate in the activities of the community of nations. Each state has the sovereign power to formulate and act on the basis of its independent foreign policy.

We can define external sovereignty of the State as its sovereign equality with every other state. State voluntarily accepts rules of international law.

These cannot be forced upon the State. India is free to sign or not to sign any treaty with any other state. No state can force it to do so. No State can really become a State without sovereignty. India became a State in 1947 when it got independence and sovereignty. After her independence, India got the power to exercise both internal and external Sovereignty. Sovereignty permanently, exclusively and absolutely belongs to the State. End of sovereignty means end of the State. That is why sovereignty is accepted as the exclusive property and hallmark of the State.

These are the four essential elements of a State. A State comes to be a state only when it has all these elements. Out of these four elements, Sovereignty stands accepted as the most important and exclusive element of the State. No other organisation or institution can claim sovereignty. An institution can have population, territory and government but not sovereignty. Andhra Pradesh, Tamil Nadu, Orissa, Punjab, Sikkim, in fact all states of the Indian Union have their populations, territories and governments.

These are also loosely called states. Yet these are not really states. These are integral parts of the Indian State. Sovereignty belongs to India. Sikkim was a state before it joined India in 1975. Now it is one of the 28 states of India.

UNO is not a state and so is the case of the Commonwealth of Nations, because these do not possess sovereignty. SAARC is not a state. It is only a regional association of sovereign states of South Asia. India, China, U.S.A., U.K., France, Germany, Japan, Australia, Egypt, South Africa, Brazil, Argentina and others such countries are States because each of these possesses all the four essential elements of state. The presence of all these four elements alone vests a State with real statehood.

Necessity of the State:

1. State is the Natural Institution:

Man is a social animal. His nature impels him and necessities compel him to live in society and enter into social relations with others. He is by nature a gregarious animal. He always

wants to live and remain in the company of fellow human beings. State is needed by him for providing security law and order as well as for punishing all criminals and anti-social elements.

2. State is a Social Necessity:

When man lives in the company of others, he naturally develops social relations with other human beings. He forms family and several other groups. He gets involved in a system of relations. He inherits several relations and throughout his life remains bound up with these. Further, his physical and economic necessities always force him to form economic trade and cultural relations. He and his society need security for their life, property and relations. The state serves this need, by protecting the society from internal and external dangers.

3. Economic Necessity of State:

In each society the people need the state because it provides currency and coinage for the conduct of economic business and trade relations. State formulates and implements all financial policies and plans for the benefit of all the citizens. It provides financial help to the poor and weaker sections of society. By providing security law and order, the state helps the people to carry out their economic relations and activities.

4. State secures Peace, Security and Welfare of all in Society:

Social relations continuously need peace, security and order. Man is a social being. However along-with it some selfishness is also a part of his being. At times, selfishness of some persons can cause some difficulties and harms to others. This is prevented by the state. While living in society, man needs protection for his life and property. This is provided by the state.

5. State is needed for Protection against War and External Enemies:

State is needed for getting protection and security against external aggressions, wars and internal disturbances and disorders. The society needs the state for security, peace, order stability and protection against external aggressions and wars.

State maintains defence forces for fighting external wars and meeting aggressions. The state works for the elimination of terrorism and violence.

State is the sovereign political institution of each society. It protects the people and tries to ensure conditions for their happiness, prosperity and development

Each society needs the State. It satisfies several important needs of society:

(1) State provides security against external aggressions and war. For this purpose the state maintains an army.

(2) State ensures security against internal disturbances disorders and crimes. For this purpose the state maintains police.

(3) State legally grants and guarantees the rights of the people.

- (4) The state issues and regulates currency and coinage.
- (5) State undertakes steps for the creation of necessary conditions for the socio-economic-politico-cultural development of the people.
- (6) State grants citizenship and protects their interests and rights.
- (7) State conducts foreign relations, foreign trade and economic relations.
- (8) State secures the goals of national interest in international relations.

2.3 GLOBALIZATION AND STATE SOVEREIGNTY

Globalization as the name suggests is a global economic movement which involves all national international economic players including the all-pervasive bureaucracy. It is a multi-role, multi-layered phenomenon in which everyone contributes his bit. The growing progress of science and faster means of communication have converted the world into a global village wherein people from all strata of society have converged to share the economic benefits which are a resultant of increase in production. States' national boundaries are shrinking and an inter-state commonwealth is emerging on the basis of a common cooperative endeavor. In every such growing economy, one feels the presence of an "invisible hand" (Biju, 2006) of bureaucracy.

The term globalization implies economic integration through cross country flow of information, ideas, technologies, goods and services. Its seminal features are:

- (i) Removal of trade barriers to facilitate free flow of goods all over world
- (ii) Generating environment which conduces to the free flow of capital among nation-states
- (iii) Facilitating the free flow of technology, and
- (iv) Providing opportunities for the free and unfettered movement of labor among various nations.

To put it in a nutshell, globalization leads to economic growth and integration which can happen through trade in goods and services, movement of capital, and flow of finance through movement of people. But in reality globalization is a multi-layered phenomenon. Across borders, unity ushered under the impact of globalization has several dimensions - cultural, social, political and economic. That is why some economists termed it as a process of creation of global economy, whereas others talked of political and social globalization, a globalization of ideas that led to technological changes.

Broadly speaking it can be suggested that "Though the world globalization (as a synonym for privatization and liberalization) is more often used in its economic sense of removing trade barriers and state controls on economic activities of people, it implies widely the unification of peoples, cultures, nations and continents through interaction in various fields.

The tempo and pace of globalization is so momentous that it has transformed world politics. States are no longer closed and compact political units that could control their economies independently. They are greatly influenced by international financial and trade institutions, and policies. Common global culture is a worldwide phenomenon and under its influence, most urban centers of various nations have developed a close affinity with one another. "The world is becoming more homogeneous. Differences between people are diminishing. Time and space seem to be collapsing. Our old ideas of geographical space and chronicle time are undermined by the speed of modern communication and media. There is emerging a global polity, with transitional social and political movements and the beginning of a transfer of allegiance from the state to sub-state, transitional and international bodies. A cosmopolitan culture is developing."

The proponents of globalization stress that as a result of the policies of globalization, developing nations would be able to improve their finances and march towards rapid economic growth. In India globalization has become synonymous with economic liberalization which was adopted when the Indian economy faced unprecedented crisis in July 1991 and tons of gold had to be mortgaged with England. The government, headed by Prime Minister P.V. Narasimha Rao, felt compelled to reverse the licence-permit raj resting on an economic policy of stringent controls and protectionism.

Consequently, structural adjustments involving liberalization of trade and gradual opening up of the economy by means of a program of privatization were undertaken, resulting in the process of dismantling trade barriers in 1991. Since then every year, the government has reduced customs duties and also removed quantitative restrictions, in order to facilitate the free flow of goods, capital and technology. Thus, globalization becomes a motivating force for nations to develop at a faster rate. For a developing country like India it opened up access to new markets and new technology.

Globalisation and Its Impact on the State

Globalisation has been producing a subtle change in the functions of the State. Its role in the ownership and production of goods has been getting reduced. However, this does not in any way mean a return of the *Laisses faire* state.

In the era of globalisation, the functions of the State began undergoing a change. With the increasing disinvestment of public sector, privatisation was encouraged. Public sector was made to compete with the private sector, and as a whole open competition, free trade, market economy and globalisation were practiced. State ownership of industries came to be rejected. The role of state began emerging as that of a facilitator and coordinator. The exercise still continues.

In this era of Globalisation, several changes have been taking place in the functions of the State:

1. Decreased Economic activities of State:

The process of liberalisation- privatisation has acted as a source of limitation on the role of the state in the economic sphere. Public sector and enterprises are getting privatized and state presence in economic domain is shrinking.

2. Decrease in the role of the State in International Economy:

The emergence of free trade, market competition, multinational corporations and international economic organisations and trading blocs like European Union, NAFTA, APEC, ASEAN and others, have limited the scope of the role of state in the sphere of international economy.

3. Decline of State Sovereignty:

Increasing international inter-dependence has been compelling each state to accept limitations on its external sovereignty. Each state now finds it essential to accept the rules of international economic system, the WTO, the World Bank and the IMF. The role of MNC/TNC has also been growing in national and local politics as they play a significant role in shaping the state decisions and policies. Their key objective behind influencing the state decision and policy-making is to promote their vested interests.

4. Growing People's Opposition to their Respective States:

Globalisation has encouraged and expanded people-to-people socio-economic-cultural relations and cooperation in the world. As IT revolution and development of fast means of transport and communication have been together making the world a real Global Community. The people of each state now deal with people of other states as members of the World Community. The loyalty towards their respective states continues, but now the people do not hesitate to oppose those state policies which are held to be not in tune with the demands of globalization.

5. Reduced Importance of Military Power of the State:

The state continues to maintain its military power as an important dimension of its national power. However, the strength being gained by movement for international peace and peaceful coexistence as the way of life has tended to reduce the importance of military power of the state.

6. Increasing Role of International Conventions and Treaties:

Several international conventions and treaties have placed some limitations upon all the states. All the states are now finding it essential to follow the rules and norms laid down by such conventions. The need to fight the menace of terrorism and rogue nuclear proliferation as well as the shared responsibility for protecting the environment and human rights, have compelled all the states to accept such rules and regulations as are considered essential for the securing of these objectives. Thus, Globalisation and several other factors have been together responsible for influencing a change in the role of State in contemporary times.

7. Decline in Public Expenditure on Public Welfare Policies

Most advanced western states appear committed to reducing social expenditure on public welfare programs, and to introducing measures such as labour market deregulation and lowered tax rates which facilitate greater economic competitiveness, but impact adversely on rates of poverty and inequality. These economic and political initiatives have coincided with a period of intense economic globalisation. The growing significance of international trade, investment, production and financial flows appears to be curtailing the autonomy of individual nation states. In particular, globalisation appears to be encouraging, if not demanding, a decline in social spending on public welfare programs and policies.

CONCLUSION

The march of globalization is unstoppable. It is no longer an option; it is a fact. It is spreading its tentacles everywhere and the developed nations use it as a means to control world economy. Some dub it as yet another form of economic colonialism. Under these circumstances the civil services should strive to save the country from the thrall dom of imperialistic and monopolistic globalization. By protecting them from the dangers of globalization they should act as protective shields. In the words of D. C. Pande and P. S. Bisht, the state "must promote" ethics in politics and allow only those honest individuals into politics who firmly believe that they are there simply because of political need for economic development and certainly not because of any political desire of their own."

In brief, to label globalization in absolute terms as either a totally positive or negative phenomenon is a simplistic approach. Ultimately, globalization benefits society at large in countries that enjoy some degree of political stability, that have in place adequate infrastructure, equitable social safety nets and in general strong democratic institutions. Experience has shown that globalization requires strong, not weak States.

CHECK YOUR PROGRESS:

1. What is State?
2. What are the different theories of origin of the state?
3. What is Globalization?
4. How does globalization impact the sovereignty of the state?

CHAPTER 3

MAJOR CONCEPTS IN POLITICAL THEORY

LEARNING OUTCOME: After going through this lesson, students will be able to -

- **Know the importance of liberty, equality and justice to Human Life**
- **The meaning and types of liberty, equality and justice**
- **Various views regarding these basic concepts**

We shall probably all agree that liberty, rightly understood, is the greatest of blessings; that its attainment is the true end of all our efforts as citizens. But when we thus speak of freedom (liberty and freedom are used interchangeably here although some theorists make distinction between the two), we should consider carefully what we mean by it. We do not mean merely freedom from restraint or compulsion. We do not mean merely freedom to do as we like irrespective of what it is that we like. We do not mean a freedom that can be enjoyed by one man or one set of men at the cost of a loss of freedom to others. When we speak of freedom as something to be so highly prized, we mean a positive power or capacity of doing or enjoying something worth doing or enjoying, and that, too, something that we do or enjoy in common with others.

We mean by it a power which each man exercises through the help or security given him by his fellow-men, and which he in turn helps to secure for them. When we measure the progress of a society by its growth in freedom, we measure it by the increasing development and exercise on the whole of those powers of contributing to social good with which we believe the members of the society to be endowed; in short, by the greater power on the part of the citizens as a body to make the most and best of themselves.

3.1 THE CONCEPT OF LIBERTY

Liberty is derived from a Latin word “Liber”, which means free or independent. The concept of liberty occupies a very important place in civics. It has made powerful appeal to every man in every age. It is the source of many wars and revolutions. In the name of liberty war, battles, revolutions and struggles have taken place in the history of mankind. Liberty means the unrestricted freedom of the individual to do anything he likes to do. But this sort of unrestricted liberty is not possible in society.

Liberty being the central value of human life has traditionally been defined and explained from the negative and positive perspective. In general, negative liberty is the absence of obstacles, barriers or constraints.

One has negative liberty to the extent that actions are available to one in this negative sense. Positive liberty is the possibility of acting — or the fact of acting — in such a way as to take control of one's life and realize one's fundamental purposes. While negative liberty is usually

attributed to individual agents, positive liberty is sometimes attributed to collectivities, or to individuals considered primarily as members of given collectivities. The idea of distinguishing between a negative and a positive sense of the term 'liberty' goes back at least to Kant, and was examined and defended in depth by Isaiah Berlin in the 1950s and '60s. Discussions about positive and negative liberty normally take place within the context of political and social philosophy.

They are distinct from, though sometimes related to, philosophical discussions about free will. Work on the nature of positive liberty often overlaps, however, with work on the nature of autonomy. According to Berlin, negative and positive liberty are not merely two distinct kinds of liberty; they can be seen as rival, incompatible interpretations of a single political ideal. Since few people claim to be against liberty, the way this term is interpreted and defined can have important political implications.

Political liberalism tends to presuppose a negative definition of liberty: liberals generally claim that if one favours individual liberty one should place strong limitations on the activities of the state. Critics of liberalism often contest this implication by contesting the negative definition of liberty: they argue that the pursuit of liberty understood as self-realization or as self-determination (whether of the individual or of the collectivity) can require state intervention of a kind not normally allowed by liberals.

Nature & Scope

The idea of liberty may be analyzed in terms of:

Freedom as the quality of Human Being: Animals, birds, insects are governed 'struggle for existence' and 'survival of the fittest'. Only a human being is capable of freedom. Man as a hominid has distinguished himself from other living beings as he claims to have an aim in his life. Man has created many social organizations. Man has tamed and controlled animals. Freedom is the distinctive quality of man. Human beings capacity to gain scientific knowledge is the source of their freedom.

Freedom as the Condition of Human Being: Liberty is usually defined as 'absence of constraint'. The concept of liberty has very wide implication in the sphere of political philosophy. We demand liberty for the human being (as a condition of life) because we treat him to be a rational creature.

Since here our demand is confined to the removal of external restraint, hence it is termed as negative liberty. Now a man may not be free even if there is no essential restraint. Freedom in the wider sense requires that man should not feel any internal or external constraints. This means, freedom from physical pain, disease, ignorance, fear or wants. A state tends to secure positive liberty for its citizens. We wish to have freedom for the rational agent. If a person is not free in the real sense and still he is not keen to have freedom, efforts should be made to arouse his conscience and made him anxious to win his freedom.

Classification of Liberty

Natural Liberty,

Social / Civil Liberty

Moral Liberty.

Social / Civil liberty

It is further classified in to:-

Personal liberty

Political Liberty

Economic Liberty

Domestic Liberty

National Liberty

International Liberty

Natural Liberty: It implies complete freedom for a man to do what he wills. In other words, it means absence of all restraints and freedom from interferences. It may be easily understood that this kind of liberty is no liberty at all in as much as it is euphemism for the freedom of the forest. What we call liberty pertains to the realm of man's social existence. This kind of liberty, in the opinions of the social philosophers like Hobbes, Locke and Rousseau was engaged by men living in the "state of nature" – since where there was not state and society. This kind of liberty is not possible at present. Liberty cannot exist in the absence of state. Unlimited liberty might have been engaged only by few strong but not all.

Social/Civil liberty: it relates to man's freedom in his life as a member of the social organization. As such, it refers to a man's right to do what he wills in compliance with the restraints Imposed on him in the general interest. Civil or social liberty consists in the rights and privileges that the society recognizes and the state protects in the spheres of private and public life of an individual.

Social liberty has the following sub categories: Personal liberty: it is an important variety of social liberty. It refers to the opportunity to exercises freedom of choice in those areas of a man's life that the results of his efforts mainly affect him in that isolation by which at least he is always surrounded.

Political Liberty: It refers to the power of the people to be active in the affairs of the state. Political liberty is closely interlinked with the life of man as a citizen. Simply stated political liberty consists in provisions for universal adult franchise, free and fair elections, freedom for the avenues that make a healthy public opinion. As a matter of fact political liberty consists in curbing as well as constituting and controlling the government.

Economic Liberty: It belongs to the individual in the capacity of a producer or a worker engaged in some gainful occupation or service. The individual should be free from the constant fear of unemployment and insufficiency.

Domestic/ Family Liberty: It is sociological concept that takes the discussion of liberty to the sphere of man's family life. It implies that all associations within the state, the miniature community of the family, is the most universal and of the strongest independent vitality. Domestic liberty consists in :- Rendering the wife a fully responsible individual capable of holding property, suing and being sued, conducting business on her own account, and engaging full personal protection against her husband.

It is establishing marriage as far as the law is concerned on a purely contractual basis, and leaving the sacramental aspect of marriage to the ordinance of the religion professed by the parties and seeing the physical, mental and moral care of the children.

National liberty: It is synonymous with national independence. As such, it implies that no nation should be under subjection of another. National movements or wars of independence can be identified as struggles for the attainment of national liberty. So, national liberty is identified with patriotism.

International Liberty: It means the world is free from controls and limitation, use of force has no value. Dispute can be settled through peaceful means. Briefly all countries in the world will be free of conflicts and wars. In the international sphere, it implies renunciation of war, limitation on the production of armaments, abandonment's of the use of force, and the pacific settlement of disputes. The ideal of international liberty is based on this pious conviction to that extent the world frees itself from the use of force and aggression it gains and peace is given a chance to establish itself.

Moral Liberty: This type of freedom is centered in the idealistic thoughts of thinkers from Plato and Aristotle in ancient times to Rousseau, Kant, Hegel, Green and Bosanquet in modern times. Moral liberty lies in man's capacity to act as per his rational self. Every man has a personality of his own. He seeks the best possible development of his personality. At the same time he desire the same thing for other. And more than this, he pays sincere respect for the real worth and dignity of his fellow beings. It is directly connected with man's self – realization.

POSITIVE AND NEGATIVE LIBERTY

Positive Liberty: -

It does not consist merely in the removal of restraints. Liberty is best realized in the enjoyment of certain positive opportunities that are necessary for the development of personality. Positive liberty consists in providing opportunities to the individual where he is incapacitated due to socio-economic conditions. Liberty in its positive aspect means removal of those constraints which obstruct the individual in his pursuit of happiness. Rights are a necessary condition for liberty. The state must, therefore, regulate activities and provide opportunities.

The state must restrain those who obstruct social welfare. Hence, the State must create positive conditions for the welfare of all. Negative Liberty: Negative aspect of liberty means, 'absence of restraints.' This aspect implies that there should be no limits or control on individual liberty. The supporters of this theory are Locke, De Tocqueville, Edmund Burke, Thomas Paine, Bentham, Spencer and most significantly J.S. Mill. The negative concept of liberty regaled in the hands of the individualists. The state, according to them, is a necessary evil. It must not interfere with the natural liberty of individuals. The state should not impose restraints on the individuals. 'That government is the best which governs the least.' As long as an individual does not deprive others of their liberty, he is free to do what he wants.

ISAIAH BERLIN

Isaiah Berlin (1909–97) was a British philosopher, historian of ideas, political theorist, educator and essayist. For much of his life he was renowned for his conversational brilliance, his defense of liberalism, his attacks on political extremism and intellectual fanaticism, and his accessible, coruscating writings on the history of ideas. His essay *Two Concepts of Liberty* (1958) contributed to a revival of interest in political theory in the English-speaking world, and remains one of the most influential and widely discussed texts in that field: admirers and critics agree that Berlin's distinction between positive and negative liberty remains, for better or worse, a basic starting-point for theoretical discussions of the meaning and value of political freedom. Late in his life, the greater availability of Berlin's numerous essays began to provoke increasing scholarly interest in his work, and particularly in the idea of value pluralism; that Berlin's articulation of value pluralism contains many ambiguities and even obscurities has only encouraged further work on the subject by other philosophers. Berlin had always been a liberal; but from the early 1950s the defence of liberalism became central to his intellectual concerns. This defence was, characteristically, closely related to his moral beliefs and to his preoccupation with the nature and role of values in human life; in his thinking about these issues Berlin would develop his idea of value pluralism, which assumed prominence in his work in the 1960s and '70s. In the early 1960s Berlin's focus moved from his more political concerns of the 1950s to a concern with the nature of the human sciences; throughout the 1950s and '60s he was working on the history of ideas, and from the mid-1960s nearly all of his writings took the form of essays on this subject, particularly on the romantic and reactionary critics of the Enlightenment.

By the early 1950s Berlin's central beliefs had emerged out of the confluence of his philosophical preoccupations, historical studies, and political and moral commitments and anxieties; and his major ideas were either already fully formed, or developing. Such essays of the late '50s as 'Two Concepts of Liberty' served as the occasion for a synthesis and solidification of his thoughts. Thereafter, he would continue to refine and rearticulate his ideas, but his course was set, and he appears to have been largely unaffected by later intellectual developments.

|

BERLIN'S TWO CONCEPTS OF LIBERTY

Imagine you are driving a car through town, and you come to a fork in the road. You turn left, but no one was forcing you to go one way or the other. Next you come to a crossroads. You turn right, but no one was preventing you from going left or straight on. There is no traffic to speak of and there are no diversions or police roadblocks. So you seem, as a driver, to be completely free. But this picture of your situation might change quite dramatically if we consider that the reason you went left and then right is that you're addicted to cigarettes and you're desperate to get to the tobacconists before it closes. Rather than driving, you feel you are being driven, as your urge to smoke leads you uncontrollably to turn the wheel first to the left and then to the right. Moreover, you're perfectly aware that your turning right at the crossroads means you'll probably miss a train that was to take you to an appointment you care about very much. You long to be free of this irrational desire that is not only threatening your longevity but is also stopping you right now from doing what you think you ought to be doing. This story gives us two contrasting ways of thinking of liberty. On the one hand, one can think of liberty as the absence of obstacles external to the agent. You are free if no one is stopping you from doing whatever you might want to do. In the above story you appear, in this sense, to be free. On the other hand, one can think of liberty as the presence of control on the part of the agent. To be free, you must be self-determined, which is to say that you must be able to control your own destiny in your own interests.

In the above story you appear, in this sense, to be unfree: you are not in control of your own destiny, as you are failing to control a passion that you yourself would rather be rid of and which is preventing you from realizing what you recognize to be your true interests. One might say that while on the first view liberty is simply about how many doors are open to the agent, on the second view it is more about going through the right doors for the right reasons.

In a famous essay first published in 1958, Isaiah Berlin called these two concepts of liberty negative and positive respectively. The reason for using these labels is that in the first case liberty seems to be a mere absence of something (i.e. of obstacles, barriers, constraints or interference from others), whereas in the second case it seems to require the presence of something (i.e. of control, self-mastery, self-determination or self-realization).

In Berlin's words, we use the negative concept of liberty in attempting to answer the question "What is the area within which the subject — a person or group of persons — is or should be left to do or be what he is able to do or be, without interference by other persons?", whereas we use the positive concept in attempting to answer the question "What, or who, is the source of control or interference that can determine someone to do, or be, this rather than that?" It is useful to think of the difference between the two concepts in terms of the difference between factors that are external and factors that are internal to the agent. While theorists of negative freedom are primarily interested in the degree to which individuals or groups suffer interference from external bodies, theorists of positive freedom are more attentive to the internal factors affecting the degree to which individuals or groups act autonomously. Given this difference, one might be tempted to think that a political philosopher should concentrate exclusively on negative freedom, a concern with positive freedom being more relevant to

psychology or individual morality than to political and social institutions. This, however, would be premature, for among the most hotly debated issues in political philosophy are the following: Is the positive concept of freedom a political concept? Can individuals or groups achieve positive freedom through political action? Is it possible for the state to promote the positive freedom of citizens on their behalf? And if so, is it desirable for the state to do so?

The classic texts in the history of western political thought are divided over how these questions should be answered: theorists in the classical liberal tradition, like Constant, Humboldt, Spencer and Mill, are typically classed as answering 'no' and therefore as defending a negative concept of political freedom; theorists that are critical of this tradition, like Rousseau, Hegel, Marx and T.H. Green, are typically classed as answering 'yes' and as defending a positive concept of political freedom. In its political form, positive freedom has often been thought of as necessarily achieved through a collectivity. Perhaps the clearest case is that of Rousseau's theory of freedom, according to which individual freedom is achieved through participation in the process whereby one's community exercises collective control over its own affairs in accordance with the 'general will'.

Put in the simplest terms, one might say that a democratic society is a free society because it is a self-determined society, and that a member of that society is free to the extent that he or she participates in its democratic process. But there are also individualist applications of the concept of positive freedom. For example, it is sometimes said that a government should aim actively to create the conditions necessary for individuals to be self-sufficient or to achieve self-realization. The negative concept of freedom, on the other hand, is most commonly assumed in liberal defences of the constitutional liberties typical of liberal-democratic societies, such as freedom of movement, freedom of religion, and freedom of speech, and in arguments against paternalist or moralist state intervention. It is also often invoked in defences of the right to private property, although some have contested the claim that private property necessarily enhances negative liberty.

CRITICAL ANALYSIS

In Berlin's view, the state can only secure negative liberty to the individual by ensuring that he is not prevented from choosing his own course of action. On the other hand, positive liberty belongs to the individual's own will and capacity which is beyond the scope of state. He further said, if one cannot fly like an eagle or swim like a whale, one is by no means deprived of political liberty on this count. Similarly, if a man is too poor to afford something on which there is no legal ban – a loaf of bread, a journey around the world, recourse to law courts – he cannot complain that he has been deprived of political liberty. The capacity or incapacity to fulfil one's desires belongs to man himself; the state is not concerned with this sphere.

Accordingly, the existing social inequalities cannot be questioned from the point of view of liberty. Berlin's position on this point is itself questionable. On deeper analysis, it becomes clear that Berlin has confused between two sphere of positive liberty, namely the moral sphere and material sphere. In the moral sphere, Berlin's conception is very illuminating.

However, when we turn to the material sphere, enjoyment of positive liberty is hampered by different reasons. Here again Berlin has confused between two types of disabilities. Just recall his illustration: in the first case Berlin is pointing to natural limitations (unable to fly like an eagle or swim like a whale), something that is unalterable. Hence any complaint in this behalf would be untenable.

In actual life, such disabilities are never sought to be overcome by political action. But in the second case, Berlin is referring to such disabilities as are the product of social arrangement (unable to buy a loaf of bread, etc.) that is alterable by political action. Despite these critical points on Berlin's theory of liberty his distinction of liberty into negative and positive continues to dominate mainstream discussions about the meaning of political and social freedom.

3.2 EQUALITY

The American Declaration of Independence, 1776 proclaims that. "all men are created equal, that they are endowed by their Creator with certain unalienable rights. The French Declaration of 1789 also proclaimed," men are born and live free and equal in their rights. Both the documents underline the fact that Equality is a protest ideal, a symbol of man's revolt against chance, fortuitous disparity, unjust power, crystallized privilege

Equality is difficult and controversial notion in politics. It is a fact that humans are not equal. They have differences in their mental, moral qualities or their attitudes and abilities. The demand for equality does not neglect the differences among humans it is a protest against unjust, undeserved, and unjustified inequalities, for hierarchies of worth and ability never satisfactorily corresponds to effective hierarchies of power. Demand for equality provides necessary motion to break the inertia of human society, which constantly tends to perpetuate the existing vertical structures Such structures perpetuate themselves with nurturing the belief that each man should live according to his station? And by means of routine custom, and traditional, social mechanisms. The ideal of equality works against such force of gravity inherent in politico-socio organisms.

Meaning of Equality

Thus the very differences in the nature of men require mechanisms for the expression of their wills that give to each its due hearing In brief, equality refers to the equal enjoyment of rights by all citizens and absence of any discrimination based on status, race or sex The principle that all men are equal only means that they ought to be treated in the same manner in certain vital respects It means impartiality of treatment According to Harold J Laski equality means the absence of special privilege availability of adequate opportunities open to all it is fundamentally a levelling process. Marx argued for equality as an end to class domination and economic exploitation of man by man. These definitions shows two aspects of equality

- 1) Negative aspect - It means absence of special privileges
- 2) Positive aspect - It means that adequate opportunities should be made available to all

Dimensions of Equality

Legal Dimension of Equality

Legal dimension of Equality is essential ingredient of liberal democracy. Legal equality implies that every individual is equal before the law and is entitled to and can claim equal protection of the laws. In modern democratic states, law neither allows special privileges to any particular class nor confers unequal rights on, or claim unequal obligations from, different categories of citizens. Equality before the law does not guarantee equal treatment by the law but equal access to the law, and consideration only of those factors laid down by law as relevant. Legal equality does not mean that any two persons must always be treated exactly alike. It claims that the grounds for deciding between two persons should be only those laid down by law, and not any legally extraneous ones, whether unreasonable grounds of moral sentiments or Natural law, or unreasonable ones of private caprice. Application of legal dimension is contextual. Division of labour and distributive justice provides ground for legitimate unequal treatment to certain classes or categories of individuals or groups. Equality before the law basically denotes equal enjoyment of certain fundamental rights and duties.

Political Dimension of Equality

Political equality implies equal access to political power. This form of equality is closely associated with liberal democratic form of government. The concrete expression of political equality is the conferment, on all adult citizens, of the right to vote and its corollaries, the right to contest for public office and equal eligibility for administrative and judicial posts provided the necessary technical qualifications are fulfilled.

In short, political equality denotes the equality of political rights of citizens. This notion of equality is heavily discarded by many. According to elitist theory, ordinary citizens, even when they have votes, have no real access to political power. In democratic political system power is contested by political parties which are themselves controlled by a clique or self-appointed leaders. According to Laski, "political equality, is never real unless it is accompanied by virtual economic equality. Political power, otherwise is hound to be the handmaid of economic power." Marx ridiculed the notion of equality in a society based on capitalism.

Socio-Economical Dimensions of Equality

It is generally agreed that legal and political dimensions alone are not adequate to interpret equality because it ignores the basic fundamental aspect of equality, i.e., its socio-economic dimensions. If the legal and political equalities are of the formal type, economic and social equalities are substantive and of the material type. First is apparent and second is real equality.

Laterally it implies the attempt to expunge all differences in wealth, allotting to every man and woman an equal share in worldly goods. But practically it is difficult to follow this meaning. Properly interpreted, economic equality means the provision of adequate opportunities for all in the material sense of equalising the starting-points, that is, creating by means of a relatively equal distribution of wealth the material conditions for equal access to

opportunities In Marxian sense it demands State ownership of all wealth. The principle of social equality remains a characteristically democratic preoccupation.

Characteristic Features of Equality

- 1) Absolute equality i.e., complete identity of treatment and reward is not desirable
- 2) Men are by nature unequal in their capacity
- 3) It is basically a levelling process
- 4) It is essential for social justice
- 5) It means equal opportunities to all
- 6) It means absence of special privileges to any one
- 7) Essential things must be provided to all

Types of Equality

Equality can be classified into four types

Ontological Equality:

This form of equality has its base in religious and moral tradition. It is expressed in the religious belief that all persons are equal before God. Natural theorists stressed an essential equality of human beings qua human beings. In the modern scientific world this notion is quite ineffective to argue in favour of equality. But Marxism takes a similar position when it asserted that all human beings are knowledgeable, conscious and practical agents. All human beings have to labour productively to produce their means of existence and reproduce their own species.

Equality of Opportunity

It means that access to important social institutions should be open to all on universalistic grounds. Especially by achievement and talent. The debate about equality of opportunity was especially important in the development of modern educational institutions where promotion and attainment were in thereupon intelligence, skill and talent regardless of parental and class background, in terms of universe of achievement, not on ascribed standards of age, sex or wealth.

Equality of Condition

Equality of opportunity is closely linked to equality of condition. Equality of opportunity rewards those who have ability and who are prepared to exercise their skills in the interest of personal achievement in a competitive situation. In order for equality of opportunity to have any significant content, it is essential to guarantee equality of condition, that is, all competitors should start at the same time.

Equality of Outcome

It stressed on equality of result regardless of starting point and natural ability. It seeks to transform inequalities at the beginning into social equalities as a conclusion. Social programmes of positive discrimination in favour of disadvantaged or disprivileged groups are meant to compensate for significant inequalities of condition in order to bring about a meaningful equality of opportunity to secure an equality of result.

EVALUATION OF THE NOTION OF EQUALITY

Importance of Equality

- 1) A peaceful society can be developed only on the solid foundation of equality. The history is full of wars, clashes and revolutions because there was absence of equality.
- 2) Equality is a necessary precondition for enjoyment of liberty. Without equality liberty becomes a privilege of some people.
- 3) Equality promotes justice.

Equality is highly contested concept. It is one of the leading ideals of the body politic, it is the most controversial of the great social ideals. It is the essence of social justice. Along with other ideals it is the basic core of today's egalitarianism. Despite various differences it serves to remind us of our common humanity. In social sciences we use the concept of equality in number of ways. e.g. Equality before the law, equality of opportunity, equality of outcome, gender equality, racial equality, social equality etc. There is no single acceptable, common notion of the term equality.

Apart from common meaning of the term the value of equality itself is attacked by many thinkers and school of thoughts. In ancient Greece Aristotle justified inequality when he justified slavery. He contended that slavery was natural and reasonable institution because there was a fundamental difference and inequalities among men. In his words, some are marked out for subjection, others for rule. Cicero contradicts these arguments of Aristotle, According to him, men differ indeed in learning, but they are equal in the faculty of learning, nature has given to all men reasons.

Main obstacles in the implementation of equality:

- 1) Social-Age old customs, traditions and superstitions create inequality of social status.
- 2) Political-Political power is enjoyed by people belonging to certain castes and certain families. This means absence of equal opportunities.
- 3) Economic-There is concentration of economic wealth in the hands of few.

Following are some common arguments against equality.

The different components of equality are often, mutually incompatible. For example, equality of opportunity and condition tend to produce inequality of results. The notion of equality of

opportunity is characteristic of liberalism and some versions of liberalism are content to accept a situation where inequality of outcome is predominant

A political programme to secure equality generally would be feasible, since to secure radical equality of condition or equality of outcome would require massive social and political regulation by the state resulting in a totalitarian and authoritarian regime. The price of significant equality is political despotism which would subordinate individual talent and achievement.

The achievement of equality may be incompatible with other values which are also desirable than personal liberty, or at least that liberty and equality are somewhat mutually exclusive.

DWORKIN AND EQUALITY

Equality is a popular but mysterious political ideal. People can become equal (or at least more equal) in one way with the consequence that they become unequal (or more unequal) in others. If people have equal income, for example, they will almost certainly differ in the amount of satisfaction they find in their lives, and vice versa. It does not follow, of course, that equality is worthless as an ideal. But it is necessary to state, more exactly than is commonly done, what form of equality is finally important. Dworkin considers two general theories of distributional equality. The first (which he calls equality of welfare) holds that a distributional scheme treats people as equals when it distributes or transfers resources among them until no further transfer would leave them more equal in welfare. The second (equality of resources) holds that it treats them as equals when it distributes or transfers so that no further transfer would leave their shares of the total resources more equal. For Dworkin, each of these two theories is very abstract because there are many different interpretations of what welfare is, and also different theories about what would count as equality of resources. Nevertheless, even in this abstract form, it should be plain that the two theories will offer different advice in many concrete cases. Suppose, for example, that a man of some wealth has several children, one of whom is blind, another a playboy with expensive tastes, a third a prospective politician with expensive ambitions, another a poet with humble needs, another a sculptor who works in expensive material, and so forth.

How shall he draw his will? If he takes equality of welfare as his goal, then he will take these differences among Equality of Welfare his children into account, so that he will not leave them equal shares. Of course he will have to decide on some interpretation of welfare and whether, for example, expensive tastes should figure in his calculations in the same way as handicaps or expensive ambitions. But if, on the contrary, he takes equality of resources as his goal then, assuming his children have roughly equal wealth already, he may well decide that his goal requires an equal division of his wealth. In any case the questions he will put into himself will then be very different.

DWORKIN AND EQUALITY OF RESOURCES

The difficulty for Rawls in this area was brought out very well indeed by Ronald Dworkin, who, in a pair of long papers at the same time, set out a response to Nozick's libertarian

challenges, as well as attempting to refute a range of competing egalitarian theories. Dworkin can be read as raising two central challenges to Rawls.

The first develops Nozick's objections, and can be put like this: before devoting social resources to improving the position of those with the least income and wealth, should we not, at the very least, first investigate how they came to be in that position? Some may be badly off because they are unable to work, or unable to find work. But others may have chosen to do no work. Are they equally deserving or entitled to benefit from the work of others? Can it be fair to tax the hard-working for the benefit of those who are equally capable of hard work, and equally talented, but choose to laze around instead? The difference principle, however, does not require answers to these questions. Hence, to put Dworkin's first argument in a nutshell, it subsidizes scroungers, or to put it less tendentiously, the deliberately under-productive. In Dworkin's view this is contrary to equality. Equality should, other things being equal, allow those who work hard to reap the rewards, while those who chose to do less should bear the consequences of their choices. A second objection raises a new difficulty.

The index of primary goods, and in particular the focus on income and wealth, ignores the fact that some people have much more expensive needs than others. In particular, people who are severely disabled, or have expensive medical requirements, may have a reasonable income, but this could be wholly inadequate to pay the expenses needed to achieve a reasonable level of well-being. The natural response to the problem of expensive needs, such as those of disabled people, would be to abandon primary goods as a currency of justice, and move to assessment of well-being in terms of some form of welfare, such as happiness or preference satisfaction. However, Dworkin argues that this would be a mistake. First he unleashes a battery of objections against the coherence of a welfare measure – essentially the difficulty of determining when two different people are at the same level, which of course is central to any theory of equality. But the argument that is most distinctive and has had the greatest impact, is the problem of expensive tastes. Imagine two people who have the same ordinary tastes, talents and resources, and the same ability to convert resources into welfare, however that is construed. Now one of them – Louis – decides that he wants to change his tastes, and manages to develop expensive taste for dining at high ended restaurants and is consequently unsatisfied with normal home meal. According to Dworkin, the theory of equality of welfare would require a transfer of resources from the person with ordinary tastes to the person with expensive tastes, in order to equalise their resources. This, he plausibly argues, is deeply counter-intuitive.

The difficulties he identifies in Rawls's theory are addressed by Dworkin in a way which avoids the problem of subsidizing expensive tastes. The key insight is that a notion of responsibility can be incorporated within the theory of equality. It is possible to make people responsible for matters within some domains, but not within others. Dworkin makes a distinctive between one's ambitions –including the realm of the voluntary choices one makes – and endowments, which we can think of as including in-born talents, genetic pre-dispositions, and so on. In brief, Dworkin's theory is that while equality requires government to take steps to compensate for the bad 'brute luck' of being born with poor endowments, or

unforeseeable poor luck in other aspects of life, it does not require compensation for poor ‘option luck’ which typically includes the results of freely made choices.

Hence on Dworkin’s view there is no reason to subsidise Louis, who has made his own choice to develop expensive tastes. Similarly those who choose not to work, if they are able to, will not be subsidised either, and this, in principle, overcomes the ‘problem of responsibility’ identified with Rawls’ Difference Principle.

COMPENSATION

On the question to determine the appropriate level of compensation or subsidy Dworkin makes the brilliant move of appealing to the idea first of insurance, and then of hypothetical insurance. His first observation is that real life insurance converts brute luck into option luck. It may be a matter of pure chance whether lightning strikes my house. But it is not a matter of pure chance if I have declined to take out an easily available insurance policy to protect myself from loss. Dworkin’s argument is that if insurance is available against a hazard, and I decide not to take out insurance, then, against a background of equality, there is no case in justice for subsidising the uninsured by taxing others who beforehand were no better off. If it were possible to insure against all brute luck then it appears that Dworkin’s theory would simply require an equal distribution of resources and then allow people to make their own choices and run whichever risks they wished. Life, though, is not so simple. Brute lucks affect us from the moment we are born. Some people are born with low talents, or, as already discussed, disabled: this was one of the problems Dworkin identifies for Rawls. But it is not possible to take out insurance against bad brute luck which has already happened. However, it is possible to imagine what insurance one would take out, hypothetically, behind a veil of ignorance in which you knew the preponderance of, and disadvantage caused by, different types of disability, but did not know whether or not you personally were affected. Knowing this information should allow one to decide whether to insure, and if so at what level. Averaging the decisions gives a standard hypothetical premium and payout, and these can be used to model a just tax and transfer scheme. A similar move is available to model appropriate welfare payments for those of low talent.

Dworkin’s argument, then, has the merit of squaring up to, and attempting to answer, a number of hard questions. What is the currency of justice? How do we make room for issues of responsibility within egalitarian theory? How do we determine the appropriate level of compensation for people of low earning power or who have disabilities? A coherent systematic picture emerges which provides a response to Nozick, and repairs defects identified in Rawls’s position. This explains the central place of his work in the literature.

DWORKIN’S EQUALITY: CRITICAL APPRAISAL

Before looking at direct responses to Dworkin, it is worth noting that not everyone accepts that the problem of responsibility is as serious as he supposes. An alternative theory suggests that each person is entitled to a payment from the state whether or not they work, or are willing to work or not. This is the theory of ‘unconditional basic income’, and it has several possible foundations. Philippe van Parijs and Andrew Levine, have defended the view

essentially on the grounds of neutrality between conceptions of the good; some prefer to work, some prefer not to, and, to simplify, why should we privilege the conception of the good of one over the other? Arguments are also made that it would have various consequential advantages such as ending discrimination against part-time workers, and requiring work with poor conditions to be paid a decent wage.

In an alternative version defended by Hillel Steiner, all human beings are joint owners of the earth and its resources. To simplify, we can imagine each of us as the owner of one share in 'Earth PLC'. Anyone who wishes to use any of the world's resources must pay a rent to do so, and this rent is returned to the shareholders as a dividend. Accordingly anyone who uses more than a per capita share of the world's resources owes more rent than he or she will get back in dividend; those who use less will get more dividend than they must pay in rent. This, of course, yields a payment for everyone, whether they act responsibly or irresponsibly, although, of course, some will pay more in rent than they receive back in dividend. While I will not here pursue this option further, it is necessary to register it as a live and important line in political philosophy.

EQUALITY OF WELFARE REVISITED

To return to the main line, recall that Dworkin considers and rejects equality of welfare as a possible response to the problem presented by the fact that disabled people may need more resources than other people to achieve an acceptable standard of living. The rejection is based on the argument from Louis's expensive tastes. Richard Arneson, however, suggests that this argument is confused. The problem with Louis is that he has deliberately cultivated expensive tastes. He could have achieved the same level of welfare as other people by remaining content with hen's eggs and beer, but for whatever reason he decided to cultivate expensive tastes. Arneson's response is that we need to understand that there is a distinction not only between theories of resources and theories of welfare, but also what we could call 'outcome' and 'opportunity' theories. It is true, Arneson, accepts, that equality of welfare outcomes would require subsidizing Louis's deliberately cultivated expensive tastes. However, Louis does have equality of opportunity for welfare, but he squanders this by deliberately cultivating expensive tastes. If he was born with expensive tastes then the case for subsidising is more compelling, for he would then lack equality of opportunity for welfare. Hence, Arneson argues, Dworkin has drawn the wrong conclusion from his example. In effect, Arneson suggests, Dworkin has compared equality of welfare outcomes with equality of opportunity for resources.

The expensive tastes argument shows that equality of welfare outcomes is unacceptable, but this is a reason for moving to an opportunity conception, not a resources conception. G.A. Cohen argues in a similar way, although unlike Arneson he claims that an adequate theory of equality must use the currency of 'advantage' which incorporates both welfare and resources, although Cohen admits that he has no account of how the two notions can be combined. Cohen endorses one of Dworkin's arguments against pure welfarism; that it would have the bizarre consequence that it would require transfers from the very cheerful poor – such as Dickens' Tiny Tim – to the wealthy but miserable, such as Scrooge. But equally, Cohen

argues, it would be wrong to follow Dworkin and endorse a pure resource based metric in which people were not compensated for pain and suffering, for example.

Dworkin, however, is not persuaded by the criticisms of Arneson and Cohen, arguing that the objection to subsidizing expensive tastes is equally strong even if they are the result of genetic pre-disposition. Whether a person should be subsidised for their expensive tastes depends on whether the average person would, hypothetically, have insured against having that taste. The origin of the taste is, for Dworkin, not relevant. Critics are far from convinced that this is plausible response, and I think it is fair to say that the dispute especially between Dworkin and Cohen remains unsettled.

Dworkin has made important contributions to what is sometimes called the equality of what debate. He advocates a theory he calls 'equality of resources'. This theory combines two key ideas. Broadly speaking, the first is that human beings are responsible for the life choices they make. The second is that natural endowments of intelligence and talent are morally arbitrary and ought not to affect the distribution of resources in society. Like the rest of Dworkin's work, his theory of equality is underpinned by the core principle that every person is entitled to equal concern and respect in the design of the structure of society. Dworkin's theory of equality is said to be one variety of so-called luck egalitarianism, but he rejects this statement.

3.3 THE CONCEPT OF JUSTICE

Meaning-

The word justice has been derived from the Latin term justitia, which means the idea of joining or fitting, the idea of bond or tie. The joining of fitting implied in the idea of justice is that between man and man in an organized system of human relations. According to Barker justice is not only about binding man and man but also is the reconciler and the synthesis of political values. It is their union on in an adjusted and integrated whole. Rawls, "Justice is a set of principles for defining the appropriate distribution of benefits and burdens of social co-operation after identifying the relevant considerations which determine this balance"

Nature of Justice

It is one of the most provocative concept that contain the essence of values like liberty, equality, rights, fraternity, dignity etc. In common parlance it is employed as just behavior or treatment, the quality of being fair and reasonable The essence of justice is in achieving proper balance In legal sense it means fair trial, a just sentence In political theory, justice has concerned both the terms of membership of a social group and the distribution of burdens and benefits within that group In first sense it is called as social justice while in second sense it is known as distributive justice.

Plato attempts to assimilate virtue of justice with the pursuit of the common good According to him every member of society should perform their social functions without interrupting work of others He designed an ideal state with fixed statuses and locations of its members and thus balances in their personal roles and social functions Aristotle was of the opinion that

justice denotes an equality of proportion between person and things assigned to them i.e. those differences in treatment should be proportional to the degrees to which individuals differ in relevant respects.

The liberal view of justice emphasized on legal and political dimensions. The rule of law i.e. equality before law and equal protection of laws with provision for civil and political rights to participate in the political process are the determining characteristics of modern liberal democratic school of thought.

Barker has shown that justice represents synthesis of the principles of liberty, equality and fraternity. Human relations are guided by faculty of reason present in humans it is this virtue of reason that convinces humans that all human are equal in dignity and potentially capable of acquiring excellence according to their capacities and making suitable contributions to the social good They all need and deserve equal freedom for personal development in their own right so as to prove their worth to society Unrestricted freedom to some is denial of liberty to others. Value of liberty demands proper balance by equality. At the same time forced or imposed equality is detrimental to the development of creative and productive tendencies of individuals. Undue emphasis on equality is against the liberty of the people. Fraternity among humans provides a common bond that keeps human relations harmonious and helps to solve and content antagonistic tendencies between liberty and equality. Thus finally justice implies that liberty should be qualified by the principle of equality and equality is further qualified by the principle of fraternity. It is a dynamic idea because our realization of it is a continuous process. Our progress towards its realization depends upon the development of our social consciousness, so that what was regarded as just some centuries ago is not so today.

Bases of Justice

According to barker there are four premises on which people generally consider a legal system just or unjust They are namely religion, nature, economics and in Barker sown opinion ethics St Thomas Aquinas supported religion, Blackstone supported natural law, Duguit, Produhon, Marx regarded economics and Plato, Aristole, Hegel, Kant, Green and Barker hold that the true source of justice is to be found in ethics.

DIMENSIONS OF JUSTICE

Legal Dimensions of Justice

Law refers to the general body of rules recognized and enforced by the state and upheld by the courts. The essence of justice in any given society implies legal codes enacted by the state and supplemented by customary rules which are observed by the people. Law defines the rights and duties of individuals and associations in a community The legal dimension of justice denotes adherence to declared rules.

Political Dimension of Justice

Political justice refers to the transformation of political institutions, political process and political rights according to current conceptions of justice. It means the establishment of democratic institutions in the political life of the community so that these institutions represent and take care of the interests of the people, not of any privileged class. It also implies a full guarantee of the liberty of thought and expression, especially the right to criticize the government and its policies, right to form associations and interest groups. It postulates a universal availability of the mechanism for resolving the conflicting claim of different interests in society.

Social Dimension of Justice

Social justice implies elimination of all kinds of discrimination and privileges on the grounds of birth, race, caste, creed or sex. Social roles should be determined on the basis of capacity and not status. There should be social mobility between the various types of occupations and trades.

Economic Dimension of Justice

Socialists, anarchists and the Marxists advocated that justice must be sought in the economic structure of a given society. Proudhon advocated an economic system based on the principle of mutual cooperation, Dugust stressed on social solidarity, Marxists sought to end proletarian suffering which are due to their exploitation by bourgeois, by overthrowing the existing state apparatus through a socialist revolution and establishing classless society.

VIEWS OF JOHN RAWLS

John Rawls was an American political philosopher in the liberal tradition. His theory of justice as fairness envisions a society of free citizens holding equal basic rights cooperating within an egalitarian economic system. His account of political liberalism addresses the legitimate use of political power in a democracy, aiming to show how enduring unity may be achieved despite the diversity of worldviews that free institutions allow.

JUSTICE AS FAIRNESS: JUSTICE WITHIN A LIBERAL SOCIETY

Justice as fairness is Rawls's theory of justice for a liberal society. As a member of the family of liberal political conceptions of justice it provides a framework for the legitimate use of political power. Yet legitimacy is only the minimal standard of political acceptability; a political order can be legitimate without being just. Justice is the maximal moral standard: the full description of how a society's main institutions should be ordered.

THE BASIC STRUCTURE OF SOCIETY

Justice as fairness aims to describe a just arrangement of the major political and social institutions of a liberal society: the political constitution, the legal system, the economy, the family, and so on. The arrangement of these institutions is a society's basic structure. The basic structure is the location of justice because these institutions distribute the main benefits

and burdens of social life, for example who will receive social recognition, who will have which basic rights, who will have opportunities to get what kind of work, what the distribution of income and wealth will be, and so on.

THE ORIGINAL POSITION

Rawls suggests the original position where individuals can decide about the principles of justice in a fair and free atmosphere. The original position aims to move from these abstract conceptions to determinate principles of social justice. It does so by translating the question: “What are fair terms of social cooperation for free and equal citizens?” into the question “What terms of cooperation would free and equal citizens agree to under fair conditions?” The move to agreement among citizens is what places Rawls's justice as fairness within the social contract tradition of Locke, Rousseau and Kant. The strategy of the original position is to construct a method of reasoning that models abstract ideas about justice so as to focus their power together onto the choice of principles.

The original position is a thought experiment: an imaginary situation in which each real citizen has a representative, and all of these representatives come to an agreement on which principles of justice should order the political institutions of the real citizens. Were actual citizens to get together in real time to try to agree to principles of justice for their society the bargaining among them would be influenced by all sorts of factors irrelevant to justice, such as who could appear most threatening or who could hold out longest.

The original position abstracts from all such irrelevant factors. In effect the original position is a situation in which each citizen is represented as only a free and equal citizen, as wanting only what free and equal citizens want, and as trying to agree to principles for the basic structure while situated fairly with respect to other citizens. For example citizens' basic equality is modelled in the original position by imagining that the parties who represent real citizens are symmetrically situated: no citizen's representative is able to threaten any other citizen's representative, or to hold out longer for a better deal. The most striking feature of the original position is the veil of ignorance, which prevents other arbitrary facts about citizens from influencing the agreement among their representatives. As we have seen, Rawls holds that the fact that a citizen is for example of a certain race, class, and gender is no reason for social institutions to favour or disfavour him.

Each party in the original position is therefore deprived of knowledge of the race, class, and gender of the real citizen they represent. In fact the veil of ignorance deprives the parties of all facts about citizens that are irrelevant to the choice of principles of justice: not only their race, class, and gender but also their age, natural endowments, and more. Moreover the veil of ignorance also screens out specific information about the citizens' society so as to get a clearer view of the permanent features of a just social system. Behind the veil of ignorance, the informational situation of the parties that represent real citizens is as follows: a. Parties do not know: i. The race, ethnicity, gender, age, income, wealth, natural endowments, comprehensive doctrine, etc. of any of the citizens in society, or to which generation in the

history of the society these citizens belong. ii. The political system of the society, its class structure, economic system, or level of economic development. b. Parties do know:

i. That citizens in the society have different comprehensive doctrines and plans of life; that all citizens have interests in more primary goods.

ii. That the society is under conditions of moderate scarcity: there is enough to go around, but not enough for everyone to get what they want;

iii. General facts about human social life; facts of common sense; general conclusions of science (including economics and psychology) that are uncontroversial.

The veil of ignorance is intended to situate the representatives of free and equal citizens fairly with respect to one another. No party can press for agreement on principles that will arbitrarily favour the particular citizen they represent, because no party knows the specific attributes of the citizen they represent. The situation of the parties thus embodies reasonable conditions, within which the parties can make a rational agreement. Each party tries to agree to principles that will be best for the citizen they represent (i.e., that will maximize that citizen's share of primary goods). Since the parties are fairly situated, the agreement they reach will be fair to all actual citizens.

THE TWO PRINCIPLES OF JUSTICE AS FAIRNESS

Under the veil of ignorance people agree to two principles of justice. First Principle: Each person has the same indefeasible claim to a fully adequate scheme of equal basic liberties, which scheme is compatible with the same scheme of liberties for all; Second Principle: Social and economic inequalities are to satisfy two conditions:

1. They are to be attached to offices and positions open to all under conditions of fair equality of opportunity;
2. They are to be to the greatest benefit of the least-advantaged members of society (the difference principle). The first principle of equal basic liberties is to be used for designing the political constitution, while the second principle applies primarily to economic institutions.

Fulfilment of the first principle takes priority over fulfilment of the second principle, and within the second principle fair equality of opportunity takes priority over the difference principle. The first principle affirms for all citizens' familiar basic rights and liberties: liberty of conscience and freedom of association, freedom of speech and liberty of the person, the rights to vote, to hold public office, to be treated in accordance with the rule of law, and so on. The principle ascribes these rights and liberties to all citizens equally. Unequal rights would not benefit those who would get a lesser share of rights, so justice requires equal rights for all in all normal circumstances. Rawls's first principle accords with widespread convictions about the importance of equal basic rights and liberties. Two further features make this first principle distinctive. First is its priority: the basic rights and liberties must not be traded off against other social goods. The first principle disallows, for instance, a policy that would give draft exemptions to college students on the grounds that educated civilians

will increase economic growth. The draft is a drastic infringement on basic liberties, and if a draft is implemented then all who are able to serve must be equally subject to it.

The second distinctive feature of Rawls's first principle is that it requires fair value of the political liberties. The political liberties are a subset of the basic liberties, concerned with the rights to hold public office, the right to affect the outcome of national elections and so on. For these liberties Rawls requires that citizens be not only formally but also substantively equal. That is, citizens similarly endowed and motivated should have the same opportunities to hold office, to influence elections, and so on regardless of their social class.

Rawls's second principle of justice has two parts. The first part, fair equality of opportunity, requires that citizens with the same talents and willingness to use them have the same educational and economic opportunities regardless of whether they were born rich or poor. "In all parts of society there are to be roughly the same prospects of culture and achievement for those similarly motivated and endowed". So for example if we assume that natural endowments and willingness are evenly distributed across children born into different social classes, then within any type of occupation (generally specified) we should find that roughly one quarter of people in that occupation were born into the top 25% of the income distribution, one quarter were born into the second-highest 25% of the income distribution, one quarter were born into the second-lowest 25%, and one quarter were born into the lowest 25%. Since class of origin is a morally arbitrary fact about citizens, justice does not allow class of origin to turn into unequal real opportunities for education or meaningful work. The second part of the second principle is the difference principle, which regulates the distribution of wealth and income. With these goods inequalities can produce a greater total product: higher wages can cover the costs of training and education, for example, and can provide incentives to fill jobs that are more in demand. The difference principle requires that social institutions be arranged so that any inequalities of wealth and income work to the advantage of those who will be worst off. The difference principle requires, that is, that financial inequalities be to everyone's advantage, and specifically to the greatest advantage of those advantaged least.

Consider four hypothetical economic structures A-D, and the lifetime-average levels of income these would produce for representative members of three different groups: Economy Least-Advantaged Group Middle Group Most-Advantaged Group A 10,000 10,000 10,000 B 12,000 30,000 80,000 C 30,000 90,000 150,000 D 20,000 100,000 500,000 Here the difference principle selects Economy C, because it contains the distribution where the least-advantaged group does best. Inequalities in C are to everyone's advantage relative to an equal division (Economy A), and relative to a more equal division (Economy B). But the difference principle does not allow the rich to get richer at the expense of the poor (Economy D). The difference principle embodies equality-based reciprocity: from an egalitarian baseline it requires inequalities that are good for all, and particularly for the worst-off. The difference principle gives expression to the idea that natural endowments are undeserved. A citizen does not merit more of the social product simply because she was lucky enough to be born with gifts that are in great demand. Yet this does not mean that everyone must get the same shares. The fact that citizens have different talents and abilities can be used to make everyone better

off. In a society governed by the difference principle citizens regard the distribution of natural endowments as an asset that can benefit all. Those better endowed are welcome to use their gifts to make themselves better off, so long as their doing so also contributes to the good of those less well endowed. "In justice as fairness," Rawls says, "men agree to share one another's fate."

DIFFICULTIES WITH THE RAWLSIAN THEORY

The task for Rawls was to create a theory that was more in aligning with our intuitive conceptions about fairness, both with respect to institutions and actual behaviour. But Amartya Sen argues that 'in the Rawlsian system of justice as fairness, direct attention is bestowed almost exclusively on 'just institutions', rather than focusing on 'just societies' that may rely on both effective institutions and on actual behavioural features'. Sen has a point. It seems like Rawls thinks that the two principles are seen to both ensure the right choice of institutions and to lay the ground for the emergence of appropriate actual behavior. This is not so obvious.

A second critique raised by Sen is connected with Rawls perception of the primary goods. According to Sen, Rawls fails to acknowledge the wide variety between people, with respect to their differences in health, need and mobility. Since Rawls considers health to be a natural good, it is regarded by him as not being subject to distribution. What about differences in need? For example, a pregnant woman needs, among other things, more nutritional support than another person, who is not bearing a child. She can do far less with the same level of income and other primary goods. Is it then reasonable to think that individuals value a marginal increase of social primary goods equally? Sen thinks otherwise, and argues that we should move our focus to actual assessment of freedoms and capabilities. Rawls theory has been subject to a lot of critique. Among them, the absent of direct dialogue between the participants. His assumption that the participants of the 'social contract' are mutually disinterested are also a lose one. Although some of his critics seem to think that his theory could be extended to capture more diverse cases and meet further challenges. However, being subject to critical scrutiny for over three decades, contemporaries seem to have abandoned his basic ideas. But his fundamental idea that justice is to be viewed in terms of fairness, which is a Rawlsian hallmark, is by large still seen as a common point of departure for further elaboration on distributional justice

LET US SUM UP

John Rawls was arguably the most important political philosopher of the twentieth century. He wrote a series of highly influential articles in the 1950s and '60s that helped refocus Anglo-American moral and political philosophy on substantive problems about what we ought to do. His first book, *A Theory of Justice*, revitalized the social-contract tradition, using it to articulate and defend a detailed vision of egalitarian liberalism. In *A Theory of Justice*, Rawls attempts to solve the problem of distributive justice (the socially just distribution of goods in a society) by utilising a variant of the familiar device of the social contract. The resultant theory is known as "Justice as Fairness", from which Rawls derives his two

principles of justice: the liberty principle and the difference principle. Many critiqued Rawls' views regarding Justice.

Amartya Sen states that ideas about a perfectly just world do not help redress actual existing inequality. Sen faults Rawls for an over-emphasis on institutions as guarantors of justice not considering the effects of human behaviour on the institutions' ability to maintain a just society. Sen believes Rawls understates the difficulty in getting everyone in society to adhere to the norms of a just society. Sen also claims that Rawls' position that there be only one possible outcome of the reflective equilibrium behind the veil of ignorance is misguided. Sen believes that multiple conflicting but just principles may arise and that this undermines the multi-step processes that Rawls laid out as leading to a perfectly just society.

CHECK YOUR PROGRESS:

1. What is Liberty?
2. What is Equality?
3. What is Justice?
4. What is the necessity of Liberty, Equality and Justice to Human Life?

CHAPTER 4

DEMOCRACY

LEARNING OUTCOME: After going through this lesson students will be able to-

- **Know about meaning and definition of Democracy**
- **Understand the necessity of Democracy**
- **Understand the different theories of Democracy**

4.1 CONCEPT AND FEATURES

The word democracy comes from the Greek words "demos", meaning people, and "kratos" meaning power; so democracy can be thought of as "power of the people": a way of governing which depends on the will of the people.

There are so many different models of democratic government around the world that it is sometimes easier to understand the idea of democracy in terms of what it definitely is not. Democracy, then, is not autocracy or dictatorship, where one person rules; and it is not oligarchy, where a small segment of society rules. Properly understood, democracy should not even be "rule of the majority", if that means that minorities' interests are ignored completely. A democracy, at least in theory, is government on behalf of all the people, according to their "will".

The idea of democracy derives its moral strength – and popular appeal – from two key principles:

1. Individual autonomy: The idea that no-one should be subject to rules which have been imposed by others. People should be able to control their own lives (within reason).
2. Equality: The idea that everyone should have the same opportunity to influence the decisions that affect people in society.

These principles are intuitively appealing, and they help to explain why democracy is so popular. Of course we feel it is fair that we should have as much chance as anyone else to decide on common rules!

The problems arise when we consider how the principles can be put into practice, because we need a mechanism for deciding how to address conflicting views. Because it offers a simple mechanism, democracy tends to be "rule of the majority"; but rule of the majority can mean that some people's interests are never represented. A more genuine way of representing everyone's interests is to use decision making by consensus, where the aim is to find common points of interest.

THE DEVELOPMENT OF DEMOCRACY

Ancient history

The ancient Greeks are credited with creating the very first democracy, although there were almost certainly earlier examples of primitive democracy in other parts of the world. The Greek model was established in the 5th century BC, in the city of Athens. Among a sea of autocracies and oligarchies – which were the normal forms of government at the time – Athenian democracy stood out.

However, compared to how we understand democracy today, the Athenian model had two important differences:

1. There was a form of direct democracy – in other words, instead of electing representatives to govern on the people's behalf, "the people" themselves met, discussed questions of government, and then implemented policy.
2. Such a system was possible partly because "the people" was a very limited category. Those who could participate directly were a small part of the population, since women, slaves, aliens – and of course, children – were excluded. The numbers who participated were still far more than in a modern democracy: perhaps 50,000 males engaged directly in politics, out of a population of around 300,000 people.

Democracy in the modern world

Today there are as many different forms of democracy as there are democratic nations in the world. No two systems are exactly the same and no one system can be taken as a "model". There are presidential and parliamentary democracies, democracies that are federal or unitary, democracies that use a proportional voting system, and ones that use a majoritarian system, democracies which are also monarchies, and so on.

One thing that unites modern systems of democracy, and which also distinguishes them from the ancient model, is the use of representatives of the people. Instead of taking part directly in law making, modern democracies use elections to select representatives who are sent by the people to govern on their behalf. Such a system is known as representative democracy. It can lay some claim to being "democratic" because it is, at least to some degree, based on the two principles above: equality of all (one person – one vote), and the right of every individual to some degree of personal autonomy.

DEFINITIONS

The term "democracy," refers very generally to a method of group decision making characterized by a kind of equality among the participants at an essential stage of the collective decision making. Four aspects of this definition should be noted. First, democracy concerns collective decision making, by which means decisions that are made for groups and that are binding on all the members of the group. Second, this definition means to cover a lot

of different kinds of groups that may be called democratic. So there can be democracy in families, voluntary organizations, economic firms, as well as states and transnational and global organizations. Third, the definition is not intended to carry any normative weight to it. It is quite compatible with this definition of democracy that it is not desirable to have democracy in some particular context.

So, the definition of democracy does not settle any normative questions. Fourth, the equality required by the definition of democracy may be more or less deep. It may be the mere formal equality of one-person one-vote in an election for representatives to an assembly where there is competition among candidates for the position. Or it may be more robust, equality in the processes of deliberation and coalition building.

“Democracy” may refer to any of these political arrangements. It may involve direct participation of the members of a society in deciding on the laws and policies of the society or it may involve the participation of those members in selecting representatives to make the decisions. The function of normative democratic theory is not to settle questions of definition but to determine which, if any, of the forms democracy may take are morally desirable and when and how. For instance, Joseph Schumpeter argues that only a highly formal kind of democracy in which citizens vote in an electoral process for the purpose of selecting competing elites is highly desirable while a conception of democracy that draws on a more ambitious conception of equality is dangerous. On the other hand, Jean Jacques Rousseau is apt to argue that the formal variety of democracy is akin to slavery while only robustly egalitarian democracies have political legitimacy. Others have argued that democracy is not desirable at all. To evaluate their arguments we must decide on the merits of the different principles and conceptions of humanity and society from which they proceed.

Like other political concepts democracy is also essentially contested concept. Thus, democracy, according to Greeks is the system of governance, where people rule over themselves without any external interference.

1. Aristotle considered it as a perverted form of government when he talks about many forms of government.
2. Herodotus, describes democracy as that form of government in which the ruling power of the state is mostly vested in the whole community.
3. Abraham Lincoln defined it as a government ‘of the people, by the people and for the people.
4. Bryce defined democracy as that form of government in which state is legally sovereign.
5. According to Mazzini democracy is the best and wisest form of government.

Main features of Democracy: -

1. Popular sovereignty: - The people here have the almighty power in their hands. They are the ones who are represented and controlled by the people of the real government. The opinion of the people here is very important and their opinion is same as the opinion of God.

This is because of the fact that Democracy is a systematic government where people form government and run the country.

2. Equality: – Democracy is a state of equality. Discrimination has no place in democracy. All are equal in a democracy. Brotherhood is the symbol of friendship. The neutrality of national policies influences its governance.
3. Liberty and Justice: Freedom is most important weapon of an individual. Freedom helps a person to develop his personality. It simply came to our notice then. Justice, on the other hand, is the key to the rule of law. Another name for justice is truth. Justice is intended not to oppress the weak. Without justice, there would be no faith in the rule of the nation. So it is a person's freedom and trust. It is the system that promotes democratic values. Justice is always based on equality.
4. Importance of Majority: In a democracy, the importance of majority thinking is much higher than that of quality thinking. In this government, all unjust majority is established in Viv. Although it emphasizes the majority, it does not neglect the minority.
5. Election: Elections are the most powerful means of expressing democratic values. This gives citizens the opportunity to represent the government. This increases the effect of the person's innate personality. Elections explore talent and change in many ways.
6. Political Parties: Political parties are an integral part of increasing the dynamics of democracy. This increases political participation. The party system trains the new generation. The activism of the opposition further dissolves democracy. Political parties are therefore compared to the heart of democracy.
7. Opened Discussion: In a democracy, all decisions are made through open discussion. The talks are being held between representatives of the ruling party and the opposition in the legislature. The rule of law in this country prioritizes the personal ideology of the ruler. Governance is not reflected in the expression of thought or personal will. Therefore, public opinion is respected through open interpretation.
8. Change of the Government by Public Opinion through Constitutional means: Change of the Government by public opinion through Constitutional means at regular intervals Violence is not seen here to overthrow the government. Governance is governed by the Constitution. The public enjoys this power through voting.
9. Tolerance: A tolerant or patient attitude maintains a brotherly relationship. The decision is made by a majority vote, promising not to ignore anyone. Tolerance is very helpful for a strong mind. Tolerance promotes unity by discouraging social divisions.
- 10 Promoting Welfarism: - The gap between rich and poor is reduced through a variety of welfare schemes. The state is always trying to meet the basic needs of the people. There are many ways to look at minorities.

11. Rule of Law: This system of governance is based on the rule of law. No one here is above the law. The law is the youngest way to avoid arbitrariness. The law is used as the main weapon to establish equality, justice, and freedom. The rule here is not of anyone, but the people. It is the duty of all to abide by the law and to respect it. Equality of law is essential for building a prosperous and prosperous society. The popular law is enforced here and the government is strengthened.

12. Political liberty: - Citizens take an active part in governing the country in a democracy. Citizens enjoy political independence, the right to vote in elections, the right to freedom of expression, the right to criticize the government, and the right to form unions. In addition, fundamental rights are granted to the development of the personality of the individual.

4.2 CONDITIONS NECESSARY FOR THE SUCCESS OF DEMOCRACY

While admitting that Democracy is the best system, we have to remember that there are several possible demerits which must be controlled. In-fact, the success of Democracy can be possible only when it works in such conditions as are essential for its successful working.

It can be successful only when following conditions are secured:

1. Democratic Society:

A democratic society is essential for the success of a democratic government. A democratic society is one which willingly accepts the values of liberty and equality. It is a society which is not characterised by a democratic thinking, no democracy can be successful. Without being supported by a democratic society, no democracy can successfully work.

2. Economic Equality:

Economic equality in society can guarantee the success of democracy. Without economic democracy, political democracy remains true only on papers. People cannot be fed on votes, they need foods. They cannot live on mere slogans and populism. Economic equality involving equitable distribution of income and wealth and adequate opportunities for livelihood, is an essential condition for the success of democracy.

3. Educated and Enlightened Citizenship:

Democracy is a system which involves a continuous and active involvement of the people in the political process. Without popular and effective political participation, no democracy can be successful. For this purpose, it is essential that literacy should be widespread and people must be enlightened in respect of their rights, freedoms and duties as citizens of a democratic system.

No democracy can work successfully if its citizens are not prepared to sacrifice their individual interests for the sake of social good. Only educated and enlightened citizens are expected to realize and follow this vital condition for the success of democracy. Illiteracy and ignorance always hinder the success of democracy. The experience of our own country is before us.

4. Full respect for Fundamental Rights and Freedoms:

Democracy is regarded as the best form of government because it grants and guarantees fundamental human rights and freedoms to all its people. For this purpose it is essential for a democracy to take all steps which are necessary for granting, preserving and protecting the rights the people. For this purpose Rule of Law, Separation of Powers, Judicial Review, Decentralisation of Power and Independence of Judiciary have to be ensured.

5. Freedom of Press:

Without freedom of press, we cannot even imagine the working of a democratic government. Public opinion has to be the basis of all policies and decisions of a democratic government. The government must keep a continuous track of the demands of public opinion.

Press is the means for transmitting the public opinion to the government. Only a free press can perform this task in a desired manner. It is only through a free press that the people can exercise their right to freedom of speech and expression as well as their right to discuss and debate, criticize or support the policies and programmes of their government. Press is often described as the fourth essential but non-governmental institution of democracy.

6. Well Organised and Active Opposition:

In a democratic system political parties play a key role. These contest elections, wield power when voted to majority or act as opposition when not is majority. The majority party uses power of the government and the opposition parties criticise the policies of ruling party. Both have to play their respective roles and only then can a democracy work.

The ruling party can misuse its position by ignoring the interests of the minorities and the people in general. There is every need to keep it under supervision and check. It must be prevented from misusing its power in the name of majority. For this purpose the existence of a strong, well-organised and well-functioning opposition is always essential.

7. Mature Leadership:

The people are sovereign but they have to be led by their leaders and only then can they fruitfully exercise their power. In a democracy the leaders are in reality the policy-makers and the decision-makers. They can perform these tasks only when they are able, mature, honest and dedicated.

8. Spirit of Tolerance and Compromise:

In a democratic government no person, group or party can be permitted to act arbitrarily. No one should try to impose one's will upon others and use power in an arbitrary way. This can be possible only when the people have a high sense of tolerance, accommodation and compromise.

The majority should not ignore the minority. It must respect the wishes of the minority. The minority should not act in a way as can create hindrances in the way of exercise of power by

the majority. This can be secured only when all the people accept tolerance, accommodation, compromise, secularism and mutual give-and-take in national interest as their values.

9. Well organised and Powerful system of Local Government:

For a successful working of a democratic system one of the most essential conditions is the existence of a well organised and powerful system of local government. A local government is that through which the people of a local area meet their local needs and problems with the help of local resources and through a locally elected government.

It is as such a training school of democracy. Local government system constitutes the grass root level base of a democratic system. Just as no big building can be raised without broad and solid foundations, likewise no democratic government can be really organised and effectively run without the existence of a board, strong and efficient system of local government working at the foundation level.

10. Democratic Institutions:

Independence of judiciary, rule of law, decentralisation of powers, separation of powers, sound and independent election machinery, healthy education system, and liberalism in thought and actions are the other essential requirements for the success of a democratic system. All these features must be properly secured only then can a democracy be expected to work successfully.

At these are the essential conditions for the successful working of a democracy. These conditions can help a democracy to reduce its possible demerits as well as to let its merits help the people in developing their personalities and in enjoying their lives.

Democratic theory deals with the moral foundations of democracy and democratic institutions. It is distinct from descriptive and explanatory democratic theory. It does not offer in the first instance a scientific study of those societies that are called democratic. It aims to provide an account of when and why democracy is morally desirable as well as moral principles for guiding the design of democratic institutions. Of course, normative democratic theory is inherently interdisciplinary and must call on the results of political science, sociology and economics in order to give this kind of concrete guidance. This brief outline of normative democratic theory focuses attention on four distinct issues in recent work. First, it outlines some different approaches to the question of why democracy is morally desirable at all. Second, it explores the question of what it is reasonable to expect from citizens in large democratic societies. This issue is central to the evaluation of normative democratic theories as we will see. A large body of opinion has it that most classical normative democratic theory is incompatible with what we can reasonably expect from citizens. It also discusses blueprints of democratic institutions for dealing with issues that arise from a conception of citizenship. Third, it surveys different accounts of the proper characterization of equality in the processes of representation. These last two parts display the interdisciplinary nature of normative democratic theory. Fourth, it discusses the issue of whether and when democratic institutions have authority and it discusses different conceptions of the limits of democratic authority.

THE AUTHORITY OF DEMOCRACY

Since democracy is a collective decision process, the question naturally arises about whether there is any obligation of citizens to obey the democratic decision. In particular, the question arises as to whether a citizen has an obligation to obey the democratic decision when he or she disagrees with it. There are three main concepts of the legitimate authority of the state. First, a state has legitimate authority to the extent that it is morally justified in imposing its rule on the members. Legitimate authority on this account has no direct implications concerning the obligations or duties that citizens may hold toward that state. It simply says that if the state is morally justified in doing what it does, then it has legitimate authority. Second, a state has legitimate authority to the extent that its directives generate duties in citizens to obey. The duties of the citizens need not be owed to the state but they are real duties to obey. The third is that the state has a right to rule that is correlated with the citizens' duty to it to obey it. This is the strongest notion of authority and it seems to be the core idea behind the legitimacy of the state.

The idea is that when citizens disagree about law and policy it is important to be able to answer the question, who has the right to choose? With respect to democracy we can imagine three main approaches to the question as to whether democratic decisions have authority. First, we can appeal to perfectly general conceptions of legitimate authority. Some have thought that the question of authority is independent entirely of whether a state is democratic. Consent theories of political authority and instrumentalist conceptions of political authority state general criteria of political authority that can be met by non-democratic as well as democratic states. Second, some have thought that there is a conceptual link between democracy and authority such that if a decision is made democratically then it must therefore have authority. Third, some have thought that there are general principles of political authority that are uniquely realized by a democratic state under certain well defined conditions.

LIMITS TO THE AUTHORITY OF DEMOCRACY

If democracy does have authority, what are the limits to that authority? A limit to democratic authority is a principle violation of which defeats democratic authority. When the principle is violated by the democratic assembly, the assembly loses its authority in that instance or the moral weight of the authority is overridden.

A number of different views have been offered on this issue. First, it is worthwhile to distinguish between different kinds of moral limit to authority. We might distinguish between internal and external limits to democratic authority. An internal limit to democratic authority is a limit that arises from the requirements of democratic process or a limit that arises from the principles that underpin democracy. An external limit on the authority of democracy is a limit that arises from principles that are independent of the values or requirements of democracy. Furthermore, some limits to democratic authority are rebutting limits, which are principles that weigh in the balance against the principles that support democratic decision making. Some considerations may simply outweigh in importance the considerations that

support democratic authority. So in a particular case, an individual may see that there are reasons to obey the assembly and some reasons against obeying the assembly and in the case at hand the reasons against obedience outweigh the reasons in favor of obedience.

On the other hand some limits to democratic authority are undercutting limits. These limits function not by weighing against the considerations in favor of authority, they undercut the considerations in favor of authority altogether; they simply short circuit the authority. When an undercutting limit is in play, it is not as if the principles which ground the limit outweigh the reasons for obeying the democratic assembly, it is rather that the reasons for obeying the democratic assembly are undermined altogether; they cease to exist or at least they are severely weakened.

4.3 THEORIES OF DEMOCRACY:

Liberals claim that the state is to promote the interests of the individual; the individual is the end, and the state is the means. According to them, the freedom of the individual should not be unduly restrained by the state. The essence of democracy for them lies in maximising the freedom of the individual. The better off an individual is, the freer he is. So to say, the interests of individuals are identical with their freedoms. Locke who said that the state had to ensure the safety of the life, liberty and property of the individual is generally regarded as the most influential and respected liberal philosopher.

The liberal theory of democracy has passed through three phases and in each phase it has got a different name. As a result, we have got the classical liberal theory of democracy, the elitist theory of democracy, and the pluralist theory of democracy.

Classical Liberalism

The main proponents of the classical liberal theory of democracy are John Locke, Montesquieu, Rousseau, Bentham and J. S. Mill. Locke said that the individual had the right to resist the state and revolt against it if the latter failed to discharge its basic duty of safeguarding the life, liberty and property of the former. He emphasized that the government, based on the consent of the individual, was limited in its authority. Montesquieu who propounded the theory of separation of powers provided sufficient safeguards against the growth of dictatorship.

The utilitarians, in general, laid emphasis on the importance of people's participation in the political process. They held that the government whose main objective was to provide "greatest good of the greatest number" should encourage increased political participation on the part of individuals. Jeremy Bentham, the proponent of the "pleasure and pain" theory, advocated universal adult franchise while J .S. Mill, the son of his illustrious friend, James Mill, emphasized the need of enhancing the quality of democracy by increasing the quality of political participation. Mill, the "reluctant democrat", focussed on the moral aspect of democracy.

He believed that political participation would help the individual in fashioning his all-round development. Hence Mill has been described by Macpherson as the propounder of the "developmental theory of democracy".

Salient Features

1. Man is at the centre of democracy. Democracy aims at defending and promoting the interests of man. The government is the instrument for this, the state is not a sanctified entity. It is neither endowed with any supernatural quality nor invested with any supreme power unrelated to the realisation of its basic aim of serving the individuals belonging to it.
2. The government is constitutional, limited and responsible. It is based upon the consent of the people expressed through periodic elections which are based upon the principle of universal adult suffrage. The man is assumed to be rational; he makes rational choices while casting his vote.
3. The government is not run whimsically according to the sweet desires of some persons in power. It functions in conformity with the provisions of the constitution. Because of separation of powers and check and balance implicit in the constitution itself, the government is expected not to act illegally and arbitrarily. The executive is accountable to the legislature and the members of the latter, sooner or later, are responsible to the people who regularly elect them at regular intervals. In other words, the government, because of its responsibility to the people, would seldom neglect and ignore them. Public opinion is thus highly respected in democracies.
4. Democracy is the art of reaching compromise and consensus. It encourages debates, discussions, arguments and negotiations which help in narrowing down the difference between adversaries and enable them to reach some compromise. Discussions and debates are potentially conflict reducers. These contribute towards lessening tensions, taking away a lot of heat and anger, and prepare the ground for effecting compromises.
5. Democracy respects fundamental rights; in particular, the freedom of expression is very highly valued. Any state which tries to dwarf its men would soon realise that it cannot accomplish any big things with such dwarfed men, said J.S. Mill.

To sum up, observes that the liberal theory of democracy assumes "the existence of rational and active citizens who seek to realise a generally recognized common good through collective initiation, discussion and decision of policy questions concerning public affairs, and who delegate authority to agents (elected government officials) to carry through the broad decisions reached by the people through majority vote.

"He further says, "participation in the management of public affairs would serve as a vital means of intellectual, emotional, and moral education leading towards the full development of the capacities of individual human beings." According to Peter H. Merkel, the four principles of liberal democracy are: government by discussion, majority rule, recognition of

minority rights, and constitutional government. The majority should form the government, but it-Should not ride roughshod over the minority. J. S. Mill evinced keen interest in the minority. He strongly argued that the views of the minority should be respected.

Criticisms

1) The classical theory of democracy assumes that the man is rational. He is capable of determining his vital interests and the best strategy for promoting them. But the experience suggests that individuals are often swayed by other considerations which hardly serve their interests best. They tend to be guided in their political behaviour by parochial factors like Casteism, Ethnicism, Communalism and Localism.

2) Democracy is said to be reflecting the will of the people. A democratic government, in theory, is based upon the consent of the people. It claims legitimacy because it is formed by the people through their free choice. "Free choice" of the people involves some difficulties. Are people really free in a society which is poor, backward and is characterised by inequality and domination?

The political freedom of the people is often seriously undermined and crippled by ignorance, poverty and fear. Elections are often won by money, muscle-power and parochialism. Even in developed countries the democratic process is not free of these shortcomings and flaws. Thus it is criticised that the democratic legitimacy derived from "consent" and "free choice" is more of a myth than of a reality.

3) Democracy is meant to serve the interests of all. But it is not so easy a game as can be played by all of them. Both the process and organisation of democracy are quite complex and complicated. Democracy involves many laws and principles, and operates at several levels. An ordinary man would find it difficult to grasp all these things properly and successfully.

The excessive emphasis laid upon the unrestrained freedom of the individual by the classical liberals was apparently meant to prevent state intervention in the economic pursuits of the rich. Macpherson has observed: "Liberal democracy has typically been designed to fit a scheme of democratic government into a class-divided society; that this fit was not attempted, either in theory or in practice, until the nineteenth century; and that, therefore, earlier models and visions of democracy should not be counted as models of liberal democracy.

ELITE THEORY

The elite theory states that the society is always ruled by a minority who are "superior" to others. The earlier elite theorists like Mosca and Pareto said that the elites were superior to others in quality. On the other hand, the later elite theorists like C. W. Mills and Floyd Hunter stated that the so-called superiority of elites was derived from their family and social backgrounds and the hierarchical organization of the society.

The classical liberal theory truly reflected the needs of the new middle class of the 18th and 19th centuries during which it emerged. The new middle class was then fighting against the decaying monarchical and feudal orders. The bourgeoisie, through democratisation, sought to curb the feudal control over power structures. Hence the emphasis in classical liberal theory on the unrestrained freedom of the individual and political equality.

By the 20th century the problems and priorities of the bourgeoisie had greatly changed. Having strongly entrenched itself in power by banishing the feudal lords from it, it wanted to monopolise it by preventing other elements of the society from competing with it for power. The elite theory, like its predecessor - the classical liberal theory - was developed to serve the interests of the dominant class, the bourgeoisie. It was designed to rationalise the existing political order prevailing in the early part of the 20th century -the domination of power-structures by elites.

Elements of Elite Theory –

All need not be equally active in democracy. It is enough that some are more active and involved in the political process than others. In other words, democracy, for its success, requires the gradation of the political involvement of citizens.

1. Elites should be drawn from all sections of the people as much as possible.
2. Elites should not neglect the common people to whom they are accountable at regular intervals.
3. The elite structure should be open, and the deserving people from below should be encouraged and enabled to enter it. Otherwise, it will gradually lose its vitality, and decay.
4. In democracy, there should not be too much stress on "ideology". It is better that the ideological polarisation among political elites/parties is reduced to the minimum. The "end of ideology" is a recent feature of democracies. The one ideology to which all of them should be committed is the maintenance and stability of the system. None of them should see radical change in it.
5. The government is a mechanism of mediating between the competing elites and establishing compromise and consensus among them. It should aim at minimising conflict among them.

Criticisms

1. The elite theory is anti-democratic in nature. It has little faith in the people. It pins its hopes on elites. The common man is devalued, while elites are overvalued.
2. Elitists are primarily concerned with the maintenance of the stability of the system. They have not much sympathy for any effort to reform or modify the system. They are thus highly conservative and even reactionary.

3. Moral man misses in the writings of elite theorists. For them the utility of the common man lies in its function as the voter, required to elect ruling elites at regular intervals. The all-round development of individual is of little concern to elitists.

The Pluralist Theory of Democracy

Both Marxists and elitists hold that powers rest in the hands of a minority; the majority of the members of the society are excluded from the power structure. The pluralists, on the other hand, maintain that powers are not concentrated; these are dispersed. These are shared among all sections of people primarily through different organizations formed to articulate their interests. These groups and associations make regular and intense efforts to influence government policies and decisions. Some of them are overtly political while many others are potentially so. The latter, though apparently meant to serve some socio-cultural/economic purposes, are, when need arises, politically mobilised and activated.

A closer look at the dynamics of political and semi-political associations would reveal that these are dominated by a small group of leaders who tend to monopolize powers. As Lipset has observed in relation to trade unions, leadership tends to be oligarchic. This means that to a great extent the competition among different organizations for power-sharing is the competition among the leaders of these organizations. It is thus apparent that there is a great deal of overlapping between the Dahl-Schumpeter version of the elite theory, and the pluralist theory of democracy. In the ultimate analysis it is the elites who dominate political parties and interest groups, and who seem to be having close links with the ruling elites controlling the governmental structure.

Elements of Pluralism

1. Powers are fragmented and dispersed. The state is required to share powers with several political parties, interest groups, private groups and individuals.
2. Because of the provision of separation of powers, and check and balance at several points, there is not much possibility of the rise of dictatorship. Neither any branch of the government nor any other organization is likely to emerge over-dominant for a long time. These actors through containing one another would prevent anyone of them having monopoly of power.
3. Sovereignty is not the exclusive possession of either the state or any other group or association. It is, in fact, distributed among them. The sovereignty of the state is limited by the powers of other actors to contain it.
4. Political organizations and other groups, seeking to articulate the demands of their members, help in establishing contact between them and the state. Through their mediation, they help in bridging the distance between the government and the people. Further, they

contribute to improving the quality of governmental decisions by supplying their skill and interest.

Criticisms

1. Dahl claims to have discovered a plurality of elites competing with one another for power by examining the making of decisions on some issues. It is, however, argued by some critics that Dahl has examined only "safe decisions". In any power structure some crucial issues do not come for decision-making; these are settled outside the policy-making structure. The powerful elites bring only those issues to the decision-making structure on which they are sure of getting favorable decisions or if they are not to lose much even if the decisions are not up to their satisfaction. Thus the examination of safe decisions would fail to prove the existence of pluralist power structures.

2. Pluralists argue that the government is not decisively controlled by economic elites and it enjoys "autonomy". The critics do not reject the contention that the government enjoys some amount of autonomy. But they argue that it is in the interests of ruling elites including economic elites that the government should have some amount of autonomy. Autonomy would help it in dealing effectively and flexibly, with the members of the subject class. By making some token concessions it can dissuade them from making serious challenges to the dominance of ruling elites.

3. Pluralism is criticised on the ground that it encourages "pressure politics". The interest groups are hardly expected to rise above their narrow interests and perspectives. Further, in pursuance of their interests, they indulge in illegal and unfair practices. They tend to pressurise the government to favor them even at the expense of the vital interests of the community/nation. Pressure politics has the potential to weaken and immobilise the government, and seriously damage the important interests of the nation.

MARXIST THEORY OF DEMOCRACY

Marxists, in principle, do not oppose democracy. On the other hand, they claim that their "democracy" is genuine whereas the bourgeois democracy is 'fake' and a 'sham'. Marxists do not regard democracy as a political system. They view it as a system of values and a form of society. In the latter sense democracy does not have a final point of achievement. It is a continuously growing process. Thus democracy goes on struggling to go beyond itself, in the process retaining its essence and improvising it further.

As a political system, democracy is a class organism. It is meant to serve the interests of a particular class. Lenin distinguishes working class democracy from bourgeois democracy. The latter serves the interests of the bourgeoisie -a small minority -whereas the former promotes the interests of the proletariat the vast majority of the society. When socialism - the transitional phase matures into communism, democracy as a political system will cease to exist, but democracy as a system of values will flourish. A communist society is a democratic society because it nourishes democratic values like socio-economic equality and the absence of exploitation of one class by another. According to Lefebvre, Marx regards democracy "not

as a system but as a process which comes down essentially to a struggle for democracy. The latter is never completed because democracy can always be carried forward or forced back.

The purpose of struggle is to go beyond democracy and beyond the democratic state, to build a society without state power". 16 According to Marxists, in bourgeois democracy, the state is controlled by the economic elites-the finance capital. The members of this class, by occupying key posts in different branches of the power structure, use the government to promote the interests of their class. Some other Marxists take a slightly different view. They do not think that the organs of the government are manned by the members of rich class. They believe that the latter, by preferring to stay outside the government, dominate policy-making process from behind the scene. They allow the state some autonomy so that the state can utilise that autonomy to better serve their interests. It is thus clear that both Marxist viewpoints - capitalists controlling the government machinery (a) from within, (b) from without-point to the same proposition that the government in capitalist countries is controlled by economic elites who use it to further their own interests.

Marxists reject the legitimacy of elections in bourgeois democracies. They argue that political parties in bourgeois states hardly differ from one another in respect of ideology. The ideologies of all of them are designed to buttress the interests of rich people. As a result, the poor people of capitalist countries have little choice. Whichever party they vote for would help the rich against them.

Marxists further argue that in bourgeois democracies justice is very expensive. It is only the rich who can get judgments in their favor. They gave the money to buy justice. By money power and political influence they can close the eyes of the court to their crimes and other misdeeds. The poor, even if innocent, would be punished by courts. They have little leverage vis-a-vis the judiciary. The judiciary, it is contended, is not impartial. It has got a class character. It is manned by the representatives of the rich class and, no wonder, derives its interests.

Before we make a critical examination of the Marxist theory of democracy, we may bring to an end the preceding discussion by quoting Lenin from his State and Revolution. He said:

The dictatorship of the proletariat - the organization of the vanguard of the oppressed as the ruling class for the purpose of suppressing the oppressors - for the first time becomes democracy for the poor, democracy for the people, and not democracy for the money-bags. The dictatorship of the proletariat imposes a series of restrictions on the freedom of the oppressors, the exploiters, the capitalists.

Criticism

The Marxist theory of democracy has been criticised on the following grounds.

1. Negation of Democracy: The Liberals criticise that the socialist democracy is not democracy at all; it is the opposite of democracy. They argue that democracy is a government of the whole people of the society. Democracy is not a government of one group to be used by it against another. But the socialist democracy, which represents the interests of one class

only - though it is the majority group fails to satisfy the main criterion of democracy mentioned above. The liberals charge that the dictatorship of proletariat, far from being the democracy for the proletariat, is a dictatorship over them. In socialist democracy the party bureaucracy becomes growingly powerful and the common man becomes increasingly alienated from the system. Sartori describes it as a "dictatorship pure and simple", while Popper paints it as a "closed society" in which there is neither freedom nor democracy.²⁰ Benn and Peters have observed: Marxists can equate the "dictatorship of the proletariat" with "democracy" because they exclude any but the workers from the "people" But this is not what is meant by the "people" in the context we have in mind. We should say that a system was just as undemocratic if it denied people votes because they were rich, as if it denied them votes because they were poor.

2. Bloody and Heartless: Some minor differences among them notwithstanding, Marxists, in general, agree that the socialist revolutions as well as the socialist democracy are predominantly violent in nature. Lenin advocates the "bloody" overthrow of the bourgeois government. Excessive emphasis upon violence makes the working men democracy unacceptable to many. Many cultures in the world either hate violence or give very low place to it. No wonder, because of its open support to violence, the Marxist democracy is not welcome in these cultures.

3. Parliamentary Socialism: Many people believe that socialism, a good goal, can be achieved through parliamentary peace. One need not resort to violence and revolution for this. Important reforms with the objective of helping the mass can be pushed through legislations. The people can make use of elections, pressure groups and other democratic instruments at their disposal to influence -if necessary; force the government to adopt "welfare" measures.

This is particularly the strong feeling of the Communist parties of Western Europe who have evolved "Euro-Communism" to represent their point of view. Some democratic countries of the third world are also of this opinion. It is important to note that this view has won support in Moscow at a few points of time. In 1956 Khrushchev, the General Secretary of the Soviet Communist Party, declared that there are two roads to socialism: one is 'revolution', and the other is 'parliamentary road'. However, China bitterly attacked Khrushchev for this.

4. Not a Pure Democracy: Some revisionists like Bernstein and Kautsky have criticised socialist democracy on the ground that it is not a "pure democracy." Kautsky charged that the dictatorship of proletariat, established in Russia after the 1917 revolution, did not grant liberties to citizens. While Bernstein criticised the socialist democracy of Russia for unnecessarily indulging in violence, Rosa Luxemburg, a German Marxist, attacked it for its failure to grant freedoms to the press and people. In her opinion, the dictatorship of proletariat of Russia has become the dictatorship of some politicians.

MACPHERSON'S THEORY OF DEMOCRACY

Political philosopher C.B. Macpherson explores the implications of the ideas about democracy in *The Political Theory of Possessive Individualism and Democracy Theory – Essays in Retrieval*. Macpherson modifies, extends, and clarifies the concept of a man's

power and that of the "transfer of powers," and argues that a liberal-democratic theory can be based on an adequate concept of human powers and capacities without insuperable difficulties.

Arguing that the neo-classical liberalisms of Chapman, Rawls, and Berlin fall short of providing an adequate basis for a twentieth-century liberal-democratic theory largely because, in different ways, they fail to see or understate the transfer of powers. Macpherson suggests that the liberal theory of property should be, and can be, revised fundamentally to accommodate new democratic demands. In this manner Macpherson establishes the need for a theory of democracy that gets clear of the disabling central defect of current liberal-democratic theory, while recovering the humanistic values that liberal democracy has always claimed.

MACPHERSON'S FOUR "MODELS" OF LIBERAL DEMOCRACY

Macpherson designated four models of liberal democracy are as "Protective Democracy", "Developmental Democracy", "Equilibrium Democracy", and "Participatory Democracy." He critically examines the first three models of democracy and then presented his model of participatory democracy.

PROTECTIVE DEMOCRACY

The first, which makes its case for democracy on the grounds that it alone can protect the governed from oppression, is found in the utilitarianism of Bentham and James Mill, reluctant democrats who simply felt that the needs of an essentially capitalist economy in the then prevailing conditions demanded such political reforms as the extension of the franchise.

DEVELOPMENT DEMOCRACY

The "developmental" model, which Macpherson divides into two stages, is a more humanistic one. The model is best represented by J.S. Mill who first articulated the principle which for Macpherson is the essence of the tradition, that aspect of it he wants to preserve: the commitment to the self-development of all individuals equally. In the 20th century, this developmental model, represented by philosophical idealists like Barker or Lindsay, pragmatists like Dewey or "modified utilitarians" like Hobhouse, while retaining Mill's ethical commitment lost some of his realism concerning the obstacles to the fulfillment of the liberal goal posed by the realities of class and exploitation. They simply assumed that the regulatory and welfare state would suffice to bring about the desired end.

EQUILIBRIUM DEMOCRACY

The third model, the currently prevalent one, is that of modern social scientists, the "pluralist elitist equilibrium model" inaugurated by Schumpeter and developed by political scientists like Robert Dahl. This model, argues Macpherson, lacks the ethical dimension of the previous one and offers a description, and a justification, of stable democracy as a "competition between elites which produces equilibrium without much popular participation." Democracy

according to this model is "simply a mechanism for choosing and authorizing governments, not a kind of society or a set of moral ends. . ."

PARTICIPATORY MODEL

Macpherson after critically examined each of these models and explaining the reasons for their successive failures and eventual replacement by a new model, finally turns to the emerging model of "Participatory Democracy", which began as a slogan of the New Left student movement. He proposes to develop this into a complete model to supersede earlier ones, embodying a specific political programme and some suggestions about the kinds of social and ideological changes which would be needed to make the political programme workable. Macpherson has observed that Schumpeter-Dhal axis treat democracy as a mechanism designed to maintain an equilibrium. It conceives of democracy as a competition between two or more elite groups for the power to govern, the whole society, requiring only a low level of citizen participation. In Macpherson's view, it is a distorted view where democracy is reduced from a humanistic aspiration to market equilibrium.

Concept of participatory democracy repudiates this model of democracy as it regards peoples political participation as the basic principle of democracy. In short, political participation denote the active involvement of individuals and groups in the governmental process affective their lives. In other words, when citizen themselves play an active role in the process of formulation and implementation of public policy and decision, their activity is called political participation.

Conventional modes of political participation includes voting, standing for office, campaigning for a political party or contributing to the management of a community project, like public safety, or the maintenance of a public park, etc. interestingly, an act of opposition or public protest also involves political participation. For example, signing a petition, attending a peaceful demonstration, joining a protest march or forming a human chain, etc. come within the preview of political participation. Indeed, the various acts of public protest in the nondemocratic setup like passive resistance, civil disobedience and satyagraha, also qualifies as political participation. They are the manifestation of the strong awareness of public interest.

LET US SUM UP

Democracy claims, and at least in theory is granted, universal applicability. It is such a 'feel-good' word that almost every regime, however tyrannical, describes itself as 'democratic'. In reality, the degree to which a government is democratic can be measured by the extent to which the people' influence government. From other perspectives, we need to consider how far the people are protected from an oppressive state ('defensive democracy') or the extent to which they are encouraged to participate in decision-making ('citizen democracy'). Democratic government can be described as governing with the consent of the people. Majority rule, equality of rights and the rule of law are also important dimensions to democracy. Moreover, democracy requires the social underpinning of a democratic culture. Democracy has often been attacked. A conservative view is that governance is best left to a

highly-skilled elite; a liberal view is the idea that the masses cannot be entrusted with power. Others, such as Marxists and feminists, argue that 'democracy' is but a façade to hide unjust class rule. Defenders of democracy argue that elites are not to be trusted with power. Besides, democracy promotes social cohesion, encourages citizenship development and enables social change to occur without violence. There is also a claim that, as all have a stake in society, all have a right to participate in its decisions.

CHECK YOUR PROGRESS:

- What is Democracy?
- What are different theories of Democracy?
- What is the necessity of Democracy?

READING REFERENCES:

Sir E. Barker, *Principles of Social and Political Theory*, Calcutta, Oxford University Press, 1976.

N. P. Barry, *Introduction to Modern Political Theory*, London, Macmillan, 1995.

S. Benhabib and D. Cornell, *Feminism as Critique*, Cambridge, Polity Press, 1987.

S. I. Benn and R. S. Peters, *Social Principles and the Democratic State*, London, George & Allen, 1959.

A. Brecht, *Political Theory: The Foundations of Twentieth Century Political Thought*, Bombay, The Times of India Press, 1965.

M. Carnoy, *The State and Political Theory*, Princeton NJ, Princeton University Press, 1984.

G. Catlin, *A Study of the Principles of Politics*, London and New York, Oxford University Press, 1930.

D. Coole, *Women in Political Theory: From Ancient Misogyny to Contemporary Feminism*, New York, Harvester Wheatsheaf, 1993.

B. Crick, *In Defence of Politics*, Harmondsworth, Pelican Books, 1963.

R. Dahl, *Modern Political Analysis*, Englewood Cliffs NJ, Prentice Hall, 1963.

R. Dahl, *A Preface to Democratic Theory*, Chicago, University of Chicago Press, 1965.

J. Dunn, *Modern Revolutions*, London, The Clarendon Press, 1989.

- D. Easton, *The Political System: An Inquiry into the State of Political Science*, New York, Wiley, 1953.
- D. Easton, *A Systems Analysis of Political Life*, Englewood Cliffs NJ, Prentice Hall, 1965.
- D. Germino, *Beyond Ideology: The Revival of Political Theory*, New York, Harper and Row, 1967.
- B. Goodwin, *Using Political Ideas*, Chichester, John Wiley and Sons, 1992.
- N. J. Hirschman, and C. D. Stefano (eds.), *Revisioning the Political: Feminist Reconstructions of Traditional Concepts in Western Political Theory*, Westview Press, Harper Collins, 1996.
- D. Heater, *Citizenship: The Civic Ideal in World History, Politics and Education*, London, Orient Longman, 1990.
- D. Held, *Models of Democracy*, Cambridge, Polity Press, 1987.
- D. Held, *Political theory and the Modern State*, Cambridge, Polity Press, 1989.
- D. Held, *Political Theory Today*, Cambridge, Polity Press, 1991.
- B. Hindess, *Discourses on Power: From Hobbes to Foucault*, Cambridge, Basil Blackwell, 1996.
- P. Kennedy, *The Rise and Fall of the Great Powers: Economic Change and Military Conflict from 1500-2000*, London, Fontana, 1988.
- H. J. Laski, *A Grammar of Politics*, London, Allen and Unwin, 1948.
- P. Laslett and W. G. Runciman (eds.), *Philosophy, Politics and Society*, Series 1-5, Oxford, Blackwell, 1956-79.
- J. Lively, *Democracy*, Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, 1975.
- R. M. MacIver, *The Modern State*, Oxford, Oxford University Press, 1926.
- C. B. Macpherson, *Democratic Theory: Essays in Retrieval*, Oxford, The Clarendon Press, 1977.
- G. McLellan, D. Held and S. Hall (eds.), *The Idea of the Modern State*, Milton Keynes, Open University Press, 1984.
- R. Miliband, *Marxism and Politics*, Oxford, Oxford University Press, 1977.
- D. Miller, *Social Justice*, Oxford, The Clarendon Press, 1976.
- S. M. Okin, *Justice, Gender and the Family*, New York, Basic Books, 1989.

E. Owens, *The Future of Freedom in the Developing World: Economic Development and Political Reform*, New York, Pergamon Press, 1987.

C. Pateman, *Participation and Democratic Theory*, Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, 1970.

R. Plant, *Modern Political Thought*, Oxford, Blackwell, 1991.

G. Poggi, *The Development of the Modern State*, London, Hutchinson, 1978



Techno City, Khanapara, Kling Road, Baridua, 9th Mile,
Ri-Bhoi, Meghalaya-793101
Phone: 9508 444 000, Web : www.ustm.ac.in