

REV-00

**SELF-LEARNING
MATERIAL**



MA POLITICAL SCIENCE

MPS 101- POLITICAL THEORY

w.e.f Academic Session: 2024-25



**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

M.A. POLITICAL SCIENCE

MPS 101

POLITICAL THEORY

Academic Session 2024- 25



CENTRE FOR DISTANCE AND ONLINE EDUCATION

UNIVERSITY OF SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY MEGHALAYA

ACCREDITED 'A' GRADE BY NAAC

Self Learning Material

Centre for Distance and Online Education

University of Science and Technology Meghalaya

First Edition

Print August 2024

© CDOE- USTM

Author(s):

Dr. Md Nazeer Hussain,

Dr. Himashree Patowary,

Miss Akankhya Kalita

Edited by: Akankhya Kalita.

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

Printed and Published on behalf of Centre 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 No.	Chapter Name	Page No.
Chapter 1	Introduction 1.1 Political Theory: Meaning And Significance 1.2 Approaches: Traditional And Modern 1.3 Decline And Resurgence: Debate In Political Theory	1- 22
Chapter 2	State 2.1 State: Concept, Elements And Origin 2.2 Different Perspectives 2.3 Globalization And State Sovereignty	23- 44
Chapter 3	Major Concepts In Political Theory 3.1 Liberty 3.2 Equality 3.3 Justice	45- 67
Chapter 4	Democracy 4.1 Concepts And Features 4.2 Conditions For Success Of Democracy 4.3 Theories Of Democracy	68- 95

ABOUT THE COURSE STRUCTURE:

This is the first paper of the M.A. first semester in the subject Political Science. The paper explores a basic understanding of the meaning and significance of political theory with its various approaches. It also examines important concepts, providing necessary introductions and explanations. The course is designed with the needs of learners in mind who have been disconnected from traditional learning methods but remain interested in continuing their education. To make the material learner-friendly, we have attempted to recreate the traditional instructor-led experience through features like sticky notes on the ‘utility of learning’ each topic, ‘let's rewind’ sections for review, ‘let's sum up’ chapter summaries, and ‘check your progress’ quizzes with answers. Model questions are included at the end of each chapter and can be used as assignments. Learners can refer to the ‘let's rewind’ notes for clarification and are encouraged to consult the provided references for their assignments.

ABOUT THE CHAPTERS:

Chapter 1: Introduction

Political theory is the systematic study of fundamental political concepts, principles, and values. It seeks to understand the nature of politics, the purpose of government, and the relationship between the state and its citizens. This chapter explores the various ways in which political theory can be approached, including normative, empirical methods. It also delves into the historical development of political theory, examining periods of decline and resurgence in its influence. Ultimately, the chapter highlights the significance of political theory in shaping political thought and practice.

Chapter 2: The State

Chapter two focuses on the concept of the state, a central entity in political analysis. It defines the state, outlining its essential elements such as territory, population, sovereignty, and government. The chapter explores the evolution of the state and the various theories explaining

its origins. In the context of globalization, it examines the impacts of globalization to state sovereignty that undermines the power of the State to a considerable level.

Chapter 3: Major Concepts in Political Theory

This chapter delves into three core concepts that strengthen political theory: liberty, equality, and justice. It explores different interpretations of these concepts and their historical and contemporary manifestations. The chapter examines the tensions and complexities involved in balancing these ideals, and how they shape political systems and policies.

Chapter 4: Democracy

Chapter four is dedicated to the concept and practice of democracy. It provides a comprehensive definition of democracy, distinguishing it from other forms of government. The chapter explores the various theories of democracy, including participatory, representative, and deliberative models. It discusses the essential conditions for successful democracy, such as political participation, civil society, and the rule of law.

CHAPTER 1: INTRODUCTION

CHAPTER STRUCTURE:

Learning Outcome

Utility of Learning Political Theory

1.1 Political Theory: Meaning and Significance

1.2 Approaches to Political Theory

1.3 Decline and Resurgence: Debate in Political Theory

Let's Sum Up

Further Reading

Model Questions/ Assignment

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
- Grasp major approaches of Political Theory

UTILITY OF LEARNING POLITICAL THEORY:

Imagine building a massive fort. Political theory is like the vast collection of strategies people have devised throughout history for constructing the most effective structure. Each element of the fort represents the diverse concepts and ideas contributed by different individuals, all crucial or helpful in completing the structure. Studying political theory equips you as a citizen with a deeper understanding. You become familiar with the various approaches to organizing a society and the reasons behind them. It empowers you to critically examine how things function, question notions of fairness, and gain insight into the underlying philosophies shaping our world.

1.1.POLITICAL THEORY: MEANING AND SIGNIFICANCE:

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 it 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 found 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.

Political theory is essentially a systematic explanation of political phenomena. Rooted in the Greek concept of "theoria," it involves a contemplative examination aimed at understanding political realities. While encompassing broader interpretations, as per Arnold Brecht, its core function is explanatory. Unlike mere description or hypothesis, theory seeks to provide a comprehensive framework for understanding political events, identifying patterns, and predicting outcomes. It bridges the gap between philosophy and science, demanding both logical reasoning and empirical evidence. As Karl Deutsch suggests, theory organizes complex data, reveals underlying connections, and guides practical applications.

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 analyze 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.

DEFINITIONS OF POLITICAL THEORY

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.

LET'S REWIND:

Political theory is a core discipline within political science that examines the foundational ideas shaping political life. It involves analyzing the concepts and principles underlying political events and institutions, seeking to understand, explain, and evaluate them. Political theory goes beyond describing the state's current form; it also explores its ideal form. To facilitate study, it's divided into classical, modern, and empirical branches. Classical theory, rooted in philosophy, focused on describing, explaining, prescribing, and evaluating political phenomena. In contrast, empirical theory adopted a scientific approach, prioritizing description and explanation. Contemporary theory aims to bridge the gap between these two perspectives.

CHECK YOUR PROGRESS:

- What is the origin of the word theory?
- Who authored the book 'The Nerves of Government'?

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.

LET'S REWIND:

- Even though Political theory draws heavily from Political Thought, Political

Philosophy and Political Science, yet it is distinct from them. It is neither pure thought, nor philosophy, nor science.

- Political thought is the philosophy of a particular age whereas; political theory is the speculation of a particular thinker. There can be different political theories of the same period on an identical matter. Political thought is implicit while political theory is explicit.
- While political philosophy is abstract or speculative, political theory can be both normative and empirical. However, political theories must be supplemented by philosophy, absence of which distorts the former.
- Political Science is a broader subject of which Political theory is a sub- field.
- Political science is concerned with describing and explaining the realities of political behaviour, 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.

CHECK YOUR PROGRESS:

- How does political theory differ from political thought?
- Mention the best possible relationship between political theory and political science?
- What is the primary difference between political theory and political philosophy?

CHARACTERISTICS OF POLITICAL THEORY:

Political Theory can be characterized under the following grounds-

- **Human Creation:** Political theory is a product of human intellect, shaped by societal, cultural, and historical contexts. It is a dynamic field influenced by evolving human understanding. It focuses on the nature of human beings, their interactions, and the formation of societies. It examines the factors influencing political behaviour and decision-making.
- **Explanatory Framework:** It seeks to provide rational explanations for political phenomena, such as the state, power, and governance. These explanations are based on underlying assumptions and arguments. It explores the institutions, systems, and procedures through which power is exercised and distributed. It analyzes the dynamics of governance and the relationship between the state and its citizens.

- **Hypothetical Construction:** Political theories are built upon hypotheses or educated guesses about the political world. These hypotheses are subject to testing, refinement, and potential rejection. It aims to comprehend the complexities of political life, identifying patterns, trends, and causal relationships
- **Disciplinary Foundations:** The methodologies and perspectives of various disciplines, such as philosophy, history, sociology, and economics, influence the development of political theory. This interdisciplinary nature enriches its analytical depth. Political theories are often rooted in specific ideologies that provide a framework for understanding the world and prescribing political action. These ideologies shape the values, beliefs, and goals of theorists.
- **Normative Evaluation:** Political theory often involves assessing the desirability of different political arrangements and policies based on ethical, moral, or ideological principles.
- **Social Change:** It can be a tool for advocating for political reforms and transformations. Theorists may propose alternative models of governance or challenge existing power structures. Political theory has evolved over time, reflecting changing social, economic, and political conditions. Different historical periods have emphasized different issues and produced distinct theoretical approaches.
- **Diverse Issues:** The scope of political theory is broad, encompassing a wide range of topics such as justice, equality, liberty, democracy, and the state. Contemporary political theory also addresses emerging challenges like globalization, environmentalism, and technology.

LET’S REWIND:

Political theory is a human-constructed intellectual endeavor aimed at understanding the complexities of political life. It involves creating and testing explanations for political phenomena, influenced by various disciplines and historical contexts. Beyond mere description, political theory seeks to evaluate political systems and advocate for change. It is shaped by underlying ideologies and addresses a wide range of issues, evolving over time to reflect changing social and political realities.

CHECK YOUR PROGRESS:

- Political Science is a broader subject of which Political theory is a sub- field. Is the statement true?
- Who authored the book- *Leviathan*?

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-

- **Provides Moral Compass:** Political theory offers ethical guidelines to evaluate political systems and propose alternatives based on moral principles.
- **Explanatory Framework:** It describes, explains, and analyzes political phenomena, offering insights into the complexities of political life.
- **Goal Setting and Action Planning:** Political theory helps identify desirable political goals and outlines strategies to achieve them, addressing societal challenges.
- **Conceptual Clarification:** It clarifies fundamental political concepts, their interrelations, and their impact on society, promoting understanding and informed debate.
- **Problem-Solving Tool:** By analyzing political issues, political theory offers potential solutions to problems like poverty, inequality, and conflict, aiding policymakers.
- **Catalyst for Change:** It can inspire and guide social and political transformations by providing intellectual foundations for reform and revolution.

LET'S REWIND:

Political theory is essential for understanding and improving society. It provides moral frameworks, explains political phenomena, sets goals for governance, clarifies core concepts, and offers solutions to societal problems. By analyzing political issues and proposing alternative approaches, political theory empowers individuals and societies to strive for a better future.

1.2 APPROACHES TO POLITICAL THEORY

Approaches and methods are distinct yet interconnected tools in social sciences. Approaches guide the selection of research questions and relevant data, while methods are specific techniques for data collection and analysis. While approaches often dictate the choice of method, the reverse is not always true. For instance, the behavioral approach commonly employs scientific methods, whereas the normative approach leans towards philosophical ones.

CLASSIFICATION OF APPROACHES:

Political science employs various approaches to study politics. Wasby categorized these into normative and empirical based on the fact-value distinction, and philosophical, ideological, institutional, and structural based on the study's objective.

While Wasby's classification is influential, contemporary scholars often divide approaches into normative and empirical perspectives. Normative approaches, often with a liberal bias, focus on values and ideals. In contrast, the empirical approach, pioneered by behavioralism, emphasizes scientific observation and analysis of political behavior. More recently, feminist approaches have emerged, offering a gendered lens to political study.

TRADITIONAL APPROACHES

The traditional approach to political science is characterized by a value-laden perspective that intertwines facts with normative judgments. This approach, rooted in the works of Plato and Aristotle, prioritizes the study of broad political questions such as the state's nature, purpose, and ideal form.

Key features of the traditional approach include:

- **Normative Emphasis:** A strong focus on values, ideals, and ethical considerations.
- **Philosophical Orientation:** A search for underlying principles and the good life, evident in the works of thinkers like Plato and Aristotle.
- **Historical Perspective:** Recognition of the importance of history in understanding political phenomena, as seen in the writings of Machiavelli, Sabine, and Dunning.

- **Institutional Focus:** Analysis of political structures like the executive, legislature, and judiciary, exemplified by Aristotle and modern thinkers like Bryce and Laski.
- **Legal Orientation:** Consideration of the state as a legal entity and the role of law in shaping political order, with theorists like Cicero, Bodin, and Austin.

The following are the approaches fall under the category of traditional approaches-

Philosophical Approach

This approach seeks to understand the fundamental principles governing political life through philosophical inquiry. It often delves into normative questions about justice, equality, and the good life. The Key features of the philosophical approach include- Normative emphasis, search for universal principles, and focus on ideal political orders. Plato, Aristotle, Augustine, Aquinas, Machiavelli were some of the prominent thinkers of the approach. Plato's "Republic" that explores the ideal state governed by philosopher-kings can be cited as an example based on the philosophical approach.

Historical Approach

It examines political phenomena within their historical context, emphasizing the evolution of political ideas and institutions over time. It focuses on historical development, contextual analysis, emphasis on continuity and change. Machiavelli, Montesquieu, Burke were the major thinkers of the approach. Machiavelli's "The Prince" analyzes political power and leadership in the context of Renaissance Italy which can be understood as a work applying the historical approach.

Legal Approach

The legal approach centers on the role of law in shaping political systems. It examines the relationship between law, the state, and individuals, often focusing on constitutionalism and the rule of law. It emphasizes on legal institutions and processes, study of constitutional law, analysis of rights and obligations. John Austin, Jeremy Bentham, Montesquieu supported the approach. In fact, Montesquieu in his "The Spirit of the Laws" applies this approach to examine the relationship between different forms of government and legal systems.

Institutional Approach

This approach focuses on the structure and functions of political institutions, such as governments, legislatures, and bureaucracies. It analyzes how these institutions shape political outcomes and the distribution of power. Focus on formal institutions, study of government structures and processes, analysis of power distribution are some of the key features of this approach. Woodrow Wilson, Maurice Duverger were the top supporters of this approach. Woodrow Wilson's work on comparative government examined different political systems and their institutional arrangements.

While the traditional approach has contributed significantly to political thought, it has also been criticized for its lack of empirical rigor and its tendency towards idealism. Nevertheless, its emphasis on fundamental questions and enduring values remains relevant in contemporary political discourse.

MODERN APPROACHES:

Modern approaches to political theory emerged as a departure from the normative and philosophical foundations of traditional thought. Shifting focus to the empirical and scientific study of politics, these approaches prioritize observable data and systematic analysis. They often incorporate methodologies from other disciplines to gain a comprehensive understanding of political phenomena. The features of modern approaches are-

- **Empirical Focus:** A strong emphasis on observable, verifiable data and evidence.
- **Scientific Methodology:** Employing quantitative and qualitative research methods to analyze political phenomena.
- **Behavioralism:** A focus on understanding the behavior of individuals and groups in the political process.
- **Interdisciplinary Approach:** Integrating insights from other social sciences like sociology, psychology, and economics.
- **Systemic Perspective:** Viewing politics as a complex system with interconnected parts and feedback loops.

- **Focus on Power and Authority:** Examining how power is distributed and exercised in political systems.
- **Policy Orientation:** A concern with practical implications and the development of effective policies.

The following are the approaches fall under the category of modern approach-

Behavioral Approach

This approach emerged in the mid-20th century, seeking to introduce scientific rigor into political science. It emphasizes empirical observation, quantification, and hypothesis testing to study political behavior. Emphasis on scientific method, focus on individual behavior, use of quantitative data are the important features of the behavioral approach. David Easton, Harold Lasswell were the major supporters of this approach. Studies of voting behavior and public opinion are the examples of behavioural approach.

Post-Behavioral Approach

A reaction to the perceived limitations of behavioralism, this approach seeks to balance scientific objectivity with normative concerns. It emphasizes the importance of values, ethics, and social context in political analysis. It combines empirical and normative elements, focus on policy relevance, emphasis on social justice and equality. Almond, Verba were the major thinkers to support the approach. Studies on political culture and democratization satisfy this post-behavioural approach.

Structural-Functional Approach

This approach views political systems as complex organisms with interconnected parts working together to maintain stability. It focuses on the functions performed by different institutions. It emphasizes on system maintenance, analysis of political functions, focus on equilibrium and adaptation. Its prominent thinker includes- Talcott Parsons. Studies of political socialization and the role of political parties are the examples under this approach.

Marxist Approach

Rooted in the works of Karl Marx, this approach emphasizes economic factors as the primary determinants of political power and social relations. It focuses on class conflict and the exploitation of the working class. Economic determinism, class analysis, emphasis on revolution and social change are the key focus of this approach. Karl Marx, Vladimir Lenin were the prominent thinkers of the Marxist approach. Analysis of capitalist societies and the role of the proletariat is the most suitable example under this approach.

Feminist Approach

This approach examines politics from a gender perspective, highlighting the experiences and perspectives of women. It critiques traditional political theory for its male-centered bias and seeks to incorporate gender equality into political analysis. Focus on gender inequality, analysis of women's political participation, critique of patriarchal structures etc. are the significant features of this approach. Betty Friedan, Judith Butler were the supporters of the approach. Studies on gender and political representation can be cited as an example under this approach.

Postmodern Approach

This approach challenges traditional assumptions about knowledge, power, and identity, emphasizing the diversity of human experiences and the importance of language and discourse in shaping political reality. Critique of grand narratives, focus on power relations, emphasis on difference and diversity are key focus of the post- modern approach. Michel Foucault, Jacques Derrida were major supporters of it. Analysis of discourse and power in political institutions fall under this approach.

These modern approaches have significantly shaped the study of politics by introducing new methods, perspectives, and research questions. They have broadened the scope of political inquiry and contributed to a more nuanced understanding of political phenomena. While the modern approach to political theory has brought significant advancements, it also faces certain **limitations-**

- **Overemphasis on Quantification:** The heavy reliance on quantitative methods can sometimes overlook the qualitative aspects of political life, such as values, beliefs, and cultural factors.
- **Ahistorical Tendencies:** The focus on empirical data and contemporary issues can lead to a neglect of historical context, which is crucial for understanding the evolution of political ideas and institutions.
- **Reductionism:** The attempt to simplify complex political phenomena into measurable variables can oversimplify reality and overlook important nuances.
- **Value Neutrality:** While striving for objectivity, the complete separation of facts and values can be problematic, as values inevitably influence research questions and interpretations.
- **Limited Explanatory Power:** The modern approach often struggles to explain fundamental questions about the nature of politics, justice, and the good life, which were central to traditional political theory.
- **Neglect of Power Structures:** The focus on individual behavior can sometimes overlook the broader structures of power and inequality that shape political outcomes.

These limitations highlight the need for a balanced approach that combines the strengths of both traditional and modern perspectives.

An attempt to draw a **comparative analysis between traditional and modern approaches** leads to the following remarks-

Traditional political theory focused on establishing normative ideals and understanding the fundamental principles governing political life. It was rooted in philosophy and history, with a strong emphasis on values, ethics, and the good society.

Modern political theory emerged as a departure from this normative focus, emphasizing empirical observation and scientific analysis. It seeks to explain and predict political phenomena through data-driven research.

KEY DIFFERENCES BETWEEN TRADITIONAL AND MODERN APPROACHES:

- **Focus:** Traditional theory focused on ideals and values, while modern theory focuses on empirical data and observable behavior.
- **Methodology:** Traditional theory relied on philosophical and historical analysis, while modern theory employs scientific methods like quantitative and qualitative research.
- **Goals:** Traditional theory sought to understand the best form of government, while modern theory aims to explain and predict political outcomes.
- **Nature of inquiry:** Traditional theory often dealt with broad, philosophical questions, while modern theory tends to focus on specific, testable hypotheses.

Essentially, the shift from traditional to modern political theory reflects a broader movement in the social sciences towards a more scientific and empirical approach to knowledge production.

LET'S REWIND:

Approaches to political theory involve different methods of studying political phenomena. Traditional approaches relied on philosophical and historical analysis to understand ideal government structures and principles. In contrast, modern approaches prioritize empirical data and scientific methods to explain political behavior and outcomes. This shift reflects a broader trend towards scientific inquiry in the social sciences.

CHECK YOUR PROGRESS:

- Name three political thinkers who had supported the traditional approach to political theory.
- What is the central focus of behaviouralism?

1.3 DECLINE AND RESURGENCE: DEBATE IN POLITICAL THEORY

The mid-twentieth century marked a period of decline for political theory, primarily due to the rise of behavioralism. This methodological shift emphasized empirical observation, quantification, and a value-free approach, challenging the normative and philosophical foundations of traditional political theory. Key factors contributing to this decline include:

- **Historicism:** Excessive focus on historical context and past events, neglecting the analysis of contemporary issues.
- **Positivism:** The dominance of a scientific, empirical approach, leading to a neglect of normative questions and values.

- **Moral Relativism:** A decline in belief in universal moral principles, undermining the basis for normative political theory.
- **Hyper-factualism:** Overemphasis on data collection without a strong theoretical framework, leading to a fragmentation of knowledge.

However, thinkers like Isaiah Berlin and George H. Sabine argued against the notion of political theory's demise. They emphasized the enduring nature of fundamental political questions and the continued relevance of normative inquiry. Scholars such as Hannah Arendt, John Rawls, and Robert Nozick contributed to the resurgence of political theory by addressing core questions of justice, liberty, and the nature of the political community.

The revival of political theory was also fueled by broader societal changes and the limitations of empirical approaches. The rise of new social movements and the complexities of modern life created a demand for fresh theoretical perspectives. As a result, political theory experienced a renewed emphasis on normative questions, while also incorporating empirical insights to inform its analysis.

Several factors contributed to the revival of political theory in the latter half of the twentieth century:

- **Limitations of Behavioralism:** The recognition of the limitations of a purely empirical approach, including its inability to address normative questions and its overemphasis on quantitative methods.
- **Social and Political Changes:** The emergence of new social movements and political challenges, such as civil rights, feminism, and environmentalism, demanded new theoretical frameworks.
- **The Challenge of Modernity:** The complexities of modern society, including globalization, technology, and cultural diversity, necessitated a re-examination of traditional political concepts.
- **Return to Normative Questions:** A renewed interest in questions of justice, equality, and the good life, reflecting a desire for a more comprehensive understanding of politics.

The resurgence of political theory has led to a more pluralistic and interdisciplinary field, incorporating insights from various disciplines and perspectives.

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, and Jean-Francois Lyotard. These scholars attacked the universalistic foundations of political theory and stress on decentred, 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 Bhiku 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, Bhiku Parekh and Karl Popper **revived** the political theory.

LET'S REWIND:

The mid-20th century witnessed a period of critique directed at political theory. Concerns arose that the field was becoming overly focused on historical analysis, neglecting its ability to address contemporary issues. Additionally, an emphasis on scientific methods was seen as potentially downplaying the importance of value judgments and questions of fairness. However, since the 1970s, political theory has enjoyed resurgence. New approaches like feminism and critical race theory have broadened the scope of the field, offering fresh perspectives on power, justice, and the role of government.

CHECK YOUR PROGRESS

- According to David Easton, what is the major cause of decline of political theory?
- How will you define the resurgence of political theory?

LET'S SUM UP:

Political theory, a cornerstone of political science, examines the ideas and philosophies that shape our understanding of government and political systems. It delves beyond simply describing how things work to critically analyze power structures, justice, and societal functions. This field asks not just "what is" but also "what should be," exploring how governments should be structured and citizens can best participate. Distinct from pure philosophy or science, political theory incorporates historical thought, examines societal goals, and even proposes solutions for improvement. The field has seen various approaches emerge, from the classical pursuit of the ideal state to the modern focus on individual liberty and data-driven analysis. Today, political theory continues to evolve with new perspectives like feminism and critical race theory, providing invaluable tools for navigating the complexities of the modern world.

FURTHER READING:

- Brecht, *Political Theory: The Foundations of Twentieth Century Political Thought*, Bombay, The Times of India Press, 1965.
- D. Coole, *Women in Political Theory: From Ancient Misogyny to Contemporary Feminism*, New York, Harvester Wheatsheaf, 1993.
- D. Germino, *Beyond Ideology: The Revival of Political Theory*, New York, Harper and Row, 1967.
- D. Held, *Political Theory Today*, Cambridge, Polity Press, 1991.

- N. J. Hirschman, and C. D. Stefano (eds.), *Revisioning the Political: Feminist*
- N. P. Barry, *Introduction to Modern Political Theory*, London, Macmillan, 1995.
- *Reconstructions of Traditional Concepts in Western Political Theory*, Westview Press, Harper Collins, 1996.
- S. Benhabib and D. Cornell, *Feminism as Critique*, Cambridge, Polity Press, 1987.
- Sir E. Barker, *Principles of Social and Political Theory*, Calcutta, Oxford University Press, 1976.

ANSWERS TO CHECK YOUR PROGRESS:
--

- What is the origin of the word theory?
 - The word “theory” finds its roots in the ancient Greek term “theoría.”
- Who authored the book ‘The Nerves of Government’?
 - Karl Deutsch authored the book ‘the Nerves of Government’.
- How does political theory differ from political thought?
 - Political theory is implicit while political thought is explicit.
- Mention the best possible relationship between political theory and political science?
 - Political theory is a branch of political science.
- What is the primary difference between political theory and political philosophy?
 - Political theory is more practical, while political philosophy is more abstract.
- Political Science is a broader subject of which Political theory is a sub- field. Is the statement true?
 - Yes.
- Who authored the book- *Leviathan*?
 - Thomas Hobbes authored the book *Leviathan*.
- Name three political thinkers who had supported the traditional approach to political theory.
 - Plato, Aristotle and Thomas Hobbes were some of the thinkers who had supported the traditional approach to political theory.
- What is the central focus of behaviouralism?

- 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.
- According to David Easton, what is the major cause of decline of political theory?
- According to David Easton, historicism may be regarded as the major cause for the decline of political theory.
- How will you define the resurgence of political theory?
- The resurgence of political theory can be defined as an evolutionary phase of the growth of political theory that in order to cope up with the changing situation and needs of evolving society incorporated new ideas and thoughts within it.

MODEL QUESTIONS/ ASSIGNMENTS:

1. What do you mean by political theory? Give at least two definitions best suitable to your answer.
2. Weinstein considers political theory as an activity. How do you understand this?
3. Political theory is divided into distinct streams such as classical, modern and empirical. Elaborate.
4. How Gould and Kolb defined political theory?
5. How do you see the nature of political theory?
6. What is the significance of political theory?
7. What are the various approaches to political theory?
8. How do you see the reasons behind the emergence of post- behaviouralism?
9. What do you mean by Decline and Resurgence of Political Theory?

CHAPTER 2: STATE

CHAPTER STRUCTURE:

Learning Outcome

Utility of Learning the Topic

2.1 State: Concept, Elements And Origin

2.2 Different Perspectives of State

2.3 Globalization and State Sovereignty

Let's Sum Up

Further Reading

Model Questions/ Assignment

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

UTILITY OF LEARNING THE TOPIC:

Imagine waking up in a strange new world. Everyone seems nice, but there are no laws, no police, and no agreed-upon way to resolve disagreements. One day, someone takes away your gadget! With no clear system in place, who would you turn to? How would you even get your belonging back? This chaotic scenario underscores the importance of studying the state in political theory. The state, functioning like a complex web of agreements and institutions, provides a framework for order. By delving into various theories about the state, you become a more informed citizen. This empowers you to ask critical questions: **a)** Is the state's primary role to protect its citizens, or to control them? **b)** Who has a voice in how the state operates? **c)** Does the current system ensure fairness and efficiency?

2.1 STATE: CONCEPT, ELEMENTS AND ORIGIN

A state is a political organization that regulates society and the population within a defined territory. It is a fundamental concept in political science, representing a complex form of human organization. It is distinguished from other social groups by its specific purpose, methods, territory, and sovereignty.

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". Bluntschli says, "The state is the politically organized people of a definite territory". 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". 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.

Therefore, the state is a natural, a necessary, and a 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 cannot 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 and organized society."

Defining Characteristics of the State

- **Purpose:** The state's primary function is to establish order and security within its territory. This involves creating and enforcing laws, protecting its citizens, and resolving disputes.
- **Methods:** The state employs formal institutions, legal frameworks, and coercive power to achieve its objectives. It maintains a monopoly on the legitimate use of force within its borders.
- **Territory:** The state exercises jurisdiction over a defined geographic area, establishing boundaries and controlling the movement of people and goods.
- **Sovereignty:** The state possesses supreme and independent political power within its territory, free from external control.

Distinctions from Other Entities

It is essential to distinguish the state from related concepts:

- **Society:** While society represents a broader community of people sharing common values and interests, the state is a political organization with a specific territory and government.

- **Government:** The government is the machinery through which the state exercises its authority. It is a subset of the state.
- **Nation:** A nation is a cultural and ethnic group, while the state is a political entity. A nation-state is a political unit where the majority of the population shares a common cultural identity.

In essence, the state is a complex and multifaceted entity that plays a crucial role in modern society. It provides the framework for political, social, and economic life while maintaining order and security.

THEORIES OF 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. 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 as 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 Hobbes'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 involving 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 meete 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 for 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 headship. 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 affects the individual more markedly than did their earlier counterparts.

LET'S REWIND:

A state is a political entity characterized by four key elements: a defined territory, a permanent population, a recognized government, and sovereignty.

There are certain theories that explain the origin of State.

The Theory of Divine Origin holds that the state was created directly by God, with the ruler acting as God's representative on Earth. The core concept of **the force theory of state** is that states emerge through conquest, where the strong overpower the weak and establish themselves as rulers, laying the foundation for the state. The core concept of **social contract theory** is that governments derive their legitimacy from an implicit agreement among the people. This agreement involves individuals surrendering some freedoms in exchange for the advantages of

an orderly society with laws, protection of rights, and other benefits. The core concept of **the evolutionary theory** of the state is that states weren't created through a single event, but rather emerged gradually over time. This gradual development is seen as a product of various social changes that took place over a long period.

CHECK YOUR PROGRESS:

- What is the core concept of the 'Divine Origin Theory'?
- Who were the exponents of the social contract theory?

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, Maldivies, 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.

LET'S REWIND:

There are four important elements in a state. They are-

- **Population:** A state needs a community of residents living within its defined borders. While there's no minimum size, a sufficient population is necessary to sustain itself and its government.
- **Territory:** A well-defined geographic area is essential for a state. This establishes its physical boundaries and distinguishes it from other states.
- **Government:** An organized system for creating laws, enforcing them, and providing public services is crucial. This structure allows the state to function effectively and maintain order within its territory.
- **Sovereignty:** The supreme authority to govern itself without outside control is a defining characteristic. This empowers the state to make its own decisions and act independently in international affairs.

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

LET'S REWIND:

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.

CHECK YOUR PROGRESS

- Media is regarded as the fourth pillar of democracy. Name the other three pillars.
- What do you mean by sovereignty?

2.2 DIFFERENT PERSPECTIVES 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 wealthier 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 perspective on the state diverged significantly from traditional Western political thought. He viewed the state as a necessary evil, an instrument of violence and oppression that hindered individual freedom and moral development.

Key points of Gandhi's critique:

- **State as Violence:** Gandhi equated the state with organized violence, arguing that it inevitably employs force to maintain order and enforce its authority.
- **Individual vs. State:** He prioritized individual conscience and morality over the state's authority, believing that the state suppressed individual freedom and creativity.
- **Ideal of Stateless Society:** Gandhi envisioned a future without the state, characterized by self-governing communities based on non-violence, truth, and cooperation.
- **Critique of Western Civilization:** He rejected the materialism and individualism of Western civilization, arguing that it led to the growth of oppressive states.
- **Emphasis on Swaraj:** Gandhi's concept of "Swaraj" or self-rule emphasized individual and collective self-governance rather than reliance on a centralized state.

Gandhi's ideas had a profound influence on anti-colonial and independence movements worldwide, inspiring a rethinking of the state's role in society.

LET'S REWIND:

The liberal perspective of state prioritizes individual rights and freedoms. The liberal view of the state prioritizes individual rights and freedoms. In this model, the state acts as an impartial umpire, enforcing laws and safeguarding liberties like free speech and property ownership. Its legitimacy stems from the consent of the governed, not from divine right or force.

The Marxist perspective views the state as an instrument of the ruling class. In this analysis, the state enforces laws that favor the wealthy and maintain their dominance over the working class. Marxists believe the state is a temporary apparatus that will eventually wither away in a communist society.

The Gandhian view held a complex view of the state. He famously argued that while humans possess a soul, the state functions as a soulless machine, capable of wielding violence. In his view, the state could hinder individual responsibility and growth.

CHECK YOUR PROGRESS:

- What is the essence of the liberal theory of state?
- What do you mean by the rule of law?

2.3 GLOBALIZATION AND STATE SOVEREIGNTY

Globalization refers to the increasing interconnectedness of the world through the flow of goods, services, capital, people, and ideas across national borders. It is driven by advancements in technology, transportation, and communication.

Key features of globalization:

- **Economic integration:** Removal of trade barriers, free flow of capital and technology.
- **Cultural exchange:** Diffusion of ideas, values, and lifestyles across cultures.
- **Political interdependence:** Growing influence of international organizations and agreements on national policies.

Globalization has led to a more integrated global economy but also raised concerns about inequality, cultural homogenization, and the erosion of national sovereignty.

- **Globalisation and Its Impact on the State**

Globalization 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 Laissez faire state.

In the era of globalization, the functions of the State began undergoing a change. With the increasing disinvestment of public sector, privatization was encouraged. Public sector was made to compete with the private sector, and as a whole open competition, free trade, market economy and globalization 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 Globalization, **several changes** have been taking place **in the functions of the State**:

1. Decreased Economic activities of State:

The process of liberalization- privatization 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 organizations 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:

Globalization 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, Globalization 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 globalization. The growing significance of international trade, investment, production

and financial flows appears to be curtailing the autonomy of individual nation states. In particular, globalization 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, those 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.

LET'S SUM- UP:

States are like powerful organizations that govern societies. They are defined by four key elements: a specific territory, a settled population living within it, a government that creates and enforces laws, and the authority to rule themselves (sovereignty). There are different ideas about how states originated. Some believe it's a divine creation, while others see it as a result of conquest or a social agreement among people to create a better society.

There are also varying perspectives on a state's role. Liberals believe it should prioritize individual rights and freedoms. Marxists view it as a tool for the wealthy class. Gandhi acknowledged its necessity but cautioned against its potential dangers.

Despite these differing viewpoints, states fulfill essential functions. They provide security from external threats with armies and internal issues with police. They establish and enforce laws, protecting our rights and regulating aspects like currency. States also work towards

improving our lives economically, socially, politically, and culturally. They even manage our interactions with other countries. In essence, states play a crucial role in shaping and running a society.

The rise of globalization, the increasing interconnectedness of the world, has added a new layer of complexity. While it can boost economies and trade, it can also challenge a state's control over its borders and its ability to set independent policies.

FURTHER READING:

- D. Easton, *The Political System: An Inquiry into the State of Political Science*, New York, Wiley, 1953.
- D. Held, *Political theory and the Modern State*, Cambridge, Polity Press, 1989.
- G. McLellan, D. Held and S. Hall (eds.), *The Idea of the Modern State*, Mitton Keynes, Open University Press, 1984.
- G. Poggi, *The Development of the Modern State*, London, Hutchinson, 1978
- M. Carnoy, *The State and Political Theory*, Princeton NJ, Princeton University Press, 1984.
- R. M. MacIver, *The Modern State*, Oxford, Oxford University Press, 1926.
- S. I. Benn and R. S. Peters, *Social Principles and the Democratic State*, London, George & Allen, 1959.

ANSWERS TO CHECK YOUR PROGRESS:

- What is the core concept of the 'Divine Origin Theory'?
- The core concept of the Divine Origin Theory is that the state was created directly and deliberately by God. The ruler is a divinely appointed agent and he is responsible for his actions to God alone.
- Who were the exponents of social contract theory?
- Thomas Hobbes, John Locke and Jean-Jacques Rousseau were the three exponents of the Social Contract Theory.
- What is the essence of the liberal theory of state?
- The essence of the liberal theory of state revolves around individual freedom, limited government, consent of the governed, rule of law and economic freedom.

- What do you mean by 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.
- Media is regarded as the fourth pillar of democracy. Name the other three pillars.
 - Legislature, Executive and Judiciary are the other three pillars of democracy.
- What do you mean by sovereignty?
 - Sovereignty means absolute power of the state within its territory. It has two dimensions. One is internal that implies- state's exclusive right to make and enforce laws applicable to its entire citizen within its border. The other is external sovereignty that 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.

MODEL QUESTIONS/ ASSIGNMENTS:

1. What is State? What are the different theories of origin of the state?
2. What is Globalization? How does globalization impact the sovereignty of the state?
3. How do you see the importance of state in your life as well as in the society?
4. Explain the important elements of State.
5. Define social contract theory with an emphasis on the viewpoints of its three main exponents.

CHAPTER 3: MAJOR CONCEPTS IN POLITICAL THEORY

CHAPTER STRUCTURE:

Learning Outcome

Utility of Learning the Concepts

3.1 Liberty

3.2 Equality

3.3 Justice

Let's Sum Up

Further Reading

Answers to Check Your Progress

Model Questions/ Assignment

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

UTILITY OF LEARNING THE CONCEPTS:

Imagine a world where you can freely do everything without any restriction. You can speak your mind, pursue your dreams, and start your own profession. Sounds pretty amazing, right? This is the essence of **liberty**, a fundamental concept in political theory. But here's the twist: liberty isn't just about doing whatever you want. It's about having the balance of **equality** and **justice** while enjoying your liberty.

3.1 THE CONCEPT OF LIBERTY

The word Liberty has 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 AND SCOPE

The following summarizes the nature and dimension of liberty in political theory-

- **Individual Autonomy:** Liberty is often associated with the capacity of individuals to make choices and pursue their own interests without external constraints.
- **Negative and Positive Liberty:** This distinction highlights the difference between freedom from external restraints (negative liberty) and the capacity to act meaningfully (positive liberty).
- **Civil Liberties:** These are specific freedoms guaranteed by law, such as freedom of speech, religion, and assembly.
- **Political Liberty:** This refers to the right to participate in the political process, including voting and holding public office.
- **Economic Liberty:** This involves the freedom to engage in economic activities without undue government interference.

The Scope of Liberty:

The scope of liberty is influenced by various factors, including:

- **Social and Cultural Context:** Different societies have varying conceptions of liberty based on their historical, religious, and cultural values.
- **Political System:** The nature of the political regime significantly impacts the extent of individual liberty. Democratic systems generally prioritize individual freedoms, while authoritarian regimes may restrict them.
- **State Intervention:** The balance between individual liberty and state authority is a complex issue. While the state may be necessary to protect individual liberties, excessive state intervention can also limit them.

In conclusion, liberty is a complex and contested concept with far-reaching implications for political, social, and economic life. Understanding the different dimensions of liberty and the factors that influence its scope is essential for evaluating the quality of a society.

CLASSIFICATION OF LIBERTY

Liberty can be classified under following categories:

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 exercise 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 centred 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 desires 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.

ISAIAH BERLIN'S TWO CONCEPTS OF LIBERTY
--

British intellectual **Isaiah Berlin** (1909-1997) left his mark as a philosopher, historian, and defender of liberalism. His 1958 essay, "Two Concepts of Liberty," ignited renewed interest in political theory with its distinction between positive and negative liberty. This concept continues

to be a cornerstone of discussions on freedom. Berlin remained a champion of liberalism throughout his life, intertwining it with his moral beliefs and focus on human values. He also explored the history of ideas, particularly critiques of the Enlightenment, in the latter part of his career.

By the 1950s, Berlin's core ideas were well-established. Isaiah Berlin, in his seminal essay "Two Concepts of Liberty," introduced a profound distinction between two fundamental understandings of freedom: negative liberty and positive liberty.

Negative Liberty

Negative liberty emphasizes the absence of external constraints on individuals. It focuses on the area within which an individual is free to act without interference from others. In essence, it is about freedom from coercion. The more areas of activity a person can enter without resistance from others, the greater is their negative liberty.

Positive Liberty

Positive liberty, on the other hand, focuses on the individual's capacity to act in accordance with their own will and to fulfill their potential. It is about being one's own master and realizing one's true self. This concept often requires the presence of certain conditions, such as education, healthcare, and economic opportunity, which enable individuals to exercise their freedom effectively.

Key Differences

- **Focus:** Negative liberty focuses on external constraints, while positive liberty focuses on internal capacities.
- **Role of the state:** Negative liberty often involves limiting state intervention, while positive liberty can justify state action to create conditions for individual flourishing.
- **Nature of freedom:** Negative liberty is about freedom from, while positive liberty is about freedom to.

Berlin argued that these two concepts are not merely different ways of describing the same idea but represent fundamentally different political ideals. While negative liberty is often associated with classical liberalism, positive liberty has been influential in various political ideologies, including socialism and communitarianism.

LET'S REWIND:

Liberty in political theory signifies freedom from restrictions, empowering individuals to pursue their goals and participate meaningfully in society. It's about freedom from undue control, allowing individuals to make choices, express themselves, and reach their potential. However, how much liberty a person can have is still a debate.

There are several kinds of liberty. **Natural liberty** refers to the idea of inherent freedom individuals possess before any government exists with no laws or rulers to restrict. **Moral liberty** refers to the freedom to act according to one's own conscience and values, independent of external pressures or social norms. It's about being free to choose our own moral path. **Social or civil liberty** focuses on the freedoms guaranteed by society or law, like free speech, religion, and assembly. It's about the rights one has within the framework of an organized society. This social or civil liberty has further sub- divided in to **personal liberty** (it focuses on freedom in one's own private life, like choosing lifestyle, beliefs, and personal relationships, with minimal government interference.), **political liberty** (it is the freedom to participate in the political process, including voting, holding office, and expressing political views.), **economic liberty** (it is the freedom to make one's own economic choices, like pursuing desired career, owning property, and engaging in trade without undue government restrictions.), **domestic liberty** (it refers to freedoms within the family unit), **national liberty** (focuses on a nation's freedom from external control.), international liberty (refers to the freedom of nations to interact without undue dominance from other states.)

Liberty in its **positive aspect means** focuses on having the power and resources to actually pursue one's goals and fulfil one's potentialities within a society. **Negative liberty** is about **freedom from interference**. It emphasizes the absence of external constraints that prevent a person from acting on his or her will.

CHECK YOUR PROGRESS

- What is the origin of the word Liberty?
- What do you mean by positive liberty?

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 underlines 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 show 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 cheque 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 is not desirable

Complete uniformity in treatment and reward is impractical and undesirable. Individuals possess diverse talents, skills, and needs, making identical treatment counterproductive.

2. Natural inequality among individuals

People are born with different abilities, potentials, and circumstances. Recognizing these inherent differences is essential for a just society.

3. Equality as a leveling process

The concept of equality is often associated with reducing disparities and ensuring fairness. However, it does not imply creating a homogenous society where everyone is identical.

4. Equality as a foundation for social justice

Equality is a fundamental principle for achieving a just society. It provides a basis for fair distribution of opportunities and resources.

5. Equal opportunities for all

Equality means that everyone should have the same chances to succeed in life, regardless of their background or circumstances. This requires removing barriers to advancement and ensuring access to education, healthcare, and other essential resources.

6. Elimination of special privileges

Equality demands the removal of advantages granted to specific individuals or groups without justification. It promotes a level playing field where everyone has equal rights and opportunities.

7. Provision of essential goods and services

Ensuring access to basic necessities like food, shelter, and healthcare is essential for creating a just and equitable society. This is often seen as a core aspect of equality.

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 modern scientific world this notion is quiet ineffective to argue in favour of equality. But Marxism takes 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 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, a 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.

LET'S REWIND:

Equality is the bedrock of a just society. An equal society is one where opportunities are open to all, and judgments are based on merit and character, not on factors like race, gender, or social class. The law serves as a great equalizer, ensuring everyone has the same rights and receives fair treatment. In essence, equality removes artificial barriers, allowing individuals to

reach their full potential and contribute to society.

Absence of special privileges indicates **negative aspect** of equality while availability of adequate opportunities for all indicates **positive aspect** of equality.

The core concept of **legal dimension of equality** envisages equal legal protection to all without any discrimination. The essence of **political equality** is that everyone can take part equally in the governing process including fair representation and ability to hold govt. offices. The **socio-economic dimension of equality** focuses on **reducing disparities in social status and economic opportunities**.

However, social customs, unequal resources, lack of awareness may create hurdles in the proper implementation of equality.

DWORKIN'S THEORY OF EQUALITY:

Ronald Dworkin offered a significant contribution to the debate on equality by proposing the concept of "equality of resources". He challenged the dominant theories of his time, such as Rawls' difference principle and utilitarianism.

Key points of Dworkin's theory:

- **Critique of Rawls:** Dworkin argued that Rawls' focus on primary goods neglected the importance of individual choices and responsibilities. He questioned the fairness of subsidizing those who make irresponsible choices.
- **Equality of resources:** Dworkin proposed that individuals should be compensated for unequal starting points (e.g., disabilities, talents) but not for choices that lead to unequal outcomes.
- **Hypothetical insurance:** To determine fair compensation, Dworkin introduced the idea of a hypothetical insurance scheme where individuals would insure against life's uncertainties.
- **Responsibility and choice:** Dworkin emphasized the importance of individual responsibility. People should be held accountable for the consequences of their choices, but not for their inherent talents or circumstances.

Dworkin's theory aimed to balance the competing demands of equality and individual responsibility. While it has been influential, it has also faced criticisms, particularly regarding the

difficulty of implementing hypothetical insurance schemes and the potential for unintended consequences.

While Dworkin's theory of equality of resources represents a significant contribution to political philosophy, it has faced several criticisms.

Challenges to Dworkin's Equality of Resources

- **The Problem of Luck:** Critics argue that Dworkin's distinction between brute luck and option luck is not always clear-cut. Some forms of luck, such as natural talents or family background, may fall into a gray area.
- **The Role of the State:** Dworkin's theory focuses on individual responsibility and choice, but critics argue that the state plays a crucial role in shaping opportunities and creating conditions for equality.
- **Ignoring Structural Inequalities:** Dworkin's focus on individual choices may overlook the impact of broader social and economic structures on inequality. Critics argue that addressing systemic inequalities requires more than individual responsibility.
- **The Challenge of Measurement:** Determining what constitutes equal resources in practice is difficult, as it requires making complex judgments about the value of different goods and services.
- **Neglect of Needs:** Some argue that Dworkin's theory insufficiently addresses the needs of individuals with disabilities or other special requirements, who may require additional resources to achieve a comparable level of well-being.

Despite these criticisms, Dworkin's theory remains influential and continues to shape debates about equality and justice.

LET'S REWIND:

Legal philosopher Ronald Dworkin viewed equality as central to a just government. He believed all citizens, regardless of background, deserve equal respect and consideration. Dworkin wasn't satisfied with a single concept of equality. He identified different types, such as equal opportunity (a fair shot at success) and equality of resources (fair distribution of things like education and healthcare). His "envy test" imagined a scenario where, in a truly

equal system, no one would be envious of another person's resources.

Dworkin further linked equality to individual respect through his concept of the "Hermeneutic of Dignity." He argued that judging laws and policies should involve evaluating how well they treat people with the inherent dignity they possess. Dworkin's ideas on equality, though complex and debated, remain influential in discussions about fairness and the government's role in achieving it.

CHECK YOUR PROGRESS:

- What forms Dworkin's central point of equality?
- Write three main obstacles towards implementation of equality in society.

3.3 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 concepts 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's own opinion ethics.

St Thomas Aquinas supported religion, Blackstone supported natural law, Duguit, Proudhon, Marx regarded economics and Plato, Aristotle, 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, Duguit stressed on social solidarity, Marxists sought to end proletariat

suffering which are due to their exploitation by bourgeois, by overthrowing the existing state apparatus through a socialist revolution and establishing classless society.

LET'S REWIND:

Justice represents the ideal of fairness for all. It's about ensuring everyone receives what they deserve, whether it's an equal opportunity to succeed, fundamental rights, or a fair share of society's benefits. The law plays a crucial role in upholding justice by guaranteeing consistent rules and protections that apply to everyone.

The core principle of **legal justice** lies in the fair and impartial application of the law. This ensures everyone is held accountable to the same set of rules, irrespective of their background. Consistent enforcement, protection of fundamental rights, and delivering proportionate consequences for violations are all crucial aspects of achieving this legal ideal.

Political justice focuses on the principle of fair influence within government. This translates to ensuring everyone has an equal opportunity to participate in the political process. This participation can take the form of voting for representatives, running for office themselves, or expressing their views on political issues.

Social justice stands for equality in social standing and opportunities. It aims to dismantle barriers based on factors like race, gender, or social class that prevent individuals from reaching their full potential. Social justice seeks to create a society where everyone has a fair chance to succeed, regardless of their background.

Economic justice seeks to create a fair and equitable economic system. It aims to dismantle barriers that prevent equal access to resources and opportunities for economic well-being, regardless of background. This could involve policies promoting fair wages, access to education and healthcare, and a social safety net that helps those in need.

JOHN RAWLS AND THE THEORY OF JUSTICE

John Rawls' theory of justice as fairness is a prominent framework in contemporary political philosophy. It offers a conception of justice that aims to balance liberty and equality within a democratic society.

The Original Position

Central to Rawls' theory is the concept of the original position. This hypothetical scenario involves individuals selecting principles of justice behind a "veil of ignorance," unaware of their

social and economic status, natural talents, or comprehensive conception of the good. This device ensures impartiality in the choice of principles.

The Principles of Justice

From this original position, Rawls argues that individuals would select two fundamental principles of justice:

1. **Equal Basic Liberties:** Each person has an equal right to the most extensive basic liberties compatible with similar liberties for others. These liberties include freedom of speech, assembly, and conscience.
2. **Fair Equality of Opportunity and the Difference Principle:** Social and economic inequalities are to be arranged so that they are both:
 - To the greatest benefit of the least advantaged
 - Attached to positions and offices open to all under conditions of fair equality of opportunity.

The first principle prioritizes equal basic liberties, while the second addresses economic and social inequalities. The difference principle ensures that inequalities benefit the least advantaged members of society.

Key Features of Rawls' Theory

- **Justice as Fairness:** Rawls seeks to establish principles of justice that are fair to all members of society.
- **The Veil of Ignorance:** This device promotes impartiality by preventing individuals from knowing their own social position.
- **Priority of Liberty:** Basic liberties are given priority over economic and social inequalities.
- **Distributive Justice:** The difference principle focuses on ensuring that inequalities benefit the least advantaged.

Rawls' theory has been influential but also subject to criticism, with debates centering on the plausibility of the original position, the interpretation of the principles, and the relationship between justice and other political values.

LET'S REWIND:

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 utilizing 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.

John Rawls' theory of justice asks us to imagine choosing the rules of society blind to our own advantages. This "original position" ensures fairness. From this thought experiment, Rawls argues for two key principles: equal basic liberties for all and allowing inequalities only if they benefit the society are least fortunate. In essence, Rawls' theory emphasizes a fair society that prioritizes basic rights and ensures those at the bottom have the most to gain from any social or economic disparities.

CHECK YOUR PROGRESS

- What is the origin of the word Justice?
- 'The most striking feature of the original position is the veil of ignorance'. True or False?

LET'S SUM- UP

Political theory brings forefront the core concepts like liberty, equality, and justice. Liberty encompasses freedom from restrictions, empowering individuals to pursue goals and participate in society. It can be natural (inherent freedom), moral (acting according to conscience), or social/civil (guaranteed freedoms like speech or religion). Social/civil liberty itself has various subcategories like personal liberty (choices in private life), political liberty (participation in government), and economic liberty (economic choices). Positive liberty focuses on having the resources to pursue goals, while negative liberty emphasizes freedom from interference.

Equality is the cornerstone of a just society. It envisions a level playing field where

opportunities are open to all and judgments are based on merit, not background. The law plays a crucial role by ensuring equal rights and fair treatment. Equality can be negative (absence of privileges) or positive (availability of opportunities for all). Different dimensions of equality exist, such as legal equality (equal protection under the law), political equality (fair representation and ability to hold office), and socio-economic equality (reducing disparities in social status and economic opportunities).

Justice embodies the ideal of fairness for all. It's about ensuring everyone receives what they deserve, whether it's an equal opportunity to succeed, fundamental rights, or a fair share of society's benefits. Legal justice focuses on the fair and impartial application of the law, while political justice ensures everyone has a fair say in government through voting, holding office, or expressing views. Social justice strives for equality in social standing and opportunities, and economic justice aims to create a fair and equitable economic system with equal access to resources and opportunities for everyone.

John Rawls' influential theory of justice asks us to imagine choosing the rules of society blind to our own advantages (original position). This thought experiment leads him to propose two key principles: equal basic liberties for all and allowing inequalities only if they benefit the least fortunate in society. Rawls' theory has been critiqued for overemphasizing institutions and neglecting the impact of human behavior on maintaining a just society. Additionally, critics argue for the possibility of multiple just principles existing, which challenges Rawls' proposed process for achieving a perfectly just society.

FURTHER READING

- D. Easton, *A Systems Analysis of Political Life*, Engelwood Cliffs NJ, Prentice Hall, 1965.
- D. Miller, *Social Justice*, Oxford, The Clarendon Press, 1976.
- G. Catlin, *A Study of the Principles of Politics*, London and New York, Oxford University Press, 1930.
- H. J. Laski, *A Grammar of Politics*, London, Allen and Unwin, 1948.
- R. Dahl, *Modern Political Analysis*, Englewood Cliffs NJ, Prentice Hall, 1963.
- R. Plant, *Modern Political Thought*, Oxford, Blackwell, 1991.
- S. M. Okin, *Justice, Gender and the Family*, New York, Basic Books, 1989.

ANSWERS TO CHECK YOUR PROGRESS

- What is the origin of the word Liberty?

- The origin of the word Liberty is “Liber”, a Latin word the meaning of which is free or independent.
 - What do you mean by positive liberty?
- Positive liberty means having the situations and resources to pursue one’s goals and fulfil one’s potentialities within a society. It indicates availability of conditions prerequisite to one’s growth.
 - What forms Dworkin’s central point of equality?
- The principle of ‘**equal concern and respect**’ forms the central point of Dworkin’s equality concept.
 - Write three main obstacles towards implementation of equality in society.
- Three main obstacles towards implementation of equality are- a) **Social** (Age old customs, traditions and superstitions create inequality of social status); b) **Political** (power is enjoyed by people belonging to certain castes and certain families indicating absence of equal opportunities and misuse of it); c) **Economic** (concentration of economic wealth in the hands of few may hinder the process of implementation of equality in the society).
 - What is the origin of the word Justice?
- The word justice has been derived from the Latin term *justitia*, which means the idea of joining or fitting
 - ‘The most striking feature of the original position is the veil of ignorance’. True or False?
- True.

MODEL QUESTIONS/ ASSIGNMENT

1. What is Liberty? Do you think as a citizen you are completely free within the state? If Yes, why and if No why. Support your answer with logical explanation.
2. What is Equality? Is equal treatment possible in a society? Give reasons in support of your answer.
3. What is Justice? How justice can be attained in an unjust environment? Think and write your own observations.
4. What is the necessity of Liberty, Equality and Justice to Human Life?
5. Explain the theory of justice given by John Rawls.

CHAPTER 4: DEMOCRACY

CHAPTER STRUCTURE:

Learning Outcome

Utility of Learning the Concept

1.1 Concepts and Features

1.2 Conditions for Success of Democracy

1.3 Theories of Democracy

Let's Sum Up

Further Reading

Answers to Check Your Progress

Model Questions/ Assignments

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

UTILITY OF LEARNING THE CONCEPT:

Imagine a world where everyone's voice matters, shaping the rules and how things work. Democracy is like a giant team project, where everyone gets a say in the rules and how things are run. It's not just about voting, though that's important too. It is about the presence of that environment in which everyone can express themselves, get justice for unjust. Learning about democracy isn't memorizing dates; it's about exploring how we can all work together to build a fair and just society. So, are you ready to be a part of the team? Let's get started!

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.

DEVELOPMENT OF THE CONCEPT- 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. Open 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 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.

LET'S REWIND:

Democracy is all about people's government which is formed by their elected representatives. In a democracy, citizens aren't simply subjects; they have a say in how things are run. This participation can be direct, like voting on laws, or indirect, by electing representatives who reflect their views. The core idea is that everyone has a voice and the system is fair, protecting the rights of all. Laws and policies are made through a process that reflects the will of the people, not a king or a small elite group. This often involves **features like free and fair elections, freedom of speech to express ideas, and a rule of law** etc. that applies equally to everyone. Democracy isn't a perfect system, but it's a powerful idea that gives people the chance to shape their own society.

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 organized 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 organized 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 organized 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, decentralization 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.

LET'S REWIND:

Democracy needs a few things to work well. An educated citizenry is crucial, as informed voters make informed choices and actively participate in the political process. This participation is further bolstered by free and fair elections, where the people's will determines who holds power. However, a strong democracy goes beyond just elections. It necessitates a strong rule of law, where everyone, regardless of status, is subject to the same set of laws. This fosters trust and stability within the system. Finally, a healthy democracy thrives on active public engagement. This can take many forms, from holding leaders accountable to expressing views and concerns. Through informed participation and a strong legal framework, a democracy can ensure its long-term success.

CHECK YOUR PROGRESS

- What do you mean by democracy?
- Give two conditions necessary for the success of democracy.

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 favour 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 maximizing 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", focused 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 realization 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 realize that it cannot accomplish any big things with such dwarfed men, said J.S. Mill.

To sum up, it was observed that the liberal theory of democracy assumes "the existence of rational and active citizens who seek to realize 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 characterized 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 criticized 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 organization 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.

LET'S REWIND:

Developed in the 18th century, **classical liberal democracy** placed individual liberty at the heart of a well-functioning government. This theory emphasizes a limited government's role, focusing on protecting fundamental rights like life, liberty, and property, rather than micromanaging personal choices. It champions individualism, where people are free to pursue their goals as long as they don't harm others. The rule of law binds everyone, including the government itself, ensuring a fair and predictable system.

However, classical liberalism isn't without its **critics**. Some argue that a purely free market championed by this theory can lead to wealth concentrating in the hands of a few, undermining equal opportunity for all. Additionally, concerns exist about the "tyranny of the majority." Unrestricted majority rule could potentially disregard the rights and needs of minority groups. Finally, critics point out that a limited government might neglect social welfare programs and public goods, potentially leaving some citizens behind. Despite these criticisms, classical liberalism laid the groundwork for modern democracy, and the debate around balancing individual freedom with social responsibility continues to be a cornerstone of democratic discourse.

- **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 democratization, 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 minimizing 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.

LET'S REWIND:

Elite theory, drawing from the ideas of Pareto, Mosca, and Michels, argues that a small, influential elite holds the reins in society's key areas like economics, politics, and social issues. This elite may not be born into power, but maintains control through wealth, influence, or positions within important institutions. Critics argue elite theory downplays the power of democratic processes and public pressure on decisions. Additionally, it's seen as overly simplistic, neglecting the complexities of power structures where alliances shift and struggles for influence can occur within the elite itself. Despite these critiques, elite theory remains a valuable lens for examining how power imbalances and concentrated influence shape social outcomes.

- **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 mobilized 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 criticized 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 pressurize 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 immobilize the government, and seriously damage the important interests of the nation.

LET'S REWIND:

The pluralist theory of democracy presents a contrasting view to the elite theory. Here, power isn't concentrated in a single elite group, but rather dispersed amongst various social groups with distinct interests. These groups, like labour unions or environmental organizations, compete to influence government policy through lobbying and advocacy. Policy decisions become the product of bargaining and compromise between these competing forces. While acknowledging limitations in direct public participation, pluralists believe these groups effectively represent the public's diverse interests. However, **critics** argue that some groups hold more resources and influence, creating an uneven playing field. Additionally, the theory

might downplay the significant role powerful institutions can play in shaping policy. Possibility of favouritism attitude is also undeniable.

- **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". 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 view-points - 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 criticized on the following grounds.

1. Negation of Democracy: The Liberals criticize 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. 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 that 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 criticized 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 criticized 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.

LET'S REWIND:

Marxist theory challenges the idea of traditional (bourgeois) democracy as a true representation of the people's will. They argue it favors the wealthy elite. For Marxists, genuine democracy can only emerge after a socialist revolution led by the working class. This worker-controlled state would dismantle social classes and ensure everyone has a voice in government. This might involve participatory democracy with citizens directly involved in decision-making, rather than just choosing representatives. The ultimate Marxist vision is a classless, stateless society where the need for democracy itself dissolves. However, it has been criticised as opposite to democracy.

- **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 liberalism 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 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'S REWIND:

Political theorist C.B. Macpherson critiqued the idea of democracy solely defined by voting and elections. He argued that capitalism, with its emphasis on individual ownership and self-interest ("possessive individualism"), creates an unequal power dynamic that hinders true democracy. Macpherson believed a more just democracy requires a more equitable distribution of power and resources. This would allow for active citizen participation and collective decision-making beyond simply choosing leaders.

CHECK YOUR PROGRESS

- Name three main proponents of the classical liberal theory of democracy.
- Name three political thinkers associated with the Elite theory.

LET US SUM UP

Democracy empowers citizens to shape their own society. Participation, either directly through voting on laws or indirectly through elected representatives, ensures everyone has a voice in a fair and just system. Free and fair elections, freedom of speech, and a strong rule of law are essential features. However, an educated citizenry and active public engagement are crucial for a healthy democracy.

Theories: Classical Liberal Democracy, emphasizing individual liberty and limited government, has been criticized for potentially creating economic inequality and neglecting social welfare programs. Elite theory suggests power concentrates in a wealthy few, while Pluralism sees it spread among various social groups vying for influence. Marxism rejects the concept of true democracy existing within capitalism, advocating for a socialist revolution and a classless society. C.B. Macpherson argues for a more equitable distribution of power and resources, allowing for active citizen participation beyond just voting. Democracy's complexity lies in the ongoing debate about the best way to achieve a society where power serves the people, not the other way around.

FURTHER READING:

- B. Crick, *In Defence of Politics*, Harmondsworth, Pelican Books, 1963.
- B. Hindess, *Discourses on Power: From Hobbes to Foucault*, Cambridge, Basil Blackwell, 1996.
- C. B. Macpherson, *Democratic Theory: Essays in Retrieval*, Oxford, The Clarendon Press, 1977.
- C. Pateman, *Participation and Democratic Theory*, Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, 1970.
- 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.
- E. Owens, *The Future of Freedom in the Developing World: Economic Development and Political Reform*, New York, Pergamon Press, 1987.
- J. Dunn, *Modern Revolutions*, London, The Clarendon Press, 1989.
- J. Lively, *Democracy*, Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, 1975.

- P. Kennedy, *The Rise and Fall of the Great Powers: Economic Change and Military Conflict from 1500-2000*, London, Fontana, 1988.
- R. Dahl, *A Preface to Democratic Theory*, Chicago, University of Chicago Press, 1965.

ANSWERS TO CHECK YOUR PROGRESS

- What do you mean by democracy?
 - It is a form of government where the sovereign authority lies with the people. Modern democracy is an indirect form of democracy where people elect their representatives to represent their voice and interest while policy making process.
- Give two conditions necessary for the success of democracy.
 - A democratic society and respect and protection towards fundamental rights and freedom can be considered two important conditions out of many for the success of a democratic government.
- Name three main proponents of the classical liberal theory of democracy.
 - John Locke, Montesquieu, Bentham are some of main proponents of the classical liberal theory of democracy.
- Name three political thinkers associated with the Elite theory.
 - Vilfredo Pareto, Gaetano Mosca, and Robert Michels were the political thinkers associated with the Elite theory.

MODEL QUESTIONS/ ASSIGNMENT

1. Explain the concept of democracy with an emphasis on its important features.
2. For the success of democracy, there are certain conditions need to fulfil. Explain.
3. What are different theories of Democracy?
4. Is democracy necessary for human growth? Support your answer with logical explanations.
