

Ahmednagar Jilha Maratha Vidya Prasarak Samaj's
NEW LAW COLLEGE, AHMEDNAGAR

POLITICAL THEORIES

(Subject Code – BA0202)

**STUDY MATERIAL
FOR**

B.A.LL.B. – I (Sem. – II) Pattern – 2017

By

Prof. Dnyandev BhausahabMore

(Asst. Prof.)

M.A. B.Ed. SET (Political Science)

Asst. Professor

New Law College, Ahmednagar
Savitribai Phule Pune University,
Pune

Academic Year

2020-21

MODULE NO	PARTICULARS	PAGE NO
Module 01	<p>Introduction :</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Meaning and Definition of Political Theory 2. Significance of Political Theory 3. Impact of Political Theory on Society and Law 	4
Module 02	<p>Approaches to the study of Political Theory :</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Traditional Approaches – Philosophical- Historical- Legal- Institutional 2. Contemporary Approaches – Positivism, Constructive and Communitarian 	11
Module 03	<p>Theories of Power and Authority :</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Nature and Significance of Power and Authority 2. Max Webber’s View on Authority and Robert Dahl’s views on Influence 3. Different forms of Power and Authority 4. Theories of Power – Elite Theory and Group Theory 5. Difference between Power and Authority and Legitimacy 	29
Module 04	Overview of Political Theory :	

	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Liberalism - Meaning- Main currents of liberalism- J. S. Mill' s views- Decline of Liberalism 2. Socialism and its variants - Fabian – Guild - Syndicalism – An overview 3. Marxism- Contemporary relevance 4. Utilitarianism - Jeremy Bentham and Contribution of J.S. Mill 5. Nationalism and its facets – Fascism and Nazism, Challenges before Nationalism – Sub-nationalism - Regionalism 6. Gandhism and Sarvodaya 7. Social Justice Theory of Dr. B.R. Ambedkar 	41
Module 05	<p>Contemporary Political Theories and Viewpoints :</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Theories of Environment, Feminism 2. Realism and Cultural-relativism 3. Human Rights 4. Current State of Political Theory - Pluralism and Reconciliation 	110
BIBLIOGRAPHY		145

Module No-1 Introduction to the Political Theories

INTRODUCTION

Political theory is not only a theory of/about politics, it is also the science of politics, the philosophy of politics at that. As a theory, Bluhm explains, political theory “stands for an abstract model of the political order... a guide to the systematic collection and analysis of political data” (Theories of Political System, 1981). Andrew Hacker, enlarging the point of view, says that political theory as a “theory, in ideal terms, is dispassionate and disinterested. As science, it will describe political reality without trying to pass judgement on what is being depicted, either implicitly or explicitly. As philosophy, it will describe rules of conduct which will secure good life for all of society...” (Political Theory: Philosophy, Ideology, Science, 1961).

Political theory is not fantasy, though it may contain an element of political vision. It is not politicking, though it does take into account political realities for its study and analysis. It is not all scientism, though it seeks to reach the roots of all political activity analytically and systematically. It is not ideology, though it attempts to justify a political system and condemns another. It is theoretical, scientific, philosophical and at the same time dynamic with a clear objective of attaining a better social order. It thus, has in varying degrees, elements of ‘theory’, ‘science’, ‘philosophy’ and ‘ideology’.

What is Theory?

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

‘description’ because “describing” is only a part of “thinking”, its other parts, for example, include “discovering”, “determining”, “augmenting”, “explaining” and “framing” a phenomenon. Theory is not hypothesis, for hypothesis denotes a tentative assumption of facts, and, therefore, lacks what theory really has, “definiteness”. Theory is not philosophy because while theory is about “something”, philosophy is about “everything”. Theory is not thought because it is a thought about thought, and not an entire thought itself. There is, indeed, much that is common between theory and reason, for both have a claim on being scientific, yet theory looks beyond reason, beyond science.

Political Theory: Implications—

Theory implies both science as well as philosophy. It is, against this background, that one may say that a theorist is both a scientist and a philosopher; a theorist is more than a scientist; he is more than a philosopher. To understand theory when applied to politics would mean understanding politics as a theory, as a science and also as a philosophy. Bluhm would, thus, explain political theory as “an explanation of what politics is all about, a general understanding of the political world, a frame of reference. Without one we should be unable to recognize an event as political, decide anything about why it happened, judge whether it was good or bad, or decide what was likely to happen next. A theory helps us identify what is happening in a particular case of politics... It helps us to explain why an event occurred and to predict future events ... Theory also is a tool for evaluating what is happening and for guiding our political choices....”. The job of the political theorist is really important. Brecht makes a note of it saying, “It is the function of the political theorist to see, sooner than others, and to analyze, more profoundly than others, the immediate and the potential problems of the political life of society; to supply the practical politicians, well in advance, with alternative courses of action, the foreseeable consequences of which have been fully thought through; and to supply him not only with brilliant ideas, but with a solid block of knowledge on which to build.” When political theory performs its function well, he continues, “it is one of the most important weapons in our struggle for the advance of humanity.”

The discussion on what a theory is or what political theory is would help us identify the characteristic implications or the major aspects of political theory. Some of these can be stated as under: i) The area in which political theory works extends to the realms of politics only – political life of the citizen, his political behaviour, his political ideas, the government that he seeks to establish, and the tasks expected from such a government.

ii) The methods, which political theory adopts, include description, explanation and investigation of the political phenomenon.

iii) Though political theory is all about what is 'political', yet it attempts to understand 'political' in relation to 'social', 'economic', 'psychological', 'ecological', 'moral', and the like.

iv) The objective which political theory seeks to achieve is to build a good state in a good society, and in the process, create processes, procedures, institutions and structures historically tested and rationally attained.

v) As a body of thought, political theory attempts to explain, evaluate and predict political phenomena, and in the process builds not only scientifically testable models, but suggests values as rules of human conduct.

vi) Political theory is both prescriptive and explanatory.

NATURE OF POLITICAL THEORY

Political Theory as History

That political theory is history has been emphatically advocated by scholars like George Sabine, but all history is not political theory just as all political theory is not history. Political theory without history is a structure without a base. In studying and analysing politics, what we learn to understand is a political tradition, and a concrete way of behaviour. It is, therefore, proper that the study of politics should essentially be a historical study. History, we should know, is more than the tale of the dead and the buried; it is a storehouse of experience and wisdom; successes and failures, of what has been achieved, and what has been lost. It is the sum-total and simultaneously the formation-head of a new development, something, as Professor L.S. Rathore says, "eternally significant and instructive, inseparably linked with contemporaneity in the perpetual progress of mankind." "Ignore history", he warns, "and the delight of political theory is never to be retrieved."

Political theory as history defies what has lost its value. No one cries now that the state has been a divine creation or the result of a contract in the state of nature. As history, political theory conserves what has significance and helps posterity to cherish it for a long time to come. Concepts such as justice, liberty, equality, obligation, as evolved through the annals of time, are being held high by political theory today and shall continue to be so in future. Indeed, history never repeats, but it can hardly be ignored. In the attempt to divorce itself from history, political theory loses its own significance, for there can be no fruits without roots as Seeley had said long ago. It is through history that political theory explains what is what. One can never understand a text without its context. Plato's communism was significantly different from what is claimed to be Marx's communism, and one can understand communism of each by understanding the history of their respective times. It is one's age that prompts and propels

one's political theory: history shapes and reshapes political theory. How can, then, political theory ignore its one aspect, the historical aspect? Sabine writes that great political theory excels both in "an analysis of a present situation and in suggestiveness for other situations". As such, "a good political theory", Professor S.P. Varma (Modern Political Theory, 1987) writes, "even though it is the outcome of a peculiar set of historical circumstances, has a significance for all times to come. It is exactly this universal character of political theory which makes it respectable". (See George H. Sabine, "What is Political Theory?" Journal of Politics, Vol. I, No. 1, February 1939).

Political Theory as Philosophy

Political theory is a philosophy has been very well enunciated by scholars like Leo Strauss, ("What is Political Philosophy?" Journal of Politics, XIX, August 1967), but all philosophy is not political theory as all political theory is not philosophy. Philosophy, as an abstract study encompassing the whole universe in general, and morals, norms, and values in particular, is the sum-total of general laws governing the whole world. It has served political theory well through the ages as its valuational factor, as Sabine has said. Philosophy, as Kant says, has answered three questions: "What can I know?" "What must I do?" and "What can I hope for?" and this is what makes philosophy a lodestar of life. Without philosophy, no political theory can ever hope to exist; without an eye on future, no present can ever afford to stay as no present stands without its past.

Political theory is a philosophy, for it not only seeks to know the nature of things but also attempts to explain as to why things really exist. One understands an action or a thought only by evaluating it. Evaluation is a part of understanding. Philosophy as distinct from theory is a 'quest for wisdom' or as Strauss holds the view, "quest for universal knowledge, for knowledge of the whole". Political theory as philosophy is "the attempt truly to know both the nature of political things and the right, or the good, political order" (Strauss). Politics is not what one assumes or opines. In fact, a political theorist is expected to possess more than an assumption or an opinion; he has to have knowledge. Philosophy emerges when opinion/assumption attains the heights of knowledge, and that is what exactly is the task of political theory. Political theory as philosophy is an "attempt to replace opinion/assumption about the nature of political things by knowledge of the nature of political things" (Strauss).

Values, Strauss believes, are an indispensable part of political theory as they are, of philosophy. Every political philosopher has to be a teacher in his own right: he must profess; he must teach; he must persuade. Professor Varma, therefore, writes that the object of persuasion is always there before the political theorist. "What some of the modern writers have described as "the folk-lore of political philosophy', or mere 'ideology', is vital for the

understanding of political theory.” Political theory not only explains, but also affects, favourably or adversely. Evaluational aspects of a political activity are as important as its factual aspects. It is, in this sense, that values and facts form an integral part of any political theory.

Theory as Science That political theory is a science has been forcefully emphasised by scholars from Arthur Bentley (*The Process of Government*, 1908) to George Catlin (*The Science and Method of Politics*, 1927); David Easton (*The Political System*, 1953) and Robert Dahl (*Modern Political Analysis*, 1963); but all science is not political theory, just as all political theory is not science. Political theory is not science in the sense Chemistry or Physics or Mathematics is a science. It is not as exact a science as these natural or physical sciences are, because there are no universally recognised principles, no clear cause-effect relationships, no laboratories and no predictions are made in political theory the way these are found in natural and exact sciences.

It is a science in so far as it admits concepts and norms which are both observable and testable, and in so far as it responds to the requirements of reason and rationalism. The American social science researchers in general, and the Behaviouralists in particular, sought to create a science of politics and in the process, indulged in what may be called ‘reductionism’. Political theory is a science in so far as it can, and in fact, is applied to a social gathering and the definitive rules of the exact sciences are applicable within the limitations as in any social science. Political theory as a science is only a social science.

It is a science in its methodology, in its approach and in its analysis. To that extent, it is a science, a prime science as Aristotle had described it. It is a science in so far as its conclusions are drawn after ‘study’, ‘observation’, ‘experiments’, features which go along with any normal definition of science. There is no need to go a long way to make a ‘science’ of politics, and to find ‘techniques’, and ‘tools’ to make politics an exact science, no matter whether there remains, in the process, any political theory or not. The role of science in political theory should be limited to the extent that it helps understand a political phenomenon, and to that extent, science should have an entry in the realms of political theory. Political theory admits objectivity in association with subjectivity, facts in relation to values, research together with theory. Political theory as science generates neutral, dispassionate and objective knowledge (See, Colin Hay, *Political Analysis*, 2002). There are limits of social sciences. In contrast, the rules of the game (that of the exact sciences) do not change with time. The laws of physics, for instance, can be assumed to pertain to all situations at all times – past, present and future. But this is not true of the social sciences. “The nature of the ‘economic’ and the ‘political’ is,” Colin Hay says, “different after Keynes and Marx in a way that the ‘physical’ and the ‘natural’ is not after Newton and Einstein”. We must remember that (i) “Social structures, unlike natural structures, do not exist independently of the activities they govern”, (ii) “social

structures, unlike the natural structures, do not exist independently of the agent's conceptions of what they are doing in their activity." (iii) "social structures, unlike natural structures, may be only relatively enduring." (See R. Bhaskar, *The Limits of Naturalism*, 1979). This is where the social sciences are different from the natural sciences. The limits of political theory are worked out within the ethics of political analysis.

Significance of Political Theory

The significance of political theory has been under a cloud by scholars, mostly of the behaviouralist school. John Plamenatz, in his essay entitled "The Ease of Political Theory" does not agree. As he puts it: "Political philosophy (meaning here political theory) is dead, I have heard man say, killed by the logical positivists and their successors who have shown that many of the problems which exercised the great political thinkers of the past were spurious, resting in confusions of the sight and the misuse of the language." According to him, political theory has its uses which may be stated as under:

- (i) Political theory is a serious and difficult intellectual activity and the need for this kind of exercise, in modern times, is indeed much greater.
- (ii) It is a study of values, norms and goals, though it does not produce the same kind of knowledge as empirical political theory does.
- (iii) (iii) It is a study of theories which have, historically, powerfully influenced men's images of themselves, and of society, and profoundly determined their social and political behaviour.
- (iv) (iv) It has an element of socially conditioned ideology. This ideology may be an illusion, and yet, unless man had these illusions, the course of social development would not have been what it is and
- (v) (v) It produces a coherent system of political principles which can guide us to an appropriate political action. Its political theorists, as Plamentaz says, "do not, like honest shopkeepers, display a large variety of goods, describing them all accurately and leaving it to the customer to choose what pleases him most. They produce a hierarchy of principles, and try to explain how men should use them to make their choices... They are not mere purveyors of ideas; they are the preachers and the propagandists."

C. Wright Mills (*The Marxists*, 1962) writes, "Political philosophies are intellectual and moral creations. They contain high ideals, easy slogans, dubious facts, crude propaganda, and sophisticated theories." He describes the significance of political theory, saying:

- (i) “Firstly, it is itself a social reality; it is an ideology in terms of which certain institutions and practices are justified and others attacked; it provides the phrases in which demands are raised, criticisms made, exhortations delivered, proclamations formulated, and at times, policies determined.
- (ii) Second, it is an ethic, an articulation of ideal, which, at various levels of generality and sophistication, is used in judging man, events and movements and as goals and guidelines for aspirations and policies.
- (iii) Third, it designates agencies of action, of the means of reform, revolution and conservation. It contains strategies and programmes that embody both ends and means. It designates, in short, the historical levels by which ideals are to be won or maintained after they have been won. (iv) Fourth, it contains theories of man, society, and history, or at least assumptions about how society is made up of, and how it works. It tells us how to find out where we stand, and where we may be going.”

Political theory aims at comprehending the world in which it comes into being. It tries to identify its salient character, to understand its crisis and it assesses its capacity to resolve that crisis. Political theory contributes to the capacity of man to understand himself and after himself, his polity and his history. It exhorts man to take command of his own common affairs. In short, it explains, illuminates, understands, evaluates, enlightens and alters.

By way of conclusion, one may say that political theory builds a model of the highest political order, serves as a guide to the systematic collection and provides an analysis of political data. As a science, political theory describes political reality without trying to pass judgement on what is being depicted. As a philosophy, it describes rules of conduct which help secure good life for all.

MODULE NO 2 APPROACHES TO THE STUDY OF POLITICAL THEORIES

Concept of Political Theory:

Political theory is a set of specified relationships encompassing political matters that focus and organize inquiry to describe, explain, and predict political events and behaviours. Political theory is considered as the basis and branch of political science which attempts to arrive at generalizations, inferences, or conclusions to be drawn from the data gathered by other specialists, not only in political science, but throughout the whole range of human knowledge and experience. 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. The most dominant political theories realise all three goals such as describe, explain, and predict. The theories are the results of thoughts and research of many scholars and exponents of political science. Thinkers on the subject formulate definitions of various political concepts and establish theories (D. K. Sarmah, 2007).

Germino described that 'Political theory is the most appropriate term to employ in designating that intellectual tradition which affirms the possibility of transcending the sphere of immediate practical concerns and viewing man's societal existence from a critical perspective.' According to Sabine, 'Political theory is, quite simply, man's attempts to consciously understand and solve the problems of his group life and organization. It is the disciplined investigation of political problems not only to show what a political practice is, but also to show what it means. In showing what a practice means, or what it ought to mean, political theory can alter what it is.'

Numerous eminent theorists explained the nature of political theory.

David Held described 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." WC Coker explained political theory as "When political government and its forms and activities are studied not simply as facts to be described and compared and judged in reference to their immediate and temporary effects, but as facts to be understood and appraised in relation to the constant needs, desires and opinions of men, then we have political theory." According to Andrew Hacker, "Political Theory is 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 stated that "Political theory includes political science and political philosophy. While science refers to the phenomenon of control in many forms over all the processes of whole social field. It is concerned with the end or final value, when man asks, what the national good is" or "What is good society." John Plamentaz delineates political theory in functional terms and said that "The function of political theory has come to be restricted to the analysis and clarification of the vocabulary of politics and the critical examination, verification and justification of the concepts employed in political argument." Another

theorists, Norman Barry defined that “Political theory is an electric subject which draws upon a variety of disciplines. There is no body of knowledge or method of analysis which can be classified as belonging exclusively to political theory.”

Approaches of political theory:

The study of political science and in the process of search for political truth certain procedure must be followed. These procedures are defined as approaches, methods, techniques and strategies. Approaches to study political science are grouped as traditional and modern approaches (D. K. Sarmah, 2007).

Traditional approaches:

Traditional approaches are value based. These approaches put emphasis on values more than facts. Advocates of this approaches believe that the study of political science cannot and should not be purely scientific. They stated that in social science such as facts values are closely related with each other. In politics, emphasis should not be on the facts but on the moral quality of political event. There are huge number of traditional approaches such as philosophical, institutional, legal, and historical approaches (D. K. Sarmah, 2007).

Characteristics of Traditional approaches:

1. Traditional approaches are largely normative and stresses on the values of politics.
2. Emphasis is on the study of different political structures.
3. Traditional approaches made very little attempt to relate theory and research.
4. These approaches believe that since facts and values are closely interlinked, studies in Political Science can never be scientific.

Different types of traditional approaches:

1. Philosophical Approach: This approach is considered as the oldest approach in the arena of Political Science. The development of this approach can be traced back to the times of the Greek philosophers like Plato and Aristotle. Leo Strauss was one of the main supporter of the philosophical approach. He considered that “the philosophy is the quest for wisdom and political philosophy is the attempt truly to know about the nature of political things and the right or good political order.” Vernon Van Dyke observed that a philosophical analysis is an effort to clarify thought about the nature of the subject and about ends and means in studying it. The aim of this approach is to evolve the standard of right and wrong, for the purpose of critical evaluation of existing institutions, laws and polices (Gaub, 2009).

This approach is based on the theoretical principle that the values cannot be separated from the study of politics. Therefore, its main concern is to judge what is good or bad in any political society. It is mainly an ethical and normative study of politics and, thus, idealistic. It addresses the problems of the nature

and functions of the state, citizenship, rights and duties etc. The supporters of this approach consider that political philosophy is strongly associated with the political beliefs. Therefore, they are of the opinion that a political scientist must have the knowledge of good life and good society. Political philosophy supports in establishing a good political order (Gaubu, 2009).

Historical Approach: Theorists who developed this political approach focused on the historical factors like the age, place and the situation in which it is evolved are taken into consideration. This approach is related to history and it emphasizes on the study of history of every political reality to analyse any situation. Political thinkers such as Machiavelli, Sabine and Dunning considered that politics and history are closely related and the study of politics always should have a historical standpoint. Sabine stated that Political Science should include all those subjects which have been discussed in the writings of different political thinkers from the time of Plato. This approach strongly maintains the belief that the thinking or the dogma of every political thinker is formed by the surrounding environment. Furthermore, history provide details of the past as well as it also links it with the present events. History gives the chronological order of every political event and thereby helps in future estimation of events also. Therefore, without studying the past political events, institutions and political environment it would be erroneous to analyse the present political events. But critics of historical approach designated that it is not possible to understand the idea of the past ages in terms of contemporary ideas and concepts.

Institutional Approach: This is traditional and significant approach in studying Political Science. This approach primarily deals with the formal features of government and politics accentuates the study of the political institutions and structures. Therefore, the institutional approach is concerned with the study of the formal structures like legislature, executive, judiciary, political parties, and interest groups. The supporters of this approach includes both ancient and modern political philosophers. Among the ancient thinkers, Aristotle had significant role in shaping this approach while the modern thinkers include James Bryce, Bentley, Walter Bagehot, Harold Laski contributed to develop this approach.

Legal Approach: This approach concerns that the state is the fundamental organization for the formation and enforcement of laws. Therefore, this approach is concerned with the legal process, legal bodies or institutions, justice and independence of judiciary. The supporters of this approach are Cicero, Jean Bodin, Thomas Hobbes, Jeremy Bentham, John Austin, Dicey and Sir Henry Maine.

The various traditional approaches to the study of Political Science have been disapproved for being normative. These approaches were principled also as their concern went beyond how and why political events happen to what ought to happen. In the later period, the modern approaches have made an attempt to make the study of Political Science more scientific and, therefore, emphasize pragmatism.

Modern approaches:

After studying politics with the help of traditional approaches, the political thinkers of the later stage felt the necessity to study politics from a new perspective. Thus, to minimize the deficiencies of the traditional approaches, various new approaches have been advocated by the new political thinkers. These new approaches are regarded as the “modern approaches” to the study of Political Science. Modern approaches are fact based approaches. They lay emphasis on factual study of political events and try to arrive at scientific and definite conclusion. The aim of modern approaches is to replace normativism with empiricism. Therefore modern approaches are marked by empirical investigation of relevant data.

Positivism and Its Characteristics

As a philosophical ideology and movement positivism first assumed its distinctive features in the work of the French philosopher Auguste Comte, who named the systematized science of sociology. It then developed through several stages known by various names, such as Empiricocriticism, Logical Positivism and Logical Empiricism and finally in the mid-20th century flowed into the movement known as Analytic and Linguistic philosophy. In its basic ideological posture, positivism is worldly, secular, anti-theological and anti meta-physical.

Comte’s positivism was posited on the assentation of a so-called law of three stages of intellectual development. There is a parallel, as Comte saw it, between the evolution of thought patterns in the entire history of man; on the one hand and in the history of an individual’s development from infancy to adulthood on the other.

In the first or so called theological stage, natural phenomena are explained as the result of supernatural or divine powers. It does not matter whether the religion is polytheistic or monotheistic; in either case miraculous powers or wills are believed to produce the observed events. This stage was criticized by Comte as anthropomorphic, i.e. as resting on all too human analogies.

The Second stage called metaphysical, is in some cases merely a depersonalized theology. The observable processes of nature are assumed to arise from impersonal powers. The sort of fruitfulness that it lacks can be achieved only in the third stage, the scientific or positive stage.

Hence the title of Comte's magnum opus; the Positive Philosophy of Auguste Comte 1853 because it claims to be concerned only with positive facts.

The task of the sciences and of knowledge in general, is to study the facts and regularities as laws, explanations of phenomena can consist in no more than the subsuming of special cases under general laws. Mankind reached full maturity of thought only after abandoning the pseudo-explanations of the theological and metaphysical stages and substituting an unrestricted adherence to scientific method.

In his three stages Comte combined what he considered to be an account of the historical order of development with a logical analysis of the leveled structure of the sciences. By arranging the six basic and pure sciences one upon the other in a pyramid, Comte prepared the way for Logical positivism to 'reduce' each level to the one below.

He placed at the fundamental level the science that does not presuppose any other sciences—Mathematics—and then ordered the levels above it in such a way that each science depends upon and makes use of, the sciences below it on the scale ; thus Arithmetic, geometry and mechanics, astronomy, physics, chemistry, biology and sociology. Each higher level science, in turn adds to the knowledge content of the science or sciences on the levels below, thus enriching this content by successive specialization.

Positivism is a term which designates a philosophical tendency oriented around natural science and striving for a united view of the world of phenomena both physical and human, through the applications of the methods and the extension of the results whereby the natural sciences have attained their unrivaled position in the modern world. From the point of view of methodology the term 'positive' is conceived in polemical opposition to the metaphysical abstractions of traditional philosophy.

Philosophy of science is positivism; Positivism is more a philosophy, method rather than a theory. It is that philosophy which preaches that the interpretation of the world is based on human experience. It insists on the application of scientific method of natural sciences to the study of social world.

It deals with the application of scientific method by natural scientists and by the sociologists in understanding human-behaviour. The idea of positivism can be traced back to Bacon, Berkeley, Locke and Hume. Before Comte, Saint Simon also advocated positivism. He proposed scientific reorganization of society and promotion of science, since he believed that progress depended on it. The idea of positivism was present in an embryonic form in the mind of Saint Simon and Comte expanded this idea.

Positivism brought a revolution or renaissance in the field of social science. It combined a belief in progress and a passion for serving humanity. It is based on the belief that a scientific analysis of history would show the way to cure for the ills of society.

The characteristics of positivism are:

(a) Science is the only valid knowledge.

(b) Fact is the object of knowledge.

(c) Philosophy does not possess a method different from science.

(d) The task of philosophy is to find the general principles common to all sciences and to use these principles as guides to human conduct and as the basis of social organization.

(e) Positivism denies intuition, prior reasoning, theological and metaphysical knowledge.

Comte used positivism as a weapon against the negative philosophy prevalent before the French Revolution. That negative philosophy was more concerned with emotional than practical questions. Comte regarded such speculations as negative, since it was neither constructive nor practical. As an alternative, Comte invented 'positivism' which remains concerned with the questions about how things are in reality.

Comte's positivism is described in several ways. One salient point is that it is scientific. Science should not be confused with empiricisms or mere collection of facts. Comte believed that the whole universe is governed by natural laws and these laws could be learned through the method of science.

Positive knowledge is based on experience and considers only real phenomena. Comte did not deny the existence of unknown, but positivism was no way concerned with the supernatural. Chambliss has presented the essence of Comtean positivism in this following words, "positivism is not fatalistic, or optimistic or materialistic. It is concerned with the real, rather than fanciful, useful rather than all knowledge."

Apart from the above, there are also some other characteristics:

1. All Scientific knowledge must be based on direct experience of a reality or direct observation is the surest way to acquire scientific knowledge.

2. The direct experience of a reality could be understood by *La certitude*, i.e. the unity of scientific method. This implies that the different branches of study are distinguished by their object of study not by their method.

3. The concept of unity of scientific method requires *La precise*, i.e. a common scientific goal of formulating testable theories. It also implies that there are no value judgements in scientific enquiry.

4. The positivist view science as containing the principle of *La utilize* i.e. all scientific knowledge must serve some useful purpose. It should be used as a tool for social engineering.

5. Positive knowledge is *La relative*, which means that scientific knowledge is unfinished because there is no absolute knowledge in science. Lastly, science gives prediction and from prediction comes action.

Normative Aspect of Positivism:

Up to the positive method Comte was highly praised as the founder of science. Auguste Comte was a philosopher among the sociologists and a sociologist among the philosophers; says Raymond Aron. He had a scientific bent of mind. But unfortunately Comte's reformatory zeal overpowered his scientism. He had to reform the French Society. He thought that with the help of science, reformation can be brought to the society.

He wanted to write religion and science. He turned towards religion because he was a philosopher and a social reformist. In the normative aspect, we may include, the concept of positive religion, positive society. Scientific religion was between science and religion. He founded a new religion called the "religion of humanity". This religion of humanity is the scientific interpretation of religion.

Religion of Humanity:

In theological stage, super natural forces were the object of worship and God was everything. But in scientific religion, God is replaced by humanity. Humanity will be worshipped. Humanity consists of all those who are dead and who are living and who would be born in future.

Comte put emphasis on those who are dead and those who had sacrificed their life for the welfare of mankind. He told to "love mankind." In religion of humanity selfishness is sin; sacrifice is a way of salvation. He puts emphasis on altruism. You must live for others and not for yourself. Comte got the idea of religion of humanity from Feuerbach.

Comte believed that society which was built in scientific principles needed very badly a religion called religion of humanity. The egoistic tendencies of mankind as evinced in previous history

would be replaced by altruism and by the command “Live for others”. Men would be imbued with love for their fellowmen.

Comte at this stage made “Love and affection” the central points of human life, Comte not only considered himself a social scientist, but a prophet and founder of new religion that promised salvation for all ailments of mankind. He made a purely social religion. Mankind was an end in itself.

Comte was not a strict religionist as such, but he considered the atheist “the most irrational of all theologians”. Huxley called Comte’s religion “Catholicism minus Christianity”. Some others criticized it as highly “egoistic religion”. A few others considered it as Utopian in character.

Comte disregarded violent procedure and gave emphasis to persuasion and compassion. Universal brotherhood is the end of positive politics. According to Comte, politicians are important for the society. But the sociologists should be allowed to form the government.

Criticisms:

(i) Though, Comte claimed to be the father of positivism or scientific approach; he himself was not committed to it.

(ii) Prof Timasheff opines, Comte’s sociological theories represent a premature jump from the level of observation and inferences to the level of theory.

(iii) According to John Stuart Mill, Comte’s religion does not stand the test of rationalism because that can never be put into practice.

(iv) Comte’s religion was born out of his “moral intoxication”.

(v) According to Rollin Chambliss, Comte wanted to build a science of social phenomena. But instead of doing that he struggled to provide his projects of social reorganisation. He built a Utopia instead of science.

Auguste Comte gave maximum importance to the scientific method. In spite of criticisms, his insistence on positive approach, objectivity and scientific attitude contributed to the progress of social sciences in general.

Constructivism Theory

The basics of constructivism

Constructivism sees the world, and what we can know about the world, as socially constructed. This view refers to the nature of reality and the nature of knowledge that are also called ontology and epistemology in research language. Alexander Wendt (1995) offers an excellent example that illustrates the social construction of reality when he explains that 500 British nuclear weapons are less threatening to the United States than five North Korean nuclear weapons. These identifications are not caused by the nuclear weapons (the *material structure*) but rather by the meaning given to the material structure (the *ideational structure*). It is important to understand that the social relationship between the United States and Britain and the United States and North Korea is perceived in a similar way by these states, as this shared understanding (or intersubjectivity) forms the basis of their interactions. The example also shows that nuclear weapons by themselves do not have any meaning unless we understand the social context. It further demonstrates that constructivists go beyond the material reality by including the effect of ideas and beliefs on world politics. This also entails that reality is always under construction, which opens the prospect for change. In other words, meanings are not fixed but can change over time depending on the ideas and beliefs that actors hold.

Constructivists argue that agency and structure are mutually constituted, which implies that structures influence agency and that agency influences structures. Agency can be understood as the ability of someone to act, whereas structure refers to the international system that consists of material and ideational elements. Returning to Wendt's example discussed above, this means that the social relation of enmity between the United States and North Korea represents the intersubjective structure (that is, the shared ideas and beliefs among both states), whereas the United States and North Korea are the actors who have the capacity (that is, agency) to change or reinforce the existing structure or social relationship of enmity. This change or reinforcement ultimately depends on the beliefs and ideas held by both states. If these beliefs and ideas change, the social relationship can change to one of friendship. This stance differs considerably from that of realists, who argue that the anarchic structure of the international system determines the behaviour of states. Constructivists, on the other hand, argue that 'anarchy is what states make of it' (Wendt 1992). This means that anarchy can be interpreted in different ways depending on the meaning that actors assign to it.

Another central issue to constructivism is identities and interests. Constructivists argue that states can have multiple identities that are socially constructed through interaction with other actors. Identities are representations of an actor's understanding of who they are, which in turn signals their interests. They are important to constructivists as they argue that identities constitute interests

and actions. For example, the identity of a small state implies a set of interests that are different from those implied by the identity of a large state. The small state is arguably more focused on its survival, whereas the large state is concerned with dominating global political, economic and military affairs. It should be noted, though, that the actions of a state should be aligned with its identity. A state can thus not act contrary to its identity because this will call into question the validity of the identity, including its preferences. This issue might explain why Germany, despite being a great power with a leading global economy, did not become a military power in the second half of the twentieth century. Following the atrocities of Adolf Hitler's Nazi regime during the Second World War, German political identity shifted from one of militarism to pacifism due to unique historical circumstances.

Social norms are also central to constructivism. These are generally defined as 'a standard of appropriate behaviour for actors with a given identity' (Katzenstein 1996, 5). States that conform to a certain identity are expected to comply with the norms that are associated with that identity. This idea comes with an expectation that some kinds of behaviour and action are more acceptable than others. This process is also known as 'the logic of appropriateness', where actors behave in certain ways because they believe that this behaviour is appropriate (March and Olsen 1998, 951–952). To better understand norms, we can identify three types: regulative norms, constitutive norms and prescriptive norms. *Regulative norms* order and constrain behaviour; *constitutive norms* create new actors, interests or categories of action; and *prescriptive norms* prescribe certain norms, meaning there are no bad norms from the perspective of those who promote them (Finnemore and Sikkink 1998). It is also important to note that norms go through a 'lifecycle of norms' before they can get accepted. A norm only becomes an expected behaviour when a critical mass of relevant state actors adopt it and internalise it in their own practices. For example, constructivists would argue that the bulk of states have come together to develop climate change mitigation policies because it is the right thing to do for the survival of humanity. This has, over decades of diplomacy and advocacy, become an appropriate behaviour that the bulk of citizens expect their leaders to adhere to. Liberals, on the other hand, might reject the notion of climate change politics in favour of continued economic growth and pursuing innovative scientific solutions, while realists might reject it due to the damage that climate policies may do to shorter-term national interests.

Although all constructivists share the above-mentioned views and concepts, there is considerable variety within constructivism. Conventional constructivists ask 'what'-type questions – such as *what causes an actor to act*. They believe that it is possible to explain the world in causal terms and are interested in discovering the relationships between actors, social norms, interests and identities. Conventional constructivists assume, for instance, that actors act according to their identity and that it is possible to predict when this identity becomes visible or not. When an identity is seen to be under- going changes, conventional constructivists investigate what factors

caused which aspects of a state's identity to change. Critical constructivists, on the other hand, ask 'how'-type questions such as *how do actors come to believe in a certain identity*. Contrary to conventional constructivists, they are not interested in the effect that this identity has. Instead, critical constructivists want to reconstruct an identity – that is, find out what are its component parts – which they believe are created through written or spoken communication among and between peoples. Language plays a key role for critical constructivists because it constructs, and has the ability to change, social reality.

Most constructivists, however, position themselves between these two more extreme ends of the

Conclusion

Constructivism is often said to simply state the obvious – that actions, interactions and perceptions shape reality. Indeed, that idea is the source of the name of this theory family. Our thoughts and actions literally *construct* international relations. Yet, this seemingly simple idea, when applied theoretically, has significant implications for how we can understand the world. The discipline of International Relations benefits from constructivism as it addresses issues and concepts that are neglected by mainstream theories – especially realism. Doing so, constructivists offer alternative explanations and insights for events occurring in the social world. They show, for instance, that it is not only the distribution of material power, wealth and geographical conditions that can explain state behaviour but also ideas, identities and norms.

COMMUNITARIANISM

Political ideologies have developed over the decades and new political ideologies have been introduced into political theory and philosophy. Communitarianism is a recent development in political ideology that is viewed by many as a criticism of liberalism. It draws on ideas from previous schools of thought. It revolves around the community and the individuals comprising it, rather than the individual being at the center, which is what liberalism emphasizes. Although communitarianism is mainly viewed as a critique of liberalism, it draws similarities from other schools of thought such as conservatism and feminism. This paper will argue that communitarianism is the most suitable ideology for individuals due to its examination of individuals and their freedom through the sense of community in the society. To better show how communitarianism is more suitable, I will examine the context of individuals and communities presented in the communitarian thought and how it differs from the liberal and libertarian

sense sense. I will then focus on the libertarian idea of distributive justice and the communitarian critique of it. Lastly, I will examine how communitarianism emphasizes the importance of social responsibility, which other ideologies lack, and how that responsibility achieves freedom and justice for individuals. Lastly, I will show how environmentalism can be advocated through communitarian ideologies. Thus, communitarianism offers a better and a more improved ideology for individuals compared to other ideologies.

First, it is important to address the issue of communitarianism being a school of thought. Communitarianism developed as a criticism to liberalism. Just like conservatism, it deals and identifies itself more through criticisms than with its own established ideals. Several people have argued that this is considered a weakness for communitarianism; that “communitarianism fails as an alternative to liberalism,” and that “it doesn’t define itself clearly or sufficiently.” [1] However, as this paper will show, this is not true. Communitarianism is an ideology on its own, since it offers new ideas through its criticisms of liberalism. Furthermore, Mariam seems to draw from the liberal perspective in saying that “there are many forms of communities and it is unclear what form communitarianism promotes.” [2] This is also similar to a dilemma of communitarianism, which Kenny mentions, of whether communitarianism is an “anti-liberal” force or not. [3] But, unlike liberalism, it does not promote a universal ideal that predominates over all. It recognizes the differences in communities and thus depends on a particular society. It is an ideology which depends on particularity, rather than universality. Thus, “communitarianism differentiates itself more on what it disagrees with in liberalism rather than proposing a new theory of political philosophy.” [4]

Communitarianism is defined as a philosophy that “emphasizes the importance of community in the functioning of political life, in the analysis and evaluation of political institutions, and in understanding human identity and well-being.” [5] It integrates individuals into political life through a sense of belonging and commitment to their community and the individuals within this community. Individuals are thus considered to be a part of a wider community and not an independent entity existing by themselves. Liberalism, on the other hand, is a doctrine that “takes protecting and enhancing the freedom of the individual to be the central problem of politics.” [6] Liberals believe that governments should exist for the sole purpose of protecting the individuals from harm by other individuals. That should be the sole purpose for the existence of governments, since liberals are skeptic about any forms of government. This is due to the belief that governments of any sort are in themselves a threat to the people and their freedom, which can only be achieved if intervention was kept to a bare minimum and only for fundamental matters that would help promote and maintain individual freedom.

From this stems a fundamental difference which is subject to debate: individuals and the government. Liberalism detaches the individual from the government and only considers individuals and how they can maintain their freedom. However, communitarianism criticizes this detachment and instead focuses on a sense of community amongst the people. This community allows for the people and the

government to interact in a broader sense. Communitarianism not only criticizes this, but it criticizes the fact that “Liberalism, in basing itself on the rights of the individual, has fundamentally misunderstood social life and has produced a political philosophy that is itself the cause of the problems with which we are beset.” [7] Thus, Liberalism does not create any social order or any sense of a society by basing itself solely on the individual. Liberals and Libertarians have mostly argued for this need to look only at the individual.

Right Libertarians (and Nozick in particular) have argued that the government should only use its power to maintain self-ownership rights and to protect individuals’ property. In *The Entitlement Theory of Justice*, Nozick argues in his theory of justice, that “the holdings of a person are just if he is entitled to them by the principles of justice in acquisition and transfer, or by just rectification of justice.” [8] Hence, he is critical of Rawls’s idea of the redistribution of justice and wealth. [9] Nozick believes that anyone who earns something justly should not be held responsible for other individuals. Thus, if all property, for example, ends up with one person, then that does not call for taxation or any action. Furthermore, by using the Wilt Chamberlain example, Nozick shows how equality results into inequality through freedom. This means that people originally start by having complete freedom to make their own choices, but then they choose to give up that freedom. Thus, to redistribute Chamberlain’s or any justly earned wealth is a “violation of people’s rights.” [10]

However, what Nozick is implying is injustice to the individuals themselves. If one person owns everything, then people will be reduced to slaves and work for that one person who owns all the resources, and they will not be free. Communitarians have criticized this libertarian idea of “distributive justice and individual rights [because it] works to divide the citizens of the modern state against one another, thereby fostering isolation, alienation, and apathy rather than commitment to a common civic enterprise.” [11] Thus, the sense of community and the freedom that it entails for the individuals of the society disappears. Libertarianism only focuses on individual rights as being the most important ones, which does not work, especially in pluralistic societies today, which need both individuals and the government to have responsibilities and rights, and not just a focus on one individual who claims they obtained something justly. It is difficult to assess what is just, which is another limitation to Nozick’s argument. People can easily claim that they obtained something justly, even if they did not. Thus, a community needs to exist where all individual freedoms are guaranteed, instead of questionable individual rights.

Communitarians “draw heavily on conservative ideas about the importance of tradition [and society] in providing a coherent framework of values within which we can live.” [12] Liberalism tends to focus on the individual for the individual and their right, but “this is contingent upon cultural factors.” [13] The society and culture “in which individuals are raised in [are] important when determining their autonomy.” [14] Consequently, Individuals cannot detach themselves from the society, because their individual rights are contingent upon their society and their surroundings. People are bound to society

just as they are bound to family. As Finlayson notes of Oakeshott, conservative individuals prefer “the familiar to the unknown;” [15] a society with traditions where people are bound is more familiar than an individualistic society which seeks universalism.

Yet, these traditions and values are not always concrete for people to attach themselves to. One evident criticism of conservatism is the fact that people do not always follow their traditions. People can just as easily detach themselves from certain traditions, which themselves are always changing and never remain the same. Fahad criticizes Scruton’s argument by stating that “one is born with the capacity to run one’s own life, and with free will and volition to choose from an ethical or political framework to adhere to.” [16] The fact that Scruton emphasizes the need for people to follow their society and the traditions as given, leave Scruton “unable to even question the very liberalism that serves as the foundation for his ability to construct a philosophy in the first place.” [17]

Scruton’s arguments for following the norms of the society are extreme. People are not just programmed to accept everything without questioning it or improving it. However, Fahad seems to argue that people can make their own choices and decisions based on their own free will, which is unlikely. As communitarians argue, people are influenced by their societies, and this influence plays greatly onto the choices that people believe they are making out of their own free will. People can have a freedom of choice, as he points out, however this will not emerge out of nothing. Even though people might think that they are making a purely objective decision, there is always some subjectivity that will come into play. Communitarians draw from the conservative thought the importance of traditions; however, people are not obliged to follow these traditions. They exist to unify the people and create a sense of belonging in the society. Furthermore, they affect the way people make decisions and how they essentially live their lives, as some traditions cannot be eliminated from people’s lives.

This draws on Rawls’s use of the veil of ignorance. This is an imaginary veil where people are in an original position where they know nothing about anything that defines who they are [18]. People are supposed to ignore these ideals and values and focus on remaining neutral and objective in order to make decisions that would benefit all the people. These decisions are supposedly right in that people reach them through rational and selfless thinking. Besides it being a difficult practical concept, it is also flawed. People cannot just assume that they know nothing about their lives and forget everything they are connected to. Their society and ideals will come into play at some point and it will influence their decisions. It is false to assume that a rational decision is a right decision just because it is rational. People cannot be fully rational, they will always have something affecting the way they think, no matter how insignificant it might seem. Therefore, communitarianism stresses on the importance of the society in individuals’ lives because the society shapes people and many things within the society can easily have an impact on them. Rawls’s theory of justice through the veil of ignorance is thus inaccurate, because, as communitarians argue, “the standards of justice must be found in forms of life and traditions of particular societies and hence can vary from context to context.” [19] Furthermore, communitarians see the “moral agency” of making decisions always existing “within the context of a particular structure of traditions and practices, manifested in the life of a community.” [20]

What communitarianism advocates (and conservatism lacks), is open discourse and an emphasis on social responsibility (which liberalism lacks). One way of emphasizing the importance of society for individuals is through the recognition of individuals' roles towards their society. For communitarians, the "preservation of individual liberty depends on the active maintenance of the institutions of civil society where citizens learn respect for others as well as self-respect." [21] This respect would lead to an "appreciation of our own rights and the rights of others." Individuals will also obtain civic responsibilities and the development of "self-government skills," as well as "the habit of governing ourselves, and learn to serve others— not just self." [22] Governments, too, will "have obligations—including the duty to be responsive to their members and to foster participation and deliberation in social and political life." [23]

The communitarian perspective, in a sense, "mandates attention to what is often ignored in contemporary policy debates: the social side of human nature." [24] This social side shows how individuals and governments both have responsibilities towards each other. It does not only assume that individual rights are important, because as Scruton points out, "'by enlarging the space around one person it diminishes the space enjoyed by his neighbor.'" [25] It can be seen that communitarianism goes further than the conservative idea of following traditions; it emphasizes on the social aspect of the people and what the people want. It also criticizes the narrowness of liberalism by just assuming that only the individual matter and that the government is there to protect it from injustice only. However, it is not only a one way street; individuals have rights and responsibilities, which is important to realize. A focus is made on individual liberty, but that liberty is achieved with the society, not as liberalism promotes it of being just a focus on one individual. [26]

One could argue that the notion of civic responsibilities and virtue is that of republicanism. As Kenny points out, communitarianism "has some distinctly non-liberal antecedents as well." [27] Also, writers of classical republicanism emphasize ideas such as "the importance of civic virtue and political participation," [28] amongst other ideas. However, civic republicanism stresses the importance of independence from arbitrary power. Ideologies stress on the importance of the individuals being at the center, and the relationship with the polity in terms of rights and responsibilities between the two. However, republicanism draws on more liberal ideas of civic virtue and a polity made by the people. Communitarianism, on the other hand, focuses more on the importance of traditions and values in order to have civic virtue. It focuses more on individuals and their individual and social responsibility, whereas republicanism focuses on individuals' responsibility towards other individuals only.

However, both communitarianism and republicanism "stem from an uneasiness with liberalism." [29] Both ideologies criticize liberalism for being "guilty of an excessive or misguided emphasis on the rights and liberties of the individual that 'nurtures a socially corrosive form of

individualism.” [30] Yet, as Dagger points out, how liberalism is flawed and how it should be fixed is what “communitarians and republicans disagree – not only with each other, but among themselves.” [31]

According to Kenny, Rawls’s defines the self through the original position as imagined as “the subject of social contract” where the original position would serve to strip it from social and cultural attributes. [32] Communitarians question this individualistic self and how it “can be said to exist prior to or outside social settings and communal attachments.” [33] The existence of these settings leads to the development of the individual and his objectives. It is only a “socially and intersubjectively constituted self [that] can plausibly be said to possess goals.” [34] What liberals promote is a “political society” in which there are “contracts made by sovereign individuals who are accorded a number of basic rights as well as the right of ‘exit’.” [35] This just separates the individual and the state, with all the benefits going to individuals with nothing to the government.

But, individuals, according to liberals, are not free if they do not have the free will to make their own choices, without any effects from the outside. According to Gaus and Courtland, Green mentions that individual is only free if they are self-directed or autonomous. [36] Their actions must be their own and not influenced by anything else. That is why Rawls stresses the importance of not including anything in the original position. This is a negative notion of freedom [37] , where people can pursue their own ends, and thus do not “follow custom.” [38] Another form of liberal freedom is what Vallentyne echoes of Berlin as negative freedom, to pursue one’s interests without harming others through “one’s fundamental purposes.” [39] Thus, it can be argued, that if the self was influenced by society, then this influence can limit if from being free. It can for example, constrain someone through certain traditions which might be false. People will thus be shaped by those traditions and unable, or unwilling, to break free from them and develop their own.

Yet, liberalism’s view of freedom, whether positive or negative, is both problematic. In the negative sense, people are allowed to do anything without any consequences or constraints to their actions. Likewise, in the positive sense, people are expected to know when to limit themselves and it is hard to assume all individuals are able to control individuals. In the communitarian sense, people would have to include some part of their traditions and values to pursue their goals. Sometimes it is even helpful to have some guidance when making decisions. The self is thus, in the communitarian sense, “both pluralistic and particularistic: many of the features of persons are shaped by the intersubjective values and traditions of the communities into which they are born.” [40] Moreover, if traditions are false, people would draw from the surroundings of their environment to develop new beliefs that they believe is right; their own beliefs do not just exist. To illustrate, a community can exist where everyone smokes as a rule. A person who thinks that this tradition is false would refer to the harm it causes to people to develop his own belief.

The issue of freedom is also related to multiculturalism. It deals with pluralistic societies, where “the population may come from many different cultural backgrounds; and peoples are increasingly asserting their need for a state that recognizes this differentiation.” [41] Although the self is pluralistic in the communitarian thought, it is hard to claim that these traditions in the community are pluralistic. As Young explains, seeking equality and ignoring differences would allow for the development of “cultural imperialism by allowing norms expressing the point of view and experience of privileged groups to appear neutral and universal.” [42] A view of a group as the “other” would develop. Although this is a critique towards the liberal idea of universalism and its claim of neutrality, it can also be critically examined through a communitarian perspective. Since communitarians emphasize the importance of traditions and values in a society, it can be difficult to agree on these traditions. Besides them being right or wrong, a society is at risk of having the traditions of one group to dominate over it. If, for instance, one community mainly practices one religion, it would be difficult to be neutral or to have the acceptance of the people if the laws and regulations rely on that religion. Thus, there would be no sense of community between the people and the government, but rather a responsibility to abide by laws that were set by a majority. Whether this is intentional by the people or not, it still entails that some would better be able to achieve their capacities than others.

Even though communitarianism criticizes the liberal idea of a universalism and neutrality, Young’s argument entails that some groups in society might not be able to fully participate in the public sphere without abiding by the dominant thought. Since communitarianism does not in itself address the issue of multiculturalism and dominance, I believe that this idea of roles by the people and the society would entail that equality would be considered. As Caney would point out, one critique that communitarians make is that there is a “meta-ethical claim emphasizing political principles should mirror shared understandings.” [43] People should take into account the social responsibilities that they have, since it is not a one-way responsibility from the government, which would ensure that there should be some equality.

However, Young’s argument is a valid one and is a worry to any political ideology, since in any society; there can always be a majority, regardless of whether it follows liberal or conservative ideologies. However, it is very hard to assess how this should be addressed. She argues that there should be a positive discrimination towards the minority groups. Yet, this is difficult in itself for two reasons. The first is that it is hard to choose which group is a minority. There are many factors like numerical and cultural, for example, that can be taken into account. Thus, there are more minority groups than those which exist today because there are people advocating for those minorities. The second is that where should we stop in giving these minorities rights, or to create one public sphere where differences are recognized. In the communitarian sense, some accommodations can be made to try and limit differences between groups.

Lastly, the communitarian ideology can offer an argument for environmentalism. As Hayward discusses, environmentalism refers to the “belief that environmental protection is a significant ethical, social and political value.” [44] However, it is often ignored because it is viewed as a “discrete [issue] for policy-makers to deal with.” [45] Yet, from a communitarian perspective, it can be integrated as part of the social responsibility of individuals in relation to ecogism. The ecological argument of “humans as a part of nature” [46] shows how there can be a social responsibility from individuals towards nature because that would ensure that the society they live in is a safe one. However, from a liberal point of view, this responsibility would not exist as individuals would only consider what is best for them, even if that comes at the cost of nature and the environment.

In conclusion, communitarianism was originally a critique of liberalism, but it quickly developed to be an ideology with its own unique ideas that are best towards individuals. It looks at individuals as being at the center, but at the same time, it also looks at the community being in that center. Although many of its critiques are towards liberalism and the idea of the individualistic self existing with universal ideals, communitarianism can be critically examined through different ideologies. It focuses on how Individuals and the government coexist together with both having responsibilities and rights that are preserved through the community. It draws on conservative ideas of having a sense of traditions and values that are maintained through the community. These traditions and what shapes people are important to how individuals make decisions in life, which is not done through the liberal objective sense. It also includes individuals into the political life, like republicanism, but this involvement is through the sense of the community and what is best for the whole community. Communitarianism also focuses on how individuals can obtain freedom through this interaction with the society, and not just by limiting themselves to their individualistic goals. Hence, communitarianism is the most suitable ideology for individuals because it preserves their freedom and offers a sense of community between all individuals in the society.

MODULE NO 3 Power and Authority

Definition of Power:

Power and authority are perhaps the most vital aspects of all organisations in general and political organisations in particular. Power is related to taking of decisions and for the implementation of those decisions. No organisation, whatever may its nature be, can do its duty or achieve objectives without power.

Robert Dahl in many of his works has defined power and analysed its various aspects. In his A Preface to Democratic Theory Dahl calls power a type of relationship in respect of capability and control. Take a very simple example. There are two men—A and B. If A possesses the capability to control B then it will be assumed that A has the power. So power involves a successful attempt to do something which he could not do otherwise.

In any society there are diverse interests and all are alike. When there are conflicts among them one interest proceeds to dominate over the other and the interest which prevails upon the other the former may be called powerful interest.

Karl Deutsch says that power means the ability to be involved in conflict, to resolve it and to remove the obstacles. Though Deutsch defines the concept in the background of international politics, its relevance to national politics is, however, undeniable. In domestic politics or pluralistic societies there are many competing groups and all struggle to capture power or to influence. The group which succeeds finally will be called powerful.

D. D. Raphael (Problems of Political Philosophy) has analysed power from various aspects. He believes that generally power means the ability. Raphael says that in French there is a word “Pouvoir”. In Latin “Potestas” is commonly used. Both these words (these are verbs) mean “to be able”.

Raphael is of opinion that the English word power is derived from these two words and naturally power may be used to mean ability and hence his definition of power is specific kind of ability. Why specific kind? Let us quote him: “The ability to make other people do what one wants them to do”.

Some political scientists want to mean that there is a special type of power which may be designated as political power. For example, Alan Ball feels that power may generally be used in political sense. Hence political power may broadly be defined as the capacity to affect another’s behaviour by some form of sanction. Leslie Lipson (The Great Issues of Politics) thinks that power is nothing but the ability to achieve results through concerted action.

Hague, Harrop and Breslin's definition is slightly different: "In a broad sense the power is the production of intended effects". A sociologist's definition of power is: the possibility of having one's own decision, select alternatives or reduce complexities for others. Thus, power means the capacity to make decisions binding and ability to discharge responsibilities and perform certain functions.

Nature of Power:

From the definitions of power noted above we can get certain features and the first such feature is it is used in relational sense. When there is only one actor or element the issue of power does not arise. It is because power implies ability to influence or control others or to get things done by others. Naturally power relates to the relationship or interaction between two or among more than two elements or actors. So power is always viewed in the background of relationship.

In the second place, "power is disaggregated and non-cumulative it is shared and bartered by numerous groups spread throughout society and representing diverse interests". In any pluralist society there are numerous groups and they all compete among themselves at various levels to capture political power or to influence the agencies who exercise their influence.

Hence it is observed that power is not concentrated at any particular centre. Again, all the centres of power do claim to have equal or almost equal amount of power. In other words, there is an unequal distribution of power like an unequal distribution of wealth.

Thirdly, in a class-society there are diverse interests and each power centre represents a particular interest. This point may further be explained. In any capitalist society there are several classes, both major and minor, and each class strives for the realisation of its own interests which are generally economic.

But there may be political interests. However, the conflicts among the classes sometimes lead to the other conflicts and this is the general characteristic of capitalist society. But the advocates of the capitalist system argue that this conflict does not create an atmosphere of class struggle. There are processes of peaceful resolution of all conflicts. At least Talcott Parsons and many sociologists think so. According to these persons the capitalist system is so structured that the conflicts do not create any impasse.

Fourthly, Maclver is of opinion that power is a conditional concept. Power, Maclver says, is an ability to command service from others. But this ability, he continues, depends in some measure

upon certain conditions and if the conditions are not fulfilled properly power cannot function. Power is not something which is permanently fixed. It is subject to change and it has source.

If the source dries up power generation or enhancement will stop. Again, mere existence of sources cannot cause the rise of power. The holder of power must have the ability to use or utilise the sources of power. All these conditions establish the fact that power is conditional.

Fifthly, power (used in political science) is a very complex notion. How it is used, what consequences it produces, how it is to be achieved-all are in real sense complex. No simple analysis can unearth the various aspects of power. Different people use different terms to denote power. For example, Dahl uses the term 'influence' to mean power.

Definitions and Nature of Authority:

"The right or the capacity or both to have proposals or prescriptions or instructions accepted without recourse to persuasion, bargaining or force". Concise Oxford Dictionary of Politics- defines the term in the following words: the power or right to give orders and enforce obedience, the power to influence others based on recognised knowledge or expertise.

"Authority can most simply be defined as legitimate power..... Authority is, therefore, based on an acknowledged duty to obey rather than on any form of coercion or manipulation. In this sense authority is power cloaked in legitimacy or rightfulness".

R. S. Peters' definition is: "Authority is derived from the Latin word auctoritas and auctor. ... An auctor is he who brings about the existence of any object or promotes the increase or prosperity of it whether he first originates it, or by his efforts gives greater permanence or continuance to it" (Authority. by R. S. Peters, published in Political Philosophy. Edited by Anthony Quinton).

In the opinion of Maclver "By authority we mean the established right within any social order to determine policies, to pronounce judgments or relevant issues and to settle controversies or, more broadly, to act as leader or guide to other men" (The Web of Government).

"Authority is the right to rule. It exists when subordinates acknowledge the right of superiors to give orders. Authority is more than voluntary compliance".

D. D. Raphael offers a very precise definition of authority. He says: "To have authority to do something is to have the right to do it". Authority is, therefore, a kind of right to do something. But Raphael explains the term right in the following manner. Here the word right carries a lot of significance and that is why he elaborates it. In his opinion the right has two meanings.

An authority or a man has right implies that he may do something or he is permitted to do something. It may be that the person has been licensed to do the job or take an action. Here the

term right is used in the sense of freedom. According to Raphael right has another meaning. This meaning proposes that right means to receive something. Right also means the claim to something. Let us explain it. An individual can claim to have something from another person or source. When right is used in this sense we call it right of recipience.

Hence we find that authority is used in both senses. An individual can do something and when he is challenged by others he will meet the challenge by saying that he has the authority to do the work. He receives this authority either from the established law or from the consent of the people. This consent may be unanimous in character or majority opinion. Here authority is cloaked by legitimacy.

Power and Authority:

The readers, I am sure, have acquired preliminary ideas about two vital concepts— power and authority. It is now high time to go through the relationship between them. Power, in its broadest sense, is the ability to achieve desired results. Power also means the ability to do something.

These are the common interpretations of power. But this ability may not be legitimate. An individual or a military general may by physical force seize political power but behind that there may not be sanction of law or constitution. In that case, the person's ability to force others to do something is also not authorised by law. So it is held that power is not legitimate, the authority is always legitimate. Behind every act or decision of the authority there shall be approval of law. Law and constitution always stand behind an authority.

A person having power may demand obligation from other persons. But if they refuse to act accordingly the holder of power legally or constitutionally cannot force him to show obligation. Behind power there lies coercion or application of coercive measures or physical force. But people show obligation to the authority on the ground that it is legally entitled to claim obligation.

In explaining authority we have seen that the holder of authority is empowered to do something or claim something. It means that authority, whatever may its nature be, is always based on law or legitimacy. So it is said that the authority is not only legal but authorities claim is based on right. In other words, authority has full freedom to demand something. We can say that authority has freedom.

But this conception is not applicable to power. This relation between power and authority has been stated by Leslie Lipson in the following words. "What demarcates authority from power is that the former is power recognised as rightful. Authority is government that all accept as valid. Its exercise is, therefore, sectioned by those who approve the particular act or agent and is tolerated by those who disapprove. ... Authority is power clothed in the garments of legitimacy".

The relationship between the two can be explained still from another angle. Raphael observes that authority can exist without power. This may be illustrated in the following way. A man may be invested with authority of an office in accordance with law or formal rules. Naturally he can take any decision. But he fails to exercise his authority on the ground that majority men do not support or recognise him.

This may be due to the popular mass upsurge. On the other hand, power can exist without authority. This frequently happens in many countries. The military rulers demand obligation from citizens though he has not that authority. But people, out of fear, obey the order of the person who holds and exercises power. This is a very common feature of many Third World states.

Max Weber's views on Authority:

Max Weber, the doyen of sociology, has classified authority on the basis of legitimacy. Authority's claim to do something and to demand allegiance from the citizens are based on arguments which Weber calls legitimacy. Needless to say that Weber uses the term legitimacy in the light of greater and wider perspective.

There are three types of authority. The first is traditional authority. Second is charismatic authority and the third is legal-rational authority. This classification, though not fool proof one, is still recognised and accepted by majority people.

The above mentioned types of authority are explained below:

1. Traditional Authority:

The first type of authority is called traditional authority because authority is based on customs and traditions which are long established. That is, people of a community show respect to a particular authority on the ground that their forefathers did the same and naturally they cannot violate the tradition.

In earlier epochs authority existed and received obedience from the citizens. The tradition continues. The authority, in this way is sanctioned by the tradition. An aspect of the traditional authority is that there is no legal sanction behind such authority. Simple customs, traditions and conventions have made the authority legitimate.

The records of the activities of the traditional authority are to be found in the pages of history. Weber says that in ancient time and even in middle Ages in many political systems the traditional authority existed. There was also traditional authority in tribal societies of all countries. This was due to the fact that political system in its present form did not develop in the tribal societies. But this did not adversely affect the functioning or management of tribal societies or political systems of earlier epochs.

In hereditary social and political systems the traditional authority exists. In many countries of Africa (or West Asia) there are hereditary systems or dynastic rulers. The son or daughter of a ruler becomes ruler. The rulers of the hereditary system have built up the tradition and that tradition continues.

The governing system of Saudi Arabia, Kuwait and Morocco provide the examples of traditional authority and hereditary system. In some industrialised countries the hereditary systems still prevail. These states are Britain, Spain, Belgium and the Netherlands. Britain has no written constitution, but there is a constitutional system or framework based on tradition, customs, convention etc. and British people obey them and give them legal sanction. The British parliament also obeys these customs and conventions. In some countries, customs, conventions and written laws and constitution all are mixed together.

2. Charismatic Authority:

Charismatic authority is Weber's second type of legitimate authority. People obey the authority or show allegiance mainly due to the charisma possessed by the authority. An individual creates tremendous impact upon the mind of the people by dint of his personality or charisma. Not all individuals or men holding power possess such type of personality or charisma. If we open the pages of history we shall find that few leaders such as Hitler, Mussolini, Napoleon, Ayatollah Khomeini, and Fidel Castro possessed the charismatic power.

The charisma is so powerful that people do not go into the legal aspects of the power. With the help of charisma the authority exercises power and people accept it. Charismatic authority is not always supported by law. Charisma is a special quality or gift of God. Sometimes charisma and legality are to be found in a single person. For example, de Gaulle of France, Margaret Thatcher of Britain had exceptional qualities to influence people.

Nehru of India had the same qualities. But all these persons came to power through legal and constitutional means. Not in reality it is not always clear who is simply a charismatic authority and legal or constitutional authority. This is specially correct if we consider the regimes of Hitler and Mussolini. Hitler, Mussolini and even to some extent de Gaulle forcefully seized political power and they remained in power with the help of charisma.

3. Legal-Rational Authority:

Weber's final classification is legal-rational authority. In almost all the modern states this type of authority is generally found. It is legal because the formal authority is supported by existing laws of the constitution. It is rational on the ground that the posts and positions are clearly defined by law. Power and duty are also clearly stated. Rational-legal authority is the explicit form of a right to give orders and to have been obeyed.

The core idea of the legal-rational authority is the holder of the authority has the right to issue orders or to take decisions and also the authority (sanctioned by law) to implement them. When the authority is challenged by rebellion or recalcitrant elements the authority has the power/ability to take legal action. Everything is cloaked with legality.

An important aspect of legal-rational authority is—it cannot do anything or take any decision on its own accord. Whatever the authority wants to do it must have legal sanction. Legal-rational authority can be called a type of limited form of government. John Locke contemplated such type of government. Later on legal-rational authority laid the foundation of liberal form of government.

The government cannot whimsically interfere with the freedom of citizens. The central theme of the legal-rational authority is law and rationality is the vital points. There is no place of whims and the rationality in such authority.

THE ELITE THEORY OF POWER

- **The elite theory of power argues that all societies are divided into two main groups the ruling and the ruled. The classical elite theorists such as Vilfredo Pareto (Italian thinker) Gaetano Mosca argued that the political power always lies in the hands of small elite and the egalitarian ideas such as socialism (Marxist theory).**
- Pareto is highly impressed by Italian social system. On this basis Pareto has presented the following outline of social system. Social system is made up of 2 kinds of people:
 1. Elite class (Governing class or Ruling class)
 2. Non-elites (Mass or Ruled Class)

Elites are further divided into two types based on their Personal-**Psychological qualities:**

- (i) Residues of combination – Fox
- (ii) Residues of Group Persistence – Lion

- People of first group work on the **principle of maximum gains** and so are **very selfish**.
- They want to bring substantial change in the system, for which they easily mix up with the people.

- **The second group** puts lot of thrust on stability in the system. They are idealistic, therefore neither they are selfish nor believe in the immediate gain. Unlike first group, they are more contained and so do not easily mix up with people.

They could be better understood under political, economic and idealistic aspects.

The political aspect of first group is Fox because they are equally clever and manipulative and diplomatic,

- Whereas Political Aspect of the second group is Lion, a symbol of stability and idealism.
- The power rotates between the two, which Pareto called ‘circulation of Elites’.
- According to Pareto, all societies are divided into two main groups which are a Elites-Ruling minority and the Non Elites-The Ruled. This situation is inevitable. If the proletarian revolution occurs, it will merely result in the replacement of one ruling elite by the other. Italian sociologist Vilfredo Pareto claimed in his *Mind and Society*, 1935 that personal qualities separate the rulers and the ruled and they are the same at all times. According to Pareto, there is a *ruling minority* and the *ruled majority*. According to him, this situation is inevitable as even in communism, such polarisation takes place where a section of *the have nots* occupy a dominant position.
- According to Pareto, there are two types of governing elite which are lions and foxes (he borrowed this concept from Niccolo Machiavelli). Lions rule by force e.g. dictators and foxes rule by cunningness e.g. Chanakya and Chandragupta, 19th Century European Democracies etc. They replace each other in a process which Pareto calls as *Circulation of Elites*.
- Elites rule over the masses of people because they are dominated by non-rational forces and lack rational capacities. This is the reason that the masses are unlikely to be a revolutionary force. Social change occurs when the elite begins to degenerate and is replaced by a new elite, derived from the non-governing elite or higher elements of the masses. All elites tend to become decadent. They *decay in quality* and *lose their vigour* as they become complacent. In this situation, the other elites seize the power.
- Each type of elite lacks the qualities of its counterpart, qualities which are essential to retain the power in the long run.
- For example, an elite group of lions lack the imagination and cunningness necessary to maintain its rule and they recruit foxes from among the masses, who grow stronger over the time and ultimately replace the lions as the rulers. He even saw the modern democracies as just another form of elite domination. He is, however, criticized for not making distinction among various forms of rules like dictatorship, democracy, fascism, and communism.
- **Pareto places particular emphasis on psychological characteristics as the basis of elite rule.** Major change in society occurs when one elite replaces another, a process which Pareto calls “circulation of elites” and he believes history is a never-ending circulation elites. For him state is a

tool in the hands of the ruling elite. He saw modern democracies as merely another form of elite domination.

- **Gaetano Mosca believed that rule by a minority is an inevitable feature of social life. He claims that in all societies two classes of people appear a class that ruled. The first class, always the less numerous, performs all political functions and monopolises power and the advantages that power brings.**
- **The second , the numerous class is directed and controlled by the first.** He viewed that there are important differences between democracies and other forms of rule. **By comparison with close systems such as caste and feudal societies the ruling elite in democratic societies is open.**
- There is, therefore, a great possibility of an elite drawn from a wide range of social background. As a result the interests of various social groups may be represented in the decisions taken by the elites. The majority may therefore have some control over the government of society.

GROUP (PLURALISM) THEORY OF POWER

Pluralism is the view that politics and decision making are located mostly in the framework of government, but that many non-governmental groups use their resources to exert influence. The central question for classical pluralism is how power and influence are distributed in a political process. Groups of individuals try to maximize their interests. Lines of conflict are multiple and shifting as power is a continuous bargaining process between competing groups. There may be inequalities but they tend to be distributed and evened out by the various forms and distributions of resources throughout a population. Any change under this view will be slow and incremental, as groups have different interests and may act as "veto groups" to destroy legislation. The existence of diverse and competing interests is the basis for a democratic equilibrium,^[1] and is crucial for the obtaining of goals by individuals. A polyarchy—a situation of open competition for electoral support within a significant part of the adult population—ensures competition of group interests and relative equality. Pluralists stress civil rights, such as freedom of expression and organization, and an electoral system with at least two parties. On the other hand, since the participants in this process constitute only a tiny fraction of the populace, the public acts mainly as bystanders. This is not necessarily undesirable for two reasons: (1) it may be representative of a population content with the political happenings, or (2) political issues require continuous and expert attention, which the average citizen may not have.^[citation needed]

Important theorists of pluralism include Robert A. Dahl (who wrote the seminal pluralist work, *Who Governs?*), David Truman, and Seymour Martin Lipset.

Pluralist conception of power

The list of possible sources of power is virtually endless: legal authority, money, prestige, skill, knowledge, charisma, legitimacy, free time, and experience. Pluralists also stress the differences between potential and actual power as it stands. Actual power means the ability to compel someone to do something and is the view of power as a causation. Dahl describes power as a "realistic relationship, such as A's capacity for acting in such a manner as to control B's responses".^[2]

Potential power refers to the possibility of turning resources into actual power. Cash, one of many resources, is only a stack of bills until it is put to work. Malcolm X, for example, was certainly not a rich person growing up, but received money from many groups after his prison term and used other resources such as his forceful personality and organizational skills. He had a greater impact on American politics than most wealthy people. A particular resource like money cannot automatically be equated with power because the resource can be used skillfully or clumsily, fully or partially, or not at all. Pluralists believe that social heterogeneity prevents any single group from gaining dominance. In their view, politics is essentially a matter of aggregating preferences. This means that coalitions are inherently unstable (Polsby, 1980), hence competition is easily preserved. In Dahl's^[3] because "political heterogeneity follows socioeconomic heterogeneity", social differentiation increasingly disperses power. The pluralist approach to the study of power, states that nothing categorical about power can be assumed in any community. The question then is not who runs a community, but if any group in fact does. To determine this, pluralists study specific outcomes. The reason for this is that they believe human behavior is governed in large part by inertia. That said, actual involvement in overt activity is a more valid marker of leadership than simply a reputation. Pluralists also believe that there is no one particular issue or point in time at which any group must assert itself to stay true to its own expressed values, but rather that there are a variety of issues and points at which this is possible. There are also costs involved in taking action at all – not only losing, but expenditure of time and effort. While a structuralist may argue that power distributions have a rather permanent nature, this rationale says that power may in fact be tied to issues, which vary widely in duration. Also, instead of focusing on actors within a system, the emphasis is on the leadership roles itself. By studying these, it can be determined to what extent there is a power structure present in a society.

Three of the major tenets of the pluralist school are (1) resources and hence potential power are widely scattered throughout society; (2) at least some resources are available to nearly everyone; and (3) at any time the amount of potential power exceeds the amount of actual power.

Finally, and perhaps most important, no one is all-powerful unless proven so through empirical observation. An individual or group that is influential in one realm may be weak in another. Large military contractors certainly throw their weight around on defense matters, but how much sway do they have on agricultural or health policies? A measure of power, therefore, is its scope, or the range of areas where it is successfully applied as observed by a researcher. Pluralists believe that with few exceptions power holders usually have a relatively limited scope of influence. Pluralism

does leave room for an elitist situation- Should a group A continuously exert power over multiple groups. For a pluralist to accept this notion, it must be empirically observed and not assumed so by definition.

For all these reasons power cannot be taken for granted. One has to observe it empirically in order to know who really governs. The best way to do this, pluralists believe, is to examine a wide range of specific decisions, noting who took which side and who ultimately won and lost. Only by keeping score on a variety of controversies can one begin to identify actual power holders. Pluralism was associated with

A contradiction to pluralist power is often cited from the origin of one's power. Although certain groups may share power, people within those groups set agendas, decide issues, and take on leadership roles through their own qualities. Some theorists argue that these qualities cannot be transferred, thus creating a system where elitism still exists. What this theory fails to take into account is the prospect of overcoming these qualities by garnering support from other groups. By aggregating power with other organizations, interest groups can over-power these non-transferable qualities. In this sense, political pluralism still applies to these aspects.

Elite pluralist

Elite pluralists agree with classical pluralists that there is "plurality" of power; however, this plurality is not "pure" as some people and groups have more power than others. For example, some people have more money than others, so they can pay to have their opinion put across better (i.e. more advertising) than the working class can. This inequality is because society has "elites"; people who have more power, perhaps through money, inheritance or social tradition than others.[5]

Basically, it claims that elites play a big role in decision making. The idea behind reads as follow: in democracies the people participate in electing the elites who will represent them and, at the end, the ones who are going to make the laws. As Davita S. Glasberg and Deric Shannon highlights, "political elites are not a monolithic, unified interest group representing their own narrow group of interests but rather are diverse, competitive elites representing a wide range of interests".[6] They have to compete in "the political market place" in order to gain voters being the power equally distributed between all the potential voters. Moreover, the stability in the system is achieved through this competition among the elites, as they have to negotiate in order to pass a bill. And, sometimes, they have to change their positions and points of view in order to reach a common point. Elites respect and follow the policy-making procedures because they are accountable of their acts and they can be replaced through legal procedures of through new elections.

DIFFERENCE BETWEEN POWER, AUTHORITY AND LEGITIMACY

All three of these following terms have a relationship which is more than just loosely related, Power “the ability to do something or act in a particular way, especially as a faculty or quality.” In simple terms, power is the fundamental capability of being able to do the specific thing.

Authority is simply having the “the power of the right to give orders, make decisions, and enforce obedience.” Simply meaning that if you have authority, it means that you have the ability, to be able to command and enforce. Legitimacy means “popular acceptance of a government, political regime, or system of governance.” Simply meaning that the majority is accepting of this specific leadership. All of these terms work off of each other and bring something unique to the table.

Power relates to the ability to complete attempting a task, and this task in the case of government is to be able to govern and protect the people. At which point the task of authority, is given to the government, also meaning that the Government has the ability to order and command the people based off of its own will. In the case of Power in terms of government, it means the ability to get a task done by someone solely off of a wish, and authority would simply be the usage or day to day application of that power.

Authority is based on the power which is given to the state, government. This authority is all based on the power that the government is given, the authority is simply the execution of that power. Likewise, the Legitimacy is also based off of the power Max Weber proclaimed that “societies behave cyclically in governing themselves with different types of governmental legitimacy. That democracy was unnecessary for establishing legitimacy, a condition that can be established with codified laws, customs, and cultural principles, not by means of popular suffrage.” Legitimacy is simply the acceptance of something in political science. Legitimacy is the root of all Communist, Democracy’s, and Monarchy’s which are all forms of government.

MODULE NO 4. OVERVIEW OF POLITICAL THEORY

LIBERALISM

Introduction:

The scholars, after a thorough research, have concluded that the liberalism as a political ideology is not the outgrowth of the twentieth century's intellectual progress. Its origin can be traced to the political ideas of the fourteenth century. During the last six centuries the concept had to face several situations and had to overcome uphill tasks in the sense that many political systems, individuals and organisations stridently opposed it on various grounds some of which had solid foundations.

The flood-like appearance of Marx's and Engels' works and Marxian literatures eclipsed though temporarily, the growth and influence of liberalism. The establishment of Bolshevik government in Russia in 1917 kindled the hope in the minds of anti-liberals that with the weapon of Marxism the rapid advance of liberalism could be stopped and particularly an anti-liberal atmosphere could be built up in the Third World states.

At first Moscow and later on Beijing opposed liberalism tooth and nail. Ultimately the academic and political worlds were deeply plunged into the conflict between two leading ideologies of the world—liberalism and socialism. The recession of the Cold War in the mid-seventies and finally the collapse of Soviet Union in 1991 turned the condition of liberalism upside down. It was being felt that only liberalism could provide solace to all people of the world. It was capable of solving the basic problems both economic and political.

Origin and Definitions:

The word liberal is derived from the Latin word liber which means free men Liberalis is also a derivative of liber. The central idea of all these words is freedom or liberty. Liberal also denotes generosity or open-mindedness. Open-mindedness/generosity indicate liberty in taking food, drink, social attitude, behaviour and selection of the alternatives.

Thus we find that freedom is always associated with the word liberal. In the middle Ages when the French people used the word liber they meant that people will have freedom in respect of their selection of alternatives and pursuit of thoughts and ideas.

There are large numbers of definitions of liberalism which convey more or less same ideas.

Some are noted below:

“It means the belief that it is the aim of politics to preserve individual's rights and to maximise freedom of choice” (Oxford Concise Dictionary of Politics). Advocates of liberalism have used some selected words to denote the meaning of liberalism. It means political to (1) Freedom and choice. The freedom to select alternatives which are suitable. (2) Liberalism is a systematic

political creed. (3) It is the manifestation of reason and toleration in the face of tradition and absolutism. (4) Freedom, equality, liberty etc. are embodied in the liberalism.

As an adjective “liberal” implies an attitude of mind, rather than a political creed. But the noun liberalism designates a Political Creed and this was used specifically in the early parts of the nineteenth century. Robert Eccleshall in his noted article Liberalism has stated that liberalism, in ultimate analysis, is a political ideology intimately associated with the birth and evolution of the capitalist world. So we can say that as a political ideology liberalism means to pursue policies of freedom in political and economic spheres and clear restrictions on the activities of state authority.

Liberalism does not embody a particular meaning. It is a cluster of meanings, in different periods it has meant different conceptions. For example, it is an intellectual movement whose purpose is to curb the power and authority of state and to ensure freedom of individuals. It has been observed by a recent analyst that liberalism is an ideology based on a commitment to individualism, freedom, toleration and consent.

Hence we can say that in modern sense liberalism are both an ideology and a movement whose purpose is to strengthen the cause, progress etc. of individuals through the vindication of right to select the choicest alternative and for that purpose to endorse the restrictions upon the authority of state.

Liberalism, strictly speaking, an offshoot of capitalism since it was believed that the meteoric growth of capitalism could be possible only through an adoption of liberal policies which contain an allowance of maximum freedom to investors and producers. Thus, liberalism is an economic and political doctrine.

Rise and Growth of Liberalism:

It is really an uphill task to ascertain the origin of liberalism because an ideology cannot be created at a particular point of time. However, it's quite safe to say that liberalism was born in England during the middle of seventeenth century. Here again the readers may be cautioned that the seeds of liberalism existed in British society even before that time.

Nevertheless, we can say that several factors and writings of a number of persons contributed to the origin of their political ideology:

(1) The collapse of feudalism is an important cause of the origin of liberalism. Let us explain it briefly. In the feudal period the feudal lords practically controlled the economy and politics

along with the church and its fall opened the advent of capitalism and emergence of a middle class which aspired to have a positive role in politics. The capitalist class and the middle class did not want the dominant role of the church.

The capitalists supplied the finance for the management of state and the middle class supplied executives and administrators. Slowly but steadily these two classes captured the power of the state and wanted to impose restrictions upon the government. In this way there arose liberalism in embryonic form.

(2) Eccleshall in his article Liberalism maintains that Enlightenment is another factor of the growth of liberalism. The thinkers and philosophers of the Enlightenment period were sceptical about the role of laws, administration, custom etc. They strongly advocated for the rational reconstruction of society so that the individuals can get enough freedom. Autocratic rule or dictatorial administration was vehemently opposed.

(3) Two major events of the second half of the eighteenth century helped the emergence of liberalism. These two events are: Declaration of American Independence in 1776 and the Declaration of the Rights of Man in 1789. Both these events furthered the progress of liberalism. American war of independence was not simply a war of the independence of a particular nation but a major war against colonialism which contained the seeds of liberalism. On the other hand, after the French Revolution, Declaration of Rights of Man heralded the collapse of autocratic rule in France and its wave spread to other parts of Europe and this accelerated the advent of liberalism.

(4) The writings (including philosophy) of some men were conspicuous in advancing the emergence of liberalism. Some of them may be stated briefly. John Gray says that Thomas Hobbes may be regarded as an exponent of liberalism. Hobbes' (1588-1679) "Closeness to liberalism lies in part in his uncompromising individualism. It is found also in his egalitarian affirmation of the equal liberty of all men in the state of nature and his rejection of a purely hereditary title to political authority". Benedict de Spinoza (1632-1677) was also a precursor of liberalism. He was mainly concerned with natural rights, freedom, curtailment of political power, maintenance of peace and security.

Behind the birth of liberalism there was a very important role of John Locke (1632- 1704). Locke, by many, is regarded as the father of modern nationalism. His Two, Treatise of Government, A Letter Concerning Toleration are regarded by many as potential sources of liberalism. Gray says that Locke's thought harbours a number of themes which confer a distinctive complexion on English liberalism that persists up to the time of John Stuart Mill.

His theory of natural rights, right to property, concept of consent, constitutionalism, people's right to dislodge a government for its failure to act in accordance with the terms and conditions of contract are classic examples of liberal thought.

The major ideas of liberalism enunciated by Locke were carried out by many who belonged to the latter part of the eighteenth century and early years of nineteenth century. To be brief Locke vigorously championed the central themes of liberalism. Tom Paine (1737-1809) was another figure whose thought symbolises the ideas and spirit of liberalism.

Paine strongly advocated for natural rights and limited government which later on became the focus of liberal thought and philosophy. His limited government is nothing but minimal government or state which has been elaborated by Robert Nozick. J. S. Mill and several other political scientists thought that people's liberty, rights and other interests could only be assumed through the constitutionalism, representative government and constitutional declaration of human rights.

Elements of Liberalism:

Liberalism has been branded by many as meta-ideology which means that it encompasses many principles, values and elements within its fold. Whereas other ideologies do not possess this capacity. The following are the main elements/principles/values of liberalism— Individualism, freedom, reason, toleration, consent, constitutionalism, equality and justice.

1. Individualism:

Individualism is the central idea or theme of liberalism. It believes that the interests or welfare of the individual should be given primacy over all other values and principles. Individual is the basic concept of political theory and arrangements shall be made to safeguard his interest. Liberalism says that since a political system consists of individuals it should be the chief objective of this system to see that their interests are fully protected and the individuals are quite capable of doing their own job. The role of the state is to some extent like a night watchman.

This conclusion is based on certain presumptions such as they are reasonable and do not harm others. They are capable of pursuing their own interests and outside interference will not produce any benefit. To reach the goals (the development of individual's personality, protection of interests, allowance of freedom etc.) it is essential that the society is to be restructured suitable for people.

It has been suggested by liberal thinkers that establishment of market economy, curtailment of state authority to the minimum level, non-governmental organisations must have maximum freedom to operate etc. The liberalism believes that all these are indispensable for the

development of the latent qualities of the individuals. That is why it is frequently said that the primacy of the individuals is the core of liberalism or liberal political philosophy.

2. Freedom:

Another important core value, principle or element of liberalism is freedom. To the liberals it is the value of supreme importance because without it the individual will simply be a unit without any dignity. Moreover, liberty or freedom is the best vehicle for developing the best qualities. But the liberals do not advocate for absolute or unrestricted freedom because freedom/liberty will do more harm.

They are in favour of chained or restricted liberty. J. S. Mill (1806-1873) was the pioneer of individual liberty but he favoured the association of law with freedom because he believed that restriction is for the general welfare of the community. The famous British historian Isaiah Berlin (1909-1997) developed a famous concept of liberty which states that liberty/freedom has two concepts—negative and positive.

The negative liberty implies that man should be allowed to enjoy an atmosphere free from all sorts of restrictions. This was the contention of classical thinkers. But modern liberals do not think of liberty where there shall be no restrictions. It is positive liberty because real liberty is one which implies laws and restrictions.

3. Reason:

Liberalism harbours upon reason. To put it in other words, liberalism and reason are inseparable from each other.

This relationship can be viewed from angles more than one:

(1) Mention has been made earlier that liberalism partially the product of Enlightenment which strongly emphasises that man is rational being and guided by reason and rationality. The advent of Enlightenment emancipated man from age- old superstition, ignorance and bondage. Enlightenment also established the age of reason.

(2) Since individuals are rational and reasonable they are quite capable of taking any decision and to judge what is good and what is bad for them. In that case there is no necessity of imposing any decision by any outside power/authority.

(3) The liberals believe that real progress of society could be achieved only through the individual initiative and outside interference will dampen the spirit of initiative.

(4) The primacy of reason ultimately led Adam Smith (1723-1790) to enunciate a doctrine of laissez-faire. A large number of philosophers and thinkers enriched the various aspects of Enlightenment through their philosophy and ideas. Enlightenment in all possible ways gave

priority to reason and rationality. “Rationalism is the belief that the world has a rational structure and that this can be disclosed through the exercise of human reason and critical enquiry”.

4. Toleration:

Toleration is another value/element of liberalism. In any society there is found different opinions, religious sects or communities of belief and faith. All of them must live side by side peacefully and for this is required toleration. Also various ideologies and opinions make a society diverse. It is the basic feature of any society. Liberalism believes that all these diversities must exist side by side.

One community/section has no right to impose its decision or belief of another. Only in authoritarian community imposition of ideas and belief happens. On the other hand, liberalism attempts to accommodate all the beliefs, faiths, ideologies and opinions. Lord Ramakrishna very frequently said many are the opinions and many are the ways.

The noted French philosopher Voltaire (1694-1778) once said “I detest what you say but I will defend to the death your right to say it”. This opinion of Voltaire clearly shows that he forcefully advocated for the practice of toleration. Massacre of St. Bartholomew (1572) is the manifestation of the most hated type of intolerance.

Not only this massacre, numerous other events took place in various parts of European society and they were definitely black spots of society. What liberalism wants to impress upon us is that toleration ought to be practised by all sections of body politic and if it is not done the progress will be adversely affected which will be a loss for whole humanity.

5. Consent:

Consent is another value/element of liberalism. The idea of consent though very old, its modern appearance took place in the hands of the contractualists, such as Thomas Hobbes and John Locke. Both of them assertively argued that the members of the state of nature assembled together to take a decision about the setting up of a body politic and behind this decision there was the consent of all. Locke dealt elaborately with consent and this was one of the pillars of his liberalism.

The freedom fighters of America raised their arms against the British rulers and said that they had no consent behind British rule in America. We hold the view that consent is a very important element of any democratic government and this has been variously explained by many in numerous forms. It is generally held that representative form of government is the most popular embodiment of consent. J.S. Mill was a great defender of government based on consent.

The liberal thinkers even go a step ahead and declare that every law and policy must be based on the consent of those for whom these are made. In this way consent has become an integral part of democracy and liberal political philosophers are of the opinion that all forms of pluralist societies (also liberal societies) must start from below. That is, consent of all or majority must constitute the basic structure of society.

6. Constitutionalism:

Constitutionalism is an important principle/value/element of liberalism. It has two meanings—narrow and broad. In its narrow meaning constitutionalism means certain limitations upon the government specified by constitution. The narrow meaning further states that whenever a government intends to discharge any function or adopt a policy it must follow the restrictions.

In broader sense it implies values, principles and ideas which act as guide to the government. Whenever the government proceeds to some work it must implement these values, principles, ideas etc. The objective is to give proper credence to the aspirations of the people and to translate them into reality.

Constitutionalism is a basic principle of liberalism. It, in simple language, states that government's business never specifies that it has the unlimited freedom to do anything without considering the advantages or disadvantages of the common people. It must follow certain basic rules and procedures laid down in the basic or ordinary laws.

Needless to say that this idea was first formulated by Locke and in the later periods it was adhered to by many. This is called constitutionalism or liberation. We can further state that constitutional principles must be observed by both the rulers and the ruled and none has the authority to act arbitrarily. The arbitrariness and constitutionalism are the issues situated at two opposite poles. Constitutionalism is another name of limited government or the theory of limited state.

7. Equality:

Liberalism is based on another principle and it is equality. Though we treat it as a political principle/value it is also a religious and moral principle because the religious-minded people generally say that every person is born equal as Rousseau said man is born free. So it is unreligious to deprive him of his equal status with others.

The religious people also believe that it is never the intention of God to create inequalities among men and if an artificial distinction is created among men that will go against the will of God and in that sense it is immoral. We can further observe that as a political ideology liberalism has also built up a nexus with religion.

But liberalism is also an ideology of practical world. In any society all the individuals cannot claim same levels of merit, intelligence and capacity of hard work and in that case there must arise clear differences in remuneration. This must be admitted. Idleness and hard work cannot be equally remunerated and if done so that will make way for the appearance of gross injustice. None will be ready to demonstrate his ability.

This type of social inequality does not infringe upon the concept of equality. Equality as a principle in political science asserts that none will be allowed to enjoy special privileges ignoring the common minimum privileges to which everyone has legitimate claims.

8. Justice:

Though justice is a principle of both socialism and liberalism, the latter gives it more importance and politically declares that the very basis of liberalism is justice. The liberal justice has several forms or meanings. We note few of them. It is the declared policy of liberalism that each individual will have his due share and since all men are born equal none can deprive other of the share.

All the persons have same status in society and there shall be an atmosphere so that people can enjoy the status. “Liberals, fiercely disapprove of any social privileges or advantages that are enjoyed by some but denied to others on the basis of factors such as gender, race, colour, creed, religion or social background. Rights should not be reserved for any particular class of persons. The most important forms of equality are legal equality and political equality”. Liberal conception of justice further draws our attention to the point that the door of opportunity shall be open to all.

Everyone will get the chance to have a share of opportunity. Liberalism also speaks of social equality. All these interpretations lead to the liberal conception of justice. It also says that talented and non-talented persons are not to be grouped together. In this political ideology there is a special place of talents which means that merit should be recognised and should be given its due share. It is called meritocracy.

Marxism

“Marxist philosophy is like great poetry – after it no one else can write without taking it into account. “— T. S. Eliot

Karl Marx's political thought called Marxism is the most vital political philosophy of nineteenth century world. It not only topsy-turvid the conservative world but created a practical way of politico-economic life of Russia and China and served as the model for the toiling mass of the third world, who took it as an way to end poverty, injustice and exploitation of all types. For them, Marxism stood as a symbol of progress and advancement.

According to V. I. Lenin:

“Marxism is not a dogma, but a guide to action. Marxism continued and completed the main ideological currents of the nineteenth century belonging to the three most advanced countries of mankind.”

There are four corner-stones which build up the structure of Marxism. We shall study these four ingredients of Marxism one-by-one:

1. Dialectical Materialism:

The entire political thought of Karl Marx is based on what is called dialectical materialism. Literally dialectic means “union of opposites”. The expression is rooted in the Greek word *dialego* which means to debate or discuss with a view to arrive at the truth by admitting the contradictions in the arguments of the opponents.

Although Marx got the idea of dialect, from Friedrich Hegel, he differed from Hegel in many respects and he developed it in his own way. While Hegel believed that human evolution was in a straight line, for Marx it moved in a zig-zag course. Both said that **“contradiction was the moving spirit of the world.”**

But Marx differed from Hegel from the point of view of approach. For Hegel, human idea was an ultimate reality. But Marx was resolute in his view that it was matter rather than human idea or opinion which was the real thing. In other words, while the Hegelian conception was that the world changes by the force of human thinking, Marx was firm in his conviction that it was matter which was the ultimate reality and the human idea must take a back seat in the social evolution.

For Marx, human idea was nothing but a reflex of the material condition of the society at a particular point of history. Ideas actually emanate from the material condition of the society. He had no doubt that all thinking's pertaining to religion, politics, philosophy, etc. are the products of actions and reactions of material conditions of society. Dialectics is nothing but actions and reactions (called contradictions).

The onward march of history is actuated by the contradictions between the opposite elements. According to Marx, there are two opposite classes at every stage of social evolution. In the slave system the two classes are the slaves and the slave owners. It takes the form of serfs and

feudal lords in the feudal system. In the capitalist system we find the working classes and the industrialists.

Whatever the name of the two classes, one is the exploited and the other is the exploiter. One is the thesis, the other is antithesis. Their actions result in the creation of a new force called the synthesis.

EX

The synthesis does not work unopposed and in the result comes again the tussle between thesis and antithesis. With the creation of synthesis begins a new era. Thus we find the slave system, feudalism, capitalism and finally socialism. When fire is thesis, water is its antithesis and the resultant gas is the synthesis.

This type of action and reaction are found invariably in every stage of history. The last phase of such contradiction is capitalism and working class. The class struggle will come to an end with the emergence of socialism, which will establish a classless society. Marx underlined that it is the dialectics which give us the real insight into the history of human civilisation. This will take us to the materialistic conception of history, which we are going to study at the moment.

2. Materialistic Conception of History:

According to Karl Marx, the application of dialectical materialism to the study of historical evolution is historical materialism or materialistic conception of history. For Marx, history is a continuous evolutionary process from the lowest or earliest stage to the highest or the most modern state. The change is not effected by any outside agency or transcendental factor. It is rather a self-regulated process in accordance with the laws of dialectical materialism.

Marx underlined the mode of production in material life as the determining factor in the general character of social, political and spiritual process of the world. It is the process of production which is the key factor of social evolution. The productive system and production relation among the men is the foundation of the superstructure of the society. Any change in the mode of production is bound to have a corresponding effect on social relations.

Thus all political institutions, laws and traditions, art and philosophy, religion and morality hinge on the nature of a particular method of production and the nature of relations that obtains between the owners of means of production and the workers engaged in such production.

Marx mentions five stages of human history, namely, the primitive communal system, the slave system, the feudal system, the capitalist system, and socialist system. Except the last one, all these systems came and went yielding place to new ones. Needless to say that the gradual process was on the progressive lines of man-power.

In the case of the first one there was no class exploitation, because the produce could maintain the bare subsistence of the people, there being no surplus which is root factor of exploitation. It applies equally to the last stage, namely socialism, because there the surplus was not in the hands of the few at the head but was distributed among the people!

In the period of slave system, the means of production were rude and primitive and there was a need for a change for better means. So came better methods of agriculture and with it came the feudal system which replaced the slave system. Thus feudalism brought in its trail new laws, new religion and new philosophy.

But the mode of production in the feudal system proved outmoded with the emergence of the Commercial Revolution and Industrial Revolution, which brought in the capitalist system where the industrial workers were engaged in the production for the benefit of the capitalist few who won the industries and factories.

Like the feudal system, the capitalist system too proved unworkable and this was replaced by the workers themselves in a violent revolution in Russia in 1917, whereupon the workers themselves came to own the industries and factories. This socialism is the swan-song of Marx's materialist conception of history.

Socialism is bound to remain permanent because it is better than any other system, because here the wealth will go to the state, not to any group. In Marx's diction, the material basis of life in society-is determined by the mode of production. Other factors like geography and population play a minor role in history.

Criticism of Marx's Materialist Conception of History:

Critics hurl searching attacks on Karl Marx's theory of historical materialism because he kept his eyes closed on the forces other than the economic factors. Economic factor may be just one of the factors, but never the sole or only factor. The material factors loomed so large before him that he made a too simplistic solution of a very complicated problem. We know that the Ramayana war did not relate to economic factor. It arose and ended over Sita. Here Marx must prove a false prophet.

But in defence of Marx we may say that he did not totally ignore the other factors germane to the historical process. He only gave importance to the economic factors. So there is nothing wrong in Marx's theory.

3. Class Struggle:

Marxism is a five-dimensional philosophy, namely dialectical materialism, historical materialism, class-struggle, surplus value and theory of revolution. We have studied the first

two. Here we shall take up the third one, namely the class-struggle. There was a group consciousness-or class in every stage of history and its concomitant opposite class.

These two classes conflicted and clashed in all ages in different forms. To say in the words of Karl Marx: **“The history of all hitherto existing society is the history of class-struggles.... Each time ended whether in a revolutionary reconstruction of the society at large or in the common run of the contending classes.”**

The alignment was on the lines of haves and have-nots which Marx described: “Freeman and slave, patrician and plebian, baron and serf, guild-master and journeyman, in one word, oppressor and the oppressed, standing constantly in opposition to each other, carried on an interrupted warfare, now open, now concealed.”

We get a very clear definition of class from V. I. Lenin: “Classes are large groups of people differing from each other by the place they occupy in a historically determined system of social production, by their relation to the means of production, by their role in the social organisation of labour, and consequently, by the dimensions of the share of social wealth of which they dispose and the mode of acquiring it”

The earliest stage of man’s history was the hunting stage where the implements for hunting and the hunted animals were taken as the common wealth of the community and it partook the nature of primitive communism. That society had no class conflict, because there was no surplus wealth to appropriate or exploit with. So there was no class-struggle in the primitive stage of human civilisation.

With the coming of the pastoral stage the society got divided on the basis of the owning the herds of cattle and the opposite side without these. The apple of discord was the private property of the cattle. This was the beginning of the class war. As man settled with agriculture on an improved scale, the land became the property and the class conflict veered round the possession of land.

The land-owners and the landless population got polarised. The land-owners became the exploiting class and the landless the exploited ones. The inventions and improvement in technology created the feudal age where the barons exploited the serfs.

But this would not continue forever. The exploited class will rise against the exploiters and they would establish more equitable relations among the people. Thus in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries the ‘ feudalism was replaced by the capitalist system. That too was not permanent. The all wall-washing French Revolution of 1789 overthrew feudalism. It took some more years for other countries to follow suit.

The emergence of big machines as a fruit of the Industrial Revolution gave rise to big and heavy industries which made the mode of production simple and profits immense so that the factory lords let loose the steam-roller of oppression on the factory workers. Now we find the capitalists and the working classes. Marx called them bourgeoisie and proletariats.

This stage saw the concentration of wealth in the hands of the few who reduced the working class in abject poverty. To say in the words of Marx: **“Our epoch, the epoch of bourgeoisie, has simplified the class antagonism. Society as a whole is more and more splitting up into two hostile camps, into two great classes directly facing each other – bourgeoisie and proletariat.”**

It is a period of exploitation of wage-labour by capital. But Marx was confident that the proletariats would one day rise in arms to terminate with the capitalist system. This would be the final revolution, because at the end of the revolution the proletariats will come to power and there would be no oppressed class.

In this way, history will reach the stage of socialism which actually took place in Russia and China. In other countries of the world socialism has not come and these countries are still witnessing the conflict between the capitalist and the working class. Socialism cannot be halted anywhere. It is bound to materialize all over the world.

The state, which is an instrument of class-antagonism, will wither away with the oncoming of socialism where public ownership takes the place of private ownership and need-based distribution will operate in place of distribution according to work. When communism will pervade all human relationship, there will be no need for the state, which will wither away without the necessity of being killed.

Criticism of Marxist Class-Struggle:

Marx's theory of class-struggle has evoked scathing criticism. It is difficult to believe that history of all societies was worked by dispute and distrust of different classes. On the other hand, there was a spirit of fellow-feeling and cooperation among the various interests in the society. The real and universal feeling was class-cooperation. And class-antagonism was few and far between.

The second attack on Marxist class-struggle is that Marx magnified only the economic dispute and did not mention of religious, linguistic and ethnic ones which are present in all societies and as true as the sun and the moon. Revolution took place and wars were fought on other issues than economic. How could one shut his eyes to all such antagonism? So Marx did not give the correct picture in class struggle.

In support of the Marxist class struggle we may conclude that Marx was not blind to the other issues omitted by him. He only emphasised on the economic front, since the bread and butter

question is more vital than religion, fine arts or music. So we have to justify the Marxist doctrine of class-struggle.

4. The Theory of Surplus Value:

The whole philosophy of Marxism is based on the theory of surplus value. In this matter Karl Marx took a leaf out of the book of the classical economists like Adam Smith and David Ricardo, who are the acknowledged authorities of the theory of value. That theory says that labour is the source of the value of a commodity.

In other words, the value of a commodity is determined by how much labour and time are spent on it. Although the value of a commodity is sometimes influenced by the forces of demand and supply, there is no denying the fact that in the long run the amount of man-power spent on the production of the commodity is the key factor to fix the price of the commodity. Marx called labour concealed labour and the value as crystallised labour. So in the Marxist doctrine labour is also a commodity.

In the capitalist system all the means of production are in the hands of the private factory lords called the capitalists. The worker sells his labour in the manufacture of the commodity for the capitalist owner in the machinery and with the raw material supplied by the capitalist factory owner. It was a sad truism that the wage paid to the workers was much below the price of the things sold in the market.

As a matter of fact, there was a roaring gulf between the two, which enabled the capitalists to pocket a huge difference called the surplus. The surplus amount is worked as the difference between the earning of the workers and the sale price of the produced thing. As a result, the capitalists exploit the surplus for his own private gains. The capitalists rolled in wealth and the workers were to be content with bare subsistence.

About the unfair appropriation of the surplus value by the capitalists, Marx said: “Capitalists are not interested introducing those goods that are useful and needed by society but in extracting as much surplus value as possible.” This is open deprivation of the legitimate dues by the capitalists. This system continues until the workers rise in uprising and overthrow the capitalist order by a classless society called socialism. Thus Marx encourages a revolution of the nature of the Bolshevik Revolution in 1917 and the Communist Revolution in China in 1949.

Criticism of Marx's Theory of Surplus Value:

The theory of surplus value comes under heavy criticism on the ground that Karl Marx distorted the relation that exist between the rich ruling class and the working class. The industrialists actually work for the benefit of the workers and launch several welfare schemes.

Even effective legislations are enacted to reach the maximum benefits to the toiling and depressed classes.

In the past and the present there existed goodwill and cooperation among all sections of the people in the society. Exploitations and oppressions were few and far between. The revolutions that took place in Russia in 1917 and in China in 1949 were not because of economic exploitations but because of the evil effects of the First World War in Russia and the evil effects of the Second World War in China. If economic factor was the real cause, there could have been similar events in England, France, Germany or the USA. So Marx's theory of surplus value is to be discarded.

All the same, the theory of surplus value had some welcome aspects. It was the inculcation of the doctrine of surplus value that made the working class conscious of their legitimate rights. His teachings opened the eyes of the capitalists also in the sense that they softened their rigour of oppression and evolved a policy of ameliorating the condition of the workers. So Karl Marx did not prove a false prophet. This is the bright side of the theory of surplus value.

5. Theory of Revolution:

The fifth dimension of Marxism is the theory of revolution. We have got a glimpse of Karl Marx's teachings of revolution as a weapon of the working class to terminate the oppressive regime of the capitalists. Now we shall make a detailed study of it.

The Marxian theory of revolution is the direct outcome of historical materialism, according to which all progress in the society go on the economic lines and on the modes of production. This would ultimately give rise to social revolution. To say in the words of Karl Marx from his Communist Manifesto- "At a certain stage of their development the material forces of production in society come into conflict with the existing relations of production or what is but a legal expression for the same thing – with the property relations within which they had been at work before. From the forms of development of the forces of production these relations turn into their fetters. Then comes the period of social revolution."

The ratio of dialectical materialism, historical materialism and class- struggle is that in different stages of human history there is conflict between two forces, be it slavery, feudalism or capitalist system. Marx explained- "**Free men and slave, patrician and plebian, lord and serf, guild-master and journeymen, in a word, oppressor and oppressed stood in constant opposition to one another**".

This class struggle is marked by the fights between the exploiters and the exploited. In the seventeenth century, feudalism was replaced by capitalism. The revolution of France in 1789 overthrew the feudalist order and created capitalism. This became the established system all over the world until 1917 when the working class people overthrew the capitalists and captured power in Russia. This was repeated in China in 1949.

Both Russia and China set up socialism, which is the most perfect and the final stage in the evolution of human history. Socialism will come in the world in a bloody way as it did in Russia and China. Thus Marx not only preached socialism but revolution also. Since there is no private property or private gain, there will be no surplus value.

So the Marxian revolution will terminate for ever private enterprise and enthrone public undertaking and everything public. The final stage in Russia and China was achieved by violence. But Marx felt that revolution could be either violent or non-violent Marxist class-struggle reaches its finale in the revolution by the oppressed and exploited class.

The other countries of the world are now passing through the capitalist system where a class-struggle is going on between the capitalists and the working class. All these states will switch over to socialism by effecting a revolution. Marx thus poses as the most outstanding prophet of the twenty-first century.

Criticism of Marxian Theory of Revolution:

The Marxist theory of revolution could not go unchallenged. Marx would have us believe that, in order to break down the capitalist society, revolution will take place in the most industrially advanced countries like England and Germany. This has not yet taken place. On the other hand, revolution took place and socialism was created in industrially backward countries like Russia and China.

In the second place, the critics felt that big changes are possible not by a revolution by the masses but by a change-over effected by the key politicians alone. In recent years socialism was overthrown from Russia in 1991 and Russia became what she had been before socialism. If socialism could be reversed by a slow game, there is no reason why it cannot be brought in by a similar slow dose. Force cannot hold a state together. What holds the state together is the common good of the people.

Lastly, what happened in Russia in 1991 is against the dream of V. I. Lenin. The USSR once again became Russia. Communism has been thrown in the wind, and socialism went on the reverse gear. Thus Marxism suffered a major setback before our very eyes. Now the only big communist country in the world remains to be China. If China also goes on the way of Russia that will be a bad day for communism

RELEVANCE OF MARXISM

In economics and the social sciences, Marx accomplished what Darwin achieved in biology. He presented a systematic and economic worldview of the historical flow of events, through dialectics and evolution.

Marx explained that previously, we had a slave society which transformed into the feudal system of kings and princes and dukes. After the Industrial Revolution and the exponential rise in scientific discoveries, this system evolved into capitalism, which destroyed the old feudal system and created two new classes – the ruling classes, who owned the means of production, and the working classes which sold their labour for a salary. According to Marx, this would eventually evolve into socialism, where the workers would take over control of means of production. Finally, this would lead to communism, where a classless society would be formed. Hence, Marx had presented a scientific framework based on economic relations to study history and predict the future.

Is communism a failed idea of the 20th century and irrelevant in the 21st?

Today, many economists may argue that capitalism is still strong and thriving. They may also say that capitalism has been able to get millions out of poverty, while the so-called communist countries or socialist states inspired by Marxism have collapsed. So, isn't this a rebuttal to Marx's economics and his socialist dream ?

This is a very strong argument and is true to an extent. However, like Marx did, we also need to study this issue dialectically. I am not a staunch supporter of communism who will support all the aspects of the 'Soviet Model' and blame Gorbachev and Khrushchev for the Union's collapse. Neither am I one of those critics or escapists who consider that the Soviet Union didn't indulge in socialism at all. Instead, I would like to take a more balanced approach.

Based on the working conditions in the Victorian era, Marx had predicted that the workers (who used to live in devilish conditions, while working 15-16 hours a day on a meagre salary) would rise up against the capitalist classes and their regimes, trigger a revolution and take power. This, as Marx predicted, happened in many European countries like Germany, France, Hungary, Austria, where workers and Marxist parties became revolutionary and tried to take power on multiple occasions. But they were often crushed brutally.

Only in Russia, under the dynamic leadership and strong ideals of Lenin, did the communist party manage to take power and hold on to it, despite severe criticism and attacks from

Western powers. Similar revolutions happened in China, Vietnam, Cuba – and many countries also adopted a more democratic version of socialism like India and Egypt.

Hence, after World War II, it would definitely seem that socialism was the triumphant and the better-planned economic model. The 5-year plans, heavy industrialisation and collectivised agriculture, developed under Stalin, became a role model for newly-developed or developing nations which lacked capitalist might – India under Nehru, China under Mao, Vietnam under Ho Chi Minh, Cuba under Fidel Castro, Egypt under Nasser, etc.

However, in my opinion, the economic failures of the Soviet Model started emerging when they failed to adopt innovation, market feedback and consumer satisfaction into their model of a planned economy. Hence, the model which had worked very well for heavy industries, space research, defence (and other allied sectors) failed to work for the automobile, consumer goods and later on, the computer and telecom sectors.

But, to say that Lenin and Stalin's model of socialism in the Soviet Union was a failure would be a false statement. If there's been a model of socialism which worked in the 20th century, it was Stalin's planned economic model which was adopted in different forms in newly-developed third world countries. The model even helped some poor countries come out of poverty.

However, it is true that it developed its own economic contradictions. Furthermore, the geopolitical factors behind the Cold War also contributed to the collapse of the Soviet Union.

Is Marx's prediction of a 'capitalist crisis' coming true?

After the 2008 economic crisis in US, Europe and rest of the world, Marx has been brought out of the coffin. In the West, the interest in Marxism is rising fast. The phenomenon of Bernie Sanders in the US, Jeremy Corbyn in the UK, Syriza in Greece, Melenchon in France (among others) show that the Left is on the rise. In fact, socialism is not a taboo even in the most capitalist countries like the USA.

The global economy is failing to provide jobs for the unemployed – and the growth rates are only resulting in jobless growth. Why is this so? Well, as Marx had written in “Das Kapital” – the capitalist economy only leads to concentration of wealth in a few hands. This is well demonstrated by the latest Oxfam report on global inequality which says that the world’s richest 1% get 82% of the wealth. So, with technological automation and the hegemony of finance capital, the supply of jobs get dried up. Manufacturing activities decrease – and the virtual economy of real estate, banking, credit, interest take over. It’s not surprising that countries in Europe (like Greece) are facing a severe economic recession and massive unemployment.

So, what is the remedy? Can capitalism be overthrown by revolution ? No. This seems unlikely in the modern, democratic, liberal framework. Marx always maintained that capitalism will create its own contradictions, which will pave the way for alternatives. So, can 20th century socialism be an alternative? This too seems very unlikely. One of the debates which happened in the early 20th century between social democratic parties and communist parties was centred around the ‘evolutionary path’ and the ‘revolutionary path’ to socialism. It looks like this debate can give us some insights into a possible road to socialism.

The welfare-state model of social democratic countries like Sweden, Norway, Finland and even Canada, have a lot to offer. These countries have espoused the welfare-state model of taxing the rich at a high rate and using that tax revenue for ensuring universal healthcare, education and a better quality of life. This social democratic model looks at taming capitalism and using it to improve social and economic indicators – and it seems to have worked well.

To summarise, let’s go back to the question we asked at beginning: is Marxism relevant in the 21st century? Yes it is, because Marxism offers a tool to understand history and economics – and it single-handedly offers an explanation for the global capitalist crisis, which no other theory probably offers. And what is the possible solution? An evolutionary transition from capitalism to socialism via the welfare-state model may well be the way forward.

Theory of Socialism:

Socialism as a theory of the sphere of state activities came to eradicate the evils associated with the free competition and private property under the individualistic order of the nineteenth century. Individualism gives rise to capitalism, which creates inequalities of wealth by dividing the society into “**haves**” and “**have-nots**”.

The capitalistic system is plagued by absence of planning and the presence of profit motives, which goes to exploit the poor gravely. In protest of this economic order came socialism, which aims at placing all the means of production under the ownership of the state, which will regulate economic competition and eliminate the profit motive. Since land is a free gift of nature it cannot be grabbed by only a few individuals but must be placed under the whole community.

According to the socialists, the state is not an evil but a positive good and so the state must be clothed with widest powers. Since the state alone can bring maximum material benefits to the people, the state should be given maximum powers. All the means of production should be owned by the state.

It is the state alone that can equally distribute the national income among all the people so that each individual can receive his due share of the income in proportion to his labour and efficiency. So the thrust of socialism is “**from each according to his capacity and to each according to the quantity and quality of work put in.**”

The main tenets of socialism are six. They are:

- (a) It aims at eradication of inequalities of wealth by equitable distribution of wealth and prevention of exploitation by the capitalist class;
- (b) It seeks to replace competition by cooperation and thus prevents all wastes and losses;
- (c) It seeks to establish a system of planned economy, in which the needs of the people are assessed and production is properly adjusted to meet the needs;
- (d) It wants to replace the profit motive by that of social service and social good;
- (e) It places all the means of production under the ownership of the state and
- (f) It guarantees to pay everybody according to the quantity and quality of his works.

Criticism of Socialism:

The following is some of the attacks against socialism:

First, in a state-controlled system there will be lack of initiative and efficiency in the work of the people. People are likely to work more sincerely where there is incentive for personal benefits and gains. Socialism will reduce the human beings into so many nuts and bolts in a machine.

Secondly, socialism makes no difference between the intelligent and the idiots, which is bound to produce gross injustice to all. Socialism does not recognise the extra-calibre of the few who should be given a better treatment in the hands of the state. The society is bound to suffer in such a system.

Thirdly, if the state takes over all the means of production it may tend to become authoritarian and bureaucratic, which will result in corruption, inefficiency, intrigues and red-tapism. So socialism cannot be a panacea of the ills of the capitalist society but will become a prey for all that it wants to eradicate.

Fourthly, socialism by lightening its noose round the neck of the individuals will create a neo-slavery in the modern age. In his book Road to Serfdom Von Heyak asserted that socialism will regiment human thought and actions and make every individual a slave of the community.

Conclusion:

There is no doubt that the tide of socialism is so strong that it can sweep away all other isms, capitalism included. It stands for progress and welfare. That is why more and more states until 1991 were switching over to the creed of socialism. There is again a new tendency among some of the countries to evolve a kind of synthesis between socialism and individualism.

This is called general welfare theory, which three-fold object – the well-being of the individuals, well-being of the state or the collective interests of individuals in their associated capacity and promotion of human civilisation. Only by performing these pursuits the state can justify its existence.

In India we have half-socialism and half-individualism. The state controls the key industries of the country. At the same time, some industries are left to the care of the private sectors. Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru called this system socialistic pattern of society. This has worked well in India. It strikes a middle course between socialism and individualism.

. Various Forms of Socialism:

There are very few terms in political science that have involved so much controversy as socialism. This is so because socialism has several facets and it can be viewed from different angles of vision. So it has wide-ranging variations from nationalisation of key installations and public utility services to the creation of a totally paternal state which will willingly do everything for the individuals.

So C.E. M. Joad rightly observed:

“It is a matter of some difficulty to give within a small compass, a comprehensive account of socialism since the socialists all the world over, are divided into a number of opposing schools which are separated by acute differences both as regards aims and methods.”

Although there are various forms of socialism, here we shall discuss only three types of it, namely Utopian Socialism, Fabian Socialism and Scientific Socialism which is known also as Marxism.

i. Utopian Socialism:

Socialism came into existence to uproot the evils of extreme poverty, repression and discriminations associated with the capitalistic society in the wake of the Industrial Revolution. There was a protest against the uncontrolled course in production and the dismal condition of the working class. Those who made the protests were the first socialists and they were called “**Utopian Socialists**”.

The name Utopian was derived from the book Utopia by St. Thomas More (1478-1535) who by Utopia meant an ideal state. His plan was to restructure the society and establish a system, by which the profits produced by labour could be divided among the workmen. Robert Owen (1771-1858) was the first and the most famous of the Utopians.

He made his factory town New Lanark in Scotland a model community and wanted to establish similar communities all over the world. The main result of the Utopian movement was the formation of cooperative and profit-making industries and stores which were successfully introduced in various parts of the world. In France the chief Utopians were Count Saint-Simon (1760-1825) and F. M. C. Fourier (1772-1837). Louis Blanc (1811-1882), who was another French Utopian, advocated for what is called “government ownership socialism”. Thus the Utopians did some spade-works as the pioneers of socialism.

ii. Fabian Socialism:

Fabian Socialism was brought into existence in England in 1884 by a galaxy of intellectuals who had been deeply concerned with the increasing evils of the capitalist society. The Fabians, who were also called the state socialists, did not believe in violent revolutions. They wanted that the state should take over the control of production by peaceful methods.

Prominent among them were George Bernard Shaw, Sidney Webb, Beatrice Webb, Annie Besant, G. D. H. Cole, H. G. Wells, Graham Wallas, M. Headlam, E. R. Pease, etc. The term Fabian was derived from the famous Roman General Fabius (210 B. C.) who is said to have defeated Hannibal by strategic evasion without any actual fight.

The Fabians put their basic ideas in a book *Fabian Essays* published in 1889. Although Karl Marx's views were before them, they did not accept these and rather preferred a milder course of action. They were also called state socialists because they gave all powers to the state and not to the working class as was the case with Karl Marx.

Their programmes, compared with Marx's, had subdued notes like:

- (i) Nationalization of land in some form or other;
- (ii) Competition of the state with the private enterprises;
- (iii) Gradual extension of franchise with universal adult franchise as the target;
- (iv) Gradual nationalisation of industrial capital with compensation to the owners;
- (v) Slow and gradual state control over all economic activities and replacement of profit-motive by cooperation;
- (vi) Propagation of socialist ideas among the educated middle class; and
- (vii) Social and economic reforms by parliamentary legislation.

Criticism of Fabian Socialism:

First, the Fabians are the academic socialists or the armchair socialists, having little concern for the realities. They rely on their own education and intellect to recommend the school of thought among the educated middle classes.

Secondly, the Fabians are opportunists and believers in compromise. They want to perpetuate capitalism with little relaxation of its rigour. They want to recommend the existing capitalistic order with little changes here and there. So Ernest Barker assailed it: **"It sails under a false flag, wishing not to arouse suspicion as to its objects."**

iii. Scientific Socialism or Marxism:

Socialism took a new turn with the advent of Karl Marx and his ideals, ingrained in the *Communist Manifesto* published in 1848.

Marx defined socialism:

“Socialism is not a mere feeling for the downtrodden or speech-making about them. It is a social system which comes into being when the state power is seized by the workers and peasants and all lands and industries are nationalized without any compensation. A true socialist is one who believes in this creed and actively works it in his own way for the relevant transformation of the society in order to implement the dictatorship of the proletariat.” It was the firm belief of Marx that all history was a long struggle between the “**haves**” and the “**have-nots**”.

The new capitalist class became a new class in the society in the wake of the introduction of the machines. The capitalists used their surplus wealth to buy the tools which were used by the labourers to produce still more wealth. This wealth was used in building more factories and so on.

In this way, the capitalist class or the bourgeoisie will grow richer and richer at the expense of the proletariats or the working class. In the final stage of the capitalist system, one man will possess all the wealth of the world and will make all other people his slaves.

Marx was an original thinker and his Communist Manifesto is considered a remarkable contribution to the mankind. He gave a clearer delineation of his ideal in his other book Das Kapital. Marx believed in a violent change in the social order. He was a revolutionary asking for bold and quick action. He appealed to the working class and wanted that the working class should hold on the cockpit of power. His appeal to the working class was: “Workers of the world, unite! You have nothing to lose but your chains, and the world to win.”

Marxism occupies a preeminent position in the realm of socialistic thinking. Its scientific and logical attack on capitalism and its picture of a classless society carries a continuous appeal not only to the working classes but all the intelligentsia of the world. Marxism acted as the foundation-stone, upon which other socialistic theories like anarchism, syndicalism, collectivism guild socialism, etc. have been built up.

So Morris Hillquit, a leading American socialist, rightly observed:

“Marxism is still the avowed creed of all contending (socialist) camps, each claiming strict adherence, to the doctrines of the theoretical founder of the modern socialist movement and charging its opponents with palpable departure from individual.

Difference between Fabian Socialism and Marx’s Socialism:

The contrast between Fabian socialism and Marxism is of wide marks.

First, Fabian socialism is a typical English socialism. Unlike Marx, the Fabians do not believe in a violent revolution to eradicate the evils of unrestricted capitalism. They are of the view

that this can be achieved by parliamentary legislation. This has been rightly asserted by George Bernard Shaw- **“We want to give up the delightful ease of revolutionary heroics and take to the hard work of practical reforms on ordinary parliamentary lines.”**

Secondly, unlike Marx, the Fabians do not believe in class struggle. They give the thrust on the educated middle class and want welfare for all classes, the working class not excluded. Thus the Fabians reject the idea of the hegemony of the working class which is the ultimate goal of Marx.

Thirdly, the Fabians do not share Marx’s theory of dialectical evolution or the materialistic conception of history and lays more emphasis on social legislation, education and propaganda. Thus Fabianism is a slower dose of socialism. Marxism, on the other hand, recommends a surgical operation of the society.

Fourthly, while Marx wanted to abolish the state and enthrone the working class instead, the Fabians wanted that socialism must progress under the care and control of the state. The state must take the leading role in bringing socialism in the world.

Democratic Socialism:

The expression democratic socialism has been an enigmatic one because democracy and socialism are generally taken to be opposite of each other. Does it suggest that socialism must be diluted by democracy or there must be fifty-fifty ratio of democracy and socialism to make the system workable? The other question mark is whether democracy by itself was not sufficient to appeal to the people without a socialistic slogan? The answer is that the rigour of Marxist socialism made it too bitter a pill to be stomach.

The over-emphasis on economic rights in total disregard of morality and religion and right to freedom of speech and expression made a section of the people feel that, side by side with the advantages of socialism, the state could go for the advantages of democratic tenets. In other words, side by side with the public ownership of land and means of production there could exist private ownership of land and means of production.

The illustrious Fabian socialists of England like Sydney Webb, H. G. Wells and Bernard Shaw did a lot for the growth of democratic socialism. The democratic socialists wanted socialism not by a violent process but in an evolutionary way. The highest exponent of the theory of democratic socialism, Edward Bernstein of Germany, was the first to delineate his thesis in his book Evolutionary Socialism. Like Karl Marx, he also wanted that the state should control the land, mines and all major industries, but he, at the same time, suggested freedom of thought and expression as those obtained in England, France and the USA.

So democratic socialism is a mixture of capitalism and socialism, there being no dictatorship of the proletariat or use of violence to steer clear of the evils of capitalism. There is also no

withering away of the state. The Labour Party in England believes in democratic socialism. India is following this under the name of socialistic pattern of society which is a symbol of mixed economy.

In England democratic socialism found its most remarkable votary in the person of the illustrious socialist thinker of England Harold J. Laski. And the present day democratic socialism got publicity and acceptability through the teachings of Laski. In Laski's own admission, socialism was his life's central conviction and he had been a socialist since the last years of his school days.

In 1930 in his book *Liberty in the Modern State*, the English socialist said- **“Any society, in fact, the fruits of whose economic operations are unequally distributed will be compelled to deny freedom as the law of its being.”** In 1930 in England and the USA there was virtually unlimited freedom, compared with the Marxist socialist country, namely the USSR where freedom of criticism was totally absent. That is why many an English and American, Laski not excluded, could criticise the government. This goes to the credit side of democratic socialism. As a champion of democratic socialism, Laski openly condemned the volatile way of Marxism. He wanted that legal and constitutional means rather than the path of violence should be the means of attaining the powers and the goals of democratic socialism. He had no hesitation to suggest that the right to property should be abolished in respect of the monopolistic industries and business houses and in their place must come public ownership.

He was aware of the lopsided civil service in England and so he said from hindsight that nationalisation of basic industries was not a solution of the malaise. Laski wanted democratisation of the industries in the hands of the government. He was also critical of the functioning of the democratic socialist countries and called them bourgeois democracy, a term used by Karl Marx.

Thus we find that Laski not only supported democratic socialism but pointed out some inherent defects of that system also. As a matter of fact, the defects of democratic socialists' programme in England, France, the USA and India is getting corrected and remedied on the lines suggested by Laski. Actually, democratic socialism, rather than Marxian socialism has come to stay in the world. This idea has been further strengthened after the USSR in 1991 bade a farewell to Marxist socialism.

Guild Socialism:

Guild socialism is a half-way house between Fabian socialism and syndicalism. Those English philosophers who were once the frontline spokesmen of Fabianism came to champion a new course of action, which came to be called Guild Socialism. Like syndicalism it is another offshoot of socialism. What is a guild? A guild is self-governing association of mutually dependent people organised for the discharge of a particular function of society. The myth of

guild socialism is all that was good with the ancient cottage industries where the workers or the artisans had the full control over their work and full satisfaction in its making and marketing.

According to the guild socialists, the workers of each industry should be organised into guilds or unions. These guilds will manage the industries, but the ownership of the industries will lie with the state. Thus there would be an ownership of the means of production by the community as a whole, but the ownership of the industries will be in the hands of the state.

Like Marx, the guild socialists believe in the theory of class struggle. They also criticise the capitalist system as unsound and irrational. They are not interested in political democracy which does not bring any good for the workers. On the other hand, they clamour for industrial power.

The crux of guild socialism is rightly delineated by G. D. H. Cole:

“Guild socialism is based on the idea of partnership between the producers and the state in the control of industry. Guild socialists emphasise that the first need of socialism is the placing of industrial power in the hands of the workers, and that, without such industrial freedom, every change in the structure of society must be a bureaucratic sham.”

The guild socialists attack the existing parliamentary representation as tentorial representation. But any representation to be real must be functional. There are various interests concerning the various institutions. But these institutions are not represented in the existing system of parliamentary elections.

The society will be completely democratic only when it is organised on a functional basis. So representation should be from a local and regional body. So the guild socialists insist on devolution or decentralisation of powers and functions of the state to a number of local and regional bodies.

Finally, the method to achieve the changeover is that of trade-union, which will have a monopoly of the trade market and will mount increased pressure on the employers to nationalise the industries. Thus we find that guild socialism is a half-way house between syndicalism and collectivism.

Criticism:

Critics point out that the theme of guild socialism is inconsistent and rather academic. By trying to give representation to the industrial interest the guild socialists are actually canvassing for two parliaments’ one for political democracy and the other for industrial democracy. This will make things absurd. Secondly, if the guilds are given the control over the means of

production this will result in stagnation and inefficiency in industry and a consequent reduction in output.

Since the founding fathers of guild socialism are all intellectuals and never workers, they cannot realise the practical problems involved in it. Finally, decentralisation of powers to the local and regional guilds will breed mutual jealousy and rivalry which will hinder the industrial progress.

FABIAN SOCIALISM

Introduction:

Fabian socialism, founded in 1884, is a form of socialism that advances the principles of democratic framework to achieve gradual conversion to socialism rather than by revolutionary overthrow. This originated from the movement for the Utopian socialism.

Body:

The characteristics of Fabian socialism are:

- Fabian socialism is gradual in nature, a slow and steady process. There is no place for abruptness. The socialism proceeds step by step with people participation and extension of democratic rights.
- It feels the necessity of 'State' as an ultimate arbiter of all disputes. Though power shall be rested in the hands of the state, there shall be no opportunity to exercise it arbitrarily.
- It advocates nationalization of key industries in the economic structure of the society, but did not support management of entire economy by state.
- State has to improve the conditions and make way for socialism without curbing freedom.
- Control of state or parliament over the economy to stop development of aberration.
- It includes parliamentary processes like Universal Adult Franchise, periodic elections; enact laws by representatives etc. for the functioning of society.
- It is against complete revolution or armed struggle as it believes that it can ensure only temporary relief but in the long run may cause disastrous results.

- Permeation or privileged membership: This form of socialism was also exclusively membered by intellectuals or the higher class. They were believed to directly influence or actively ensure the spread of Fabians.
- Emphasis on the possibility of reasonable reconstruction of government and society on what they perceived as a scientific basis.

Famous Fabian socialists:

- George Bernard Shaw, Beatrice Webb, Sidney Webb, Annie Besant etc. The Britain Labor Party was believed to be completely Fabian in ideology.
- India: PM Jawaharlal Nehru was inspired by Fabian views and socialism. The Mahalanobis model, rationing and control of public choices were his ways of implementing Fabian thought.

Conclusion:

Working of the history of world economics and a look at the challenges for the future, the socialistic economics with Fabianism and a mix of capitalism seem to give an ideal economic fabric as a way ahead

Guild Socialism: Exponents, Basic Tenets and Other Details

Guild socialism is a compromise between syndicalism and collectivism:

Guild socialism, which was the intellectual child of English fabianism and syndicalism, took birth in the first and second decades of the twentieth century. This is a middle way between collectivism and syndicalism. Syndicalism, in which there was no place for the state, did not fit in with the mental attitude of the British people, because the English people have strong faith in democracy and parliamentary government.

On the other hand, collectivism establishes total control of the government officials instead of the capitalist control and it creates such a situation in which the labourers can improve their own plight. It means that the labourers cannot achieve self-government in industries. In this way, Guild socialism is a via media, between syndicalism and collectivism. It assimilates the qualities of the both and leaves out their drawbacks.

Exponents of Guild Socialism:

The chief supporters of Guild socialism were A.J. Penty (1875-1935), A.R. Orange (1873-1934), S.G. Hobson (1894-1940), G.D.H. Cole (1880-1959), Bertrand Russell and R.H. Tauney. S.G. Hobson and A.R. Orange proved in their essays that there should be a self-government in industries and in other professions of the workers. Their control and administration should be in the hands of the workers. G.D.H. Cole was the chief philosophic apostle of this new movement. His books, "Self-Government in Industries" were published in 1917 and his other books, "Guild Socialism Restated", and "Social Theory", were published in 1920. G.D.H. Cole supported Pluralism in his books and accepted that the state was an ordinary institution like other numerous institutions. He refused to accept the state as a sovereign institution. Hobson accepted the state as a sovereign association.

Basic Tenets of Guild Socialism:

- Like Marx, Guild Socialism opposes capitalism. They want to abolish capitalism and vest the control and management of the factories in the hands of the Guilds. Like Collectivists, they are not in favour of state control over the industries. They criticise the present representative system, which has been established on territorial basis.
- They argue that a government by representatives elected on a territorial basis is incapable of understanding and solving the complex problems of an industrial society. They maintain that a system of functional representation based upon industrial unions will be best suited to a modern community.
- They are not in favour of abolishing the system of territorial representation as, according to them, only Territorial representation system can solve problems of law and order, defence, education and currency. The Guild Socialists want a Guild Congress to control and organise economic functions. For the management of national and common interests, they want a parliament. For the solution of local problems they want local institutions. They are not in favour of making the state omnipotent; they want to limit its functions.
- All Guild Socialists agree that the state should not interfere in economic matters, because they want to place the management of economic matters of the society in the hands of the Guilds. The Guild Socialists condemned the surplus value and undesirable guilds. Each profession will have a separate guild, which will elect an executive committee in order to function smoothly. Above them will be a central or national organisation, which will be called Guild Congress.
- The Guild Congress will decide all the labour disputes. In case the Guild Congress is unable to decide the mutual disputes of the guilds, these will be decided according to the

plan propounded by Hobson. The Guild Socialists condemned the surplus value and undesirable profit of the capitalists. They also bitterly criticise the institution of private property, because it results in the concentration of national income in the hands of a few capitalists and consequently the workers starve.

- They also condemn the system of machines, which has destroyed the freedom of the workers, and given a set-back to their skill. The workers have become the slaves of the capitalists on daily wage. Therefore, they have criticised the wage system and have strongly supported the self-government in the industries.
- The Guild Socialists are in favour of giving the workers an honourable place in the society. They want to improve the position of the producers as well as give protection to the consumers' interests. They want a joint committee of the supreme classes of the producers and the consumers, which will create a co-ordination between the two.
- The Guild Socialists want that without the approval of the consumers, the producers should not be given the right to fix the rates of the commodities arbitrarily. But should fix the rates by a joint decision. Therefore, in the opinion of G.D.H. Cole, the consumers will be in a position to protect themselves against the guilds of the producers.
- Regarding the place of the state in a Guild socialist system, G.D.H. Cole and Hobson have advocated different views. Hobson wants to keep the sovereign state, but he wants to limit its powers. He wants minimum interference of the state in economic functions and wants maximum economic functions to be performed by the workers' guilds.
- But in certain matters he wants to place ultimate control in the hands of the state. He says that the state shall be the owner of the machines and will give those machines to the guilds on lease. The state will establish economic justice in the society and decide mutual disputes of the guilds, if the Guild Congress is unable to do so.
- The state will impose taxes on the guilds. G.D.H. Cole is unwilling to make the state sovereign. He is ready to hand over defence, suppression of crimes, welfare of the destitute and the invalid to the state, but he is not ready to give more functions to the state. He considers it an association like other ordinary associations. He has named it Democratic Supreme Court of Fundamental Equity.
- The institution will have complete control over law and order and it will have the right to decide disputes between various institutions. Therefore, they differ from syndicalism in

so far as the abolition of the state is concerned, but they want to limit its economic functions and want to transfer those functions to the guilds of the workers.

Means:

In order to achieve their ends the guild socialists believe neither in constitutional means nor in violent means; they believe in the trade union means. They say that though capitalism will disappear by and by, yet in order to finish it earlier, the workers' guilds should organise themselves fully and they should snatch facilities from the capitalists by and by, so that many of the functions of the capitalists be performed by the elected representatives of the workers. They are not in favour of revolution, strike and sabotage. Thus, here the views of Communists, Anarchists and Guild Socialists are different.

Criticism:

(1) This theory is not practicable. The capitalists will not be ready to give numerous facilities to the workers and to withdraw their control by and by. In this way, capitalism cannot be abolished without struggle and socialism cannot be established.

(2) It is not fair to limit the functions of the state, because many of the functions cannot be performed by guilds and only state can perform these functions according to its plan. The state has now become a welfare institution and it takes up many plans in its hands to enhance production. Therefore, the state control is being increased in every sphere.

(3) The plan of functional representation is not proper because there are numerous professions in the state and it is not fair to give representation to each one of them. This system was adopted in Soviet Russia after the revolution of 1917 but later on it was given up due to practical difficulties.

(4) It is impossible to separate economic and political difficulties.

(5) The Guild Socialists want to organise each profession into a separate free guild and want to transfer their control in their own hands. The guilds have neither sufficient capital to purchase the machines nor do they have the capability to organise them. Therefore, in doing this, there will be great disorder in the professional field and the production will fall.

Importance:

Though Guild Socialism has been bitterly criticised, yet the plan relating to the improvement of economic democracy and the condition of the workers and the protection of the interests of the consumers and the producers, is very important. It has warned against the growing powers of the state and has taken special steps to check this process

Syndicalism: Definition, Means and Criticism of Syndicalism:

In the last decade of the nineteenth century a new communist ideology, named Syndicalism, took birth in France. It adopted the views of the class struggle preached by the communists, and confrontation with the state by the anarchists. Then it mingled some of its own views in them. The word syndicalism has its root in syndicate or federation. It is used for syndicate in French language.

Definition of Syndicalism:

(1) F.W. Coker has defined it as under:

“Syndicalism, loosely defined, holds that the workers alone must control the conditions under which they work and live, the social changes they need can be achieved by their own efforts, by direct action in their own associations, and through means suited to their peculiar needs”.

(2) G.V. Hooper writes, “As now employed. Syndicalism means the theories and programmes of those revolutionists who would utilize the economic power of industrial unions and destroy capitalism and organise a socialist society”.

(3) C.E.M. Joad says, “Syndicalism may be defined as that form of social theory which regards the Trade Union Organisations as at once the foundation of the new society and the instrument whereby it is to be brought into being”.

Means of Syndicalists:

The chief supporters of Syndicalism were Pollontier, Sorel, Pouget, Lager- Lelle and Edward Berth, Emile Patand, etc. but Sorel is the most popular among them. The syndicalists believe in sabotage, general stake, boycott, and label to achieve their end.

Sabotage means the destruction of machinery by the workers. It also includes production of goods of poor quality and slow work. General strike means strike in all government offices, in police and military and in factories all over the country, so that the capitalist government may find it difficult to function and workers may be able to control the administration.

Boycott means, the propaganda by the labourers against the purchase of goods of the capitalists. When there is no sale of goods, the capitalists will definitely suffer. Label means propaganda by the workers regarding manufacture of goods in the factories under the workers' control. A separate label will be fixed on such goods and the people will purchase only those goods, and not the goods manufactured in the factories owned by the capitalists.

Criticism of Syndicalism:

Syndicalism has been criticised as under:

- (1) Syndicalism encourages class struggle, which results in low production. Social unity is weakened and the country is ruined.
- (2) The syndicalists have criticized democracy, party system and parliamentary government. This is not desirable, because the working class can get power by winning the elections and it can improve its position just as the labour party has done in England.
- (3) The syndicalists' enmity against the state is condemnable. Probably state has been supporting the capitalists in the past but today it is a welfare institution. Therefore, it is necessary to maintain it.:
- (4) The state can defend the people against foreign aggression and can also maintain internal law and order. In the absence of the state, the labour organisations will not be in a position to perform this function.
- (5) The syndicalists have adopted the system of sabotage which is not appreciated. It creates conflicts. It will spoil the nature of the workers and the production will definitely fall. If the machines are put out of order, crores of rupees will have to be spent to repair them.
- (6) The government will never tolerate general strike and it will adopt every possible measure to curb it.
- (7) The syndicalists attach importance only to the interests of the producers, and ignore the interests of the consumers. It will result in the increase of the prices of commodities by the producers in an arbitrary manner and thus the consumers will be exploited.
- (8) Lack of faith in nationalism is a seditious act

Utilitarianism:

Utilitarianism was basically an ethical theory. The original basis of this theory was Hedonism, a psychological theory. According to Hedonism, the main aim of life is the achievement of maximum pleasure. According to this theory, the value of an act is to be assessed on the basis of pleasure and pain which it gives. The act which gives maximum pleasure is good and the act which gives pain, is bad. Therefore, the criterion of each act is pleasure and pain.

The actions which cause pain should be avoided by the individual and the state, and the action which brings pleasure should be performed by the individual. The actions which bring pleasure for the individual are useful, and those which bring pain to him, are useless.

The form of utilitarianism and state:

As a school of political thought, utilitarianism owes its origin to Jeremy Bentham, an English thinker of the nineteenth century. According to this theory, the government should promote “the greatest good of the greatest number”, or maximum welfare of maximum people. Jeremy Bentham and J.S. Mill were the main supporters of this theory.

The utilitarian’s opposed the principle of natural rights and the theory of social contract. They said that the people created state for their own benefit. They were not prepared to accept the divine right concept of the state.

The state is there, because it is a useful institution. The basis of the functions and rights of the state is ‘maximum welfare of the maximum number’. Which functions should or should not the state perform, will be decided by the fact as to which functions guarantee the maximum welfare of the maximum number.

The utilitarian’s were reformists. Therefore, they supported the interference of the state in the reforms of certain social evils and defective laws because it will ensure maximum welfare of the maximum people. Thus they adopted a middle course between idealism and individualism.

They were not in favour of idealism because it absorbs fully the individual’s personality in the state. Nor were they wholly in favour of individualism, because according to it, the functions of the state are only protective.

Though the amalgamation of utilitarianism and individualism was never complete, yet the utilitarian’s leaned towards individualism to a great extent. It was so because John Stuart Mill was both utilitarian and individualist. In its early stage the nature of utilitarianism leaned towards the view that the society should be evaluated from the point of view of individual comfort.

Besides, like individualists, the utilitarians were the supporters of private enterprise. They agreed that the maximum welfare of the individual is possible only when in the economic field, the individual is left free. It means that the state should have minimum interference in his functions.

The utilitarians, inspired by the feeling of the public welfare, organised campaigns for improvements in public health, education and reforms in the systems of jails and administration. They were successful in their aim to a great extent. The utilitarians wanted progress. Their aim was public-welfare.

They said that everything of the individual depends upon the organisation and existence of the state. The aim of the law should be the maximum welfare of the people. The existence of the state and other institutions depends upon their utility.

Development of Utilitarianism:

The seeds of the theory of utilitarianism which is based on Hedonism can be discovered in the ancient times. In ancient Greece, the Epicurian philosophers, and the 'Charwak' philosophers in India also, had faith in Hedonism. We see a glimpse of this philosophy in the views of Hobbes and his contemporary critic Richard Cumberland.

After this, certain simple hints are also available in John Locke's books, "Essay on Human Understanding". Francis Hutcheson has also expressed his views on this subjects as he says, "The action is best which procures the greatest happiness for the greatest number".

First of all English philosopher David Hume explained this theory in a clear form. David Hume said that the basis of the state is utility and he condemned the theory of Social Contract. He emphasised the fact that the state should perform such functions as help in creating the maximum welfare of the maximum people.

David Hume's influence was also seen in France and in the latter half of eighteenth century. Helvetius (1715-1771) and Holbash supported these views. They also made pleasure and pain as the criterion for public functions and said, that only those functions are proper through which the maximum welfare of the individual is achieved.

View of Jeremy Bentham (1748-1832):

Bentham developed the views of the philosophers mentioned above and the explained utilitarianism in a clear, detailed and systematic manner. Bentham, in his first book, 'Fragment on Government' criticised bitterly Blackstone's 'Commentary on the British Constitution'.

This book was published for the first time in 1773, which made him popular. His second book, 'introduction to the Principles of Morals and Legislation' was published in 1789. In this book much light has been thrown on the philosophy of utilitarianism.

Their slogan was, “Nature has placed mankind under the governors of two sovereign masters, pain and pleasure. It is for them alone to point out what to do, as well as to determine what we shall do”. According to Bentham, the only criterion to measure virtue and vice is pleasure and pain. If we derive pleasure from an action, that will be a good action and if we derive pain from it, it will be a bad action. Good work is worth doing, while a bad action is to be discarded.

Bentham has given a list of 14 pleasures and out of those 14, important pleasures are- reason, wealth, proficiency, friendship, reputation, strength, magnanimity, and religious mindedness. He along-with fourteen pleasures, counts twelve pains also, among which ill-fame, enmity, malice, vulgarity, want, etc., are the main pains. According to Bentham, the theory of utility is the direct result of pleasure and pain.

Bentham said that the basis and origin of law can be traced in utility. Thus all new laws should be useful for human society. Therefore, he laid special emphasis on the maximum welfare of the maximum people. He accepted the superiority of democratic rule, as maximum welfare of maximum number is possible only in this rule.

He refused to endorse the theory of natural rights, because he said that rights were possible only in state. He also criticised the Social Contract theory, because according to it the basis of the state was contract and not utility. He said that we acted according to the orders of state, because those orders were useful. His aim was public welfare and thus he tested all the functions and policies of the state on the basis of utility.

Bentham considered it unreasonable to impose any type of control of the constitutional sovereignty of the state. He said that the will of sovereignty in the form of order was law. He was not in favour of any law or constitution which imposed restrictions on the powers of a sovereign.

He said, that if the powers of the sovereign were not limited through any agreement or rule, they would be unlimited. However, he wanted that the sovereign should see, before issuing any order, whether it was in conformity with the public interest or not. If the order went counter to public interest, the people would revolt against it.

James Mill (1773-1836):

James Mill supported Bentham’s utilitarianism. He said the state should not make such laws as to encourage anyone to achieve his own pleasure, and harm the pleasure of others. Therefore, the state or government should impose a check on the improper actions of the individuals. It should strive for the maximum welfare of maximum people.

He was not opposed to monarchy. He wanted a reform in bad laws. Bad laws were those laws which proved harmful for maximum people. He did not want to abolish the House of Lords,

but he wanted to impose a check on its powers. He was a supporter of democracy, and for this purpose, he was in favour of giving more power to the middle class people.

John Stuart Mill (1806-1873):

John Stuart Mill was the son of James Mill. He was a great logician, economist, philosopher and politician. Though he accepted the basic tenets of Bentham and also of his father James Mill, yet he made some amendments according to the needs of the times. For instance, according to Bentham, all pleasures are equal and there is only a difference of degree and not of quality. Mill disagreed with this notion and said that there is a difference of degree as well as quality in pleasure.

For example, the pleasure that a mean person derives from sexual act, gambling or drinking is inferior to the pleasure that a poet derives from his poetic creation. Thus John Stuart Mill has said, "It is better to be a human being dissatisfied than a pig satisfied. It is better to be a Socrates dissatisfied than a fool satisfied". Mill also did not agree with Bentham on another point. He supported public interest instead of individual interest.

He writes, "The utilitarian standard is not the agent's own greatest happiness, but the greatest amount of happiness altogether....As between his own happiness and that of others, utilitarianism requires him to be as strictly impartial as a disinterested and benevolent spectator. In the Golden Rule of Jesus of Nazareth,, we read the complete spirit of the ethics of utility. To do so as one would be done by and to love one's neighbour as oneself, constitute the ideal perfection of utilitarian morality". Therefore, Brown writes that John Stuart Mill made Bentham's dry morality generous and in this way made utilitarianism more human, though there was deficiency in his pure logic.

John Stuart Mill was a great supporter of individual liberty. He expressed his views about liberty in his book 'On Liberty', which was published in 1859. He also supported the holding of differences of views and the toleration of those differences of opinion.

He writes, "If all mankind minus one were of one opinion, mankind would be no more justified in silencing that one person than he, if he had the power, would be justified in silencing mankind".

He further said, "If the opinion is right, they are deprived of the opportunity of exchanging error for truth; if wrong, they lose, what is almost as great a benefit, the clearer perception and livelier impression of truth, produced by its collision with error".

Mill expressed his views about the administration in his book, 'Representative Government' which was published in 1861. Mill was the supporter of democracy, but in democracy, too, sometimes, we discover the atrocities of majority over the minority.

Therefore, for the safeguard of the minority interest, he supported the system of Proportional Representation. He said that the majority had no right to suppress the feeling of the minority. He supported the system of Plural Voting for the protection of minority interests.

He considered character and education as the main basis of democracy. Therefore, he suggested that prior to granting Adult Suffrage, every adult should be properly educated. He was a staunch supporter of women franchise. In spite of all this, it strange that he did not support secret ballot.

Mill has not used the word 'state' in his political philosophy, but according to his need, he used the word 'society' or 'government'. According to him, an ideal government was one in which the sovereignty lay in the entire society. Each individual should not only be given the voting right in the expression of sovereign will, but in practice he should also be given the right to take part in public affairs.

John Stuart Mill was a radical member of the British Parliament from 1866 to 1868. Therefore, he fully supported the interests of the labourers and also the Land Reforms in Ireland. In the economic field, he was a blind follower of individualism.

He said that if the government, expanded its activities in the public interest, it was not objectionable. In his later life he seemed to be inclined towards socialism, because he wanted that the entire human society should have a control over the raw material of the world, like the socialists. But the basis of Mill's socialism was the theory of individual interest. Mill was a political liberal. He wanted to protect the individual's interest and he wanted to encourage the social interests to the maximum.

As a good utilitarian, he accepted pleasure as the final criterion of human behaviour. At the same time, he laid stress on individual liberty. After John Stuart Mill, there was no change in utilitarianism and many of his supporters like George Great, John Austin and Alexander Ben continued propaganda in favour of utilitarianism.

Criticism of Utilitarianism:

Utilitarianism has been criticised as follows:

(1) The moral and psychological basis of utilitarianism is not real:

Utilitarianism is based on the notion that whatever functions should or should not be performed by the individual should be tested on the touch-stone of utility. If this notion is accepted, each individual will work only for his own pleasure.

He will ignore benevolence, renunciation, service and sacrifice. This is the main drawback of Bentham's theory. That is why Carlyal said angrily, "Bentham's theory is the theory of the

pigs”. He thought that “man is also a fleshy body, who need only physical pleasure and nothing else. There is no place for a thing like moral consciousness in his conscience”.

Robert A. Murrery writes, “If we take away conscience, as Bentham does, there is no such thing as moral or immoral action, though there may remain acts that are generally useful of the reverse. As there is no individual conscience, so there is no collective conscience. The culprit does not feel the censure of the community”.

(2) Against human nature:

The utilitarian’s are of the view that the individual does every work for the attainment of pleasure and for the avoidance of pain. But this analysis of human nature is one-sided. The fact is that human nature is complex. He has qualities like pity, faith, service, benevolence, love, sympathy, sacrifice and forgiveness in him.

He fixes his high ideals on the basis of these qualities and bears every type of pain smilingly. For instance, when India was under the foreign rule, many people faced many hardships at the hands of Britishers. They did all these not for their personal pleasure but for their high ideals.

Similarly, when in 1962 China invaded India and later on when in 1965 and 1971 Pakistan invaded India, thousands of heroes displayed exemplary courage and also sacrificed their lives. They did all this not for their personal interest but for the high ideal of the protection of their country.

Buddha, Christ, Shivaji, Guru Gobind Singh, V.D. Savarkar, B.G. Tilak, Subhash Chandra Bose and Mahatma Gandhi sacrificed everything not for any personal pleasure but for high ideal of benevolence.

(3) The utilitarian’s laid emphasis upon the material comforts only and ignored the spiritual happiness:

The utilitarian’s have cared only for physical comfort, and have ignored the suppression of sense and self-control. They have also no cared for the spiritual comfort which one derives from self-sacrifice for the sake of humanity.

(4) It is improper to lay emphasis solely upon the quantity of pleasures:

Bentham has stressed only upon the quantity of pleasure. He has not taken up the qualitative difference; therefore, John Stuart Mill has taken up the qualitative difference, which is appropriate.

(5) Bentham did not establish any reconciliation between the interests of the individual and those the society:

Maxy has written, “Nor was Bentham able to cross the chasm between individual and social utility”. He did not agree that it was difficult to make any difference between the individual interests and social interests. C.L. Wayper has rightly said, “Besides in his portrayal of the hedonistic individual, Bentham seems to have left life out of the picture.....in his study of the atomic individual, he has left out both society and history”.

(6) The doctrine of maximum welfare of the maximum number is not free from complications:

Sometimes it is possible that the majority may become selfish and in the name of maximum welfare of maximum number; it may suppress the minority. For instance, the Muslims of Pakistan have turned out the Hindus from their country. This is altogether unfair. Therefore, many atrocities can be committed in the name of this doctrine.

(7) This theory ultimately leads to the theory of Laissez Faire:

A majority of the utilitarians were in favour of the view that the government should not interfere in the affairs of the individual, so that the individual should be in a position to achieve maximum welfare. Though, in public interest, John Stuart Mill accepted some control of the state, yet he was chiefly a utilitarian. The policy of Laissez Faire harms the interests of the poor and the weak sections of society. Thus this theory suffers from many weaknesses.

Conclusion:

The theory of utilitarianism has been bitterly criticised and many difficulties will crop up, if it is given a practical shape. However, the main advantage of this theory was that many speculative theories regarding the state received a severe set-back. The utility became the criterion for the test of the values of state and institutions.

The aim of state was settled as maximum welfare of maximum number of people. Therefore, the function of the state was limited only to the maintenance of law and order. But it was also expected to work for the public welfare.

All the reforms of the nineteenth century are attributed to the demands of utilitarians. Thus the utilitarianism, for the reforms of its own time and for its being connected with public welfare, proved to be a progressive theory.

Nationalism:

Suffice it to say here that the people who have same race, language, religion, history, literature, economic interests and political aspirations, feelings of nationalism are aroused among them. Nationalism teaches us to love our motherland.

The nationalist love their motherland, rivers, mountains, flowers, animals and birds very much and they say that motherland is better than paradise. Hans Kohn writes, “Nationalism is an idea, an idea-force which fills man’s brain and heart with new thoughts and sentiments and drives him to translate his consciousness into deeds of organised action”.

According to Dr. Gamer, “It is one of the characteristic features of modern nationalism that most peoples who constitute a nationality aspire either to be independent and to be under a state organisation of their own choice and creation or at least to be accorded a large political autonomy where they are united with another nationality or nationalities in the same state”.

Merits of Nationalism:

(1) Helpful in liberating the country from foreign yoke:

Nationalism infused the spirit of patriotism in the minds of the people. If a country is under the yoke of a foreign rule as was the case in India before 1947, the people can be united for attaining freedom through nationalism.

In the nineteenth century, in Greece, Italy, Bulgaria, Serbia and Poland and in the twentieth century in many countries of Africa, Asia and South America many freedom movements were started. Inspired by the national feelings, the people of these countries freed themselves from the foreign rule.

(2) It leads to social unit:

Through nationalism the feelings of the high and low and casteism are banished from the minds of the people, and social unity is achieved. The nationalist leaders make the people understand with full force that our nation can progress and can have a prestigious place in the world only, when all disparities are removed.

(3) It leads to the spirit of heroism and self-sacrifice:

Nationalism creates the feeling of heroism and self-sacrifice. Every nation has to make several sacrifices for the attainment and protection of its freedom. India at first freed itself from the Turks and the Mughals and later from Britishers.

In order to achieve this aim, our people made many sacrifices which have gained an important place in our history. Similarly, our countrymen made several sacrifices to face the Chinese and

Pakistani aggressions and our armed forces displayed a spirit of unique heroism. It forms a golden chapter of our history.

(4) It leads to economic prosperity:

The feeling of nationalism unites the people and they work for the economic prosperity of the country. They bear the burden of extra taxes in order to implement plans in the national interest.

(5) Nationalism enables the country face the economic and political crisis effectively:

Every nation faces an economic or political crisis once or twice in its career, and the world history is a clear proof of it. If the people have national feelings, they will have unity, and the spirit of self-sacrifice. With the help of this spirit, the people of that country shall be able to face the crisis boldly.

(6) It leads to political unity and stability:

Nationalism is a great organising force. Through this force, the leaders create political unity among the people and they crush disintegrating tendencies. It brings about stability in the nation. For example, when on October 20, 1962, China invaded India, the spirit of nationalism was aroused among the people but the Leftist Communists preached in favour of China and their anti-national tendency was clearly seen. Therefore, the then Minister for Home Affairs, Shri Gulzarilal Nanda, put them behind the bars and created political unity and stability in the country.

(7) Nationalism helps in curbing mutual conflicts and quarrels and the attention of the people is drawn towards big problems.

(8) The individual gives up his selfish interest and works for national interest.

(9) True nationalism is an important link between different countries of the world. Mahatma Gandhi, Shri Jawaharlal Nehru and Mrs. Indira Gandhi being true nationalists, were Internationalists also. Under the inspiration of Shri Jawaharlal Nehru, the U.N. declared the year 1965 as international co-operation year.

India under the leadership of Mrs. Gandhi had become President of Non- Aligned Movement. After her assassination on October 31, 1984, Mr. Rajiv Gandhi became the President of Non-Aligned Movement. If the nationalism is liberal, it is not harmful. Liberal nationalists want world peace. They believe in equality, liberty and prosperity of all nations. However, sometimes it becomes aggressive nationalism.

The following are the drawbacks of aggressive nationalism:-

Demerits of Aggressive Nationalism:

(1) Aggressive nationalism leads to racism:

Aggressive nationalism leads to racism. Hitler encouraged racism in the name of nationalism and said that Aryan race was the best race and it had been made to rule all over the world. He turned the Jews out of Germany. Mussolini also believed in racial supremacy. The British likewise believed in the supremacy of the white race.

(2) It encourages Colonialism and Imperialism:

In the name of nationalism many European races discovered many new markets for their goods in the name of racism and established colonies. Later on for the sake of their national interests, they conquered many parts of the world and expanded their empire. The English, Dutch, French, Russians, Japanese, Germans, Italians and Spanish people acted similarly during the nineteenth and twentieth century's.

(3) It is likely to endanger world peace:

When nationalism takes the extreme form in any country, that country invades other weaker countries, which becomes the basis for a world war. For example, Hitler invaded Austria, Czechoslovakia, Poland, Denmark, Norway, Belgium and France and Russia.

Mussolini invaded Ethiopia, The result of all these invasions, was the Second World War in which there occurred a great destruction of men, money and material. After the Second World War, Pakistan followed this policy and, first in 1947, and later in 1965 and 1971, she invaded India. It resulted in a great loss of life and property to both the countries.

(4) It is hindrance in the way of World Federation and international cooperation:

Militant or aggressive nationalism is a great hindrance in the way of international co-operation. Many modern intellectuals are of the view that in order to establish world peace, it is essential that every state should give up a part of its sovereignty and give it to the world-federation. But militant nationalism proves a hindrance in its way.

Conclusion:

If the nationalism does not take the militant form, it is a good thing. It will help in settling international conflicts. Unity will be established and mutual goodwill and co-operation will be increased. As Hayes has said, "Nationalism will prove a boon for the humanity and the world if it means pure patriotism. If it takes a militant form, it will result in mutual enmity and non-co-operation among the nations and the world peace will be disturbed. In that situation, it will prove a curse".

Political Ideologies: Fascism

Fascism is an effective political ideology whose central theme is the notion of an organically combined national community, exemplified in a belief in 'strength through unity'. The individual, in a factual sense, is nothing; individual identity must be completely absorbed into the community or social group. To simply elaborate, Fascism is an authoritarian Nationalist political ideology that promotes nation above the individual, and that stands for a centralized autocratic government controlled by a dictatorial leader, severe economic and social regulation, and powerful suppression of opposition. It often claims to be concerned with concepts of cultural decline or decadence, and seeks to achieve a national rebirth by subduing the interests of the individual, and instead promoting cults of unity, energy and transparency.

Concept of fascism:

The term "fascismo" was invented by the Italian Fascist dictator Benito Mussolini (1883 - 1945) and the self-described "philosopher of Fascism" Giovanni Gentile (1875 - 1944). It is derived from the Latin word "fasces", an ancient Roman symbol consisting of a bundle of rods tied around an axe, used to suggest "strength through unity". It was formerly used to refer specifically to Mussolini's political movement that ruled Italy from 1922 to 1943, but has consequently also been used to describe other governments. Fascism can be applied to the formation of new revolutionary nationalist movements which rose to power in Europe between the World Wars (Payne, 1998).

It is considered by many thinkers that fascism is a highly nationalist, militaristic, totalitarian political ideology in which one person has absolute power. World War I was the major event that procreated fascism. The war was the first major war fought between industrialized nations, which were armed with technology such as machine guns and chemical weapons. The result was complete destruction. Millions of people died, entire countries malformed, and those who survived were often deeply disillusioned. For many people, the war presented that contemporary ideas had failed and that a new way was required. The majority of European fascist states developed from the amalgamation of and as a consequence to a multitude of significant events, including a troubled society with destabilised governments, the detrimental effect caused by the impact of World War and, by some, the disappointment caused by signing the Treaty of Versailles. Fascism was the movement and political response which offered European people the ability to reconstruct their nation and escape the existing dilemma.

Fascism emerged in Italy in the 1920s. Italy had battled on the winning side of World War I, but it had agonised greatly. Many Italians were annoyed and disappointed that the country gained very little for the price it paid. Some war veterans felt alienated from society: They had grown accustomed to the fears of war, and now normal life seemed unreal and incomprehensible. Some of these war veterans began to rally together, trying to re-create the companionship of the war. Their meetings led to the increase of fascism. In its original form, fascism was neither racist nor anti-Semitic. Undeniably, some early Italian fascists were Jewish. Although Italy was the origin of fascism, it expanded to other countries. In the mid to

late twentieth century, the Spanish government under General Francisco Franco was fascist, as were the Argentinean government under Juan Peron and some of the governments in Eastern Europe before World War II. The Japanese government before and during World War II also shared some fascist thoughts.

The fascist model is that of the 'new man', a hero, inspired by duty, honour and self-sacrifice, prepared to devote his life to the magnificence of his nation or race, and to give unquestioning obedience to a top leader. In many respects, fascism establishes a revolt against the ideas and values that dominated Western political thought from the French Revolution onwards in the words of the Italian Fascist slogan: '1789 is Dead'. Values such as rationalism, progress, freedom and equality were upturned in the name of struggle, leadership, power, heroism and war. In this respect, fascism has an 'anti-character'. It is explained by what it opposes: it is anti-rational, anti-liberal, anti-conservative, anti-capitalist, anti-bourgeois, and anti-communist. Fascism signifies the dimmer side of the Western political tradition, the central values of which it changed rather than uncontrolled. Fascists stated that freedom means complete submission, democracy is associated with dictatorship, progress suggests constant struggle and war, and creation is identified with annihilation.

Fascism has been a complex historical phenomenon, and it is tough to identify its fundamental principles or a 'fascist minimum'. For example, although most commentators treat Mussolini's Fascist dictatorship in Italy and Hitler's Nazi dictatorship in Germany as the two principal manifestations of fascism, others regard Fascism and Nazism as dissimilar ideological traditions. Italian Fascism was basically an extreme form of statism that was based upon unquestioning respect and absolute loyalty towards a 'totalitarian' state. Fascist philosopher, Gentile (1875-1944) indicted that 'everything for the state; nothing against the state; nothing outside the state'. German Nazism was created largely on the basis of racialism. Its two principal theories were Aryanism (the belief that the German people constitute a 'master race' and are destined for world domination) and a virulent form of anti-Semitism that portrayed the Jews as inherently evil and aimed at their eradication.

Fascist ideology based on national unity behind a single revered ruler and for the idea that citizens must serve the state (as opposed to most forms of liberal democracy, which have an inverse view of this relationship). Fascism is principally remembered for its oppressive treatment of citizens, infringements on personal freedoms and cruel crushing of opposition. It usually requires unusual of personality around a single central figure, hero worship, and a strong emphasis on a particularly militaristic view of national security. A consecutive theme in fascist regimes is the concept of palingenetic ultranationalism, or that there must be an "organic" rebellion that will lead to a national renaissance to a more pure era that will do away with corruption and weakness within the nation. Seldom are there many specifics given on what this may look like or how to reach this "rebirth" but it is however strongly identified with fascism, to the point where some say it is the primary difference between fascist regimes and

other right-wing dictatorships. In this way, fascism could be considered an extreme take on reactionary political viewpoints.

While the theory of fascism makes society to be ordered in a corporatist fashion, favouring collective bargaining for all groups in society, such as workers, farmers, employers, clergymen, etc., in practice, this transformed to the fascist states simply favouring and strengthening the largest and most sympathetic businesses, exercising heavy state control on them in return. In contrast to communism, these businesses will remain formally under private ownership, with their profits going to the owners rather than the state.

Fascist authoritarianisms are usually not just content with a silent, dutiful population, but expect the people to actively come out and support the government. A successful fascist dictatorship will rely more on public opinion than on absolute oppression. This is another point where fascism differs from other right-wing dictatorships, which usually rely on little more than oppression and try to ignore public opinion.

The French Revolution and its political inheritance had profound influence upon the expansion of fascism. Fascists interpreted the French Revolution as a largely negative event that resulted in the entrenchment of liberal ideas such as liberal democracy, anticlericalism, and rationalism. Challengers to the French Revolution initially were conservatives and reactionaries, but the Revolution was also later disparaged by Marxists and racist nationalists who opposed its universalist principles. Racist nationalists in particular condemned the French Revolution for granting social equality to "inferior races" such as Jews. Mussolini condemned the French Revolution for developing liberalism, scientific socialism, and liberal democracy, but also recognized that fascism extracted and utilized all the elements that had preserved those ideologies' vitality, and that fascism had no desire to restore the conditions that precipitated the French Revolution. Though fascism opposed core parts of the Revolution, fascists sustained other aspects of it. Mussolini declared his support for the Revolution's demolition of remnants of the Middle Ages such as tolls and compulsory labour upon citizens, and he noted that the French Revolution did have benefits in that it had been a cause of the whole French nation and not only a political party (Blamires, Cyprian, 2006).

It was appraised that the French Revolution was responsible for the entrenchment of nationalism as a political ideology both in its development in France as French nationalism and in the formation of nationalist movements particularly in Germany with the development of German nationalism by Johann Gottlieb Fichte as a political response to the development of French nationalism (Alexander J. Motyl, 2001). The Nazis blamed the French Revolution of being dominated by Jews and Freemasons and were deeply disturbed by the Revolution's intention to completely break France away from its past history in what the Nazis claimed was a repudiation of history that they asserted to be a trait of the Enlightenment. Though the Nazis were highly critical of the Revolution, Hitler in *Mein Kampf* said that the French Revolution is a model for how to realise change that his claims were caused by the rhetorical strength of

demagogues. Additionally, the Nazis idealized the *levee en masse* (mass mobilization of soldiers) that was developed by French Revolutionary armies, and the Nazis sought to use the system for their paramilitary movement (Blamires, Cyprian, 2006).

Major persons who greatly influenced fascism, the French revolutionary syndicalist Georges Sorel influenced by anarchism and contributed to the synthesis of anarchism and syndicalism together into anarcho syndicalism (Mark Antliff, 2007). Sorel encouraged the legitimacy of political violence in his work *Reflections on Violence* (1908) and other works in which he supported radical syndicalist action to accomplish a revolution to overthrow capitalism and the bourgeoisie through a general strike. In *Reflections on Violence*, Sorel stressed need for a revolutionary political religion. In his work "The Illusions of Progress", Sorel condemned democracy as reactionary, saying "nothing is more aristocratic than democracy" (Mark Antliff, 2007). By 1909, after the catastrophe of a syndicalist general strike in France, Sorel and his followers left the radical left and went to the radical right, where they sought to merge militant Catholicism and French patriotism with their views, advocating anti-republican Christian French patriots as ideal revolutionaries. Primarily, Sorel had officially been a revisionist of Marxism, but by 1910, announced his rejection of socialist literature and claimed in 1914, using an aphorism of Benedetto Croce that "socialism is dead" due to the "decomposition of Marxism" (Sternhell, Zeev, Mario Sznajder and Maia Asheri, 1994). Sorel became a follower of reactionary Maurrassian integral nationalism beginning in 1909 that influenced his works. French right-wing monarchist and nationalist Charles Maurras held interest in amalgamation of his nationalist principles with Sorelian syndicalism as a means to confront liberal democracy. Maurras stated "a socialism liberated from the democratic and cosmopolitan element fits nationalism well as a well-made glove fits a beautiful hand" (Douglas R, 2000). Sorelianism is considered to be a forerunner to fascism. This combination of nationalism on the political Right with Sorelian syndicalism on the Left, around the outbreak of World War I. Sorelian syndicalism, dissimilar other ideologies on the left, held an exclusive view that the ethics of the working class needed to be raised. The Sorelian concept of the positive nature of social war and its insistence on moral revolution led some syndicalists to believe that war was the decisive manifestation of social change and moral uprising (Sternhell, Zeev, 1994).

Fascism wanted to accommodate Italian conservatives by making major modifications to its political agenda; cancelling its previous populism, republicanism, and anticlericalism, implementing policies in support of free enterprise, and accepting the Roman Catholic Church and the monarchy as institutions in Italy (De Grand, Alexander, 2000). To plea to Italian conservatives, Fascism approved policies such as promoting family values, including promotion policies designed to reduce the number of women in the workforce, limiting the woman's role to that of a mother. The fascists barred literature on birth control and increased penalties for abortion in 1926, pronouncing both crimes against the state. Though, Fascism accepted a number of positions designed to appeal to reactionaries, the Fascists sought to maintain Fascism's revolutionary character, with Angelo Oliviero Olivetti saying "Fascism

would like to be conservative, but it will be by being revolutionary (Zeev Sternhell, Mario Sznajder, 1994). The Fascists supported ground-breaking action and committed to secure law and order to appeal to both conservatives and syndicalists. Earlier to Fascism's accommodation of the political right, Fascism was a small, urban, northern Italian movement that had about a thousand members. After Fascism's accommodation of the political right, the Fascist movement's membership soared to approximately 250,000 by 1921 (Cristogianni Borsella, 2007).

International flow of fascism:

The happenings of the Great Depression caused an international swell of fascism and the creation of several fascist administrations and regimes that adopted fascist strategies. The significant fascist regime was Nazi Germany, under the leadership of Adolf Hitler. With the upsurge of Hitler and the Nazis to power in 1933, liberal democracy was dissolved in Germany, and the Nazis mobilized the country for war, with expansionist territorial aims against several countries. In the decade of 1930s, the Nazis executed racial laws that deliberately discriminated against, disenfranchised, and persecuted Jews and other racial and minority groups. Hungarian fascist Gyula Gombos rose to power as Prime Minister of Hungary in 1932 and visited Fascist Italy and Nazi Germany to consolidate good relations with the two regimes. He attempted to establish his Party of National Unity throughout the country; created an eight-hour work day, a forty-eight-hour work week in industry, and sought to entrench a corporatist economy; and followed irredentist claims on Hungary's neighbours. The fascist Iron Guard movement in Romania floundered in political support after 1933, gaining representation in the Romanian government, and an Iron Guard member assassinated Romanian prime minister Ion Duca. During the crisis in 6th February 1934, France faced the greatest domestic political disorder since the Dreyfus Affair when the fascist Francist Movement and manifold far right movements rioted en masse in Paris against the French government resulting in major political violence. Several para-fascist governments that copied elements from fascism were formed during the Great Depression, including those of Greece, Lithuania, Poland, and Yugoslavia (Stanley G. Payne, 2005).

Historian Stanley Payne in the 1990s appealed that a prominent and Hindu nationalist movement Rashtriya Swayamsevak Sangh (RSS) holds strong similarities to fascism - including its use of paramilitaries and its irredentist claims, calling for the creation of a Greater India (Stanley G. Payne, 2005). Cyprian Blamires in *World Fascism: A Historical manual* defines the philosophy of the RSS as "fascism with 'Sanskrit characters'" - a unique Indian variant of fascism (Blamires, 2006). Blamires notes that there is indication that the RSS held direct contact with Italy's Fascist government and admired European fascism. However these interpretations are extensively criticized (Gregor, Anthony James, 2006).

America also represented some features of fascism. United States is a nation whose leaders frequently plunge their nation into, and force them to pay for, serial wars overseas, whereas stealing their freedom at home.

Fascism emphasizes:

- Action: Human beings find meaning and purpose by acting, not by reasoning or thinking.
- Community spirit: People need to be part of a community. Individualism is dangerous because it turns people away from their community.
- Nationalism: The community that matters the most is the nation. People should work together to promote the glory and power of the nation.
- Militarism: The nation must have a strong, powerful military. The nation displays its power by expanding its territory.
- The future: Fascists love the speed and power of technology. They look optimistically to the future.
- One party: The nation must be unified and speak with one voice. Therefore, only one political party is allowed, and that party rules with absolute power.
- Violence: The government rules its people through violence or the threat of violence.

Fascism usually involves in the following elements:

- Nationalism (based on the cultural, racial and/or religious attributes of a region).
- Totalitarianism (state regulation of nearly every aspect of public and private sectors).
- Statism (state intervention in personal, social or economic matters).
- Patriotism (positive and supportive attitudes to a "fatherland").
- Autocracy (political power in the hands of a single self-appointed ruler).
- Militarism (maintaining of a strong military capability and being prepared to use it aggressively to defend or promote national interests).
- Corporatism (encouragement of unelected bodies which exert control over the social and economic life of their respective areas).
- Populism (direct appeals to the masses, usually by a charismatic leader).
- Collectivism (stress on human interdependence rather than on the importance of separate individuals).

NAZISM

Nationalsozialismus), more commonly known as **Nazism** (/ˈnɑːtsizəm, ˈnæt-/),^[1] is the ideology and practices associated with the Nazi Party—officially the National Socialist

German Workers' Party (*Nationalsozialistische Deutsche Arbeiterpartei* or NSDAP)—in Nazi Germany, and of other far-right groups with similar ideas and aims.

Nazism is a form of fascism and showed that ideology's disdain for liberal democracy and the parliamentary system, but also incorporated fervent antisemitism, anti-communism, scientific racism, and eugenics into its creed. Its extreme nationalism came from Pan-Germanism and the ethno-nationalist *völkisch* movement prominent in the German nationalism of the time, and it was strongly influenced by the *Freikorps* paramilitary groups that emerged after Germany's defeat in World War I, from which came the party's "cult of violence" that was "at the heart of the movement."^[2]

Nazism subscribed to pseudo-scientific theories of racial hierarchy^[3] and Social Darwinism, identifying the Germans as a part of what the Nazis regarded as an Aryan or Nordic master race.^[4] It aimed to overcome social divisions and create a German homogeneous society based on racial purity which represented a people's community (*Volksgemeinschaft*). The Nazis aimed to unite all Germans living in historically German territory, as well as gain additional lands for German expansion under the doctrine of *Lebensraum* and exclude those who they deemed either community aliens or "inferior" races.

The term "National Socialism" arose out of attempts to create a nationalist redefinition of "socialism", as an alternative to both Marxist international socialism and free market capitalism. Nazism rejected the Marxist concepts of class conflict and universal equality, opposed cosmopolitan internationalism, and sought to convince all parts of the new German society to subordinate their personal interests to the "common good", accepting political interests as the main priority of economic organization,^[5] which tended to match the general outlook of collectivism or communitarianism rather than economic socialism.

The Nazi Party's precursor, the Pan-German nationalist and antisemitic German Workers' Party, was founded on 5 January 1919. By the early 1920s the party was renamed the National Socialist German Workers' Party—to attract workers away from left-wing parties such as the Social Democrats (SPD) and the Communists (KPD)—and Adolf Hitler assumed control of the organization. The National Socialist Program or "25 Points" was adopted in 1920 and called for a united Greater Germany that would deny citizenship to Jews or those of Jewish descent, while also supporting land reform and the nationalization of some industries. In *Mein Kampf* ("My Struggle"; 1924–1925), Hitler outlined the anti-Semitism and anti-Communism at the heart of his political philosophy, as well as his disdain for representative democracy and his belief in Germany's right to territorial expansion.^[6]

The Nazi Party won the greatest share of the popular vote in the two Reichstag general elections of 1932, making them the largest party in the legislature by far, but still short of an outright majority. Because none of the parties were willing or able to put together a coalition

government, in 1933 Hitler was appointed Chancellor of Germany by President Paul von Hindenburg, through the support and connivance of traditional conservative nationalists who believed that they could control him and his party. Through the use of emergency presidential decrees by Hindenburg, and a change in the Weimar Constitution which allowed the Cabinet to rule by direct decree, bypassing both Hindenburg and the Reichstag, the Nazis had soon established a one-party state.

The Sturmabteilung (SA) and the Schutzstaffel (SS) functioned as the paramilitary organizations of the Nazi Party. Using the SS for the task, Hitler purged the party's more socially and economically radical factions in the mid-1934 Night of the Long Knives, including the leadership of the SA. After the death of President Hindenburg, political power was concentrated in Hitler's hands and he became Germany's head of state as well as the head of the government, with the title of Führer, meaning "leader". From that point, Hitler was effectively the dictator of Nazi Germany, which was also known as the "Third Reich", under which Jews, political opponents and other "undesirable" elements were marginalized, imprisoned or murdered. Many millions of people were eventually exterminated in a genocide which became known as the Holocaust during World War II, including around two-thirds of the Jewish population of Europe.

Following Germany's defeat in World War II and the discovery of the full extent of the Holocaust, Nazi ideology became universally disgraced. It is widely regarded as immoral and evil, with only a few fringe racist groups, usually referred to as neo-Nazis, describing themselves as followers of National Socialism

GANDHISM

Social and political ideologies of Gandhi ji is multidimensional. His political philosophy was a deep-seated departure from the past in the sense that it was neither constitutional loyalist of the Moderates nor extremism of the revolutionary terrorists. In his speech of Indian nationalism, he sought to incorporate the emergent constituencies of nationalist politics that remained peripheral in the past era. Gandhi was the only effective nationalist leader who truly attempted to go beyond the class conflicts by creating a method which for the first time, brought about the national aggregation of an all India character. His social and political ideas were the consequence of his serious engagement with issues reflective of India's peculiar socio-

economic circumstances. Gandhi concurrently launched movements not only against the British rule but also against the terrible social structures, customs, norms and values, justified in the name of Indian's ancient traditions. Therefore, Gandhi's thought is neither purely political nor absolutely social, but a complex combination of the two.

Gandhian philosophy was a thoughtful engagement with modernity and its drawbacks. Against the troubles of industrialisation, materialism and selfish pursuits, Gandhiji suggested swaraj, swadeshi, trusteeship and a minimal state vested only with co-coordinative powers. He was a genuinely a religious man. This standpoint shaped his politics his economic ideas and his view of society. However, the religious approach that he absorbed was significantly different from other religious man. He accepts the inner oneness of all existence in the cosmic spirit, and saw all living beings as representatives of the everlasting divine reality. Gandhiji believed that man's ultimate goal in life was self- realisation. According to him, Self-realisation meant seeing God face to face, i.e., realising the absolute truth or, knowing oneself. He believed that it could not be attained unless man identified himself with the whole of mankind. This necessarily involved participation in politics.

According to Gandhi, man's ultimate aim is the realisation of God and all his activities social political religious have to be directed by the ultimate aim of the vision of God. It is only through the means of self-purification that self-realisation can be attained. The fasts, prayers and works of service that he undertook were all directed towards such an end. In his autobiography, Gandhiji stated that self-realisation required self-purification as its ethical foundation. Men's moral life flows from such a search into this oneself and express itself in outward activity of fellowship and concern to others. This moral outlook is mainstay of Gandhiji's political viewpoint even as his ethics has for its foundation in his metaphysical principles. According to Gandhiji, the moral discipline of the individual is the most important means of social construction.

Gandiji appealed following moral principles:

1. - Truth
2. - Non-violence
3. - Non-stealing
4. - Non possession
5. - Celibacy

The adherence of these moral principles would purify man and enable him to strive after self-realisation.

Techniques of political struggle: There are two major tactics that Gandhi ji adopted in his political struggle that include satyagraha and non-violence.

The basic moralities of Gandhian techniques are the Satyagraha and Non-violence or ahimsa. It was mentioned by numerous authors that during the period between his South African experiment and the agitation against the Rowlatt Act, it was Satyagraha that held the key to his entire crusade. Only in the repercussion of the 1919 anti-Rowlatt Satyagraha, was non-violence included as integral to Gandhi's Satyagraha campaign. Undoubtedly, ahimsa always remained an important influence in the conceptualisation of satyagraha, but it was not projected as crucial a component as it later became.

According to Mahatma Gandhi, ahimsa suggests uttermost selflessness. It means, if anyone wants to realize himself, i.e., if he wants to search for the truth, he has to behave in such a way that others will think him entirely safe. Gandhi stated that this is the way of ahimsa. He did not consider non-killing alone to be non-violence. To him, non-violence is not a negative concept but a positive sense of love. He talked of loving the wrong-doers, but not the wrong.

He had strongly opposed any sort of proposal to wrongs and injustice in an indifferent manner. He thought that the wrong-doers can be fought only through the severance of all relations with them.

As a technique, Satyagraha was always learned by ahimsa, though its role was not vividly expressed till their 1919 campaign against the Rowlatt Act. From 1919 onwards, Gandhiji paid enormous attention to both conceptualising and justifying the importance of ahimsa in political mobilisation by referring to the ancient scriptures in his defence. Gandhiji was preparing for a pan-Indian non-cooperation movement in the Satyagraha format in which ahimsa was to play a significant role in political mobilisation. The micro experiments of Satyagraha in Champaran, Kheda and Ahmadabad where ahimsa was constitutive of Gandhian model of anti-imperialism, therefore, became pivotal in Gandhi's social and political thought.

Gandhian doctrine of satyagraha: Satyagraha was a daunting defence that Gandhiji used to fight against injustice. It is a natural outcome from the ultimate concept of truth. Satyagraha is factually holding on to truth, and it means, therefore, Truth force. Satyagraha means the exercise of the purest soul-force against all injustice, oppression and exploitation. Suffering and trust are characteristics of soul-force. Truth is soul or spirit, it is known as soul force. It excludes the use of violence because man is not capable of knowing the absolute truth. According to for Gandhiji, truth or satya is go himself. He changed the statement, ' God is truth' later in his life into ' Truth is God ' and suggested that it was one of the fundamental innovations of his life's experiments. The life of man, for Gandhiji, is a march of his pursuit in search of Truth or God. Satyagraha is not merely the insistence on truth, it is, in fact, holding on to truth through ways which are moral and non-insolent; it is not the imposition of one's will over others, but it is appealing to the reasoning of the challenger, it is not compulsion but is persuasion. It means urge for satya or Truth.

Gandhi emphasized several characteristics to Satyagraha. It is a moral defence and does not have ill-feeling towards the rival, it is a nonviolent trick and calls upon its user to love his

enemy, it does not abate the opponent but strengthens him morally; it is a tool of the brave and is constructive in its approach. Gandhiji stressed that a satyagrahi is always truthful, morally impregnated, non-violent and a person without any hatred, he was devoted to the service of all. Gandhiji decisively believed that truth can be achieved only through non-violence which was not negative, meaning absence of violence, but was a positive condition of love. Resort to non-violence is recourse to love. In its positive sense, it strive for non-injury to others, both in words as well as deeds.

A satyagrahi cooperates not out of fear of punishment but because cooperation is vital for the common good. Satyagraha is battle without any bitterness or hatred or injury to the opponent. A satyagrahi also suffers the consequences of resistance. As a person he owes it to himself to suffer, if necessary for his conscience and as a citizen, it is his duty to suffer the consequences of his conscientious disobedience to the laws of the state. A satyagrahi invites suffering upon himself and does not seek mercy.

The following rules must be followed in satyagraha:

1. Self-reliance at all times.
2. Initiative in the hands of the satyagrahis.
3. Proliferation of the objective, strategy and tactics of the campaign.
4. Reduction of demands to a minimum consistent with Truth.
5. Liberal advancement of the movement through steps and stages- direct action only when all other efforts to achieve an honourable settlement have been exhausted.
6. Investigation of weakness within the satyagraha group- no sign of impatience, discouragement or breakdown of non-violent attitude.
7. Persistent search for avenues of cooperation with the adversary on honourable terms by winning over the opponent by helping him. There must be sincerity to achieve an agreement with rather than triumph over the adversary.
8. Rejection to surrender essentials in negotiation and there must be no compromise on basic principles.
9. Insistence on full agreement on fundamentals before accepting a settlement.

Gandhi recommends to follow below steps in a satyagraha:

1. Negotiation and arbitration.
2. Preparation of the group for direct action- exercise in self-discipline.
3. Agitation. It means demonstration such as mass meetings, parades, and slogan-shouting.
4. Issuing of an ultimatum.
5. Economic boycott and forms of strike- picketing, dharna, non-violent labour strike and general strike.
6. Non-cooperation.
7. Civil disobedience.

8. Usurping of the functions of government.

Basically, the techniques of Satyagraha may take the form of non-co-operation, civil disobedience, Hijrat, fasting and strike. Gandhiji believes that subjugation and exploitation were possible only on account of the cooperation of the people. If people refused to cooperate with the government, the latter could not function well. Non-cooperation may manifest itself in the form of hartals, Picketing etc. Hartal involved the stopping of work as a measure of protest and its objective was to strike the imagination of the people and the government. Gandhiji had an opinion that hartals in order to be effective were to be voluntarily organized and non-violent method could be used. In the case of picketing also, it is not good to use any force. Picketing should avoid coercion, pressure, rudeness, burning of images and hunger strike.

Civil disobedience: It is another effectual tactics suggested by Gandhiji for the realisation of satyagraha. It was considered as a "complete effective and bloodless substitute of armed revolt". There can be individual as well as mass civil disobedience. Gandhiji said that complete civil disobedience inferring a refusal to render obedience to every single state made law can be a very powerful movement. It can become 'more dangerous than an armed rebellion' because the stupendous power of innocent suffering undergone on a great scale has great strength.

Hijrat: It was another form of satyagraha recommended by Gandhiji which inferred voluntary exile from the permanent place of residence. This was to be done by those who feel beleaguered and cannot live without loss of self-respect in a particular place and lack the strength that comes from true non-violence of the capacity to defend themselves aggressively.

Fasting: This is other technique of Satyagraha. Gandhiji regarded this tactic as a burning weapon but it has to be applied only against those who are bound by ties of close personal affection. It required purity of mind, discipline, humility and faith. Gandhiji's vision was that fasting stimulated the lethargic conscience and fired the loving hearts to action.

Strike: It is also effective method of Satyagraha. Gandhiji's view of strike was different from that supported by the socialists and communists. According to Gandhiji, strike was a voluntary, purificatory suffering undertaken to convert the erring opponent. He did not believe in the theory of class war. His opinion was that industry was a joint enterprise of labour and capital, and both of them were trustees. The strikers were required to propose their demands in very clear terms. Some researchers have tried to connect and identify the Gandhian principle of Satyagraha with passive confrontation. While identifying the features of satyagraha in his Hind swaraj, Gandhi had an opinion that passive resistance fails to convey what he meant. It defined a method, but no hint of the system of which it is only a part. It can be said that the similarity between satyagraha and passive resistance was just peripheral since both of them were evidently defined methods of political resistance which were opposed to violence.

Gandhi had drawn passive resistance theoretically, but when he elaborated satyagraha, he emphasised its unique nature and characteristics. As he expounded in Hind swaraj, passive resistance is a technique of securing rights by personal sorrow. He said that "it is reverse of offensive to my conscience, I use social-force." Passive resistance can never be likened with satyagrah as it involved application of force as well. Hence, he stated that passive resistance is an all sided sword, it can be used anyhow, it blesses him who uses at and him against whom it is used without drawing a drop of blood, it produced for reaching results.

Satyagraha was not physical force but soul force that drew on the spontaneous sacrifice of self by the partakers, which constituted the central of his campaign. Gandhi linked passive resistance with internal violence. It unleashed forces of prejudice and separatism rather than compassion and incisiveness. Gandhiji explained that satyagraha was not only a political dogma directed against the state, it had also social and economic trusts relevant to and drawn on human natures. In contrast with the constitutional and extremist methods of political mobilisation, satyagraha was highly original and creative conceptualisation of social transformation and political action. The ideologies governing satyagraha and its participants are explanatory of his attempt to organise mass protest within a strict format that clearly specifies the duties and responsibilities of the individual satyagraha. It is beyond dispute that satyagraha was to be a constant process looking for transformation of the individuals by appreciating the human ethical values that remained confined due to colonization and various social biases, and justified with reference to religion.

Non -violence: Gandhiji was not considered as the originator of this belief. He explored the ideology of non-violence from historical account and his greatness lies in the fact that he made it on the basis of his life and espoused to serve the needs of time. He changed it into social and political method. He regards it as the best concept for the improvement of politics. It is revealed in abundant of literature that the basis of Gandhism is non-violence (Ravindra Kumar, 2002). Non-violence is practised in almost all major faiths and religions: Islam, Hinduism, Christianity, Judaism, Jainism and Buddhism. In fact, for some of these faiths, non-violence is not just a matter of choice; it is an undeniable and irrevocable way of life to which followers must strictly adhere.

Gandhiji powerfully specified that Non-violence or Ahimsa is the central of all religions. Non-violence is truth itself; its very soul, and its fruit. Truth and non-violence are two sides of a smooth unstamped metallic disc and are so intervened that it is very difficult to separate them. Gandhiji stressed on truth than non-violence because he believed that truth existed beyond and unconditioned by space and time, but non-violence existed only on the part of all finite beings (William Borman, 1986).

The crucial component of this theory is ahimsa, "action based on the refusal to do harm." Ahimsa was first revealed in the Chandogya Upanisad as one of the five ethical qualities, and it was later related with Jainism. In modern India, Jainism is strongest in Gandhi's native Gujarat.

In medieval India, it should be noted, the notion of nonviolence was significant but was never taken to mean the prohibition of either war or capital punishment. According to Gandhi, in this principle, physical injury is to be avoided and may not even seek to embarrass the challenger. The first step in solving differences is to accentuate interests that the parties to the conflict share, or to express interests that they might possibly share, and to attempt to establish cooperation on this basis. Issues must be made as simple as possible so that difficulties are not further intensified by misinterpretations.

Gandhi supposed that there were always common purposes, but he did not believe that compromise in which each side makes concessions so as to reach agreement was the means for arriving at these purposes. Only when principles were not involved should compromise be employed as a practice. Instead of decreasing demands, a program for resolving conflict should aim at bringing about a new and higher level of adjustment which would prove mutually acceptable.

Non-violence is the recognition of spiritual metaphysics. It is not just the negative act of renouncing from doing offence, injury and harm to others but it signifies the ancient law of positive self-sacrifice and constructive anguish. Gandhiji construed it as representing utter selflessness and universal love. The decisive aim of non-violence is even to love the so-called enemies or opponents. According to Gandhiji, there are three levels of non-violence. The highest form was the enlightened non-violence of resourcefulness or the non-violence of the brave. It was the non-violence of one who adopted it not by painful necessity but by inner conviction based on moral considerations.

Non-violence was not just political but holds every sphere of life. The second kind of non-violence was espoused as a measure of expediency and sound policy in some spheres of life. That was the non-violence of the weak or the passive non-violence of the helpless. It is weakness rather than moral belief which rules out the use of violence. It pursued honestly with real courage so long as it is accepted as a policy. It is capable of achieving results to a certain extent. Nevertheless, it is not as effective as the non-violence of the courageous. The third level of non-violence is the passive violence of the coward. As Gandhiji has indicated that timidity and ahimsa (non-violence) do not harmonize. The coward seeks to evade the conflict and flies from the danger. Cowardice is an impotent worse than violence. Gandhiji considered that non-violence cannot be taught to a person who fears to die and has no power of resistance.

Gandhism is not an organized, well worked out political philosophy in the western perspective. It does not claim to apply purely logical procedure and scientific methodology as the positivists do. There is a noticeable realism in Gandhis' economic philosophies. Gandhism is not only a political doctrine, his philosophy bring about a transformation in human life by the supremacy of self-suffering love. He stressed peace, modesty, gentleness and a sense of sincere respect for the religious views of others. This comprehensive orientation of Gandhian lessons makes it the moral foundation of socialism and democracy. Gandhi has been welcomed as the greatest

Indian since Gautama Budha. He made Indian liberation movement into a mass movement. His teachings of non-violence is significantly pertinent to the modern world infested with militarism, violence, and power politics.

Gandhism ideology in contemporary period:

Gandhian democracy is still relevant in India. It is clear from the 73rd amendment of Indian constitution. That amendment is related only with rural administration of India. One noteworthy provision of that amendment is decentralization of power up to the rural level. That amendment has already been implemented in India. Gandhian systems are mostly following by the Indian people to fulfil different demands. Gandhi's philosophy of life is applicable to all humanity. He did not reserve any afford in serving India and humanity and sacrificed even his life. He was a forager, a manual labour, an economist, a politician, a religious man, a lover of humanity and above all a Mahatma. Gandhi's life and ideologies are great message to humankind.

In Gandhian creed, the first principle which guided all his thoughts and activities is the complete unity and integrity of body, mind and soul in the individual human being. Gandhiji never tried to speak that the body should be controlled by the mind and the mind by the soul. But this control is not to be accomplished by neglecting either the body or the mind or in the mystic exhilaration of the soul by itself. He attached to physical health and well-being as much importance as to plain and logical thinking or moral responsibility. He was one of the most logical and influential writers.

It has been observed that the greatest attainment of Gandhi was the spiritualization of politics. This is unquestionably true; but he had no faith in religiousness by itself as an abstract virtue. He considered it as a kind of brightness which should accompany every thought and action. It is difficult to define it through the verses of the Bhagavad-Gita which constituted his daily prayer. The second principle of Gandhian viewpoint is that all social action should be governed by the same simple set of moral values, of which the main elements are selflessness, non-attachment, nonviolence and active service. He believed that the development of a man's personality is balanced to his faith in and practice of these virtues. This is possible only when he identifies himself more and more with an ever-increasing circle till it grips all humanity and even all living beings. He judged the value and vivacity of social institutions by their capacity to foster such progress.

His third conviction was that no society, state or any other institution has any worth or importance apart from its part in contributing to the development of the individuals of which it is composed. The State, the Nation, the community and other traditional groupings had no inherent value for him.

Gandhiji had firm belief that means are at least as important as, and often even more important than, ends. It is, of course, desirable that ends should be good and reasonable. But they merely give a direction to life while the means adopted constitute life itself. Therefore, if the means

are right, that is, if they conform to the tests of truth and nonviolence, even mistakes, errors and failures aid the growth of the individual. On the other hand, wrong means unethical the soul and no good can ever come out of them. Gandhi rejected emphatically the idea that ends justify the means. This implies the rejection of war, espionage and crooked diplomacy, even when they are accepted for the noble ends of defending the country, religion or humanity.

According to Gandhi, faith in God is the groundwork of all moral values. He never defined God and was prepared to allow every person to have his own idea of God. He was motivated to think of Him as the Upanishadic Brahman. But, so long as a person believes in some source of spiritual life and holds it superior to the material universe, he is a believer in God. Gandhi had no objection even to a formal profession of doubt, so long as a person established by his attachment to moral values that this viewpoint was essentially spiritual in spirit.

To summarize, Gandhism is a dominant political ideology that made immense transformation in the arena of political science. Gandhi is one of the great activist-theoreticians of the twentieth century. His writings arose during the varied process of social, economic and political actions. Gandhism represents a humanitarian world view. The idea is devoted to the transformation of the society for betterment and for the raising the standard of poor people in the society. Gandhi believed in humanity and equality (Teacher Forum, 2014). Basic tools of Gandhi ji for developing noble society and get rid of political turmoil, is satyagrah, nonviolence.

According to Gandhi, Satyagraha is based on a philosophical respect for law and is resorted to non-violently and publicly. The Satyagrahi keenly accepts full penalties, including the rigours of jail discipline as resistance is respectful and restrained, undertaken by law-abiding citizens. Gandhi claims that 'disobedience without civility, discipline, discrimination and non-violence is certain destruction'. A satyagrahi accepts personal responsibility publicly. He must inform the concerned government official(s) about the time and place of the act, the reasons for protest and if possible, the law that would be defied. Gandhi asserts on the need to anchor power and authority in the supreme values of satya, ahimsa and dharma to guarantee that politics eventually is service of all people in general and the underprivileged and the marginalised in particular. The uniqueness of Gandhism ideologies is that Gandhiji desires social and political transformation through non-violent means. He also provides a revelation of his model and accepts modifications to this ideal on grounds of viability

SARVODAYA

21st century is the era of globalization. New economic policy of globalization moves on to make the world a global village. New challenges and problems have emerged before youth. The belief that all emergent problems - ecological, social, economical, political and moral-

could be resolved by discoveries and technological innovations persists, failures in the past notwithstanding. What is happening today is in line with what Gandhi almost predicted in Hind Swaraj as he prepared its manuscript in 1908. Gandhi put forward four main goals before youth for humanity, so as to move towards its destiny. These are Swaraj, Non-violence, Swadeshi and Sarvodaya. These are the main pillars of the thesis he has propounded in the Hind Swaraj. In this paper an attempt is made to focus on Sarvodaya as one of the pillars to bring Hind Swaraj. Objectives of this research paper are to know Gandhian philosophy of Sarvodaya for changing attitude of youth & aware youth for their rights & duties. Primary & secondary resources are used for this paper.

Meaning of Sarvodaya:

Sarvodaya is a term meaning '*Universal Uplift*' or '*Progress of All*'. The term was first coined by Mohandas Gandhi as the title of his 1908 translation of John Ruskin's tract on political economy, "*Unto This Last*", and Gandhi came to use the term for the ideal of his own political philosophy.¹ Later Gandhian, like the Indian nonviolence activist Vinoba Bhave, embraced the term as a name for the social movement in post-independence India which strove to ensure that self-determination and equality reached all strata of India society.

Inspirations from Ruskin's Book:

Gandhi received a copy of Ruskin's "Unto This Last" from a British friend, Mr. Henry Polak, while working as a lawyer in South Africa in 1904. In his *Autobiography*, Gandhi remembers the twenty-four hour train ride to Durban (from when he first read the book, being so in the grip of Ruskin's ideas that he could not sleep at all: "I determined to change my life in accordance with the ideals of the book."² Gandhi advances the concept of Sarvodaya, which were based on three basic principles:

- That the good of the individual is contained in the good of all.
- That a lawyer's work has the same value as the barber's in as much as all have the same right of earning their livelihood from their work.
- That is a life of labour, i.e., the life of the tiller of the soil and the handicraftsman is the life worth living.

The first of these I knew. The second I had dimly realized. The third have never occurred to me. '*Unto This Last*' made it clear as daylight for me that the second and third were contained in the first. I arose with the dawn, ready to reduce these principal to practice."³

Simple Living & High Thinking:

Mahatma Gandhi was of the firm view that the earth provides enough to satisfy every man's needs, but not for every man's greed. In the Sarvodaya society of his dream, therefore, every member will be free from any greed for limitless acquisition of material wealth and more and more luxurious living and they will follow the motto of simple living and high thinking. Everyone will, thus, get ample opportunity to produce and earn sufficiently through honest work for decent and dignified living. Consequently there will be no problem of unemployment. Of course, obviously, income of different people may be different, depending on their talent, ability and effort. But those who will earn more will use the bulk of their greater earnings for the good of the society as a whole. In such a society, all wealth, including land, will be assumed as common property to be utilized for the welfare of all. If an individual has more than his proportionate portion, he becomes a trustee of the excess wealth for the benefit of the less fortunate members of the society. As regards use of machinery in economic activity, Gandhi said that "If we feel the need of machines, we certainly will have them. But there should be no place for machines that concentrate power in a few hands and turn the masses into mere machine-minders, if, indeed, they do not make them unemployed." In order, therefore, to minimize use of machines in a Sarvodaya society, Gandhi strongly advocated that everyone should do some productive physical work at least to earn his/her daily bread as was also advocated by Leo Tolstoy – the great Russian thinker and writer and everyone should uphold the dignity of labour irrespective of the type of honest labour performed by an individual.⁴

Objects of Sarvodaya Movement:

The Sarvodaya Movement has as its target the establishment of a whole network of such self-supporting village communities. The family relationships which are confined at present to the blood group will be extended to cover the whole village where distinctions based on race, creed, caste, language and so forth will completely be eliminated. Agriculture will be so planned that all the people will have enough to consume. Industry will be conducted on a cottage basis till all the people in the village are gainfully employed. The needs of the village will be determined by the people of the village themselves, through Village Council, representative of the whole village.

Principles of the Sarvodaya:

- There is no centralized authority, and there is political and economic atmosphere in the villages.
- Politics will not be the instrument of power but an agency of service and *Rajnity* will yield place to *Loknity*.
- All people will be imbued with the spirit of love, fraternity, truth, non-violence and self-sacrifices. Society will function on the basis on the non-violence.
- There will be no party system and majority rule and society will be free from the evil of the tyranny of the majority.
- The sarvodaya society is socialist in the true sense of the term. All calling will be the same moral, social and economical values. The individual personality has the fullest scope for development.
- The sarvodaya society is based on equality and liberty. There is no room in it for unwholesome some competition, exploitation and class-hatred.
- Sarvodaya stands for the progress of the all. All individual should do individual labour and follow the ideal of non possession. Then it will be possible to realize the goal of: from each according to his work and to each according to his needs.
- There will be no private property, the instrument of exploitation and the source of social distinctions and hatred. Similarly, the profit motive will disappear, rent and interest to will go.
- The Sarvodaya Movement is based on Truth, Non-violence and Self-denial.
- The Sarvodaya Movement makes a sincere and bold attempt to create the necessary atmosphere to bring together such individuals with an unwavering faith in the Welfare of All
- The gain to the individual would be small. The development of each quality depends upon every other. If all the qualities are improved a little, then the individual would gain more.

Sarvodaya Movement:

Gandhi's ideals have lasted well beyond the achievement of one of his chief projects, Indian independence (Swaraj). His followers in India (notably, Vinoba Bhave) continued working to promote the kind of society that he envisioned, and their efforts have come to be known as the Sarvodaya Movement. Anima Bose has referred to the movement's philosophy as "a fuller and richer concept of people's democracy than any we have yet known." Sarvodaya workers associated with Vinoba, J. P. Narayan, Dada Dharmadhikari, Dharendra Mazumdaar, Shankarrao Deo, K. G. Mashruwala undertook various projects aimed at encouraging popular

self-organization during the 1950s and 1960s, including Bhoodan and Gramdan movements. Many groups descended from these networks continue to function locally in India today.⁵

Agency of Common Welfare:

That Sarvodaya is an agency of Service for Common Welfare Sarvodaya sets its face squarely against the politics of power and exploitation. It lays great emphasis on moral and spiritual values. It seeks to create new social and economical values. The concept of possession yields place to the concept of trusteeship. People will work for the good of all and family feeling will animate the entire community. There will be fullest scope for freedom, fellowship and equality.

The state is to be an agency of power. Gramrajya is a base of non-violence. Sarvodaya stands for good of all and not for the good of any particular individual or class. Bhoodan at the early stage, Gramdan at a later stage and Sampattidan will bring about a change of heart. The rich and poor will give up their ideas of attachment to private property and will strive to work for the good of all.

Conclusion

So, lastly we can conclude that Sarvodaya ideals are not practicable. Though the ideals of sarvodaya will be noble. Nobody can find fault with them, in the actual world. They will be found wanting. It will be almost impossible to establish a society strictly on the basis of great principles by Mahatma Gandhi and others. Sarvodaya doctrines are soaring and it is doubtful whether they can rest on the earth. The poor record of Panchayat Raj in India bears testimony to the backward condition in which people are. In the highly competitive world, one country can not succeed in having Gramraj. Unless all states in the world accept the Sarvodaya idea. The chances of having it in a particular country like India are bleak. As well as, it is difficult to bring a change of the heart in the youth, who is given to selfishness. People donated useless land in response to the Bhoodan.

Dr. B. R. AMBEDKARS CONCEPT OF SOCIAL JUSTICE

The concept of social justice is broader than that of justice. The word 'social' is connected with society. Its scope is wide, including social issues, problems and reforms, thereby it encompasses social and economic change. Social justice involves measures taken for the

advancement of the depressed and disadvantaged classes of society. Hence it calls for social engineering which is an attempt to change society in order to deal with social problems. Such socio-economic changes can be brought through law. Social justice aims towards creating political, economic and social democracy, ending class and caste distinctions. It combines the principles of socialism with the personal freedom granted by democracy. So the word 'social' has a wide connotation, connected with society and how it should be organized, and what should be its social values and structure.

1The concept of justice can be defined by different perspectives. The Greek philosopher Plato saw justice as the true principle of social life. According to Ernest Barker, an English political scientist, justice was the hinge of Plato's thoughts and the text of his discourse

.2 Plato in his book *The Republic* discusses the concept of justice through a dialogue with friends like Cephalous, Polemarchus and Glaucon. Cephalus says justice consists in speaking the truth and paying one's debt, while Polemarchus explains justice is in giving to each man what is proper for him. "Justice is the art which gives good to friends and evil to enemies." Glaucon argues justice is in "the interest of the weaker Thrasymachus, a sophist of ancient Greece, saw justice as the interest of the stronger, in other words, might is right. Plato rejected all these definitions because they treated justice as something external and artificial. For Plato, justice is the primary moral value and is intrinsically linked with other essential and moral qualities

.3Another Greek philosopher, Aristotle, propounded the concept of 'distributive justice'. Aristotle's distributive justice is the name of that principle of distribution by which goods, services, honour and offices are distributed among the citizens of the state. But the principle of distribution is based upon the worth or virtue of an individual. The principle recognizes and preserves distinction between the worthy and the non-worthy. It counters equality of the unequal and ensures that a man's rights, duties and rewards correspond to his merit and social contribution. Aristotelian distributive justice is thus, another name for proportionate equality. The word 'justice' means fair treatment of people: which means law based on the principles of justice and rationality, that is, equal rights and justice for all, irrespective of class, sex, race or caste distinctions. It means that the state should deal with people correctly and completely; it should be morally fair and reasonable; and it should frame just laws and enact them justly

.4The word 'social justice' is formed by combining two words: social and justice. Each has a specific meaning and they convey a particular meaning when conjoined. According to John Rawls, the concept of social justice is: all social primary goods – liberty and opportunity, income and wealth, and the basis of self-respect are to be distributed equally unless an unequal distribution of any or all of these goods is to the advantage of the least favored.

Roscoe Pound, a jurist, classifies three legally protected interests: □public interests social interests and private interests.⁶Justice V R Krishna Iyer, a former judge of the Supreme Court of India, says, “Social justice is not cant but conscience, not verbal borrowing from like documents but the social force of the supreme law”. Social justice is people oriented, legal justice is canalized, controlled and conferred by law.⁷The concept of social justice is multi-dimensional and has been viewed differently by scholars of law, philosophy and political science.

The term social justice is quite comprehensive and presents as the balancing wheel between the haves and the have not's. Social justice is the equitable distribution of social, material and political resources to all citizens. It seeks to remove all social, economic and political inequalities and discriminations, and affords equal opportunities to all men and women in social affairs and economic activities. Social justice is the product of social injustice; it seeks to ensure equality of status and opportunity to all. In general, it may be defined as “the right of the weak, poor, aged, destitute, children, women and other under-privileged persons in society”.

3.4 AMBEDKAR'S VIEWS ON SOCIAL JUSTICE

According to B. R. Ambedkar, social justice is a means to create an ideal or a just society. To him a just society is a casteless society, based on the principles of social justice and a combination of three components: liberty, equality and fraternity. Ambedkar's ideal society is based upon two fundamental principles. The first is that the individual is an end in himself and that the aim and object of society is the growth of the individual and development of his personality. Society is not above the individual and if the individual has to subordinate himself to society, it is because such subordination is for his betterment and only to the extent necessary. The second essential is that the terms of associated life between members of society must be regarded by consideration founded on liberty, equality and fraternity.⁸James Massey writes that in Ambedkar's view, a caste-based society gives no place to an individual, whereas, in Ambedkar's proposed society, individual is the final end. In a caste-based society a person's relationship with members of other classes is already fixed. But in the society envisioned by Ambedkar, relations have to be based on liberty, equality and fraternity.⁹ Besides the two essential principles, one of the most important components is 'justice', or the 'principle of justice', because for Ambedkar, “the norm or the criterion for judging right and wrong in the modern society is justice”. Justice, according to him, was “simply another name for liberty, equality and fraternity.”¹⁰ Thus the key components of Ambedkar's concept of social justice are liberty, equality and fraternity. The first component is liberty. Ambedkar, quoting Laski, said: that for liberty to be real, it must be accompanied by certain social conditions.

Firstly, there should be social equality. Privilege tilts the balance of social action in favour of its possessors. The more equal are the social rights of citizens, the more able they are to utilize their freedom.....If liberty is to move to its appointed end it is important that there should be equality.¹¹ Secondly, there must be economic security. A man may be free to enter any vocation he may choose....yet if he is deprived of security in employment, he becomes a prey of mental and physical servitude incompatible with the very essence of liberty.....The perpetual fear of the morrow, its haunting sense of impending disaster, its fitful search for happiness and beauty which perpetually eludes, shows that without economic security, liberty is not worth having. Men may well be free and yet remain unable to realize the purposes of freedom.¹² Thirdly, knowledge must be made available to all individuals. In the modern complex world, man lives at his peril and must find his way in it without losing his freedom. There can, under these conditions, be no freedom that is worthwhile unless the mind is trained to use its freedom. The right of man to education becomes fundamental to his freedom. Deprive a man of knowledge and you will make him inevitably the slave of those more fortunate than himself.....deprivation of knowledge is a denial of the power to use liberty for great ends. An ignorant man may be free.....but he cannot employ his freedom, so as to give him assurance of happiness.¹³ So, Ambedkar believed that the three essential conditions that make liberty real were: □ social equality, economic equality and access to knowledge. He believed that there can be no real liberty in ancient societies and under Hinduism because of the absence of these three conditions. The second component of social justice is equality. It means all men are of the same essence, all men are equal and everyone is entitled to the same fundamental rights and to equal liberty. Ambedkar says, The system of rank and gradation is, simply another way of enunciating the principle of inequality so that it may be truly said that Hinduism does not recognize equality.¹⁴ It is to be noted that in ancient societies there is no equality because they are based on the principle of gradation and rank. The antique society as also Hinduism lead to a degradation of human personality because of denial of social and religious equality. Ambedkar held that with social justice, equality would be the mainstay of a modern society. The third component of social justice is fraternity. Ambedkar, talking about the importance of fraternity in a society, writes, There are two forces prevalent in society such as Individualism and fraternity.

Individualism is ever present. Every individual is ever asking “I and my neighbors, are we all brothers, are we even fiftieth cousins, am I their keeper, why should I do right to them” and under the pressure of his own particular interests acting as though he was an end to himself, thereby developing a non-social and even an anti-social self. Fraternity is a force of opposite character. Fraternity is another name for fellow feeling. It consists in a sentiment which leads an individual to identify himself with the good of others whereby “the good of others becomes to him a thing naturally and necessarily to be attended to like any of the physical conditions of our existence.” It is because of this sentiment of fraternity that the individual does not “bring

himself to think of the rest of his fellow-creatures as struggling rivals with him for the means of happiness, whom he must desire to see defeated in their object in order that he may succeed in his own.” Individualism would produce anarchy. It is only fraternity which prevents it and helps to sustain the moral order among men.¹⁵ Ambedkar believed that it is only fraternity which prevents anarchy and helps to sustain the moral order among men. Individualism produces anarchy. Without fraternity, which is a very significant component of social justice, an ideal society is inconceivable. Therefore, according to Ambedkar, the core components of social justice are liberty, equality and fraternity. Social justice means a complete change in the fundamental notions of individual life and a complete change in our outlook and attitude towards men and things. Ambedkar was fully aware of the pattern and problems of Indian society. Hence Ambedkar’s concept of social justice included: □unity and equality of all human beings equal worth of men and women respect for the weak and the lowly regard for human rights benevolence, mutual love, sympathy, tolerance and charity towards fellow beings humane treatment in all cases dignity of all citizens abolition of caste distinctions education and property for all and good will and gentleness. He emphasized more on fraternity and emotional integration. His view on social justice was to remove man-made inequalities of all shades through law, morality and public conscience. He stood for justice for a sustainable society.¹⁶ According to Ambedkar the root cause of social injustice to the Scheduled Castes and Scheduled Tribes was the caste system in Hindu society. He observed that castes are enclosed units and it is their conspiracy with clear conscience that compels the excommunicated to make themselves into a caste. The logic of their obdurate circumstance is merciless and it is in obedience to its force that some unfortunate groups find themselves closed out with the result that now groups by a mechanical law are constantly being converted into castes in a widening multiplicity. He further maintained that the root of untouchability was the caste system; the root of the caste system was religion; the root of the religion was attached to varnashram; the root of the varnashram was Brahmanism and the root of Brahminism lies in political power.¹⁷ Ambedkar’s social vision is reflected in his own words. As an economic system permitting exploitation without obligation, untouchability is not only a system of unmitigated economic exploitation, but it is also a system of uncontrolled economic exploitation. That is because there is no independent public opinion to condemn it and there is no impartial machinery of administration to restrain it, there is no check from the police or the judiciary for the simple reason that they are all Hindus, and take side of exploiters.¹⁸ B. R. Ambedkar was fully aware of the pitiable and pathetic condition and the low status of women in the Indian society. He tried to uplift women generally and Hindu women in particular. According to Ambedkar, women were treated as mere tools to bear the burdens of the family and were restricted to the role of bearing children and fulfilling duties of a wife or mother. Division of labour is not in their favour, as a result Indian women have lost their identity. They have to face discrimination on the basis of gender and because of this, equal opportunity remains a dream for them. They have to endure poverty, illiteracy, lack of health, inequality and powerlessness. Traditional attitudes regard them as physically, intellectually and socially

inferior to men and subject them to male exploitation and unjustified division of labour. Such a society, where women, comprising half of the population, have a low status, came into being primarily due to the fact that women have no control over material and social resources. This is further compounded by lack of participation opportunities for women, in the decision-making process of the family.¹⁹ The concept of social justice is enshrined in the Indian Constitution. The fathers of the Indian Constitution had a dream of a new social, economic and political order, the soul of which was social justice. Ambedkar was the chief architect of the Indian Constitution. He was fully aware of the pattern and problems of the Indian society and the conflicting interests. The Constitution is a monumental example of social engineering. Social justice is not defined in the Indian Constitution. It is a relative concept, taking in its wings the time and circumstances, the people and their backwardness, blood, sweat and tears.²⁰ The Constitution of India brings a renaissance in the concept of social justice when it weaves the trinity of the Preamble, the fundamental rights, and the directive principles of state policies. This trinity is the “the core of the commitments to the social revolution.”²¹ Though social justice is not defined in the Constitution, the Preamble, the directive principles of state policy and the fundamental rights clearly illustrate the philosophy of social justice. Social justice, according to a writer is, a relative concept taking in its wings the time and circumstances, the people, their traditions and aspirations, their turmoil and torrents, their backwardness, blood, sweat and tears.²² Therefore, all these three sections are important for social transformation and reconstruction of the Indian society, which constitute the gist of social justice. Ambedkar argued that social justice alone could lead to social harmony, social stability and patriotic feelings of all individuals in society.

MODULE NO. 5. CONTEMPORARY POLITICAL THEORIES AND VIEWPOINTS

THEORIES OF ENVIRONMENT

Environmental politics designate both the politics about the environment^a and an academic field of study focused on three core components:

- The study of political theories and ideas related to the environment;
-
- The examination of the environmental stances of both mainstream political parties and environmental social movements; and
-
- The analysis of public policymaking and implementation affecting the environment, at multiple geo-political levels.

Neil Carter, in his foundational text *Politics of the Environment* (2009), suggests that *environmental* politics is distinct in at least two ways: first, "it has a primary concern with the relationship between human society and the natural world" (page 3); and second, "unlike most other single issues, it comes replete with its own ideology and political movement" (page 5, drawing on Michael Jacobs, ed., *Greening the Millenium?*, 1997).

Further, he distinguishes between modern and earlier forms of environmental politics, in particular conservationism and preservationism. Contemporary environmental politics "was driven by the idea of a global ecological crisis that threatened the very existence of humanity." And "modern environmentalism was a political and activist mass movement which demanded a radical transformation in the values and structures of society."

Environmental concerns were rooted in the vast social changes that took place in the United States after World War II. Although environmentalism can be identified in earlier years, only after the war did it become widely shared social priority. This began with outdoor recreation in the 1950s, extended into the wider field of the protection of natural environments, and then became infused with attempts to cope with air and water pollution and still later with toxic chemical pollutants. After World War II, environmental politics became a major public concern.[3] The development of environmentalism in the United Kingdom emerged in this period following the great London smog of 1952 and the Torrey Canyon oil spill of 1967.[4] This is reflected by the emergence of Green politics in the Western world beginning in the 1970s.

Democratic challenges

Climate change is slow relative to political cycles of leadership in electoral democracies, which impedes responses by politicians who are elected and re-elected on much shorter timescales.[5] In the United States, although "environmentalism" was once considered a White phenomenon, scholars have identified "pro-environment positions among Latino, African-American, and non-Hispanic white respondents," with growing environmental concern especially among Latinos.[6] Other scholars have similarly noted that Asian Americans are strongly pro-environmental, with some variation among ethnic subgroups.

Effectively responding to global warming necessitates some form of international environmental governance to achieve shared targets related to energy consumption and environmental usage.[8] Climate change complicates political ideology and practice, affecting conceptions of responsibility for future societies as well as economic systems.[8] Material inequality between nations make technological solutions insufficient for climate change mitigation. [8] Rather, political solutions can navigate the particularities of various facets of environmental crisis. Climate change mitigation strategies can be at odds with democratic priorities of prosperity, progress, and state sovereignty, and instead underscore a collective relationship with the environment.

The international political community is presently based on liberal principles that prioritize individual freedoms and capitalist systems that make quick and ambitious climate responses difficult.[8] Interest-group liberalism is guided by individual human priorities.[9] Groups unable to voice their self-interest, such as minorities without suffrage, or non-humans, are not included in the political compromise. Addressing environmental crises can be impeded when citizens of liberal democracies do not see environmental problems as impacting their lives, or when they lack the education to evaluate the importance of the problem.[10] The human benefits from environmental exploitation and protection compete.[10] Considering the implications of ecological degradation for future human generations can give environmental concerns a basis in anthropocentric liberal democratic politics.

William Ophuls posits that liberal democracies are unfit to address environmental problems, and that the prioritization of these challenges would involve a transition to more authoritarian forms of government.[11] Others counter this by pointing to the past successes of environmental reform movements to improve water and air quality in liberal societies.[9] In practice, environmentalism can improve democracy rather than necessitate its end, by expanding democratic participation and promoting political innovations.

The tensions between liberal democracy and environmental goals raise questions about the possible limitations of democracy (or at least democracy as we know it): in its responsiveness to subtle but large-scale problems, its ability to work from a holistic societal perspective, its aptness in coping with environmental crisis relative to other forms of government.[10] Democracies do not have the provisions to make environmental reforms that

are not mandated by voters, and many voters lack incentives or desire to demand policies that could compromise immediate prosperity. The question arises as to whether the foundation of politics is morality or practicality.[10] A scheme that conceives of and values the environment beyond its human utility, an environmental ethics, could be crucial for democracies to respond to climate change.

Alternative forms of democracy for environmental policy.

In political theory, deliberative democracy has been discussed as a political model more compatible with environmental goals. Deliberative democracy is a system in which informed political equals weigh values, information, and expertise, and debate priorities to make decisions, as opposed to a democracy based on interest aggregation.[13] This definition of democracy emphasizes informed discussion among citizens in the decision making process, and encourages decisions to benefit the common good rather than individual interests.[9] Amy Gutmann and Dennis Thompson claimed that reason prevails over self-interest in deliberative democracy, making it a more just system.[14] The broad perspective that this discursive model encourages could lead to a stronger engagement with environmental concerns.[9]

In political theory, the lottery system is a democratic design that allows governments to address problems with future, rather than immediate, impacts. Deliberative bodies composed of randomly selected representatives can draft environmental policies that have short-term costs without considering the political consequences for re-election.[5]

New materialism and environmental justice.

New materialism is a strain of thought in philosophy and the social sciences that conceives of all material as having life or agency.[15] It criticizes frameworks of justice that center on human attributes like consciousness as insufficient for modern ethical problems that concern the natural environment. It is a post-humanist consideration of all matter that rejects arguments of utility that privilege humans. This politically relevant social theory combats inequality beyond the interpersonal plane.[16] People are ethically responsible for one another, and for the physical spaces they navigate, including animal and plant life, and the inanimate matter that sustains it, like soil. New materialism encourages political action according to this world vision, even if it is incompatible with economic growth.[16]

Jane Bennett uses the term "vital materialism" in her book *Vibrant Matter: A Political Ecology of Things*. She develops the concept of materialism with the aim of providing a stronger basis in political theory for environmental politics.

New materialists have invoked Derrida and other historical thinkers to trace the emergence of their philosophy and to justify their environmental claims.

Feminism

Definition of Feminism:

There are number of definitions of feminism and a very lucid one has been offered by the author of the article published in Oxford Concise Dictionary of Politics.

“Feminism is a way of looking at the world which women occupy from the perspective of women. It has at its central focus the concept of patriarchy which can be described as a system of male authority which oppresses women through its social, political and economic institutions. Feminism is, therefore, a critique of patriarchy on the one hand and an ideology committed to women’s emancipation on the other”.

Feminism is, therefore, a doctrine which is concerned with emancipation of women. But broadly speaking the concept embraces other areas of women’s life such as their development, role in political, social, cultural and economic affairs. It also talks about women’s rights and freedom.

The social and political structure have been built up in such a manner that women are not always at par with men in various affairs of society and this has practically given birth to a male-dominated society. Feminism, therefore, wants to highlight the idea that, since women form one-half of the population, social progress (interpreted in all senses) can never be a reality without the complete and spontaneous participation of women.

Feminism vs Feminist Approach to Politics:

Readers here are confronted with two terms—feminism and feminist approach to politics. To remove this confusion the two terms need to be clarified. We have already noted that feminism is a movement whose aim is to accelerate the social role of women because without this role and its advancement all-round progress is practically an impossibility. Hence feminism is an ideology.

But this concept cannot throw sufficient light on feminist approach to politics—when it was strongly felt that without women’s whole-hearted participation in all sorts of social functions neither social development nor their emancipation are possible. Naturally gender equality has become an issue of great importance. In order to ensure women’s participation and realisation of their rights a change in the entire structure of society must be made effective and this can be done only through political machinery—state and its agencies.

A long-drawn movement—both academic and non-academic—can turn this concept into a reality. It is necessary to note here that in real sense feminism and feminist approach to politics are not different ideas or concepts; both are interlinked. Women are to be treated in equal terms with men—this is the basic concept. This is a demand and this has led to a movement. Both academic and non-academic ideas are associated with these two.

Rise and Development of the Concept:

Early History:

Though feminism or feminist approach to politics is chiefly a product of the second half of the twentieth century its origin can be traced as far back as the ancient civilizations of China, Greece and India. In all these countries, from the history we come to know, women had special position and honour and they were found to participate in various affairs of the society.

In Brihadaranyaka Upanishad there are several conversations between Maitreyee and her husband Yajnavalkya which denote that women had freedom and opportunity to actively participate in religious, social, cultural and ethical issues and they could record their valued opinion on these matters. Both in ancient India and China women were respected, Christine de Pisan's Book of the City of Ladies was published in 1405 and this book foreshadowed many of the ideas of modern feminism.

At the fag end of the eighteenth century several people voiced this resentment against the inappropriate and unequal treatment meted out to women. It was declared that since women form one-half of population and they are moral, intelligent and rational beings they must have equal rights with men.

This concept was vigorously advocated by Mary Wollstonecraft (1759-1797). She published A Vindication of the Rights of Women in 1792. Wollstonecraft wrote the book in the backdrop of the French Revolution (1789). Subsequently the movement earned greater momentum.

Wollstonecraft and Feminism

We award special treatment to Wollstonecraft's contribution to the cause of feminism. At the end of the eighteenth century it was really a courageous effort to fight for the cause of women. In the above-noted book she said, "If the abstract rights of man will bear discussion and explanations, those of women, by a parity of reasoning, will not shrink from the same test."

She also observed that if men are allowed to enjoy freedom and happiness is it not unjust and inconsistent to deprive women of the same? She charged the society with the argument that it is deliberately depriving the women of various rights and freedom and this is done in a calculated way. She asked who made man the exclusive judge. Both men and women have the gift of reason.

But the structure of society makes a discrimination. Wollstonecraft made the following suggestion: Women ought to have representatives, instead of being arbitrarily governed without having any direct share. Here we have given special importance to Wollstonecraft's view because of the fact that what she said in 1792 is still important and, at the same time, thought-provoking today. The central idea of feminism or feminist approach to politics was forcefully advocated by her. She is regarded as pioneer in this field.

In the 19th and 20th Centuries:

Feminism assumed the character of a movement in the thirties and forties of the nineteenth century. In many parts of USA women gathered at the street corner meetings and demanded equal rights and privileges with men and in the sixties this movement gathered momentum when the demand for the abolition of slavery tormented the entire political scene of USA. Conventions were held at different places of USA and in those conventions women demanded that they would be given equal rights with men.

The women's movement was particularly strong in the industrially advanced and democratic countries of the West. J. S. Mill (1806-1873) vehemently opposed the tactics to oppress the women's movement and he strongly advocated political and other rights for women. He criticised the steps taken by the House of Commons for defeating the proposal for women suffrage.

At the beginning of the twentieth century women formed associations and accelerated their movement for the realisation of their demand for suffrage. The movement first started in Britain and France and spread subsequently in other parts of Western Europe.

In some cases the movement was quite militant in nature because the sponsors and supporters of the movement not only campaigned for their cause but also resorted to attacks upon property. This particularly happened in Paris and other areas.

Recent Picture:

Though feminism was a late eighteenth century product its actual development took place in the second half of twentieth century. Particularly after the 1960 the feminist movement began to draw the attention of many serious people of both sides of Atlantic.

The American feminist and political activist Betty Friedan published *The Feminine Mystique* in 1963 and immediately after the publication the book created ripples in the academic and political circles. What she emphasise was that the advanced democratic countries of the world were granting several political and other rights to women and in spite of this the central question of women was far away from any solution.

The main question was the complete emancipation of women from male domination. This question would be solved if women were granted equal rights with men; they were allowed to participate in all affairs of state and society. The arguments of Frieden were accepted by other feminist leaders.

In the seventies and eighties several other books were published in support of the movement and because of this feminism were termed as a wave. Two books were published in 1970. One was Kate Millett's *Sexual Politics* (1970) and Germaine Greer's *The Female Eunuch*. The publication of these books encouraged the women community to strengthen the movement and men began to take active interest in women's movement. etc.

Women and Political Science:

"Women are Systematically Ignored":

On a different perspective it has been pointed out that the intellect and wisdom of women have not been duly recognised in political science. In recent years, women scholars began to study the different branches of political science and they were surprised to find that in this subject there are many paradigms and these do not make any due recognition of the importance of women and, as a result of it, in the entire system of analysis there are many gaps and distortions.

This created a lot of resentment in the minds of women scholars of the discipline. The male scholars of political science and its various branches have built up theoretical and conceptual frameworks without mentioning the contribution of women. The tangible consequence is all the paradigms and conceptual frameworks have remained incomplete. Sometimes these have deliberately distorted the importance of women's scholarship.

The women scholars, have questioned the veracity of various paradigms and conceptual frameworks. This approach of women scholars is quite natural because no discipline can claim its development complete without proper recognition of women scholars. Even if any discipline suffers from scarcity of women scholars attempts shall be made to arouse the interests of women.

Politics is a Masculine Product:

Only one aspect of male-dominated politics, that is theoretical, is highlighted. But there is a vast field of political science, which is a practical one. In all industrialised developed countries

of the world there are well-organised institutions and well-built administrative structure. In democracies all these do function well to satisfy the requirements of the authority and they do not leave any stone unturned to cater the interests of elite groups and ruling class.

But there is a dark corner behind this so-called well-illuminated and highly publicised picture. Let us see how a critic puts the matter “Historically, the actions of governments have been the actions of men, their politics—both foreign and domestic, have been made by men”.

All aspects of domestic and foreign affairs are more or less dominated by men. Even policies are determined by men. Women’s function and responsibility practically terminate at the point of exercising right to vote. This function we may call peripheral.

Because women are not fully and deeply involved in these functions such as policy-making and policy-implementation. The majority policy-makers of all the developed countries of the world are men. “Concepts such as justice, equality, citizen participation, democracy, political obligation, social contract theory were developed by men”.

Gender-Bias in Early Politics:

In order to have a clear idea about the importance or role of women in politics/political science it is necessary that attention should be focused on ancient literature of politics. Plato’s Republic and Aristotle’s Politics have not paid due consideration to the contribution of women to the academic analysis of political science and other subjects.

In the constitution, management and administration of ideal state women’s role is almost absent. The guardian class devotes the time and energy to the cause of ideal state and it is capable of doing this because this class is completely relieved of the day-to-day drudgery of earning livelihood and this is performed by slaves, women and workers.

Thus we see that the ideal state is built upon the wisdom of guardian class consisting of men only. But the common sense knowledge teaches us that the wealth, intellect and prosperity of the ideal state could not be built sans the hard labour of women. Aristotle made a compromise between private life and public life by subordinating the former to the latter.

Men will enjoy freedom and leisure so that they can pursue political and intellectual activities and women are the providers of leisure and freedom. Middle Ages could not produce any remarkable political scientist.

But, however, all sorts of political activities were dominated by men. In Middle Ages politics was controlled by religion and religion was controlled by men. In Machiavelli’s The Prince we find the same thing. Women were subordinated to men. Rousseau and other thinkers did not make any concession for women.

A Change in Attitude is Necessary:

If we look at the history of Western political thought we shall come across two clear opposite trends. Firstly, political theory is by and large dominated by the thoughts and ideas expanded by male political scientists which may lead one to think that women have no contribution. The other trend is that there have been challenges to this notion. Political theory and political affairs cannot be the exclusive domains of male thinkers.

There are a very good number of political scientists of the women category. But the tragedy is that their contribution has failed to draw attention and proper recognition. Women are quite capable of thinking political theory in a befitting manner and they can also participate in political affairs.

For the proper recognition of women's contribution it is essential that males must change their attitude. Everywhere the common term "individual" is used. But individual includes both men and women and to reach this goal men must change their attitude. In today's democracy the unitary concept prevails. But a real democracy is of a federal character.

It is managed and flourished by both men and women. In a real democracy there is no place of sexual difference. The patriarchal character of modern society deliberately ignores the importance of women. This outlook must change out and out. There are physiological differences between man and woman which have nothing to do with the political theory.

Recent Trends:

There have been occurred some encouraging trends in recent years. They have taken place in large scale in industrialised societies of West and in a smaller scale in the developing societies of the Third World. One trend is qualified and able women are participating in administration which was previously a male domain.

It has been found that women have all 'the good qualities required for running and managing administration. Another trend is in almost all the spheres of public life women have entered into the keen competition with men. These two spectacular trends have enormously strengthened the position of women in the academic sphere. Even many male academicians have persuasively argued that women are at par with men in so far as their intellect is concerned.

All combinedly have encouraged women to come forward with their intellects and ideas and they have considerably enriched political thought. Women's participation in political affairs, in compared with earlier ages, has also increased.

This makes democracy participatory in its true sense. Many states of both West and East are making concessions to women so that they can compete with men in all spheres. In spite of all

these the cause of the women is still a neglected domain and women are variously battered by the patriarchal structure of society.

Conclusion:

In almost all the states of the Third World women are deprived of basic rights and privileges. Their role in policy-making and management is far below the expectation. Only a very few women win elections and happen to be law-makers. In academic fields the number of women is rising but here again the number is not up to the desirable limit.

In family and social affairs they are not at par with men. The rate of the progress of women in the developing nations is so slow that it can reasonably be called a frustration. Because of this, it is alleged, women's cause, ideas and intellect are not duly reflected in the policies and decisions.

Even the academic outputs in different disciplines are not satisfactory at all. In family, in society, in politics and in the affairs of the state women are subject to exploitation. There must be an end to all kinds of exploitation.

Rights: Meaning ; concept of Human Rights

A right is described as an entitlement or justified claim to a certain kind of positive and negative treatment from others, to support from others or non-interference from others. In other words, a right is something to which every individual in the community is morally permitted, and for which that community is entitled to disrespect or compulsorily remove anything that stands in the way of even a single individual getting it. Rights belong to individuals, and no organisation has any rights not directly derived from those of its members as individuals; and, just as an individual's rights cannot extend to where they will intrude on another individual's rights, similarly the rights of any organisation whatever must yield to those of a single individual, whether inside or outside the organisation. Rights are those important conditions of social life without which no person can generally realize his best self. These are the essential conditions for health of both the individual and his society. It is only when people get and enjoy rights that they can develop their personalities and contribute their best services to the society.

In simple words, rights are the common claims of people which every cultured society recognizes as essential claims for their development, and which are therefore enforced by the state.

1. According to Laski, “Rights are those conditions of social life without which no man can seek in general, to be himself at his best.”
2. T. H. Green explained that “Rights are powers necessary for the fulfilment of man’s vocation as a moral being.”
3. Beni Prasad stated that “Rights are nothing more nor less than those social conditions which are necessary or favourable to the development of personality”

Other moral theorists like Isaiah Berlin defines rights in terms of positive liberties and negative freedoms. A positive right is an entitlement to; A right to free expression, for instance, entitles one to voice opinions publicly. A negative right is a freedom from; Freedom of person is a right to be free of bodily interference. Most rights are both positive and negative.

Main features of Rights:

1. Rights exist only in society. These are the products of social living.
2. Rights are claims of the individuals for their development in society.
3. Rights are recognized by the society as common claims of all the people.
4. Rights are rational and moral claims that the people make on their society.
5. Since rights are here only in society, these cannot be exercised against the society.
6. Rights are to be exercised by the people for their development which really means their development in society by the promotion of social good. Rights can never be exercised against social good.
7. Rights are equally available to all the people.
8. The contents of rights keep on changing with the passage of time.
9. Rights are not absolute. These always bear limitations deemed essential for maintaining public health, security, order and morality.
10. Rights are inseparably related with duties. There is a close relationship between them “No Duties No Rights. No Rights No Duties.” “If I have rights it is my duty to respect the rights of others in society”.
11. Rights need enforcement and only then these can be really used by the people. These are protected and enforced by the laws of the state. It is the duty of a state to protect the rights of the people.

Concept of Human Rights:

Human rights are those moral rights that are morally important and basic, and that are held by every human being because they are possessed in virtue of the universal moral status of human beings. Human rights are one of the significant aspects of human political reality. It is the

moral rights of highest order. Human Rights are evolved out of self-respect. It is intrinsic to all humans without any discrimination of race, sex, nationality, ethnicity, language, religion and colour etc. It received new shape when human beings began to think themselves. Each and every human beings are entitled to these rights without any discrimination. Human rights comprise of civil and political rights, such as the right to life, liberty and freedom of expression; and social, cultural and economic rights including the right to participate in culture, the right to food, and the right to work and receive an education.

Human rights are protected and supported by international and national laws and treaties. The UDHR was the first international document that spelled out the “basic civil, political, economic, social and cultural rights that all human beings should enjoy.” The declaration was ratified without opposition by the UN General Assembly on December 10, 1948. Under human rights treaties, governments have the prime responsibility for protect and promote human rights. However, governments are not solely responsible for ensuring human rights. The UDHR states:

“Every individual and every organ of society shall strive by teaching and education to promote respect for these rights and freedoms and by progressive measures, national and international, to secure their universal and effective recognition and observance.”

In theoretical review, many theorists expressed their views about human rights. S. Kim construed that human rights are "claims and demands essential to the protection of human life and the enhancement of human dignity, and should therefore enjoy full social and political sanctions". According to Subhash C Kashyap, human rights are those “fundamental rights to which every man inhabiting any part of the world should be deemed entitled by virtue of having been born a human being”. Milne opined that “human rights are simply what every human beings owes to every other human being and as such represent universal moral obligation”. According to Nickel, human rights are norms which are definite, high priority universal and existing and valid independently of recognition or implementation in the customs or legal system of particular country.

The Protection of Human Rights Act 1993 describes” Human Rights mean rights relating to life liberty, equality and dignity of the individuals guaranteed by the constitution or embodied in the International Covenants and enforceable by courts in India.”

The United Nation Centre of Human Rights defines Human Rights as “those rights which are inherent in our nature and without which we cannot live as human beings”

The Universal Declaration of Human Rights which adopted on 1948, states human rights as “rights derived from the inherent dignity of human person”

Historical origin of human rights: Records indicated that Though modern historians traced “Magna Carta” of 1215 as the historical beginning of human rights, but its real origin goes back to 539 B.C. when Cyrus, the great (king of ancient Persia) conquered the city of Babylon, he freed all slaves to return home and declared people to choose their own religion and even maintained racial equality. The idea of human rights quickly spread from Babylon to many nations especially India, Greece and eventually Rome where the concept of natural law arose in observation of the fact that people tended to follow certain unwritten laws in due course of life. There the concept of “natural law” arose, in observation of the fact that people tended to follow certain unwritten laws in the course of life, and Roman law was based on rational ideas derived from the nature of things.

Documents asserting individual rights, such as the Magna Carta (1215), the Petition of Right (1628), the US Constitution (1787), the French Declaration of the Rights of Man and of the Citizen (1789), and the US Bill of Rights (1791) are the written precursors to many of today’s human rights documents.

The Magna Carta, or “Great Charter,” was debatably the most important early influence on the extensive historical process that led to the rule of constitutional law today in the English-speaking world. In 1215, after King John of England violated a number of ancient laws and customs by which England had been governed, his subjects forced him to sign the Magna Carta, which enumerates what later came to be thought of as human rights. Among them was the right of the church to be free from governmental interference, the rights of all free citizens to own and inherit property and to be protected from excessive taxes. It established the right of widows who owned property to choose not to remarry, and established principles of due process and equality before the law. It also contained provisions forbidding bribery and official misconduct. The Magna Carta was a crucial defining moment in the fight to establish freedom.

Another breakthrough in the development of human rights was the Petition of Right, produced in 1628 by the English Parliament and sent to Charles I as a statement of civil liberties. Rejection by Parliament to finance the king’s unpopular foreign policy had caused his government to exact forced loans and to quarter troops in subjects’ houses as an economy measure. Arbitrary arrest and imprisonment for opposing these policies had produced in Parliament a violent hostility to Charles and to George Villiers, the Duke of Buckingham. The Petition of Right, introduced by Sir Edward Coke, was based upon earlier statutes and charters and asserted four principles:

1. No taxes may be levied without consent of Parliament.
2. No subject may be imprisoned without cause shown (reaffirmation of the right of habeas corpus).
3. No soldiers may be quartered upon the citizenry.
4. Martial law may not be used in time of peace.

In 1789, the people of France brought about the abolishment of the absolute kingdom and set the stage for the establishment of the first French Republic. Sometime later, the storming of the Bastille, and barely three weeks after the abolition of feudalism, the Declaration of the Rights of Man and of the Citizen (French: La Déclaration des Droits de l'Homme et du Citoyen) was espoused by the National Constituent Assembly as the first step toward writing a constitution for the Republic of France.

The Declaration decrees that all inhabitants are to be guaranteed the rights of “liberty, property, security, and resistance to oppression.” It discusses that the need for law derives from the fact that “the exercise of the natural rights of each man has only those borders which assure other members of the society the enjoyment of these same rights.” Therefore, the Declaration sees law as an “expression of the general will”, intended to promote this equality of rights and to forbid “only actions harmful to the society.”

In 1864, sixteen European countries and several American states attended a conference in Geneva, at the invitation of the Swiss Federal Council, on the initiative of the Geneva Committee. The diplomatic conference was held to adopt a convention for the treatment of wounded soldiers in combat. The main ideologies laid down in the Convention and maintained by the later Geneva Conventions provided for the obligation to extend care without discrimination to wounded and sick military personnel and respect for and marking of medical personnel transports and equipment with the distinctive sign of the red cross on a white background.

By 1948, the United Nation’s new Human Rights Commission had attracted global attention. Under the dynamic headship of Eleanor Roosevelt, President Franklin Roosevelt’s widow, a human rights winner in her own right and the United States delegate to the UN, the Commission set out to draft the document that became the Universal Declaration of Human Rights. Roosevelt, credited with its motivation, referred to the Declaration as the international Magna Carta for all mankind. It was accepted by the United Nations on December 10, 1948. In its prelude and in Article 1, the Declaration unequivocally proclaims the inherent rights of all human beings: “Disregard and contempt for human rights have resulted in barbarous acts which have outraged the conscience of mankind, and the advent of a world in which human beings shall enjoy freedom of speech and belief and freedom from fear and want has been proclaimed as the highest aspiration of the common people. All human beings are born free and equal in dignity and rights.”

The Member States of the United Nations promised to work together to encourage the thirty Articles of human rights that, for the first time in history, had been assembled and codified into a single document. As a result, many of these rights, in various forms, are part of the constitutional laws of democratic nations in present situation.

In nut shell, The written inventor to the modern human rights documents are the English Bill of Rights (1689), the American Declaration of Independence (1776), the French Declaration of the Rights of Man and Citizen (1789), the first Ten Amendments of the Constitution of the United States (Bill of Rights 1791) and the Universal Declaration of Human Rights of UN (1948).

Human rights is the basic rights and freedom of all human, it include the right to life, liberty, freedom of thought, expression and equality before the law. It is unified, interdependent and indivisible.

Rights agree to duties in three ways:

1. Individual duties of forbearance (non-interference)
2. Institutional duties of assistance
3. Individual duties of assistance

If we consider the right to property, conceived primarily as the right not to have one's personal property taken without one's consent. This implies that

- a. Other individuals have a duty to forbear from taking a person's possessions without his or her consent.
- b. Institutions, such as governments, should establish and enforce laws against theft and should do so in all neighbourhoods where theft is a possibility.
- c. Officials in the government have an individual duty, as officials, to support such laws and or enforce them.

The individual duties of assistance are performed in several ways: If the government were lax in this area, citizens might have a positive duty to pressure government to pass an appropriate law if one were missing or to enforce already existing laws.

Beyond that, individual citizens who are aware of persons with sticky fingers, as it were, have an obligation, where it could be done at reasonable cost to themselves, to thwart acts of theft.

Many theories have been developed to explain human rights. According to Dr. Justice Durga Das Basu, "Human rights are those minimal rights, which every individual must have against the State, or other public authority, by virtue of his being a 'member of human family' irrespective of any consideration. The philosopher John Finnis argues that human rights are reasonable on the grounds of their instrumental value in creating the necessary conditions for human well-being.

The Universal Declaration of Human Rights (UDHR), 1948, stated that human rights as “rights derived from the inherent dignity of the human person.” Human rights when they are guaranteed by a written constitution are known as “Fundamental Rights” because a written constitution is the fundamental law of the state.

Characteristics of human rights:

1. **Human Rights are Inalienable:** Human rights are deliberated on an individual due to the very nature of his existence. They are innate in all individuals irrespective of their caste, creed, religion, sex and nationality. Human rights are conferred to an individual even after his death. The different rituals in different religions bear testimony to this fact.
2. **Human Rights are essential and necessary:** Human rights are needed to maintain the moral, physical, social and spiritual welfare of an individual. Human rights are also essential as they provide suitable conditions for material and moral upliftment of the people.
3. **Human Rights are associated with human dignity:** To treat another individual with dignity regardless of the fact that the person is a male or female, rich or poor is concerned with human dignity.
4. **Human Rights are Irrevocable:** Human rights are irrevocable as they cannot be taken away by any power or authority because these rights originate with the social nature of man in the society of human beings and they belong to a person simply because he is a human being. As such human rights have similarities to moral rights.
5. **Human Rights are essential for the fulfilment of purpose of life:** Human life has a purpose. The phrase “human right” is applied to those conditions which are essential for the fulfilment of this purpose. No government has the power to curtail or take away the rights which are sacrosanct, inviolable and immutable.
6. **Human Rights are Universal:** Human rights are not a domination of any privileged class of people. Human rights are universal in nature, without consideration and without exception. The values such as divinity, dignity and equality which form the basis of these rights are inherent in human nature.
7. **Human Rights are never absolute:** Man is a social animal and he lives in a civic society, which always put certain limitations on the enjoyment of his rights and freedoms. Human rights as such are those limited powers or claims, which are contributory to the common good and which are recognized and guaranteed by the State, through its laws to the individuals. As such each right has certain limitations.
8. **Human Rights are Dynamic:** Human rights are not stationary, they are dynamic. Human rights go on expanding with socio-economic-cultural and political developments within the State. Judges have to construe laws in such ways as are in tune with the changed social values.
9. **Rights as limits to state power:** Human rights infer that every individual has legitimate claims upon his or her society for certain freedom and benefits. So human rights limit the state’s power. These may be in the form of negative restrictions, on the powers of the State,

from violating the inalienable freedoms of the individuals, or in the nature of demands on the State, i.e. positive obligations of the State.

Principles of human rights:

- Universality
- Inviolable
- Inalienable
- Indivisible
- Interdependent
- Inter-related
- Universality
- Inviolable
- Inalienable
- Indivisible
- Interdependent
- Inter-related
- Equality
- Non-discriminatory

Positive Rights:

Positive rights, initially proposed in 1979 by the Czech jurist Karel Vasak, may include other civil and political rights such as police protection of person and property and the right to counsel, as well as economic, social and cultural rights such as food, housing, public education, employment, national security, military, health care, social security, internet access, and a minimum standard of living.

Negative Rights:

Negative rights are an absolute right whose slightest violation breaks this right. Right not be tortured. Duty bearer has to refrain.

Distinctions between Negative and Positive Rights:

Many writers distinguish between negative rights and positive rights.

Negative rights would correspond to duties of forbearance: If X has a negative right to V, then others have a non-interference duty in relation to X's enjoyment of V.

Positive rights would correspond to duties of assistance: If X has a positive right to V, then others (perhaps government) have a (positive) duty to provide X with V.

It can also be used to defend securing for human beings what they need in order to function as rational beings.

Categories of Rights:

Human rights can be grouped into following categories:

- Civil Human Rights
- Political Human Rights
- Economic Human Rights
- Social and Cultural Human Rights
- Development Oriented Human Rights

1. In the era of the seventeenth, eighteenth and nineteenth centuries, the civil and political rights, were strengthened which assured civil and political liberties. The Civil and Political Human Rights are collectively known as 'Liberty Oriented Human Rights' because they provide, protect and guarantee individual liberty to an individual against the State and its agencies. Liberty rights also referred to as Blue Rights are the First Generation of Human Rights.

2. In the twentieth century, economic, social and cultural rights and the rights of minorities as well developed. The intent of these rights to promote the economic and social security through economic and social upliftment of the weaker sections of the society. These rights are essential for dignity of personhood as well as for the full and free development of human personality in

all possible directions. These rights guarantee a minimum of economic welfare of the masses and their basic material needs, recognized by the society as essential to cultured living.

The economic, social and cultural rights, including the rights of the minorities are together called the “Security Oriented Human Rights” because these rights jointly provide and guarantee the essential security in the life of an individual. In the absence of these rights, the very existence of human beings would be in danger. These are also known as the “Second Generation of Human Rights”. They are also called as Red Rights or also as positive rights. These rights along with the Civil and Political Rights were declared by the Universal Declaration of Human Rights and later were recognized by the Covenant on Civil and Political Rights and the Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights in December 1966.

3. The Development Oriented Human Rights were originated in the late twentieth century. These rights empower an individual to partake in the process of overall development and include environmental rights that enable an individual to enjoy the absolutely resources of nature, such as air, water, food and natural resources, free from pollution and contamination. These are known as the Third Generation of Human Rights or Green Rights. They are also called as Solidarity Rights, because their implementation depends upon international cooperation.

Solidarity rights have immense importance in developing countries, because these countries want the creation of an international order that will guarantee to them the right to development, the right to disaster relief assistance, the right to peace and the right to good government.

Brian Orend, a Canadian philosopher, in his *Human Rights: Concept and Context*, develops this idea in the direction of human rights as follows: To respect human beings as an end is to respect their interests in being protected against grievous harm.

Orend lists five vital needs that, he claims, are common to all human beings. If these needs were not met at a basic level, we could not function as rational beings. They are security, subsistence, freedom, equality, and recognition. It would be interesting to compare this list with Martha Nussbaum's list of basic capabilities in her account of the things to which human rights entitle us.

Human rights in India:

Human rights are vital for all round development of individuals. The Constitution of India makes provisions for basic rights also known as Fundamental Rights for its citizens as well as for aliens. The Supreme Court of India is the guarantor of the rights according to the Constitution. The court takes into account fundamental duties while interpreting the constitutional right. In Indian constitution, Rights are classified mainly in three broad

categories: (a) Civil (b) Political (c) Economic and Social. Fundamental Rights in India recognize certain civil rights. Certain Political and Economic and Social rights are recognized by other provisions in the Constitution. The Supreme Court of India recognizes Fundamental Right as “natural right”

In Indian constitution, the Fundamental Rights are defined as the basic human rights of all citizens. These rights are defined in Part III of the Constitution regardless of race, place of birth, religion, caste, creed or sex.

Guha quoted that “The demand for a declaration of fundamental rights arose from four factors:

- Lack of civil liberty in India during the British rule.
- Deplorable social conditions, particularly affecting the untouchables and women.
- Existence of different religious, linguistic, and ethnic groups encouraged and exploited by the Britishers.
- Exploitation of the tenants by the landlords.

Fundamental Rights includes:-

Right to Equality:

The Right to Equality is one of the chief guarantees of the Constitution of India. Articles 14–18 of Constitution highlights the right to equality. It refers to the equality in the eyes of law irrespective of caste, race, and religion, place of birth or sex. When appraising Indian constitutional law, it can be stated that Article 14 guarantees equality before law as well as equal protection of the law to not only citizen of India but also to all the people within the territory of India. This includes the equal subjection of all persons to the authority of law, as well as equal treatment of persons in similar circumstances. The State cannot refuse this right. But no persons or group of persons can demand for any special treatment or any special privilege.

Article 15 forbids discrimination on the basis of religion, race, caste, sex, place of birth, or any of them. This right applies only to inhabitants of India and can be enforced against the State as well as private individuals, individuals, regarding free access to places of public entertainment or places of public resort maintained partly or wholly out of State funds. The State has the right to make special treatment for women, children and for the development of backward class, scheduled caste or scheduled tribe people.

Article 16 promises equality of opportunity in matters of public employment. It prevents the State from discriminating against anyone in respect of employment on the grounds of religion, race, caste, sex, descent, and place of birth or place of residence. However, the State may provide special reservation to the people of backward classes, scheduled castes or scheduled tribes for the upliftment of the weaker sections as well as for a person professing that particular religion in case of religious institution.

Article 17 abolishes the practice of untouchability. It has been declared an offence punishable by law. The Protection of Civil Rights Act, 1955 has been enacted by the Parliament which states punishments for not allowing a person to enter the place of worship and from taking water from a well or tank.

Article 18 prohibits the State from granting any titles other than military or academic distinctions, distinctions, and even the citizens of India cannot accept titles from a foreign state. Thus, Indian aristocratic titles and titles of nobility given by the British have been abolished.

Right to Freedom:

The Right to Freedom is mentioned in Articles 19–22, with the view of guaranteeing individual rights. But some of the rights are subject to security of the State, friendly relation with foreign countries, public order, decency or morality and for which certain restrictions may be imposed by the State on individual liberty under specified condition.

Article 19 assures the citizens of India the following six fundamental freedoms subject to certain restrictions:

- Freedom of Speech and Expression
- Freedom of Assembly
- Freedom of form Associations
- Freedom of Movement
- Freedom of Residence and Settlement
- Freedom of Profession, Occupation, Trade and Business.

Article 20 provides protection from conviction for offences in certain respects, respects, including the rights against ex post facto laws, double danger and freedom from self-incrimination.

Article 21 averts the encroachment /protection of life or personal liberty by the State. No person shall be deprived of his life or personal liberty except according to procedure established by law.

Article 22 offers specific rights to arrested and detained persons, i.e., the rights to be informed of the grounds of arrest, arrest, consult a lawyer of one's own choice, be produced before a magistrate within 24 hours of the arrest, and the freedom not to be detained beyond that period without an order of the magistrate. Article 22 also provides that when a person is detained under any law of preventive detention, the State can detain such person without trial for only three months, months, and any detention for a longer period must be authorised by an Advisory Board. The person being detained, has the right to be informed about the grounds of detention, and be permitted to make a representation against it, at the earliest opportunity.

Right against Exploitation: The Right against Exploitation, contained in Articles 23–24, lays down certain provisions to prevent exploitation of the weaker sections of the society by individuals or the State. Child labour and Begar is forbidden under the Right against Exploitation.

Article 23 prohibits human trafficking and forced labour or any act of compelling a person to work without wages where he was legally entitled not to work or to receive remuneration for it. Any contravention leads to an offence. However, it permits the State to impose compulsory service for public purposes, including conscription and community service. The Bonded Labour system (Abolition) Act, 1976, has been enacted by Parliament to give effect to this Article.

Article 24 prohibits the employment of children below the age of 14 years in factories, mines and other hazardous jobs. Parliament has enacted the Child Labour (Prohibition (Prohibition and Regulation) Regulation) Act, 1986, providing regulations for the abolition of, and penalties for employing, child labour, as well as provisions for rehabilitation of former child labourers. The Employment of Children Act, 1938 was the first act to prevent Child Labour.

Right to Freedom of Religion:

The Right to Freedom of Religion, enclosed in **Articles 25–28**, provides religious freedom to all citizens and ensures a secular state in India. According to the Constitution, there is no official State religion, and the State is required to treat all religions impartially and neutrally.

Article 25 promises all persons the freedom of conscience and the right to preach, practice and propagate any religion of their choice. This right is, however, subject to public order, morality and health, and the power of the State to take measures for social welfare and reform. The right in this article shall not affect the operation of any existing law or prevent the State from making new law.

Article 26 guarantees all religious denominations or any sections, subject to public order, morality and health; to manage their own affairs in matters of religion, religion, set up or manage institutions of their own for charitable or religious purposes, and own, acquire and manage property in accordance with law. These provisions do not derogate/deviate from the State's power to acquire property belonging to a religious denomination.

Article 27 guarantees freedom for payment of taxes. No person can be compelled to pay taxes for the promotion or maintenance of any particular religion or religious institution.

Article 28 forbids religious instruction in a wholly State-funded educational institution, and educational institutions receiving aid from the State cannot compel any of their members to receive religious instruction or attend religious worship without their consent or their guardian's consent in case of minor.

Cultural and Educational Rights: The Cultural and Educational rights stated in Articles 29 and 30, are measures to protect the rights of cultural, cultural, linguistic and religious minorities, by enabling them to conserve their heritage and protecting them against discrimination.

Article 29 grants any section of citizens having a distinct language, script culture of its own, and the right to conserve and develop the same, and thus defences the rights or interest of minorities by preventing the State from imposing any external culture on them. It also prohibits discrimination against any citizen for admission into any educational institutions maintained or aided by the State, on the basis of religion, race, caste, language or any of them. Nonetheless, this is subject to reservation by the State for socially and educationally backward classes, as well as reservation of up to 50 percent of seats in any educational institution run by a minority community for citizens belonging to that community.

Article 30 promises the right of minorities to set up and administer educational institutions of their choice in order to preserve and develop their own culture, and prohibits the State, while granting aid, from discriminating against any institution on the basis of the fact that it is administered or managed by a religious or cultural minority.

Right to constitutional remedies:

The Right to Constitutional Remedies is covered in Article 32. It empowers inhabitants to approach the Supreme Court of India to seek enforcement, enforcement, or protection against infringement, of their Fundamental Rights. Article 32 provides a guaranteed remedy for enforcement of all the other Fundamental Rights, and the Supreme Court is designated as the protector of these rights by the Constitution. The Supreme Court has been empowered to issue writs, namely habeas corpus, mandamus, prohibition, and quo warrant, for the enforcement of the Fundamental Rights, while the High Courts have been empowered under Article 226 - which is not a Fundamental Right in itself.

India was a signatory to the Universal Declaration of Human Rights.

Table: Civil and Political Rights in the Universal Declaration of Human Rights and in the Indian Constitution:

Sl No.	Name of Rights	Universal Declaration	Indian Constitution
1	Equality before law	Article 7	Article 14
2	Prohibition of discrimination	Article 7	Article 15(1)
3	Equality of opportunity	Article 21 (2)	Article 16(1)
4	Freedom of speech and expression	Article 19	Article 19(1)a
5	Freedom of peaceful assembly	Article 20(1)	Article 19(1)b
6	Right to form associations or unions	Article 23(4)	Article 19(1)c
7	Freedom of movement within the border	Article 13(1)	Article 19(1)d
8	Protection in respect of conviction for offences	Article 11(2)	Article 20(1)
9	Protection of life and personal liberty	Article 3	Article 21
10	Protection of slavery and forced labour	Article 4	Article 23
11	Freedom of conscience and religion	Article 18	Article 25(1)
12	Remedy for enforcement of rights	Article 8	Article 32
13	Right against arbitrary arrest and detention	Article 9	Article 22
14	Right to social security	Article 22	Article 29(1)

It is also revealed that most of the economic, social and cultural rights proclaimed in the universal Declaration of Human Rights have been incorporated in part IV of the Indian Constitution.

Table: Economic, Social and Cultural Rights in the Universal Declaration of Human Rights and in the Indian Constitution:

Sl No.	Universal declaration of rights	Article in the universal declaration	Article in the Indian constitution
1	Right to work, to just and favourable conditions of work	Article 23(1)	Article 41
2	Right to equal pay for equal work	Article 23(2)	Article 39(d)
3	Right to education	Article 26(1)	Article 21(A), 41, 45, & 51(A)k
4	Right to just and favourable remuneration	Article 23(3)	Article 43
5	Right to rest and leisure	Article 24	Article 43
6	Right of everyone to a standard of living	Article 25(1)	Article 39(a) & Article 47

	adequate for him and his family		
7	Right to a proper social order	Article 28	Article 38

The Supreme Court of India recognises these fundamental rights as 'Natural Rights' or 'Human Rights'. The Judiciary in India plays a significant role in protecting human rights. In Indian constitution, human rights are implied as civil liberties and democratic rights (Asish Kumar Das, 2007).

To summarize, rights are regarded as central to civilization, being observed as established pillars of society and culture. Traditionally, Rights are moral laws specifying what a person should be free to do, and they come from God. In other way, rights are political laws specifying what a person is free to do, and they are created by governments. Third category describe that rights are moral laws specifying what a person should be free to do, and they are inherent in man's nature. The concept of human right is described as rights are moral principles or norms, which describe certain standards of human behaviour and are regularly protected as legal rights in municipal and international law. These are moral claims which are unchallengeable and inherent in all human beings by virtue of the member of the humanity alone. Today these claims are articulated and formulated and called as human rights. It can be supposed that human rights reproduce the minimum standards essential for people to live with self-respect. Human rights give people the freedom to choose how they live, how they express themselves, and what kind of government they want to support, among many other things. Human rights also assure people the means necessary to satisfy their basic needs, such as food, housing, and education

CURRENT STATE OF POLITICAL THEORY

PLURALISM

The Pluralist view of the state is distinct from the perspective of Marxist. The Pluralist does not hold that the state is essentially contradictory in nature, as the Marxist and the Elitist schools of thought consider. Instead, the Pluralist view of the state that it is neutral in nature. It is also supposed that the state is vulnerable to numerous influences from various groups in the society. The modern state is not only dominated by one class, that is the capitalist or the bourgeoisie class, which dominates the political power, as believed by the Marxist philosophy. The modern state is a type of framework wherein interests of the society can be reunited.

In simple term, Pluralism is an influential protest against the monistic theory of sovereignty which endows the state with supreme and unlimited power. Pluralist theories indicate that political power should be regarded as analytically distinct from economic power and, in contrast to elitists, power is not concentrated in the hands of a single group, but widely dispersed among a variety of groups and actors. The exponents of Pluralism are Harold Laski, J.N. Figgis, Ernest Barker, G. D.H. Cole, A. D. Lindsay, Duguit, MacIver and others. Pluralists stated that sovereignty resides not with the state but it resides with many other institutions. There exist many social, political, cultural and economic institutions in society and many of these institutions are prior to the State. For example, Family and Church are prior to the State.

According to the Pluralist view, the notion of the state is that there can be various sources of political power. Therefore, a single group do not have monopoly of political power. Although the capitalist class can have a very strong position in the society, they cannot however have complete dominance over the working class, as anticipated by the Marxists. The proletariats can extend their power through labour unions or trade unions. According to the Pluralists, since the capitalist class cannot do without the labour class, the working class also exerts a strong influence on the capitalist class. The modern state is not actually a tool by which one class can control over the other class. It is rather a framework which helps in the reconciliation of diverse society interests (Schwarzmantel, 1994).

The central position of pluralist power is that all inhabitants have a chance to become politically active through either individual or group action. Views are signified in policy making not only through representative elections but also through the participatory mechanism of group politics. The process of decision making is just the outcome between different groups, with government institutions acting as a mediator. This philosophy represent that no group tends to dominate this process because of the plurality of political resources. The diverse base of group power means that if a group has little money, it may call on public opinion to sustain its views in the decision making process. The electoral mechanism assumes that government doesn't persistently favour one group as bias alienates the government from the rest.

Pluralists detailed that the State is not only the highest institution. On the contrary, like other institutions, the State is also one of the institutions of society. There the State does not reserve the authority to exercise autonomy according to his will. Sovereignty is not his private

property. The Pluralistic state is “simply a state in which there exists no single source of authority”. According to Pluralists, sovereignty is not indivisible and exclusive”. One the opposing statement is that it is a diversity in its essence and manifestation, it is separable in two parts and should be divided”.

A.D. Lindsay has very pertinently remarked in this connection. “If we look at the facts it is clear enough that the theory of sovereign state has broken down”. Professor Laski believed that “it is impossible to make the legal theory of sovereignty valid for political philosophy”. He thought that “it would be lasting benefit to political science if the whole concept of sovereign was surrendered”. Krabbe indicated that the “notion of sovereignty must be expunged from political theory”. Although Barker stated that “We see the State less as an association of individuals in a common life; we see it more as an association of individuals, already united in various groups for a further and more embracing common purpose”. These associations have an inner life which is at least as autonomous as that of the state.

Consequently, the pluralists enthusiastically supported the freedom of profession, political, religious, economic, social and educational associations. Gettell has dominantly summarized the idea of pluralism as “The pluralists deny that the state is a unique organisation, they hold that other associations are equally important and natural, they argue that such associations for their purpose are as sovereign as the state is for its purpose. They emphasise the inability of the state to enforce its will in practice against the opposition of certain groups within it. They deny that possession of force by the state gives it any superior right. They insist on the equal rights of all groups that command the allegiance of their members and that perform valuable functions in society. Hence, sovereignty is possessed by many associations. It is not indivisible unit; the state is not supreme or unlimited”.

Development of the Pluralistic Theory:

The pluralistic theory devised by Otto V. Gierke through his writings. According to Professor R.N. Gilchrist, “The germ of Pluralism is to be found in the work of the German Jurist, Von Gierke (1844-1921) whose immense work on the legal theory of corporation, part of which was interpreted, with a sympathetic introduction, by the English Jurist, F.W. Maitland, in his “Political Theories of Middle Ages” (1900). It gave an incentive to the idea of companies as legal entities, with a life of their own independent government”

Many thinkers opined that the theory of pluralism devised in the last quarters of the nineteenth century and developed in the start of the twentieth century, yet its background can be traced in the Medieval Age. In Medieval Age, the organisation of the State in Europe was loose and the church, vocational associations and Guilds had vital role in society. In sixteenth and seventeenth century, national sentiment gathered force in Europe and as a consequence national states developed. These national states became influential and all the powers, in these states, were centred with the ruler. In due course of time, these national states faced rebellion and public-movements and the result was the birth of democracy.

In Democracy, the authority of the ruler was limited, the cabinet became more powerful but the state remained sovereign and supreme. With the arrival of the Welfare State, there was rapid increase in the functions of the State and there remained no sphere of life with which the State did not interfere, the sovereign and the supreme state also faced revolt and reaction. This reaction against the sovereign and supreme state resulted into the emergence of pluralism.

The Pluralist Model: Types of Groups

There are two types of groups within the pluralist model that include insider groups, which tend to be more powerful, and outsider groups.

Insider groups are well established and are able to work diligently with the chosen officials in government because of their position within the community. The people in these groups tend to have similar views to the government in power, which may not always be a positive factor.

Insider groups include business groups that concentrate their efforts on issues directly affecting business interests (in the U.S., the American Petroleum Institute works on behalf of all oil companies, as an example.).

Insider groups also include labour groups that promote policies that benefit workers in general and union members in particular, Agricultural groups that consist of general and specialty farm associations, Professional groups that have lobbying associations to promote the interests of their members.

Outsider groups are observed as less dominant. Characteristically, members of outsider groups have less access to elected government officials. Their groups are more recently established, which could be a sign of weakness.

Outsider groups include grassroots activism that may hold marches and rallies to bring attention or action for their cause, political Action Committees (PACs) that filter money to support specific candidates for office.

Although the pluralist model rotates around the theory that power is equally dispersed, critics are quick to indicate that this is not always the case. Many critics view the pluralist model as a form of the 'good old boys' network in which membership is based on class or ethnicity.

Pluralists Dunleavy and O'Leary recognized the three main pluralist views of the state. They are as follows:

The Weathervane model: The states direction echoes public opinion and the demands of pressure groups. This means that state policy is based on the concerns and interests of society.

The neutral state model: The state is perceived as the neutral or impartial arbiter who acts in the public's interests. This arbiter compromises between the demands of different pressure

groups and makes sure that even the weakest groups are heard. These demands are then evaluated in terms of what is best for society. It is dissimilar from the Weathervane model because it is more active in that it listens to a range of different views then makes decisions in the public's interest.

The broker state model: This model visualizes groups within the state as having their own interests and concerns. Although, state officials may negotiate with a number of interests groups and can develop compromises with conflicting demands, most policies tend to reflect the concerns of the state officials themselves.

Factors responsible for the development of Pluralism:

- The individuals put emphasis on the lessening of the powers of the State. The Pluralists also followed suit. But the main point of difference between the individualists and pluralists is that the individualists laid emphasis on the rights and freedom of the individual whereas the pluralists laid emphasis on the rights and freedom of the associations of the individuals and guilds.

- Both the individualists and pluralists laid emphasis on the need of cooperation between the state and other associations for promoting the common welfare.

- In the modern age, all the states of the world are inter-dependent on one another in one way or the other and, therefore, the need of limiting the sovereignty of the state is felt these days.

- Many intellectuals like German Jurist Otto Von Gierke (1844-1921), F.W. Maitland, famous English Jurist, J.N. Figgis and others have debated that the Churches and Guilds possessed internal freedom and were party to sovereignty in the Medieval Age.

- Anarchism and Guild Socialism laid more emphasis on the confinement of the sovereignty of the state and this gave motivation to Pluralism.

The pluralist model can be simply described as employee organizations and trade unions. Since organizations and trade unions have the power over the government, the politicians, trade unions, businesses and the proletariat have a share in the state power. The Pluralist view affirmed that the power is distributed among the government, the organizations and the labour unions as well, proving once again that the neutrality of the state is also valid.

It is appraised that pluralists visualize the state as a mechanism which signifies all the interests of every member of the state and it works because it is not possible for the political process to directly represent the views of every single member of society, as modern societies are little complex. Therefore, a plurality of pressure groups acts as an evocative voice for all members of society.

Advocates of Pluralism:

Some of the followers of Pluralism were Otto Von Gierke, F.W. Maitland, Figgis, G.D.H. Cole, A.D. Lindsay, Ernest Barker, Krabbe, Duguit, Laski, Cober, Zimmern, Durkheim.

According to Gierke, “The state should accept the common point of view that permanent associations have rights and duties as groups whether or not the state has accepted them as corporations”.

Laski specified that, “State is only one among the various forms of associations and as compared with them, has no superior claims to the individual allegiance”. He further stated that “These associations are not less sovereign than the state itself. Since society is federal therefore the authority must also be federal”.

Krabbe considered that the “notion of sovereignty must expunged from political theory”. Figgis has also acknowledged the importance of associations. He stated that “Human society is not a heap of individuals related only through the State but an ascending hierarchy of groups.”

The traditional theory of sovereignty is venerable superstition”. MacIver has indicated in his famous book, “The Modern State” that “State is one association among many associations within the community”. The Pluralistic philosophy has been summarized by Cober, “The state is confronted not merely by unassociated individual but also by other associations evolving independently, eliciting individual loyalties, better espoused than the state-because of their select membership, their special forms of organisation and action for serving various social needs.

Criticism of Pluralism:

The pluralist theory is criticised for being too expectant about the State and the government. The State cannot act as an truthful broker as it is impossible to govern without using power and without favouring certain power and political groups.

The theory of the pluralistic state has been critiqued by a number of political philosophers on the following grounds:

- The State is needed to control various types of institutions existing in society. It is the sovereign state that brings about unity and controls all the associations existing in society. Gierke, Barker, Miss M.P. Follet and Figgis and many other advocates of Pluralism have to realise the need of the State for this purpose.
- If sovereignty is divided among various associations existing in society, this division will lead to the devastation of sovereignty. As a result, chaos will prevail in society and there will be turmoil.
- Several pluralists believe that law is superior to the state and the State is controlled by law. But this hypothesis is incorrect because laws are outlined by the state.
- It is a mere illusion and not a reality that other associations are equal in status to the State.
- Laski, main supporter of Pluralism, has also gone to the extent of condemning Pluralism and stated that it has not closely studied the different sections of society.

- If sovereignty is divided among various associations existing in society, these associations will be so dominant that it would be difficult for the State to have a control over these associations. This will augment numerous problems in the State.
- If these associations are reassigned limited sovereignty, society will worsen and mutual disputes will arise.
- State is needed for guarding people from the excess of associations.

It is evaluated that the pluralist theory emphasizes immaterial power. Power can be in the form of many principles such as political, religious, skilled or even persuasive power. This power is to be distributed to all members of the social contract, nobody is to have more or less say in the institution than any other. The Pluralist Theory goes even farther to suggest that no one controls the social contract as everyone has such an equal state in it. While some theories debate as to how a system should be run and who should be the head of said system, the Pluralist Theory challenges by arguing there be any system, let alone a head of a system, at all. Potential Power is also a recurrent theme between the two theories, and Potential Power, like abilities of the people, shall always outweigh the actual Present Power, such as Executive Rulers or rights of a central power. Hyperpluralism is one of the great flaws of pluralism. It occurs when the pluralistic society feels as if it does not give the people enough power and so they rise up against the government. It results in a complete crippling of government as the government bends to the will of all the interest groups.

To summarize, pluralism theory is famous theoretical tradition used to analyse political actions in modern autonomous states. This theory is reliant upon a viewpoint that citizens are involved in political arenas through different interest groups, and that political power should be distributed to secure its own genuine interests and none of these groups will control the system (Miller, 1983). The theory is grounded in the concept that in a diverse society such as the United States, several interest groups exist to allow any one coherent group of elites to rule. Government decisions are made in the field of competing interests, all contending for influence and struggling to express for the people that they represent. Some pluralists have debated that the originators characterized different interests (such as rural vs. urban, or north vs. south), and that many points of view were actually represented. The model still works today, as pluralists argue, creating strong links between government officials and their popular base. This is currently the predominant theory of government

THEORY OF RECONCILIATION

Theory of Reconciliation

Theory of Reconciliation The term provides an outline of a political idea based on a concept of legality which, during the years of the revolution of 1848-49, aimed at a denial of this revolution and a compromise between the leading forces of liberal bourgeoisie and the crown in Prussia. The general concern was to reach an accommodation between the traditional rights of the crown and the constitutional claim of the up-and-coming bourgeoisie, without allowing the March revolution to become the starting point for new constitutional revisions. Therefore, the representatives of the principle of reconciliation made crown and parliament equitable partners in forming a constitutional consensus. Thus, sovereignty of parliament was from the very beginning limited, with the crown having an advantage as the established power in case of a conflict of interests. The idea of reconciliation was commensurate with the aim of transforming the existing semi-feudal regime into a constitutional monarchy. This idea implied a partial renunciation of power by the citizens because they wanted to secure the continuity of state power and to prevent a breach with the legal title of the king. But ultimately, the principle of reconciliation was forced to fail because the crown's unwillingness to compromise and the restorative forces increased their influence to overcome the revolutionary and democratic movement.

The term "Theory of Reconciliation" emerged as a critical reaction to a policies of the liberal ministry Camphausen/Hansemann in Prussia and the Berlin constituent assembly. This term, which described the idea of reconciliation as "estranged from life" and as "impracticable", was essentially coined by Karl Marx and Friedrich Engels and, probably, had been introduced into political journalism in the beginning of June 1848. The *Neue Rheinische Zeitung* provided for a rapid propagation of this term that was preferred by the critics of the course of the liberal bourgeoisie. The advocates of reconciliation called it the "principle of reconciliation". They spoke of an "accommodation between old and new conditions", of a "settlement" or of the indispensable "transaction with the crown".

It was the Marxist-oriented historiography that took over the critical linguistic usage coined by K. Marx and F. Engels. But the idea of reconciliation was reflected also by several other authors in a more or less critical manner. At the same time the idea has subsequently been vindicated. The discussion of the possibility of a policy of a "balance in the middle" as necessary and justifiable has been a subject of controversy. As a result it was possible to portray the different causes for motives, background and correlations underlying bourgeois policies during the revolution.

Ludolf Camphausen (1803-1890), the Cologne banker and railway entrepreneur, and his liberal ministry in Prussia (March 1848- June 1848) were the exponents and consistent advocates of the idea of reconciliation. Thus, L. Camphausen has been often described as the inventor of the

"theory of reconciliation" in the contemporary and historical literature. But it has so far been impossible to document such an immediate connection.

The idea of reconciliation does not represent any separate and self-enclosed theoretical complex, or any special teachings of national and constitutional law. It is rooted in the policies of moderate reforms of the bourgeois wing of the liberal movement. The idea of reconciliation goes back to the theory of the fundamental rights, according to which a new civil law could and would have to be developed out of the existing legal foundation. The theory on fundamental law had already been propagated among the moderate liberal movement long before the revolution. It referred to the constitutional promises made by the Prussian king and by other German rulers in their struggle against Napoleon's foreign rule and at the time of the foundation of the German Confederation's federal act. The invocation of the legal fundamentals entailed, in consequence, the constitutional claim of liberal bourgeoisie. While this stance prior to the revolution clearly aimed at a change of the existing semi-feudal system, after the March revolution, this approach was directed at a recognition of the newly emerging legal position.

The idea of reconciliation politics emanated from the deliberations on the formation of the liberal ministry in Prussia by the end of March 1848. This idea provided the core of the government program of Ludolf Camphausen, the first bourgeois Prussian premier. At the beginning of April 1848 he convened the second United Landtag against the resistance and the protests of the democratic movement and proposed to it a program of legislation. This Landtag expressly confirmed its old electoral law, the competence of which was laid down in an agreement, or reconciliation of a constitution with the crown. In addition, the United Landtag passed the "Decree on the foundations of the future Prussian constitution". Thus the mode and major content of the imminent constitutional work were legally stipulated from the very beginning. Quite consciously, the Camphausen/Hanseemann ministry had reconvened this institution of the former semi-feudal system in an attempt to show clearly that it had derived its governmental order from existing legal foundations rather than from the March revolution.

The idea of reconciliation found its clearest expression in the project of an "Assembly convened on the agreement of the Prussian national constitution", which met in Berlin from May 22, 1848 until it was forcibly dissolved in November and was finally closed after a last session at the beginning of December. Although the Prussian assembly had asserted its claim to sovereignty in individual questions, it proved incapable of elevating itself to a permanent body. This proved to be fatal, because on June 9, 1848, the majority of deputies failed to pay tribute to the fighters of the March revolution and virtually sanctioned the principle of reconciliation.

The draft constitution of the government (May 20, 1848) had enshrined the concept of reconciliation as a pervasive constitutional principle. Reference was made to it already in the preamble. With no concessions to the principle of popular sovereignty, the crown was actually left with the absolute veto. The king did not swear to uphold the constitution, as was the

general practice in constitutional monarchies. He was only deprived of the right to absolute disposal of legislation.

The liberal March ministry under Ludolf Camphausen, which perceived itself as the "ministry of mediation" was thwarted by the limits and conflicts in the middle of June 1848 which it had cause for itself with the principle of reconciliation. Nevertheless, L. Camphausen in his subsequent function as the delegate of the Prussian government to the interim central power in Frankfurt am Main, was seeking to reassert the principle of reconciliation also *vis-à-vis* the national assembly.

Elements of the policy of reconciliation were found outside Prussia with the moderate wing of the liberal movement in other German states

BIBLIOGRAPHY :

1. Arneil, Barbara, *Politics and Feminism*, Oxford, Blackwell, 1999.
2. Bealey, Frank, *The Blackwell Dictionary of Political Science*, Oxford, Blackwell, 1999.
3. Beetham, David, *The Legitimation of Power*, Houndmills, Macmillan, 1991.
4. Rajeev Bhargava and Ashok Acharaya, *Political theory : An Introduction*, Pearson Longman, Delhi, 2008.
5. Cohen, J. and Arato, A., *Civil Society and Political Theory*, Cambridge, MIT Press, 1992.
6. David Boucher and Paul Kelly (2009) *Political Thinkers : From Socrates to the Present*. Oxford University Press.
7. De Crespigny, Anthony, et.al. (Eds.) *Contemporary Political Theory*, London, Nelson, 1970.
8. Dodson, Andrew, *Green Political Thought*, London, Routledge, 2000, reprint.
9. Dunn, John, *The History of Political Theory and Other Essays*, Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, 1996.
10. Jain, P.V. *Political Science I (Political Theory)*, Allahabad: Central Law Publication, 2016.
11. Varma S. P. *Modern Political Theory*, New Delhi, Vikas, 1983.
12. Sir E. Barker, *Principles of Social and Political Theory*, Calcutta, Oxford University Press, 1976.
13. S. Ramaswamy, *Political Theory: Ideas and Concepts*, Delhi, Macmillan, 2002.
14. Mukherjee and S. Ramaswamy, *A History of Political Thought: Plato to Marx*, New Delhi, Prentice Hall, 1999.

Recommended Articles :

1. Guyora Binder (1999) *Cultural Relativism and Cultural Imperialism in Human Rights Law*, Buffalo Human Rights Law Review, Vol. 5, pp. 211-221.
2. Pradeep Nair and Sandeep Sharma (2016) *Gandhi and Governance: Rethinking Development at Grassroot Level*, Mainstream, VOL LIV No 41, New Delhi.
3. Jonathan Haidt (July 2016). *When and Why Nationalism Beats Globalism*, The American Interest: Volume 12, Number 1.
4. Robert J. Delahunty (March 2012) *Nationalism, Statism and Cosmopolitanism*, Northwestern Interdisciplinary Law Review, U of St. Thomas Legal Studies, Research Paper No. 12-08.
5. Yogendra Yadav, *Rethinking social justice*.

(www.india-seminar.com/2009/601/601_yogendra_yadav.htm).

6. Neer Varshney (Feb 2014), *Equality and Social Justice: Is Affirmative Action in India Justified?* OIDA International Journal of Sustainable Development, Vol. 06, No. 11, pp. 81-90.
7. Marc F. Plattner (2010) *Populism, Pluralism, and Liberal Democracy*, Journal of Democracy, Volume 21, Issue 1, 2010, pp. 81-92.
8. Sunita Narain, *Changing Environmentalism*.
(www.india-seminar.com/2002/516/516%20sunita%20narain.htm).
9. Jyh-An Lee (2011), *The Greenpeace of Cultural Environmentalism*, Widener Law Review, Vol. 16, No. 1, 2010.
10. R. Claire Snyder (2008) *What Is Third-Wave Feminism? A New Directions Essay* - The University of Chicago Press Journals, Vol. 34, No. 1 (Autumn 2008), pp. 175-196 Stable. (<http://www.jstor.org/stable/10.1086/588436>).
11. S. Narayanswami *Sarvodaya Movement – A Critical Analysis* - (2001) Journal of Extension and Research, Volume III, Nos. 1 and 2, pp54-59.
12. Chela Sandoval, *"US Third World Feminism"*, "Feminist Theory under Postmodern Conditions: Toward a Theory of Oppositional Consciousness".
13. Joan Scott, *"The Evidence of Experience; Gender and the Politics of History"*; her essay in *Contesting Feminisms*; ed, Feminism and History.

Recommended Journals :

1. Journal of International Political Theory.
(www.st-andrews.ac.uk/intrel/publications/journalofinternationalpoliticaltheory)
2. American Journal of Political Science. (www.ajps.org).
3. Political Theory. (<http://journals.sagepub.com/home/ptx>).
4. Canadian Journal of Political Science (CJPS). (<https://www.cpsa-acsp.ca/cjps.php>).
5. International Political Science Review (IPSR).
(<http://journals.sagepub.com/home/ips>).