



INSTITUTE  
OF DISTANCE  
EDUCATION **IDE**  
Rajiv Gandhi University

# BPOL201 POLITICAL THEORY-I



**BA (POLITICAL  
SCIENCE)**  
**3<sup>RD</sup> SEMESTER**

**Rajiv Gandhi University**

[www.ide.rgu.ac.in](http://www.ide.rgu.ac.in)

# POLITICAL THEORY

**Bachelor of Arts**

**Third Semester**

**Paper 201**



**RAJIV GANDHI UNIVERSITY**  
Arunachal Pradesh, INDIA - 791 112

## BOARD OF STUDIES

Prof. P K Panigarhi Dept. of Pol. Science, RGU	Chairman
Prof. M N Das Department of Pol. Science Dibrugary University	Member
Prof. N N Hina Dept. of Pol. Science RGU	Member
Prof. Ashan Riddi Director, IDE, RGU	Member Secretary

### Revised Edition 2021

All rights reserved. No part of this publication which is material protected by this copyright notice may be reproduced or transmitted or utilized or stored in any form or by any means now known or hereinafter invented, electronic, digital or mechanical, including photocopying, scanning, recording or by any information storage or retrieval system, without prior written permission from the Publisher.

"Information contained in this book has been published by Vikas Publishing House Pvt. Ltd. and has been obtained by its Authors from sources believed to be reliable and are correct to the best of their knowledge. However, IDE—Rajiv Gandhi University, the publishers and its Authors shall be in no event be liable for any errors, omissions or damages arising out of use of this information and specifically disclaim any implied warranties or merchantability or fitness for any particular use"



Vikas® is the registered trademark of Vikas® Publishing House Pvt. Ltd.

VIKAS® PUBLISHING HOUSE PVT LTDE-28, Sector-8, Noida - 201301 (UP)

Phone: 0120-4078900 • Fax: 0120-4078999

Regd. Office: 7361, Ravindra Mansion, Ram Nagar, New Delhi 110 055

Website: [www.vikaspublishing.com](http://www.vikaspublishing.com) • Email: [helpline@vikaspublishing.com](mailto:helpline@vikaspublishing.com)

**SYLLABI- BOOK MAPPING TABLE**  
**POLITICAL THEORY**

<b>Unit I</b>	Meaning, Nature and Scope of Political Science
<b>Unit II</b>	Approaches to the study of Political Science; Historical, Philosophical, Institutional, Behavioral and Marxian
<b>Unit III</b>	Relation with other Social Sciences: Geography, Economics and Sociology.
<b>Unit IV</b>	Theories of the Origin of State: Historical, evolutionary, social contract.
<b>Unit V</b>	Concepts: Rights, Liberty and Equality.

**Unit- I****DEFINITION, NATURE AND SCOPE OF POLITICAL SCIENCE, RELATION WITH  
OTHER SOCIAL SCIENCES****Structure**

- 1.0 Objectives
- 1.1 Introduction
- 1.2 Definitions
  - 1.2.1 Traditional Definitions
  - 1.2.2 Modern Definitions
- 1.3 Nature of Political Science
- 1.4 Scope of Political Science
- 1.5 Let Us Sum Up
- 1.6 Key Words
- 1.7 Check Your Learning
- 1.8 Suggested Reading

**1.0 Objectives**

After reading this unit you shall be able to:

- comprehend the meaning of political science;
- explain the difference between the traditional and modern views of political science;
- know the nature and scope; and
- discuss relations with other social sciences.

## 1.1 Introduction

The systematic study of political science began when human beings came to believe that they could fashion their own government according to understood principles. The discovery occurred in ancient Greece about 2350 years ago when the Greeks separated politics from theology. They dealt with the problems of state (city state), rights and obligations of citizens and was able to give scientific shape to it. Plato named his Book “The Republic” that deals with the state and expounded his ‘ideal state’ based on functional specialization for the realization of justice in the society. Aristotle started with the political nature of man to analyse the nature of state and employed ‘politics’ as the title of his most celebrated treatise that deals with the state and society.

The centre of Greek Political thought was the ‘polis’ or city-state – the general form of political organization in the ancient Greece. These city-states provided enough materials for political thinking and speculations. The thinkers were probing into the life of human kind in the society and politics. The science of city-state was evolved as an instrument to serve as a moral guide to the ruling section of the society for the realization of good life in all its aspects and to adjust the mutual relationships in the society. It encompassed the study of social and political organization and functioning of the city. It was designed and projected as a master science broad enough to cover all such activities which paved the way for good life. So, the Greeks defined politics as the study of ‘polis’ through which men strive for moral perfections.

Following the traditions, a number of other political philosophers addressed themselves to similar problems. They tried to answer in their own way, keeping in view the social and political condition of their time. Noteworthy among these writers were Cicero St. Augustine, St. Thomas Aquinas, Machiavelli, Hobbes, Locke, Rousseau and so on. They also tried to lay some norms of public life, both for the ruler and the ruled, and expected everyone to follow them faithfully. In this way, political science acquired characteristic of philosophical imagination and prescription based on undue concern for the state and its institutional paraphernalia. To sum up political science, that we inherited from the past, bore the features of philosophical imagination, prescriptiveness, Normatism and historical in nature.

Toward the mid-nineteenth century, the traditional political science began to lose its grip over the new generation. It witnessed the emergence of a reaction against the dominance of philosophy and history in the study of political science. The First World War struck the discipline like a tornado and swept away all that was traditional. Comte and Saint Simon made a forceful plea for the development of the discipline on the lines of the natural sciences. They thought that like chemistry and physics, political science too should concern itself with the reality, and tried to find out casual relations among facts with the help of observations and empirical examination. This initiative given by them was enthusiastically followed by later writers.

Toward the end of the first quarter of twentieth century, there emerged the behavioural school which further challenged the subservience of political science to philosophy and law. Thinkers of this school emphasized the need to look into the actualities of political life. They pointed out that the way political science was being taught over the years in colleges and universities had but little relevance to the needs of society. Political scientists should, therefore, take more and more interest in the comprehensions and analysis of the day to day phenomenon of the politics.

## **1.2 Definitions**

### **1.2.1 Traditional Definitions**

As discussed above, the traditional political scientists founded their attention on the state and other allied institutions. While dealing with the state, they stretched their study to all those political institutions which helped the state to fulfill its ends such as government and its organs (legislature, executive, civil service, judicial, social authority and administrative apparatus). Besides institutions, the traditionalist also looked into those philosophical issues (law, liberty, equality, justice, citizens, rights and duties etc) which closely conditioned the functional pattern of these institutions. Conversely, they seldom cared to look into the non-formal institutions like political parties and pressure group) and informal institutions (public opinion).

One school of traditional political scientists led by Garner, Getell and others believed that political science exclusively dealt with the theory of state alone. According to Garner, 'Politics begins and ends with the state.'

*R.G. Getell* says, "Politics is a study of state in the past, present and future."

The famous Swiss Scholar Bluntschli defines political science "as a science which is concerned with the state, which endeavours to understand and comprehend the state in its fundamental conditions, in its essential nature, its various forms of manifestations, its developments."

*Garris*, a famous author, is of the opinion that "Political science deals with the origin, developments, purpose and all political problems of the state."

*Prof. Appadora* defines, "Political science is concerned with the state and of the conditional essential to its existence and development."

The other school of thought led by Stephen Leacock, and others is of the view that political science deals with the government because state is imaginary and impossible without government. They further hold that it is the government that gives shape to the state. As Seeley says, "Political science investigates the phenomena of government as political economy deals with wealth, biology with life, algebra with numbers and geometry with space and magnitude."

But scholars like Harold Laski, Gilchrist and others admit that both the state and government constitute the subject matter of political science, because despite the differences found between state and government, the scope can't be separated from that of other. The state is an agency under which government functions and the role of one is complementary to that of the other, as Laski defines "Political science deals with state and government."

Paul Janet who says, "Political science is that part of social science which treats of the foundations of the state and the principles of government."



The close study and analyses of all the definitions draw our conclusion that the main concern of the study of political science is state and government. And, all these definitions are in the substantial agreement on the essential point, namely phenomena and processes of state in its varied aspects.

### **1.2.2 Modern Definitions**

All these definitions remained valid for a very long time until the dawn of 20<sup>th</sup> century which saw fresh ground with the shifting of the focus of study from the state to the actual reality of political life being started by George Catlin, Charles Marriam, Max Weber, Laswell, Robert Dahl and others. These scholars turn their attentions not on the state but on the political system and they do not necessarily confine their analysis of politics to physical force, which compel every person to observe the legally prescribed rules and regulations. They take into account all type of compulsions - moral, physical, social, economic etc. which result in individual's adherence to socially prescribed mode of public conduct. They also considered that study of political science involves some sort of power, rule and authority which, in other words, implies an element of force which can be applied against those members of the system who refuse to abide by the rules of the game. Max Weber in an attempt to distinguish political science from other social sciences made a departure and pointed out that the central idea of the subject must be power. The point was well highlighted by a host of writers.

*Harold Laswell*, a leading political scientist of the USA, defines "political science, as an empirical discipline, as the study of the shaping and sharing of power and a political act one performs in power perspective."

*Robson* defines, "Political science centres on the struggle to gain and retain power, to exercise power or influence over others or to resist that exercise."

The definitions of political science emphasize the dynamic nature of the discipline and call attention to the fact that the forces controlling the form and behaviour of the state are similar to those that operates in other institutions. Churches, corporations, trade unions, colleges, and other associations of various kinds have to provide for their internal government and all these

governments operate in response to force that seems natural to call political. Robert A O Dahl further observes, “This definition of political science is very broad. Indeed it means that many associations we do not ordinarily regard as ‘political’ possess political systems: Private clubs, business firms, labour unions, religions organizations, civic groups, primitive tribes, clan, perhaps even families.”

*D.G. Hitchner* has also rightly pointed out that “The world is clearly a political world. All mankind has been drawn into some political association through which men engage in operation and conflict.” Consequently, no aspect of human life is free from state intervention. This is equally true of liberal democracies as well as socialist countries. “Whenever you are or want to be,” says Marshal Berman, “you may not be interested in politics but politics is interested in you.”

Subsequent attempts were accordingly made to modify the concept of power by an appeal to the legitimacy of the government. As *David Easton* says, “political science is concerned with the authoritative allocations of values for the society.” Simultaneously, other political scientists drew attention to the study of human behaviour on which rested the policy-making and policy implementing functions of the government.

Political science has come a long way to become an important and independent subject in the discipline of social science. From a subject dealing with the administrative aspect of the ‘polis’ of ancient Greek, it has become a subject which embraces the contents of economics, sociology, psychology, history and many other social sciences under its fold. Its scope has been widened a lot.

### **Check Your Progress-I**

- (i) What is political philosophy?
- (ii) Define political science.
- (iii) What are the main concerns of traditional political science?
- (iv) What are the main concerns of modern political science?

### 1.3 Nature of Political Science

There is a great diversity of opinion about the exact nature of political science. Some scholars consider it as a science of the state and government. While others are of the opinion that it is one of the most backward of all the arts. Aristotle, the greatest thinker and writer on the subject, called political science as the master or supreme science. Some other distinguished scholars like Bodin, Hobbes, Sidgwick, Bluntschli, Lord Bryce, Montesquieu, Cornwall Lewis and Jellinck also have the same opinion and considered it a science. Towards the second half of the 20<sup>th</sup> century, many drastic changes have occurred which revolutionized the nature and content of political science. Political scientists have started adopting many scientific techniques of measurement appropriate to its sphere of study. Some modern theorists like Robert Dahl, David Easton, etc. have developed laws of political behaviour and principles underlying the state, the rules for establishing and maintaining the most just and efficient structure and process of decision making, etc. Political science has also been recognized as a science because it is a branch of knowledge or study dealing with a body of facts or truths.

However, there are other writers who dispute its scientific status, they say that it is of a misnomer to call political science a science. The supporters of this view of nature of political science are Buckle, Auguste Comte and F.W. Maitland, who have denied the scientific character of political science and are not ready to call it a science at all. In their opinion, scientific study of political science is not possible. "There is no science of politics any more than there is a science of aesthetics, for a line of politics is not like the science of mathematics. No lines can be laid down for civil and political wisdom. They are a matter incapable of exact definition." Maitland ridicules the scientific status of political science, and says, "When? See a good set of examination questions headed by the words 'political science'; I regret not the questions but the title." Buckle is more sarcastic and says that "in the present state of knowledge, political science far from being a science is one of the most backward of all arts."

These writers refuse to see any scientific component in political science. Before examining whether the subject is a science, we should have a very clear idea of what a science is. According to Chambers' Twentieth Century Dictionary, "Science is a knowledge ascertained by

observation and experiment, critically tested, systematized and brought under general principles, a department or branch of such knowledge or study.” A science is any systematized branch of knowledge having a definite set of rules and principles. The term ‘science’ generally means a systematic way of gathering and organizing knowledge. A scientist develops the method of selecting problems, collecting data, formulating hypothesis, verifying results, analyzing and classifying facts, observing and experimenting and formulating principles. Arnold Brecht says that scientific method concentrates on “scientific actions”, “Scientific operations”, or “steps of scientific procedure.” These include:

- (i) observation;
- (ii) description;
- (iii) measurement;
- (iv) acceptance or non-acceptance of fact or reality;
- (v) inductive generalization;
- (vi) explanation;
- (vii) logical deductive reasoning;
- (viii) testing;
- (ix) correcting;
- (x) predicting; and
- (xi) non-acceptance of all statements not obtained or confirmed in the manner mentioned above.

Baring upon these principles, there are writers who are not prepared to treat political science as a science and explain with arguments why it cannot be regarded as “Science”. According to them, the following reasons can be given to substantiate that it cannot claim the status of a science-

- i. Several modern political scientists who are not willing to recognize the scientific character of political science argue that principles of political science are not absolute and universal. It is absolute and universal equation of Arithmetic that two and two make four but political science does not have such absolute and universal principles. Besides, there is no consensus of opinion among experts as

to its method, principles and conclusions - For example, Democracy is the best form of government but the experts do not opine alike about it. It is not unanimously accepted that Democracy is the best form of government. Some scholars like Lecky, and Sir Henry Maine, etc. have outrightly condemned democracy. And it is also difficult to predict whether democratic form of government will be successful in every country of the world. Owing to certain reasons, it is successful in some countries while it is less successful in others. For example, in countries like China, Nepal, Pakistan, Iraq, Iran, etc. democracy could be successful whereas in England, India, Japan, France, etc., it is successful but not equally successful in each of these countries. Thus we fail to find that uniformity, absoluteness and universalities in the principles of political science which we find in other natural and physical sciences.

- ii. Political concepts like liberty, law, equality, justice, etc. are so complex and influenced by so many factors including human motives, emotions and passions that it is very difficult to arrive at exact generalizations regarding them. Even among the political scientists, there is no consensus regarding the validity or conclusions of various political principles. So, its principle can't be usually applied to solve political problems or to make accurate political predictions. On the other hand, the laws or generalizations of physical sciences are exact and they are applied to all places equally. For example, chemistry can tell accurately how a particular metal will react when dipped in a particular acid or what will happen if two molecule of Hydrogen and one molecule of oxygen will be mixed together.
- iii. The political scientist is unable to expect particular results like a scientist in a laboratory or make any correct predictions. Political phenomena do not follow proper sequence like those in exact science according to invariable laws and hence political researcher finds it difficult to predict the future course of events. Unlike in sciences like physics and chemistry, in political science correct prediction cannot be made. In fact, at times, the effects are quite contrary to the expectations of the observer - even the shrewdest government blunders, and

become wise only after events. Results in physical sciences can be easily forecast. Social phenomena, on other hand, are undergoing changes on account of a variation in human attitude in the light of new ideas and experiences. R.N. Gilchrist says, “In political science it is difficult to find uniform and unvarying laws. The material is constantly varying actions and reactions take place in various and often unforeseen ways.”

- iv. Generalization in physical science, such as chemistry and physics can be made on the basis of experiments conducted under controlled conditions in a laboratory. But there is no scope for such conscious experimentation in political science because it deals with human being and laboratory method does not work in any of the social sciences.
- v. Political science lack complete objectivity, an essential characteristic of physical sciences. A true or real scientific investigation implies that general laws or principles should be collected in an unbiased or detached manner. It is possible in physical sciences because they deal with inanimates which do not have any choice. But it is not possible in political science. Because the personality of a political scientist or investigator and his likes and dislikes often influence the collections of facts and generalizations based on them. Data in political science tend to be interpreted on the basis of one’s own values.

Because of these limitations, some thinkers even call it ‘Political Theory’ instead of political science. It is true that political science, by its nature, is neither an abstract science like mathematics nor is an exact science like physics, chemistry, botany and zoology. But still then some writers defended the above limitations and regarded political science as science dealing only with one aspect of man’s social behaviour, that is, political. G. E. G. Catlin observes, “Politics is a science in the sense that it is a body of knowledge that admits of statements as much as Economics in general laws. These laws are capable of empirical verification no less than the economic law of inverse ratio between supply and

price where the demand is constant.” Political science may be treated like “a science of aesthetics” (Burke) or “a science of morals” (Pollock) or “an inexact natural science like meteorology” (Bryce). The word ‘science’ should not be taken as seriously and as exactly as in the case of the exact sciences.

The following arguments can be given to regard political science as an inexact social science:

- i. Though absolute truth and precision cannot be attained by the subject, its study according to scientific principles is possible. Scientific methods and establishment of connection between causes and effect are possible in political science, and this has been actually demonstrated by political researchers. R.G. Gettell says, “If however a science be described as a mass of knowledge concerning a particular subject acquired by scientific observation, experience and study, and analyzed and classified into a unified whole, then political science may justly claim to be a science.” Aristotle considered politics as the master or supreme science, and employed scientific methods in his study of city-states. Besides Gettell, modern scholars like Bryce, Garner, Seeley, Burgess, Willoughby and others call it a science.
- ii. Though laboratory experiments are not possible, experiments under limitations are feasible, and in several countries political experiments have been successfully tried – methods of direct democracy like referendum and initiative were used and found workable in countries like Switzerland. At present political scientists know scientific techniques of studying problems of government and politics, which were known in the past. A political scientist or practitioner keenly observes political phenomena like the rise of new states, the eruptions of revolts and revolutions, the emergence of political parties or a change in the voting pattern. He then goes beyond his observations to discover causality and apply explanatory principles. Later, after testing his principles over a certain period, he proclaims them in public.

- iii. Though a scientific study, political thinkers have arrived at certain broad influences, conclusions and principles, which can be actually applied in the field of political organization. For example, it is an accepted principle in political science that civil servants should be employed on permanent basis and they should be neutral and impartial. Similarly, it is agreed that the judiciary should be independent, upright and impartial judges should be handsomely paid, their security of tenure should be guaranteed, and they should not be thrown to the tender mercies of the executive.
  
- iv Political science, that is, the subject dealing with state and government, is on par with other social sciences. If political science can't be treated as a science, no other social science can claim the same status. R. N. Gilchrist says, "To say that the only real sciences are those which have exact results with dogmatic proof of experiments is to deny the possibility of ethics, political economy, political science, sociology, metaphysics being treated sciences."

Today, political scientists, like any natural scientists, are carrying on the investigation of the political phenomena as scientifically as possible. They observe and collect data on any given problem at hand, classify it into categories, establish their linkage and on the basis of facts, analyze, build up an assumption or the hypothesis which is then tested through the inter-relationship of facts. Thus, there is less biasness involved in the studies of political science. The innumerable case studies of communities, villages, cities and individuals as political actors focus on the actualities in a fluid situation.

Thus, if by the term 'science' we mean systematized knowledge acquired through a scientific process, political science can be described as a science. We can conclude by saying that without being an exact science, political science has been responding to the needs of time and thus approximating itself to the claim of being called as science. It is a science in the sense that there is an important body of knowledge about the state, about the condition under which different kinds of government emerge, about the relation of the government with the government



in the different historical situation etc. It is not as exact as physical sciences because it is involved with human being whose actions can not be predicted with absolute certainty. But it definitely has a scientific outlook.

### **Check Your Progress-II**

- (i) Is political science really a science?
- (ii) What are the characteristics of pure science?
- (iii) Discuss the scientific character of political science.

## **1.4 Scope of Political Science**

Political science is a very vast subject. It is the study of the changing fluid of the society because of dynamism. Because of this dynamic character of political science, it encompasses many fields of knowledge which serve mankind. Its scope is ever expanding and its subject matter is entering into new virtue of the social, political and economic life of man. It is indeed difficult to determine the boundaries of a subject which is related to almost every aspects of human life.

### **i. Study of the State and Government**

There is no general agreement on the nature and scope of political science. Earlier writers on the subject simply used the term 'politics' in describing the entire science of the subject. In the Greeks' view, politics embraces everything that touches the life of the people only within the boundary of the city -states. Despite this, the Greek thinkers, notably Aristotle, considered politics a master science by clarifying a number of concepts and principles included in the subject. Writers of an earlier generation like Jellinek, Holtzendorff, and Sedgwick preferred the term 'politics' to political science.

Sir Frederick Pollock, using the term 'politics' in its broad sense, divides it into theoretical politics and practical or applied politics. The theoretical politics includes (a) The Theory of State, (b) The Theory of Government, and (c) The Theory of Legislation.

Thus, theoretical politics deals with the basic problems of the state, without concerning itself with the activities of any particular government on the means by which the end of any particular state is attained. On the other hand, practical politics deals with the actual working of the governments and its institutions.

The scope of political science is much more comprehensive than the term 'politics'. It connotes not only the whole range of knowledge regarding the state but also the society and all human efforts relating to governance. It also includes the structure and function of government, its forms and institutions, mode of representation, interaction of political parties, interest groups, mass media, relationships involving rule, authority, power, legitimacy both in national and international fields under its fold.

## **ii. Political Philosophy**

Political philosophy is an important area of study in the subject of political science. It deals with the fundamental problems of the nature of state, citizenship, questions of duty and right and political ideals. J.H. Hallowell rightly says, "Political philosophy is not concerned so much with political institutions as with the ideas and aspirations that are embodied in institutions." Political philosophy or theory has three ingredients (a) factual descriptive (b) Generalization based on observation and (c) Moral concepts or value judgments. H.B. Mayo says that each type of political system has a theory appropriate to it, a more or less cohesive body of principles on which it operates and a body of normative beliefs to justify it.

## **iii. Comparative Government and Legislation**

Comparative study of institutions of various constitutions is another important area of the study of political science. The study is nearly as old as political theory. Writers from Aristotle to Herman Finer have attempted to do it in a masterly way. Constitutions are studied one by one or in comparison with each other. Under the latter heading, we may study executive, the legislature, the judiciary, the political parties and civil services of different countries in a comparative way; and in so doing we may even evolve a theory or theories of constitutions and governments. It is possible to evolve a theory or theories of legislation for comparative study of legislation.

#### **iv. Study of Associations and Institutions**

The scope of political science also includes the study of associations and institutions as Garner observed, “In organized way fundamental problems of political science include, first, an investigation of the origin and nature of the state, second, an inquiry into nature, history and forms of political institutions and third, deduction therefrom, so far as possible, of laws of political growth and development.” In other words, we study in political science the origin and development of the state and many other political institutions and associations. There are many types of institutions in a country or in a society. State, an institution that stands supreme, controls all of them. These institutions are useful to the nation and have their utility in society. This is the reason why we study, in political science, these institutions, along with the state.

#### **v. Political Dynamics**

Political Dynamics refers to the forces at work in government and politics. There may be moral, economic, social, psychological forces or pressure in the political activities which explain political action. It includes (a) the organization of political parties, their function, support ideology and structure etc. (b) the role of premier groups and lobbies (c) the nature and manipulation of public opinion (d) the analysis of mass behaviour.

#### **vi. Study of National and International Problems and Political Study of Man**

The term ‘political science’ is intimately related to the English word “politics” which itself has been derived from the Greek words ‘polis’ or city-state. In ancient times, Greece was divided into small city-states and the affairs related to these city states were known as politics. But now, meaning of ‘politics’ is not considered to be so narrow. But these days it deals with the national and international problems. Despite this, it will not be wrong to say that the scope of political science includes the political study of man also; otherwise, the study of political science will remain incomplete. Herman Heller has laid stress on this point in ‘Encyclopedia of social Sciences’. He writes, “It may be said that the character of political science in all of its parts is determined by its basic pre-supposition regarding man.”

Explaining the scope of political science, Burgess has pointed out that the modern demands of land-extensions, representative government and national unity have made political science not only a science of political independence but that of state sovereignty also. According to Laski, “The study of political science concerns itself with the life of man in relation to organized states.”

#### **vii. Public Administration**

Public administration is a branch of political science. On account of their great importance in the modern world there is an increasing tendency to give them independent status. The subject matter of public administration includes:

- (a) organization (structure, coordination and control);
- (b) personnel administration (recruitment, training, promotion and morale of public employees);
- (c) financial administration (building, accounting, borrowing, taxation)
- (d) public relations;
- (e) administrative adjudication (giving justice in taxation labour, rent cases); and
- (f) administration of local self-governing units etc.

#### **viii. International Relations**

It is a significant and growing area of political science. International relations encompasses the study of various forces which shape the foreign policies of nation, emergence of international organization and diplomacy etc. In studying diplomacy, one studies not only the theory and practice of diplomacy but also its history. The new area of diplomacy has assumed increasing importance in the stability and management of all modern states. The pressure of international events makes the study of diplomacy an indispensable part of modern political science.

#### **ix. International Law and Organization**

Fen Wick says that international law is the body of general principles and specific rules which are binding upon the members of the international community in their mutual relations. It

imposes certain obligations and grants, certain rights on the states. These rules and regulations are formulated by various international organizations like United Nations Organizations and various organs and organizations associated with it. The present world of mutual intercourse and relationship and international law and organizations assumes utmost importance as the subject matter of political science.

**x. Study of Political Ethics**

Political science is also concerned with the political ethics of a polity. It starts with the vexing questions of the best form of the government and proceeds to what the government ought to do and how best it is to be done. It not only suggests the compulsions of the maintenance for the particular system but also methods to attain perfections. While doing so, it prescribes the purposes, ends and limits of political obligation.

**xi. Study of Political Behaviour**

Another important part of the scope of political science is the study of human behaviour as a member of any political unit in the process of politics. Voting behaviour, political participation, leadership recruitment, elite behaviour, mass politics, etc. form an integral part of political science. It also conducts studies at village, city of community.

**xii. Problem Solving Science**

As a problem solving science, the main concern of political science is to help people to live in harmony. It, therefore, takes up the practical problems and offers solution based upon particular situations reflecting the capacity of a political system and the attainment of its goals.

Thus the scope of political science extends not only to the description and understanding of the state and government in their historical, political and administrative spheres but also to the psychological and social analysis of the individual or group political behaviour. In modern terms, the scope of political science has been extended to all aspects of man from his cradle to the

grave. It has emerged as the most dynamic force to meet the requirements of the nuclear space age. It is the master science which provides answers to all problems, which seeks to control human actions and behaviour in unfolding, supporting and directing the various dimensions of man.

### **Check your progress-III**

- (i) Discuss the scope of political science.
- (ii) Highlight the importance of political science.
- (iii) Why is the study of state and government important?

### **1.5 Let Us Sum Up**

To sum up, political science, which developed in Greece 235 years back, evolved as a discipline which concerned with the political activities of individual and state. Being one of the branches of social sciences dealing with relation of human with a man, it has a close connection with other social sciences like history, economics, jurisprudence, sociology, etc.

### **1.6 Key Words**

City-state	:	The general form of political organisation in the ancient Greece.
Theoretical politics	:	It deals with the basic problems of the state without concerning itself with practical politics.
Practical Politics	:	It deals with actual working of the governments and its institutions.
Political philosophy	:	It is an important area of study in the subject of political science which deals with fundamental problems of nature of state, citizenship, questions of duty and right and political ideals.

Political dynamics : It refers to the forces at work in government and politics.

### 1.7 Check Your Learning

1. Define political science and discuss its nature and scope.
2. Define political science and discuss its relations with other social sciences.
3. Define political science and discuss its relations with History and Law.
4. Define political science. Is it really a science?

### 1.8 Suggested Readings

- Apter David, E : *Introduction to Political Analysis*, Prentice Hall of India Private limited, New Delhi, 1981.
- AshirVatham, Eddy : *Political Theory*, S. Chand and Company limited, New Delhi, 1980.
- Gilchrist, R. N. : *Principles of Political Science*, Orient Longman, 1987.
- Jain, M.P. : *Political Theory – Liberal, Marxian*, Kaveri Printers (p) limited, New Delhi, 1979.
- Verma, S P : *Modern Political Theory*, Vikas Ghaziabad, 1980.
- Agarwal R.C. : *Political Theory*, S. Chand and company, New Delhi, 1991.
- Johari, J.C. : *Contemporary Political Theory*, Sterling Publication, New Delhi, 1983.
- WasbyL . Stephen : *Political Science - The Discipline and Its Dimensions*, Scientific Book, Calcutta, 1970.

## Unit II

### **APPROACHES TO THE STUDY OF POLITICAL SCIENCE –HISTORICAL, PHILOSOPHICAL, INSTITUTIONAL, BEHAVIOURALISM AND MARXIAN**

#### **Structure**

- 2.0 Objectives
- 2.1. Introduction
- 2.2 Traditional Approaches
  - 2.2.1 Philosophical Approach
  - 2.2.2 Historical Approach
  - 2.2.3 Legal Approach
  - 2.2.4 Institutional Approach
- 2.3 Modern Approaches
  - 2.3.1 Development of Behaviouralism
  - 2.3.2 Behavioural Approach
  - 2.3.3 Characteristics of Behaviouralism
- 2.4 Post Behaviouralism
  - 2.4.1 Characteristics of Post Behaviouralism
- 2.5 Marxist Approach to the Study of Political Science
- 2.6 Let Us Sum Up
- 2.7 Key Words
- 2.8 Check Your Learning
- 2.9 Suggested Readings

#### **2.0 Objectives**

After reading this unit you should be able to:

- comprehend the various approaches to political science;



- understand and distinguish between traditional and modern approaches; and
- know the development of Post Behaviouralism and Marxist approach to the study of political science.

## **2.1 Introduction**

Political problems have been subjected to different kinds of analysis since the beginning of political thought. The thinkers, theoreticians and analysts have taken diversified views in their own ways as per time and necessity to understand and explain the '*political reality*'. Various explanatory methods or approaches were used by political scientists to understand the political phenomena and processes, which help us to understand dynamics of political science. These approaches are useful in ordering the apparently disorganized and fragmented political phenomena. Using a particular set of concepts, an approach seeks to provide a framework for explanation and prediction.

On the basis of modes of analysis and time dimensions, the approaches to the study of political science can be categorized into (a) Traditional and (b) Modern approach. The philosophical, historical, legal and the institutional mode of analysis based on normative evaluation of political phenomena are associated with the Traditional approaches. The Modern approaches, on other hand, are supposed to be value-free, empirical and behavioural. However, this classification is a very crude one. The mode of analysis which is now called Modern approach has its roots in traditional political thinking and there is a degree of continuity in political analysis, both substantively and methodologically.

Besides these two, another approach has achieved considerable significance in recent times. This can be called the Marxist approach to the study of politics which has its distinctive character in terms of method and categories of analysis.

## **2.2 Traditional Approach**

Traditional approach is a broad term which refers to the normative, institutional, historical, legal and ideological approaches to the study of politics. It stands for using knowledge

of history, law and philosophy for describing various political processes and phenomena. It regards politics as the activities of political institutions of state, and focuses on the institutions as key agencies of social control and social change.

### **2.2.1 Philosophical Approach**

Philosophical approach is the oldest approach to the study of politics. It can be described as a normative or ethical approach. It advocates the study of state as the philosophy of state. The questions like the nature of state, ends of states, the ideal relationship between state and individual, etc., form the core of this approach. It seeks to study theoretically, logically and ethically, discuss and give answers to above questions. Its aim is to provide true and best knowledge about various political institutions. A follower of philosophical approach wants to make conceptions of reality as clear, consistent, coherent and helpful as possible. He seeks to influence and guide thinking and the expression of thought so as to maximize the prospect that the selected aspect of reality (politics) will be made intelligible.

The great political philosophers from Plato, Kante, Hegel to Leo Strauss and Eric Voegelin used this approach. It is purely a speculative and deductive method. The thinkers start with certain premises or a prior conception about the nature of the world, human being's place in it, and purposes of human life. On the basis of these premises, they lay down certain ideas for individual and collective life. Then through a process of reasoning, they construct a theory of the state and the government and try to show how the society and government should be organised so that those ideals may be realized.

A noteworthy feature of this approach is that the thinkers do not prove, by reasoning or experimentation, the original premises with which they had started. They consider them to be self evident truth and take them for granted. Secondly, on the basis of their self-evident truth, they lay down certain principles regarding the purpose, functions and organizations of the state. In this approach, general laws are not derived from fact of political life, but an attempt is made to show that the facts confirm to the general laws.

## **Evaluation**

The philosophical approach is criticized for being speculative and abstract. Such an approach takes us far away from the world of reality. For this reason, it is accused of being hypothetical. The critics of this approach further pointed out that the approach ignores the role that sociological environment and the individual behaviour play in conditioning a political phenomenon. The actual actors in all political phenomena are the individuals whose behaviour in turn are formed by their psychological make-up and sociological environments. However, the great protagonist of this approach like Leo Strauss affirms that values are indispensable part of political philosophy and they cannot be excluded from the study of politics. This approach has the merit of evolving great principles for whose realization the state is supposed to exist. This approach shows that political scientist should not get lost in the world of mere facts and experiments. The supporter of this approach also considered that political science is essentially a normative discipline. Every political act implies some underlying political value which cannot be discussed scientifically. What is justice? What makes power and its exercise legitimate? Questions like these cannot be answered by Science. This is within the scope of philosophy. Hence, philosophical speculation of political phenomena will always continue to be relevant.

### **2.2.2 Historical Approach**

The second important approach to the study of political phenomena is the historical approach. Montesquieu, Seeley, Maine, Freeman and Laski are some of the eminent exponents of this approach. This approach advocates the study of politics as history of state, government and other political institutions. It justifies the study of past, as a whole or in phases, as the best means to understand the present for analyzing and predicting their future. For studying the history of state and other political institutions, this approach advocates the study of socio-economic conditions, crisis of the past and the impact they left on the minds of great thinkers. For example, by analyzing the ideas of Plato and Aristotle, we can analyse the nature and functions of Greek city-states and by analyzing the ideas of Hobbes and Locke, we can understand the nature and function of the state of the 17<sup>th</sup> century. As such, by training and analyzing the history of political institutions, we can understand the nature and functioning of contemporary political institutions. Political philosophy, political action, political thought and

political theory are always affected and determined by the politics and socio-economic conditions which prevailed at that time. As much for understanding political theory and politics, it is necessary to clearly understand the history of socio-economic conditions and politics.

This approach has been a popular approach in political science. The first modern political thinker Machiavelli used the historical approach to explain and justify his political ideas. In contemporary times, George H. Sabine has been the representative of this approach. In the opinion of Sabine, a political theory is always advanced in “reference to a pretty specific situation and therefore reconstruction of time, place and circumstance in which it was produced is essential to understand it. It only by understands the history of political theory in this context that we can clearly understand and describe the present politics and assess the future possible course.” As such by studying history and ideas of the political philosophy, we can understand the nature and evolution of politics and political theory. Study of politics, therefore, naturally demands a study of history of political institution and events.

## **Evaluation**

This approach has certain weaknesses. For instance, as James Bryce says, it is often loaded with superficial resemblances. As such historical parallels may sometimes be illuminating, but they are also misleading in most of the cases. Likewise, Prof. Ernest Barker maintains that history can trace a process; it cannot determine the value of the result. It remains a record of what it was and of how it comes to be. It cannot attain to a view of what ought to be. Another serious defect in this historical approach is that it often leads to a temptation to use historical approach degenerated into historicism. The historical approach promotes a deterministic attitude toward social change and belittles the importance of human efforts.

Nevertheless, the value of the study of political theory in context of its historical evolution and growth cannot be so lightly dismissed. It helps researcher and students of political science to understand political institutions and make generalizations on the basis of historical records. Again it is from history that political scientists know about the contributions made by political thinkers. A good number of modern political thinkers like Karl Popper, Crossman,

Russell have tried their best to interpret classical platonic ideas by giving new theories. It is history which has presented accounts of the origin and growth of political institutions. No study of political science can be made without the proper use of the historical approach. This historical approach enables the researcher to broaden his mental horizon and have a proper perspective for the study of political science.

### **2.2.3 Legal Approach**

The legal approach advocated by lawyers and jurists stands for the study of political science in terms of political powers, functions and positions of governmental institutions. Themes of law and justice are treated as not mere affairs of jurisprudence, rather political scientists look at state as the up keeper of an effective and equitable system of law and order. Matters relating to the organizations, jurisprudence and independence of judicial institution therefore become an essential concern of political scientists. The protagonist of this approach viewed the politics as a science of legal norms having nothing in common with the science of state as a social organism. Thus, this approach treats the state primarily as an organization for the creation and enforcement of law. George Jellinck, John Austin, Meyer, Laband and others have put forward the legal method of study treating the state as a legal entity.

This approach regards organised society not as a social or political phenomena, but a purely juridical regime, an 'ensemble' of public law, rights and obligation, founded on a system of pure logic and reason.

### **Evaluation**

This approach made rich contribution to political science by developing the legal concept of Sovereignty, State, Law, International law and Administrative law. But this approach is also criticized from many angles. It is incorrect to lock the state within legal framework, completely ignoring non legal factors like social and economic, which profoundly affect the developments of the state. The approach rigidly restricts the field of study and hence, by this approach, political science cannot be studied correctly and fully. Jurists advocating this approach belong to different

schools and they have not been able to evolve a common method which can serve the purpose of political scientists.

#### **2.2.4 Institutional Approach**

Institutional approach focuses on the study of institutions. The institutions include constitutions, structures of legislatures, courts and executive branches, rules and other basic documents on which government is supposed to rest. The rules include registration and election laws, and the rules by which political parties and different forms of Municipal government are operated. This approach advocates that political institutions must be clearly understood before studying their effects and working.

The Institutional approach may be visualized in the work of several English and American writers. Walter Bagehot, Munro, Herman Finer Laski, Bryce, Maurice, Duverger, Sartori and others supported and employed this approach to analyze the political phenomena. The striking feature of their works is that the study of politics has been confined to the formal, as well as informal institutional structure of a political system.

#### **Evaluation**

This approach has been criticized for being too narrow. It ignores the roles of individuals who constitute and operate the formal structures and sub-structures of a political system. It is because of that the behavioral approach has overshadowed the significance of this approach. Another difficulty is that the meaning and range of an institutional system vary with the views of the scholar. Further, this approach does not specify as what is to be included or excluded for its study. It cannot be considered as an independent approach because it studies the institutions in isolation and not in an integrated way. Finally, the students of this approach have also tended to ignore the international politics.

Thus, the traditional approach may be said to have four main varieties as discussed above. Their outstanding feature is that the value-laden system dominates. Normatism assigns to

them a peculiar and distinctive character. As a result of this, political theory is said to have become abstract, hypothetical, speculative and even metaphysical. To sum up, the characteristics of traditional approach to the study of political science are:

1. It is historical, descriptive and prescriptive in character with dominant concern with values and goals. Theory building through data collection and analysis is given little importance.
2. It is theoretical. Its main sources of study are opinion, views, speculation and impressions of various political scholars.
3. The scope of study is limited. No attempt is made to relate the working of political institutions with the socio-economic environment in which they work.
4. Non-political and extra-constitutional elements of politics are given scant attentions.
5. It focuses on legalistic and institutional analysis.
6. It ignores the role of individuals who constitute and operate the formal structures and sub-structures of political systems.
7. It involves a study of politics with the help of law, history and philosophy.

With all these limitations, the traditional approach naturally failed to hold the support of political scientists of the 20<sup>th</sup> century. The wide scope and scientific nature of contemporary studies of politics made it essential for them to adopt new approaches. The modern approaches including the behavioral scientific approach came to be much more popular than traditional approach. Nevertheless, it should not be taken to mean that the traditional approach is already dead or dying. It will continue to be popular with a number of political scientists who advocate dependence on law, history and philosophy as the best way to understand human political institutions and processes.

### **Check Your Progress-I**

- (i) What are traditional approaches and who were the pioneers?
- (ii) Discuss various traditional approaches.
- (iii) Who were the supporters of historical approach?
- (iv) What is philosophical approach?

## **2.3 Modern Approaches**

Partly as a reaction against the drawback of traditional approaches and partly in search more 'scientific' knowledge about politics, political scientists in recent times come out with a variety of approaches. The first breakthrough came with the emergence of 'behavioural movement' in political science. The present century has witnessed revolutionary improvements in the natural sciences, which have also influenced considerably the thinking and analysis in the social science in general. In the context of the steady development in the natural sciences and gradual sophistications in the social sciences, a new awakening took place in political science roughly after the Second World War. A new movement was ushered in by a group of political scientists, mostly in United States of America, who openly expressed their dissatisfaction with the traditional approaches. This new brand of political scientists invited attention to the development in other social sciences such as sociology, psychology, anthropology, economics, etc. from which, they felt, important lesson could be learnt by political scientists. They were unhappy with the study of traditional political sciences which did very little to apply the scientific and statistical tools and method of analysis in order to reach high level generalizations. Out of this anger and unhappiness of the new political scientists was born what is now commonly known as behavioural or scientific approach or Modern approach.

The Modern approach advocates a comprehensive and realistic study of all formal and informal, governmental and non-governmental structures and processes in terms of their actual working in the context of socio-economic, culture and psychological environment within which they are at work. These approaches regarded the use of scientific method and interdisciplinary focus as essential for explanation and theory building in politics. It stands for empirical investigation of the relevant data. Scientification is its objective. It stands for the study of facts to the exclusion of values in political studies.

### **2.3.1 Development of Behaviouralism**

Behaviouralism is one of the most important developments in political science in 20<sup>th</sup> century. The centre of origin and development of this approach has been American Universities. The British political scientist, Graham Wallas and an American political scientist Arthur F.



Bentley were the pioneers who advocated strongly the utility of political behaviour to study the actual phenomena of politics in 1908 in United States of America. Graham Wallashold that politics without the study of psychology of individual is meaningless because behaviour plays an important role in political phenomena. Both of them attacked the formalism and legalism of traditional political science. They called upon the political scientists to concentrate on the study of human being's political behaviour for understanding the political phenomena. Its systematic approach started when an America Journalist, Frank Kent wrote a book under the title 'Political Behaviour' in 1928. But the credit for its popularization and application in political science goes to Herbert Tingston who wrote a book in 1973 under the title 'Political Behaviour studies' in 'Election Statistics'. In 1925, Charles E. Merriam also showed keen interest in the study of political behaviour. The leadership of Harold Laswell, Robert Dahl, David Easton, Almond Powell and Heinz Enlan, etc. contributed substantially to behavioural methodology by giving a new direction to the study of political phenomena. With the development of behaviouralism in political science, the American political scientists started using the quantitative data's and statistical tables. Harold Laswell contributed the method of content analysis and psycho-analytical theory to the behavioural movement. Then following a host of techniques of survey design, data collection, sampling, interviewing, questionnaire, etc., the political scientists like Almond, David Easton, Verba, Powell and Apter developed theoretical framework and research design, thus enriching the literature of behavioural approach to the study of political phenomena.

### **2.3.2 Behavioural Approach**

Behaviouralism is a sort of protest movement against the traditional approaches in political science. It stresses the special importance of the scientific outlook and objectivity and made individual the centre of attention in the study of political phenomena. The behavioural approach criticized the traditional approaches as parochial and value-laden. This approach uses scientific techniques and tools, empirical and statistical methods to ensure maximum accuracy in the prediction of political problems. The essence of this approach is its central focus on 'political behaviour'. According to Heinz Enlan, "The study of 'political behaviour' is concerned with the acts, attitudes, preferences and expectations of human being in political context. It is a fundamental characteristic of behavioural approach to political science that the unit of analysis is

the individual person in a political situation.” Thus, the behaviouralist studies the behaviour of an individual whose interactions go to constitute group actions or collectivities. The behaviouralists reject political institution as the basic unit for research and identify the behaviour of the individual in political situations as the basic unit of analysis. It identified ‘Social Sciences’ as behavioural sciences and emphasized the unity of political science with the social science, so defined. This approach advocates the utilizations and development of more precise techniques of observing, classifying and measuring data and urges the use of statistical and/or quantitative formulation, and defines the construction of systematic empirical theory as the goal of political science. Behaviouralism or behavioural approach emphasizes scientific, objective and value-free study of political phenomena as conditioned by the environment, particularly the behaviour of individuals involved in these phenomena. According to Dahl, “Behavioural approach is an attempt to improve our understanding of points by seeking to explain the empirical aspects of political life by means of methods, theories, criteria of proof that are acceptable according to canons and assumptions of modern political science”. Simply stated, the behavioural approach bears the following important characteristics:

1. It is a sort of protest movement against the traditional approaches which confined its study only to the state and government ignoring political phenomena and the behaviour of men in a particular political situation. The behaviouralism have made a shift from political institution to political processes.
2. It concentrates on the theoretical and empirical analysis of the behaviour of persons and social groups rather than on the origin of the state, functions of the government and political institutions like the traditionalists.
3. The approach advocates value-free science of politics. They emphasize empirical values which are arrived at after a lot of objective study and scientific investigation.
4. It seeks to place theory and research in a frame of reference common to that of social psychology, sociology and cultural anthropology.
5. It has brought methodological revolution in the study of political phenomena in the form of techniques like observation, interview, survey, research, case studies, etc.

### **2.3.3 Characteristics of Behaviouralism as given by David Easton**

David Easton, one of the most important exponents and founder of this approach, has summed around eight characteristics of behaviouralism. They are discussed below:

#### **1. Regularities**

The behaviouralist hold the opinion that human behaviour, despite its differences, shows some remarkable uniformity in political behaviour, which can be generalized and that political phenomena can be predicted. Though the political behaviour is determined by so many factors and is not always uniform, it has been observed that human beings behave in certain respects in a more or less similar manner on different occasions. Voting behaviour is the most striking example in this regard.

#### **2. Verification**

The behaviouralists do not accept anything as granted like the traditionalists. They do not believe in abstract political theory. They believe in empirical or scientific results which can be achieved after scientific verifications.

#### **3. Techniques**

The behaviouralist emphasized the adoption of correct techniques for acquiring and interpreting the scientific data. For this purpose, they suggest the use of sophisticated tools and techniques like sample surveys, mathematical modulations and simulation etc.

#### **4. Quantification**

The behaviouralists contend that a researcher cannot properly explain political phenomena nor he can safely predict a political result for the future without measurement and quantification. For example, David Easton has observed, "Precision in the recording of data and

the statement of this findings requires tables, graphs and curves are drawn in behaviour research.”

## **5. Values**

It is the greatest point of difference between the behaviouralist and the traditionalists over the question of value neutrality. The behaviouralists believe in value-free study of political phenomena. They contend that only value which cannot be tested empirically is an ethical value. Scientific enquiry in order to be objective, therefore, must be value-free according to them. Political science is a scientific study of politics in its functional aspects, carried through empirical methods and has nothing to do with moral or ethical questions.

## **6. Systematization**

Behaviouralism believes that research in political science must be systematic by which they mean that it must be “theory-oriented’ and theory-directed”, that theory and research should form as “closely interrelated part of a coherent and orderly body of knowledge” and that “research, untouched by theory may prove trivial and theory unsupported by data, futile”.

## **7. Pure Science**

The behaviouralists insist on “pure science approach”. This means that whatever research they make, that should be applied in solving the problems of humankind. Therefore, they apply the scientific theory to political problems to analyze the political phenomena and process.

## **8. Integration**

Finally, the behaviouralists believe that social and political phenomena cannot be studied in isolation. It is difficult to draw the exact dividing line between men’s social, economic, political, and cultural and other activities and they can be understood only in the wider context of the entire social life of the society. Therefore, the behaviouralist believed in integrated approaches and for this purpose the political scientists have to study other social sciences like

sociology, history, economic, anthropology etc. Because the study of political phenomena requires understanding of how the economic, cultural and other phenomena in society are unfolding themselves. In other words, it means an inter-disciplinary approach.

These eight assumptions formed the common core of the view of almost all the behaviouralists. From these assumptions it can be concluded that behavioural approach seeks to study politics as an aspect of human behaviour in a framework of reference common to other social sciences. It prescribes the use of empirical research, mathematical-statistical - quantification techniques of data collection and analysis with the purpose of building a scientific theory of political behaviour.

### **Evaluation**

The behaviouralists have taken an important step in making the subject scientific. They have succeeded in gathering valuable data on problem of leadership, voting pattern, role of political parties, pressure groups and lobbies, political attitudes, prejudices and preferences and several other matters with the help of new data processing equipments. Political science has been made a more dynamic discipline by the advocacy of the use of the new behavioural approach. Starting with a new concept of the discipline as human behaviour in institutional situation, the behavioural approach has set before itself the normal ideals of science such as the quest for basic understanding of political process, non-prescription of ethical goals and methodological innovations in search of dependable empirical knowledge. The statutory results of behavioural approach can be summed up as: a new awareness about the need of scientific research, a readings to consciously attempt conceptualization, greater degree of empiricism and increasing use of new analytical techniques in aid of investigation. In spite of its merits, the approach has been subjected to severe criticism. The main points of criticism are:

1. It circumscribes the scope of political science by advising to study only those aspects of political life that is amenable to measurement and quantification. In this way the significance of speculative political theory is sacrificed.

2. It attaches too much importance to the techniques and methods and do not worry at all about the theoretical importance of subject.
3. It is based upon false theory of knowledge. It takes facts alone as real. On the contrary, 'Universals' are as real as facts and facts can have meaning only in connection with universals.
4. The behaviouralism makes political science dependent upon other social science, particularly psychology, sociology and anthropology.
5. The behaviouralist have been concentrating their studies on static subjects and ignored the burning problems such as threats of nuclear war, hunger, famine, under nourishment etc. because all these problems cannot be subjected to statistical and empirical verification.
6. It is very difficult to study the ever-changing behaviour of a person because the emotions, ideas and thinking go on changing continuously. Therefore, no correct prediction can be made about the behaviour of persons. Moreover, it is very difficult to measure the role of various factors governing the behaviour of a person.
7. The study of politics can never be value-free since the very selection of subjects for investigation is determined by values.
8. Behaviouralism is a pseudo-politics because it looks only to the American interest rather than striving toward the universal interest.
9. The excess dependence upon other social sciences is a likely threat to the very identity, integrity and autonomy of political science.

Despite these limitations and points of criticisms, it cannot be denied that behaviouralism has played heuristic role in the development of the discipline. It successfully focused attention upon the limitation of the traditional approach. It can legitimately claim credit for inducing, popularizing and improving the scientific method of social science research and the use of statistical and mathematical techniques in the discipline. However, in the process they are overwhelmed by concern for techniques, methodological sophistications and technical proficiency in research instead of concentrating their attentions on solving the day-to-day political crisis. As a result, within twenty years, right from mid sixties, there appeared several

cracks among the behaviouralists and many of them advocated a rejection of behaviouralism to get away from orthodoxism. Such political scientists who accepted the merits of behaviouralism and wanted reforms in it, came to be known as post-behaviouralists.

### **Check Your Progress-II**

- (i) What is Modern Approach?
- (ii) What are the characteristics of Modern Approach?
- (iii) Discuss the features of Behaviouralism.

## **2.4 Post-Behaviouralism / Post-Behavioural Approach**

In the late 1960's, dissatisfaction with the behavioural approach began to be keenly felt, and this ultimately culminated in an intellectual movement, called post-behavioural movement which exhorted political scientists to become more 'relevant' in their researches, to show concern for values and to channelize their special knowledge to improve the society. Post-behaviouralists were behaviouralists who advocated for reforms in behaviouralism for its over-concentrations on methodology ignoring the real substance and issues of politics.

David Easton, one of the founders, got disillusioned with behaviouralism and said that he felt dissatisfied with the political research and teaching under the impact of behaviouralism. The behavioural approach was trying to convert the study of politics into a discipline based on the methodology of natural sciences. In the process, political science lost touch with current and contemporary world. So, Easton asserted that role of the intellectuals has been and must be to protect human values of civilization. So post-behaviouralist decided that political science must be relevant to society and it must deliberate over such basic issues of society such as justice, liberty, equality and democracy etc. Post-behaviouralism with this new emphasis started synthesizing the contending schools of thought—behaviouralism and traditionalism. So, post behaviouralism is thus both a movement and intellectual tendency. "It is a future oriented approach, seeking to propel political science in new directions and to add rather than deny its

past heritage. It is a genuine revolution, not a reaction, a becoming, not a preservation, a reform not a counterreformation.”

#### **2.4.1 Characteristic of Post Behaviouralism**

David Easton who once described eight main characteristics of behaviouralism and called them “the intellectual foundation stones” of movement, now come out with seven major traits of post behaviouralism and described them as “credo of relevance” or a “distillation of maximal image.” They can be summarized and used as follows:

##### **1. Substance Must Have Precedence over Technique**

David Easton holds the view that substance must have precedence over techniques. It may be good to have sophisticated tools of investigation but the most important point was the purpose to which these tools were applied. Unless the scientific research was relevant and meaningful for contemporary urgent social problems, it was not worth being undertaken.

##### **2. Emphasis should be on social change and not social preservation**

The post behaviouralists say that the contemporary political science should place its main emphasis on social change, not social preservation as the behaviouralists seemed to be doing. The behaviouralists had confined themselves exclusively to the description and analysis of facts, without taking sufficient care to understand these facts in their broad social context, which have made behavioural political science an ideology of social conservatism tempered by modest incremental change.

##### **3. Political science should not lose touch with brute realities of politics**

The behaviouralists had lost touch with brute realities of politics and concentrated these efforts on abstraction and analysis. The task of post behaviouralism is to face and find solution of



increasing social conflicts and deepening fear and anxieties about the future. So political science must acquire the position of a solving science.

#### **4. Political science should not be value-free**

The post behaviouralists firmly hold the view that values played a significant role in the political research and values were the propelling force behind knowledge. Hence to understand the limit of our knowledge, we need to be aware of value premises on which it stands and alternative for which this knowledge could be used.

#### **5. Political scientist must protect human values of civilization**

The post behaviouralists argue that the political scientists being intellectuals must protect and promote human values of civilization. If the political scientists continued to keep themselves away from the social problems they would become mere technicians or mechanics for tinkering with society.

#### **6. Post-Behaviouralism emphasizes action in place of contemplative science**

Easton points out that to know is to bear the responsibility for acting and to act is to engage in reshaping. So, the post behaviouralists should concentrate more and more on action not on contemplative science. Their entire research should be oriented towards studying the social and political ills of the society and the methods to remove them.

#### **7. Urgent need to politicize the profession**

Once it is admitted that the political scientists, being intellectuals, have a positive role to play in the society, then in order to achieve the goal it becomes inevitable that all the professional associations as well as universities must be politicized.

Thus, the post-behaviouralists as such advocate the need to make political science research- or 'substance'-oriented, relevant to social phenomena and action-oriented. To quote David Easton, Post-behaviouralists plead for a more relevant research. It pleads for an orientation to the work that will encourage political scientists, even in their professional capacity to prescribe and to act as to improve political life according to human criteria. Post behaviouralism rejects the thorough going empiricism value, neutralism and technique obsession of the behaviouralists. It attacks the craze or obsession for a scientific research and seeks to offer an integrated view, combining in a subtle way behavioural advocacy of empiricism with normativism of the traditionalists.

### **Check your progress-III**

- (i) What are the factors that led to the development of post Behaviouralism?
- (ii) Discuss the characteristics of Post-Behaviouralism.

## **2.5 Marxist Approach to the Study of Political Science**

The Marxian approach to the study of political science has a distinctive character of its own in terms of method and categories of analysis. This approach is largely based on the writings of Karl Marx and Engel. It is also called Marxist Leninist approach or class approach to the study of political science because it was explained, developed and further applied for the first time by Lenin followed by Stalin in Russia and Mao-Tse-Tung in people's Republic of China. It also seeks to study politics in terms of relation between the two economic classes - The Have and Have-nots or the owners and the workers.

The Marxian approach is based on the view that political relations are determined by economic or production relations between the two economic classes which have always been present in every society and which are the two true constituents of all relations - economic, social, political, etc. It applies the theory of dialectical materialism, the law of social development and regards the politics as an aspect of political economy rather than a distinct discipline. It regards politics as a product of economic relations or the production relations

between the two economic classes – the Have and Have-nots. The Haves, in order to maintain their control over and exploitation of the Have-nots, use the state power in the form of laws, rules and policies. The whole exercise is controlled, regulated and run by the Haves for exploiting and keeping the Have-nots under their superior control. The economic relation or the relations of production constitute the fundamental structure. Upon it is based the super structure of all other types of relations – political, social, cultural, religious etc. Therefore, politics has its roots in economics. In short, Marxian views on man, society and politics are the basis of his political analysis. It viewed the state as the ‘instrument’ of exploitation in the hands of the rich for exploiting the poor, created at a particular stage of social evolution determined and conditioned by mode of economic relations.

Marx was probably the first to develop a new approach in social science which could be called a systematic inter-disciplinary approach. He locates the primary source of political behaviour in socio-economic factor. Marx takes into account to study those aspects of the social process which affects the process of politics and are affected by it. In short, Marxian paradigm of political analysis is as follows:

1. Marxist regards the modes of production as basic in socio-political analysis. Politics and state cannot be discussed in isolation from this economic base of society and the basis of politics should be seen in the economic system of society.
2. Politics is the study of class relations and class struggle in society. Economic interests of various classes are reflected in politics.
3. Study of political phenomena is only study of dialectic materialism and class struggle.
4. Study of politics is fundamentally determined by economic base and it is not something above classes and class-struggle, or above society. Every politics is class politics and every class of society has its own politics.

5. Political institutions are there to protect the class interests. They are regarded as outgrowths of the material conditions.

6. Politics is a specific phenomenon. Politics cannot end the class division of society, nor can it end the class struggle. Politics cannot serve the common interest of all the classes in a society because the interests of the different classes are antagonistic and there is no common interest in a class divided society.

7. Marxism supports revolutionary politics. Politics is only a dimension of social process. In a classless society politics will also decline. Only revolutionary politics is the correct politics because it is the way for emancipation of the working class.

### **Evaluation**

Marxist approach or more precisely speaking, class approach to study Political Science in the contemporary period is very popular among the political scientists for analysing, explaining and predicting the processes of politics at works. However, it has been criticized by others from various angles. The criticisms are:

1. It wrongly assumes that politics is a dependent process dependent upon economic relations.
2. It seeks to suggest an analysis on the basis of class struggle between the two economic classes the Haves and Have-nots.
3. It wrongly suggests that class struggle has been and still continues to be the eternal code of social evolution and that revolution is the natural and final culmination of class struggle.
4. The approach while giving utmost importance to economic factor and class war totally ignores other factors like capital, machinery, skill and organization which go a long way to produce the wealth.
5. The ideological basis of Marxism – Dialectical materialism, in particular, has been severely criticized by critics as unreal, and biased.

6. The emergence of welfare state emphasizing the use of state power, laws and policies for securing the welfare and interest of all, particularly of the poor and downtrodden nullify the Marxian view of the state as a machine or an instrument of hegemony and class control.
7. Finally, Duverger criticized this approach from two basic stand points. First, it overestimates the part played by class conflict in the formation of political differences. Secondly, it gives too narrow a definition of class.

However, despite the fact that there is some weight in the argument of critics, the Marxian approach has been and continues to be a very popular approach. This approach has definitely and considerably enhanced the ability of the political scientists to analyze and explain the whole process of politics. It indeed offers a unique and very useful way of finding sociological explanations for political problems.

#### **Check Your Progress-IV**

- (i) Who are the pioneers of Marxist Approaches?
- (ii) Discuss the Marxian view of politics.
- (iii) Discuss the characteristics of Marxist Approach to the study of political science.

## **2.6 Let Us Sum Up**

Thus, Political Science, over the years developed various methods or approaches to understand the 'Political reality'. These approaches or explanatory methods help the students of Political Science to comprehend the political dynamics, political processes and phenomena and provide various analytical tools to make political predictions. In this unit, we have discussed some important methods like philosophical, historical, legal, institutional, behavioural, etc. to study Political Science.

## 2.7 Key Words

Traditional Approach	:	Method of political science which is based on normative evaluation of political phenomena.
Modern Approach	:	The mode of analysis based on value free and empirical study of political phenomena
Ethics	:	A science of morals which lays down standard of good and bad or right or wrong.
Marxist Approach	:	The approach which is largely based on the writings of Karl Marx and Engels.
Behavioural Approach	:	A protest movement against the traditional approach which believed in value free study of political science.

## 2.8 Check Your Learning

1. Briefly describe the basic assumptions of traditional methods/ approaches to the study of political science. What are its limitations?
2. Discuss the characteristics of Modern approach to the study of Political Science.
3. Discuss the growth of behaviouralism and its principles or characteristics.  
Examine the differences between traditional and behavioural approach.
4. Discuss the basic characteristics of behavioural approach behaviouralism.  
What are its limitations?
5. What do you understand by the term 'post-behaviouralism'? Highlight the characteristics of this movement.
6. Describe the post-behavioural developments.
7. Examine the Marxian approach to the study of Political Science.

## 2.9 Suggested Readings

- Apter David, E : *Introduction to Political Analysis*, Prentice Hall of India Private limited, New Delhi, 1981
- AshirVatham, Eddy : *Political Theory*, S. Chand and Company limited, New Delhi, 1980.
- Gilchrist, R. N. : *Principles of Political Science*, Orient Longman, 1987.
- Jain, M.P. : *Political Theory – Liberal, Marxian*, Kaveri Printers (p) limited, New Delhi, 1979.
- Verma, S P : *Modern Political Theory*, Vikas Ghaziabad, 1980.
- Agarwal R.C. : *Political Theory*, S. Chand and company, New Delhi, 1991.
- Johari, J.C. : *Contemporary Political Theory*, Sterling Publication, New Delhi, 1983.
- Wasby L. Stephen : *Political Science - The decipline and its dimensions*, Scientific Book, Calcutta, 1970.
- Garner, J. W. : *Political Science and Government*, World press Calcutta, 1952.
- Ray Amal, Bhattacharya Mohit.: *Political Theory – Ideas and Institutions*, World Press Private Limited, Calcutta, 1998.
- Tripathy, R.B. and Dash S.K : *Political Theory*, Poonam Graphics, 1998.

### **Unit III**

## **RELATION WITH OTHER SOCIAL SCIENCES: GEOGRAPHY, ECONOMICS AND SOCIOLOGY AND OTHERS**

### **Structure**

- 3.0 Objectives
- 3.1 Introduction
- 3.2 Political Science and History
- 3.4 Political Science and Sociology
- 3.5 Political Science and Economics
- 3.6 Political Science and Ethics
- 3.7 Political Science and Law
- 3.8 Political Science and Geography

### **3.0 Objectives**

After reading this unit you shall be able to:

- Relationship between Political Science and History
- Relationship between Political Science and Sociology
- Relationship between Political Science and Economics
- Relationship between Political Science and Ethics
- Relationship between Political Science and Law
- Relationship between Political Science and Geography

### **3.1 Introduction**

Political Science does not stand alone, since it is not the only science which concerns itself with man in organized society. Being one of the many sciences dealing with relations of man to man, it has a close connection with other social sciences. Thus Paul Janet remarks that political science is closely connected with political economy or the science of wealth; with law, either natural or positive, which occupies itself principally with the relations of citizens to one another; with history, which furnishes the facts of which it has need; with philosophy; and especially with morals which gives to it a part of its principles.



### 3.2 Political Science and History

Political Science and history are very intimately connected. The relation between the two is well brought out in the sentence History is the part politics, politics present history. As Seeley puts it, "History without political science has no fruits." Political Science without history has no roots. To quote the same writer again, "Politics is vulgar when not liberalized by history, and history fades into mere literature when it loses sight of its relations to politics." History provides the raw material for political science. According to Seeley, "Political science and History will ultimately become identical with one another. But this seems improbable, if not possible, though both sciences are interdependent and mutually complementary, there are some fundamental differences between them."

- a. History, being narrative, deals with facts in their chronological order, whereas political science selects only such events as relate to political evolution. The method of political science is reflective. Using the material provided by history, it seeks to discover general laws and principles.
- b. History is more comprehensive because it deals with the economic, religious, and military aspects of social life, whereas political science is not interested in them except in so far as they throw some light on the nature of the state and the development of political control.
- c. History is much less philosophical than political science. History deals with concrete facts and political science deals with ideals and abstract types. Political science deals with the state as it ought to be; history deals with the state as it is and has been.

The conclusion is that political science must make use of history only to transcend it. The historian's task is not to pass moral judgment, but the political scientists are bound to make such judgments. It is there that political science joins hands ethics and parts company with economics and sociology.

### 3.3 Political Science and Sociology

Sociology is the general of social life or society. It is concerned with things man and women do in groups or associations - large or small, but in groups rather than as individuals. It investigates the origin and development of social groups, their various forms and functions, laws, customs, institutions, mode of life, etc. Political science is the study of state and government. As such it represents the political aspects of social life. Therefore, the two sciences stand in close relations to each other.

Sociology and political science are interdependent. Sociology sheds a good deal of light on the origin and nature of political institutions. It is helpful in judging the growth of customs and laws and in regulating future social relationships. Social institutions like marriage and religion deeply influence the political life. Giddings rightly says, “..... To teach the theory of state to men who have not learned the first principles of sociology is like teaching astronomy or thermodynamics to men who have not learned the Newtonian laws of motions.” Sociology also borrows facts regarding the organization of activities of the state from political science.

However, there also lies the point of differences between these two subjects.

1. The scope of sociology is wider than that of political science, because it deals with men in all his social relations viz. political, economic, religious, cultural etc.; whereas political science deals with only political aspects of men;
2. Sociology deals with all social groups - organized or unorganized. But political science deals with state and organized community or group of people;
3. Political science is not only a historical and analytical study of the state, but it also studies the state as it ought to be. It deals with the ideals and theories and seeks to determine the ideal form of political organization. But sociology studies social facts as they are, and not as they should have been.

To sum up, the two sciences are mutually contributory branches of knowledge, though distinct from each other.

### 3.4 Political Science and Economics

Political science and economics are very closely related. They exert considerable influence on each other and cover a common ground to a large extent - production and distribution of wealth are affected by the regulations of the state. All economic activity is carried on within the state on conditions laid down by the state through laws. Political movements, on other hand, are profoundly influenced by economic causes. The economic life of the people is conditioned by political institutions and ideas. Some of the important questions vitally concern economics, e.g. questions relating to tariff laws, labour legislation, a national planning, and government ownership. The relation between the two sciences is so great that a century ago, scientific writers regarded economics as a branch of political science, and the subject itself was described as political economy. As late as the eighteenth century, political economy was regarded as 'a branch of statesmanship.'

Although the two sciences are closely related, there are still some fundamental differences between them. Commenting upon the question, Ivor Brown remarks that Economics is concerned with things, while Political Science is concerned with people; one deals with prices and the other with values. If economics is concerned with people, it is not with people as ends in themselves, but only in relation to the things they make, sell and use. Political science also takes things into account, but this it does only in relation to human or moral values. Thus it is that political science easily becomes normative science, while economics remains a descriptive science. As someone has humorously remarked, an economist is one who knows the price of everything, but the value of nothing.

Political institutions, ideas and movements are themselves influenced by economic ideas, activities and conditions. The economic theories of Karl Marx, for example, have profoundly influenced the political ideas and movements in the world. Again, the origin of many political revolutions cannot be explained without studying their economic causes. Experience has shown that democracy cannot be genuine and effective if the masses are miserably poor and a few persons are enormously rich. It is thus obvious that political institutions and movements are

vitally affected by economic ideas and conditions. Thus both economics and political science are interdependent and interrelated.

### 3.5 Political Science and Ethics

Ethics is a science of morals. It studies human conduct and lays down standards of good and bad or right and wrong. It tells us what men ought to do and ought not to do. Ethics has deep affinities with political science. Ancient political scientists like Plato and Aristotle believed that political science can not be separated from ethics. Later, some political thinkers like Machiavelli and Hobbes divorced politics from ethics. Machiavellians believe that expediency, not morality should be the guiding principle of state craft.

But this view is wrong. A state should be guided by expediency as well as by normal standards. The close relationship between political science and ethics is clear from the fact that political science deals not only with the state as it has been or as it is but also as it ought to be. This means that political science is also a normative science. It seeks to prescribe principles and organize political institutions to regulate the conduct of individuals with a view to promote their moral life. It deals with many questions that have a moral aspect. As Kant says, "True politics can't take a single step unless it has first done homage to morals. Basically, the political ideals of society cannot very much differ from the moral ones. In general terms, it can be said that what is wrong morally is also wrong politically." Gilchrist says, "Political ideal cannot be divorced from ethical ideal. We can't conceive a perfect state where wrong ethical deals prevail. The ethical and political must in this case coincide."

"There is another point which needs mention. Laws or commands of state are obeyed readily if they are in tune with the moral ideas of the community. If they are in conflict with those ideas, they may be difficult to enforce," Gettell says, "Moral ideas, when they become widespread and powerful, tend inevitably to be crystallized into law - on the other hand, laws may modify moral standards, but if they attempt to force moral ideals in advance of their time, they usually fail in enforcement."

The political science, the science of the state and government, stands closely related to ethics.

### 3.6 **Political Science and Law**

The state is both a social phenomenon and a legal institution and any attempt to explain the state in its entirety must include both these points of view. From the legal standpoint, state is a person in the sense that it is subject of rights and duties. It can sue and be sued in a law court. Or to put it in the form of a definition, it is a corporation composed of men domiciled upon a particular territory and endowed with original ruling power.

Jurisprudence may be defined as the science of law. Although, strictly speaking, a subdivision of political science, it is studied as a separate branch of study owing to the vastness of its scope and its technical nature.

Constitutional law defines the organs of the state, their relations to one another and the relations of the state to the individual. International law regulates the relation of states to one another.

Stoicism and Roman jurisprudence have made much contribution to the development of western law. Hallowell observes that the universal brotherhood of man and the universal law of reason are the principal contributions of stoicism to western civilization. The relation between the political science and law is established from the fact that it is the state, the central subject of political science, which provides machinery through which law operates. So the study of law and political science cannot be separated from each other. The political scientists seek to help jurisprudence and enrich its subject matter. For example what is the ultimate source of law, what is the sanction behind law and many others related questions come within the purview of political science. Jurisprudence also throws a good deal of light on all these questions. It studies the nature of law, its development and its true relations to the life of people. It has immensely influenced political speculation and practice, and the actual administration of the justice.

### 3.7 Political Science and Geography

Man is, to a considerable extent, influenced by his physical environment and the geographical conditions under which he lives. It is easy to exaggerate the influence of the climate, topography, and physical features of a country upon the character, institutions and accomplishments of a people. While these external factors play an important part in man's life, it is necessary to remember that civilized man is not a passive tool of nature. Like the lower animals, he does not blindly allow himself to be adapted to nature. By the use of intelligence and thoughts, he adapts nature of his purposes.

After making due allowance for exaggerations, it remains undoubtedly true that geographical conditions have influenced in considerable measure the determination of national policies and to some extent, the character of political institutions. At the same time, we are safe in saying that Geography is a much less important factor in moulding social and political institutions today than it was in earlier times.

An emerging science known as Geopolitics is of a great value today, even though it was prostituted to low ends by certain German Scholars. It was made to do service to Nazi aggression. Rightly understood, it means that mountains, great rivers, and oceans have more to do with theories of state action, international relations, and the like than beautiful theories of the state written from an armchair. A good illustration of the importance of Geopolitics is the Island situation of Great Britain which has helped it to develop into a naval power because of its geographical location.

#### Check Your Progress-IV

- (i) Why political science is called a master science?
- (ii) Explain how political science is related to other social sciences.
- (iii) Discuss the relations of political science with history.

### 3.8 Let Us Sum Up

To sum up, political science, which developed in Greece 235 years back, evolved as a discipline which concerned with the political activities of individual and state. Being one of the branches of social sciences dealing with relation of human with a man, it has a close connection with other social sciences like history, economics, jurisprudence, sociology, etc.

### 3.9 Key Words

City-state	:	The general form of political organisation in the ancient Greece.
Theoretical politics	:	It deals with the basic problems of the state without concerning itself with practical politics.
Practical Politics	:	It deals with actual working of the governments and its institutions.
Political philosophy	:	It is an important area of study in the subject of political science which deals with fundamental problems of nature of state, citizenship, questions of duty and right and political ideals.
Political dynamics	:	It refers to the forces at work in government and politics.

### 3.10 Check Your Learning

1. Write a short note on the relationship between Political Theory and Geography.
2. Explain the concept of Political Sociology.
3. Discuss the relationship between Political Science and Economics.
4. Explain the concept of Political History.
5. 'Political Science is considered also as normative science.' Discuss in light of its relationship with ethics.

## 1.9 Suggested Readings

- Apter David, E : *Introduction to Political Analysis*, Prentice Hall of India Private limited, New Delhi, 1981.
- AshirVatham, Eddy : *Political Theory*, S. Chand and Company limited, New Delhi, 1980.
- Gilchrist, R. N. : *Principles of Political Science*, Orient Longman, 1987.
- Jain, M.P. : *Political Theory – Liberal, Marxian*, Kaveri Printers (p) limited, New Delhi, 1979.
- Verma, S P : *Modern Political Theory*, Vikas Ghaziabad, 1980.
- Agarwal R.C. : *Political Theory*, S. Chand and company, New Delhi, 1991.
- Johari, J.C. : *Contemporary Political Theory*, Sterling Publication, New Delhi, 1983.
- WasbyL . Stephen : *Political Science - The Discipline and Its Dimensions*, Scientific Book, Calcutta, 1970.
- Garner, J. W. : *Political Science and Government*, World press Calcutta, 1952.



**IV****THEORIES OF ORIGIN OF STATE-HISTORICAL OR EVOLUTIONARY,  
SOCIAL CONTRACT & MARXIAN****Structure**

- 4.0 Objectives
- 4.1 Introduction
- 4.2 Historical or Evolutionary Theory
  - 4.2.1 Introduction
  - 4.2.2 Explanation of the theory
  - 4.2.3 Development of the theory
    - 4.2.3.1 Sri Henry Maine(1822-1888)
    - 4.2.3.2 Walter Bagehot(1826-77)
    - 4.2.3.3 Robert M. Maclver(1882-1970)
  - 4.2.4 Factors of Origin and development of the State
    - 4.2.4.1 Social Nature of Man
    - 4.2.4.2 Kinship
    - 4.2.4.3 Religion
    - 4.2.4.4 Force
    - 4.2.4.5 Economic Activities
    - 4.2.4.6 Political Consciousness
- 4.3 The Social Contract Theory
  - 4.3.1 Introduction
  - 4.3.2 Explanation of the Theory

- 4.3.3 Development of the Theory
  - 4.3.3.1 Thomas Hobbes
  - 4.3.3.2 John Locke
  - 4.3.3.3 J.J. Rousseau
  - 4.3.3.4 Criticism of the theory
    - 4.3.3.5 Historical
    - 4.3.3.6 Legal
    - 4.3.3.7 Philosophical
- 4.3.4 Relevance of the Theory
- 4.3.5 Decline of the Theory
- 4.4 Marxist Theory of the Origin of the State
  - 4.4.1 Introduction
  - 4.4.2 Frederick Engels
  - 4.4.3 Lenin
  - 4.4.4 Antonio Gramsci
  - 4.4.5 Criticism of the Theory
- 4.5 Let Us Sum Up
- 4.6 Key Words
- 4.7 Check Your Learning
- 4.8 Suggested Readings

#### **4.0 Objectives**

After reading this unit you should be able to:

- know the origin of the most complex political phenomenon i.e. state.
- study the most important theories on the origin of the state.
- acquaint yourselves with the factors which contributed to the growth and development of the state.
- make an attempt to understand the statement i.e. state is a historical growth.

- make out the interpretations of the contractualists on the origin of the state.
- study the value or relevance of social contract theory.
- examine how state originates in class conflict and operates as an instrument of domination.

#### **4.1 Introduction**

In traditional political theory, the state is considered to be the central theme. Political science was regarded as the science of the state. Dr. Garner even went to the extent of saying that “Political Science begins and ends with the state”. It shows the significance of the concept of the state in the discipline of Political Science. But the origin of this complex political organization is yet to be traced.

The political scientists of past and present and historians are not unanimous with regard to the exact genesis of the state. This can be attributed to the fact that the origin of the state goes back to the prehistoric stage. Whatever information we get from history and other modern sciences like ethnology and anthropology do not tell us definitely as to when, how and why the state originated. As there is lack of concrete historical data, the political thinkers and historians go for philosophical analysis which is based on rigorous and rational analysis to ascertain various factors which might have been contributed for the origin of the state. Some of them perceive that the secrets associated with the origin of state lie in the hands of God. Some others think that they lie in the will of the society and still others relate it to the process of evolution.

A number of theories have been advanced with regard to the origin of the state. These include the Divine Origin Theory, the Force theory, the Patriarchal/Matriarchal Theories, the Social Contract Theory, the Evolutionary or Historical Theory and the Marxian Theory. The Divine Origin Theory, the Force Theory and the Social Contract Theory are regarded as purely speculative theories.

However, notable among these and ones which are being discussed below are the Historical/Evolutionary Theory, Social Contract Theory and the Marxian theory relating to the origin of the state.

## **4.2 Historical or Evolutionary Theory**

### **4.2.1 Introduction**

The Evolutionary Theory of the origin of the state is otherwise known as the Historical Theory. This is the most satisfactory and well accepted theory on the origin of the state. The other theories have been proved incomplete and inadequate by modern political researchers. Moreover, the historical or evolutionary theory of the origin of the state has differentiated itself from speculative theories as it tries to trace the origin of the state from scientific, historical, anthropological and sociological evidence and research.

### **4.2.2 Explanation of the Theory**

The historical or evolutionary theory of the origin of the state regards the state as a product of historical development like any other human institution. According to this theory, the state is neither of divine origin, nor a product of force, nor an instrument deliberately created by individuals to achieve certain definite objectives. Similar view has been reflected in the writings of Dr. Garner. He writes, "The state is neither a handiwork of god, nor the result of superior force, nor the creation of resolution or convention, nor a mere expansion of the family". State, on the other hand, is a product of slow historical evolution extending over a long period of time. Thus, the state was not created at any single point of time. Even men did not invent the state as a mechanical device. During the process of organizing their social life, men slowly evolved certain forms of organization which eventually led to the emergence of the state.

The evolution of the state may be compared to the evolution of language. Men did not invent their language suddenly; rather during the course of speaking to each other they identified some words for conveying some definite idea. The process resulted in the evolution of their language. Likewise, the primitive forms or simple forms of their social organization ultimately led to the evolution of the state. In the words of Leacock, “The state is a growth, an evolution, the result of a gradual process running throughout all the known history of man and receding into remote and unknown past”.

### **4.2.3 Development of the Theory**

The Historical school of Political Philosophy of the 18<sup>th</sup> century supported this theory. Later this theory was highly influenced by Darwin’s theory of evolution which provides that every organism has birth, growth and decay. This idea was applied by social scientists to analyze the evolutionary process of all social and political institutions including the state.

The theory also developed significantly because of the contributions made by its exponents like Maine, Bagehot and Maclver. Let us discuss the contributions of these exponents.

#### **4.2.3.1 Sir Henry Maine (1822-1888)**

Maine was a British jurist and legal historian. He may be regarded as an early exponent of evolutionary theory of state. He published his “Ancient Law: Its Connection with the Early History of Society and Its Relation to Modern Ideas” in 1861. In this work, he applied the principle of evolution to social institutions. He traces the evolution of the modern state to the earlier form of paternal authority of the kin-group where rights of the individual were unknown. This eventually paved the way to the modern form of authority of the state which duly recognizes individual rights.

#### **4.2.3.2 Walter Bagehot (1826-77)**

Bagehot was a British political and constitutional theorist. He sought to evolve his idea of social evolution by combining Darwin's biological theory of struggle for existence and survival of the fittest with Henry Maine's account of human history.

#### **4.2.3.3 Robert M. MacIver (1882-1970)**

MacIver evolved a historical theory of the origin of the state, primarily to reflect the functional value of the state. He demonstrated how institutional structures have developed through various historical stages to their present democratic form.

His theory of the origin of the state is based on scientific, historical, anthropological and sociological evidences, instead of mere speculation. But he has included certain essential elements of the Social Contract Theory in his theory i.e. the state is a product of the will of the society. Further he has gone beyond the social contract theory to explain his own theory. He argues that state is an artificial contrivance of society, yet he has not used the hypothesis of "state of nature". Similarly, he demonstrates that the state is a product of the will of society, yet he has not taken the help of the hypothesis of the "Social contract" as an instrument of expression of that will.

#### **4.2.4 Factors of Origin and Development of the State**

According to this theory the modern state has developed through a very long process of evolution extending over thousands of years of history and pre-history. It is very difficult to trace the original fountain-head from which this stream has come to us. In other words, the origin of the state cannot be attributed to any particular

point of time or to any specific factor. Rather the state is a product of the operation of various factors and influences over a very long period of time. Each factor plays its part in achieving the necessary unity and organization in early social groups out of which the state emerged. The following are the main factors for the historical evolution of the state.

#### **4.2.4.1 Social Nature of Man**

Greek Philosopher Aristotle said that, “Man is a social animal”. The social instinct of man to live in the society along with other members of society is quite natural. Man cannot live without society. When human beings live in a society collectively, they realize the necessity of some authority which may control them and maintain peace and tranquillity in society. So because of social nature of human beings, society emerged. Similarly, due to the requirements of society, state has come into existence.

#### **4.2.4.2 Kinship**

Kinship implies blood-relationship. According to Maclver ‘Kinship creates society and society at length creates the state’. Kinship brought the members of the family together and they all accepted the authority of the head of the family, who was either a matriarch or a patriarch. With the passage of time kinship or blood relationship went beyond the boundaries of the original family. Families expanded into clan and clans into tribes. After that a tribal chief conquered and subjugated other weak tribes and established his hold over a definite territory and eventually the state emerged.

#### **4.2.4.3 Religion**

Like kinship, religion played an important role in bringing people together in primitive society. In the view of Gettle, kinship and religion were simply two

aspects of the same thing. Common worship further strengthened the bond of unity among families, clans and tribes. This worship took different forms like animism and ancestor worship. Common belief in gods and worship of common ancestors helped in promoting community discipline and group solidarity. It subordinated barbaric anarchy and made the early men to acquaint themselves with authority and discipline. In this way, religion played a significant role in the growth and development of the state.

#### **4.2.4.4 Force**

In early times religion and kinship bonds started weakening with the expansion of the group. At this juncture open use of force was necessary for maintaining peace and order and securing unity and obedience to laws and customs. Force, during this time, translated weakness into subjugation, subjugation into unity and unity into strength. Through war, families, clans and tribes remained together under the leadership of tribal chief. Survival of the fittest was the law in ancient times. Demands of perpetual warfare gave rise to the permanent leadership. By using coercive force, leaders laid down the foundation of the sovereign state. Further military conquests were undertaken for the territorial expansion of the state.

#### **4.2.4.5 Economic Activities**

There were three economic stages through which primitive people have passed. Those were the huntsman stage, the herdsman or pastoral stage and the husbandman or agricultural stage. In the hunting stage, men lived in the conditions of primitive savagery, moving from one place to another. They lived in this primitive communal society without any concept of private property. They kept domestic animals as pets but later on they realized that they could gain more by keeping them on a permanent basis. As a result, the huntsman became a herdsman and flocks and herds became their wealth. At the herdsman stage some men accumulated property. Thus people and classes based on wealth emerged and certain



rules, regulations, customs and laws also came into existence to safeguard this property. In course of time, herdsman began to settle on a particular territory and became husbandmen. In the husbandman stage, people started agriculture, primitive men settled on a particular territory permanently. This permanent residence and secure income from agricultural source led to the emergence of the concept of private property. The necessity for protecting property and regulating complex economic activities made the process of governmental regulation and the emergence of the state fast. Thus the state emerged in an elementary form with population, territory, organization and authority.

#### **4.2.4.6 Political Consciousness**

Political consciousness means awareness among people which make them to realize that state is an institution of utility. People felt that through state common purposes and ends can be materialized. To be more specific they realized that state or political organizations can provide them with security, help them in moral, social and economic development. It can also protect their life and property, maintain their rights and liberties and protect them from external aggression. This political consciousness made the people to extend due recognition to the law of the state and keep faith in the rationality of the state.

The Historical or Evolutionary theory seems to be more realistic theory than any other theory dealing with the origin of the state. It is now a widely recognized liberal theory of the origin of the state.

#### **Check Your Progress-I**

1. Name the exponents of Historical or Evolutionary Theory.
2. Discuss the factors responsible for the origin and development of state.
3. Do you remember three economic stages through which primitive people have passed?

## **4.3 The Social Contract Theory**

### **4.3.1 Introduction**

The Social Contract Theory, like liberal point of view, regards the state as a product of an artificial instrument created by mutual agreement among the individuals. This mutual agreement is known as social contract. It was invented by men for the mutual benefit or to serve the interests of all individuals and all sections of society. According to this theory, the consent of the people or the will of the people is central to the origin of the state. To be more specific, the theory proposes that the state is a product of contract, a man-made institution, neither a creation of God nor the result of force.

### **4.3.2 Explanation of the Theory**

The Social Contract Theory of the origin of state starts with the assumption that people were living in the initial stage without any recognized civil law, authority, power or order. This state or life-pattern of men is described as the 'state of nature'. There was no law or right in the state of nature. There were only 'natural law' and 'natural rights'. According to some philosophers, this state of nature was pre-social and to others it was pre-political and to some others it was both pre-social and pre-political also. It shows that the state of nature was either inconvenient or troublesome to live in. Thus people decided to come out of the state of nature. They made a contract or agreement to create state. Through this contract, they escaped from the state of nature and constituted the state. In this way state was created through the voluntary agreement of all individuals.

### **4.3.3 Development of the Theory**

The idea that authority of rulers is based on an agreement or contract with the people is very old. The sophists of ancient Greece described the state as an outcome

of the contract between men. In Indian philosophy also one can find the idea of social contract. In Kautilya's *Arthashastra* the idea of social contract has been mentioned. During the Roman period the theory was supported by philosophers like Cicero in the first century B.C. Some traces of the theory are found in the Bible too. The social contract idea declined during the Medieval period as the idea of divine origin of authority was usually supported in this period. However, this theory received widespread recognition since the 16<sup>th</sup> century. During the 17th century, the theory was provided with solid foundation by English philosophers like Thomas Hobbes (1588-1679), John Locke (1632-1704), and in the 18<sup>th</sup> century French philosopher Jean Jacques Rousseau (1712-78). These three are regarded as the main exponents of the theory.

However, all the three main exponents of the theory have different views with regard to the state of nature, human nature, terms of contract, parties to contract and number of contracts. Let us discuss the views of these three philosophers with regard to various aspects of the social contract theory.

#### **4.3.3.1 Thomas Hobbes**

Hobbes presents a gloomy picture of the state of nature. His projection of state is the clear cut reflection of his perception of human nature. In his view man is selfish by nature. Self interest is the motivating factor for human action. In the absence of law and justice, the state of nature was characterized by a state of perpetual war and strife. In Hobbes's own words, the life of man at this state is 'solitary, poor, nasty, brutish and short. Every man is enemy to every man'. 'Might is right' was the order of the day. Men were free to take what they can, and to rob whomever they can. There was no law to prevent oppression or to contain the 'law of the jungle'. It was a state of total insecurity and perfect anarchy. According to Hobbes, it was 'pre-social' and also 'pre-political'. People wanted to come out of the horrible and dangerous condition and thus made contract among themselves and established state. By this contract, people surrendered all their rights to a common

power, who was called the sovereign, unconditionally. The sovereign might be a single person and his authority was absolute, unlimited and indivisible. This shows that Hobbes favored authoritarianism and absolute monarchy. However, sovereign was not party to the contract as sovereign did not exist before the conclusion of the contract.

#### **4.3.3.2 John Locke**

Locke provides an entirely different description of the state of nature and the contract. In his views the state of nature was not a stage of war and strife but of peace and good-will. According to him it was a state of liberty but not of license. Locke did not take a dark view of human nature as Hobbes had done. Rather Locke argued that men are by nature rational beings, and influenced by their inner nature to undertake those activities that would lead to the betterment of the humanity. Thus Locke's state of nature was only pre-political and not pre-social. But there were few persons who set aside the rules of morality for the sake of their self interest. Since there was no established authority in the state of nature, it became very difficult to deal with such offenders. Similarly, there were certain other inconveniences like absence of the legislature to formulate law, the executive to administer law and judiciary to interpret law. In order to solve these difficulties men abandoned the state of nature and entered into political society through a contract. Locke postulated conditional and partial surrender of natural rights, because some natural rights (like right to life, liberty and property) are fundamental and the cornerstone of human freedom. In this way Locke advocated limited government and constitutional monarchy.

#### **4.3.3.3 J.J. Rousseau**

Rousseau presented an interesting picture of the state of nature. According to him man in the state of nature was a 'noble savage'. In the state of nature man was free, equal, independent, self-sufficient and thoroughly contented. Man was leading

a solitary, happy, carefree and dress less life. He had neither family nor property in the beginning stage of the state of nature. But with the rise of population, emergence of the feelings of 'mine' and 'thine' or private property and rise of the so-called 'civilization' made the individual life complicated and insecure. Because of this, inequality, jealousy, conflict and selfishness competition developed among the people in the last stage of the state of nature. As a result, the state of nature became intolerable and dangerous. So people decided to get rid of this insecure stage and formed state through contract. With this contract people surrendered all their natural rights to the community which became a sovereign body. The sovereign body is based on the will of the people. Rousseau called it the 'General will'. 'The General will' is the supreme and all powerful in the stage. The general will is the sum total of goodwill of real will of the whole community. Thus Rousseau advocated popular sovereignty.

#### **4.3.3.4 Criticism of the Theory**

In spite of great contribution of this theory to political ideas and political movements, it has been criticized on many grounds. Primarily it has been attacked from three different angles the historical, the legal and the philosophical.

#### **4.3.3.5 Historical**

From the standpoint of history, the following are the main points of criticism.

- i) This theory is not based on fact. There is no historical evidence to substantiate that a state has come into existence as a result of a deliberate and voluntary agreement among individuals emerging from a state of nature.

- ii) This theory presupposed that men at some particular period lived without any social organization. The modern anthropological studies have proved it unhistorical or false.
- iii) There have been historical examples of governmental and political contracts. These contracts define the rights and duties of the rulers and people. But such contracts have been made by the people who are already living in the political society. The idea of social contract by which the state was created is thus a fiction.
- iv) The theory assumes that natural rights and natural liberty were prevalent before the creation of state. But it is a fact that rights are available only within the state. Without the state we cannot think of rights.

#### **4.3.3.6 Legal**

On legal ground the main points of criticisms are the following

- i) A contract, to be valid, needs the force or sanction of state. But the contract made by the primitive men for the creation of state lacks such sanction or force.
- ii) A contract has binding effect upon only those who accept it voluntarily. But the social contract is supposed to bind succeeding generations of men who have had no say in the matter at all.
- iii) A contract presupposes at least two parties who must be bound by its terms and conditions. But the contract in Hobbes's idea does not bind the sovereign who is not a party but a product of it. Such a notion of contract is one-sided and illegal.

#### **4.3.3.7 Philosophical**

The main points of criticism on philosophical ground are as follows:

- i) This theory has reduced the position of state to that of a machine which is artificially created by men. But state is the most natural and universal institution among all other social institutions. According to Plato and Aristotle, state is as natural as life itself and it is an organic institution.
- ii) The entire idea of the state of nature and laws of nature is absurd. It is highly improper to assume that whatever preceded the formation of state is 'natural' and whatever has followed it is artificial.
- iii) According to Bluntschli, the social contract theory is the most dangerous, since it makes the state and its institutions the product of individual whims and caprices. If the state is the creation of men, then they can overthrow it whenever they desire. Thus it underestimates the relevance of the state and encourages revolutions and unrests.
- iv) MacIver criticized the theory because it ignores the fundamental distinction between the state and society.

Thus, because of the above mentioned weaknesses, the Social Contract theory has been criticized as a bad history, bad law and bad philosophy.

#### **4.3.4 Relevance of the Theory**

No doubt Social Contract theory has been faced with multiple weaknesses. Still then the theory is relevant or significant in various ways like:

- i) The contribution of the theory to the concept of sovereignty is noteworthy. Hobbes was the champion of legal sovereignty which finally led to Austin's theory of sovereignty. Locke gave the idea of political sovereignty and his theory of separation of powers was later developed by Montesquieu. Rousseau's idea of popular sovereignty influenced the future history tremendously.

- ii) The theory emphasized the role of human will in the creation and perpetuation of political societies or state. The fundamental point of this theory is that obedience to political authority rested on the voluntary consent of free individuals. This idea of consent was of immense importance in the evolution of democratic govt.
- iii) The theory preaches that right, not might, is the basis of political society. Individuals create political societies or state for protection of certain fundamental rights, like right to life, liberty and property.
- iv) According to Dr. Garner, social contract theory “served as useful purpose in its day by providing a weapon for combating irresponsible rulers and a justification for resistance to tyranny”.
- v) It rejected the divine origin theory as obsolete and provided an alternative theory of the origin of the state.

#### **4.3.5 Decline of the Theory**

The Social Contract theory which is primarily based on speculation and deductive methods of reasoning declined with the emergence of historical and empirical methods of enquiry. Moreover, Darwin’s theory of biological evolution influenced different branches of study and led to the Evolutionary theory of the origin of political institutions. It was considered that state has come into existence slowly and gradually rather than suddenly with social contract.

It is a fact that the Social Contract theory has influenced political thought during modern times. It is not only a theory of origin of state but also of the nature of state and sovereignty, relation of the state with individuals, individuals’ rights and liberties, and functions of the state. The theory has brought the state and political matters out of the domain of God and founded them on rational basis of the consent of individuals.



## **Check Your Progress-II**

1. In accordance with the social contract theory, what is the key to origin of the state?
2. Who are known as the Contractualists?
3. What served as the basis for modern democracy?

### **4.4 Marxist Theory of the Origin of the State**

#### **4.4.1 Introduction**

Marxism is a political philosophy of the helpless, downtrodden and working class. It is a philosophy and a world view of the working class and its object is to make this class free from all kinds of exploitation. It is a scientific, revolutionary and progressive philosophy which tries to provide an alternative way to get rid of exploitation, oppression and injustice in society. Keeping the essence of this philosophy in mind now we can proceed to analyze the idea of origin of the state advanced by Marxist theory.

The idea of the origin of state in the Marxist theory is found in the writings and views of revolutionaries, philosophers, and thinkers like Karl Marx. Engels, Lenin, Stalin, Mao, and Gramsci the following paragraphs will focus upon the views of some of these philosophers.

According to Karl Marx, society and state are different. Society is a natural institution but the state is not. In his view the state neither originates in the will of society nor is it maintained for the benefit of all sections of society. Rather it originates in class conflict and operates as an instrument of dominations. Its existence cannot be linked to the fulfillment of a moral purpose.

In order to understand the Marxist theory on the origin of the state, it is necessary, at the beginning, to distinguish between the foundation or base of society and the structure above its foundation or the superstructure. In this building-like structure, it is assumed that the character of the superstructure will depend on the character of the base. The forces of production constitute the basis of all social relationships and they belong to the base or sub-structure. Legal and political structure, religion, morals and social customs belong to the superstructure. Accordingly, the state, like other parts of the superstructure of society rests upon the prevailing economic conditions.

The origin of the state should, therefore, be traced in the material conditions of production prevailing at different historical states. According to Marx, with the only exception of primitive communism state, which was classless, in all other stages of history there were two classes. One had been the class of exploiters while another had been the class of exploited. But the names of these two classes have differed from age to age. In the ancient times there had been the masters and slaves. During the feudal times, there were the landlords and the tenants. In the modern age, there have been the capitalists and the labourers. But there had been always clash of interest between the two classes. The former, being the dominant class, always exploited the latter class which was weaker. The dominant class, in order to perpetuate exploitation and to maintain its dominant position in all the spheres of social life, creates an executive. Thus state came into existence.

#### **4.4.2 Frederick Engels**

The excellent exposition of the Marxian theory of the origin of the state is given by Frederick Engels in his book “The Origin of the Family Private Property and State” published in 1884.

According to Engels, the state did not exist from the beginning. The state is not a natural institution. State is not something above society or super-imposed on

it. It has not been made by God or any divine power. It is not the image and reality of reason as maintained by Hegel. It is not the product of a contract among the people but the product of specific historical circumstances.

When the means of production were not well developed, the amount of production was just enough for survival. There was no private property and there was no state. When surplus production became possible, private property came into existence and the society was divided into two classes- the haves and the have-nots, dominant and dependent, masters and slaves, exploiters and exploited. In this situation the state was created by the dominant class with the basic intention of protecting its private property. He wrote, "The state is an organization of the possessing class for its protection against non-possessing class". Thus it has originated because of class division and class struggle in society. The state is an instrument of the dominant economic class. It is instrumental in the exploitation of the economically weak classes. Thus state does not belong to the whole society. However, according to him, with the change in the economic system or mode of production and with the abolition of private property, when society will be classless, the state will automatically 'wither away'.

#### **4.4.3 Lenin**

Lenin was a great revolutionary leader of the working class. He was a staunch follower of Karl Marx and Engels. His views are very much similar to those of Engels. Supporting the view of Engels, Lenin in his famous work, "The State and Revolution", writes, The state is a product and manifestation of the irreconcilability of class antagonisms. The state arises where and when in so far as class antagonisms objectively cannot be reconciled. And, conversely, the existence of state proves that these class antagonisms are irreconcilable". It means the state cannot resolve the class conflict because this conflict, by its very nature, is incapable of resolution. The interests of both the 'haves' and 'have-nots' are so antagonistic that they cannot be reconciled by any arrangement.

He regarded state as an instrument of a particular class rather than as an instrument of general welfare. He does not accept the view that the state emerged to bring unity, peace and order in society. According to him the state will automatically wither away with the establishment of a classless society.

#### **4.4.4 Antonio Gramsci**

Gramsci, an Italian Marxist leader, was the most interesting and suggestive thinker since Marx. In his view, state came into existence through the struggle of three kinds of social forces. Firstly, social forces which provide leadership, secondly, social forces against whom struggle is waged and thirdly, some auxiliaries or allied forces which give active or passive consent to the leaders.

Gramsci points out that state has originated because of domination and hegemony. Hegemony here implies political leadership endowed with legitimacy or credibility. The concept of hegemony also implies moral and intellectual leadership which can get the support of the masses and claim to have legitimacy. Domination, on the other hand, refers to force. According to Gramsci, the power of the state is not based only upon naked force. Rather it has to rely also upon the passive or active consent of the masses. In other words, ruling classes do not rule by material force alone, but by ideological force too. He argues that state is not confined to only 'coercive' role, rather it has also an ideological role to play. He further maintains that state has not only a material basis, but also an ideological basis. To be clearer, perpetuation of political control can not be possible only by use of physical force; rather it demands a leadership having consent, false or true, of masses.

The above discussion makes it clear that Gramsci extends proper consideration to the ideological aspect of state and the role of ideology in the origin, functioning, maintenance of the state. However, Like Marxian

understanding, he regards the state as an instrument of the ruling class. He maintains that state serves the interest of ruling class and not only of the whole community.

#### **4.4.5 Criticism of the Theory**

The theory has been criticized on the following grounds

- i) According to Liberal writers, state was not a product of class struggle. It was not created by the dominant class; rather it developed through a process of growth.
- ii) The theory considers economic factor as the most significant factor in the formation of the state. Thus it ignores the importance of other factors.
- iii) Prof. Maclver and Plamentaz do not accept the Marxist theory about the origin of the state as propounded by Engels and Lenin. They completely discard the concept of primitive communism. According to them, division of labour does not lead to the creation of antagonistic classes. It only creates different occupations.
- iv) The element of consent in the evolution of the state is totally ignored by Marx and Engels. They have also ignored the role of the state in promoting the common good.
- v) Critics also point out that the state is not an organ of class rule in the liberal democracy. It exists for the conciliation of divergent socio-economic interest.

The Marxists, like the Liberal thinkers, regard the state as an artificial device. But unlike the liberal thinkers, they are convinced that this device was created by a dominant class for its own benefit, not for the benefit of all society.

That apart, Marxist theory of the origin of the state pays the greatest importance to 'exploitation' as the motive force behind the creation and continuation of the state.

### **Check Your Progress-III**

1. Mention Engel's famous work in which he has explained the origin of the state.
2. Explain Gramsci's view regarding the origin of the state.
3. What do you mean by hegemony?

#### **4.5 Let Us Sum Up**

Several theories of the origin of the state have been examined. Their merits as well as demerits have been brought forward. The chief elements in state formation and development have been specified, but we can conclude by saying that the state is a historical growth in which kinship, religion and political consciousness have been predominant elements. It is impossible to say at what stage any one element predominated, or even when it entered or left the field.

#### **4.6 Key Words**

**Anthropology:** The study of human beings, in particular the study of their physical character, evolutionary history, racial classification, historical and present day geographic distribution and cultural history.

**Ethnology** :The study of the characteristics of different people and the differences and relationship between them.

**Divine origin theory:** The state is established and governed by God Himself or by some superhuman power.

Deductive : Conclusion reached by reasoning from general laws to a particular case.

Empirical : Based on observation and experiment

Absolute Monarchy: The monarch can do whatever he pleases and there is absolutely no check on him.

Constitutional Monarchy: The monarch exists in name and his power is regulated by the constitution.

#### 4.7 Check Your Learning

1. Discuss the Historical or Evolutionary Theory of the origin of the state.
2. Explain the Marxian Theory of the origin of the state.
3. The Social Contract theory of the origin of the state is a bad history, a bad law and bad philosophy. Comment.

#### 4.8 Suggested Readings

Gilchrist, R.N. : *Principles of Political Science*, Orient Longman, Madras, 1975.

Jain, M.P. : *Political Theory, Liberal and Marxian*, Authors Guild Publications, Delhi, 1989.

Asirvatham, eddy, : *Political Theory*, S. Chand & Company Ltd, New Delhi, 1993.

Verma, S.P. : *Modern Political Theory*, Vikash Publishing House, New Delhi.

Gupta, R.L.: *Political Theory*, S. Chand & Sons, New Delhi, 1988

**Unit-V****CONCEPTS - RIGHTS, LIBERTY AND EQUALITY****Structure**

- 5.0 Objectives
- 5.1 Introduction
- 5.2 Liberty: Meaning and Definitions
- 5.3 Equality: Meaning and Explanation
  - 5.3.1 Kinds of Equality
  - 5.3.2 Relationship Between Liberty and Equality
- 5.4 Rights: Meaning and Definition
  - 5.4.1 Theories of Rights
  - 5.4.2 Classification of Rights
- 5.5 Law: Meaning and Definitions
  - 5.5.1 Classification of Laws
  - 5.5.2 Sources of Laws
- 5.6 Justice: Meaning and Explanation
  - 5.6.1 Development of Concept of Justice
  - 5.6.2 Dimension (Types) of Justice.
- 5.7 Let Us Sum Up
- 5.8 Key Words
- 5.9 Check Your Learning
- 5.10 Suggested Readings

**5.0 Objectives**

After reading this unit, you should be able to:

- know the meaning of liberty;



- explain the kinds of liberty;
- know the meaning of equality;
- discuss the kinds of equality;
- establish the relationship between liberty and equality;
- understand the meaning of rights;
- evaluate the theories of rights;
- make classification of rights;
- define law;
- classify laws;
- analyse the sources of law;
- know the meaning of justice;
- the development of the concept of justice; and
- discuss types of justice.

## **5.1 Introduction**

Liberty, equality, rights, law and justice are highly inter-related concepts. Taking this into account, this unit discusses these concepts in a comprehensive manner for a lucid understanding of the same.

## **5.2 Liberty: Meaning and Definitions**

The term 'Liberty' is derived from the Latin word 'liber' which means free. It has negative connotation denoting absence of all restraints. Literally, liberty means freedom to do whatever one like regardless of its consequences. But such kind of absolute liberty is dangerous. Liberty cannot be absolute and unrestricted, as it has to be understood in a social context, in which the needs of individual should be in harmony with those of society. Liberty, in the sense of a complete absence of all restraints is not possible in a civilized human society. Such liberty will lead to strife and chaos in the society.

The true meaning of liberty is freedom to do everything provided it does not injure the freedom of others. It implies necessary restraint on all in order to ensure the greatest possible amount of liberty for each. "Do unto others as you would have others do unto you" explains the true meaning of liberty. The reasonable restrictions imposed by law, customs and usages does not destroy liberty, rather it lays the ideal condition for liberty. Thus, liberty may be understood as absence of arbitrary, illegal and unreasonable restraints.

To understand the various dimensions of the meaning of liberty, we may refer to some important definitions given by the scholars. According to Massimo Salvadori, "Liberty is free choice, each individual's own decision concerning his own course of action; it belongs to himself, not to the external world that surrounds him."

Ramsay Muir Says, "By liberty I mean the secured enjoyment by individuals, and by natural and spontaneous groups of individuals, such as nation, church, trade union, of the power to think their own thoughts and to express and act upon them, using their own gifts in their own way under the shelter of law, provided they do not impair the corresponding rights of other."

Mckechnie believes that "Freedom is not the absence of all restraints, but rather the substitution of rational ones for the irrational". But to Burns, Liberty means liberty to grow to one's natural height, to develop one's abilities. Again Gettell says, "Liberty is the positive power of doing and enjoying those things which are worthy of enjoyment and work." Liberty, according to G.D.H. Cole, is the freedom of the individual to express without external hindrances to personality. Seeley says, "Liberty is the opposite of over-government".

Thus, on the basis of the above definitions, we can say that liberty is a very precious possession without which human being cannot develop their life and personality. Liberty has positive aspect which is indeed very important. It implies positive freedom of individual to develop his personality to the fullest extent. Liberty is not only the absence of restraints but also involves positive opportunity for many sided development of the human being. Laski rightly stated that liberty is the eager maintenance of that atmosphere in which men have the opportunity

to be their best selves. Liberty can exist only when the state maintains those conditions, which help the citizens to rise to the full stature of his personality.

### 5.2.1 Kinds of Liberty

- i. **Natural Liberty** - Natural liberty implies unrestrained or unlimited freedom of man to do whatever he likes. Such type of freedom practically does not or cannot exist in a state. Unrestrained liberty is the very negation of liberty. Such liberty is supposed to have been enjoyed by people in the state of nature when there was no civil society or state. However, the rational or philosophical interpretation of natural liberty has a deeper meaning. Natural liberty may be understood as freedom given by nature to all, the need to treat all as equal in society and the prevention of any kind of artificial discrimination based on position and authority. It is intimately connected with the doctrine of natural law of which the natural equality is the fundamental principle.
- ii. **Civil Liberty**- Civil liberty is synonymous with rule of law. It refers to the liberty enjoyed by men in society. It includes right to life, property, thought and expression etc. Civil liberty is the liberty of individuals either by themselves or in association with one another, to choose and pursue objectives which they deem good, provided that all enjoy that liberty equally. It implies absence of those restraints which are not reasonable and legitimate. Civil liberty is not absolute. It is subject to limitation imposed by law in order to secure the greatest interest of the community. The protection of civil liberty is guaranteed by the laws of the state.
- iii. **Political Liberty** – It means liberty of citizens to participate in the political process of the state. To Laski, political liberty means power to be active in the affairs of the state. Leacock calls political liberty as constitutional liberty while Gilchrist regards it as synonymous with democracy. Political liberty of an

individual includes right to vote, right to contest election, right to hold public office, right to criticize the government and so on.

- iv. **Economic liberty** – Economic liberty implies freedom from hunger and poverty. It means liberty to earn one’s daily bread. The civil and political liberty has no meaning in the society unless it is preceded by economic liberty. The rights and freedom have no significance for a hungry man. Thomas Hobbes also questioned what good freedom is to a starving man. He cannot eat freedom or drink it. Economic liberty of an individual includes right to work, right to living wages, right against economic exploitation etc.
- v. **National liberty** – National liberty implies liberty of a nation to decide its own course of action without external interference. It is synonymous with national sovereignty. National liberty is said to exist when a nation is free and independent of any foreign control. National liberty is the foundation of civil, political and economic liberty of its citizen.

### 5.3 Equality: Meaning and Explanation

By equality, we generally mean that all men are equal and all should be entitled to equality of treatment and income. It implies that all men are born equal and nature has willed them to remain so. This natural equality of men was recognized in the Declaration of the Right of Men in France in 1789 when French National Assembly declared that men are born and always continue free and equal in respect of their rights. Similar statement was made in the American Declaration of Independence when it said, “We hold these truths to be self-evident, that all men are created equal. But in practical life no two men are equal. There is difference in physical constitution, capacity and temperament of individuals. Nature has endowed human beings with different capacities and so long as they differ in their wants, needs and capacities in satisfying them, equality in its popular sense is not practicable. Equality, in this sense, does not even imply similarity of reward for effort.

Absolute equality is an impracticable proposition. Thus, equality in its true meaning has two connotations. Firstly, equality means the absence of social privilege. It implies that there should not be any special privilege for anyone on the basis of birth, wealth, sex, caste, creed and colour. In this sense, equality is a leveling process. It wants to remove inequalities in the society. Everyone should be entitled to enjoy all those social and political privileges to which others are entitled. No individual shall be discriminated.

Secondly, equality means, adequate opportunities are given to all for the development of their personality. Thus, equality involves absence of legal discrimination against individual and provision of adequate opportunities to all against individual provision of adequate opportunities to all.

### 5.3.1 Kinds of Equality

- i. **Social Equality** – Social equality implies that all citizens are entitled to enjoy equal status in the society and no one is entitled to special privilege. There should not be artificial distinction between individuals on the basis of caste, creed, clan, race, tribe, colour etc. All men should get equal and adequate opportunities to realize his life and ambition without discrimination.
- ii. **Civil Equality** – Civil equality implies the enjoyment of similar civil liberties and civil rights by all the citizens. All should be subject to the law and equal before the law. Law should treat all individuals equally without distinction of superior or inferior, rich and poor, caste and creed etc. Equality before law and equal protection of law is the essence of civil equality.
- iii. **Political Equality** – Political equality means equal access of everyone to the avenue of political authority. It is closely related to political rights of an individual which include right to vote, right to stand for election, right to hold public office etc. Thus, political equality implies equal political rights and opportunities to all.

- iv. Economic Equality** – By economic equality, we generally mean the provision of equal opportunities to all so that everyone may be able to make their economic progress. Economic equality is very important because without it political or civil equality are meaningless. But there is nothing like absolute economic equality. Absolute economic equality is simply impracticable because not only do men's wants differ but also their capacity to satisfy them. However, everyone must get at least the basic necessities of life such as food, cloths and shelter. Economic equality basically talks of primary needs of the human being.

### **5.3.2 Relationship between Liberty and Equality**

There are two opposing views regarding the relationship between the liberty and equality. One view is that liberty and equality are anti-thetical to each other. Another view held that they are not anti-thetical rather complicatory to each other. According to Lord Acton, "The passions for equality make vain the hope for liberty". They argued that the desire to have equality destroys the possibility of having full liberty. For instance, when the state passes legislation to bring equality, the liberty of some is restricted. These thinkers are of the view that inequality is conferred by the nature, so there cannot be equality in society.

However, most of the political thinkers reject this view and subscribe to the proposition that liberty and equality are complementary or closely related to each other. The view that liberty and equality are antagonistic is the result of misunderstanding of what equality implies. If the individual is given unrestrained liberty, there will be chaos and disorder in the society. Liberty has to be understood in a social context and true liberty implies reasonable restraints and responsibility for the good of all. History is the evidence that unrestrained economic liberty under the garb of laissez fair ultimately led to the exploitation of the working class by the capitalists who want destruction of the liberty of the vast majority in society.

Hobbes rightly observed that what good freedom is to a starving man. He cannot eat freedom and drink it. Similarly, without civil or political equality, we cannot think of liberty.

Where there is no equality before law and equal protection of law, there cannot be true liberty. In a state where citizens are not given equal right to participate in the political process, liberty has no meaning. Pollard rightly observed that there is only one solution to the problem of liberty, it lies in equality. Thus, liberty and equality are not only complementary to each other but also the fact of same ideal. Equality provides the very basis for liberty. Both aim at contributing to the progress of mankind. Liberty and equality are to be reckoned. They are, indeed, subordinate means to the end of realizing the potentialities of individual personality on the widest possible scale.

### **Check Your Progress-I**

1. Name the Latin word from which the term 'liberty' has been derived.
2. What does civil liberty include?
3. What does political liberty include?
4. What do you mean by economic equality?
5. Who says "The passion for equality makes vain the hope for liberty"?

#### **5.4 Rights: Meaning and Definition**

Rights constitute the essential condition of good life. Rights are those conditions of social life without which man cannot be at his best or give his best to what is needful to the adequate development and expression of his personality. Laski defined, "Rights are those conditions of social life without which no man can seek to be himself at his best." Hence, rights are those opportunities the absence of which deprives man of something essential. All doctrines of freedom and liberty assume the existence of right. Webster's unified Dictionary and Encyclopaedia defines rights as a power or privilege with which the law invests a person. It may be either power to act or to demand action on the part of another.

Rights may be substantive – those of life, liberty, property, etc. and remedial – those used to protect substantive rights. However, rights can be enjoyed only in group. Rights in isolation are meaningless. This implies that rights must be understood in social context. It is based on the

principle of 'Live and let live'. Wilde rightly pointed out that rights are reasonable claims to freedom in the exercise of certain activities. Rights are always accompanied by corresponding duties. Hobbhouse stated that rights are what we may expect from others and others from us, and all genuine rights are conditions of social welfare. We can sum up the content and meaning of the rights as follows.

- a. Rights arise in society only. Without society, there cannot be rights.
- b. Every right has corresponding duty. Rights and duties are same thing looked at from different angle.
- c. Right is not unlimited. It must be compatible with common good.
- d. State does not create rights; rather state maintains, recognizes and coordinates the rights of individuals.
- e. Rights are dynamic and have tendency to grow.

#### **5.4.1 Theories of Rights**

- i. Natural Theory of Rights** – This theory maintains that rights are natural. Rights are not created by any human agency but given by the nature. To them, rights are pre-social and pre-political.
- ii. Legal Theory of Rights** – This theory, on the other hand, maintains that rights are created and maintained by state. State is the main source of right. The state lays down the framework for rights. It is the states that provide, guarantee, enforce and uphold the rights.
- iii. Historical Theory of Rights** – Historical theory maintains that rights are the outcome of historical evolution. Its origin can be traced from the customs and usages. The custom and usages passed on from one generation to another and in the long process are recognized as inherent rights. Ritchie observed that custom is primitive law.



- iv. **Social Welfare Theory of Rights** – The exponents of this theory maintains that rights are the essential condition for social welfare. Rights are created by society for realization of social or common good. Those conditions which are against the social welfare cannot be recognized as rights. Laski once commented, “Rights have no meaning without social utility”.
- v. **Idealist Theory of Rights** – This theory links rights with the moral development of man. They look at rights from the moral and ethical point of view. They say that without rights, it is not possible for individuals to live upto and realize his full potentialities. The idealists believed that state is the march of God on earth and only state can create ideal condition to realize human happiness.

#### 5.4.2 Classification of Rights

Rights can be broadly classified into two – Moral rights and Legal rights. The legal rights can further be divided into civil rights and political rights.

**Moral Rights** – The rights which are based on the ethical or moral sanction of the society are moral rights. Moral rights do not have legal sanction or it cannot be enforced through law. For example, it is the moral right of children to be loved, protected and educated by their parents but such law cannot be enforced legally. The violation of moral right is not punishable under the law. The only sanction behind the moral right is the established opinion of the community.

**Legal Rights** – Legal rights are those rights which are recognized and upheld by the law. Violations of legal rights are punishable under the law. They are enforceable through the court of law. The legal rights are of two types (i) Civil rights and (ii) Political rights.

- i. **Civil Rights** – Civil rights are those rights which are related to the protection of life and property within the society. It is important for the progress of mankind and welfare of the society. The civil rights enable an individual to lead a normal social life. Some of the important civil rights include right to life and security,

right to property, right to family, right to speech, right to religion, right to equality and so on.

- ii. **Political Rights** – Political rights are those rights which enable a citizen to take part in the political process of the country. Some of the important political rights include right to vote, right to be voted, right to hold public office, right to criticize the policies of the government etc.

### 5.5 Law: Meaning and Definitions

The term ‘Law’ is derived from Teutonic word ‘lag’ which means something fixed or even. The term is used to denote something which is uniform or fixed. In Political Science, the term ‘law’ means a body of rules to guide human action. Law regulates the human life and without it, there will be perpetual chaos in the society. The laws regulate not only the relationship among individuals but also regulate the relationship between individuals and the state. It is a written rule made by state for regulating the conduct and behaviour of its citizens. Law is a general rule of external human action enforced by a sovereign political authority. Social life cannot be peaceful and orderly unless rules are made to bring about a minimum uniformity. A definite pattern of social behaviour is prescribed by a set of rules made by the state. These are known as laws. Some of the important definitions of law given by the scholars are mentioned here.

Woodrow Wilson maintained, “Law is that portion of the established thought and habit which has gained distinct and formal recognition in the shape of uniform rules backed by the authority and power of the government”. According to H.R. Solton, “A law is rule of behaviour for the members of state, the disregard of which with a penalty which will be enforced by the state’s machinery of power”. To Holland, “Law is a general rule of external human action enforced by a sovereign political authority”.

From the above definitions of law, it is further clear that laws are enforceable and violation of it is punishable by the state apparatus. The state operates through the government

and the government interprets the will of state through law. Law is, thus, the vehicle of sovereignty. Asirvatham stated that any discussion of sovereignty involves the question of law and sovereignty does not have much meaning unless it expresses itself in and through law.

### 5.5.1 Classification of Laws

- i. **Private Laws** – Laws which determine the relation of one citizen to another are the private laws. They regulate the relationship among individuals and state stands as an impartial arbitrator.
- ii. **Public Laws** – Laws which determine the relationship between state and its citizens are the public laws.
- iii. **Constitutional Law** – Laws that define, interpret and regulate the functions of the government are known as constitutional laws. They directly or indirectly affect the distribution or the exercise of power in the state. Constitutional laws are the basic laws according to which the government in a state conducts itself.
- iv. **Administrative Law** – Administrative laws are related to the interpretation of the office and the responsibilities of the government servant.
- v. **Statute Law** – Laws which are framed by the legislature are called statute laws.
- vi. **Common Laws** – Common laws are those laws which rest on customs but are enforced by the court of law like statute law.

### 7.5.2 Source of Laws

- i. **Custom** – Most of the laws spring from the custom and recognized by the state. Customs mean common usages or practices. When a certain act is frequently

repeated over a long period of time, it becomes a custom. Customs carry the authority of long standing public acceptance.

- ii. **Religion** – Religion is the most important source of law. In primitive society, basically religious customs or law used to govern the society. For example, in India, Hindu Law is based on the code of Manu and Mahmeddan law is based on the Shariat.
- iii. **Indirect Decision** – Judicial decision is the living source of law. The judiciary enforces and interprets the laws and in the process creates new laws through its various judgments.
- iv. **Equity** – Equity, in common usage, means justice or fair play. It implies impartiality, equality and moral uprightness. In the cases where laws do not fit in or laws are ambiguous, the principle of equity is applied and the case is decided according to common sense and fairness.
- v. **Scientific Commentaries** – The opinion and comments by learned jurists or scholars on laws and verdicts of court is an important source of law. Such expert comments lay the basis for new laws or modification of the old ones.

## 5.6 Justice: Meaning and Explanation

The term 'justice' is derived from the Latin word 'justitia' which implies the idea of joining or fitting, the idea of bond or tie. It implies the joining or fitting not only between man and man in an organized social system but also between value and value or a synthesis of values. Barker identified three different values – liberty, equality and fraternity, which are necessary for organized system of human relationship. Justice lies in proper synthesis of these values. The claims of liberty have to be adjusted with those of equality or vice-versa. From this notion, justice may be understood as adjusting, joining or fitting the different political value. Justice is the reconciler and the synthesizer of political values.

The term 'justice' has been variously defined and interpreted by political thinkers in different ages. However, in common parlance, justice means righteousness or virtue. It is opposed to what is unjust, wrong or unreasonable. Hence, justice is primarily a concept intricately linked with morality and ethics. In broader sense, justice is looked at with reference to total behaviour in society. It is understood as virtue, righteousness, truth, and morality concerning individuals in the social system. Philosophers like Plato, Augustine and others viewed justice as an absolute concept.

However, others like Aristotle and Bentham viewed it as a relative concept which changes with changing times and values. In narrower sense, justice is seen to be associated with the legal process in the society. Impartial judiciary, equality before law, fairness of legal process, etc. ensure justice in society.

### **5.6.1 Development of Concept of Justice**

In ancient times, justice was synonymous with the principle of 'eye for eye and a tooth for a tooth'. The Sophists viewed justice as the 'interest of the stronger'. The earliest Greek concept of justice is to be found in the writings of the early Pythagoreans. They viewed justice as a square number. A number is square if its parts are equal. Likewise, a state is just if it is composed of equal parts and justice is the constitution of that equality. However, Plato gave spiritual and ideal dimension to justice. To him, justice is the supreme virtue. The other virtues are temperance, wisdom and courage. Justice harmonizes these virtues. A state is just when the ruling class rules by its wisdom; the soldiers fight with courage and producing class produces with self control or temperance.

Justice lies in the functional specialization of the roles of individuals. Justice in individual, according to Plato, implies that reason, spirit and appetite are kept within their proper limit. Aristotle believed that justice implies a certain degree of equality. To him justice is an equality of proportion between persons and things assigned to them.

St. Augustine linked the idea of justice with religion and divinity. To him, justice can prevail only in the Christian state and its order must be obeyed because it is a divine institution. Justice in the middle ages was purely theological ideal and Church was considered as the only institution for strong hold of justice.

The Marxists maintained that the concept of justice in capitalist society is irrelevant or dangerous. The concept of justice is based on the capitalist mode of production. Justice has meaning only for those who own the means of production. For the working classes, this justice in form is injustice in reality. There will be justice only when the mode of production is owned by the working classes. Further, the utilitarian's like Hume, Bentham and Mills substantiated earlier concept of justice with the principle of utility. To them, justice lies in the greatest happiness of the greatest number. The liberals and neo-liberals equated justice with the concepts like equality before law, equal protection of law, equality of opportunity, minimum standard of living, etc.

Hence, the concept of justice is dynamic, and not static. What was considered just at one point of time may not necessarily be considered just at another point of time. For example, slavery was once justified and accepted in the society but it is no more justified nowadays. Hence, the true meaning of justice can be understood in the light of the prevalent social consciousness.

### **5.6.2 Dimension (Types) of Justice**

The modern concept of justice is different from the traditional concept. The traditional concept of justice primarily concerns with the personal virtues which may enhance the moral worth of a man. It insists on the individuals conforming to pre-conceived notion of society. Now, it is being replaced by the idea of social justice. When the modern idea of social justice is applied to various aspects of social life, we get legal, political, social and economic notions of justice.

**Legal Justice** – Legal justice is related to fairness in the judicial process. It implies that law should be reasonable, rational and equal for all. For rational law, the law making institution should also be rational and just. There must be impartial and independent judiciary to check the arbitrariness of legislature and executive. The principles of equality before law and equal

protection of law can promote legal justice. The legal justice talks of ‘justice according to law’ and ‘law according to justice’.

**Political Justice** – Political justice implies a full guarantee of the liberty of thought and expressions, particularly right to criticize the government and its policies. It refers to the reorientation of political institutions, political process and political rights according to the current conception of justice. The liberal view of political justice means equal right to vote and equal share in government services. Hence, political justice is closely related to political rights and political equality.

**Social Justice** – Social justice presupposes an equal availability of social opportunities for development of personality by the people without discrimination. No man should be deprived of those social conditions which are essential for his development. It is closely associated with social equality and social rights.

**Economic Justice** – Economic justice implies that all should have access to the means of satisfying their primary economic needs. It is not possible without economic equality. The liberals believed that economic justice can be achieved through provision of equal opportunities and minimization of economic disparities. However, the Marxists maintain that economic justice is not possible until there is private property, and means of production are owned by a few.

### **Check Your Progress-II**

1. Mention various theories of rights.
2. What do you mean by legal rights?
3. What do you mean by public laws?
4. Discuss the sources of law.
5. Who viewed justice as the interest of the stronger?

## 5.7 Let Us Sum Up

To sum up, this unit discusses the meaning and various aspects of liberty, equality, rights, law and justice for clear understanding of the same. Further, the basic inputs derived from this study would help the readers for having an analytical observation of the concepts in a wider perspective in real world situation.

## 5.8 Key Words

Restraints	:	Restrictions
Social context	:	In context of society or in relation to society
Chaos	:	Lawlessness or disorder
Arbitrary	:	Absolute, not bound by law
State of nature	:	When there was no state (laws or rules)
Antithetical	:	Opposite
Co-exist	:	To exist together, or to live side by side.
Antagonistic	:	Opposite or inimical
Laissez-faire	:	Another name for individualism which advocates, non interference by state in economic activities of individual
Potentiality	:	Capabilities
Substantive	:	Essential; having firm basis
Exponent	:	Proponent; one who advocates particular thought or idea
Ambiguous	:	Not clear; not specific
Synthesis	:	Putting things together; combination
Preconceived notion	:	Previously held opinion or already held view
Economic disparities	:	Gaps in economic status of the people



## 5.9 Check Your Learning

1. Discuss the various meanings of the term 'liberty'. Can liberty of an individual and power of the state co-exist?
2. Discuss the various kinds of liberty.
3. What is equality? What are its various kinds?
4. Discuss the relationship between liberty and equality.
5. Define law. What are the sources of law?
6. What do you mean by rights? Discuss the various theories of rights.
7. Discuss the meaning of rights. Explain its classification.
8. Explain the meaning of the term 'justice'. What are the various dimensions of justice?

## 5.10 Suggested Readings

- |               |   |   |
|---------------|---|---|
| R.C.Agarwal   | : | <i>Political Theory</i> , S. Chand & Company, Delhi   |
| A.C. Kapoor   | : | <i>Principles of Political Science</i> , S.Chand& Company, Delhi                                  |
| B.K.Gokhale   | : | <i>Political Theory – Theory &amp; Governmental Machinery</i> , Himalayan publishing house, Delhi |
| V. D. Mahajan | : | <i>Political Theory</i> , S.Chand& company, Delhi.<br><i>CBSE Books and IGNOU Books</i>           |



**INSTITUTE  
OF DISTANCE  
EDUCATION** **IDE**  
Rajiv Gandhi University

# Institute of Distance Education Rajiv Gandhi University

A Central University

Rono Hills, Arunachal Pradesh

## Contact us:

 +91-98638 68890

 Ide Rgu

 Ide Rgu

 helpdesk.ide@rgu.ac.in