



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

BPOL202

POLITICAL THEORY-II



**BA (POLITICAL
SCIENCE)
4TH SEMESTER**

Rajiv Gandhi University

www.ide.rgu.ac.in

POLITICAL THEORY-II

Bachelor of Arts

Fourth Semester

Paper 202



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 • Email: helpline@vikaspublishing.com

SYLLABI- BOOK MAPPING TABLE
POLITICAL THEORY

Unit I	Concepts: Liberalism and Marxism.
Unit II	Sovereignty: Monistic and Pluralistic.
Unit III	Power, Authority and Legitimacy
Unit IV	Democracy: Liberal and Marxist approaches.
Unit V	Political Culture and Political Participation

Unit- I**CONCEPTS: LIBERALISM AND MARXISM****Structure**

- 1.0 Introduction
- 1.1 Unit Objectives
- 1.2 Liberalism
 - 1.2.1 Growth of Liberal Trend: Laski
 - 1.2.2 Communitarianism
- 1.3 Marxism
 - 1.3.1 Theory of Alienation
 - 1.3.2 Strands of Contemporary Marxism
- 1.4 Let us Sum Up
- 1.5 Key Terms
- 1.6 Answers to 'Check Your Progress'
- 1.7 Questions and Exercises
- 1.8 Suggested Reading

1.0 Introduction

In this unit, you will learn about the ideology of Karl Marx, a German philosopher, economist, sociologist, historian, journalist and revolutionary socialist. Some of his major works are The Holy Family (1844), The Communist Manifesto (1848), Poverty of Philosophy (1847), Critique of Political Economy (1859) and Das Capital, the first volume of which appeared in 1867. You will also learn about the ideology of Liberalism.

1.1 Objectives

After going through this unit, you will be able to:

- Understand the concept of liberalism
- Discuss the meaning of communitarianism
- Explain the concept of Marxism
- Describe the political thoughts

1.2 Liberalism

Laski was an English economist and political theorist whose ideas are well known in intellectual circles. He was a man of many talents, and his importance lies in the fact that he always tried to put his political philosophy in practice to make it applicable to real-life situations. John Rawls was a liberal democrat and a prolific writer who wrote on various topics of international relations. Rawls was distressed about the prevailing situation in the capitalist world. He wanted to bring about tangible changes in a society plagued with distressing situations at a time when the world was divided between the rich and the poor. He had a vision of a community in which everybody could play a due role according to his/her capacity. Nozick criticized Rawls's approach and adopted a realistic approach, taking into account different modes of acquisition of goods and entitlement of different individuals.

Liberals promote ideas like constitutionalism, liberal democracy, human rights accepted, even by those political parties which do not frankly admit a liberal ideological capitalism, free and fair elections and freedom of religion. These ideas are extensively course. Liberalism includes classical liberalism, which became well-admired in the eighteenth century; and social liberalism, which became famous in the twentieth century. It rejected several initial postulations that governed many earlier theories of government. For the first time, liberalism emerged as a powerful force in the Age of Enlightenment such as absolute monarchy, nobility, established

religion and the divine right of king's First liberal thinker, John Locke, who is frequently credited for the conception of liberalism as a distinctive philosophical tradition, employed the idea of natural rights and the social contract to dispute that:

- The rule of law should swap absolutism in government.
- Rulers were subject to the assent of the governed.
- Private individuals had a basic right to life, liberty and property.

The rebels in the American Revolution and the French Revolution freely used liberal philosophy to give good reason for the armed defeat of dictatorial rule. The 19th century saw the setting up of liberal governments in many nations in Europe, Latin America and North America. Liberal concepts spread even further in the 20th century, when in two World Wars, liberal democracies were victorious, surviving major ideological confrontations from fascism and communism. In today's modern world, liberalism, in its different forms, continues to be a political force of diverging degrees of power and impact on almost all countries.

1.2.1 Growth of Liberal Trend: Laski

Laski traced the historical evolution of the theory and practice of liberalism and interpreted this evolution in economic terms. He concluded that the changes in the political theory and practice of liberalism were conditioned by the economic exigencies of the different phases of capitalism. In this way, he substantiated his thesis about the class character of the modern liberal state by examining its historical background. Finally, he concluded that the philosophy of liberalism had entered a phase of decline on account of the developing crisis and contradictions of the capitalist system. The only philosophy which could take its place, he felt, was the philosophy of socialism.

In the realm of constitutional theory, Laski has bequeathed upon us two monumental British constitution, and *The American Democracy*, probably the most comprehensive works *Parliamentary Government in England*, which is a critical commentary of the survey of the American democracy in action ever undertaken by any single writer. In his analysis of the parliamentary system in England, he arrived at certain remarkable conclusions. First, he declared that the existence of a monarchy even in the present form is inconsistent with the true spirit of

democratic equality. Moreover, the influence of the monarch in any constitutional crisis or emergency is bound to be exerted on the side of reaction as typified by the resignation of the MacDonald government in 1931 and an immediate formation of a reactionary national coalition in its place. . Similarly, Laski proposed the abolition of the House of Lords as he considered a hereditary second chamber inconsistent with a genuinely democratic system.

Laski visualized the creation of a strong cabinet. He did it to effectively control the House of Commons and bring about a socialist transformation of British society through legislative decrees and immediate administrative action. These changes could only be done by removing reactionary checks like the discretion of the monarch in forcing untimely plebiscites and the power of a second chamber to delay legislation. Criticizing this proposal, George Catlin remarks that this constitutional thesis is only superficially non-monarchical and democratic. In fact, it implies a belief in the government of a veiled socialistic dictatorship, which does not recognize any checks upon its power, whether by the constitution, judiciary, a second chamber or an electoral referendum.

Laski has made similar observations about the working of the American constitution. In *The American Presidency*, he analysed the nature of the working of the Presidential government in the USA and concluded that the system of checks and balances was not conducive to real efficiency in the government. The fathers of the American constitution, he thought, had designed it to suit the needs of a social structure based upon the ideals of *laissez faire*. Those ideals had now become quite irrelevant in the context of the worldwide vogue of positive government.

In *The American Democracy*, Laski examined other political institutions through which democracy in the USA operates and discussed the impact of the social, economic and cultural environment upon its functioning. He declared that the spectacle of the separation of powers was really a spectacle of confusion of powers. The pattern of division of powers between the federal and state governments had become obsolete in the context of modern developments. The difficulties, which President Roosevelt faced in the realization of his New Deal Programme, showed clearly how the American political system was designed to serve the interests of reaction. He regarded the Supreme Court's veto over legislation as undemocratic and pleaded for the full legislative sovereignty of the Congress on a British pattern. Similarly, he pleaded for

strengthening of the presidential office and proposed devices for a closer cooperation between the legislative and executive wings of Government.

Laski also criticized the party system in the USA as corrupt and antiquated. He lamented the fact that a socialist party had not yet developed in the US. He foresaw two alternative lines of development for capitalist democracy in USA-it must either renounce its capitalist character and become a socialist democracy or choose the second alternative of dissolving democracy internally and seek the solution of its economic crisis in aggressive imperialism abroad.

Political Liberalism

On the question of stability, Rawls' later work contented that whether it was possible that a society that was ordered by the two principles of justice endured? His answer to this question is traced in a collection of lectures titled Political Liberalism. In this, he introduced the idea of an overlapping consensus - or agreement - on justice as fairness between citizens who hold different religious and philosophical views or conceptions of the good. Further, 'Political Liberalism' also introduced the idea of public reason - the common rationale of all citizens. This is, in a sense, a right understanding for the betterment of society for all practical purposes.

Rawls addressed the most pressing criticism fabricated in 'A Theory of Justice'— the criticism that the principles of justice were simply an alternative systematic conception of justice that was understandably not better to utilitarianism or for that matter any other comprehensive theory. From the point of view of critics, 'justice as fairness' is merely a theory that catered to the problem of justice and a political conception of justice that rational doctrine. For them, it did not distinguish between a moral and a comprehensive people with conflicting yet logical, religious or metaphysical views would accept to regulate liberalism is that it requires reaching a point of consensus without appealing to any one the intrinsic unit of society. The distinction of Rawls' accounts and the earlier ones of Liberalism is that is that it requires reaching a point of consensus without appealing to any one metaphysical source.

The idea of political liberalism' goes against the views of social contractarians like John Locke or John Stuart Mill, who promote a more robust cultural and metaphysical liberal consensus regardless of the 'deep' religious or metaphysical values that the parties appreciate. This outcome is underlined as an 'overlapping consensus' due to often conflicting and different

accounts of nature, morality, etc. These tend to 'overlap' with each other regarding the issue of better rules applicable to humanity. Rawls further brought changes in the principles of justice, which are as follows:

- Each person has an equal claim to a fully adequate scheme of equal basic rights and liberties, which scheme is compatible with a similar scheme for all.
- Social and economic inequalities satisfy two conditions: first they must be attached to offices and positions open to all under conditions of fair and equal opportunity and second, they must be to the greatest benefit of the least advantaged members of society.

These principles are subtly modified from those in A Theory of Justice. The first principle now reads 'equal claim' in place of 'equal right', and also replaces the phrase 'system of basic liberties' with a fully adequate scheme of equal basic rights and liberties.

Contemporary Liberalism

In this section, you will be acquainted with John Rawls' and Robert Nozick's versions of the contemporary liberalism.

1. John Rawls

Contemporary liberalism owes much to the classical as well as modern liberalist thinkers such as Locke, Kant and Mill. However, if one has to single out one important political philosopher of the twentieth century whose influence has been the most profound in liberal thinking it is John Rawls. Before going into the details of the Rawls' philosophy let us have a brief look into his life profile.

John Rawls was born in 1921 in Maryland, United States. Rawls attended school in Baltimore for a short time before transferring to Kent School, an Episcopalian preparatory school in Connecticut. Rawls studied graduation at Princeton University After his completion of graduation in 1943, he joined the Army and participated in World War-II. After the war, he returned to Princeton to pursue a doctorate in moral philosophy. Rawls married Margaret Fox, a graduate, in 1949. He finished his Ph.D. from Princeton in 1950 and thereafter he taught there until 1952, when he received a Fulbright Fellowship to Oxford University, where he was influenced by the liberal political theorist and historian Isaiah Berlin and the legal theorist

H.L.A. Hart. After returning to the United States, he served first as an assistant and then associate professor at Cornell University. In 1962 he became a full professor of philosophy at Cornell, and soon achieved a tenured position at MIT. That same year, he moved to Harvard University, where he taught for almost forty years, and where he trained some of the contemporary figures in moral and political philosophy, including Martha Nussbaum, Thomas Nagel, Onora O'Neill, Christine Korsgaard, Susan Neiman and Thomas Pogge. Rawls is noted for his contributions to liberal political philosophy.

John Rawls was Professor Emeritus of Philosophy at Harvard University. He is the author of the well-known and path breaking *A Theory of Justice* and the more recent work *Political Liberalism*. His book *A Theory of Justice* provides a skeletal account of Rawls' project of using social contract theory to generate principles of justice for assigning basic rights and duties and determining the division of social benefits in a society. This book is regarded as the most important work of political philosophy written in English since the Second World War. It has influenced modern liberals and social democrats alike.

Rawls proposed a theory of 'justice as fairness' that is based on the belief that social inequality can be justified only if it is of benefit to the least advantaged. This presumption in favour of equality is rooted in Rawls's belief that most people deprived of knowledge about their own talents and abilities would choose to live in an egalitarian society, rather than an inegalitarian one. As for most people, the fear of being poor will outweigh the desire to be rich, redistribution and welfare can be defended on grounds of fairness. The universalist presumptions of his early work were modified to a certain degree in his another famous work *Political Liberalism*. Two monumental treaties written by Rawls-*A Theory of Justice* (1971) and *Political Liberalism* (1993) have laid the contemporary terms of debate and discussions on liberalism and its values.

Rawls revived the social contract tradition of Locke, Rousseau, and Kant. Both of these philosophers redeployed and depend Mill's vindication of liberty in a free society, and argued against conventional judgments, especially those of utilitarianism that treated individuals as means towards attending the collective good. A liberal state, according to Rawls, must not only guarantee that all its citizens have an equality of fundamental liberty rights, such as voting, and freedom of speech, religion and association; it must also ensure that those who are least well-off

are assured as good a life as possible. He asserts that freedom should never be sacrificed on the grounds of an increase in material well-being. This is why he gives priority to the equal enjoyment of liberty (the liberty principle) over the principle that requires the welfare of the least well-off to be taken care of (the difference principle). Overall Rawls holds out an account of egalitarian liberalism that is hospitable to redistributive experiments of the liberal state.

John Rawls in his celebrated work *A Theory of Justice* has pointed out that a good society is characterized by a number of virtues. Justice is the first virtue of a good society. In other words, justice is a necessary but not a sufficient condition of a good society. A well-ordered society, according to Rawls, is effectively regulated by a public conception of justice. It is a society which everyone accepts and knows that the others accept the same principles of justice and the basic institutions satisfy these principles. For Rawls, what is directly relevant for social ethics and justice is the individuals' means to pursue their own ends and to live whatever 'good life' they choose for themselves. These means are 'basic liberties', on the one hand, and 'primary goods', on the other.

Rawls weaves an intricate and elaborate pattern of enquiry and provides a coherent, systematic and powerful defense of a new kind of egalitarianism that preserves and extends individual liberty. He outlines the features of his conception in an article that appeared in 1957, entitled *Justice as Fairness* culminating in *A Theory of Justice*. The elaboration and clarification of theory continues through a series of books and two more books *Political Liberalism* and *The Law of Peoples*.

According to Rawls, the problem of justice consists in ensuring a just distribution of 'primary goods', which include rights and liberties, powers and opportunities, income and wealth, means of self-respect and so on. He has described his theory as the theory of pure procedural justice. It means that once certain principles of justice are unanimously accepted, the distribution resulting from their application will be necessarily just. Rawls has severely criticized those theories of allocation which ignore moral worth of the individual for the attainment of any pre-determined goal. He has attacked utilitarianism because in calculating the 'greatest happiness of the greatest number' it does not care if it leads to extreme hardship to any particular individual. He has brilliantly argued that you cannot compensate for the sufferings of the distressed by

enhancing the joys of the prosperous. Rawls has evolved a unique methodology for arriving at a unanimous procedure of justice.

Rawls observes that the political constitution and the principal economic and social arrangements, such as the legal protection of freedom of thought and liberty of conscience, competitive markets, private property in the means of production and the monogamous family, must be accepted as given.

Unfortunately, this system breeds deep inequalities that cannot possibly be justified by an appeal to the notions of merit or desert. It is these inequalities, presumably inevitable in the basic structure of any society, to which the principles of social justice must in the first instance apply. The justice of a social scheme depends essentially on how fundamental rights and duties are assigned and on the economic opportunities and social conditions in the various sectors of society. In this way, Rawls is interested in developing a conception of justice that can provide a standard by which the distributive arrangements of a given society can be assessed but which need not concern itself with the fundamental question of ownership of the means of production. His aim is to present a conception of justice, which generalizes and carries to a higher plane the familiar theory of the social contract. The guiding idea is that the principles of justice for the basic structure of society are the object of the original agreement.

Rawls has evolved a unique methodology for arriving at a unanimous procedure of justice. Following the tradition of the 'social contract', Rawls has envisaged an 'original position' by abstracting the individuals from their particular social and economic circumstances. In Rawls own words 'In Justice as fairness the original position of equality corresponds to the state of nature in the traditional theory of the social contract. This original position is not, of course, thought of as an actual historical state of affairs, much less as a primitive condition of culture. It is understood as a purely hypothetical situation characterized so as to lead to a certain conception of justice. These individuals are symbolically placed behind a 'veil of ignorance' where they are supposed to be deliberating as rational agents. They are totally unaware of their wants, interests, skills and abilities as well as of the condition which lead to discrimination and conflict in the society. But they have an elementary knowledge of the economics and psychology, and are also endowed with a 'sense of justice'. Each individual wants to maximize his or her well- being,

without being envious. They are self-interested but not egoists. They are not prepared to take a risk or resort to gambling.

According to Rawls, in such a state of uncertainty the national negotiators will choose the least dangerous path. In other words, each individual will hypothetically place himself or herself in the least advantage positions' while recommending the criteria of allocation of the primary goods. Hence, each of them will demand greatest benefit for the least advantaged. R.P. Wolf observes Rawls revives a version of the theory of the social contract as a way of discovering a via media between utilitarianism and intuitionism. Morally, he is more comfortable with the intuitionists but methodologically his heart is with the utilitarians and with the new-classical economists.

Rawls's basic concern might be put this way-What is the most reasonable conception of justice for a society of free and equal persons? What principles should our society meet, if it is to be fair to persons conceived of as free and equal: both conceived in liberty and dedicated to the proposition that all men are created equal? In particular, should it be utilitarian, libertarian, a less liberal egalitarian society a less egalitarian liberal society? Theory offers a three-part answer to this question:

- Rawls presents two principles of justice, and offers an argument for those principles according to which the members of society would choose them in an 'original position' behind a 'veil of ignorance', which hides all information about their social position and natural endowments.
- He presents a sketch of a society that operates on these principles, to show that they are realistic.
- He argues, finally, that a just society-just by the lights of justice as fairness- would be stable in part because living in a just society and having a sense of justice guided by his principles is good for those who live in the society.

As a result of the hypothetical negotiations under such conditions, three principles of justice will be accepted by all, according to Rawls, in this order:

- Principal of equal liberty (for example, equal right to most extensive liberty compatible with similar liberty of others) which postulates that nobody's liberty will be sacrificed for

the sake of any other benefit (liberty in this sense implies equal right to political participation, freedom of expression, religious liberty, equality before the law etc.). The principle also implies that each person is to have an equal right to the most extensive total system of equal basic liberties compatible with a similar system of liberty of all.

- Second principle comprises of two parts:
 - Principle of fair equality of opportunity, particularly for acquiring offices and positions; and
 - Difference principle, which implies that any departure from equal distribution of the primary goods can be justified only when it could be proved to bring greatest benefit to the least advantaged. In other words, a special reward for extraordinary ability and effort to any individual can be treated as just only if it results in the greatest benefit to the least privileged.
- When these conditions have been fulfilled, the criteria of efficiency can be justly applied in a competitive economy. In other words, the rule of allocation 'to each according to his ability' can be applied only if higher efficiency of the concerned individuals results in ameliorating the condition of the least privileged.

Rawls introduced the ideas of the 'chain connection', which implied that in order to strengthen a chain you should start with strengthening its weakest link, and then repeat the process by identifying the weakest link on each occasion. The justifiability of any special concessions, subsidies or protection depends on the empirical facts whether or not such benefits filter down ultimately to help the neediest.

The protections of the basic liberties are especially stringent. Rawls's equal basic liberty principle has priority over the second principle. So, Rawls may seem to be endorsing a libertarian view. But his first principle is about specific liberties, not liberty or choices as such. In particular, the market liberties that were the concern of the Lochner Court are not covered by his first principle of justice. So, those liberties can be regulated to achieve the aims of the second principle of justice. So, what does the 'priority of liberty' mean? It means that justifications for limiting a basic liberty must show how the proposed limit improves the protection of the basic liberties overall. For example, to protect the religious liberty of religious minorities, you might restrict the scope of majority rule by adopting a constitutional right to liberty of conscience that

ensures the free exercise of scope of that liberty. So, one basic liberty (political liberty) is restricted to ensure another religion. This plausibly counts as a restriction of political liberty, as much as it limits the basic liberty (religious liberty). But this is the force of the priority of liberty- it is not similarly permissible to restrict political liberty in order to improve the economic conditions of the least advantaged: for example, to restrict the voting rights of the better off in order to improve the economic circumstances of the less well-off.

The difference principle says that inequalities are permissible only if they maximally benefit the least advantaged. To appreciate the moral idea behind the principle, let us assume that a society guarantees equal basic liberties and fair equality of opportunity. Still, it may show considerable inequalities. In particular, suppose some people have highly marketable skills based on relatively scarce natural talents, and that others lack similarly high-end marketable skills. Assume people in both groups get up, work hard and contribute. Nevertheless, they receive substantially different rewards in the labour market and those differences in turn have a large impact on what they aspire to, and on the extent to which they can achieve their aspirations. How, in a society dedicated to the proposition that you all are created equal, can such inequalities, founded as they are on the contingencies of natural talent, be acceptable?

The answer provided by the difference principle is that you need to mitigate these inequalities owing to differences in natural talent. More positively stated, when the difference principle is in effect, everyone and in particular the least advantaged group shares in the benefits that flow from the diversity of talents in the population.

The difference principle treats the distribution of talents as a common asset in that it seeks to ensure that the variety in our talents works to the benefit of all, and in particular benefit the least well-off. It does not mandate a socially beneficial use of one's talents but does say that people can legitimately expect greater economic rewards from the use of their talents and abilities only if the use benefits the least well-off. The point of the difference principle is not to rail against the differences of natural endowments, or to eliminate them. The question of political morality is what to do with such differences, given their potentially large consequences for the fate of morally equal persons. The difference principle proposes an answer. In advancing the difference principle, Rawls urges, in effect, that you reject the idea that a market economy should be a kind of talent contest, designed to discover and reward the gifted. Instead, it should work as

one part of a fair scheme of cooperation, and ensure a reasonable life for all members, understood as free and equal persons. 'In justice as fairness', Rawls says, 'men agree to share one another's fate. In designing institutions, they undertake to avail themselves of the accidents of nature and social circumstance only when doing so is for the common benefit'.

Third, the large ambition of justice as fairness is to effect a 'reconciliation of liberty and equality'-to bring elements of both liberal and egalitarian political thought together into a single coherent political philosophy. To see, consider how the two principles work in combination. Assume first that what matters to people is not only to have legally protected liberties, but for those liberties be valuable: for them to be worth something. Assume, second, that the value of a person's liberty is importantly determined by the resources available to that person for using the liberty. In particular, assume that the worth or value of my liberties to me is an increasing function of the resources over which I exercise control: as my command of resources increases, I can do more with my liberties.

Now put the two principles together: the first ensures equal basic liberties; the second guarantees that the minimum level of resources is maximized. If the worth of a person's liberty-its value to the person-is an increasing function of the level of his/her resources, then by maximizing the minimum level of resources, you also maximize the minimum worth of liberty. Thus, the two principles together require that society 'maximize the worth to the least advantaged of the complete scheme of equal liberty shared by all'. Maximizing the minimum worth of liberty 'defines', Rawls says, 'the end of social justice'.

It may be argued that Rawls' theory does meet the criteria for a theory of economic justice since it does propose to regulate distributive arrangements in society by an ethical principle. This argument cannot be sustained because Rawls places a severe limit to the amount of redistribution of income allowed by his ethical norm. This limit is dictated by the market economy. His ethical principle of distributive justice prescribes that transfers of income from the rich to the poor should not reach a point at which 'greater taxes interfere so much with economic efficiency that the prospects of the least advantaged in the present generation are no longer improved but begin to decline'.

2. Robert Nozick

Robert Nozick (November 16, 1938–January 23, 2002) was an American political philosopher, most prominent in the 1970s and 1980s. He was a professor at Harvard University. Robert Nozick was one of the principal advocates of libertarianism, which is one of the contemporary version of liberalism. Nozick was born in Brooklyn, the son of a Jewish entrepreneur from the Russian shtetl whose name was Cohen. Nozick was married to the poet Gjertrud Schnackenberg. He died in 2002 after a prolonged struggle with cancer. He was educated at Columbia where he studied with Sidney Morgenbesser, did his Ph.D. at Princeton and studied at Oxford as a Fulbright Scholar.

Robert Nozick's major works included: *Anarchy, State, and Utopia* (1974), *Philosophical Explanations* (1981), *The Examined Life* (1989), *The Nature of Rationality* (1993/1995), *Socratic Puzzles* (1997), *Invariances: The Structure of the Objective World*. His other works involved decision theory and epistemology. He is best known for his book *Anarchy, State, and Utopia* (1974), a libertarian answer to John Rawls's *A Theory of Justice* (1971). It is widely seen as one of the most important contemporary works of political philosophy, and it has had a profound influence upon New Right theories and beliefs.

Nozick's *Anarchy, State, and Utopia* (1974), which received a National Book Award, argues among other things that a distribution of goods is just if brought about by free exchange among consenting adults and from a just starting position, even if large inequalities subsequently emerge from the process.

Nozick appealed to the Kantian idea that people should be treated as ends (what he termed 'separateness of persons'), not merely as a means to some other end. Nozick here challenges the partial conclusion of John Rawls's Second Principle of Justice of his *A Theory of Justice* that 'social and economic inequalities are to be arranged so that they are to be of greatest benefit to the least-advantaged members of society'.

Anarchy, State and Utopia claims a heritage from John Locke's *Second Treatise on Government* and tries to base itself upon a natural law doctrine. Locke only relied on this claim to all the property of England. Nozick suggested, again as a natural law as God-given to counteract the King of England's claim to divine right and utilitarianism, that the sacrosanctity of

life made property rights non-negotiable. This principle has served as a foundation for many libertarian pitches into modern politics. Aggression principle would allow and regard as valid consensual/non-coercive enslavement. Most controversially, Nozick argued that a consistent upholding of the libertarian non- contracts between adults. He rejected the notion of inalienable rights advanced by most other libertarian academics, writing in *Anarchy, State and Utopia* that the typical notion of a 'free system' would allow adults to voluntarily enter into non-coercive slave contracts.

Nozick various books, *The Examined Life* (1989), pitched to a broader public, explores love, death, faith, reality and meaning of life. *The Nature of Rationality* (1993), presents a theory of practical reason that attempts to embellish notoriously spartan classical decision theory. *Socratic Puzzles* (1997) is a collection of papers that range in topic from Ayn Rand and Austrian economics to animal rights, while his last production, *Invariances* (2001), applies insights from physics and biology to questions of objectivity in such areas as the nature of necessity and moral value.

He developed a form of libertarianism that was close to Locke's and clearly influenced by nineteenth-century US individualists such as Spooner and Tucker. He argued that property rights should be strictly upheld, provided that wealth has been justly acquired in the first place or has been justly transferred from one person to this position it means support for minimal government and minimal taxation and it undermines the case for welfare and redistribution. Nozick's rights-based theory of justice was developed in response to the ideas of John Rawls.

Libertarianism treats liberty of the individual as its central concern. But it focuses on formal liberty and insists on minimal role of the state in economic activities of individuals. It regards the right to property as an important ingredient of individual liberty. It is largely opposed to the idea of welfare state. This perspective is chiefly represented by Nozick's theory of justice. Libertarianism differs from other right-wing theories in its claim that redistributive taxation is inherently wrong, a violation of peoples' rights. People have right to dispose freely of their goods and services, and they have this right whether or not it is the best way to ensure productivity. Put another way, government has no right to interfere in the market, even in order to increase efficiency. As Robert Nozick puts it, 'Individuals have rights, and there are things which no person or group may do to them (without violating their rights). So strong and far-reaching are

these rights that they raise the question of what, if anything, the state and its officials may do'. As people have a right to dispose of their holdings as they see fit, government interference is equivalent to forced labour—a violation, not of efficiency, but of our basic moral rights.

A libertarian is critical of liberal idea of justice-utilitarian and contractual and bases his conception of justice on the ideal of liberty. Nozick's entitlement theory of justice provides a powerful philosophical defence of the libertarian position of the minimal state. The entitlement theory is proposed as a critique and an alternate model to Rawls theory. It is purely a procedural theory of distributive justice, which defends whatever arises from a just situation by just steps is itself just.

In his book *Anarchy State and Utopia*, Nozick sought to advance an alternative to Rawls, theory of justice. While Rawls sought to moderate his libertarianism by a modicum of egalitarianism and communitarianism, Nozick stuck to libertarianism in its pure form. Rawls may be termed as left liberal or egalitarian liberal advocating a libertarian who is the ardent advocate of a laissez-faire 'night watchman' state. Nozick substantially redistributive welfare state. But Nozick can be termed as right liberal or wrote, 'our main conclusions about the state are that a minimal state, limited to the narrow functions of protection against force, theft, fraud, enforcement of contracts and so on, is justified; that any more extensive state will violate a person's rights not to be forced to do certain things, and is unjustified; and that the minimal state is inspiring as well as right'.

Robert Nozick's version of libertarian theory of justice has three aspects: principle of justice in original justification or acquisition, in transfer and of rectification of unjust holdings. The first principle sets the conditions for creation of property. The second of its passage from one owner to another and the third for remedies in case any of the other two are violated. Various aspects of Robert Nozick's theory need more elaboration, which is as follows:

- **Modes of acquisition:** Nozick has criticized John Rawls, approach, which seeks to determine the principle of distribution of certain goods as if they have come to us as a gift from heaven. Nozick has adopted a realistic approach, which stood account for the different modes of acquisition of goods and entitlement of different individuals to own

those goods. According to Nozick, there are three sources through which an individual acquires various goods. These sources are as follows:

- **By themselves:** Nozick points out that individual have absolute right over them. An individual is free to use his limbs and brain to do whatever he likes.
 - **By the natural world:** Individuals may acquire bits of the natural world through several methods and may become entitled to their use as they like. This is precisely the area where principles of entitlement are required to be determined according to logic.
 - **By applying themselves to the natural world:** An individual's entitlement to the products achieved by natural world may not be questioned. Voluntary transfer of these goods will establish others entitlement to them.
- **Principle of entitlement:** Nozick's entitlement theory regards social distribution of goods as just it is generated by processes that are just, succinctly summed up as 'from each as they chose, to each as they are chosen'. People's entitlement to self-ownership of their body and mind-their physical and mental faculty is obvious, which needs no further justification. Their entitlement to bits of the natural world and the products of their labour should be based on the principles of justice. More precisely, there are three main principles of Nozick's 'entitlement theory':
 - **A principle of just initial acquisition:** It is an account of how people come to own the things initially, which can be transferred.
 - **A principle of transfer:** Whatever is justly acquired can be freely transferred.
 - **A principle of rectification of injustice:** How to deal with holdings if they were unjustly acquired or transferred.
 - **Initial acquisition:** Those who come to settle in an uninhabited continent may legitimately acquire its land and natural resources on the first come first served basis, as long as no body is made worse off by their doing so. This means that this mode of acquisition should not result in creating scarcity for others a condition, which may scarcely be satisfied. This is similar to the condition spelled out in John Locke's Second Treaties of Government (1690) in the case of similar acquisitions, viz. as long as enough and as good is left for others. The historical answer is often that natural resources came to

be someone's property by force. According to Nozick, the use of force makes acquisition illegitimate, so current title is illegitimate.

Hence, those who currently possess scarce resources have no right to deprive others of access to them-e.g. capitalists are not entitled to deprive workers of access to the products or profits of the existing means of production.

- Voluntary transfer: This principle applies to all property whether acquired through initial acquisition or by mixing one's labour with the natural world, i.e., by means of one's talents, efforts, enterprise etc. in a market situation. In other words, if I use others' labour and pay them as per market rates, I become owner of the product of their labour. This must be based on voluntary contract, without force or fraud. In all such transactions, an individual shall be treated as 'end-in-itself' and not as a means to others' ends. This is similar to the moral principle enunciated by Emanuel Kant, a German philosopher. Hence, a contract through which an individual sells himself or any other individual to slavery will be void.
- Rectification: This principle is related to the idea where the state or the international community will be justified to intervene in order to restore justice. Nozick concedes that the history of the world abounds with voluntary transfers as well as unjust acquisitions of natural resources. As long as economic disparities result from voluntary transfers, Nozick is not bothered. But if some country has gained control over rare natural resources depriving others of their legitimate share, Nozick would step in to register his protest. If the inventor of the cure of a dreaded disease like cancer demand exorbitant charges from his patients, there is nothing wrong in this deal for Nozick, because he does not make anybody worse off by treating his patients. But if there is a single source of water which is needed by all human beings, nobody has the right to take it in his control.

The conclusion of Nozick's entitlement theory is that a minimal state, which is limited to the narrow functions of protection against force, theft, fraud, enforcement of contracts, and so on, is justified. A more extensive state will violate persons' rights and will force them to do certain things, and is unjustified. Hence, there will be no public education, no public health care, transportation, roads, or parks. All of these will involve the coercive taxation of some people against their will, violating the principle 'from each as they choose, to each as they were chosen.'

Rawls and Nozick differ on the question of which rights are most important in treating people as ends in themselves. To oversimplify, you can say that for Rawls, one of the most important rights is to have a right to a certain share of society's resources. For Nozick, on the other hand, the most important rights are rights over oneself—the rights which constitute 'self-ownership'. In his book *Anarchy, State and Utopia*, Nozick wrote in the first sentence that individuals have rights, and there are things which no individual or group can do to them (without violating these rights), which can be termed as the heart of his theory. He further said that society must respect these rights because they 'reflect the underlying Kantian principle that individuals are ends and not merely means. They may not be sacrificed or used for achieving other ends without their consent.

1.2.2 Communitarianism

The term community stands for a form of society whose members are informed by the 'community spirit' or 'a sense of community'. It denotes a 'network of relationships' which are characterized by intimacy and durability. It may be distinguished from 'association', which is based on impersonal and contractual relations. Liberal theory equates society with 'association', whereas communitarian theory equates society with 'community' to determine the nature and extent of social obligation. Communitarians argue that an individual cannot assure full development of his personality unless he is committed to the spirit of community toward his fellow-beings.

Communitarianism is the belief that the self or person is constituted through the community, in the sense that individuals are shaped by the communities to which they belong and thus owe them a debt of respect and consideration; there are no 'unencumbered selves'. Although it is clearly at odds with liberal individualism, communitarianism has a variety of political forms. Left-wing communitarianism holds that community demands unrestricted freedom and social equality (the view of anarchism). Centrist communitarianism holds that community is grounded in an acknowledgement of reciprocal rights and responsibilities (the perspective of Tory paternalism and social democracy). Right-wing communitarianism holds that community requires respect for authority and established values (the view of the New Right). Communitarianism is a contemporary philosophy. It marks a departure from the philosophy of liberalism because it places the relation between an individual and society in a new perspective.

The communitarianism repudiates the picture of the self-implied in the liberal theory. Liberal theory implied an unencumbered detached from pre-existing social form, as exemplified by the concept of possessive individualism. It postulates that an individual is the sole proprietor of his own person or capacities for he owes nothing to society. Such a view denies his commitment to other individuals, traditions, practices and conception of the good. It holds that self is prior to its ends. It is fully competent to choose its ends as well as its roles and dispositions. In contrast to this 'atomistic' view of individual, communitarianism advances the concept of situated self, as constituted by social role, practices and situations, in other words, communitarianism holds that an agent's identity is constituted by specific commitments to his social situations.

While liberalism insists on 'liberty' of individual, his interest and rights, communitarianism focuses on his social identity and upholds acceptance of 'authority' because it expresses our common will or reflects our common identity, our shared values and believes. It is significant to note that liberalism had one liberty of the individual but atomistic view of society held by liberalism let to the erosion of the sense of responsibility and the moral standards attached thereto. Communitarianism seeks to restore that sense of responsibility and reconstruct moral standards on that basis.

A major critique of contemporary Anglo-American liberalism-certainly the critique that resonates most in East Asia- has been termed 'communitarianism'. The basic themes of the communitarian critique have a long history, but modern day communitarianism began in the upper reaches of Anglo-American academia in the form of a critical reaction to John Rawls' landmark 1971 book *A Theory of Justice*. Drawing primarily upon the insights of Aristotle and Hegel, political philosophers such as Alasdair MacIntyre, Michael Sandel, Charles Taylor and Michael Walzer disputed Rawls' assumption that the principal task of government is to secure and distribute fairly the liberties and economic resources that individuals need to lead freely chosen lives. These critics of liberal theory never identified themselves with the 'communitarian movement' (the 'communitarian' label was pinned on them by others, usually critics), much less offer a grand communitarian theory as a systematic alternative to liberalism. Nonetheless, recur in the works of the four theorists named above, and for purposes of clarity one can distinguish between claims of three sorts: 'ontological' or 'metaphysical' claims about the social nature of the self, methodological claims about the importance of tradition and community. Each strand of the

debate has largely evolved from fairly abstract philosophical social context for moral and political reasoning and normative claims about the value of disputes to more concrete political concerns that may have motivated much of the communitarian critique in the first place.

Communitarian accounts of the ontology of the self were rejected by early liberal forms of liberalism. Retrospectively, this communitarian-liberal 'merger' makes sense, critics as internally contradictory, but they are now widely accepted as essential to most because close textual analysis shows that every argument made by the major communitarian philosophers was, in fact, political-not metaphysical. To wit, all of the communitarians' arguments led to the conclusion that communitarianism would provide a firmer political grounding for the liberal ideal of equal individual freedom than was offered by the individualist ontologies. *The Politics of Communitarianism and the Emptiness of Liberalism* traces this political mode of philosophizing to the British New Left that shaped Alasdair MacIntyre and Charles Taylor; and to the threat to Rawlsian liberalism represented by Robert Nozick, against whom both Michael Sandel (Taylor's student) and Michael Walzer were arguing.

Communitarianism points to the shortcomings of liberalism and attempts to redefine the relation between an individual and the community. Liberalism promotes individualism to focus on individual freedom, which undermines an individual's affinity with the community. Liberals base their theories on notions of individual rights and personal freedom, but neglect the extent to which individual freedom and wellbeing are only possible within community. Once, you recognize the dependence of human beings on society, then your obligations to sustain the common good of society are as weighty as your rights to individual liberty. Hence, communitarians argue, the liberal 'politics of good'. rights' should be abandoned or at least supplemented by, a 'politics of the common

When every individual turns to seek his own good, no one is emotionally attached to anyone. An individual would manage to have many means of comfort at the expense of his emotional security. In other words, if an individual devotes himself to the pursuit of self-interest, he cannot secure good life in the fullest sense of the term. Communitarians hold that only community is capable of realizing the common good.

1.3 MARXISM

Karl Heinrich Marx was born on 5 March 1818 in the predominantly Catholic city of Trier in the Rhineland province of Prussia in a Jewish family. His father was a moderately well-to-do lawyer. His parents were descendants of a long line of Jewish rabbis. His father was a rabbi in Trier who became protestant Christian when Marx was six years old and his children were also baptized in that faith. This was a nominal conversion for his parents but for Marx it became ultimately a deep intellectual and emotional rebirth. Marx not only ceased to be a Jew but he also became bitterly anti-Semitic and charged Judaism with many of the inequities cited against by the Jew-baiting Nazis of the Third Reich. Indeed, one of the sore trials of Marx's life was the fact that the cast of his countenance was so characteristically Hebraic that he could never be mistaken for Social Sciences, it was the consciousness of Marx's Jewish background that heightened his awareness about his sense of marginality, his ambivalence toward society, and When Marx was seventeen years of age in 1835, he began studying law at the University of Bonn. However, he soon abandoned the study of law in favour of philosophy, the study of which he pursued at the University of Berlin and Jena in 1836. He changed his course to philosophy under the influence of the young Hegelians. He became an active member of young Hegelian' while he was a student but soon shifted his interest to humanism and ultimately to scientific socialism. He was also influenced by some of the major movements of his times.

During his formative years, the idea of evolution was very much in the air in one form or the other. One of the versions of it was articulated by Hegel (Evolution of Absolute Idea or Spirit) while another version was propounded by Charles Darwin in his famous book Origin of Species. Though Marx, accepted some of the themes propounded by these writers, he also rejected many. He offered an alternative theory of historical evolution which is called the theory of dialectical materialism. He also had polemical arguments with many of his contemporaries, which include Proudhon and Bakunin, and various socialist groups.

He completed his doctorate in philosophy in 1841. The accession of Wilhelm IV in 1840 sealed Marx's prospects of an academic career. Marx fell in love with his childhood sweetheart, Jenny, daughter of Baron Ludwig von Westphalen, his spiritual guide since his adolescence. He married her in 1843 after a seven year period of courtship. Following this, he was unable to secure a University appointment as a teacher. So he joined the staff of the RheinischeZietung, a

democratic newspaper in Cologne. The following year, the paper was suppressed by the Prussian Government, and Marx went to Paris.

In Paris, he met Proudhon, the leading French socialist thinker, Bakunin, the Russian anarchist, and Friedrich Engels, who soon became his lifelong companion and close collaborator. According to W. Ebenstein in this book, *Great Political Thinkers-Plato to the Present*, Engels was the first to draw the attention of Marx to England as a laboratory in which industrial capitalism could be accurately observed.

In 1844, while Marx was in Paris, he became interested in the working class movement and political economy. During that period, Marx and Engels began working on the *German Ideology* (1847). Marx was expelled from France in 1845 by the intervention of the Prussian Government, following which he went to Brussels. It was there that Marx with the aid of Engels composed the most influential of all his writings *The Communist Manifesto*. In the revolutions of 1848, in France and Germany, he actively participated, and as early as 1849, he was expelled again by the Prussian Government.

In the late summer of 1849, he went to London where he became a permanent resident for the rest of his life. In 1848, Marx and Engels helped in the founding of the Communist League, which existed till 1950. Marx worked and studied in the British museum from 1850-1860. In September 1864, Marx was an active member in the formation of the International Working Men's Association in London. The organization has since been called the first international and it continued in existence with annual meetings until about 1862, when its headquarters were transferred from London to New York where it soon died. Then Marx devoted himself exclusively to research and writing. Shortly after, he moved to London, where he began contributing articles on the German situation to the *New York Herald Tribune*. According to P. Johnson, in his book, *Intellectuals*, Marx was helped financially by Engels. He lived a life of poverty. Three of his six children died of want and his own health did not remain well. Jenny died in 1881. She helped him a lot by editing many of Marx's scripts and preparing them for publication. Karl Marx died on March 14, 1883.

1.3.1 Theory of Alienation

The theory of alienation is one of the most original contributions of Marx to political philosophy. It is the work of young Marx which remained unpublished during his lifetime. It was discovered from the archives of German Social Democrats (1927) and later published as Economic and Philosophic Manuscripts (1844). It can be distinguished from Marx's later works which are characterized by scientific rigour. According to O.P. Gauba in his book, An Introduction to Political Theory, Marx's early works contain his humanist thought of communism, and focus on the concepts of alienation and freedom. They also expose the dehumanizing effect of capitalism.

Marx's theory of alienation was derived directly from German philosopher G.W.H. Hegel, though its roots can be traced back to much earlier times. Alienation, for Hegel, consisted in man's failure to realize that the world was not external to spirit. When man saw this, they would become free and this freedom has been realized in history. Marx's main criticism of Hegel was that man's alienation would not end with the hypothetical abolition of the external world. The external world was, in fact, part of man's nature and only the establishment of the right relationship between man and his environment could put an end to the condition of alienation.

Marx thus rejected the idealist notion of spirit and substituted its supposed antithesis to the external world by the real antithesis between man engaged in alienated labour and his social self, eager to achieve fulfilment through creative work under conditions of freedom.

In his early writings, Marx discussed several forms of alienation, ranging from religious alienation to philosophical, political and economic categories of alienation. As labour was man's most significant activity, economic aspects of alienation were regarded by Marx as more important than its ideological and political aspects. In the religious forms of alienation, gods have usurped man's position. Religion serves the dual purpose of a compensation for suffering and a projection of man's hopes and desires. Marx believed that the abolition of religion as the elusory happiness is the demand for their true happiness.

Philosophy too could constitute a form of alienation. Speculative philosophy reduced history and man to a mental process, and replacing God by the Absolute was no better than secularized theology. Marx analysed the form of political alienation in a similar manner. The

state, he said, contained a true description of human nature, but at the same time, it deprived man of the opportunity of achieving it. In *Economic and Philosophic Manuscripts*, Marx analysed the economic aspects of alienation.

The members of the proletariat were obviously the most alienated section of capitalist society. Marx, however, applied the concept of alienation to all social classes including capitalists.

Marx defined human freedom as the absence of man's alienated condition. For him, alienation and freedom were historical negations. Man expresses his humanity through productive labour which can be of economic, social, artistic, literary or scientific nature. Man as a subject transforms the material objects around him to express his creative capacities. In capitalist society, man's productive activity is deformed in such a way as to cause his alienation and estrangement. In *Economic and Philosophic Manuscripts*, Marx mentioned four aspects of estrangement: alienation from the product of work, from the work itself, from one's fellow-beings and from human species-life. Estrangement or alienation is a radical loss of freedom because it is the negation of free genuinely human creative activity.

This concept can be divided as follows:

- First, according to Marx, the worker in the capitalist mode of production does not own or control the products of his own labour. The proletarian does not use the wealth which he creates. Thus, he is alienated from his own product. The life which he has given to the object sets itself against him as an alien force. The labourer himself becomes a commodity whose value is equal to the bare means of his subsistence. The capitalist, on the other hand, who purchases the labour power of the proletarian is the real owner of the wealth which he creates. .
- Second, Marx affirms that the alien relationship of the worker to the products of his labour is only a manifestation of the alienated nature of the productive activity itself. The labourer who sells his labour-power for a wage, produces commodities under orders from the capitalist. His work is, therefore, neither free nor voluntary because he does not satisfy any creative urge of his own by working in a factory owned and managed by his bourgeois employer. The bourgeois institutions of private property reduce him to the status of a wage-slave. Human beings lost the ability to see their own products for what

they were, and were willing to be enslaved by them. This was what Marx meant by commodity fetishism.

- Third, alienated labour results in the estrangement of the proletarian from his fellow-being. It results in the hostility between the employed and unemployed workers who look upon each other as alien force. The workers similarly see in the manager and the proprietor alien forces profiting from his alienated work. The basis of genuine social relation is thus totally destroyed in capitalism.
- Fourth, the three given aspects of man's alienation show his engagement with others of his species. The egoistic, self-centred existence of the estranged proletarian alienates him from man's entire cultural heritage.

As Marx pointed out, the oppressed members of the working class are scarcely aware of the artistic, scientific, literary and other achievements of the human race. They lack the capacity to understand and enjoy these beautiful and valuable gifts of human creativity. Man is, thus, cut off from the history of his own species. By dehumanizing his existence, man becomes a slave to his own alienated activity. What is true of the worker is equally applicable to those who live parasitically on appropriations of the product of estranged labour. The capitalist, who rides on the backs of the proletariat, also leads an alienated life because he is also not personally engaged in any creative work and is a victim of the fetishization of the commodities.

Thus, it is the division of labour with all its effects, private ownership of the means of production and the products of labour, fetishism of commodities, the power of money, state, church and other institutions confronting the individual as alien forces, which produce the condition that Marx described as 'alienation'. Man, with the exception of a few individuals engaged in creative activity, cannot recognize themselves in their own works who sells his labour but also the capitalist who appropriates the product of his work and In a world dominated by private property, alienation is generalized. Not only the worker the merchant who sells the commodity in the market, the 'haves' and 'have-nots, the rulers and the ruled, are in such a system, alienated from their work, from themselves, from others and from nature.

In a society of alienation, the relationship of a man with other men is not that of a human being to his fellow human beings but that of a servant to his master, of a subordinate to his boss, and so forth. The workers' alienation is the most extreme form of alienation because it is the very

nature of his activity. For the non-workers, the master, the owner the idler, the priest, the philosopher, the general or the ruler, alienation is not activity but a condition.

All this criticism rested in the implicit utopian premise; individuals were fully human only when they developed and expressed their potential through satisfying labour. Linked with this premise was the second remarkable assumption that the modern industrial system afforded opportunities for all to engage in a rewarding labour. In the socialist utopia, division of labour would be abolished ending alienation and monotony.

The early liberals were confident that economic inequality could be prevented with constant growth, which would percolate downwards and raise the standard of living. However, Marx pointed out that the gulf between rich and poor was ever-widened Capitalism encouraged inequality and consumerism. Commodities assumed personalities of their own. To Marx, exploitation and alienation made the revolutionary transformation of capitalism possible. It was the individual as a producer who rebelled against society to free himself from exploitation and oppression. The basis of change was therefore moral. Unless private property was abolished, the worker could not be truly free. But once this was achieved, human nature would undergo a transformation, for a true communist society was one of socialized humanity.

Capitalism divided society into two hostile camps. The proletariat grew larger, with their miseries and pauperization attenuated, while the bourgeoisie became numerically small and prosperous. With wages pushed low, small entrepreneurs were forced to join the working class or merge with giant monopolies. The ever-increasing appetite of the capitalist class led to an ever increasing demand for markets, raw materials and profits, representing a crisis within capitalism. Marx argued that the increase in productivity did not benefit the worker, who only received exchange, and not use value. The surplus value was appropriated by the capitalist. With polarization of society, class struggles became sharper, making a revolution on a world scale inevitable. He conceived of a worldwide transformation, for capitalism was truly international and global in impact. He asserted that capitalism contained seeds of its own destruction. He rallied the working class under the call 'workers of all countries unite'.

Thus, Marx believed that the conditions of man's alienation can be overcome under communism which abolishes commodity production. In communism, there would be no private property and,

therefore, no alienated labour. Economic planning would reverse the existing domination of the product over the worker and distribution, according to need, will remove the workers existing concern for his physical survival. The division of labour existing under capitalism will be replaced by a new system of assigning work through which an individual can engage himself in several types of productive and creative activity according to his own aptitude and choice. In a capitalist society, the working- class cannot hope to achieve its freedom because it cannot put an end to alienation without abolishing the capitalist method of production itself.

1.3.2 Strands of Contemporary Marxism

Contemporary Marxist thought (better known as neo-Marxism) has developed in two directions, which are as follows:

- **Humanist:** The humanist strain of neo-Marxism draws particularly on the work of young Marx and constitutes the main stream of critical theory. Its dominant themes are the problems of alienation and wage to human emancipation. Herbert Marcuse, a German Jewish philosopher, has brilliantly portrayed the conditions of alienation in bourgeois societies which have reduced the human being to 'one- dimensional man'. He has stated that capitalism has cunningly anaesthetized the discontent of the oppressed by manipulating the means of communication so as to stimulate trivial material desires which are easily satisfied. Marcuse has argued that human beings should first be made aware of their condition of freedom, after which they can easily find their way to freedom.
- **Scientific:** This strain of neo-Marxism is primarily concerned with its scientific and explanatory character. It is particularly interested in structures as well as the relative importance of cultural, ideological and social factors. According to O.P. Gauba, in An Introduction to Political Theory, Louis Althusser, a French communist and philosopher, challenged the humanist themes of Marxist thinking in the early 1960s and asserted the importance of analysing the deep structure of human societies - especially their mode of production.

Dialecticism

In the Theses on Feuerbach (first published as an appendix to the 1888 edition of Engels' Ludwig Feuerbach), Marx led the foundation for what he called dialectical materialism. According to Engels, in *Anti-Duhring*, dialectic is nothing more than the science of the general laws of motion and development of nature, human society and thought. Thought itself is a natural process, acting upon and being acted upon by the natural environment in which it takes place. It is impossible to transcend the natural process - there are, 'the general laws of motion and development' and that is all.

Marx borrowed his dialectical method from Hegel and sought to combine it with his materialism. Hegel has postulated that 'idea' or 'consciousness' was the essence of universe, and that all social institutions were the manifestation of changing forms of idea. Ideas evolved into new forms because of their inherent tension, exemplified in the clash between thesis (partial truth) and anti-thesis (again a partial truth) resulting in synthesis (which is nearer the truth). According to O.P. Gauba, in *An Introduction to Political Theory*, as long as synthesis itself contains partial truth, it takes the role of thesis and undergoes the same process until this process reaches absolute truth, exemplified in 'absolute idea' or 'absolute consciousness.'

In Hegelian philosophy, dialectics is applied to the process, evolutions and development of history. He viewed history as the progressive manifestation of human reason, and the development of a historical spirit. History recorded increasing awareness and greater rationality as exhibited in human affairs. Human consciousness and freedom expanded as a result of conflicting intellectual forces, which were constantly under tension. Hegel believed in a movement from a rudimentary state of affairs to a perfect form. The process of history, for Hegel, was marked by two kinds of causation:

- Individual spirit which desired happiness and provided energy.
- World spirit which strived for higher freedom that came with the knowledge of the self.

However, through Marx agreed with Hegel that there was a constant movement in the dialectical process, he believed that 'matter' and not the 'idea' was the essence of the universe; and the social institutions were the manifestation of changing material conditions. Matter undergoes the dialectical process because of its inherent tensions, until perfect material

conditions, exemplified by a 'rational mode of production', come into existence. Marx emphasized the real rather than the ideal, the social rather than the intellectual, matter rather than mind. For Marx, the key idea was not the history of philosophy, but the history of economic production and the social relation that accompanied it.

Marx acknowledged Hegel's great contributions, which was to recognize world history as a process, as constant motion, change, transformation and development, and to understand the internal connection between the movement and its development. From Hegel, he also learned that various angles of the developmental process could not be studied in isolation, but in their relations with one another and with the process as a whole. Hegel applied dialectics to the realm of ideas. However, Marx as a materialist believed that consciousness was determined by life, and not the other way round.

Unlike the latent conservatism and idealism of Hegelian philosophy, Marxism rejected the status quo – capitalism-as intolerable. Social circumstances socially changed, with no social system lasting forever. Capitalism arose under certain historical circumstances, which would disappear in due course of time. Thus, Marx, like Hegel, continued to believe that dialectics was a powerful tool. It offered a law of social development, and in that sense, Marx's social philosophy was a philosophy of history like Hegel's.

Engels, in his book, *Anti-Duhring* (1878), postulated three laws of material dialectics or dialectical materialism, which are as follows:

- Transformation of quantity into quality and vice versa.
- Interpretation of opposites.
- Negation of negations.

These principles signify the process of resolving contradictions of material conditions of human life which pave the way for social progress. Class conflict is also a manifestation of this process.

Karl Marx does not systematically explain his theory of dialectical materialism anywhere in his works. However, he makes it clear that his materialism is dialectical and not mechanical. In mechanical materialism, evolution is the path taken by material things under the pressure of

their environment. In dialectical materialism, evolution is the development of matter from within, environment helping or hindering, but neither originating the evolutionary process, nor capable of preventing it from reaching its inevitable goal. Motion, to the dialectical materialism, is the mode of existence of matter. The ultimate reality in matter is motion.

Moreover, this is a dialectical process, the reconciliation of opposing movements is in an endless effort to achieve a more perfect harmony. Matter to the dialectical materialist is active, not passive, and moves by an inner necessity of its nature. It contains within itself the energy necessary to transform it. Matter is self-moving or self-determining.

The universe is self-sufficient, self-creating and self-perpetuating. Hegel explained the dialectical process as the activity of God in the world; Marx borrows the 'energy' from Hegel's immanent God in the world, dissociates it from God and locates it in matter itself.

The dialectical materialism is more interested in motion than in matter, in a vital energy within matter invariably deriving it towards perfect society, just as Hegel's demi-urge drove forward to the perfect realization of spirit. According to Sukhbir Singh in his book, *History of Political Thought; Bentham to Present Day*, Engel said, 'The dialectical method grasps things and their images, ideas, essentially in their sequence, their movement, their birth and death',

Historical Materialism

According to O.P. Gauba in *An Introduction to Political Theory*, while dialectical materialism represents the philosophical bases of Marxism, historical materialism represents its scientific basis. It implies that in any given epoch, the economic relations of society- the means whereby men and women undertake production, distribution and exchange of material goods for the satisfaction of their needs-play an important role, in shaping their social, political, intellectual and ethical relationships. Marx applied dialectics to the material or social world consisting of economic production and exchange. A study of the productive process explained all other historical phenomena.

Marx noted that each generation inherited a mass of productive forces, an accumulation of capital and a set of social relations which reflected these productive forces. The new generation modified these forces, but at the same time, these forces prescribed certain forms of

life, and shaped human character and thought in distinct ways. The mode of production and exchange was the final cause of all social changes and political revolutions. Marx considered matter as being active, capable of changing from within. It was not passive, needing an external stimulus for change, a conception found in Hobbes.

The Marxian interpretation of human history is economic. Marx saw evolutionary changes in the ethical, religious, social, economic and political ideas, and institutions of mankind. According to him, institutions and ideas, and therefore, actions are subject to endless change. The chief motive force which brings about this change in human beings is not the Hegelian idea but the material conditions of life. Human history, therefore, has a material basis.

The Marxist perspective postulates that the structure of society may be understood in terms of its base (the foundation) and superstructure (the external build-up). The base consists of the mode of production while the superstructure is represented by its legal and political structure, religion, morals, social practices, literature, art and culture, etc. The mode of production has two components-forces of production and relations of production. Forces of production cannot remain static; they have an inherent tendency of development in the direction of achieving the perfect society.

Forces of production have two components-means of production (tools and equipment) and labour power (human knowledge and skills). Men and women constantly endeavour to devise better ways of production. Improvement in the means of production is manifested in the development of technology. This is matched by development of human knowledge and skills as required to operate the new technology. Hence, there is the corresponding development of labour power. On the other hand, relations of production in any given epoch are given by the pattern of ownership of means of social production. This gives rise to two containing classes -haves and have-nots.

According to Gauba's *An Introduction to Political Theory*, Marx talked of four stages of human history-ancient times, medieval times, modern times and future society based on communism. In earlier stages of historical development, development of the forces of production fails to make any dent in the pattern of ownership. In other words, changes in the mode of production bring about changes in the nature of contending classes but they do not bring about an

end of the class conflict. Change in the nature of contending classes is itself brought about by a social revolution. When material productive forces of society come in conflict with the existing relations of production, these relations turn into their fetters.

The new social class which comes to own new means of production, feels constrained by these fetters and overthrows the old dominant class in a revolution. As a result of social revolution, an old social formation is replaced by a new social formation. In this process, world contending classes are replaced by new contending classes but class conflict continues on a new plan. This has been the case till the rise of capitalism, which will be overthrown by a socialist revolution leading to the eventual emergence of classless society.

Marx, in his analysis of history, mentioned the important role of ideology in perpetuating false consciousness among people, and demarcated the stages which were necessary for reaching the goal of communism. In that sense, both the bourgeoisie and the proletariat were performing their historically destined roles. In spite of the deterministic interpretation of history, the individual had to play a very important role within the historical limits of his time, and actively hasten the process.

Marx had a very powerful moral content in his analysis, and asserted that the progress was not merely inevitable, but would usher in a perfect society free of alienation, exploitation and deprivation. His materialistic conception of history emphasizes the practical side of human activity, rather than speculative thought as the moving force of history.

The State of Revolution

Marx critically dissected the Hegelian theory of the modern state and its institutions in his *Critique of Hegel's Philosophy of Right* (1843). According to Marx, Hegel's separation of civil society and the state was only relevant in his perception of a particular historical context. The state was not eternal. It would eventually disappear. Marx contended that the state was not 'a march of God on Earth' as Hegel described, but an instrument of the dominant economic class exploiting and oppressing the other sections of society. Marx rejected the dichotomy between civil society and the state in Hegelian philosophy, and concluded that the state and bureaucracy did not represent universal interests.

Marxism advocated the class perspective of the state. It is different from the mechanistic theory as well as from the organic theory of the state. It treats the state neither as a 'natural institution' nor as an 'ethical institution' as the organic theory has held. It, of course, treats the state as an artificial device, but unlike the mechanistic theory, it treats the state neither as a manifestation of the will of the people, nor as an instrument of reconciliation of conflicting interests. According to the class theory, the state comes into existence when society is divided into two antagonistic classes, one owning the means of social production and the other being constrained to live on its labour.

In other words, it is the emergence of 'private property' that divides society into two conflicting classes. Gauba, in his book *An Introduction to Political Theory*, says that those owning the means of production acquire the power to dominate the other class not only in the economic sphere but in all spheres of life.

In an antagonistic class society, the state is a political instrument, a machine for maintaining the rule of one class over another'. The economically dominant class that possessed the means of production, acquires a powerful instrument for the subjection of the oppressed and exploited in the state. The state has a clearly defined class character. According to Sukhbir singh's *History of Political Thought: Bentham to Present Day*, being the principal component of the superstructure founded on the economic basis of society, the state takes every measure to strengthen and protect this basis.

With the emergence of 'private property', society is divided into 'dominant' and 'dependent' classes. The dominant class, in order to maintain its stronghold on economic power, invents a new form of power-political power. The state is the embodiment of political power. It is, therefore, essentially subservient to economic power. Thus, according to the class theory, the state neither originates in the will of the people, nor does it stand for the benefit of all society, but is an instrument devised by a dominant class for its own benefit. It is imposed on society from above to serve the interest of a particular class.

The state has not existed from eternity. It came into existence at a particular stage of historical development. It is a product of the conscious effort of the dominant class which first

acquires the means of production and thereafter political power. The state is therefore, by no means, a natural institution as the organic theory has maintained.

In his book, *An Introduction to Political Theory*, Gauba further says that Marx also observes that at a later stage, the means of production are somewhat developed, that is, when the hunting, fishing and food-gathering economy is replaced by an economy based on animal husbandry, domestic agriculture and small industry. There is 'surplus production' which is cornered by a class owning the means of production. As a result, 'dominant' and 'dependent' classes come into existence. The structure of society is always determined by the prevalent form of production. The hand-mill gives you society with the feudal lord; the steam-mill gives you society with the industrial capitalist. The attitudes and outlook of society-the legal, political and intellectual relations as well as the religious and social systems are also determined by the material conditions of life. This means that whatever the form of the state, it is invariably an instrument of the dominant class.

Bourgeois ideologists had pictured the state as some kind of supernatural force given to man by providence since time immemorial. Such a theory of the state solved to justify the privileges of the bourgeois and the existence of exploitation and capitalism. In contrast to bourgeois ideologists, Marx has demonstrated that the state is not something introduced into society from outside, but is a product of society's internal development. The state was brought into being by changes in material production. The succession of one mode of production by another cause a change in the state system.

According to Marx, the state has not always existed. Primitive society which had no private property and no classes had no state either. Naturally, there were certain social functions, but they were performed by men chosen by the entire society which had the right to dismiss these people at any time and to appoint others. In those distant times, relations between people were regulated by public opinion. However, the further development of productive force led to the disintegration of primitive society. Private property appeared, accompanied by classes - slaves and slave-owners. It became necessary to protect private property, the role and security of its owners, and this brought the state into being. The birth of the state and its further development were accompanied

It is, thus, evident that the state is a product of class society. It arose with the appearance of classes and it will vanish with the disappearance of classes. But this will happen only under communism. The alternative that Marx envisaged was a classless, stateless society of true democracy and full of communism, in which the political state disappeared.

The dominant class uses the machinery of the state to serve its own interests which involve the exploitation of the dependent class. The state is, therefore, an instrument of oppression and exploitation, an embodiment of injustice. It does not rest on moral foundations as the organic theory believes. It is not even an instrument of harmonizing the interest of various individuals or groups as the mechanistic theory claims. Instead of being a means of conflict-resolution, the state, according to the class theory, is a device for the suppression of class conflict. It maintains order in society not because it is able to secure the willing obedience of its subjects, but because it uses its coercive power to secure compliance from the 'consent of the governed as also to offer moral justification for its existence.

The pioneers of the class theory of the state - Marx, Engels and Lenin - have made it amply clear that the state is an instrument of class rule and exploitation. Marx and Engels, in their famous Communist Manifesto (1848), observed: 'Political power, properly called is, merely the organized power of one class for oppressing other'. Engels, in his Socialism-Utopian and Scientific (1880), confirmed: "The state is an organization of the particular class which was pro-tempore the exploiting class' Again, in his The Origin of the Family Private Property and the State (1884), Engels illustrated: 'The state of antiquity was above all the state of the slave-owners for the purpose of holding down the slaves as the feudal state was the organ of the nobility for holding down the peasant serfs and bondsmen, and the modern representative state is an instrument of exploitation of wage labour by capital'.

In *The State and Revolution*, Lenin elaborated that according to Marx, the state is an organ of class rule and an organ for the oppression of one class by another; it is the creation of 'order', which legalizes and perpetuates this oppression by moderating the conflict between the classes.

According to the Marxist view, the main feature of the state is the existence of public authority. It represents the interest of the class which dominates economically and not of the

entire population. This authority rests on the armed forces - the army and the police. In a society divided into hostile classes, the armed forces are in the hands of the ruling class and are used to suppress the people to subordinate them to a handful of exploiters.

According to Marx, the state, regardless of the forms of government, is an evil, because it was a product of a society saddled with irreconcilable class struggles. It belonged to the realm of the superstructure, as it was conditioned and determined by its economic base. In the course of history, each mode of production would give rise to its specific political organization, which would further the interest of the economically dominant class. In Communist Manifesto, Marx defined the state in a capitalist society, as the 'executive committee of the bourgeoisie'.

As you already know, for Marx and Engel, the state expressed human alienation. It was an instrument of class exploitation and class oppression, for the economically dominating class exploited and oppressed the economically weaker class. The state apparatus served the ruling class, but acquired independence and became autonomous when the adversary classes were in a state of temporary equilibrium. This phenomenon was described as Bonapartism. In such a situation, the dictator with the support of the state apparatus became its guardian.

In his book Eighteenth Brumaire of Louis Bonaparte (1852), Marx denounced the bureaucratic and all-powerful state advising the proletariat to destroy it. His views on the state were determined largely by his perception and analyses of the French state, the Revolution of 1848 and the coup d'etat of Napoleon III. As a result, Marx advocated a violent revolutionary seizure of power and the establishment of the dictatorship of the proletariat. However, in countries with democratic institutions, the transition from capitalism to socialism could be peaceful.

Marx and Engels provided a blue print for a future state which would be based on communism. They elaborate that communist society would eliminate all forms of alienation for the human individual from nature, from society and from humanity. It does not merely mean consumer satisfaction, but the abolition of all forms of estrangement, the liberation of human forces and enhancement of personal creativity. The institution of private property and division of labour identifies that the source of alienation, would be destroyed as a prerequisite for the new

and truly human phase in history. They viewed proletariat as an agent and not as a tool in history, and with the liberation of the proletariat comes the liberation of society.

The transitional phase, the phase between the destruction of the bourgeois state and the inauguration of a communist state or society, symbolized by the dictatorship of the proletariat, generated a great deal of controversy in Marxist political theory. Interestingly, one of the well-known utopias was the least delineated. According to S. Avineri, in his book *The Social and Political Thought of Karl Marx*, Marx's cautious productions were imposed by his own epistemological premises. The concept of the dictatorship of the proletariat held the key to the understanding of Marx's theory on the nature of communist society and the role of proletarian state.

Marx and Engels spoke about the political rule of the proletariat, advising the workers to capture the state, destroy all privileges of the old class and prepare for the eventual disappearance of the state. Marx and Engels were convinced that the existing states, whether as instruments of class domination and oppression, or ruled by bureaucratic parasites on the whole of society, would grow inherently strong and remain minority states, representing the interests of the small, dominant and powerful possessing class. It was only when the proletarian majority ceased the state's structure that the state became truly democratic and majoritarian.

In the later part of his life, Marx was convinced of the imperative need to destroy the state and establish the dictatorship of the proletariat. In the initial stage, bearing in mind the example of the French Revolution of 1789, he anticipated a seizure of the existing state machine by the revolutionary proletariat, for he believed that political centralization would assist the revolutionary process. According to Hal Draper, in his *Karl Marx's Theory of Revolution: State and Bureaucracy*, Marx observed that the destruction of the state had only one implication for the communists, namely the cessation of an organized power of one class for the suppression of another class.

Social Revolution

On the basis of scientific analysis of the system of capitalism, Marx had declared that a social revolution was inevitable. Revolution was certain to come, because the forces of discontent would eventually accumulate and break through all obstacles. Marx had no doubt

about it but the questions remained as to how it would come and what would follow. For these questions, Marx had definite answers. The proletariat must organize for political action and make revolution. Communist Manifesto declared that all the presiding classes that got the upper hand sought to fortify their already acquired status by subjecting society at large to their conditions of appropriation.

The proletarians cannot become masters of the productive forces of society, except by abolishing their previous mode of appropriation. They have nothing of their own to secure and fortify. All previous historical movements were movements of minorities or in the interest of minorities. The proletarian movement is the self-conscious, independent movement of the immense majority. Therefore, the first step in the revolution by the working class is to raise the proletariat to the position of ruling class, to win the battle of democracy.

According to Marx, social progress would have to come about through a violent struggle between classes. By progress, Marx meant the expansion of the productive capacity of both society and individual human beings. This would ultimately lead to greater freedom and equalities and to the realization of man's capacity. Marx observed the dramatic conflict of classes intensified during a period of social upheaval reached its climax in a political revolution. The fundamental cause of any revolution was the desire and endeavour of a subject class to capture the state power from the ruling class by force; and to reorganize the state apparatus to suit its own specific needs.

A successful revolution would remove those social, economic and political institutions which obstruct the development of the class for whose benefit the revolution has been carried out. Marx has developed this general prognosis of class conflict and general and specific causes of revolution in such works as *The German Ideology*, *The Communist Manifesto* and *A Contribution to the Critique of Political Economy*. When Marx discussed the revolution, he enriched his general theory with a wealth of empirical facts. In his *Eighteenth Brumaire of Louis Bonaparte*, Marx produced a masterpiece of contemporary French revolutionary history, taking account the complexities of the revolutionary events, wherein a multitude of classes interacted changing continuously their alignments. Moreover, Marx clearly recognized the crucial role played by individuals in promoting or thwarting the course of revolution.

The Marxist Theory of Revolution is the consequence and the concentrated expression of Marx's view of historical development, that is, to say of the sequence of social formation in history. He saw the driving force of social development in the historical tendency towards establishing property relations which corresponded to the level of development and character of the technique used for production during a particular period. Marx found the key to understand the sequence of the various modes of production in the law of motion, which was activated by social classes whose interest coincided with the developing tendency. For Marx, social revolution is an ongoing process in which causes and effects are dialectically related.

According to E. Fischer, in *Marx in his Own Words*, Marx said, 'in the social production of their life, men enter into definite relation that are indispensable and independent of their will, relations of production which correspond to a definite stage of development of their material productive forces... At a certain stage of their development the material productive forces of society come into conflict with the existing relations of production, or what is but a legal expression for the same thing-with the property relation within which they have been at work hitherto. From forms of development of the productive forces relations turn into their fetters. Then begins an epoch of social revolution

D Molellan, in his book *Karl Marx-Early Text*, quotes Marx who observed, what is the basis of a partial, purely political revolution? It is that a part of civil society emancipates itself and attains universal domination, that a particular class undertakes the general emancipation of the society from its particular situations. This class frees the whole of society but only under the pre-supposition that the whole of society is in the same situation as this class, that it possesses, or can equally acquire for example, money and education".

Contradictions between the principles of the state and the real economic life of the citizens were characterized by Marx as a merely political revolution. All previous historical movements were movements of minorities, or in the interest of minorities. The proletarian movements were the self-conscious, independent movements in the interests of the immense majority. Thus, the radicalism of the revolution depended on the class that was instrumental in causing it. The proletariat alone could represent the interests of the society as a whole, a society in which the class struggle was so intensified and polarized as to promise its abolition through a social revolution. For Marx, the Paris Commune was the 'political form of human emancipation'.

It is necessary to remember that Marx emphasized the human causes of revolution. Marx, in his book *Progress of Philosophy*, said, 'Of all the instruments of production, the greatest productive force are the revolutionary class itself. The organization of the revolutionary elements as a class presupposes the existence of all the productive forces that could be endangered in the womb of old society'. But the proletariat had to undergo a massive transformation through its own education in the school of class struggle before it could become a fit agent of revolution. In the revolution, the proletariat will acquire the capacity of undertaking the task of socialist reconstruction.

The name that Marx gives to this activity is 'revolutionary praxis'. It embodies through a dialectical unity of theory and practice, the subjective and objective causes of revolution. He sums this up in his book *The German Ideology* in the following words, 'In revolutionary activity the changing of oneself coincides with the changing of circumstances'. It implied that the proletariat must become a class 'for itself by developing class consciousness, which is a necessary cause and precondition of a successful revolution.

Marx did not believe in revolutionary prophecy. He did not go into detail concerning the exact nature strategy and tactics of the socialist revolution which he thought to be imminent. Concerning the possibility of a successful revolution, Marx adopted his view according to the historical situation in which he found himself. According to D. Mclellan in *The Thought of Karl Marx*, Marx was very optimistic during the European revolution in 1848 but his hopes faded gradually thereafter except for a brief revival during the Paris Commune of 1871.

By 1851, Marx was convinced of the primacy of economic factors in determining the possibilities of revolution. His considered view about revolution now was that only a severe economic crisis caused by a falling rate of capitalist profits in a slump could precipitate it. The effective cause of revolution has to be located in economic situation and nowhere else, and new revolution is possible only as a consequence of a worsening trade cycle leading to increasing misery of the proletariat. It is just as certain as this crisis. Marx became so convinced of economic determinism of the revolutionary process at this stage that he was prepared to dissolve the Communist League when it appeared to be falling under the control of leaders who believed in attempting a revolution irrespective of the economic situation. During the next decade, he expected the capitalist crisis to breakout that would provoke a socialist revolution.

Marx's materialist view of history would indicate that it was most likely to breakout in the most advanced industrial countries like Britain, France or the United States. In D. McLellan's *The Thought of Karl Marx*, we see that in a letter to Engels in 1859, Marx mentioned that 'Revolution is imminent on the continent and will immediately assume a socialist character. Can it avoid being crushed in the small corner, because the moment of bourgeois society is in the ascendant over much larger areas of the earth?'. However, Marx also believed that in some underdeveloped countries such as Germany, a bourgeois revolution could spark a subsequent socialist revolution.

Later in his life, he came to believe that backward Russia might prove the starting point of a new European revolution, initially bourgeois but ultimately proletarian in character. Lenin implemented this Marx's theory of two-stage revolution in his own way in the Russian revolution in 1917 and Mao did the same in his own characteristic way in bringing about the Chinese revolution. While Marx generally regarded force as the midwife of the revolution, he conceded that socialism could come about as a culmination of a peaceful mass movement in some of the capitalist democracies.

Marx was opposed to the use of revolutionary terror as it weakened the cause of revolution. He strongly criticized the use of terror by the Jacobins in the French revolution. Physical force, however, as opposed to terror, was to Marx a perfectly acceptable revolutionary weapon provided the economic, social and political conditions were such as to make its use successful. It was also Marx's view that a successful revolution in one country could not be stabilized if it remained confined to the borders of a single country.

1.4 Let us sum up

This unit discusses the meaning, principles and development of liberalism and Marxism for clear understanding of the subject. The discussion has given important inputs on the understanding Liberals promote ideas like constitutionalism, liberal democracy, human rights, capitalism, free and fair elections and freedom of religion. Further it also enlighten on the Marx theory of dialectical materialism, historical interpretation, alienation and revolution on wider perspective.

1.5 Key Terms

- **Constitutionalism:** Constitutionalism is a complex of ideas, attitudes, and patterns of behaviour elaborating the principle that the authority of government derives from and is limited by a body of fundamental law.
- **Capitalist:** Capitalist refers to a person who uses their wealth to invest in trade and industry for profit in accordance with the principles of capitalism.
- **Envisage:** Contemplate or conceive of as a possibility or a desirable future event.
- **Libertarian:** A person who advocates civil liberty.
- **Epistemology:** The theory of knowledge with regard to its methods, validity and scope.

1.6 Answers to Check Your Progress'

2. Liberals promote ideas like constitutionalism, liberal democracy, human rights,
3. Capitalism, free and fair elections and freedom of religion.
4. Laski has written The American Presidency.
5. Communitarianism is the belief that the self or person is constituted through the community, in the sense that individuals are shaped by the communities to which they belong and thus owe them a debt of respect and consideration; there are no 'unencumbered selves'.
6. Marx borrowed his dialectical method from Hegel.
7. Engels has written Anti-Duhring.

1.7 Questions and Exercises

- Short-Answer Questions
 1. What do you understand by political liberalism?
 2. Write a short note on rectification.
 3. What is theory of alienation?
 4. What are the two directions in which contemporary Marxist thought developed? Discuss.
- Long-Answer Questions
 1. Describe the thoughts that Harold Laski talks about in terms of growth of liberal trend.

2. Write a detailed note on the concept of political liberalism.
3. Discuss the concept of contemporary liberalism in your own words.
4. Explain the points highlighted by John Rawls in his book A Theory of Justice.
5. Who is a libertarian? Explain.
6. Assess how communitarianism is relevant in today's world.

1.8 Suggested Readings

Miller, D.1987. : The Blackwell Encyclopaedia of Political Thought. Oxford: Blackwell Publishing Company.

Sabain, G H. 1961. : A History of Political Theory. New Delhi: Oxford and IBH

Hampsher-Monk, I. 1992. : A History of Modern Political Thought: Major Political Thinkers from
Hobbes to Marx, Oxford: Blackwell Publisher Ltd.

Coleman, J. 2000. : A History of Political Thought. New Delhi: Wiley-Blackwell.

Unit- II**SOVEREIGNTY: MONISTIC AND PLURALISTIC****Structure**

- 2.0 Objectives
- 2.1 Introduction
- 2.2 Traditional Meaning of Sovereignty
- 2.3 Definitions of Sovereignty
- 2.4 Nature and Basis of Sovereignty
- 2.5 Development of the Concept of Sovereignty
 - 2.5.1 Sovereignty in the Ancient Period
 - 2.5.2 Sovereignty in the Medieval Period
 - 2.5.3 Sovereignty in the Modern Period
- 2.6 Characteristics of Sovereignty
 - 2.6.1 Absoluteness
 - 2.6.2 Permanence
 - 2.6.3 Universality or All Comprehensiveness
 - 2.6.4 Inalienability
 - 2.6.5 Indivisibility
 - 2.6.6 Exclusiveness
 - 2.6.7. Imprescriptibility
- 2.7 Types of Sovereignty
 - 2.7.1 Legal Sovereignty
 - 2.7.2 Political Sovereignty
 - 2.7.3 Real and Titular Sovereignty
 - 2.7.4 Dejure and Defacto Sovereignty
 - 2.7.5 National Sovereignty
 - 2.7.6 Popular Sovereignty

- 2.8 Theories of Sovereignty
 - 2.8.1 Monistic Theory of Sovereignty
 - 2.8.1.1 Criticism of Austinian Theory of Sovereignty
 - 2.8.1.2 Pluralistic Attack on Austin's Theory of Sovereignty
 - 2.8.2 Pluralistic Theory of Sovereignty
 - 2.8.2.1 Principles of Pluralistic Theory
 - 2.8.2.2 Development of the Pluralistic Theory
 - 2.8.2.3 Exponents of Pluralistic Theory
 - 2.8.2.4 Criticism of the Pluralistic Theory of Sovereignty
 - 2.8.2.5 Value of the Pluralistic Theory
- 2.9 New Challenges to Sovereignty
- 2.10 Let Us Sum Up
- 2.11 Key Words
- 2.12 Check Your Learning
- 2.13 Suggested Readings

2.0 Objectives

This unit explains different aspects of sovereignty. After reading this unit, you should be able to:

- define sovereignty clearly;
- know the development of the concept of sovereignty;
- make out the differences between the types of sovereignty;
- describe the theories of sovereignty; and
- understand changing interpretations of sovereignty and new challenges faced by sovereignty because of globalization

2.1 Introduction

As we know there is no unanimity among the political scientists with regard to the functions of the state. Different theories have been advanced to solve this problem. Individualistic theory believes in the freedom of individuals and limits the functions of the state to minimum. Socialistic theory advocates the maximum functions of the state and do not favour any limitation of state activities. Then comes the theory of welfare state which is said to be a half-way house between individualism and socialism. This theory regards the state as the servant of society. Thus state undertakes multifarious welfare functions for its citizens. Now the question arises how does the state perform all these functions? The answer is state performs all these functions with the help of some authority or coercive power which is known as sovereignty. The sovereign, with whom sovereignty lies, may be a monarch, chief executive or an assembly. The sovereign enjoys original, absolute and unlimited power. There are different types of sovereignty. However, sovereignty in recent times has been confronted with new challenges because of globalization, power-blocks and global economy.

2.2 Traditional Meaning of Sovereignty

The term 'sovereignty' is derived from the Latin word "Superanus" which means supreme. Sovereignty denotes supreme power or absolute power of the state. It means every full-fledged or independent state. There is a supreme authority, unrestrained by law. This supreme and unrestrained power can control everybody, without being controlled itself by any other power. This essential attribute of the state differentiates it from all other associations. The state is supreme both internally and externally. Thus sovereignty has two aspects internal and external. Internally, the state is supreme over all individuals and associations, living or functioning, within its boundaries. And all these individuals and associations have to function under the laws and command of the state. The state exercises original, unlimited and all comprehensive power over them. The power of the state is unquestionable. If anyone violates the command of the state, he or she would face penalties or punishments. Externally, the state is subject to no other authority and is independent of any compulsion on the part of other states. In

other words, each state is independent of other states. Any other state or international organization cannot claim superiority to a state.

2.3 Definitions of Sovereignty

Definitions of sovereignty are many and varied. Some of the important definitions are given below.

According to *Bodin*, "Sovereignty is the supreme power over citizens and subjects unrestrained by law".

Willoughby writes, "Sovereignty is the supreme will of the state".

According to *Grotius*, "Sovereignty is the supreme political power vested in him whose acts are not subject to any other and whose will cannot be overridden".

Burgess characterizes sovereignty as "original, absolute, unlimited power over the individual subject and over all associations of subjects".

Blackstone says, "Sovereignty is the supreme irresistible absolute, uncontrolled authority in which the supreme legal power resides."

The above definitions of sovereignty reflect the traditional view of sovereignty which stressed upon the following points.

- i) Sovereignty is an element of the state.
- ii) Sovereignty is the supreme political power of the state.
- iii) It is absolute and unlimited power of the state.
- iv) It is the supreme will of the state.
- v) It implies the state is internally supreme and externally free.

2.4 Nature and Basis of Sovereignty

As we have already observed, the traditional concept of sovereignty regards the state as the supreme institution in society having supreme legal power to enforce its own will over all individuals and associations with its coercive instruments like police, courts, bureaucracy, prisons, etc. This is a narrow and legalistic view of this concept. Such a view has been

challenged by many modern writers who make an attempt to ground sovereignty not on naked power or coercion but on legitimacy. According to modern liberals, legitimacy of sovereignty rests on its ability to resolve conflicts, bring out harmony and serve the general interests of the community. One group of political thinkers like Machiavelli, Hobbes, Hegel, Bernhardt has equated sovereignty with power, pure and simple. Following this idea, some behaviourists like Merriam and Harold Lasswell have advocated politics as the study of power and power relations in a given society. A different power approach to sovereignty is provided by the Marxists. They maintained that sovereignty is a class power used by the economically dominant class to enhance its own interests. Modern elite theorists established that in a democratic society power is shared by competing groups of elites. Pluralists advocated the division of supreme power amongst different groups and associations. But the power approach to sovereignty has been strongly opposed by thinkers like Rousseau, Green, Laski and Mac Iver and they hold that sovereignty is not power. To Rousseau basis of sovereignty is "General will". To T.H. Green, "Will, not force is the basis of the state".

2.5 Development of the Concept of Sovereignty

The concept of sovereignty has evolved through different historical periods and found mention in the writings of different political philosophers. These periods are -- Ancient, Medieval, and Modern.

2.5.1 Sovereignty in the Ancient Period

Sovereignty is regarded as an indispensable character of modern state. But the idea of sovereignty is quite old and it goes back to the ancient Greek city-states. It was Aristotle, the father of political science, who for the first time mentioned the idea of supreme power. However, he did not present a systematic theory of sovereignty. He only highlighted the need of having supreme power in a state. During period of Roman Empire, the concept of sovereignty as such was not there. But the empire had supreme commanding legal power.

2.5.2 Sovereignty in the Medieval Period

The medieval period is known as “dark ages” in history and for sovereignty this period was truly a dark one. The middle ages were characterized by feudal order. The concept of centralized state sovereignty was missing in this localized feudal economic system because power was divided amongst different feudal lords. Besides, feudal lords also demanded considerable autonomy from royal control. Similarly, the church, during this period, wanted to be independent of royal authority. In European countries, the Pope was regarded as the representative of the church and the king was the representative of the state. However, the pope had more power, authority and respect than the king and thus, obstacles were found in the development of the state and its sovereignty.

2.5.3 Sovereignty in the Modern Period

The modern concept of sovereignty originated in the 16th century with the rise of modern national states. For the first time the concept of sovereignty or the supremacy of political power clearly emerged in the writings of Italian Philosopher Machiavelli’s masterpiece “The Prince” (1512). After Machiavelli, it was Jean Bodin, a French political philosopher, who first propounded the modern concept of sovereignty through his book “The Republic” (1576). The power of sovereignty, according to Bodin, cannot be delegated. He also says, sovereignty is perpetual and unlimited. However, customary and constitutional law and the private property limited Bodin’s sovereign.

In the 17th century, a Dutch jurist, Grotius, developed the concept of external sovereignty and explained that all the states are free, supreme and equal in the matter of their relations. But the external sovereignty, according to him, must be limited by some international law. Then Thomas Hobbes, English Philosopher further developed on Bodin. Hobbes, in his famous book ‘Leviathan’ (1651), established the modern concept of absolute legal sovereignty by removing the restrictions suggested by Bodin on internal, and by Grotius on external sovereignty of the state. According to Hobbes, the command of sovereign is law and all laws are subject to his interpretation. Then comes John Locke, another English political philosopher, who justified the

results of the Glorious Revolution of 1688. Locke advocated the doctrines of political sovereignty, supremacy of parliament, constitutional government, limited monarchy and the rule of law. Locke supported limited sovereignty.

In the 18th century, J.J. Rousseau, a French political philosopher, gave the idea of popular sovereignty in the theory of “general will”. According to Rousseau, general will and sovereignty are interchangeable concepts. And sovereignty is unlimited, supreme and absolute. After Rousseau, Bentham further explained the legal concept of sovereignty. According to him sovereignty is the supreme law-making power. John Austin, an English jurist, in his “Lectures on Jurisprudence” (1832) provided the most up-to-date and systematic exposition of legal sovereignty. His theory is known as monistic or legal theory of sovereignty. Austin’s exposition of legal sovereignty was supported by idealist philosophers like Hegel and Bosanaquet on a philosophical basis. But the monistic theory of sovereignty has been strongly attacked by the pluralists in the 20th century.

2.6 Characteristics of Sovereignty

The following are the characteristics or attributes which emerge from the traditional definitions of sovereignty.

2.6.1 Absoluteness

Sovereignty is regarded as absolute because it cannot be limited or restricted by any superior power or authority. Internally, sovereignty has absolute and unlimited control over all individuals and groups existing within the state. The sovereign can make any law it pleases. It can change even the constitution itself. The ordinary laws are made, amended and repealed by the sovereign. No law or custom can impose any limitation on the powers of sovereign. Rather internal limitations like constitutional law, traditions, moral principles and customs are only self-imposed. Externally, the state is independent of any compulsion or interference by other states. Limitations emerging out of treaties, international law and decisions of international organizations are also self-imposed by the state.

2.6.2 Permanence

Sovereignty is as permanent as the state itself. So long as the state lasts, sovereignty lasts. Sovereignty is thus, an inseparable element of the state. The death of the king or the overthrow of the govt. does not lead to the destruction of sovereignty. Rather the sovereign power shifts to the new persons who control the governmental apparatus.

2.6.3 Universality or all Comprehensiveness

The sovereign is supreme over all persons, associations and institutions within the state. No one can be exempted from the sovereign authority of the state. However, the only exemption to the universality of sovereignty is the immunity granted to the diplomatic representatives of foreign countries. But the immunity enjoyed by foreign diplomatic personnel is granted by the state as a matter of international courtesy and can be withdrawn at will.

2.6.4 Inalienability

It means sovereignty cannot be transferred or given up. Sovereignty is the life and soul of the state and it can not be transferred without destroying the state itself. Giving away of this essential attribute of the state amounts to the death of a state. Lieber, an American writer, says, "Sovereignty can no more be alienated than a tree can alienate its right to sprout, or a man can transfer his life or personality without self-destruction."

2.6.5 Indivisibility

As sovereignty is an absolute power, it cannot be divided between or shared by individuals or groups. In every state, sovereignty must be vested in a single body. This single body must be legally competent to issue final orders or commands. Division of sovereignty is bound to give rise to inconsistent, conflicting and ambiguous commands or orders. In a federal polity, sovereignty rests on the state as a whole, but power is assigned to different organs of the government viz. Legislative, executive and judicial.

2.6.6 Exclusiveness

It implies that within a state, there can be only one sovereign. There cannot be more than one sovereign in a state claiming the legal obedience of the people. If two sovereigns exist in an independent state, the unity and integrity of that state will be destroyed. However, there can be a defacto and a de jury sovereign within a single state.

2.6.7 Imprescriptibility

By imprescriptibility, we mean that if the sovereign does not exercise his sovereignty for a long period of time, it does not lead to the destruction of sovereignty. It lasts as long as the state lasts.

2.7 Types of Sovereignty

The following are different types of sovereignty.

2.7.1 Legal Sovereignty

It is the conception of sovereignty in terms of law. It is the lawyer's conception of sovereignty. It is the supreme law, making power in any society which is not bound by any law but enjoys habitual obedience from the people. In other words, laws made by the sovereign are to be obeyed compulsorily. Violation of the commands of the legal sovereign is marked with punishment. Courts recognize only the laws made by a legal sovereign. Law is nothing but the command of the legal sovereign. Thus, legal sovereign is determinate, all comprehensive and possesses coercive powers to enforce its law and command. The concept of legal sovereignty found the most comprehensive treatment in Austin's theory of sovereignty. The best example of legal sovereignty is the British king-in-parliament. The British Parliament, with the consent of the monarch, is empowered to issue the highest commands of the state. According to one saying, British parliament can do everything except making a man a woman and vice-versa.

2.7.2 Political Sovereignty

Legal sovereignty presents merely a legal viewpoint of sovereignty. In each and every society, there is an unseen power behind the legal sovereignty. This unseen power is known as political sovereignty. Political sovereignty is not recognized by law. It is not determinate in the sense that its identification is a very difficult task. However, political sovereignty is expressed in many forms like public meetings, processions, and demonstrations, etc.

It is difficult to locate political sovereignty. In representative democracies it is said to be resided in the electorate which can replace one legal sovereign by another through periodic elections. In a direct democracy, political sovereignty coincides with the legal sovereignty. The relation between legal and political sovereignty is very close, both being two facets of state sovereignty. But at the same time, both are different in many counts like the legal sovereign can express his will in legal terms. But political sovereign cannot do so. Legal sovereign is determinate, definite and visible whereas political sovereign is not determinate and clear.

2.7.3 Real and Titular Sovereignty

In ancient times many states were ruled by monarchs. These monarchs were having absolute power and their senates and parliaments were quite powerless. At that time they exercised real sovereignty. Therefore, they are regarded as real sovereigns. For example, British kings were all powerful. And hence they were real sovereigns before fifteenth century. But in due course of time with development of democracy, powers of king were transferred to the parliament. As a result, the parliament became supreme. Now except certain ordinary powers, the British king has no real powers. All powers are exercised on his behalf by the Ministers who are responsible to the British parliament. Thus now the British king or queen is “titular sovereign”. To be more clear “titular sovereignty” refers to a king or queen or executive head of a state who has no real powers but one who symbolizes the sovereign power of the state. In India, the President is the titular head while the real sovereign is the Prime Minister and his cabinet.

2.7.4 Dejure and Defacto Sovereignty

Dejure is the legal sovereignty founded on law whereas *de facto* is the actual sovereignty. The person or the body of persons who actually exercise power is called the *de facto* sovereign. The *de facto* sovereign may not be a legal sovereign or he may be a usurping king, a dictator, a priest or a prophet. *De facto* sovereignty rests upon physical power or spiritual influence rather than legal right. History abounds in examples of *de facto* sovereignties. For example, Napoleon became the *de facto* sovereign after he had overthrown the Directory. A *de facto* sovereign in the long run attains legitimacy and becomes a *dejure* sovereign. It is accorded international reorganization by foreign states in course of time. However, the analytical school of jurists criticizes the distinction between *dejure* and *de facto* sovereignty. According to them, sovereignty is essentially a legal concept and a *de facto* sovereignty, which is not based on law, cannot be called sovereign.

2.7.5 National Sovereignty

The concept of national sovereignty was first formulated by the French revolutionists in their famous declaration known as the “Declaration of the Rights of Man”. It was stated in the declaration that sovereignty resides essentially in the nation, which is a collective body of all the people. Unlike popular sovereignty, national sovereignty implies that sovereignty is not divided and fragmented among the entire population. On the other hand, sovereignty rests in the “nation” personified as a whole.

2.7.6 Popular Sovereignty

Popular sovereignty means that people have ultimate authority or supreme power and they are the source of all powers. It means that sovereignty of the state is not based either on God or on naked power but only on the people’s will. It is people who alone decide as to how the administrative machinery of a country has to be worked. The doctrine of popular sovereignty was put forward by the anti-monarchical writers of the 16th and 17th centuries to oppose despotic power claimed by the monarchs at that time. But in modern times, it is associated with

the name of J.J. Rousseau, who supported it in his theory of “General will” during the 18th century. The theory of popular sovereignty overthrew the French monarchy and caused the American Revolution. The theory of popular sovereignty has become the basis of modern democracy.

However, it is difficult to make out what actually popular sovereignty implies. Even it is difficult to know where that popular sovereignty lies. The people, who are supposed to hold that sovereignty, are not determinate and definite. The concept of the general will is also complex to understand. Because the general will cannot be the will of all the people as the masses have no definite will of their own.

2.8 Theories of Sovereignty

There are two completely opposite theories; relating to state sovereignty. The first theory known as “monistic theory” or “monism”. It is a classical defence of the determinate, absolute and indivisible character of state sovereignty. The second theory is known as “Pluralistic theory” or Pluralism”. It opposes the first theory strongly, stresses the limited nature of state sovereignty. According to pluralism, state sovereignty must be shared between the state and other associations which are as natural and indispensable as the state.

2.8.1 Monistic Theory of Sovereignty

Prominent supporters of the monistic theory of sovereignty are Bodin, Hobbes, Rousseau and Austin. This monistic view is also called the legal or traditional view of sovereignty. However, it is John Austin (1790-1859), an English jurist, who is regarded as the greatest exponent of the monistic theory of sovereignty. The traditional theory of sovereignty reached its climax in the hands of John Austin. He accepted all the characteristics of traditional theory of sovereignty. Hence the Austin’s theory of sovereignty is otherwise known as “the monistic theory” or “monism.” Monistic theory envisaged a single sovereign in the state, who can be a person or a body of persons. Austin’s notable treatise “The Province of Jurisprudence

Determined”, published in 1832, contains his most famous statement of the doctrine of sovereignty which is given below.

“If a determinate human superior not in a habit of obedience to a like superior receives habitual obedience from the bulk of a given society, that determinate superior is sovereign in that society, and the society (including the superior) is a society political and independent”. To quote Austin again, “ Law is the aggregate of rules set by men as politically superior, or thus laws are defined as the command of a superior to an inferior.”

Austin’s theory of sovereignty has certain implications which are discussed in the following lines or points.

- i) Sovereignty is essential for the state. State without sovereignty is not possible. If state is the body, then sovereignty is its spirit.
- ii) Sovereignty has to be determinate. It must reside in a person or a body of persons. According to Austin, state is a legal order in which the sovereignty can be located clearly. Hence, neither the people nor electorate, which is indeterminate, nor the general will, which is impersonal and abstract, can be designated as sovereign. Rather sovereign must be a human being or a body of human beings which can be identified.
- iii) Sovereign is the supreme power in the state. He is the source of all authority in the state. His authority is absolute and unlimited. Sovereign enjoys all comprehensive and unlimited power. No person or group of persons of the state shall command over the sovereign. Likewise, no external power will have authority over the sovereign. Thus sovereignty is independent from any internal or external control.
- iv) Law is the command of the sovereign. He is the only source of law. Law is a command given by a superior to the inferiors who are in the state of subjection. Sovereign is above the customs and traditions of society. According to Austin, rights of the citizens, including the right to property were nothing but concessions granted by the sovereign. The subjects could have no legal right against the state.

- v) The sovereign receives habitual obedience from the people. Hence the authority of the sovereign is not casual. It is continuous, regular and uninterrupted.
- vi) Sovereignty has the legitimate physical force to exert command, extract obedience and enforce its laws.
- vii) Sovereignty is indivisible. To divide sovereignty between two or more persons or bodies of persons is to limit it or to destroy it.

The above analysis shows that sovereignty according to Austin is absolute, permanent, universal, inalienable, and indivisible.

2.8.1.1 Criticism of the Austinian Theory of Sovereignty

Austinian theory of sovereignty has been challenged on various grounds by several thinkers. Some of their criticisms are discussed below:

- i) Sovereign, according to Austin, is the only source of law. Whatever he commands is law. This proposition has been strongly opposed by Sir Henry Maine in his book entitled "Early History of Institution". He says custom plays an important role in underdeveloped communities. He cited the case of Ranjit Singh, King of Sikhs, who was absolutely despotic. Even then he might not have issued a command which Austin would call a law. Rather Ranjit Singh used to pay due regards to customary laws. In fact no ruler can afford to ignore the customary laws of the society. Hence sovereign cannot be treated as the singular source of laws as conceived by Austin Customs do contribute to the origin and growth of law.
- ii) A sovereign, according to Austin, must be located in a determinate body or person. Location of sovereignty is not a problem so far as the U.K is concerned, because, in U.K. this position is held by the King-in-Parliament. But it is very difficult to locate sovereignty in federal states like the USA and India. In U.S.A,

neither the President nor the Legislatures enjoy absolute legal powers. Judicial review limits their constitutional powers. Same is the case in India.

- iii) Another proposition which invites severe criticism is the unlimited and absolute character of sovereignty. This unlimited and absolute character undermines the basic ideas of democracy. Austin discusses sovereignty in terms of a hierarchical order characterized by superior–subordinate relationship. Because he says law is the command of superior and this command flows from higher to inferior or from superior to subordinate, whereas democracy believes in a society of equals. Besides, he ignores the significance of the concept of popular sovereignty. As we know, in democratic polity, the sovereign power rests on the people.

Sovereignty is not unlimited, as it is limited internally by constitutional law, power of electorate and of public opinion. Sovereignty is also limited by international law backed by world public opinion.

2.8.1.2 Pluralistic Attack on Austin’s Concept of Sovereignty

- i) The unlimited character of sovereignty has also been criticized by pluralists. According to Laski, “No sovereign has anywhere possessed unlimited power”. Rather every sovereign has to work within the society and the society works through various customs and traditions. The development of the customs and traditions can be attributed to a long historical process. Besides, the rights of the individual international law limit the operation of sovereign power.
- ii) The Pluralists also criticized the Austinian notion of law. Law, according to Austin, is the command of the superior to the inferiors. Laski termed this proposition as ridiculous. According to him, laws are universal in character and are applied on both the law maker as well as the subjects. He further emphasized that law is a means of satisfying social needs. The laws are obeyed not because of any coercion, but because they satisfy the basic needs of the people. In the view of Duguit, “Law is the product of our social life. We obey law because they are

for social interest and that it is impossible to maintain social order without them.” MacIver also argues that the state is both the child as well as the parent of law and the authority of law is greater than the authority of state. The state is only an official guardian of law rather than its maker.

- iii) The Pluralists considered the state as an association. According to them society is comprised of multifarious associations and the state is one of them. Associations like the family and the church are as natural as the state and the state had no role in their creation. Each and every association looks after certain interests in society. Therefore, there can not be one supreme power or a single comprehensive authority in society. Laski argues that the structure of society is federal and thus the authority must be federal. It is wrong to render all the sovereign powers to the state.
- iv) The Pluralists also reject Austin’s concept of absolute sovereignty on the ground that it is dangerous for the maintenance of international peace and tranquillity. According to them the concept of absolute sovereignty is not compatible with the interests of humanity as it leads to destructive wars. They believe that it is because that the world had to face the two world wars.

It has been observed from the above discussion that the monistic theory of sovereignty or Austin’s theory of sovereignty has ignored extra-legal factors operating behind the legal sovereign. Besides, the theory is marked with manifold limitations and deficiencies. But in spite of these defects, Austin’s theory of sovereignty is considered to be a consistent and logical theory of sovereignty.

2.8.2 Pluralistic Theory of Sovereignty

The pluralistic theory of sovereignty was a reaction against the legal, monistic, traditional, absolutist and Austinian theory of sovereignty. It was an attack against those who regarded the state as the highest and supreme power in society. It was an eloquent protest against

the absolute nature of the state and unlimited sovereignty. It demanded that the sovereignty of the state should be limited, divided and controlled. It emerged as a strong voice for decentralization of authority against the absolute centralized sovereignty of the state. It claimed that sovereignty should not belong to the state only but should be divided among the various associations in society. It wanted to save the individuals and their personal liberty from the absolute and unlimited power of the state. Thus Pluralistic theory of sovereignty emerged as a democratic movement to challenge all-comprehensiveness, indivisibility and inalienability of sovereignty.

2.8.2.1 Principles of Pluralistic Theory

Pluralistic theory is just opposite to the monistic theory of state sovereignty. Monistic theory considers sovereignty to be the absolute, indivisible and supreme power of the state. Pluralistic theory of sovereignty, on the other hand, supports a limited and divided sovereignty. Pluralistic theory opposes the all comprehensiveness, absoluteness and indivisibleness of sovereignty. According to the pluralistic theory state is only an association of society for common welfare like any other association.

The pluralistic nature of society is one of the important principles of pluralistic theory which focuses upon the sociological character of the state. It recognizes the role of several associations in a society formed by men for the fulfillment of their multifarious interests. Some of these associations have been in existence prior to the origin of the state itself. Some of them exist independent of the state. In this way, they are neither created, nor maintained nor even regulated by the state. Actually, state is one of these associations, existing side by side with them and not above them.

State performs the role of co-coordinator in society. In fact state cannot be considered as different from other associations. Rather the state itself is an association of associations. As an association, state coordinates the activities of its members. In addition to this, state also coordinates the activities of the other associations in society. It resolves the conflicting claims of these associations.

The pluralistic theory argues that the claim of the state to superior authority cannot be taken for granted. The state enjoys privileged position because its jurisdiction is compulsory over all individuals and associations within the state. Unlike other associations, it possesses coercive powers by which it can punish those who ignore or violate its commands. However, this does not automatically establish the superior authority of the state but imposes a higher responsibility on the state.

The pluralistic theory does not extend unconditional acceptance to the sovereign authority of the state. It does not accept the monopoly of state on the allegiance of all individuals. It argues that the state must justify its claim to allegiance on moral grounds. Otherwise, the authority of the state will undermine democracy and the liberty of the individuals and more importantly concentration of authority in the state will badly affect administrative efficiency.

The pluralistic theory maintains that people obey laws not because they are afraid of the sovereign power of the state but because they realize that laws are good for them and for social security. The basis of law is not the power of the sovereign but morality.

2.8.2.2 Development of the Pluralistic Theory

Factors responsible for the Development of Pluralism

The rigid legal view of sovereignty known as monism is often regarded by pluralists as an important factor responsible for the development of pluralism. They consider the Legal view of sovereignty as a dangerous and futile doctrine.

Some other writers perceive that the rise and rapid spread of federalism is a significant factor for the development of pluralism. According to them, sovereignty in the Austinian sense is difficult, if not impossible to locate in a federal state. Thus they argue that pluralism is the only logical solution to locate sovereignty in a federal state.

In the modern age, all the states of the world are interdependent on one another in one way or the other. Therefore, the need of limitation on the sovereignty of the states is felt in recent times.

2.8.2.3 Exponents of Pluralistic Theory

Although the idea of pluralism was found in the guildsystem of the Medieval Age, it is essentially a modern philosophy. This philosophy has been developed by a number of social and political thinkers from Europe and America. Emile Durkheim – a French sociologist, Otto Von Guericke- a German writer, F.W. Maitland an English Legal historian, and G.D.H. Coleman an English economist are regarded as the forerunners of the pluralistic theory. The other exponents of the pluralistic theory include Leon Duguit- a French thinker, Hugo Krabbe – a Dutch writer, Harold J.Laski, Ernest Barker and A.D. Lindsay- English political thinkers, and Robert M. MacIver- an American sociologist. Of these, Laski and MacIver are the most outstanding. Views of some of these exponents are given below.

Leon Duguit argues that laws are not an expression of the commands of an absolute sovereign. Rather they are the conditions of social solidarity. Laws are obligatory not because they are the commands of a “determinate human superior”, but because their observance is fundamental to the functioning of human society.

Ernest Barker views the state as an association of associations, a community of communities, and an agency for harmonizing the interests of the groups as well as of individuals.

Laski, in his “A Grammar of Politics”, argues that the concept of absolute sovereignty is incompatible with the interests of humanity. According to him, the doctrine of absolute sovereignty is a “legal fiction” and a “barren concept”. In “The Foundations of Sovereignty”, he argues that the state is only one among many forms of human associations. In comparison to other associations, state has no superior claims to an individual allegiance.

MacIver advances a sociological view of the state and traces its evolution from primitive social structures to its modern form. In this process, he rejects the theory of absolute sovereignty

and gives the pluralist view of the state. He argues that law cannot be considered as an expression of the will of the state. The state does not create law. Law exists prior to the state. The state only gives it a definite expression in the form of its statutes.

2.8.2.4 Criticism of Pluralistic Theory of Sovereignty

The pluralistic theory of sovereignty is founded on certain utopian and unscientific liberal foundations. As a result it has been subjected to severe criticism. Some of these criticisms are discussed below.

- i) The necessity of unity in diversity is well accepted by all including the pluralists. But their approach to maintain unity in society is not correct. They assume that unity in society can be established by the state without any sovereign power. If there is no sovereign state and sovereignty is divided among various associations, the state cannot maintain unity and order in society.
- ii) According to the pluralists, all associations of the state should be given independence. This is not feasible without a superior power being given to the state. Division of sovereignty among associations is not only impossible but also improper. It is a fact that two or more than two equal powers cannot co-exist peacefully in a society.
- iii) The pluralists demand limited sovereignty of the state for protection and preservation of the rights of the individuals and other associations in society. However, in order to protect the rights of individuals and associations, the state must have sovereign power. The state without sovereign power will be a helpless spectator to witness a clash of interests of individuals and associations.
- iv) The pluralistic sovereignty is not a practical one. It does not provide a clear cut method to divide sovereignty so that coordination and equilibrium can be maintained in the political system.

- v) The pluralists wrongly assume that various associations run along parallel lines and there is no overlapping of functions. The fact is that life cannot be divided into watertight compartments, allowing various associations to control various aspects of life. Keeping the nature of society in mind, we have to accept that there is always a clash of interests and conflict of loyalties. In the absence of any supreme legal authority in the society, a chaotic atmosphere will be created in which human progress becomes impossible.

2.8.2.5 Value of the Pluralistic Theory

In spite of the criticism, the pluralistic of sovereignty has made valuable contribution to contemporary political thought. As a theory it corrects the excesses of the monistic theory of sovereignty and supplements what is lacking in it.

The pluralistic theory poses a positive, humanistic and democratic reaction against state absolutism. It emphasizes the fact that states, in spite of legal supremacy, should be subject to moral restraints.

The pluralist theory renders a great service to modern political theory by inviting the sharp attention of states to the reality of group life. It focused on the vital and significant role played by economic, social, professional, cultural and religious groups in the life of the community.

Miss Follett has tried to summarise the chief contributions of pluralistic theory or pluralism. According to her, the pluralists recognized the value of the group in political life. It marked the beginning of the disappearance of the people as a mere restoration of local life.

In spite of these contributions, pluralistic theory of sovereignty has been regarded as impracticable so far as politics is concerned, anarchic as a social theory, unscientific as an economic theory and ambiguous as a legal theory.

2.9 New Challenges to Sovereignty

With the advancement of science and technology, the global distance has been reduced drastically. As a result, the modern world has been regarded as a global village. The concept of global village will be easy to understand with the analysis of the term 'globalization'. Globalization implies the increasing interaction among the inhabitants of the world. It is a process of integrating the national economy, culture, technology and governance into a global system. However, because of this globalization, state sovereignty has confronted with many new challenges. In other words, globalization has generated many limitations on state sovereignty.

There are various impacts of globalization on state sovereignty. Firstly, with globalization, the governmental control over international borders has been reduced drastically. This has resulted in increasing flow of goods and services, ideas and cultures. Secondly, the process of globalization has reduced and restricted the influence of particular governments over the activities of their citizens. For instance, the flow of capital across borders can threaten anti-inflation measures and other government policies.

Thirdly, because of global interconnectedness or globalization, states are compelled to increase the level of their political integration with other states to control its destabilizing effects. For this, international organizations like the International Monetary Fund (IMF) and the World Trade Organization (WTO) have been established and strengthened.

The development of numerous power-blocs has also influenced the authority and integrity of the states considerably. This can be discussed under following points.

Firstly as we know the world was divided in two power-blocs (capitalist power-bloc led by the U.S.A and the communist power-bloc led by the USSR) soon after the Second World War. Both the USA and the USSR exercised their control over the members of their respective blocs. Even the domestic and foreign policies of the member countries of these two blocs were greatly influenced by the respective bloc leaders. In these days after the disintegration of the

USSR, the USA is exercising its influence to a large extent on the domestic and foreign policies of many small and weak states.

Secondly, the USA and the USSR were exercising dominance over the members of their respective power alliances. The members of these power alliances were unable to take decisions independently. These power alliances include the NATO, SEATO, CENTO, OAS of American influence and the WARSAW pact under the USSR.

Thirdly, the membership of power blocs or power alliances does not abolish state sovereignty altogether but it definitely compels the member-states to compromise on many issues. The growth and development of international organizations also limit state sovereignty. The following points will substantiate this proposition.

Firstly, now a days international organizations are making global decisions and the states have to obey them. For example, each state has to function within the framework of U.N. charter. The international organizations formulate international standards which are to be followed by the individual states.

Secondly, there are international organizations which are associated with technical areas like the Universal Postal Union (UPU), the International Telecommunication Union (ITU) etc. These organizations help the individual states in carrying out their functions. But these technical organizations also influence the foreign policies of the individual states considerably.

Thirdly the operations of certain controversial organizations like the International Monetary Fund (IMF) affect the sovereign rights of a nation. The IMF, while providing loans to a needy state, generally put forward certain conditions like reducing public expenditure, devaluation of currency, privatization of economy and all this diminish the sovereignty of the concerned state.

Fourthly, another international organization i.e. the European Union (EU) has proved to be a bigger threat to the sovereignty of the states. The members of the EU have delegated their

sovereignty in certain specific matters to the Union. The EU has an Executive body, a Legislative body and a Court of Justice. The Union legislates law that can be imposed on the member states. Thus, the member states are no more the only centres of power within their own territory. In other words, within the European Union, sovereignty is clearly divided.

2.10 Let Us Sum Up

The study of sovereignty reveals that it is an essential component of the state. The features, types and theories of sovereignty discussed in the unit also provide a broader outlook for the sound interpretation of the concept of sovereignty. Further, challenges to sovereignty in the era of globalisation also prompt the readers to have an analytical understanding of the subject.

The position of state sovereignty, now a days, lies somewhere in between the monistic and the pluralistic theories. The welfare state of the 20th century requires vast authority to render multifarious positive functions. There is enormous increase in the functions of the modern state. The increase in functions has resulted in accumulation of greater powers with the state. At the same time, mechanisms for checking the arbitrary use of power have developed. Various groups also get due importance in the decision-making process. In addition to this, globalization has curtailed the effectiveness of the state supreme power.

2.11 Key Words

Bureaucracy	:	A regulated administrative system organized as a series of interrelated offices.
Guild	:	It is a self-governing association of mutually dependent people organized for the responsible discharge of a particular function of society.
Legitimacy	:	It means lawfulness. It can be defined as the extent to which the population accepts naturally, without questioning the organization to which it belongs.

2.12 Check Your Learning

1. Define sovereignty. Discuss the types of sovereignty.
2. Examine Monistic concept of sovereignty.
3. What do you mean by sovereignty? Discuss the characteristics of sovereignty.
4. Examine the pluralistic theory of sovereignty or pluralism.
5. Write short notes on the following.
 - a) Real and Titular sovereignty
 - b) Dejure and Defacto sovereignty
 - c) Popular sovereignty.
 - d) Value of the Pluralistic theory of sovereignty.

2.13 Suggested Readings

Asirvatham, Eddy and Mishra, K.K.: *Political Theory*, S. Chand & Company, New Delhi, 1988.

Barker, Ernest : *Principles of Social and Political Theory*, Oxford University Press, Oxford, 1967.

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

Held, David : *Political Theory and the Modern State*, Polity Press, Cambridge, 1995

- Laski, Harold : *A Grammar of Politics*, Allen and Unwin, London, 1951.
- Agarwal, R.C : *Political Theory (Principles of Political Science)*, S. Chand & company Ltd., New Delhi, 1996.
- Jain, M.P : *Political Theory: Liberal and Marxian*, Authors Guild Publications, Delhi, 1989.

Unit –III
POWER, AUTHORITY, LEGITIMACY

Structure

- 3.0 Objectives
- 3.1 Introduction
- 3.2 Concept of Power
- 3.3 Meaning of Political Power and its Explanation
- 3.4 Concept of Authority
- 3.5 Meaning of Political Authority and its Explanation
- 3.6 Concept of Legitimacy
- 3.7 Meaning of Political Legitimacy and its Explanation
- 3.8 The Types and Sources: Power, Authority and Legitimacy
- 3.9 Crisis in Legitimacy
- 3.10 Relationship among Power, Authority, Legitimacy
- 3.11 Let Us Sum Up
- 3.12 Key Words
- 3.13 Check Your Learning
- 3.14 Suggested Readings

3.0 Objectives

After reading this Unit, you will be able to:

- understand the concepts Power, Authority, Legitimacy;
- explain the relationship among Power, Authority, and Legitimacy
- examine the character of these concepts;
- describe the importance of these concepts in the study of political theory, their importance in political analysis;
- evaluate the relevance of these concepts in understanding a political phenomenon.

3.1 Introduction

The idea of politics has never been static. Traditionally, the study of politics has been confined to the study of State, government and formal institutions. The political scientists were fond of this approach to politics in the light of State, which centred in Government and spoke through law. This Aristotelian tradition of study of politics went through a change in the writings of Charles E. Merriam's 'New Aspects of Politics'. He thundered a protest against this tradition. He emphasized the necessity of looking into psychological and sociological aspects of politics and made a strong plea for making political behaviour as the central object of inquiry. Politics was delinked from formal political institutions. It was David Easton who rejected all formal analysis of politics on the basis of states and their institutions. He identified the political system (replacing the concept state) with the authoritative allocation of values for a society and asserted that politics should be concerned with that system of interactions in any society through which binding or authoritative allocations are made and implemented. With this change in the dimensions of the study of politics with behavioural inputs, the concepts like power, authority and legitimacy assume importance in understanding state and political system. Every political system is characterized with the presence of these three fundamental elements like Political power, Political authority and Political legitimacy.

3.2 Concept of Power

The word 'power' is derived from the French word 'Pouvoir'. Some attribute that English word power has an etymological relation to French word "Puissance". Latin word 'Posse' is also regarded as the origin of power. The normal meaning of the term 'power' is ability. Karl Deutsch defines power as the ability to prevail in conflict and to overcome obstacles. This is the general meaning of power. But power has a political meaning. When it is used in politics, it means that the person

having power has the strength or ability to make things unpleasant. Refusal on the part of a person will be followed by retaliatory measures which are unpleasant. The man who takes many measures has power. A man makes things unpleasant by coercion. Allan. R. Ball says, “Political Power may be broadly defined as the capacity to affect another’s behaviour by some form of sanction”. (P.27). Sanction means coercion or inducement.

Power is used in relative sense. Whenever the idea or question of exercising power arises, two parties, groups or institutions arise. So power is viewed in the background of some kind of relationship whose ability is exercised against whom and what are the consequences and repercussions. These are necessary to be understood to have a clear concept of power. However we use the term power interchangeably with themes like control, influence, authority, force, might, persuasion, coercion, domination. So this use of the term at different places and different situations often confuse us to comprehend the exact meaning of power.

3.3 Meaning of Political Power and its Explanation

Writers like Harold Lasswell, Kaplan and Robert. A. Dahl discuss the scope of the study of political science as the study of influence and influential. They consider power as a process. Individuals operate this political process in society within certain areas in which Political Power exists. They treat power and influence as identical terms. While Marxists think Political Power as class Power, the liberal-Democrats view Political Power from both normative and empirical dimensions. That is, power is not only a fact or something to be achieved and possessed, it is also a value or an ideal that should be pursued and aspired for. The concept Political Power is integrally connected with the case of Political legitimacy and Political authority. To say, people obey, in a Political system, because of their convictions about the genuineness of the commands of the superiors. In this context, state exercises Political Power, as we know state can afford to wield the strongest power. It is able to reserve for itself the right to apply the severest

sanctions like imprisonment and death penalty. So power is related to both authority and legitimacy.

The nature of Political Power cannot be fully known unless we study the distribution as per law of the State/Political system. The way the Political Power is distributed determines who are the most powerful in a political community and also who thus play a decisive role in the reconciliation of conflicts that constitute the content of politics.

So, Political Power is the capacity of a government to draw on the commitments of its citizens so as to achieve collective goals such as law and order, protection from attack and economic growth. In a broad sense, Power is a production of intended effects. It is the ability to get what we want.

So from the above explanation, it can be deduced that Power i.e. Political Power is a kind of human relationship in any given Political community. It is relational, situational and contextual. By nature and character, power is not absolute. It is relative and psycho-analytic, since one person/one institution remains powerful in relation to others. Only the exercise of the power or the influence of the power holder can be felt by the sub-ordinates, to whom it is addressed. Power is manifested through different methods starting from persuasion to coercion. The legitimate use of power is known as authority.

Check Your Progress-I

1. What is Political Power and what is its nature?

3.4 Concept of Authority

Amidst various power relations in the society, the concept Political Power stands pre-eminent since it has a stable foundation. This ensures its smooth and

continuous operation. It is because of this stability inherent in Political Power that political agencies can effectively resolve the conflicts that continuously emerge in society, thereby making politics a permanent affair in our social life. Political Power involves the use of severest sanctions. So it is perceived that the ability to use the strongest coercive power provides stable foundation to Political Power. But this power must be legitimate, i.e., acceptable to the people of the Political community over whom it is exercised. That is Authority.

Authority is derived from the Latin words ‘auctoritas’ and ‘auctor’. Authority is one which exercises opinion, or issues commands, gives counsel. According to Maclver, “By authority we mean the established might, within any social order to determine policies, to pronounce judgments on relevant issues and to settle controversies, or more broadly, to act as leader or guide to other men”. The term ‘Authority’ normally means a person or group of persons possessing this right. This right is used to imply legal recognized facility. Neither law nor morality can prevent a man from doing a work if he happens to have the authority. Further this authority demands obligation from citizens. When obedience is associated with authority, then we may hold the view that people will accept the authority as valid.

3.5 Meaning of Political Authority and its Explanation

Authority in the political sphere, naturally, receives our major attention because of the fact that a political system cannot be viable unless it has a stable foundation of power, which, however, is impossible to achieve so long as this Political Power is not transformed into Political authority. Political power in the political sphere tends to be stable because of one’s fear about the sanctions i.e. Political authority. This Political authority is strengthened by legitimacy. So our belief that the Political System inclusive of the structure, procedures, acts, decisions, policies, officials or leaders of government possesses the quality of ‘rightness’, propriety, or moral goodness and should be accepted because of this quality –irrespective of the specific content of the particular act in question-- is

what we mean by legitimacy. When Political Power is thus clothed in legitimacy it is known as Political authority. So Political authority is a special kind of power; Power when legitimized gives rise to authority. To Robert Dahl, “Legitimate Power is often called authority”. Raphael says “The authority is a right to receive obedience and it corresponds to an obligation on the part of other to give obedience.

So political authority involves legitimate relationship between two. One directs, and the other complies. It is hierarchical. It involves dominance as it has the sanction of law and authority is accountable. Authority is informal power in the process of transformation to Political authority.

Check Your Progress-II

1. What is Political Authority and what is its nature?

3.6 Concept of Legitimacy

Legitimacy is another important dimension to understand a Political system. This constitutes the very foundation of a Political system. This, as a character of Political system, makes us to understand the authoritative decisions in a system. This legitimacy refers to acceptance by the people in a given political community over whom decisions are implemented. Legitimacy includes the capacity to produce and maintain a belief that existing political institutions, or forms, are the most appropriate for society. “Legitimacy is the foundation of Political Power in as much as it is exercised both with a consciousness on governments part that it has a right to govern, and with a recognition by the governed of that right”.

So legitimacy provides a base for acceptance of the political system. A Political system remains legitimate or illegitimate with reference to their faith and belief. Legitimacy means the quality of being legitimate or proper, the quality of

being authentic and original, the quality of being genuine, the quality of being authoritative and authorized.

3.7 Meaning of Political Legitimacy and its Explanation

The term 'legitimacy' refers to the acceptance by the people of the structures, procedures, decisions and policies of a Political system. They consider the Political system right and acceptable to them. The institutions and Political actors functioning in the system exert their influence or power with legitimacy, which is known as Political authority. Legitimacy is necessary for authority.

If the Political system is to survive and sustain, it should be acceptable to the people, so that they may render their obligation to it. According to Wiseman, "The function of government, then is the legitimization of power in a Political system, and the limits of such a system are set by the effective performance of the function". The concept of political legitimacy and effectiveness is such that it cannot be defined abstractly in terms of an ideal type of government with an absolute value; it can be understood concretely in terms of the historic concepts of the ideal type of government. In this sense, we describe a government as legitimate which at a given moment and in a given country, corresponds to the idea that the general populace has about a legitimate order, or in other words, we are concerned with the popular beliefs about the legitimacy of a political system.

3.8 The Types and Sources of Power, Authority and Legitimacy

In every society where power exists, man seeks power. The extent to which the power-seeking will be met with success, depends on how much 'capability' and 'will' the power-seeker possesses. Power has its own instrumental values like fame, reverence, security, respect, affection. The relationship of these values to power is always conditioned by the knowledge, organization skill, belief, authority and personality of the actor. These together constitute the sources of power.

When power is exercised as per laws, constitution or accepted traditions of the people, it is legitimate power. This power or type of power is coercive power. This power is based on the faith of the power addressee that the power holder has the right to give punishment in case of non-compliance. Reactional power believes in the principle of reward and punishment. Economic power is the power emanating from the possession of material things, especially the means of production and distribution. It is a potent factor behind politics. The obedience secured by formal organs of state like legislature, executive, judiciary, backed by sanctions, are the traditionally recognized organs of power in state. The informal organs of Political Power are not only the form of Political parties in Power and opposition, but also a large number of pressure groups, public opinion, popular movements etc.

Authority derives its Legitimacy from three different sources according to Max Weber, such as rational sources, the traditional sources and the charismatic sources. In case of **rational-legal authority**, legitimacy is derived from an office held within a system of deliberately framed rules setting out rights and duties. Obedience to authority in such case is not given to the individual holding the office but to the legally established order. In case of **traditional authority**, emanates from heritage, tradition, custom, religion, divine right etc. Thus a tribal chief holds a position of authority just because this has been the immemorial tradition in the society. Those who obey this authority, share a belief in the sanctity of settled tradition. **Charismatic authority**, on the other hand, is established by the power holder simply by virtue of his possession of some exceptional personal qualities. As we consider Father of the Nation, Sri M.K. Gandhi.

When authority is based on rational-legal source, it ensures stability. Since criticism or opposition against the actions of the persons holding this authority does not necessarily mean criticism or rejection of the political system as such. The charismatic authority tends to be institutionalized undergoing structural changes in the direction of either rational-legal or traditional authority. In several countries of Africa and West Asia we come across this type of authority transformation. Nepal

and Britain are perfect examples of traditional authority. Gandhi, Martin Luther King, Dalai Lama and Adolf Hitler are all instance of charismatic leaders and authority.

We always make a distinction between two types of authority i.e. De Jure, and Defacto. By authority we mean the right to do a work or declare a policy. Naturally when a man is in authority, it is assumed that he has the right to perform certain sort of work. The fundamental point of De Jure authority is legitimacy. If the right lacks its authority, it shall be devoid of legitimacy and in that case it is not authority in its proper sense. So the De Jure concept pre-supposes a system of rules which determines who may legitimately take certain types of decisions, make certain sorts of pronouncements, issue certain commands and perform certain symbolic acts. In primitive or pre-modern societies, the power is always exercised without proper authorization of rules or laws and the persons who perform these acts are called to have constituted authority. People show loyalty to such persons. Law or legality is never the concern of common people. They carry out order out of fear of punishment. This is *defacto* authority. However, this distinction of *de Jure* and *de facto* is not always tenable.

Legitimacy too has sources going along the concept of authority. In a Political system the ideology of the authority plays a meaningful role. The ideology of the authority commands followers and obedience too. Good ideologies always get the support of the people. In democracies, a Government ruled by a political party after getting mandate in elections acquires legitimacy, due to their ideologies. Structure means the roles performed by institutional actors who occupy and wield political power. This is done as per accepted rules and regulations. Role performance by making rules and laws, applicable to the members of a political community, by individuals occupying power and authority are structural sources. Further, the legal authority is rational in character, and it takes its stand on rational values. All persons in the context of legal authority are subject to the presence of the legal orders and actions originating from it. This includes not only the ordinary

person but also the highest office holders like President and Prime Minister. Rational legitimacy is practised by a qualified bureaucracy whose members are trained and paid to exercise or administer the legal authority. Traditional legitimacy means exercise of traditional authority guided by customary laws of equity, moral justice and personal expediency. Charismatic legitimacy refers to the exceptional qualities of a person who appears to possess super-human or extra-ordinary power and because of which he appears divine, heroic, and exemplary.

3.9 Crisis in Legitimacy

Crisis in legitimacy refers to a change. Its root lies in the character of change in modern society. The society according to Dahl is basically a polyarchy where a large number of minority groups operate possessing a variety of political resources that are unevenly distributed among them and are naturally, used by them with different degrees of intensity and efficiency. This changing character of society demands a new socio-political structure. So this transition from old to new social structure is marked by crisis in legitimacy. The reasons are (a) When the status of major traditional institutions is threatened during the period of change, (b) If the political system is not open to all the major groups in the society during the transition or at the time when they have developed critical demands. (c) when new groups become politically active, their loyalty to the system clashes with the existing old dominating groups who try to maintain their status (d) Crisis appears, despite an effective political system, if the status of major traditional groups is threatened and if emerging groups are denied access to politics at decisive periods.

Marxists emphasize crisis in legitimacy in the process of class-struggle. The legitimacy of the working class remains to Marxists the only solution to end crisis. In the age of welfarism and democracy, the crisis in legitimacy in the context of social tensions and political conflicts bears enough significance in modern political science.

Check Your Progress-IV

1. What do you mean by crisis in legitimacy?
2. Examine different sources of authority according to Weber.

3.10 Relationship among Power, Authority, Legitimacy

We have so far discussed the various aspects of these concepts. Now we have to look into the relationship. A man holds office and by virtue of that he holds power. Power authorizes him to do a work or take a decision. Hence office, power, authority are closely linked concepts. Without authority, power is useless. Power we know is ability. But this ability must be sanctioned by law or morality or constitution. If power is not valid then its holder will have no right to demand obedience. So power should be backed by law or morality to be valid. Maclver writes "Power alone has no legitimacy, no mandate, no office. Even the most ruthless tyrant gets nowhere unless he can clothe himself with authority from power is that the former is power recognized as rightful. Authority is government that all accept as valid. Its exercise therefore is sanctioned by those who approve the particular act or agent, and is tolerated by those who disapprove". So authority is power clothed in the garments of legitimacy. Authority is legitimate power.

Authority being legitimate is based on consent. It commands more respect than the illegal force exercised by intruders, dacoits and thieves. Legal sanctions statutes, commands, writs, rules, regulations bye-laws represent the techniques of authority. Authority is essentially the institutional code within which the use of power as a medium is organized and legitimized. A political system is said to be legitimate if it stands on the will of the people and its commands are taken as effective. The rulers must either make an attempt to bring the real power relationship into conformity with existing legitimization or to revise legitimization in terms of the existing or some of the preferred power relationship.

3.11 Let Us Sum Up

The concept of power developed in the writings of Hobbes and Machiavelli received importance in the writings of Montesquieu's idea of separation of powers. In 19th century Friedrich Nietzsche, in 20th century Kauffmann justified revealing the notion of power being the essence of state supremacy. It was Laswell and Kaplan who developed further this concept of power in modern political analysis i.e. modern political theory. Robert Dahl used this concept 'power' as influence in the psycho-analysis of political theory. The sociological and liberal democratic theory considered capacity of an individual is power. So power is also used in developmental sense as a concept.

The Marxists used the concept as instrument of class-domination. The concept of authority also received political prominence in the writings of Hobbes, Machiavelli, Locke, Rousseau. But Max Weber made a systemic analysis of the concept of defining the sources and types of authority. Laswell, Kaplan, and Dahl used this concept by defining authority as formal power, manifestation of power. Then the connected concept legitimacy too was developed in the writings of Max Weber and later on applied in the study of political analysis. Hence power, authority, legitimacy are inter-related and co-related to each other.

One important development we must keep in mind is that like state being the product of society, the political system too is a product of social system. The intimate relationship of state and society in modern political theory, through political analysis has made the study of political system important. So political system's understanding will be comprehensive, with the understanding of the three elements, political power, political authority, political legitimacy, which distinguish a political system from other systems.

3.12 Key Words

Power	:	Ability/influence
Charismatic	:	Popular
Authority	:	Power lawfully exercised
De Jure	:	As per law
Legitimacy	:	Acceptance as per rule
De facto	:	By fact
Coercion	:	Force
Value	:	To examine good or bad
Reverence	:	Respect

3.13 Check Your Learning

- i) Define, Power, Authority and Legitimacy and discuss their types.
- ii) Examine the relationship among Power, Authority and Legitimacy.
- iii) Discuss the basic characteristics of Power, Authority and Legitimacy and find out their sources.
- iv) Discuss the importance of these concepts in Political Theory.

3.14 Suggested Readings

R.M. Maclver	:	<i>Society : An Introducting Analysis,</i> Macmillan, London,1959
Ralph Miliband	:	<i>The State in Capitalistic Society: An Analysis of Western System of Power,</i> Weidenfeld and Nicolson, London,1973

- Dahl, Robert. A, : *Modern Political Analysis*, Englewood,
Cliffs, N.J.Prentice Hall,1963
- Das, P.G : *Modern Political Theory*, New Centre
Book Agency, Calcutta, 1996
- Johori, J.C. : *Contemporary Political Theory*,
Sterling, New Delhi, 1983
- Tripathy, R.B. : *Political Theory*, Poonam, Cuttack,1998
- A.K. Mackhopadhay : *Political Sociology*, Calcutta, K.P. Bagchi,
1980

Unit –IV**DEMOCRACY: LIBERAL & MARXIST APPROACHES****Structure**

- 4.0 Objectives
- 4.1 Introduction
- 4.2 Meaning
- 4.3 Definitions of Democracy
- 4.4 Development of the Concept of Democracy
- 4.5 Basic Principles of Democracy
- 4.6 Types of Democracy
 - 4.6.1 Pure or Direct Democracy
 - 4.6.2 Representative or Indirect Democracy
 - 4.6.3 Social Democracy
 - 4.6.4 Cosmopolitan Democracy
- 4.7 Conditions Necessary for Successful Working of Democracy
- 4.8 Theories of Democracy
 - 4.8.1 The Classical Liberal Theory of Democracy
 - 4.8.1.1 Meaning and Salient Features
 - 4.8.1.2 Criticism of the Classical Liberal Theory of Democracy
 - 4.8.2 The Elitist Theory of Democracy
 - 4.8.2.1 Meaning of Elite and Views of Some Elite Theorists
 - 4.8.2.2 Explanation of the Theory
 - 4.8.2.3 Criticism of Elitist Theory
 - 4.8.3 Pluralist Theory of Democracy
 - 4.8.3.1 Explanation of the Theory
 - 4.8.3.2 Criticism of the Theory
 - 4.8.4 The Marxist Theory of Democracy

4.8.4.1 Explanation of the Theory

4.8.4.2 Marxist Criticism of Liberal Democracy

4.8.4.3 Dictatorship of the Proletariat.

4.8.4.4 Criticism of Marxist Theory of Democracy

4.9 Let Us Sum Up

4.10 Key Words

4.11 Check Your Learning

4.12 Suggested Reading

4.0 Objectives

After reading this unit, you should be able to:

- know the concept of democracy;
- highlight the conditions necessary for successful working of democracy;
- discuss different theories of democracy; and
- make comparative analysis of theories wherever necessary.

4.1 Introduction

Democracy is a popular and fascinating slogan. It is considered at the highest ideal. It is also one of the most controversial concepts which have different meanings for different people. It is regarded not only as a form of government, but as a way of life. This is the reason for which there is always demand for democratization at all levels, such as in political parties, industrial management as well as college administration. It implies that those who are effected by particular institutional decisions should have their say or representation at the decision making level. This lesson tries to explain the meaning of democracy in clear and lucid manner. It discusses different types of democracy. The social and cosmopolitan types of democracies have been dealt with. Different theories of democracy have also been discussed extensively.

4.2 Meaning

The word 'democracy' has been derived from the Greek word "demokratia". The word "demokratia" is a combination of two words – "demos" means the people and "kratos" means rule. Thus, literally, democracy signifies 'the rule of the people'. This provides democracy its meaning as a form of government in which people rule either directly through personal participation or indirectly through representatives elected by them. In other words, democracy is that form of government in which the sovereign power of the state is in the hands of the people and the people are the source of the state power. The prominent supporters of the view that democracy is primarily a form of government include James Bryce, A .V. Lowell and John Seeley.

However, democracy is not a mere form of government. Rather it is a type of state and also an order of society. Here 'type of state' refers to the democratic state. This democratic state implies that the community as a whole possesses sovereign authority and maintains supreme control over affairs. In a democratic state, people have the right to give a shape to the govt. to appoint it and to dismiss it. Democracy also refers to an order of society. A democratic society is one where each man can develop his personality and where there is equality of opportunity. To be more specific, the spirit of equality and fraternity prevail in a democratic society. Democracy also signifies a moral principle. This democratic morality is based on equality, liberty, rights and fraternity. It emphasizes human values and welfare of human beings. Man is the end rather than the means. It is said that no government can be called a democracy if it fails to bring out the best in man.

4.3 Definitions of Democracy

Democracy has been defined by various persons from time to time. According to Abraham Lincoln, "It is a government of the people, by the people and for the people."

In the words of Lord Bryce, “Democracy is that form of government in which the ruling power of a state is legally vested, not in any particular class or classes but in the members of the community as a whole.”

“Democracy”, writes Mazzini, “is the government of the best and the wisest, for the progress of all and through all.”

Sir John Seeley defines democracy as “a government in which everyone has a share.”

According to Gettell, “Democracy is that form of government in which the mass of the population possesses the right to share in the exercise of sovereign power.”

The above mentioned definitions of democracy highlight certain features of a democratic political system. Those are –

- i) There is the supremacy of the will of the people.
- ii) The government is run by the people.
- iii) The government is responsible to the people and it aims at their welfare.
- iv) Political power is a trust of the people in the hands of the government.

4.4 Development of the Concept of Democracy

The concept of democracy goes back to the ancient Greece. It was the Greek city states which were experimenting with direct democracy. But there is a great difference between the democracy practised in the ancient Greece and the democracy which is being practised in the modern world. Because in ancient Greek city-states, the slaves, women and the foreigners who lived and worked in the city-state were excluded from the citizen body. In other words, these three categories of persons were not allowed to participate in the affairs of the Greek Polity. However, the system of democracy which was prevalent in the ancient Greek city-states was not considered as an ideal rule. This system of democracy was highly criticized by Socrates, Plato and Aristotle.

Plato decried democracy because people were not educated enough to select the best rulers and the wisest courses. Aristotle classified governments into normal and perverted forms. When the rulers aimed at the good of the community, the state would be a normal or pure form of state. Similarly, when the rulers in such a state become selfish, the state would be called a perverted state. Interestingly, in his classification, Aristotle placed democracy among perverted forms. According to him, democracy signifies the rule of the mediocre seeking their selfish interests, not the interest of the state. However, the Greek system of democracy was not suitable in a modern state on account of its large population and area.

Democracy could not develop after the fall of Roman Empire and during the Dark Age in Europe. Even in the medieval Europe, the feudal lords were very powerful and the people had no power. In course of time, the tyrannical and oppressive rulers of Europe who ruled by the theory of divine right were strongly opposed. In England, for instance, there was a struggle for supremacy between the Stuart kings and British Parliament. Finally, the British Parliament won in this struggle and parliamentary democracy was established in England. Thus Britain is regarded as the first modern democratic state.

A radical tradition of democracy came to existence in France by the Revolution of 1789. An important call of this revolution was Liberty, Equality and Fraternity. This revolution also emphasized the principle of popular sovereignty.

In the United States of America, the development of democracy was quite slow. The benefit of democracy was only restricted to white men. Voting rights were not extended to women as well as to indigenous and black people until the 20th century. However, the Declaration of Independence (1776) established democracy in that country.

The writings of the Levellers, John Locke, Jean Jacques Rousseau and Paine and documents such as the “French Declaration of the Rights of Man (1789)” and the “American Declaration of Independence (1776)” expressed important ideas and principles that have greatly contributed for the development of democracy in the Modern World.

However, it is said that democracy entered its golden age during 20th century. In the 20th century, suffrage was extended to women in the older western democracies and the much-hated apartheid was abolished in South Africa.

4.5 Basic Principles of Democracy

There are certain fundamental principles of democracy. These principles have been discussed briefly. Liberty, Equality and Fraternity are the foundations of democracy. In a democratic system, people enjoy maximum liberty. Equality is also maintained in democracy irrespective of caste, creed, religion and position or status. Fraternity is another requisite of democracy, because democracy can be successful only in a peaceful atmosphere. Democracy is based on the principle of tolerance. It does not suppress the emergence of separate ideas and ideologies within the system. Democracy supports the method of discussion and persuasion. In other words, democracy is founded upon the principle of consent and not coercion. It negates unnecessary use of force.

In a democracy every individual has right to speak. People are the sovereign in a democracy. Democracy upholds the dignity of human personality. Democracy provides different kinds of rights to the individuals. Democracy is based on the principle of majority rule, but it does not ignore rights of the minorities.

4.6 Types of Democracy

Democracy can be classified into different types. A brief analysis of the types of democracy is given below.

4.6.1 Pure or Direct Democracy

In a pure or direct democracy, people gather at a particular place and discuss as well as decide the matters which affect them. The people formulate laws in public meeting. People also directly express their will on public affairs. Direct democracy was prevalent in Ancient Greek

city-states. Even today direct democracy is found in Switzerland. The most important characteristics of direct democracy in Switzerland are the referendum, initiative and recall. In direct democracy, people take pride in participating in the affairs of the state and also they get opportunity to serve the state in some capacity. Thus it promotes a sense of patriotism and togetherness among the people. However, direct democracy is not suitable for big and populous states.

4.6.2 Representative or Indirect Democracy

In a representative democracy, people elect their representatives to carry on the administration of the state. In other words, the will of the state is formulated and expressed not directly by the people, but by their representatives to whom they delegate the power of decision making. Thus, government, in indirect democracy, is run on behalf of the people through periodic elections. Representative democracy is the prevailing form of democracy in the present world.

4.6.3 Social Democracy

It is a form of democracy which is founded on the concept of equality. The supporters of social democracy argue that the societal resources should be distributed equally among individuals to realize their own plans of life. State should also extend all sorts of help and assistance to the weaker sections of society and to the disabled persons so that they can join in the mainstream of the society. To be more specific, state in social democracy creates conditions in the society for the well being or betterment of workers, women, the disabled and the elderly persons. It is primarily interested in creating the conditions for equality, so that all citizens can enjoy their democratic rights equally.

4.6.4 Cosmopolitan Democracy

The idea of cosmopolitan democracy has emerged as a result of globalization. With the creation of large number of supranational organizations like European Union and with the

advancement of economic and cultural globalization, democracy has extended its purview beyond the borders of the nation state. It is a fact that no single institution of global governance has replaced the national state, but it is also beyond doubt that the process of globalization is primarily responsible for the emergence of the global civil society. Because of globalization, new solidarities are being forged across national borders which lead to the development of the notion of cosmopolitan citizenship.

4.7 Conditions Necessary for Successful Working of Democracy

It has been observed that for successful working, democratic institutions require a particular environment. The creation of this environment depends highly upon certain conditions. These conditions are discussed in the following paragraphs.

The successful working of democracy depends upon the high moral standard of the people as well as of the leaders. If there is dishonesty and if the ministers and public servants are corrupt, then the question of the success of democracy does not arise. Rather people as well as political leaders should have the spirit of patriotism, discipline, self-control, honesty and willingness to obey the laws of the land.

Another necessary condition is that people should have a sound system of education. As we know people are the masters in democracy and thus it is essential that they should be educated. That is why a great emphasis is given on the right to education in modern times. It has been realized that ignorance and illiteracy are the greatest enemies of democracy.

People should be well aware of their rights as well as duties to make democracy a successful one. It is a fact that the performance of duties is quite essential, but it is also essential for the citizens to become conscious of their rights. In this context it is well remarked that “Eternal vigilance is the price of Liberty.”

The necessity of a strong and vigorous public opinion is quite important. Without a strong public opinion, democracy cannot continue for a long period of time.

A peaceful atmosphere is necessary for the perpetuation of democracy. The democratic form of government is not suitable for a country where people always conflict with each other. Rather people must have sympathy for one another and must try to make out sympathetically the point of view of the other. Thus a sympathetic understanding and mutual tolerance are necessary for the smooth working of democracy.

The existence of a free, fearless and independent press is also required for the successful working of democracy. A free and independent press can examine and evaluate the plans and programmes initiated by the government. It can also criticize the government when it goes wrong. Besides, press also generates a healthy public opinion. It awakens and enlightens the people and enables them to understand the problems of democracy and discharge their duties and responsibilities properly.

Another important condition is the existence of a written constitution. A written constitution can check the autocratic activities of the government. All authorities in the state have to function within the prescribed limits. In other words, in the absence of a written constitutions, the government may function or exercise its powers in an autocratic manner.

The existence of an effective opposition is essential for the successful working of democracy. Whenever the ruling party abuses power and violates democratic principles, the opposition puts a check on it or even overthrow it and form its own government in a democratic manner.

4.8 Theories of Democracy

The theories of democracy can be classified into two broad categories. These are: the Liberal Theory of Democracy and the Marxist Theory of Democracy. The Liberal Theory of Democracy has come across three phases and in each phase, it has received a distinct name. These names are Classical Liberal Theory of Democracy, the Elitist Theory of Democracy, and the Pluralist Theory of Democracy. It is a fact that the classical Liberal Theory of Democracy is

primarily concerned with democracy as a form of government and it focuses on an ethical justification of democracy.

Whereas the contemporary theories such as the Elitist and Pluralist theories are concerned with the questions whether and in what form the democratic principle is capable of realization with the recent sociological findings. However, the basic philosophical assumptions of the three theories of Liberal Democracy (Classical, Elitist, and Pluralist) are the same. These philosophical assumptions are mainly the outcome of the ideas of liberals or the supporters of Liberalism.

As we know, the Liberals are the strong advocates of democratic ideas and ideals. According to them, the state is a means to promote the interests of the individuals. Thus, the state should not impose any unwanted restriction on the freedom of the individuals. They also view that the essence of democracy lies in maximizing the freedom of the individuals. Thus, liberals have great faith in the worth of man and his natural rights. Now let us discuss the above-mentioned theories of democracy briefly.

4.8.1 The Classical Liberal Theory of Democracy

The Classical Liberal Theory of Democracy is also known as traditional populist, Modisonian and popular theory of democracy. Classical liberal democratic ideas came to the limelight mainly during the modern period with the recognition of importance of the dignity of man. It is well-known that the modern period witnessed two important movements – Reformation and Renaissance. These two movements focused on the importance of the dignity of man and maintained that all the social institutions were for the welfare of man as an individual. Thomas Hobbes, in his *Leviathan* (1651), discussed that the state was created by the people through a social contract. John Locke also contributed significantly to the theory of classical democracy. He considered consent of the people as the basis of political power and political power is the trust of the people in the hands of the government. According to Locke, the individual had the right to resist the state and revolt against the state if the state failed to protect three natural rights viz, right to life, liberty and property of the individual.

During the 18th century, many philosophers elaborated various classical liberal democratic views. It is Montesquieu who propounded the theory of separation of powers and provided enough safeguards against the emergence of dictatorship. The theory of general will was put forward by J.J. Rousseau. The theory of general will made Rousseau the prophet of direct democracy. During this period, the American revolutionaries and constitutionalists like Jefferson and Madison put forward the institutional basis of classical liberal democratic theory.

The 19th century witnessed the emergence of clear-cut and systematic ideas regarding the Classical Theory of Democracy. Bentham and Mill, the utilitarians favoured the right to vote and representative government. In fact the utilitarians stressed upon the importance of people's participation in the political process. According to them, the main objective of government was to provide "greatest good of the greatest number." It is Jeremy Bentham who advocated universal adult franchise while J.S. Mill emphasized the need of enhancing the quality of democracy by increasing the quality of political participation. J.S. Mill believed that political participation would lead to the allround development of the individual. Because of this, J. S. Mill has been described by C.B. Macpherson as the profounder of the Developmental Theory of Democracy.

During 20th century, the writings of T.H. Green, Hobhouse, Lindsay, Ernest Barker, H.J. Laski, Mailver, Woodrow Wilson and G.D.H. Cole contributed immensely to the Classical Liberal Theory of Democracy. However, in the 20th century, the theory was strengthened on account of the extension of franchise to women and lowering the voting age to 18 years.

4.8.1.1 Meaning and Salient Features

- i) Human being is the central point in democracy. The primary objective of democracy is to safeguard and promote the interests of human being.
- ii) Liberal classical democracy requires the government to be constitutional, limited and responsible. The government should be based upon the consent of the people

expressed through periodic elections. And these periodic elections should be held on the basis of the principle of universal adult suffrage.

- iii) Classical liberal theory considers democracy as an art of solving problems through compromise and consensus. Because it is democracy which encourages debates, discussions, arguments and negotiations to sort out differences between adversaries.
- iv) Democracy respects the rights of the people. In a democracy, all citizens enjoy equal rights, opportunities. Political office or public office can be acquired only through the support of the people, not by birth, tradition or anybody's whims and caprices.
- v) The advocates of classical liberal democratic theory maintain that democracy reduces the danger of a revolution. Because democracy, according to them, is a government by persuasion and in this system change of government can be possible through peaceful methods. In a democratic political system, both order and progress can go simultaneously and there is no need of a revolution.
- vi) Democracy, according to the theory is not only a form of government, but it is also a way of life. Its basic objective is to build the totality of the life of the individual. It also seeks to promote the all-round development of the individual and to foster his moral personality.

4.8.1.2 Criticism of the Classical Liberal Theory of Democracy

This theory has been criticized by various writers. The following points highlight the attacks on this theory made by various writers on different grounds.

- i) Democracy, according to his theory, reflects the will of the people. Consent of the people is the basis of a democratic government. Thus democracy claims legitimacy as it is formed by the people through their free and fair choice. But in actual practice, the free and fair choice of people is severely undermined by ignorance, poverty and fear. To be more specific, the election which is supposed

to be a mechanism of free and fair choice is more often won by muscle power, parochialism and primordial loyalties like caste, creed, community, and religion, etc.

- ii) One of the important concepts of this theory is 'common good' which is difficult to define and determine. There is no clarity as to whether common good is the sum total of the good of all individual members of a society or it is identical with the interest of the majority. Thus it seems to be a vague concept.
- iii) The Classical Liberal Theory of democracy does not take into consideration the economic dimension of democracy. Democracy extends "equal opportunity" to all people to take part in the political process. But because of the equal opportunity, rich people try to pocket most of the available advantages while the poor watch the rich men's game helplessly.
- iv) The Classical Liberal Theory of democracy overlooks the need of stability or equilibrium of the political system. It emphasizes consent, debate, discussions and consultations, whereas in recent times consensus is more important than consent.
- v) Elitists have criticized democracy severely. According to them, democracy is a rule by an irresponsible elite. Pareto, a great Elitist considers democracy as a degenerated and perverted form of government. According to him, democracy refers to extreme decentralization and therefore incompetence. In democracy, able leaders are not elected because people are jealous of excellence and select popular persons rather than able persons to lead them.
- vi) The Classical Liberal Theory of democracy generates among people a false sense of equality. Democracy in course of time turns into or results in the tyranny of the majority.
- vii) The Elitists also attack democracy on the ground that it is a very expensive form of government. The money which should have been spent for productive purposes is spent on electioneering and other unproductive purposes. According to Pareto, democracy is the most inefficient, extravagant, factional, intolerant and stagnant political system.

In spite of various practical problems, the classical liberal theory of democracy is still significant as it is based on democratic humanism. It can be attacked as a poor theory of democratic machinery of government, but it is founded on rich, though idealistic, developmental hopes. It accepts democracy as a value, a way of life, a means to the end of individual's self development.

4.8.2 The Elitist Theory of Democracy

The elitist theories originated in the field of sociology in order to explain the behaviour of human beings in a social setting. The basic idea behind the elitist theories is that every society comprises of two categories of persons – (i) the elite or the minority within a social collectivity (here social collectivity refers to a society, a state, a religious institution, a political party, etc.) which exercises large scale influence within that collectivity and (ii) the masses or the majority which are subjected to the influence of the elite. However, in the field of politics, the theory is primarily concerned with the institutions of democracy and realities of the western liberal democratic political system.

The Elitist Theory of democracy has developed mainly during the 20th century. The Elitist theory was advanced or introduced by liberal sociologists to oppose the Marxian notion of classes. Karl Marx gave the scientific theory of ruling class in the 19th century. Marx, through this theory, scientifically depicted that in every class-divided society, the economically dominant class is always the ruling class. This economically dominant class also owns the means of production. But the elitist theory rejected these Marxian views and argued that in every society there is an elite and the basis of elite is its higher technical and administrative expertise, rather than the ownership of the means of production. To be more specific, the elite rules not because of its superior economic or military power, but because of higher abilities.

However, historically the concept of elite originated in the works of Vilfredo Pareto (1848 – 1923), Gaetano Mosca (1858 -1941) and Robert Michels. The supporters of this theory put forward the idea of 'circulation of elites' which meant that elite is not a static concept. Some

of the exponents of this theory are Joseph A. Schumpeter, Ryman Aron, Giovanni Sartori, Robert Dahl, James Burnham and Karl Manheim.

4.8.2.1 Meaning of Elite & views of some Elite Theorists

Elite refers to the chosen elements in the population. The Elite theory maintained that in every society, the political power is shared by a minority or elite. This elite is known as political elite. Thus political elite means political leaders or leadership or the leading minorities. But different words have been used for political elite by different writers. Pareto used 'governing elite' for it, Mosca called it 'political class', Mills named it 'power elite'.

Pareto and Mosca, Italian sociologists, were the first to systematically develop the elite theory. Pareto has given both broad and narrow definitions of elite. His broad definition of elite is "By elite is meant a small number of individuals, who in each sphere of activity, have succeeded and arrived at a higher echelon in the professional hierarchy." This definition provides that there are several elites in each sphere of activity like military elites, political elites, academic elites, etc. In the narrow sense, by elite, he means only the "Governing elite which is that small number of individuals who have succeeded and who exercise ruling functions politically and socially."

Pareto argued that elites possess superior psychological attributes than others in the society. According to him, elites hold lion and fox qualities. 'Lion' qualities include strength and courage while "fox" qualities consist of intelligence, shrewdness and cunning. Pareto maintained that with the changing times and situations, lion elites may be replaced by fox elites and vice versa. He describes this process of power shifting from one group to another as 'circulation of elites'. While analyzing this point, he says, "History is, and always will be, a graveyard of aristocracies."

Mosca maintained that society is divided into two classes -- the class which rules and the class which is ruled. The first class which is always a small group, performs all political

functions, monopolizes power and enjoys the advantages that power brings, whereas the second class, which is a majority group is directed and controlled by the first class.

Robert Michels, another notable elite theorist, propounded the principle of 'iron Law of Oligarchy'. Michels argues that democracy is inconceivable without organization. In democracy, in order to express their views and promote their interests, individuals are bound to join together and form organisation. But for co-ordination and dealing with complex problems, organizations need some leaders. On the basis of this analysis, Michels concludes that each organization tends to be oligarchic, that is, the rule of the chosen few. Besides this analysis, James Burnham's theory of the 'Managerial revolution' and C. Wright Mills's theory of the 'power elite' are some other important versions of the elite theory.

4.8.2.2 Explanation of the Theory

The Elitist theory of democracy opposes popular participation in the political system. The theory maintains that all people need not be equally active in democracy rather some people should be more active than the others. But one of the important roles assigned to the people is to elect the ruling elite. Thus democracy implies rule of the political elite which is being elected by the people. Without elite, there can be no democracy. In other words, democracy means election of elites by the people.

According to this theory, actual political decisions are to be taken by the elite and not by the general public. The theory assigns a limited role to people and this role consists in approving or disapproving an elite in the periodical elections.

This theory maintains that people's participation in policy-making is neither possible nor appropriate. Because policy-making is a complex affair and it cannot be entrusted to the inexperienced public. Only leaders having expertise can perform the function properly. In this way, the theory believes in the 'government by experts' instead of 'government by the people'.

The Elitist theory of democracy is primarily concerned with the maintenance of the political system. This responsibility cannot be entrusted to 'masses'. It can only be entrusted to the competing elites.

This theory does not give importance to ideologies because ideology creates polarization among political elite and parties. Thus instead of ideology, this theory is committed to maintain stability and equilibrium in the political system.

However, there are some clear-cut differences between Classical Liberal theory of democracy and Elite theory of democracy. The Classical Liberal theory of democracy is people-oriented. It has great faith in the capacity of the people in carrying out their role in the social and political processes. The Elite theory, on the other hand, is leader-oriented. It has great confidence in the ability of elites to deliver goods.

The Classical Liberal theory of democracy treats common good and public opinion as vital elements of democracy. But the theory does not give much importance to these elements as it is difficult to define common good and public opinion.

According to the Classical Liberal view, democracy is a moral system which aims at the allround development of man whereas the Elitist theory considers democracy as a mechanism to maintain stability and equilibrium in society.

4.8.2.3 Criticism of Elitist Theory

The Elitist theory of democracy has been criticized on the following grounds.

The Elitist theory is anti-democratic in nature. It has little faith in the people. It has faith only in the elites who discourage the participation of the people in politics. According to this theory, the participation of the people will destroy the equilibrium and stability of the political system.

The Elitist theory is a conservative theory as it is based on certain conservative values like stability, equilibrium, harmony, consensus, coordination, political apathy and support of the existing socio-economic system. Thus this theory destroys the progressive nature of democratic theory.

The Elitist theory does not assign due importance to ideologies. It is based on the institutional aspect of democracy. The theory considers human being as the means and the democratic system as the end and gives very little importance to the development of human beings.

The Elitist theory extends too much importance to leaders. It has been observed that the theory does not give importance to politics but gives importance to politicians.

The Elitist theory discards the principle of social and political equality. It is based on the right of the elites to rule on the basis of their intelligence and ability. It rejects the view that the government is responsible to the people which are a basic principle in democratic set-up.

In spite of criticism, relevance of the Elitist theory is beyond doubt. In fact it contains certain truth regarding the working of western democracies. To be more specific, it has exposed the undemocratic nature of contemporary western democracies. Besides, the basic principles of this theory can be applicable to all democracies as democracies are controlled by elites of one type or another.

4.8.3 Pluralist Theory of Democracy

The pluralist theory of democracy is the mixture of classical democratic ideas and the ideas expressed by the elitist theory of democracy. Like the elitist theory, it disagrees with the view that through popular participation, people can develop their personality. But it does not negate the importance of people's participation in democracy. Rather it maintains that people have to participate, but only through their organizations for better policies, democratic loyalty

and obedience. It also maintains that elections are not merely to elect an elite, but they are the simplest method of knowing popular opinion on policies.

4.8.3.1 Explanation of the Theory

As we have already discussed, the elitists claim that powers rest in the hands of a minority whereas the pluralist theory of democracy argues that powers are not concentrated in the hands of a minority, rather these are dispersed. Powers are shared among all sections of people primarily through different groups and associations formed to articulate their interests. Likewise political power should be shared between the government and different interest groups which operate in a society. Democracy, according to this theory, is the decentralization of power or the plurality of the centre of decision. This theory maintains that any single political elite, even if it is elected by the people, must not enjoy all the political power.

One of the important ideas of pluralist democracy is that power should be shared by all groups of society and all organized groups must have a share in policy making. All important decisions concerning social, economic and political matters should be taken after due consultation with the groups whose interests are going to be affected by such decisions. Thus public policy is not the result of the will of the elite or the chosen few. It is result of the interaction of all groups interested to express their view regarding that particular issue. To be more specific, the theory states that the power of the state is shared between the government and the maximum number of leaders, groups and associations. In this way, the theory favours the decentralization of the power structure of the society. It is important to note here that the classical theory assigns the role of policy making to the people, but pluralist theory of democracy assigns this role to different organizations of the society.

In fact, complete statement of group theory can be observed in the writings of A.F. Bentley. In the USA, A.F. Bentley, through his work “The Process of Government”, and also David Truman, through his seminal work book “The Governmental Process” in the early 20th century, interpreted democracy as a political game played by a great variety of groups. Bentley also argues that the society is composed of various groups which are in a perpetual interaction

with each other. Thus the pluralist theory of democracy has developed on the basis of activities of interest groups in politics.

However, the pluralist theory of democracy has been expounded during the 20th century by American political scientists. The basic intention of these political scientists is to support the view that socialist political systems are undemocratic, because socialist political systems are one party systems and in these systems political power is highly centralized. Similarly, the primary objective of this theory is to prove that the Western Liberal Political systems, particularly that of the USA, are pluralist and therefore democratic. As the political systems of the Soviet Union and China are not pluralist, they are undemocratic. Thus the pluralist theory of democracy emphasizes the role of multi-party system and pressure groups in a political system.

4.8.3.2 Criticism of the Theory

The theory has been criticized on the following grounds.

- i) The moral worth of the individual has not been recognized by this theory. Instead of individual, the theory emphasizes on organizations and associations in the society. The theory contributes to the decline of individualism because of its emphasis upon groups and associations.
- ii) The Marxist theory does not agree with the view that different associations and groups in a class-divided society can have equal share in political power and decision making. Rather it argues that in a class-divided society political power vests in the economically dominant class and its organizations. The organizations of the working class cannot have due share in the political system.
- iii) The pluralist theory of democracy has been criticized on the ground that it encourages 'pressure politics'. Because the interest groups in pursuance of their interests can indulge in illegal and unfair practices. They tend to pressurize the government to favour them even at the expense of the vital interest of the community. Thus pressure politics has the potential to weaken and immobilise the government and seriously affect the basic interests of the nation.

- iv) One can observe the existence of various organizations in any society. Some of these organizations are political, semi-political and private in nature. But all of them are not equally important, nor are they equally active in the political process. Besides some of these represent the interest of the rich, while many others represent the interests of poor. It is wrong to assume, as the pluralists do, that these organizations with opposite objectives would enter into mutual consultation and reach some consensus.

The pluralist and elitist theories of democracy are based on the assumption that 'Mass democracies' are not possible. According to these theories, as we have discussed earlier, masses can not be given an open participation in the political processes. Thus, these theories deny the feasibility of a 'governing democracy' and argue that only 'governed democracies' are possible.

4.8.4 The Marxist Theory of Democracy

4.8.4.1 Explanation of the Theory

Liberals identify democracy with its institutions. These institutions include elected legislatures, universal suffrage, political parties and such other arrangements which bring rulers and their subjects closer together. According to them, these institutions are the best devices to serve the interests of the people as their existence is linked with the consent of the people.

Marxists, on the other hand, analyze different forms of government on the basis of relationship between base and superstructure. According to them, the character of any society is determined by the nature of its base that is the economic relations shaped by its mode of production. Above the base, 'superstructure' is created which included legal and political structures, religion, morals, etc. They believe that whether a political system qualifies for democracy or not depends upon the pattern of its economic relations, not by the forms and structures of its politics. To be more specific, the capitalist economic system which primarily serves the interests of the bourgeoisie can not embody the ideal of democracy whatever political

institutions it maintains. In this way, real democracy cannot be achieved unless the economic system itself is transformed to serve the interests of the people.

From the above discussion, it is clear that Marxists do not accept the institutional view of democracy advanced by liberals. Rather Marxists consider majority rule as the most important feature of democracy. They argue that in communist states, the government really serves the interests of the majority whereas bourgeois governments defend and promote the interests of only a few the ruling elites.

Marxists also do not consider democracy as a political system. Rather they view democracy as a system of values and a form of society. As a political system, democracy is a class organism. In other words, it is meant to serve the interests of a particular class. Lenin distinguishes working class or Proletariat democracy from bourgeois democracy. The bourgeois democracy serves the interests of the bourgeoisie, a small minority, whereas the working class democracy promotes the interests of the proletariat the vast majority of the society. When socialism, which is the transitional phase, matures into communism, democracy as a political system will cease to exist, but democracy as a system of values will flourish. A communist society, according to Marxists, is a democratic society because it promotes democratic values like socio-economic equality and the absence of exploitation of one class by another.

4.8.4.2 Marxist Criticism of Liberal Democracy

Marxists regard Western Liberal democracies as bourgeois democracies. They are the dictatorship of the bourgeoisie over the working class. It is important to note here that the Marxist's meaning of dictatorship is different from that of the popular meaning. The popular notion of dictatorship refers to the selfish, immoral, irresponsible and unconstitutional political rule of one man or a small group of political elites characterized by the oppression of the masses. But according to Marxism, any form of state power implies dictatorship. The character of the state is determined by the character of its ruling class. Thus bourgeois democracy or 'bourgeois dictatorship' denotes a state characterized by the domination of the bourgeoisie. The bourgeois is nothing but the capitalist class. So political power remains in the hands of the capitalist class

and hence Liberal democracy serves the interests of the capitalist class. The interests of the working class are completely ignored and they are exploited.

The fundamental characteristics of bourgeois democracy are elections, multi-party system, liberty and rights, independent judiciary and the constitution. But all these characteristics are worthless so far as the working class is concerned. For instance, the workers have a right to vote but they have no option but to vote for one bourgeois party out of the two or more different bourgeois parties. Thus they have no real choice. Similarly, political parties in bourgeois democracy or in liberal democracy hardly differ from one another in respect of ideology. The ideologies of all of them are designed to enhance the interests of rich people. It is a fact that in a liberal democracy there exists belief, faith and worship. But in actual practice, the workers are not able to take advantage of them because the press, radio, TV and cinema are controlled by property owners. Further, justice is very expensive in liberal democracy. It is only the rich who can get judgments in their favour. If they commit any crime, they can easily escape from the eyes of court with the help of money power and political influence.

In spite of all these shortcomings, Marxists view that bourgeois democracy is not totally bad. The working class parties, by making use of the conditions under bourgeois democracy, strengthen themselves, organize and mobilize the workers and increase their political consciousness.

4.8.4.3 Dictatorship of the Proletariat

The dictatorship of Proletariat is otherwise known as socialist democracy or the working class democracy. The Marxists claim that the dictatorship of proletariat is a much better democracy than bourgeois democracy. Dictatorship of proletariat refers to a political system in which the proletariat is organized as a ruling class. It is the rule of the working class over the property owners or capitalist class. It is aimed at abolishing all exploitation of man by man. It safeguards the interests of all working class and the working people. It is a new kind of democracy whose basis is the working class which is the majority class. It can be established only through a socialist revolution under the leadership of organized working class party.

Dictatorship of the proletariat is a democracy of and for the working class. In comparison to bourgeois democracy, it is more democratic as it is the democracy of the working class which is always in majority.

However, the dictatorship of the proletariat is not to last forever. It is required only for the transitional period during which the change is to take place from capitalism to communism. Under the dictatorship of the proletariat, the state starts withering away as there are no classes to be suppressed. The process of withering away is completed as we reach the stage of complete communism.

4.8.4.4 Criticism of Marxist Theory of Democracy

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

The Liberals criticize that the socialist democracy is not a democracy at all rather it is the opposite of democracy. They argue that democracy is a government of the whole people of the society. Democracy is not a government of one group to be used by it against another. But the socialist democracy, which represents the interests of one class only though it is the majority group, fails to satisfy the main criterion of democracy mentioned above.

Some revisionists like Bernstein and Kautsky have criticized socialist democracy on the ground that it is not a 'pure democracy'. Kautsky charged that the dictatorship of proletariat, established in Russia after the 1917 revolution, did not grant liberties to citizens.

Marxists view that the socialist revolution and the socialist democracy are to be achieved through violence. Lenin outrightly advocates the 'bloody' overthrow of the bourgeois government. Excessive stress on violence makes the working men democracy unacceptable to many.

Many people believe that socialism can be achieved through parliamentary peace. One need not resort to violence and revolution for this. Important reforms, in order to help the masses, can be brought through Legislations.

It has been observed that the Marxist democracies practised in communist countries are showing little respect for political freedoms of individuals. The political choices, movements and expressions of the individuals are severely constrained and curtailed.

Political power is monopolized by a small minority ruling from above. The system is characterized by intense centralization and bureaucratization. Besides it is observed that in Marxist democracies, the individual initiative, a valuable factor of economic development, is largely absent. But in recent times, the ‘capitalist reforms’ are slowly being introduced in China and Russia. For instance the atmosphere of freedom and relaxation created in the Soviet Union as a result of the ‘Gorbachev experiment’ and the encouragement given to the private sector in China are some of the important developments in this respect.

4.9 Let Us Sum Up

To sum up, this unit discusses meaning, principles, and development of democracy for clear understanding of the subject. The classical, elitist, pluralist and Marxist theories of democracies provide important inputs by studying democracy in a wider perspective.

4.10 Key Words

Utilitarian : Utilitarian philosophy developed in the writings of utilitarian thinkers. Utilitarian philosophy emphasized the principle of utility and made it the touchstone to judge any action. It also championed the cause of the principle of greatest happiness of the greatest number.

Theory of Separation of Powers: All the powers should not be concentrated in the hands of one organ of government. Rather, Legislature should only make laws, the executive should implement those laws and judiciary should adjudicate those laws.

Universal Adult Franchise: Every adult should be given right to vote.

Socialism : It is a philosophy and a movement which wants to establish social control over the means of production. It aims at abolishing private property and investment.

4.11 Check Your Learning

1. What do you understand by Democracy? Discuss different types of Democracy.
2. Discuss the conditions necessary for successful working of Democracy.
3. Discuss the important features of the Classical Liberal Theory of Democracy? Highlight in brief the criticisms made against this theory.
4. Explain briefly the Elitist Theory of Democracy.
5. What do you mean by Pluralist Theory of Democracy? Highlight the criticisms made against this theory.
6. Short Notes –
 - (a) Marxist criticism of Liberal democracy.
 - (b) Dictatorship of the Proletariat.

4.12 Suggested Readings

- Asirvatham, E & Mishra K.K. : *Political Theory*, 1998
- Kapur, A.C. : *Principles of Political Science*, 1997
- Bottomore, T.B. : *Elites and Society*, Penguin, 1966
- N.N. Dahl, Robert A. : *Who Governs?* New Naven, New Jersey, 1961
- Haralambos, Michael, Sociology : *Themes and Perspectives*, Oxford University Publishers, Delhi, 1984

Unit- V**POLITICAL CULTURE AND POLITICAL SOCIALIZATION****Structure**

- 5.0 Objectives
- 5.1 Introduction
- 5.3 Political Culture
 - 5.3.1 Meaning
 - 5.3.2 Factors Determining Political Culture
 - 5.3.3 Orientations and Political Objects
 - 5.3.4 Types of Political Culture
 - 5.3.5 Classification of Political Systems in terms of Political Culture
- 5.4 Political Socialization
 - 5.4.1 Meaning
 - 5.4.2 Types of Political Socialization
 - 5.4.3 Agencies of Political Socialization
- 5.5 Let Us Sum Up
- 5.6 Key Words
- 5.7 Check Your Learning
- 5.8 Suggested Readings

5.0 Objectives

After reading this unit, you should be able to:

- know the meaning of political culture;
- discuss the factors of political culture;
- explain the orientations of political culture;

- discuss the objects of political culture;
- evaluate the types of political culture;
- explain political culture of different political systems of political culture;
- define political socialization;
- explain the agencies of political socialization; and
- establish the relationship between constituents of political culture.

5.1 Introduction

Political culture and political socialization are two important approaches for studying political systems from empirical angle. They also provide useful tools to differentiate the political systems. Taking this into account, this unit would discuss the meaning, factors, objects and types of political culture found in various political systems. Besides, the unit would also deal with the meaning, types and agencies of political socialization.

5.2 Political Culture

The concept of political culture was given by Gabriel Almond, and it was subsequently popularized by Sidney Verba, Lucian Pye and Powell. It is an approach for studying comparative politics.

5.3.1 Meaning

Political culture refers to values, beliefs and orientations of the people of a state towards the political objects. Almond and Powell define, “Political Culture is the pattern of individual attitudes and orientations towards politics among the members of a political system”. Almond and Verba observe, “Culture refers to psychological orientation towards social objects, cognitive, affective and evolutionary orientations”. They further observe that political culture refers to “specifically political orientations – attitudes towards the political systems and its various parts and attitudes towards the role of self in the political system”. Pye and Verba write, “Political

Culture consists of the system of empirical beliefs, expressive symbols and values which define the situation in which political action takes place.” A.R. Ball defines, “Political Culture is composed of the attitudes, beliefs, emotions and values of society related to political system and to political issues.”

The above definitions indicate that political culture includes values and orientations towards the political system as a whole and self as an important member of the same.

5.3.2 Factors Determining Political Culture

Political culture is determined by several factors. The important among them are:

- i) History and tradition
- ii) Geography
- iii) Socio-economic conditions

History largely determines the political culture of a country. The Glorious Revolution of 1688, The American War of Independence of 1776, The French Revolution of 1789 and Bolshevik Revolution of 1917 had a deep impact upon the political culture of Great Britain, U.S., France and Russia respectively. Ancient traditions also influence the political culture of a country. The principle of secularism is largely rooted in Indian cultural milieu because tolerance is the essence of our tradition. Emperor Ashoka’s inscriptions on his rock pillar calls for tolerance, “The king, beloved of the god, honours every form of religious faith.”

Geography is one of the factors responsible for determining the political culture of a country. The geographical position of the British Isles saved the country from foreign attacks and

they developed harmonious political culture. East European states adopted socialism during the Cold War due to their geographical proximity with the former Soviet Union.

Socio-economic conditions also determine the political culture of a country. Individuals in the urban industrialized society are more open and they widely participate in the decision-making process. On the other hand, individuals in the rural agricultural society are conservative and not prone to change. However, the development of information technology, communication system and universalisation of education will have strong impact upon the people of rural areas and it would subsequently change their orientations towards the political objects.

Check Your Progress-II

1. Discuss the historical factor as one of the determinants of political culture.
2. Discuss geographical factor as one of the determinants of political culture.

5.3.3 Orientations and Political Objects

Political Culture can be assessed through orientations and political objects. Orientations refer to one's own outlook regarding one's environment.

They are of three types, viz.

- i) Cognitive Orientations
- ii) Affective Orientations
- iii) Evaluative Orientations

Cognitive Orientations refer to outlook or knowledge of the people regarding political objects. In the advanced democratic systems, generally people are aware of the nature of power structure, role of political parties, pressure groups, functions of legislative, executive and judicial branches of the government. Very few people are unaware of the political system.

Affective Orientations refer to emotional involvement or rejection of the people about the political objects. In the modern democratic systems, some members show their total commitment towards the political system, whereas some others deliberately reject or show their disapproval of the same.

Evaluative Orientations refer to giving value judgment regarding political objects. Citizens governed by democratic values evaluate the political system as really democratic or authoritarian in character.

Political Objects

Orientations are meant for political objects. Political objects include:

- i) Political system
- ii) Input structure
- iii) Output structure
- iv) Self as an object

Political System

It refers to one's outlook regarding historical as well as constitutional developments of a political system, its size, population and power.

Input Structure

It refers to one's knowledge regarding political parties, pressure groups and mass media which are involved in the input process.

Output Structure

It refers to one's knowledge on the legislative, executive and judicial branches of the government.

Self as an Object

It refers to one's understanding of his rights, duties and position in the political system.

5.3.4 Types of Political Culture

After discussing orientations towards political objects, let us discuss about the types of political culture. Here Almond discusses three types of unmixed political culture. These are:

- i) Parochial Political Culture.
- ii) Subject Political Culture.
- iii) Participant Political Culture.

Parochial Political Culture is found in traditional societies. The members are not oriented towards participation either in the input or output structures. They have little or no awareness regarding the political system. This type of political culture is hardly found in western democracies.

Subject Political Culture is found in developing countries. Here the members of the political system are oriented towards participation in the output structures. They are aware of the decisions of the government and consider it good or bad. They know various welfare measures, rules and regulations that have strong impact upon their existence. But they are not oriented towards participation in the input structure.

Participant Political Culture is found in modern democracies. Here people are completely oriented towards participation in the input as well output structure. They are fully aware of the right and duties, and play an active role in the political system. They also evaluate and criticize the political system in various spheres.

Mixed Political Culture

Almond views that political culture does not exist in pure form. All political systems are marked by mixed political culture. He has mentioned three types of mixed political culture. These are:

- i) Parochial – Subject Culture
- ii) Subject – Participant Culture
- iii) Parochial – Participant Culture.

Parochial Subject Culture is found in the kingdoms. Here the majority of the people are unaware of the nature of political system. However, a section of the people is inclined to the output structure.

Subject Participant Political Culture is found in many modern democratic countries. People in these political systems are oriented towards the output structures and a segment of them also shows their inclination towards participation in the input structure.

Parochial Participant Culture is largely found in developing countries. The majority of the people in these political system are neither oriented towards the input nor the output structure. However, a section of the people is oriented towards participation in the input as well as output structures.

5.3.5 Classifications of Political Systems in terms of Political Culture

Almond divides political systems into various types in terms of their political culture. These are:

- i) Anglo-American Political systems
- ii) Continental European political systems
- iii) Pre-Industrial or Partially Industrialized political systems
- iv) Totalitarian political systems.

Anglo-American Political Systems

Anglo-American Political systems are found in U.S. and other developed countries. These systems are characterized by the following features.

- i) They are marked by homogeneous political culture.
- ii) Political actors settle their difference through consensus and never turn it into a game of war.
- iii) Politics is like a market. Decision makers in the political system sell their output as products to the citizens for winning the election or securing support. This is a kind of bargaining politics which operates between the governors and the governed.
- iv) Political parties and the interest groups play an important role in the interest articulation process.
- v) There is no concentration of political power. Power is diffused.
- vi) There is no difference among the citizens regarding end and means to achieve various objectives.

Continental European Political Systems

These political systems prevail in European countries such as Italy, France, Norway and Sweden. The following features are found in these political systems.

- i) They are marked by fragmented political culture. Various subcultures emerge out of this fragmentation.
- ii) The process of political bargaining does not exist. Politics is treated as a game. There is constant conflict among the parties in the equations of power politics.
- iii) Each political subculture tries to prevail over other and does not reach any solution through consensus.

Pre-Industrialized or Partially Industrialized Political System

Pre-Industrialized political systems include the post colonial systems. They are marked by the following features.

- i) There is no diffusion of power. There is no overlapping of roles. Dynastic ties and other parochial identities often influence the power structure.
- ii) The political leaders inherit colonial traditions and give legitimacy to the systems.
- iii) Some groups resort to violence to achieve certain goals.

Totalitarian Political Systems

Totalitarian states were found in USSR, Nazi Germany and Fascist Italy. At present, totalitarian political system is found in China. The following features are observed in these political systems.

- i) These systems are marked by an authoritarian order. All organizations follow the dictates of the state. Voluntary organizations do not get space to perform their role.
- ii) Power is highly concentrated. The state largely depends upon the police, army and bureaucracy.
- iii) Legitimacy is artificially created and secured through force.
- iv) Mass media is fully controlled by the state. It does not reflect the real picture of the state.

Political culture is immensely useful for the study of political science. It provides an important tool for classifying the political systems. It determines the course of political development and the nature of political change. However, Almond's classification of political systems in terms of political culture seems to be biased. Many of the European political systems are marked by political stability and structural differentiation. Even many of the developing countries settle their difference through consensus. There is diffusion of power, and political

parties play an important role in the interest articulation process. Totalitarian political systems may be an exception in this regard.

5.4 Political Socialization

Political socialization is another important approach for studying political science from empirical angle. Herbert H. Hyman gave this concept in 1959. Almond, Powell and David Easton etc. popularized this concept towards sixties.

5.4.1 Meaning

Political Socialization is the process through which values, beliefs and orientations about the political system are transmitted from generation to generation. It has been defined by several authors. Some of these definitions are:

Herbert Hyman defines, “Political socialization is the process of induction into the political culture. Its end product is a set of attitudes, cognitions, value standards, and feelings towards the political system, its various roles and role incumbents. It also includes knowledge of values affecting, and feelings towards the inputs of demands and claims into the system, and its authoritative outputs.”

Almond and Powell describe, “Political socialization is the process by which political cultures are maintained and changed.”

David Easton defines it as “those development processes through which persons acquire political orientations and patterns of behaviour.”

Greenstein describes political socialization as “all political learning, formal and informal, deliberate and unplanned at every stage of the life cycle, including not only explicitly political learning but also nominally non-political learning that affects political behaviour, such

as learning of politically relevant social attitudes and the acquisition of politically relevant personality characteristics.”

Robert Levine defines political socialization as “the means by which individuals acquire motives, habits and values relevant to participation in a political system.”

Check Your Progress-VI

1. What do you mean by political socialization?
2. Who gave the concept of political socialization?

5.4.2 Types of Political Socialization

Political socialization is basically divided into two types. These are:

- i) Manifest political socialization
- ii) Latent political socialization.

Manifest Political Socialization refers to explicit transmission of values, beliefs and orientations towards the political systems. It is direct in character. Teaching of democratic socialism and secularism in the educational systems is an example of manifest political socialization.

Latent Political Socialization refers to transmission of non-political attitudes which subsequently affects attitudes towards the political system. It is indirect in character. A child getting the attitudes of cooperation from social surrounding develops the spirit of obedience and tolerance towards the political system during his adolescence. This is an example of latent political socialization.

Check Your Progress-VII

1. What is manifest socialization?
2. What is latent socialization?

5.4.3 Agencies of Political Socialization

The process of socialization is performed by several agencies. The important among them are:

- | | |
|------------------|------------------------|
| i) Family | ii) Educational System |
| iii) Peer Groups | iv) Work Place |
| v) Mass Media | vi) Political Parties |

Family is an important agency of political socialization. It has direct or indirect influences in shaping the political orientations of children in their adulthood. In a narrow sense, it includes only parents. In a broader sense, it includes uncle, aunts and other relatives. A child learns the attitudes of obedience, cooperation and protest during his early childhood interaction with the family. These non-political attitudes subsequently affect attitudes towards the political objects. He may develop attitudes of obedience, cooperation and protest while participating in the political system. Davies observes, “The family provides the major means for transforming the mentally naked infant organism into adult, fully clothed in its own personality. And most of the individual’s political personality – his tendencies to think and act politically in particular way – has been determined at home, several years before he can take part in politics as an ordinary adult citizen and as a political prominent.”

Educational Institutions

Educational institutions are important agencies of political socialization. These include schools, colleges and universities. The celebration of Republic Day, Independence Day, singing of national song and other historical events in these institutions have deep impact upon the political socialization process. The curricula structure of the educational institutions also influences the political orientations. It inculcates values of democracy, liberalism, secularism and socialism and creates an atmosphere of civic sense of participation in the political system.

Peer Groups

A peer group is a group marked by certain features like age, educational qualification and institutional affiliation etc. Persons belonging to a peer group discuss issues regarding the

national as well as the global political systems. Discussion on nature of power structure, policy making, developmental issues and current international affairs have deep impact in shaping the attitudes of individuals towards the political objects. It brings further dynamism in their political orientation.

Work Place

Work place is also one of the agencies of political socialization. While working in an organization, a person comes into contact with the employers and the employees. Employees bargaining power with the employers and their participation in the trade union activities have deep impact upon the political socialization process. They learn the politics of bargaining and protest from this. Almond says in this context, “The job and the formal and informal organizations built around it – the union, the social club, and the like – may be channels for the explicit communication of political information and beliefs. Participation in the process of collective bargaining or involvement with a strike can be a powerful socializing experience for workers and employer alike. The striking labourer not only learns that he can shape the authoritative decisions being made about his future, but he gains knowledge of specific action skills, such as demonstrating and picketing, which may be used in political participation.”

Mass Media

Mass media is one of the agencies of political socialization. It includes television, newspapers, radio and other means of communication. In a liberal democratic system, media is autonomous. It transmits liberal, democratic and secular values which shape political attitudes of individuals. In a totalitarian system, media is controlled by the state and transmits conformist values to the members of the political system.

Political Parties

Political parties also play an important role in the political socialization process. They discuss various issues regarding the nation and evaluate the policies of the government. In this way, they mould public opinion which has a great bearing upon the political attitudes of the members of the system. In democratic political systems, parties enjoy freedom and shape the

political orientations quite effectively. On the other hand, in totalitarian political systems, parties do not enjoy any autonomy. They are largely prohibited from shaping the political orientations of the members of the system. The above mentioned agencies taken as a whole constitute an important part of the political socialization. All of them are to be seriously studied for comprehensive understanding of this concept.

5.5 Let Us Sum Up

The political socialization is immensely helpful for the study of political science. It is deeply connected with the political culture. It is the process through which political culture is sustained. It brings dynamism in the political culture and transmits new values to future generations.

5.6 Key Words

Political culture	:	It refers to values, beliefs and orientations of the people of a state towards the political objects.
Orientations	:	It refers to one's own outlook regarding one's environment.
Cognitive Orientation	:	It refers to outlook or knowledge of the people regarding political objects.
Affective Orientation	:	It refers to emotional involvement or rejection of the people about the political objects.
Evaluative Orientation:		It refers to giving value judgment regarding political objects.
Political Socialization	:	It is the process through which values, beliefs and orientations about the political system are transmitted from generation to generation.

Manifest political socialization:	It refers to explicit transmission of values, beliefs and orientations towards the political systems.
Latent political socialization:	It refers to transmission of non-political attitudes which subsequently affects attitude towards the political system.

10.7 Check Your Learning

1. What do you mean by political culture? Discuss the factors responsible for political culture.
2. Define political culture. Discuss various types of political culture.
3. Explain Almond's classification of political systems in terms of their political culture.
4. Define political socialization. Discuss various agencies of political socialization.

10.8 Suggested Readings

Almond and Coleman : *The Politics of Developing Areas*,
Princeton University Press, Princeton,
1960

Almond and Powell : *Comparative Politics :A Developmental Approach*, Amerind Publishing Co. Pvt.
Ltd; New Delhi, 1966.

Ashraf Ali and Sharma L.N. : *Political Sociology*, Universities Press
(India) Ltd; Hyderabad, 1983

- Gandhi Madan G : *Modern Political Analysis*, Oxford and IBH Publishing Co, New Delhi, 1985.
- Johari J.C. : *Comparative Politics*, Sterling Publishers Pvt.Ltd; New Delhi, 1992.
- Maheshwari S.R. : *Comparative Government and Politics* Lakshmi Narain Agarwal, Agra, 2002
- Ray S.N. : *Modern Comparative Politics*, Prentice Hall of India Pvt. Ltd; New Delhi, 1999.
- Varma S.P. : *Modern Political Theory*, Vikash Publishing House Pvt. Ltd; New Delhi:, 1986.