

# **POLITICAL SCIENCE**

## **KEY CONCEPTS AND THEORIES**

*Textbook for Class XII*

**AUTHOR**  
V.R. MEHTA

**EDITOR**  
NALINI PANT



राष्ट्रीय शैक्षिक अनुसंधान और प्रशिक्षण परिषद्  
NATIONAL COUNCIL OF EDUCATIONAL RESEARCH AND TRAINING

**First Edition**

ISBN 81-7450-188-6

March 2003 Phalgun 1924

**Reprinted**

November 2003 Kartika 1925

**PD 25T GR**

notesclues.com

© National Council of Educational Research and Training, 2003

**ALL RIGHTS RESERVED**

- No part of this publication may be reproduced, stored in a retrieval system or transmitted, in any form or by any means, electronic, mechanical, photocopying, recording or otherwise without the prior permission of the publisher.
- This book is sold subject to the condition that it shall not, by way of trade, be lent, re-sold, hired out or otherwise disposed of without the publisher's consent, in any form of binding or cover other than that in which it is published.
- The correct price of this publication is the price printed on this page. Any revised price indicated by a rubber stamp or by a sticker or by any other means is incorrect and should be unacceptable.

**OFFICES OF THE PUBLICATION DEPARTMENT, NCERT**

NCERT Campus Sri Aurobindo Marg New Delhi 110 016	108, 100 Feet Road Hosdakere Halli Extension Banashankari III Stage Bangalore 560 085	Navjivan Trust Building P.O. Navjivan Ahmedabad 380 014	CWC Campus Opp. Dhankal Bus Stop Panihati Kolkata 700 114	CWC Complex Maligaon Guwahati 781 021
---	--	---	--	---

**PUBLICATION TEAM**

*Editorial*      Gobind Ram  
*Production*    Atul Saxena  
*Cover*  
Amit Srivastava

R 22

*Printed on 70 GSM paper with NCERT watermark*

Published at the Publication Department by the Secretary, National Council of Educational Research and Training, Sri Aurobindo Marg, New Delhi 110 016, and Lasertypeset in-house and printed at Tan Prints (India) Pvt. Ltd., 44Km, Milestone, National Highway Rohtak Road, Village Rohad, Distt. Jhajjar, Haryana.

notesclues.com

## FOREWORD

Political Science is introduced as an elective subject at the higher secondary stage. At this stage, the study of civics, as a component of social science, has been dealt with in a very general manner avoiding the rigours of Political Science. In fact, during the first ten years of schooling the learners study the working of civic and political institutions, and the contemporary problems facing India and the world. In consonance with the objectives of general education, the focus during these years is on the development of an understanding of the various civic and political processes which form an important component of an integrated social science syllabus which has been introduced up to the secondary stage.

The present book entitled *Political Science: Key Concepts and Theories* is a new book based on NCERT's new syllabus of political science developed as a follow up of the *National Curriculum Framework for School Education - 2000* (NCFSE - 2000). In keeping with the approach of the new syllabus an attempt has been made to develop in the learners' interest in the key concepts and major theories of Political Science. The learners will also be acquainted with the approaches by which political scientists study political phenomena. The key concepts and theories have been discussed keeping in view the Indian and Western Perspectives.

Some of the core areas mentioned in the NCFSE - 2000 have been suitably infused into the relevant chapters of the book. Besides, the terminal exercises at the end of each chapter, the book also contains a glossary of difficult terms and concepts.

The Council is grateful to the learned author, the editor, the subject experts, teachers and members of the review workshop for their academic contributions and suggestions.

Comments and suggestions from the readers, for the improvement of this textbook will be welcome.

New Delhi  
January 2003

**J.S. RAJPUT**  
Director  
National Council of Educational  
Research and Training

notesclues.com

www.notesclues.com

notesclues.com

## PARTICIPANTS OF THE REVIEW WORKSHOP

V. R. Mehta  
*Vice Chancellor (Retd.)*  
Delhi University, Delhi

Nalini Pant  
*Professor (Retd.)*  
Banaras Hindu University  
Varanasi, Uttar Pradesh

S. N. Jha  
*Professor (Retd.)*  
JNU  
145, HIG Duplex, Nitikhanda III  
Indrapuram  
Ghaziabad, Uttar Pradesh

R. S. Pasricha  
*Vice Principal (Retd.)*  
DAV School, Yusuf Sarai  
331-B, Mianwali Colony  
Gurgaon, Haryana

R. K. Anand  
*Director*  
School of Correspondence Course  
Delhi University, Delhi

M. L. Sawhney  
*PGT (Political Science)*  
Govt. Boy's Sr. Sec. School  
Sector VII, R. K. Puram  
New Delhi

V. P. Pandey  
*Reader (Political Science)*  
4, Ghalib Apartments  
Pitampura, Delhi

Vijay Lakshmi  
*Senior Teacher (Political Science)*  
Green Fields School  
Safdarjung Enclave, New Delhi

S. C. Jha  
*Reader (Political Science)*  
ARSD College  
Delhi University, Delhi

Poonam Prasad  
*Reader (Political Science)*  
D-II/ 21, West Kidwai Nagar  
New Delhi

Uma Anand  
*Reader (Political Science)*  
R-837, New Rajinder Nagar  
New Delhi

P. S. Khare  
*Principal (Retd.)*  
108-A, Patel Nagar  
Meerapur  
Allahabad, Uttar Pradesh

A. P. Jain  
*Teacher*  
199, Railway Road  
Meerut City, Uttar Pradesh

S. M. Sharma  
S.R.S.D. Sr. Sec. School  
New Delhi

### **NCERT Faculty**

#### **Department of Education in Social Sciences and Humanities**

Sanjay Dubey  
*Reader (Political Science)*

W. Themmichon  
*Lecturer (Political Science)*

Supta Das  
*Lecturer S. Grade (Coordinator)*

notesclues.com

# Gandhiji's Talisman

I will give you a talisman. Whenever you are in doubt or when the self becomes too much with you, apply the following test:

Recall the face of the poorest and the weakest man whom you may have seen and ask yourself if the step you contemplate is going to be of any use to him. Will he gain anything by it? Will it restore him to a control over his own life and destiny? In other words, will it lead to Swaraj for the hungry and spiritually starving millions?

Then you will find your doubts and your self melting away.

M.K. Gandhi

notesclues.com

# CONSTITUTION OF INDIA

## Part IV A

# Fundamental Duties of Citizens

### ARTICLE 51A

Fundamental Duties – It shall be the duty of every citizen of India —

- (a) to abide by the Constitution and respect its ideals and institutions, the National Flag and the National Anthem;
- (b) to cherish and follow the noble ideals which inspired our national struggle for freedom;
- (c) to uphold and protect the sovereignty, unity and integrity of India;
- (d) to defend the country and render national service when called upon to do so;
- (e) to promote harmony and the spirit of common brotherhood amongst all the people of India transcending religious, linguistic and regional or sectional diversities; to renounce practices derogatory to the dignity of women;
- (f) to value and preserve the rich heritage of our composite culture;
- (g) to protect and improve the natural environment including forests, lakes, rivers, wildlife and to have compassion for living creatures;
- (h) to develop the scientific temper, humanism and the spirit of inquiry and reform;
- (i) to safeguard public property and to abjure violence;
- (j) to strive towards excellence in all spheres of individual and collective activity so that the nation constantly rises to higher levels of endeavour and achievement.

<b>FOREWORD</b>	<b>v</b>
<b>Unit I : Key Concepts: Indian and Western Perspectives</b>	<b>1</b>
1. Law	3
2. Liberty	9
3. Equality	19
4. Justice	23
5. Human Rights	30
6. Dharma	36
<b>Unit II : State and the Citizen</b>	<b>41</b>
7. Rights and Duties : Meaning and Relationship	43
8. The Changing Nature of State Activity	52
<b>Unit III : Comparative Politics</b>	<b>57</b>
9. Approaches to the Study of Comparative Politics : Traditional and Modern	59
10. Political Socialisation, Political Participation and Political Development	65
11. Modes of Representation	74
<b>Unit IV : Major Political Theories</b>	<b>79</b>
12. Liberalism	81
13. Socialism	87
14. Marxism	92
15. Fascism	100
16. Gandhism	106
17. Humanism	113
<b>GLOSSARY</b>	<b>117</b>



---

**UNIT I**

**KEY CONCEPTS**

**INDIAN AND WESTERN PERSPECTIVES**

---

notesclues.com

www.notesclues.com

notesclues.com

**CHAPTER 1****Law****WHAT IS LAW?**

**T**HE term law has different connotations. There is natural law, moral law, law of supply and demand and law of the state. It may mean rules telling us what we ought to do (moral law). It may also imply that there are certain regularities in nature or society (natural or scientific law). The first is a normative view and the second positivistic view. The normative view tends to argue that laws embody fundamental truth about processes of nature, while the positivists argue that laws are rules of conduct in a defined community. They are a system of legal conditions to regulate human conduct in society. To Austin it was a command of a sovereign to all others in society having for its sanction the force of the physical power of the state. Holland declared: "A law is a general rule of external action enforced by a sovereign political authority". According to this view law is a relationship between a superior and inferiors who are in a condition of habitual obedience.

Making a distinction between the moral and the state law, some theorists maintain that the existence of law is

dependent on its moral validity; while others hold that the validity of law is purely a technical question. It can only be decided in terms of legal criteria available at a particular time. A 'Law' is a law, right or wrong, if it has received the approval of the decision-making body of the state. However, whenever there is a conflict between enacted law and the moral order, such enactment lacks legitimacy in the eyes of the people. Barker emphasised the same idea when he said that every law must have 'validity' as well as value; 'validity' refers to the formal character of law and 'value' to the moral sense of the community. If a legal judgement is in accordance with the law, it has to be accepted. However, acceptance of a judgement rests on the community's sense of right and justice. In short, a law has to be seen in totality in which both legal and moral aspects merge with each other.

Another aspect of the debate is the relation between coercion and obligation in a legal system. Positivists maintain that citizens are obliged to obey law. Those who disobey a law are liable to be punished by the coercive

4) power of the state. Whatever be the nature of law, the important thing is the authority of the state behind it. Citizens do not have any choice. Such coercive quality is less noticeable in certain areas of law, as for example in International Law. But positivists regard coerciveness as the essence of the obligatory nature of law. This view is contested on three grounds:

- (i) Not all laws impose obligation. Many laws confer enjoyment of powers or rights. Such laws are the best example where no coercion is implied.
- (ii) The existence of obligation under law depends on its being morally valid. Rousseau maintained that our obligation to obey a particular law can be moral only when we are impelled to obey a system of law out of a sense of duty, perhaps by promptings of our moral consciousness without any compulsion from external power. Force reduces human beings to abject slavery. Therefore, it cannot be a legitimate basis of law. Might can never be the basis of right. Rousseau emphatically declared that to yield to force may be an act of prudence. In this case, therefore, legal obligation becomes derivative of political obligation which, in turn, depends on the general belief about the legitimacy of authority.
- (iii) Law also has to be viewed as a part of the institutional system in society. Courts do not deliver judgements in isolation. Besides

judiciary, there are other organised social institutions as legislature, executive and political parties. The entire legal system is dependent on them and cannot function in isolation from politics, society and economy. It is in this sense that legal order is related to the protection of rights and securing social justice to all. These are the grounds for imposition of legal obligations and not only the results of those obligations. Our obligation to obey law largely depends upon the ends which it fulfils, and the feeling of identity which is generated in the minds of citizens by upholding a system of justice, fairness and right.

In this sense, a law has to combine both what Dworkin has called "principle" and "policy". While 'Principle' is identical with rights, 'policy' is identical with utility. Rights are claims secured to individuals as a matter of principle and justice; policies refer to the collective good of the community as a whole. The system of law should be such as would combine both. It is in this sense that positivist view of law cannot be detached from the moral view.

The Marxian system has a distinctive view. It rejects the notion that there is a universal system of law. Lenin once said, "Law is politics". In the Communist countries, particularly the erstwhile Soviet Union, law is declared as "class" law and "proletarian" law. The Soviet system,

therefore, viewed law as an instrument for the realisation of class ideology. They also regarded International Law as an instrument to advance the goals of the Soviet society.

In view of what has been said, it is difficult to give an exact definition of law. However, a working definition could be: 'A law is a set of generally accepted rules and regulations governing interrelationships in human society seeking to create order and balanced development of all'.

### SOURCES OF LAW

Where does law come from? The sources of law can be varied. The idealistic source of law is natural law. It is often referred to as expression of 'right reason' of man. It is supposed to embody universal common agreement based on human intelligence and understanding. In ancient India, *Dharma* was one such concept. It was concerned with goals of law. But very few agree about the content of either natural law or principles of *Dharma*.

The other sources of law are constitutions, statutes, conventions, treaties, administrative rules and regulations. The orders of the executive and decisions of the courts are also the sources of law.

Austin described law as a command of the sovereign who receives habitual obedience from the people living within his jurisdiction. For him, authority rather than right reason was the source of law.

### TYPES OF LAW

⑤

There are two kinds of laws, viz. private and public. A private law refers to those rights, goods and services which would be secured to the individual regardless of the existence of the state. It includes such things as family laws, property laws and laws of succession. In such cases the role of the state is merely to recognise and enforce the relevant law. Public law, on the other hand, is related to the rights of the citizens and the state.

Some of the examples of the public law are international law, municipal law, constitutional law, administrative law, etc. International law is a set of generally accepted rules and regulations controlling the conducts of nations, international organisations and individuals. It is different from Municipal law which deals with the relationship between the individuals and their organisations within a state. While each state has its own municipal laws, the international law is common to all states and individuals. The International Court of Justice is charged with the responsibility of adjudicating the controversies arising under International law.

Constitutional law is a set of standards, rules and practices controlling the functions and powers of the Government and its subsidiary machineries. In our system, the Supreme Court of India is the highest court entrusted with the task of adjudicating disputes arising out of the constitutional law.

The private law, thus, refers to 'civil society' while the public law refers to the state. However, society has two kinds of law. A family cannot be isolated from property and property is integrally related to the system of taxation, torts and contracts. It is for this reason that some people believe that there can be no differentiation between different types of law.

Whatever the distinction between public and private law, the indisputable fact is that law is almost a universal human need. No society can exist without a legal order. We need institutions and a framework of rules and regulations to provide firmness to our mutual relations. Without law there would be complete anarchy in society. That is why we regard Rule of Law as the essence of civilised living. It provides certainty to our relationships. It emphasises that laws ought to be general in character so that there is no arbitrariness in their exercise. It also emphasises complete equality before law and equal conformity to law by officials and individuals.

Let us emphasise, however, that all laws are not conducive to human good or protect our rights or help those who are the least advantaged by the system. In fact, there are laws, which tend to destroy our freedom and humanity. Rowlatt Act of 1919 was one such law. It led to Jallianwala Bagh tragedy.

## **LAW AND MORALITY**

The relationship between law and morality is complex. As we have already

seen, issues about law are not as simple as they appear. There is no agreement about the nature of morality either. We shall not go into what constitutes morality. Here we shall only briefly state the relationship between law and morality.

Cynics believe that there is no connection between law and morality. Law is something definite and objective and has nothing to do with morality which is vague and subjective. According to them, law is not concerned with values. 'Good' and 'just' are not its subject matter. It is concerned with 'what is' and not with 'what ought to be'. It is argued that moral concepts are essentially contested and in case of a dispute one is helpless. But in the case of law there are courts to adjudicate and give a firm interpretation.

It is true that both the words do not mean the same thing. A thing may be legally right and morally wrong. When we say that an action is legal all that is meant is that it is in accordance with the law of the day. When we say that a particular action is moral, all that is meant is that it is in accordance with accepted norms of the society. This distinction helps us to differentiate legal and moral aspects of law.

However, it should be clear that sometimes moral and legal considerations overlap. In fact, moral considerations have influenced the making or enforcement of laws and conversely, morality itself has been shaped by laws. Both of them interact with each other. As we have seen, we are morally obliged to obey the laws of

our country. But if laws lose moral aspect, they will not be effective. The notions of 'value' and 'rightness' in the legal system are tied to its being moral in the eyes of the people.

There is another sense in which morality is relevant to law. Whenever a law is not clear, the judges use the concepts of natural law, equity and justice to decide the issue. Again, there are situations when law has to pronounce judgement on moral issues. For instance, laws of marriage. In all cases law will have to decide in the context of the moral character of the parties involved. In deciding cases of libel or slander the courts take moral considerations into account. In fact all courts insist on taking oath by witnesses. It will be meaningless if moral obligation meant nothing. Questions of good faith and moral intent keep arising from time to time.

Law is also used to protect and enforce morality. At least that is the view the ancient Indians took when they thought of law in the context of *Dharma*. Law cannot be viewed in isolation. It is a part of society and is interwoven into its fabric. That is why law deals with murder, theft, perjury, incest, cruelty to animals. All these are prohibited by law and are contrary to morality. What is considered as harmful depends generally upon the common values of a community.

There are different views of morality. Many levels and stages of argument come into play. There are individual moralities for which each individual takes responsibility upon himself. There

are collective moralities also which stress the social side of moral behaviour. These moralities are also known as public morality. Some laws may offend our personal morality and we may have to decide on our own whether to obey such laws or to offer resistance. Similarly, some laws may be incompatible with collective morality — morality of tribes. However, there is a general agreement that as far as possible, the state should not attempt to enforce personal morality. As far as the public morality is concerned, the relationship is complex. Sometimes law embodies it. But at times we know that a particular thing is against public morality and yet we would not like the state to enforce it. Lying is against all moral principles but except in court on oath, it is not prohibited by law. It is not prudent to have laws which are difficult to enforce or which are not likely to be followed by others at all. It is bad to pass laws which don't have the support of the majority. Such a law will not only cause lot of suffering in the process of enforcement but will also shake public faith in the effectiveness of the legal system.

Sometimes law may be at variance with collective morality. In such cases the question may arise whether we have a moral obligation to obey such a law. However, law is necessary not merely for maintenance of order but, at least in part, also for good life. It must be kept in mind that law can and in some cases should enforce morality; it should do so with great care, otherwise morality becomes rigid and loses its dynamism. Morality must be dynamic. It must respond to changes in society.

## EXERCISES

8

1. What do you understand by the term 'Law'?
2. Distinguish between Moral Law and State Law.
3. What is the meaning of Positivists' view of the theory of law?
4. What are the various sources of Law?
5. Distinguish between private and public law.

www.notesclues.com

notesclues.com



## **CHAPTER 2**

---

# **Liberty**

### **WHAT IS LIBERTY?**

**T**HE concept of liberty is complex with strong emotional connotations. The term has acquired different meaning at different times. Still there is a common thread through all its usages.

The most important sense in which liberty is used is when a rational person is able to exercise his choice without being subject to any external constraint. In this sense liberty is a necessary condition for free and full development of our personality. Without it we cannot be rational or act or achieve what seems best to us. To have liberty is to be able to act according to one's wishes, to translate one's dreams into reality and to actualise one's potential. It is the essence of humanity; and provides substance to the notion of responsibility. It is the ideal to which all of us aspire.

A man is free if he is not prohibited by others. Liberty may also mean freedom to do something or enjoying one's powers. When we are able to do what we want to do, we are said to be free. It may mean immunity from authority's exercise of arbitrary powers. It means freedom to act independently

without any fear of punishment. Then there is freedom under law. Citizens have liberty insofar as what law permits them to do or not to do. There are mainly two senses in which the concept is used: Negative and Positive.

### **NEGATIVE LIBERTY**

The negative view implies that we need liberty to protect ourselves from undue interference of the state. It implies an area in which man can do what he likes to do without being obstructed by others. There are some obstructions, which are natural. For instance, one cannot read because of blindness. But there are other areas where there is a deliberate attempt on the part of others to interfere in the area in which one could act. There is no agreement on how wide the area could or should be. There is, however, an agreement that this area cannot be unlimited otherwise there will be a social chaos. The area of free action must be limited by law but there should be a certain minimum area of personal freedom which on no account should be violated. Such was the view of Locke and Mill in England and Tocqueville in France. "The

fundamental sense of freedom", says Sir Isaiah Berlin, "is freedom from chains, from imprisonment, from enslavement by others. The rest is extension of this sense....."

Mill and others believed that unless such an area is guaranteed to individuals, civilisation cannot advance. We shall never know the truth. There will be no scope for originality or genuine moral courage. Mill argued that society will be crushed by the weight of collective mediocrity.

But this view of negative liberty suffers from following grave drawbacks:

- (i) Mill's argument that without liberty truth will not come out is not empirically correct. History shows that love for truth grows even in communities where there is strict discipline.
- (ii) Liberty in this sense is concerned with area of control and not with its source. It is not necessary to have democracy to enjoy this liberty. An autocrat may leave his subjects with a wide variety of liberty and yet be unjust or encourage inequalities. The question 'who governs?' is as important as the question 'How far does government interfere with me?'
- (iii) The job of the state is reduced to the minimum. The state is a necessary evil.

Herbert Spencer summed-up the negative view where he said "The state exists because crime exists in society, otherwise there would be no need of a

state." This is inconsistent with the view of the state as a welfare institution trying to create condition in which everyone will be able to realise his or her potential. The negative view does not adequately take into account the fact that poverty or lack of land, capital and political power are all grave obstacles to realisation of our powers. It does not see that these obstacles are an inevitable part of socio-economic system, and have to be removed by law for attaining the common good.

### **POSITIVE LIBERTY**

The positive view of liberty implies two things:

- (i) It implies the right to participate in sovereign authority. It is involved in answer to the question 'Who is the source of control or interference?'. It accepts the individual self-direction as final. It means ability to live according to one's own conscious purposes, to act and decide oneself rather than be acted upon and decided by others.
- (ii) It implies freedom of 'rational self'. Rousseau and other idealists believed that man is rational and it is this which distinguishes human beings from other creatures. They called this 'real self' inasmuch as it identifies ourselves with the social whole of which we are a part. Man can be controlled for the fulfilment of his real self. Rousseau gave us the concept of 'General Will' which was

an organisation and synthesis of 'goodwill' of all of us. Rousseau thought that the General Will could force us into obedience, because liberty was nothing but coercion by individual's own 'real self'.

This view rightly recognises that true development of man consists in the development of his powers as an integral part of a society. His ideas, aims and aspirations are social products, and they, in turn, exercise their influence upon the development of society. It is argued that whenever man finds his social existence frustrating, he has a right to expect that the state would come to his rescue. There must be interference of the state to protect one against the interference by other individuals.

This view brings into bold relief that the negative view of liberty did not sufficiently appreciate the value of man's capacity for 'rational understanding, for moral judgement and action, and for aesthetic creation and contemplation'. The positive view is identical to Indian notion of *Swaraj* which literally means complete mastery over oneself and demands that all forms of domination should be ended.

But this does not follow that every state interference is designed to increase liberty. The state power has often been abused in the past to serve the interest of one individual or class or caste.

Indeed the danger with this view is that any attack on freedom can be justified in the name of real freedom.

The state, general will, a class or a nation become super agencies. They come to be identified as real selves; and attack on freedom can then be manipulated. The more we exalt the state or the more we exalt those who speak in the name of the state, the more are the chances of these agents abusing their powers in their private interest. It is because of lack of realisation of this that the doctrine has in the past been perverted to deny the very freedom for human self-development.

Marxist thought rejects both negative and positive views; accordingly there can be no freedom in a capitalist system. Workers collectively are forced to sell their labour. Capitalism leads to domination of workers by capitalists. In order to be free, Marxists maintain, there must be a rational control of productive forces in society by the state. Marxism rightly highlights that an impoverished or propertyless labourer cannot be free. He has absolutely no bargaining power. But the danger is that there is a tendency in such a society to be tyrannised by its own institution. Bureaucracies and the party become extremely powerful and tend to disregard general interest.

Everyone agrees that freedom is valuable and necessary but there is no agreed concept of freedom. Our discussion however, suggests that the following conditions must be fulfilled before we can be called free:

- (i) Freedom must be enjoyed by all. Freedom may, however, require a system of planning, regulation

and control. John Rawls argues that everyone should enjoy the widest liberty consistent with the liberty of all. This he interprets to mean that we must do what we can to ensure that even the least advantaged will enjoy freedom as a goal worth pursuing. This view implies something like a Welfare State.

- (ii) Sufficient checks must be provided in the form of rights, rule of law and adherence to institutional arrangements of society.
- (iii) There must be some area left to the individual in which the state will not interfere without sufficient reasons.

### TYPES OF LIBERTY

There are three types of liberty—political, economic and natural or moral. By political liberty we mean the maintenance of an atmosphere in which the state does not interfere in an individual's life without sufficient and compelling reasons. Thus, the liberty of speech and expression must not be interfered with by the government, because any interference with it might muffle public opinion which stands for truth. Without such an assurance our liberty is of no avail. Political liberty has two aspects — it implies that society shall not remain subservient to any other society. It would have complete autonomy to manage its own affairs. Every society has its own peculiar and distinctive character which must be

preserved by it; only then it is fit to contribute its best to the ever-flowing stream of civilisation. A colonial country, or a country perpetually dependent on others, or which is ruled by others is like a dead body which has no life and vitality. Every society has its own peculiar ethos, which can be developed only when it is not dependent on others and when it has complete liberty to manage its own affairs. When Tilak declared, 'Swaraj is My Birth Right', he meant that so long as one country is in the clutches of another, it cannot develop according to its genius or realise its ends.

Secondly, political liberty also implies that the state or its agents shall not use their powers to interfere or control individual autonomy. It implies creation of an atmosphere in which individuals will not live in fear of persecution for holding beliefs or expressing views contrary to what holders of power at a particular time have. It also means rule of law as against the rule of human caprice.

The state should interfere only when it is absolutely necessary and is demanded by the happiness or interest of the society at large. Indiscriminate interference, not warranted by the above considerations, destroys individual's freedom. It makes individual a mere puppet or a lifeless machine. Here we should bear in mind that it is only when individuals are made to feel that the state seeks to make their lives better that they obey the state. The moment this feeling disappears, discontent, anarchy and

sometimes even violent disturbances overtake the state, a phenomenon which either destroys it beyond repair, or influences a new life and vigour into it.

Political liberty in its internal aspects is too often tied up with citizen's participation in the affairs of state. No doubt this participation constitutes an important segment of the full circle of political freedom. But there are other segments too. For example, if in a democracy the machinery of the state is in the hands of self-seeking and corrupt politicians or officials who make use of it to further their own selfish interests in wanton disregard of general welfare, there is, in effect, no real political freedom. Even if it exists, it is a farce. It is true that we must have a right to vote so that we can translate our consent into practice, but this right would be meaningless in a society where officials tamper with ballot boxes, or politicians use all sorts of devices to make democracy a farce. Anyone who is familiar with the history of England in the nineteenth century or India or Pakistan or some other under-developed countries today will realise the urgency of having rulers and politicians who are imbued with a spirit of sacrifice, who have knowledge enough to grasp the basic needs of society, and who have sincerity enough to pursue the public good ruthlessly. No state can survive for long, if it does not make an attempt to harmonise its authority with the general good of society. If both are in harmony, society flourishes and gives stimulation to the finer aspects of life. But if both are at

loggerheads, sooner or later one' or both are destroyed. A Frankenstein's monster will never produce a free people. It is only a state which regards general happiness as its own happiness, and works to realise such happiness in practice can be lasting.

Civil liberty is the most important component of political liberty. It is available to citizens in all democratic countries. Our own constitution guarantees it. It means the right of every man to stand on trial on equal terms in the courts of the land. No one has a special prerogative. There are no *jagirdars* or *zamindars* who could claim special privileges. The most important defence of civil liberty is the writ of the Habeas Corpus. A person who has been detained can apply for this writ. It is, to quote Dicey, "an order calling upon a person by whom a prisoner is alleged to be kept in confinement to bring such prisoner to have his body, when the name habeas corpus, before the Court to let the Court know on what grounds the prisoner is confined and thus to give the Court the opportunity of dealing with the prisoner as the law may regulate". Every person is considered innocent before he is proved guilty. Civil liberty requires that a prisoner must be found guilty of breaking some law, or else he must be set free. In an authoritarian system, a person can be taken prisoner in the middle of the night can be removed to a concentration camp, or kept under protective custody. He has no remedy available to him against arbitrary exercise of power. In these systems it is the executive and not the judiciary which

decides whether the person can be set at liberty.

One important aspect of civil liberty is the freedom of speech and expression. It implies freedom to communicate one's thoughts to others. It implies freedom of speech, freedom to print and to speak in public. It also implies freedom of conscience, and enjoins all of us to practice tolerance. We owe much of freedom of speech and expression to ancient Athens. Our own law gives too emphasised its importance. But in Athens it reached its high watermark. Socrates became the first martyr for its sake. His life in a way exemplifies the paradox of freedom. He was condemned to death because he preached beliefs and ideas unpalatable to the government of the day. He told his judges, "Daily discussion of the matters about which you hear me conversing is the highest good for man." He was of the opinion that life in which there is no such discussion is not worth living.

But Socrates was also aware of the responsibilities of a person who enjoys freedom of speech and expression. It cannot be used for libellous or seditious purposes. If Socrates promised silence and stopped perpetual discussion, the jury was prepared to acquit him. But "I shall not change my ways", he said, "though I die a thousands deaths". He upheld the freedom of speech and expression, but denied the right of sedition. Speaking of man's debt to his country, as he lay in prison, he told Crito, that every person ought to respect his country and submit to her and work for her when she is in need.

Social liberty implies freedom from orthodoxy or narrow walls of fanaticism or any social compulsion to make people conformists. The majority 'has a tendency to suppress the minority and become tyrannical. In the past so many great human souls have been sent to the scaffold simply because they held beliefs which were contrary to the beliefs of the majority of members in society. Indeed the tyranny of majority can be much worse than the tyranny of one man; for the former, if it chooses, can penetrate into almost all the nooks and corners of the life of individual. Therefore, it is the responsibility of the state to remove obstacles in the way of an individual pursuit of autonomy and free articulation of his faculties without any fear.

Economic liberty provides an opportunity to get all the basic things of sustenance, without depending on the will of somebody else. Economic liberty is the backbone of a free society, human being who is to depend constantly on somebody else for the wants of tomorrow cannot be expected to adhere to any notion of civic virtue. He is likely to lose even the basic sediments of humanity. This applies as much to the state as to the individual. A state which depends too much on foreign assistance, sooner or later, is compelled to compromise its freedom for the economic advantage it gets in return. The experience of the countries of Latin America is the best example. Similarly, an individual who is constantly haunted by the nightmare of hunger, disease and poverty cannot

lead an autonomous life. He/she becomes incapable of contributing his best to society. The phrase 'basic things of sustenance', however, does not include all the riches or the consumer articles which our civilisation has thrown up in a great variety. It only means securing of one's daily bread without having to depend on other's will. In this connection Laski says, "let there be sufficiency for all before there can be superfluity for some". A human being who is constantly worried about bread from dawn to dusk; who is frustrated, ignorant, living an aimless existence, who has to depend upon somebody else's will for his sustenance cannot exercise his autonomy. For want of economic liberty, sometimes, a person is obliged to sacrifice ones character, and even ones political liberty.

Indeed, political liberty has no meaning unless it is founded on the basis of economic liberty. Such a notion of economic liberty also implies that everyone in society, if one has the capacity or will to work, will get enough to enable one to participate in social and political life without any hindrance. Thus, a labourer, who can be dismissed by his employer without an impartial enquiry enjoys very little of economic freedom. Indeed for a starving person democracy or its paraphernalia has very little meaning. It has been a recurring phenomenon in human history and more so in societies in which poverty is writ large that persons devoid of their means of subsistence convulse the societies with violent revolutions.

Liberals thinkers put more emphasis on social and political liberty. They have mustered up all the armoury at their command to prove that democracy is a superior form of government than any other known so far. They have sought to build up a strong case for the minimum role of the state in the lives of individuals. It is argued that things should be left to the individual's own initiative because mostly the progress of humanity has been due to this spirit of individual initiative and adventure. John Stuart Mill argued that even if an act was badly done by an individual, it should be done by him as a part of his moral education. But this line of thinking ignores the vital fact that there might arise circumstances beyond an individual's control, which are destructive of his very existence as a moral being. There are large number of people in India who live below poverty line and in reality enjoy very limited freedom.

Liberty to vote or of religion and morality has no meaning for them. They even suspect that the state itself has become an instrument of the economically well-off classes for exploiting them. Indeed, to talk of the right to vote or to talk of religion in relation to a starving man has no meaning. A nation of paupers, sooner or later, meets its nemesis. Either the poverty-stricken class meekly reconciles itself to its status under the vain belief of past *Karma* (action of previous birth) or it is driven to resort to various kinds of resistance which offer it any glimmer of hope, and

sometimes even to violent revolution. In such societies the power of money may become the most important power. Votes are sold and purchased during an election. A starving man may find five chunks of gold, ill-gotten or well-gotten; and for him his duty to vote for the right person is much less important than to quench his thirst and hunger.

Let us not forget that even Rana Pratap at one weak moment of life, finding his son weeping for a loaf of bread, decided to accept the overlordship of Akbar, the Emperor of India. If this weak moment could come in the life of Rana Pratap, how can we expect ordinary people to safeguard their own liberty in the face of adverse circumstances.

Moral liberty, as Kant perceived, implies personal autonomy so that we are complete masters of ourselves. Moral freedom consists in the pursuit of the 'universal objects', i.e. of objects which impart character and solidarity to society. It can be attained only through a process of self-sacrifice and self-purification inherent in what the Ancient Indians called the *saatvik* way of life. The strength of a state, in the final analysis, depends not upon its wealth or armaments or even its numbers but upon the spirit of sacrifice for the common good or general welfare, which its citizens have.

However, moral liberty is not the freedom of the ascetics far removed from the din and the noise of the world. For the world around is a reality and perhaps the supreme reality. If there is something beyond it, we do not know.

Moral freedom, therefore, lies in harmony of impulses in one's private life. It can be attained through the pursuit of creative things or *saatvik* things. In social life it consists in identifying oneself with society through love, sacrifice, friendship and sympathy. The first is through virtue and the other through friendship. Moral freedom in this sense, however, is beyond the scope of the state. The state can provide all the necessary conditions for the pursuit of moral life but cannot make a human being who has neither the capacity nor the desire to be moral. And therefore, as far as the state is concerned, it has only to create that atmosphere in which people have an opportunity to develop and exercises all the virtues underlined above. Political and economic liberty are meaningless unless they provide scope for the realisation of the ends of moral liberty. Conversely, the idea of moral liberty is hard to attain in a society where there is either complete, mechanical regimentation or the society is full of poverty and squalor or where there is an undue craze for wealth.

### LAW AND LIBERTY

Law lays down what a citizen is free to do and is not free to do. Since the state controls coercive power, its law is able to secure freedom to all by preventing coercion by an individual or group. Liberty does not mean absolute freedom to do whatever one wants. We often inflate our demands. An absolutely free society is an impossibility.



Such a situation will lead to anarchy in which no one except the powerful will be able to exercise his freedom. We can be absolutely free in a vacuum in which there are no other individuals. This is so because the moment there are other individuals we shall begin to coerce each other for the fulfilment of our demands and wishes. Therefore, law and liberty are closely connected. Law may be 'a necessary evil' and we may aim at minimum of law, but it is an inescapable condition necessary to secure freedom of all.

Some restrictions become necessary to enhance our liberty. Sometimes law restrains it in the name of public interest. The law of copyright, for example, restrains man's freedom of speech and expression because if there were no such law, we would prevent authors from reaping the fruits of their labour. Similarly, restriction of freedom to secure equal treatment of all is one such example. We insist that same price be charged to anyone for buying the same articles. We do not encourage people to open schools if they discriminate in the name of caste, religion, language or community.

But, as has been pointed out earlier, not every law is conducive to liberty. Law has often been abused. Not all laws are reasonable and just. Sometimes the authorities may promulgate a law in good faith but the decision they have made may be wrong or there may be no access to courts for justice so that there is no procedure for dealing with disputes except the will of the executive. Sometimes even the adjudication of the

courts may be arbitrary. People can be 'punished' for the crimes they have been alleged to have committed without proper investigation. That is why freedom from arbitrary exercise of authority has been claimed from the beginning or the government might have usurped power by insurrection or *coup d'etat* or there may have been foreign power ruling over us. If the ruler is arbitrary or unlawful, it will be difficult for anyone to disobey. Unless there are limitations, we lose our capacity to resist unlawful or arbitrary or immoral authority. We may be compelled to do a certain thing just for the fear of punishment like threat of death, torture or even of losing our job.

It is for this reason that checks and balances are created within the legal system. Rights are secured and immunities are granted so that citizens can know that there is nothing to fear from government. We insist on rule of law and independence of judiciary. Rights prescribe the limits beyond which the rulers cannot go. They define freedom of citizens vis-a-vis the government and are the most classic expression of freedom. They provide security against the exercise of arbitrary powers. We cannot freely participate in civic life unless we are free from coercion. It is for this reason also that we insist that the process by which law is administered should be proper. Freedom from coercion except by due process of law becomes the first condition of our being free in the larger sense of the term. The due process should be recognisable so that everyone

knows not only the decision but also as to how it is reached. This creates confidence in the minds of citizens. The citizens will know that the authorities cannot get them unless they have done a wrong in terms of a specific law. I may be in the bad book of the police, but I can be sure that I will not be punished unless I have violated a definite law.

Citizens are not only free, but they must know that they are free. These substantial as well as procedural safeguards protect people against the abuse of law. It is a need that has been felt more in recent times with the massive expansion of government activities in all spheres of life.

In the ultimate cases when the system is abused, people claim right to rebellion and duty of resistance in order

to protect their own liberty. The French Revolution was one such case. Legal positivists may be right in normal cases when they declare a law valid on the ground that it is enforceable. But in abnormal situations we are reminded of St. Augustine that states without justice are but rubber bands enlarged. Nazi system in Germany was effective but insane. The British rule in India was effective but exploitative. In such situations we may be obliged to obey in the sense that if we do not, we shall be shot dead; but there is no moral compulsion to obey. As Rousseau pointed out, we are obliged to obey only legitimate powers, which confirm to the community's sense of what is right and lawful. And every law must conform to this requirement of legitimacy.

### EXERCISES

1. Explain the concepts of Liberty.
2. Distinguish between 'Negative Liberty' and 'Positive Liberty'.
3. What is Political, Economic and Moral Liberty?
4. Discuss the relationship between Law and Liberty?
5. What do you understand by the freedom of speech and expression?

## CHAPTER 3

---

# Equality

### WHAT IS EQUALITY?

SOME people have viewed equality as the principle of absolute and unconditional equality. They emphasise that all men are similar in certain basic features and traits and, therefore, they ought to be treated as equal. Some have emphasised that 'all men are created equal'. Some religious traditions as well as thinkers argued that since all are children of God, they are equal. Early liberal thinkers argued that all men are equal because they share common natural rights. Utilitarians like Bentham argued that all share common capacity to experience pleasure or pain. Kant thought that all men are equal because they have the same capacity to be moral and formulate moral laws. For socialists men share a 'common humanity'; they have the same physical characteristics and social needs. All these views highlight that all men share certain basic characteristics and needs. Our Constitution rejects any discrimination on the basis of caste, class, creed, sex or race.

This argument implies that since human beings are equal they ought to be treated equally. But this is

impossible to achieve because they are found in different social settings. For instance, the character or the position of the family is bound to exercise influence upon the character of the child. So long as the family system exists, and there is no reason why it should not, it is impossible to create perfect equality.

It is for this reason that differences are justified in terms of relevant and sufficient reasons. Aristotle distinguished equal cases on the basis of virtue. Some are good at mathematics others at flute-playing. The first deserve training in mathematics and the latter deserve good flutes. Caste system was justified on the basis of different functional capacities of different individuals. Some contemporary egalitarians do so on the basis of need. All people should receive the same treatment. Anything else is irrational.

The argument of needs or virtue or merit is often linked to equality of opportunity. A child may have talent but the poverty of his parents may prevent him from developing it. That is why both 'nature' and 'nurture' are important. Plato conceived of a society

in which equally meritorious children are provided equal chance. Adequate opportunities mean that all shall have conditions necessary for the development of their personality. It implies that a daughter of a poor man, if she has some special nature or talent, will not be hampered by either the status of her parents or for want of money. It recognises the value of freedom and autonomy of the freedom to pursue one's own life plan. But we must have opportunities to pursue it.

Early liberals postulated absolute right to property. But it has been criticised on the ground that it does not take into account the need to distribute the resources of society. Without such distribution the weaker sections cannot maximise their freedom. We have realised, for instance, that protective discrimination in favour of the scheduled castes is necessary to make them equal and free.

Liberals have emphasised political equality. All should participate in the political process as equals. For this some argue in favour of direct democracy. Others think that since it is not possible in the modern states, which are large in size, we should go in for more and more decentralisation of political power.

Marxists and Socialists, emphasise economic equality. A few propertied people should not decide the fate of all. They criticise various kinds of inequalities in society because all these inequalities lead to concentration of power in a few hands. Some socialists plead for nationalisation of all wealth,

others think that it increases the hold of bureaucracy. This bureaucracy takes the place of the property owners. Socialists, therefore, plead for decentralisation of economic along with political power.

In a truly egalitarian society all have equal opportunities to satisfy their needs and realise their potential unaffected by political control, social discrimination and economic deprivation.

### **LIBERTY AND EQUALITY**

As one can see, the general concept of liberty is inseparably tied to the concept of equality. Liberty is the condition of equality and *vice-versa*. We can be free when we are autonomous and self-determining and we can be so only when we are equal. And yet people like Lord Acton believed them to be incompatible. In his lectures on liberty he declared that in the course of the French Revolution "the passion for equality made vain the hope of freedom." But such a concept as that of Acton is based on misunderstanding. Liberty does not mean mere absence of restraint. It is a more positive thing. It means to be autonomous and self-determining. It implies that whatever autonomy I have will not prevent others from equal autonomy. It implies that we are all equally entitled to realise our capacities. Equality is the condition in which this takes place to the maximum. When we say that men have a right to liberty, we imply equal liberty or equal claims. It is for this reason that equality is often identified with justice. The

amount of liberty that one has is only as much as is compatible with an equal amount for others. Let us try to delineate the relationship between liberty and equality in a few specific areas:

- (i) Political equality is best guaranteed in a democracy in which, as Bentham has pointed out, each citizen is to count for one. There have been cases when democracies led to dictatorships. That is why Tocquivelle thought that combination of democracy and aristocracy was the best guarantee of freedom. But, on the whole, the experience tells us that democracy guarantees liberty and equality more than any other form of government.
- (ii) Civil equality or equality before law is the basic pre-condition of freedom. It means that law will not depend on whims or caprice or partiality of those who rule. Law should equally guarantee security of person and property because it is only then that we can have conditions necessary for enjoyment of our autonomy or realisation of our excellence.
- (iii) Economic equality is also necessary. All laws and taxes diminish one's liberty. But sometimes they do so to increase the general liberty. A socialistic legislation which tries to check inequalities in society far from being a violation of liberty, is its necessary condition. It aims at

more and more equality by reducing the power' of the landlord or the capitalist to exploit the peasant or the worker respectively.

Consider a simple case of monopoly. If the total electric supply were controlled by one person, all others will not be able to exercise their freedom. The person, who controls electricity, will be able to extract whatever price is demanded. One could at the most commit theft. But if the ownership of electricity were equalised, the only loser of liberty would be the original monopolist. But the persons loss would be insignificant compared to the advantage of others. All laws, which favour equality in proportion to needs or capacity, therefore, do not conflict with liberty.

What then is the relationship between political equality, civil or legal equality and economic equality. One's right to participate in civic affairs is useless without freedom of speech and expression. Political freedom is meaningless without economic equality. Economic power gives influence, power and patronage may be used to destroy political freedom of others. Even legal equality is threatened in the absence of economic equality. The poor cannot engage a good lawyer or is not in a position to fight a protracted legal battle which may take years to decide. Equality is thus necessary to secure greater freedom to greater numbers.

Not all agree about the importance of equality. Some critics point out that the price to be paid for creation of

equality of opportunity is enormous. Our attempt to distribute income may lead to lower incentives. This will adversely affect efficiency in production. It may adversely affect family autonomy because it will lead to increased competition in the society. The ideal of equality may sometimes conflict with other social values. We might prevent people by using their own talents or their own chosen life plans. Equality as

defined by socialists may create the problem of bureaucracy which increases the gulf between labour and the state. Most contemporary equalitarians, however, defend some sort of a mixture of democratic and socialist equality. They argue for decentralisation of political power along with economic power as a necessary condition for the creation of an egalitarian society.

### EXERCISES

1. What do you understand by the term Equality?
2. 'Liberty is the condition of equality and vice-versa'. Explain.
3. What do you understand by Equality before law?
4. Distinguish between Political Equality and Social Equality.

## CHAPTER 4

# Justice

### WHAT IS JUSTICE?

THE word "justice" is derived from the Latin word *jungere* (to bind, to tie together) and *jus* (a bond or tie). As a joining idea, justice combines people together in a right or fair order of relationships by distributing to each person his or her *due* share of rights and duties, rewards and punishments. Justice does this by bringing about adjustment between people and between the principles of liberty, equality and co-operation. Traditionally, the principle of justice was taken to be a principle which *balances* or *reconciles* the principles of liberty, equality, etc. Such a balancing or reconciling is done with reference to some ultimate value, e.g. the value of the greatest happiness of the greatest number or the value of freedom and equality of all the members of a society. In this context, it may be noted that it is the balancing or reconciling nature of justice, which is represented in the figure of personified justice. The figure holds a balance in her hands; it is blindfolded to convey the idea of the formal equality of the subjects of law, i.e. an equality which

disregards differences of gender, religion, race, caste, wealth, etc.

We tend to judge a state on the basis of the ends it seeks to serve. It is believed that the laws of the state should secure justice to its citizens. But justice is not easy to explain. It is a complex concept. It is sometimes used as a legal concept and sometimes as a moral one. It may be regarded to flow from laws of the state. It may also be regarded as a concept which aims at the good of the whole society. From such notion of justice we can identify three important dichotomies in the concept of justice: (i) Legal and moral justice; (ii) General order and individual interest; (iii) Conservative and social justice.

(i) Legal justice deals with principles and procedures as laid down by the system of law prevailing in a state. The entire system is called justice. Sometimes a distinction is made between natural justice and legal justice. The natural justice deals with basic principles whereas legal justice deals with laws, customs, precedents enacted or made by human agencies. Moral justice, on the

other hand, deals with what is right and what is wrong, what are our rights and what are our duties as human beings, etc. Legal justice most of the time merely protects and enforces these rights and duties.

It does not mean that everything that happens in a court of law is justice. It may be legally right but can be criticised from moral angle as injustice. If a particular law fails to meet the requirement of moral ideal of justice it can be called injustice. Similarly, a system of administration can be called unjust, if it fails to meet the requirement of justice as fairness.

(ii) Justice on the one hand, is for the general order of society as a whole, and on the other it protects the individual. Criminal law is the best example. Its purpose is not merely to punish the criminal but also to protect the fabric of society. The individuals settle their claims against one another in terms of punishment or compensation for the crime. But in the process, it is backed by the general desire of society to be protected from harmful conduct.

This does not mean that social good always takes precedence over the individual good. The system of justice is supposed to stand for the rights of the individual. That the innocent should not be punished is the basic principle of all civilised systems of justice. However, there may be exceptional situations like war when the state may force an individual to conform to its own

notion of justice. The case of preventive detention without trial is an example of this. Justice, therefore, is concerned about the relationship between the individuals and also relationship between the individuals and the groups.

(iii) Some people believe that justice implies establishment of *status quo*. It seeks to protect freedom, person and property of the individual. This is called conservative justice. There is another concept of justice which is called social justice. It seeks to reform society in accordance with current idea of what is right or fair. In our own times it seeks to bring about changes in land distribution and property right. It also seeks to prevent discrimination on grounds of race, sex, caste or creed so that there is equitable distribution of national resources and wealth. All courts tend to shift their emphasis from time to time in order to suit the requirements of the people. Our own Supreme Court has been taking a very conservative position in property cases and very reformative attitude in defence of civil rights.

However, in all cases the idea of justice is equated with equity and fairness. Originally both these terms implied equality. Indeed, the notion of equality is in some sense central to any notion of justice. Our own constitution accepts equality before law as one of the fundamentals of the system of justice.



In the history of ideas, there are two major concepts of justice:

- (i) Numerical Concept of Justice
- (ii) Geometrical Concept of Justice

**(i) Numerical Concept of Justice**

It gives equal share to all. Jeremy Bentham said, "Everyone is to count for one, nobody for more than one". It means even unequal would be treated as equal. The Greek city states took the rule so far that many offices were filled by lot. The holding of an office did not call for any special knowledge or qualification. Modern liberal democracies are also based on this principle.

**(ii) Geometrical Concept of Justice**

Plato and Aristotle favoured this concept of justice. It is a concept of proportionate equality. It means equal share to equals and unequal to unequals. It also means that distribution of power and patronage should be proportionate to the worth or contribution of the individual. As Aristotle put it, if flutes are to be distributed, they should be distributed only among those who have the capacity for flute-playing. Similarly, only those people should rule who are capable of ruling. In this concept of justice, benefits and responsibilities are equated with the worth of recipient. Numerical Justice is sometimes called democratic justice and geometrical justice is equated with aristocratic justice.

In Plato's 'Republic' too justice is related to the social order. His idea of justice in the soul is analogous to justice in the state. In the individual it consists in keeping balance between different elements. It consists in giving due satisfaction to different elements such as appetite (labour class), courage (warrior class) and reason (ruling class). Justice in the state, according to Plato, consists in harmonious order between different social classes. When each class minds its own business and does the job for which it is naturally fitted and does not interfere with the job of others, there is justice in the state. The ancient Indian concept of *Dharma* also had similar implications insofar as it identified justice with harmony of social relations in terms of the principle of "my station and its duties". Rights or privileges of different individuals flowed from this principle of *Swadharma*.

Most people, however, agree that justice as equity or fairness does not mean strict equality. It is largely a matter of proportionate distribution in terms of morally justifiable differences. The state can discriminate on the basis of some classification. This classification can be in terms of sex or need or merit or ability. *Justice* in this sense is equality of circumstances. It means to treat like cases alike and unlike cases differently.

Our Constitution has accepted equality before law as the basic governing principle. But this does not mean that the judge should treat all alike. He will have to make a distinction between the innocent and guilty, sheep

and wolf. The judge has a right to make differences. The principle of fairness requires two things.

- (a) The judge should not be a respecter of privileges. He should not favour someone because one is rich and powerful and punish someone merely because one is poor.
- (b) The judge should discriminate only in terms of relevant differences. For example, in a criminal court the relevant differences will be one's guilt or innocence. Similarly, for appointment to teaching position the relevant difference would be one's capacity to teach.

All discrimination is not bad. Sometimes law has to discriminate in favour of some people to ensure larger good of society. Rawls would think that it is justice if the laws work in favour of least advantaged. Most socialists and Marxists would identify justice with eradication of exploitation of the weak or the working class. Some identify it with equality of opportunity. Others consider satisfaction of basic needs as basic to any concept of justice. There cannot be universal agreement about the areas where discrimination is just. But if the state is doing something for the least advantaged or weaker section of the society, it is obvious that it is working for the betterment of the people. This is known as protective discrimination.

It implies discrimination in favour of the weaker and the backward sections of society. It also implies giving

preferential treatment to the weaker section of the society. For example, in our society there has been a widespread practice of discriminating against the scheduled castes. The state is now entitled to discriminate in their favour. Without this kind of discrimination these people will not be able to lead a human life. Whatever the state does to secure them their rights is justice and it is covered by the words 'equity' and 'fairness'. The blacks in South Africa were discriminated against. The state system there was unjust because its practices were morally unjustifiable. There was no equality of any kind. The strong discriminated against the weak. The system thus worked in favour of the most advantaged section in society. The apartheid as it was practiced in South Africa is morally an offence, because it considers the powerful as superior to the less powerful on account of the racial lineage. In India the caste system, is bad not because it separates different groups but because it postulates a hierarchy in which some groups are considered superior to others on account of heredity.

The object of protective discrimination, however, is not to give special advantages to a particular section but to raise them to a level where they can take advantage of the principle of equality of opportunity and compete with other sections of society on equal footing--

The state, therefore, tries to remove imbalances in social, political and economic life. It provides employment, maternity benefits, insurance against

sickness and old age security. It tries to fulfil basic needs as also to eliminate unjust inequalities. As per *Laissez faire* the business of the state was only to hold the ring for the competition in the society. Everyone was left to oneself. If the weak perished it did not matter. But, the welfare state implies that everyone has a right to fulfilment of ones' basic needs. Fulfilment of these basic needs is a matter of justice.

The Communist view of justice goes a step further. Marx declared 'from each according to his ability, to each according to his needs'. It means that the burden should be distributed according to our capacity while benefits be distributed according to our needs. Merit does not come into the picture. The basic presumption is that all of us will spontaneously work for the common good and we shall be content to receive whatever the society gives us in lieu of that work. It expects all to contribute consciously to common good and not for any private good and be satisfied with the rewards given by the society. As we have seen earlier, there are problems with such a view. There is some selfishness in all of us and this view does not take that into account.

The welfare idea of distributive justice has been put forward by a combination of the socialists and the liberals. It accepts that fulfilment of basic needs of all is necessary. But once these needs are fulfilled, the individuals should be free to compete for greater benefits. People will differ about what could constitute the basic needs. Their views will vary from country to country

and person to person. A refrigerator in America is a basic need while in India it may be considered a luxury when millions live in dire poverty. But whatever the difference, there is a consensus that there should be a fulfilment of basic needs of all before we can allow fulfilment of superfluous needs of some. In our country people can obtain free medical aid in government hospitals. But if they want greater personal care and more facilities, they are expected to pay for it. The view is that protection against disease is basic but not the extra comforts of a private nursing home.

It is in this sense that social justice becomes important. Plato and Aristotle were perhaps right when they talked of distribution in terms of needs, ability and capacities. There are different spheres of justice. Each sphere has its own logic. Justice which is applicable to the realm of friendship is different from justice in the realm of state. We choose a friend according to our own liking. We are sometimes partial to them. There is nothing wrong in that. This is all the friendship is about. But we cannot be partial in the sphere of state. Duty to act *impartially* is built into the notion of equality before law.

## **SOCIAL JUSTICE IN INDIA**

At the time of Independence in 1947, India was one of the poorest countries in the world. It was largely a result of economic stagnation under the British. But another reason was the growth of many patterns of inequalities based on

caste, class and religion. That is why we accepted the goal of social justice from the beginning. The Preamble of the Indian Constitution proclaims that the Democratic Republic of India stands committed to securing to all its citizens "Justice, social, economic and political."

The state has provided for free and compulsory education to children. Since independence various programmes have been launched which aimed at tackling the problem of poverty. For instance, the Maharashtra Government had passed a legislation guaranteeing employment at a minimum rural wage there. The *Antyodaya* scheme aims at the upliftment of the poorest by helping them to acquire income earning assets. Various programmes like Farmer Development Agency Programmes have helped small farmers with holdings of less than two hectares by giving them special loans. The Five Year Plans have evolved programmes of fulfilment of minimum needs particularly for backward areas as well as backward people. The state has also taken various steps to improve health and sanitation, housing and education. The state has tried to provide living wage, good conditions of work and reasonable standards of living to all workers. In addition, some land reforms have been implemented and efforts have been made to contain growth of monopolies.

Special steps have been taken to improve the economic condition and social status of the scheduled castes and scheduled tribes. Reservations have been made in the services. The state has positively discriminated in their favour by giving them preferential treatment in schools, colleges and employment. Posts have been reserved in favour of backward classes also. The state has also made special provisions for the upliftment of the backward classes by reserving 27 per cent of government jobs as recommended by Mandal Commission. Awareness Generation Programme (AGP) undertaken by the government aims at improving the conditions of women by creating social awareness.

In spite of all this India still remains one of the poorest countries in the world. Disparities between the rich and the poor or in terms of caste, class, wealth and power are glaring. The legal process too is costly. Our budget on welfare programmes is also not adequate enough. In order to secure effective social justice, we shall have to work for speedy economic growth so that there are no financial constraints. We shall also have to make a concerted effort to reduce disparities by proper distribution of wealth and removal of inequalities of all kinds.

1. Explain the term Justice.
2. Distinguish between legal and moral justice.
3. Describe the two major concepts of justice in the context of history of ideas.
4. What is protective discrimination? Explain.
5. What measures have been taken in India to secure social justice to its citizens?

www.notesclues.com

## CHAPTER 5

---

### Human Rights

**R**IGHTS are essential conditions for good life. They help in the all round development of people and their personality. According to Harold Laski "Rights are those conditions of social life without which no man can be his best self". All societies and cultures have in the past developed some conception of rights and principles that should be respected. Some of these rights and principles are considered universal in nature. The struggle for the recognition of such rights and the struggle against political, economic, social and cultural oppression, against injustice and inequalities, have been an integral part of the history of all human societies. The concept of rights which every human being is entitled to enjoy by virtue of being a member of the human species have evolved through history in the course of these struggles.

The origin of the concept of human rights can be traced to the period of the Renaissance and afterwards to period of the Enlightenment. Humanism (about which you will read in detail in the latter part of this book) was the keynote of these periods. Humanism extolled man, stressed his essential worth and dignity, expressed deep faith

in his limitless creative potential and proclaimed freedom of the individual and inalienable rights of the individual. The two most important declarations, which inspired revolutionary movements the world over, were the American Declaration of Independence and the French Declaration of the Rights of Man and Citizen. The main concern of these movements was the ending of despotic rules, establishment of democratic politics and the protection of liberties of the individual. A new element to the evolving concept of human rights was added by the socialist movement, which emerged in the nineteenth century. It stressed on abolition of class rule and the establishment of social and economic equality.

The contemporary concept of human rights and its universal nature and recognition is thus based on the rich heritage of the past, and should be seen in the specific historical context of the twentieth century. The history of almost the half of the 20th century is characterized by the prevalence of colonial rule in a large part of the world. The rise of authoritarian governments in many countries and the

establishment of fascist, barbarous and aggressive regimes in some of these countries could be seen in this era. Besides, the rise of national liberation movements in the colonies and movements of democracy and social progress in various countries provided a framework for the popularisation of the theory of Human Rights in the entire world.

This period was also a witness to the most devastating wars in human history. It was during the closing years of the Second World War that the conceptualisation and articulation of human rights in its proper perspective took place. The most significant feature of the new conceptualisation was its universality. It was reflected in various declaration of the aims proclaimed by countries allied against fascism and militarism. It would be appropriate if we endeavour to know the meaning of the concept 'human rights'.

**MEANING OF HUMAN RIGHTS**

Like various other concepts of Political Science the term 'Human Rights' has been defined and understood in different ways. But in general and in the ultimate analysis, human rights revolve primarily around the basic theme of survival and well-being of human beings and respect for human dignity and humanity. Human rights are those minimal rights, which every individual must enjoy by virtue of being a member of the human society irrespective of any other consideration. Conceptually, the term 'Human Rights' has two

meanings. First, human rights are those inherent and inalienable rights, which are due to a person simply because of being human. These are moral rights which are derived from humanness of every human being and they aim at ensuring their dignity. Second, human rights are those rights that pertain to legal rights. Legal rights are established according to the law making processes of societies, both national and international. In the modern world scenario both the moral and the legal aspects of rights relating to life, liberty, equality and dignity of the individual represent the core of Human Rights.

Human Rights, common to all without discrimination, has found propagation in almost all societies. The principle of equality of the human race can be found in virtually every culture, civilisation, religion and philosophical tradition. Yet, there has always been some justification offered by states and societies for violation of human dignity and discrimination between the rights of the people on various grounds. The conflict between the concept of having rights from nature, and the state denying it led to the theory of legal rights. This means rights, to be secure, must be recognised by the state and guaranteed preferably through the Constitution. It is a matter of concern, that despite legal rights, various regimes have continued suppressing and coercing their citizens, by denying them the proclaimed equality and dignified human life. As such, there had been a growing belief that governments alone cannot be trusted to safeguard

the rights of people. It was felt that these rights require both national and international guarantee. The major pressure for the internationalisation of human rights gained momentum after the Second World War. During and preceding the War, totalitarian regimes grossly violated human rights in their own territories as well as in their occupied territories. These totalitarian regimes were also responsible for the elimination of entire groups of people because of their race, religion or nationality. The experience of the War resulted in a widespread conviction that effective international protection of human rights was an urgent need of the time to secure international peace and progress. This conviction was subsequently reflected in and reinforced by the Charter of the United Nations.

### **THE UNIVERSAL DECLARATION OF HUMAN RIGHTS**

The United Nations Charter reaffirms faith in fundamental human rights, in the dignity and worth of human beings, in the equal rights of men and women and of nations large and small. The Charter makes repeated references to human rights and fundamental freedoms. Article 1 of the Charter states that one of the aims of the United Nations is to achieve international co-operation in promoting and encouraging respect for human rights and fundamental freedoms for all without any distinction relating to race, sex, language or religion.

To define the contents of Human Rights, the UN in 1945 itself, created a United National Commission on Human Rights. Its main task was to draw an International Bill of Human Rights, defining the rights and freedoms referred to in the Charter. The Commission came out with a Universal Declaration of Human Rights. On 10 December 1948 the General Assembly of the United Nations unanimously adopted the Universal Declaration of Human Rights as a common standard of achievement for all peoples and all nations. It is because of this adoption that 10 December is celebrated as Human Rights Day. Article 1 of the Universal Declaration lays down the philosophy of Human Rights. It states, "All human beings are born free and equal in dignity and rights. They are endowed with reason and conscience and should act towards one another in a spirit of brotherhood." The article thus defines the basic assumption as:

- (1) That the right to liberty and equality is man's birthright and cannot be alienated; and
- (2) That because man is a rational and moral being, is different from other creatures on earth and, therefore, entitled to certain rights and freedoms which other creatures do not enjoy.

The Universal Declaration of Human Rights comprising a Preamble and 30 Articles defines certain rights which should be available to all without any distinction of race, religion, nation, gender, and colour.



These Human Rights may be classified into three categories. The first generation rights are those that are concerned mainly with the civil and political rights of the individual. They include the rights to life, liberty, security of person, freedom from torture and slavery, and political participation. Besides, the right to property, marriage and the fundamental freedoms of opinion, expression, thought, conscience and religion, freedom of association and assembly do also form a part and parcel of the basic rights of the first generation. The second generation rights are rights which can be termed as 'security-oriented' rights; these rights provide social, economic and cultural security. These rights—social, economic and cultural are more positive in nature in that they make it the duty of the state to ensure that these rights are realised. The Universal Declaration of Human Rights reflects the consensus on the principles which form the basis of the first and second generation rights.

The third generation of human rights are of relatively recent origin. They have evolved in response to various new concerns over which international consensus has emerged in recent years. These include environmental, cultural and developmental rights. They are concerned with rights of groups and peoples rather than of individuals and include such rights as the right to self-determination and the right to development. The developing countries

have played a leading role in bringing about international consensus on these rights.

Since the adoption of the Universal Declaration, there have been many controversies regarding the question which rights are more important and which are less. The representatives of some states had been asserting that civil and political rights are more important than economic, social and cultural rights. They also had serious reservations about acknowledging the right to development which, if effectively implemented, would affect the existing pattern of economic and political power in the world. Other countries stressed the importance of economic, social and cultural rights and the right to development. These controversies, in principle, can be said to have been resolved when all human rights were recognised to be indivisible. The Vienna Declaration, issued after a conference in which representatives of 171 countries and hundreds of non-governmental organisations participated, unambiguously affirmed that "All human rights are universal, indivisible, interdependent and interrelated". It has also been affirmed that democracy is the sole guarantor of individual rights — civil, political, economic, social and cultural and collective rights within states and within the community of states.

The Universal Declaration, together with the Charter, served as an inspiration and means for the millions of people, particularly the oppressed

and under the colonial rule. The Declaration, however, was not a legally binding document. To give legal sanction to human rights the General Assembly on 16 December 1966 adopted two Covenants: the International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights, and the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights. The Covenants are legally binding treaties. Any state may or may not become party to these. Upon agreeing to become parties to the Covenants, states accept procedures for the implementation of articles, including the submission of reports on their compliance, in accordance with the provisions of the Covenants. Apart from Universal Declaration on Human Rights and two Covenants there are also a large number of other declarations, recommendations and conventions adopted by the General Assembly. As has already been mentioned, declarations and recommendations usually apply to all the members of the United Nations but do not have the same legal force as the conventions, which are binding upon the states that have become parties to them.

Importance of Declaration, however, is that it states a common understanding of all members of the human family and constitutes an obligation for the members of the international community. This also places human rights in a system of international cooperation. This implies that national borders put no limit to human rights; that by their very nature, human rights represent trans-

boundary values. Also international cooperation entails an obligation on the part of states to fulfil in good faith the undertakings they have assumed on the basis of the Charter of the United Nations and Universal Declaration of Human Rights. It is in this context that in the present world Human Rights have become an important international issue. Their violation is considered not just an internal matter of a state, but it concerns the entire international community. There is also a view that some big powers are misusing this concept of international concern and are interfering in the affairs of other countries in the name of protection of human rights; this they are doing primarily to fulfil their own vested national interests. Therefore, Human Rights issue has become a subject of serious debate.

Many countries are signatories to the Covenants and Conventions on human rights, which denotes that they have undertaken a pledge to implement them. Therefore, it is responsibility of the governments to protect and promote all these rights. However, it is necessary to remember the distinction between human rights as articulated in international declarations and conventions, and those rights which are laid down by the law of the country. The latter can be enforced, if necessary, through the intervention of the courts. The record of the past half a century, since the adoption of the UN Charter, in the implementation of human rights has been dismal. Despite the fact that the necessity of building an understanding and concern for making human rights a reality had never been greater.

Most of the important democratic systems, including India, have realised the importance of human rights for its people and have either incorporated them in their constitutions, or have accepted them through Declarations.

India has played a predominant role in this respect. The framers of the Indian Constitution adhered to the principle of human equality and dignity and made the Fundamental Rights (Part III of the Constitution) justiciable.

**EXERCISES**

1. Define Human Rights.
2. Explain the meaning of 'Universal Declaration of Human Rights'.
3. Describe the significance of Human Rights.
4. Which circumstances led to the Declaration of Human Rights?
5. When is Human Rights Day celebrated and Why?

www.notesclues.com

## CHAPTER 6

# Dharma

**D**HARMA is primarily an Indian concept. Its root goes far back into the Ancient Indian philosophy and thought. Our ancient seers realised its importance and emphasised that human life should be governed by the precepts of *Dharma*.

### WHAT IS DHARMA?

But, then a question arises. What is *Dharma* and what are its basic elements?

The word '*Dharma*' is derived from the Sanskrit word-root '*dhr*' that means 'to adopt', 'to support' or 'to sustain'. In simple language it means "the principles of right". It refers to the moral concerns of human beings. In common parlance, it is often associated with religion or spirituality. But *Dharma* is not spirituality alone. To stick to whatever course of duties we have decided to follow in life is *Dharma*. It cannot be identified with any particular religion. The *Dharmasatras* have given the definition of '*Dharma*' on the basis of the Vedic tradition. According to this tradition, the '*Dharma*' of each person is determined by the position one occupies in the societal system of

'*varnas*' and '*asramas*'. According to *Mimamsakas*, '*Dharma*' is accepted as a set of prescriptions and prohibitions. The Buddhist literature highlights it as the basic feature of conscience.

### THE CONCEPT OF DHARMA IN ANCIENT INDIAN LITERATURE

The concept of '*Dharma*' is widely discussed in the '*Santi*' and '*Anusasan*' *Parvas* of the *Mahabharata*. The view propounded here is a combination of theoretical and practical considerations. The basic view of '*Dharma*' is that it subscribes to a moral action. The concept lays stress upon the individual's nature and temperament. '*Dharma*' for one consists in the realisation of one's potential in the context of the place one occupies in society. A person is supposed to take responsibility for one's motives and intentions. It is assumed that one cannot be held accountable for the consequences of one's actions. But since man has soul, and ability to understand his environment, and relate himself to it, his motives and intentions are crucial to moral life.

In *Gita*, while exhorting *Arjuna* to act according to his 'Dharma', Krishna asks him to conquer his passion and impulses as determined by his nature and temperament, and follow his duty (*swadharma*) in a spirit of equanimity. Man does not know the working of 'fate'. He cannot also ensure that the results of his actions will be good always. But he is totally autonomous insofar as his motives and reasoning are concerned. This autonomy imposes on him an obligation to work for society. The text enjoins the central meaning of the concept of *Dharma* in terms of duty to work for others. The totality of the concept is embodied in Krishna's idea of '*nishkama karma*'.

How then we decide the right course of action. It is suggested that first follow the customs of morality as embodied in the *Vedas*, *Smriti* and other traditional sources of moral life. *Dharma* covers a wide range of meaning. The *Manu Samhita* discusses various characteristics of '*dharma*'. In usage, the term '*dharma*' refers not only to qualities and natural characteristics of things; it also refers to the highest virtue and spiritual efforts. It also talks about what one should or should not do. Secondly, '*dharma*' not only refers to civil, religious and spiritual matters, it also talks about general behaviour of individuals, as personal habits like cleanliness, sanitation and civic consciousness, good behaviour, courteous and polite ways of conduct, and even subjects of common sense. Thirdly, '*dharma*' can be understood in different ways to different classes in

society and at different stages of life and status. It could be different for men and women. It is indeed a network of diversified but interrelated duties. It has to be defined in each case by the individual himself. Fourthly, while referring to the areas and operations of '*Dharma*' as ordained in the *Vedas* and *Smritis* concerning four classes (*chaturvarna*), the law-giver *Manu* and other exponents of Hindu philosophy have given a leading place to the accepted conducts which were handed down from generations to generations by the well-meaning persons of the community. An administrator has to see that local customs are honourably maintained and given proper safeguards. Fifthly, we should not only talk about '*Dharma*' in the context of class or status and situation, we should also understand and implement it in the context of time and age. Lastly, the most important aspect of '*Dharma*' is the inclusion of the spiritual purpose of life within its ambit. Every creation has a spiritual beginning as well as end. The '*Dharma*' is related to four ends of life. These are: '*Dharma*', '*arth*', '*kama*' and '*moksha*'. *Dharma* is the controlling factor, '*arth*' and '*kama*' are subservient to it and yet, it cannot be divorced from pleasure or prosperity. '*Dharma*' is superior because it regulates all our activities in the interest of all. It is a positive concept; it is an enunciation of the highest possible ideal; it pertains to self-realisation and soul-emancipation.

Whenever there is a contradiction of different principles, the basic principle

has to be welfare of all (*upkar*). The welfare of the larger group must take precedence over the welfare of a smaller group. The good of the society is to be preferred to the good of the individual. The *Mahabharata* goes on to say that while an individual can be sacrificed for the sake of the village, village for the sake of the state, the whole world may be abandoned for the sake of the soul. In the ultimate analysis, except two virtues, truth (*satya*) and non-violence (*ahimsa*), the practice of all other virtues is dependent on a complex set of circumstances which includes individual nature and temperament as well as the status which one occupies in the society. Indeed, the moral life is not made up of a straight timber. Krishna lays down two general principles in case of doubt. First, one must strive to follow the example of great men in similar situations in the past. Second, one must subordinate personal interest to the welfare of society (*loksamgraha*). While *Manu* summed up the concept of *Dharma* in one word '*upkar*'.

### **DHARMA, STATE, LAW AND SOCIETY**

The above description of *Dharma* makes it amply clear that although the concept of *Dharma* is not directly related to either law or to the state, yet it has its influence on both.

You have already learnt about 'secular state' in your earlier class. By secular state we mean that the state has no religion of its own. It gives protection

to all its citizens irrespective of their religion, caste or creed. The Indian Constitution, as you know, is emphatic on this point. The right to religious freedom and equality before law are included in the chapter on Fundamental Rights.

However, one thing is of paramount importance to know that behind a secular state, there must be a secular society to sustain it. This means that the members of the society should not only refrain from hurting the sentiments of fellow members of their religions, but also should respect their feelings. Secularism is, thus a positive concept. India has a long tradition of tolerance and living in harmony with their fellow-members.

Against the above backdrop *dharma* cannot exactly be translated as the English word 'religion'. In our ancient tradition and culture *Dharma*, being a composite word, meant four things together. It meant (1) righteousness, (2) duty, (3) lawfulness, and (4) rightful claims.

In the Western tradition the essence of *Dharma* is captured by the motto 'My station and its duties'. It means that every one should discharge the functions of his station dutifully. In Indian tradition this is the philosophy of four classes (*chaturvarna*). For Plato, justice in an ideal state means 'division of labour' and 'specialisation of functions' among the three classes of society. To him, an ideal state/society is comprised of three classes *not* on the basis of birth, but on the basis of inherent qualities of individuals. These

qualities are desire, valour (bravery), and reason. Those in whom desire predominates produce things for the entire community; those in whom valour predominates, protect the state/society, and those in whom reason predominates become the Philosopher-Rulers or Philosopher-Kings. Thus, justice is to perform the duty of one's class faithfully without interfering in the functions of other classes, and to specialise in the function of one's class (station).

Gandhi identified it with compassion for fellow human beings in distress. (You will study Gandhian views in one of the last chapters.) The concept of *Dharma*, however, is very subtle. For example, a liberal might think that right to property is necessary. On the contrary, one who believes in the philosophy of communism would argue against this. The principle of *ahimsa* is valuable. No one would dispute the importance of the adage "*ahimsa paramo Dharma*"

but in actual practice it is admitted that there is always a choice between the more or the less. The sage *Markandeya* thus declared that "the ways of the righteous are subtle, diverse and infinite". When life or property or the moral principles themselves are at stake, one may deviate from the basic position. However, in most cases the ground on which deviation is permitted is the welfare of all.

The concept of *Dharma*, thus, is too wide, and it is too idealistic. Despite its idealism, it is valuable in so far as it emphasises the need for a moral order, which applies both to the states and to the individuals. Just as individuals are bound by moral rules, the states too must conform to moral principles. Some ancient texts point out that a king who discards *Dharma* loses both righteousness and merit. To sum up, the philosophy of *Dharma* affirms life and enjoins us to look at it in terms of all its complexities.

## EXERCISES

1. Explain the importance of *Dharma* in our social, political and civic life.
2. Explain the ancient Indian concept of *Dharma*.
3. Do you agree with the statement that the concept of *Dharma* is vague and idealistic? Explain with illustrations.
4. Explain *Dharma* as highest ethical, social and civic virtues.
5. Write short notes on :
  - (i) Secularism;
  - (ii) 'My station and its duties';
  - (iii) Chaturvarna.

www.notesclues.com



---

---

**UNIT II**  
**STATE AND THE CITIZEN**

---

---

www.notesclues.com

notesclues.com

www.notesclues.com

notesclues.com

## CHAPTER 7

---

# Rights and Duties: Meaning and Relationship

### WHAT ARE RIGHTS?

THE rights of the citizens are necessary for the creation of a better life for them. They provide external conditions necessary for the development of individual personality. The state exists for the enrichment of human personality. It is not an all embracing Leviathan, but just a necessary contrivance for human development. Some normative philosophers would assert that if it is to be a state in the real sense of the term, it must grant certain minimum rights. Indeed, rights are in the nature of claims. But all claims are not rights because rights are only those claims, which are recognised as such by society and enforced by the state. Without such a recognition rights are empty claims. Society is organic in character and an individual obviously cannot have any right apart from what the society concedes. An individual can realise the aims of his existence only through the medium of society of which he is an integral part. A selfish claim cannot,

therefore, be considered a right. To be a *right*, it must aim at the good of society, and it must be recognised as such by the general opinion of the society. If rights were not dependent on recognition by society, one would be claiming anything, depending upon one's convenience. In the midst of conflicting claims, it would be difficult to determine their relative validity. Obviously, society alone, subject to certain limitations, is competent to pronounce upon their relative validity. Sometimes society may make mistakes but its overall wisdom has to be trusted in cases of the conflict of rights. Therefore, in any state, the content of rights has to be determined according to the general opinion or consensus of the society; We might try to change them from time to time in order to make them more humane, but ultimately it is the society which determines the character and the content of our right.

However, recognition by society is to be distinguished from recognition by the state. Rights are not always creatures of law as Hobbes and

Bentham believed. Since rights are the conditions necessary for the development of individual personality, these are those principles from which the state laws derive their own validity. A state is to be judged by the conditions it is able to create for its citizens for their development; and those conditions are called Rights. A purely legalistic theory of rights, making it 'creature' of the will of the state, as Laski points out, has nothing to contribute to the development of political philosophy. He says: "It merely tells us what in fact the character of the state is. It will not tell us whether rights recognised need recognition". Rights are those claims without which the individual cannot realise the purpose of his existence. Since the state exists to secure human happiness, it can only succeed by recognising and granting to its citizens such rights as are demanded by them as necessary to their development.

Sometimes there might be a conflict between the rights recognised by the state and the rights approved by society. A state might try to protect certain privileges, as the ancient regime, for instance, did in France before 1789, which ultimately kindled the flames of the French Revolution. In those circumstances the advocates of the ideal rights would try to subvert the foundations of the state in order to replace it by a new one, which would recognise the ideal claims of individuals, as embodied in the social will.

Locke had advocated the theory of natural rights, which people enjoyed in the state of nature. In the state of nature,

before the emergence of civil society, the law of nature, it is claimed, established a system of reciprocal claims and obligations in the form of natural rights and duties. The state of nature was conceived by him to be a vast network of reciprocal claims and duties. The rights which man enjoyed in the state of nature, according to Locke, were rights permanent and indefeasible; the most important rights being the right to life, liberty and property. But Locke as well as Hobbes never succeeded in delineating precisely the contents of what is 'nature'. Sometimes the word natural is identified in their theory with what is inherent in the spontaneous search of man for security or sheer acquisitiveness, or even, for means to satisfy his aggressive instinct. Sometimes, it is identified with something which perfect reason would prompt us to do. Indeed, the doctrine of natural rights as rights enjoyed by men in the childhood of the human race is a myth. It is based on the false assumption that we can have rights and duties independently of society. Burke very eloquently pointed out that we couldn't enjoy the rights of civil and uncivil state at the same time. The more perfect the natural rights are in the abstract, the more difficult it is to recognise them in practice.

The rights are the products of social circumstances. They cannot be independent of society. Even if they are natural they are natural in the sense that they represent the ends we ought to pursue. They are natural in the sense that they are the conditions which

human beings need to realise themselves. On the one hand, they are claims of the individual without which one cannot realise one's personality; and on the other hand, they are concessions granted by the society to enable human beings to realise their claims. It is the society, which recognises and gives validity to our claims. Rights have a relevance and value when they contribute at the same time to the attainment of social good. These are the media through which an individual can promote the good of society as his own good. Rights are the conditions of our capacity to participate in the social good. On the other hand, the society can develop only on the recognition by its members of the claims of each other as contributory to the good of society. Such mutual recognition is the foundation of rights.

Thus, rights are the conditions of the welfare of an individual as a member of the society. These are those conditions of social life without which no one can seek the identity of one's own interest with the interest of society. The state only enforces these conditions. It is the purpose of the state to create conditions for the general happiness of the individuals and, therefore, if a state fails to maintain rights in the sense of conditions necessary for individual's development, it forfeits its claims to our allegiance. No doubt, it is difficult to define 'common good'. It might in practice mean either the greatest good of the greatest number, or of majority interest, or what government thinks to be the common good of society.

However, which claim is to be recognised a right is a practical problem. The contents of rights are very largely dependent upon the customs and ethos of society at a particular time and place. No list of absolute rights, which are universally applicable, can be formulated. Any such attempt would be tantamount to raising the values of one's own age to the level of absolute truth. Such a hypothetical concept of rights has very little relevance for a theory seeking to lay down general principles. All attempts to frame a list of ideal rights in the past have been guilty of what is known in technical language as "the reification of conception", namely of raising one's particular values to the level of general or universal values. Whether it was an attempt of Locke or of Thomas Paine, each was installing his own preferences as absolute principles. Every age and every society needs to define afresh for itself as to what particular rights it is going to have, in order that they might be made secure and put beyond the pale of doubt. Locke considered right to property as natural. We no longer do so because circumstances have changed.

Thus, it must be clearly recognised that rights are not absolute in character. The welfare of the individuals as members of society lies in a happy compromise between their rights as individuals and the interest of society to which they belong. A list of rights must acknowledge the fact that there cannot be such a thing as absolute or uncontrolled rights, for that would lead

to anarchy and chaos in society. My right is limited by rights of my fellow human beings. Rights have to be limited by the social control in order to be effectively possessed. In USA, there was no limitation imposed upon any of the fundamental rights added to the Constitution by the first-ten amendments of the Constitution. But the inefficacy of this arrangement in maintaining public order or for the prevention of corruption and of incitement to crime was soon realised. The Supreme Court of the USA which is charged with the responsibility to interpret the Constitution, had soon to invent the 'doctrine of implied power' under which the inherent power of the state as a co-ordinating agency imposing restrictions (on the fundamental rights) necessary to protect the common good was recognised. Our Constitution, too, recognises limitations on rights.

### **KINDS OF RIGHTS**

Coming to the particular rights which are necessary for our own age, the first right, a citizen needs is the right to personal liberty as embodied in the notion of rule of law. Our Constitution assumes that no one should be deprived of his "personal liberty except according to the procedure established by law". The right to personal liberty does not mean absolute freedom to do anything. A criminal who is always obsessed by anti-social impulses cannot claim the right to personal liberty. The right to personal liberty

means that we should be punished only for a breach of a definite law and only in a definite manner after a fair trial.

The detention of persons without a fair trial, in civilised societies; is the very negation of the rights of individuals. In this context, the preventive detention in our Constitution is one such provision. However, in times of grave national emergencies or wars, the case is different. No state can allow its security to be threatened.

The second important right is the right to equality. Equality has been used here in two senses, viz. (1) equality of opportunity, and (2) equality before law and equal protection of laws. Right to equality does not mean, as we have already seen earlier, perfect equality. Perfect equality is not only impractical but is also not desirable. Equality is only a system of proportions. It means that every one in society would have at least the minimum necessities for an honourable existence before some one can have superfluous wealth. Every state must seek to assure this basic minimum to all its citizens irrespective of the class or status. To be citizens in any real sense of the term, we must be free from fear of starvation or unemployment.

Equality before law means the absence of special privileges, and equal subjugation of all classes, viz., weak as well as strong, according to the procedure established by law and administered by the ordinary courts of the land. Equality before law means equality of treatment in equal circumstances. It means like should be

47  
treated alike. However, the state can make some classifications; the example is laws relating to reservations for the Scheduled Castes and Tribes. Such classifications must be reasonable and ought to be justified on no other ground but that it would lead to the public good. If a law deals with the members of only one well-defined class for the sake of the common good, it is supported to be upholding the principle of equality.

Third important right, which must be guaranteed to the citizens, is the right to freedom of speech and expression. This would enable people to ventilate their grievances and organise public opinion on issues of public concern. Conversely, it would also enable the rulers to know the mind of the people. John Stuart Mill gave the classic argument in favour of the freedom of speech and expression when he asserted that even the whole mankind has no right to silence a single dissenter, for who knows that he might be in the right and all others in the wrong. Human history is replete with such examples when a single dissenter was ultimately proved to be in the right and others in the wrong. The cases of Socrates, Christ and Galileo would forever remain reminders to us that the restrictions on our freedom of speech and expression, on the ground that it might lead to blasphemy, or prove contrary to the well-being of society, can be negation of individual's freedom.

Some thinkers opine that freedom of speech and expression could not be denied even during a war. An executive

which has a free hand in muzzling the freedom of speech in times of war or grave national emergencies is more often than not, likely to abuse his powers. Germany and Italy before the Second World War encountered such experiences and were destroyed in the process. However, there are limitations to the extent to which a government would allow this right to be exercised in actual practice. No government would allow a part of its population to carry out subversive propaganda. It could not obviously allow anybody to go and tell the army not to fight while the war is on. If it does so, it would cease to be a government. Similarly, an attempt to plead for a civil war or the disintegration of the country cannot be tolerated by any government. The first duty of the state is to ensure its own integrity. If it does not survive, how will the right to freedom of speech and expression survive? Moreover, freedom of speech and expression does not mean right to make libellous charges or to excite the public to commit crime. If the right is thus abused, everyone affected has a right to have a suitable remedy.

Fourth important right is the right to work and be paid adequate wages. Citizens have a right to employment and it is the responsibility of the state to provide suitable work to them. The right to work does not mean the right to do a particular work. It only means some gainful work in society by which one can sustain and nurture ones own self and dependants. It is, therefore, said that the state must pay compensation if a person is unemployed during a

certain period of time depending upon the ability of the person concerned. The right to be paid adequate wages is a necessary corollary of the right to work. This right, however, does not imply equality of income. It only means conformity to the general principles of equality. The right to work is a claim on the part of the individuals to occupy a definite place in society and perform its attendant duties.

Fifth important right of the citizen is the right to health care. It does not mean that a state can make us free from disease. Such a freedom will ultimately depend on our own care of our health. If a man struck with paralysis refuses to take advantages of the facilities provided by the state, the state is not held responsible for his health care. The right to health means that anybody who is interested in keeping fit, as most of us are, shall not be hampered for want of proper facilities. This means that it is the responsibility of the state to ensure that adequate medical treatment is available to all. A state can do so by ensuring that the poor patients are not neglected or inefficiently treated. Moreover, the state ought to provide proper safeguards against the spread of contagious disease. This could be done state through the schemes of vaccination, inoculation, etc.

Right to education is another important right for human development. Citizens must be provided with proper means by which they can follow public debates with interest and participate intelligently in the social, political and cultural

processes of then country. But again, the right to education does not mean equal education for all. Obviously people differ in their capacities and aptitudes and, therefore, all of them are not equally fit to get the same type of education. The right to education also does not mean that everyone in society should be able to get university education unless he is fit to do so. To teach the unfit and reluctant members of society would be a waste of human resources. What is necessary is that everyone in society should have, a certain minimum of education which is necessary for him to be a citizen in a meaningful sense and be able to perform necessary functions in society.

Among other rights, which need enumeration, are the right to participate in the affairs of the state, including the right to vote and the right to contest elections, and to form associations and to have adequate hours of rest and leisure. All these rights are necessary to make the state a real political community. They are necessary to make us active citizens. However, the extent to which these rights are recognised will vary with the nature of the state. In fact, the state often adjusts the various rights in terms of their priority according to nature and the problems of the society in which it has to operate. In a society in which poverty is writ large, economic rights will get precedence over political rights; and in a economically developed society a need would be felt for a greater stress on political rights. The mounting pressure for liberalisation of political life



in some of the economically developed communist countries such as the erstwhile USSR is an eloquent testimony to the fact that no society can permanently remain without recognising some of the political rights in order to have a sound social organisation.

Indeed what is important is not the form of the Government but its spirit and its achievements, the extent of happiness which a particular government is able to infuse into the life of its citizens and the confidence, which it is able to generate in its purposes. People may have a right to vote and yet the state can be the most ill-governed. If a particular state gives to its citizens at least the rights, which have been described above, and implements them sincerely, all other rights will automatically follow.

So long as state is able to make its people happy, it does not matter much whether its citizens formally enjoy rights or not in the form of a bill of rights. There are so many instances of people having been guaranteed rights in the constitution of their country in the form of a bill of rights and yet, those rights remained unfulfilled in practice. Embodiment in the constitution might give rights greater sanctity but would not ensure their realisation. Hitler and Mussolini became dictators in their respective countries inspite of democratic constitutions that their countries had. The pre-condition for the true realisation of rights is enlightened public opinion and educated people.

Here comes the question of political obligation. Should the people obey even

an unlawful authority? In fact, it is to tackle autocratic and dictatorial power that the right to disobey an unlawful authority is sometimes regarded as the most fundamental and inherent right of the people. This right cannot be taken away even by the best of the governments. It constitutes the ultimate safeguard in the hands of the people. The welfare of a state is ultimately built upon the welfare of society and its members. The interests of the two are inseparably connected with each other. Our duty to the state is after all a duty to the state, which is able to maintain and protect our lives and ensure reasonable conditions of our development. Locke argued that the state is a trust and, therefore, its purpose is to ensure safeguard and of the life, liberty and property of the people. If it fails to perform those functions for which the power has been granted to it or fails to attain those ends, which are necessary for the realisation of general happiness, it forfeits its claim to general obedience. In such circumstances, it may become an obligation for the citizens to resist the authority of the state in order to change and replace it by a better type of government. No state can be sure of a healthy continuance unless this right is recognised by all its members as a sacred right. Undoubtedly, there are risks involved in recognising such a right to the society and in order that these risks are avoided and mitigated as far as possible, it is up to the state to take necessary precautions against it.

## **RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN RIGHTS AND DUTIES**

It must be emphasised, however, that rights have corresponding duties as well as obligations. The two are correlated. Rights and duties of citizens are two sides of the same coin. The relationship between them is two fold. Firstly, society functions on the principles of reciprocity. My rights involve a duty, on the part of others to respect my rights and also a duty on my part to respect the similar rights of others. Society works on the principle of, "he who takes gives and he who gives takes". Indeed, my right is a part and parcel of the good of other members of society and, therefore, the degree of my enjoyment of a particular right has to be conceived in terms of the similar claims of other citizens. My right is integrally related to the rights of my fellow human beings. The one cannot exist without the other. A society in which people care less for their own duties and more for their rights, sooner or later, disintegrates. In their frantic effort for the vindication of their own rights at the expense of fellow human beings, society will be reduced to the status of a jungle in which ultimately the law of might will prevail. In order that everyone enjoys his or her rights it is necessary that we recognise our obligations towards others. We cannot say that we shall be free while others will be bound with their obligations. Such a position is quite untenable and inhuman.

Secondly, the logic of rights and duties also implies that if we have certain claims against the state, it is also our responsibility to contribute something towards its enrichment by doing a socially useful work. The state creates those conditions in which we can realise ourselves. In return for this, it is our duty to take advantage of these conditions and give our best to it. The best way in which we can contribute to the social stock is by following duties towards our nation, in recognising our social responsibilities and unscrupulously respecting the similar rights of others. One does not contribute only by being a son of a prime minister or a poet but by being oneself. I may not succeed in my life, but if I have given sufficient indications of sincere efforts to make such contribution, as I am capable of, my job is done. It is a duty of every one of us that we must develop our personality so as to be able to contribute our best to society. A citizen should make available valuable judgement on the various issues confronting it. One must pay one's taxes to the state and must refrain from interfering with the similar rights of other members of society. So long as the state helps in fostering a climate conducive to happiness of the individuals, the citizens must also help it in maintaining law and order and must honestly perform their public duties. They should leave no stone unturned for strengthening their own country and if need arises must be prepared to defend it at any cost. These obligations by being reciprocal in

character do not impose restrictions on the rights of individuals; rather, they give them fuller and greater reality. To think that my rights can be separated from my duties is to be guilty of gross selfishness. It is only by performing a useful function in society that we contribute towards its enrichment. A state in which citizens care more about their rights, and less about their duties remains in a precarious situation. It would lead first to anarchy and then to its disintegration. In order to preserve my right it is necessary that I must

convince my fellow human beings that in granting such a right they would be enabling me to participate in the good of society. I must show, that so far as the society does not secure me this right, it derogates me from the status of a human being and my capacity to make my contribution to social welfare. It is only in the apprehension of this equation between individual's functions and social well-being by the members of society that a true theory of rights can be constructed and society can be built on stable foundations.

### EXERCISES

1. What are Rights? Distinguish between Rights and Claims.
2. Why are Rights necessary for the betterment of individuals?
3. Are rights absolute? Give reasons in support of your answer.
4. Explain the role of Education in the development of human personality.
5. Under what circumstances can a citizen disobey the state?
6. Write short notes:
  - (i) Right to equality;
  - (ii) Freedom of speech and expression;
  - (iii) Right to work.

**CHAPTER 8****The Changing Nature of State Activity**

**W**HENEVER men come into contact with other fellow-beings, some sort of conflict is inevitable. In order that such conflicts do not create chaos and confusion in the society the need for an institution arises to ensure law and order and maintain harmony of social relations. This institution is the *State*. We need a state to keep our anti-social impulses in check and to reconcile the claims of one another in society so that there is harmony in social relationship. The state comes into existence to create those external conditions, which are necessary for the development of individual personality. The role of the state is akin to stomach in a human body. It seeks to maintain a semblance of authority. It harmonises different and conflicting interests. It ensures peaceful exchange of goods and services.

The state creates laws and rules to regulate human behaviour. In case of violation of laws, it may coerce members into obedience. The claims of the state are superior to the claims of any one else in society. "The State", wrote R.M McIver, "is an association which, acting through law as promulgated by a government endowed to this end with coercive power, maintains within a community

*territorially demarcated the universal external conditions of social order".* The primary function of the state is to protect the 'rights' of its citizens from internal threat or disturbances and from outward danger like war, and to establish peace. It has also to work for the development of its members. It is because of these functions that Aristotle in the Ancient times said 'the state comes into existence for the sake of life, and continues to exist for the sake of good life'.

**CHANGING CONCEPT OF STATE ACTIVITY**

The 20th century saw profound social changes as a result of the development of science and technology. These changes required new perspectives on national sovereignty and in the apparatus of the state and government in the control of economic activity. We have to develop a new outlook incorporating both individual and collective claims and adjust them to the changing conditions of the modern world. The order of the state is not merely for the sake of order. It is also, as Kautilya put it, for protection, conservation, development and distribution. It protects

citizens, conserves natural resources, takes steps to develop them and distribute the national wealth so developed among the citizens. Just as the concept of 'order' widens into protection, protection in turn widens into development of what has been protected and proper distribution of what has been developed. In the nineteenth century the main function of the state was understood to be providing stability and security. It was also expected to provide support to private enterprises at home and abroad. The power of feudalism had to be broken.

Today the function of the state is rather different. It still includes law and order and making of foreign policy; but more than that, it includes management and administration of vast services and industries. This expansion in the role of the state is the result of the industrial revolution, rise of the nation-state, and mass participation in policies. When the state structure was not fully developed, people did not look to the state to create conditions necessary for development. But now people expect that the state would alter inequalities arising out of the distribution of land, wealth, income, race and colour. The great Industrial Revolution in England and the Great Depression of 1929-1933 in America led to grave economic crises. In the first case there was concentration of wealth in a few hands. It led to impoverishment of large mass of population which was required to sell labour. In the second case, economic crises led to severe unemployment. Private parties and meagre state and local programmes were

too inadequate to cope with the huge problem. The state had to undertake massive relief work.

The essential functions of the state have remained more or less the same. But in different times, different activities have been emphasised. In the nineteenth century the state was looked upon primarily as an organisation responsible for law and order. This was the period of early liberalism in which liberals pleaded for the cause of free market and maximisation of individual liberty. They considered the state as evil, yet the state was necessary to hold the very basis of competitive society. It was supposed to maintain law and order. These liberals stood for free market, free trade and non-interference of the state in economic affairs. The primary role of the state was to ensure that citizens, in their pursuit of private goods and happiness, do not harm each other. This view is known as *laissez-faire*. It means: (1) absence of paternal Government, and (2) freedom of trade and commerce.

**WELFARE STATE**

There is another view of the state activity; it does not agree with the *laissez-faire* view of limited State functions. It considers state as an agency to transform society for the welfare of all. The state, according to this view, is a pro-active agent to ensure the welfare of the people. John Maynard Keynes (1883-1946) pioneered the idea in the context of the events during the World War-II. The emphasis becomes more on state playing an active role in the field of public health

and alleviation of poverty. It is expected to create basic facilities, which will enable every one to have at least the minimum of education for effective participation in the affairs of the state. Further, the state must ensure right to work, the right to secure income and the right to shelter to all its citizens. The state becomes a regulator, a promoter and a manager, all in one. It regulates private enterprises to secure justice for all. It provides subsidies to agriculture and works for land reform. It manages industries by setting up enterprises in public sector or joint sector.

After independence, India worked on these principles under our Five Year Plans. We make comprehensive efforts to reduce inequalities in society, create an atmosphere of security and service and provide a notional minimum to all. The slogans such as '*garibi hatao*' and 'employment for all' became common. The state made extra efforts to secure social rights to weaker sections including scheduled castes and scheduled tribes. In the beginning after Independence, Banks were nationalised and major industries were set up in the public sector in the beginning after independence. The state became the biggest employer in the country. Private sector was subjected to massive state regulations.

However, the experience of a state managed economy also started showing inadequacies. It led to bureaucratisation and red tapism. In India, for instance, it led to what is known as '*licence—permit raj*'. It stifled incentive, opportunity and responsibility. Little was left for

encouragement of voluntary activities. It also increased expectation from the state with the result that in the due course of time, it created enormous pressure on the state to perform. Every 'interest' turned into a 'vested interest' to reap maximum benefit from the state. In the initial years, the state had some capacity to give concessions to different sections. The leadership also enjoyed great prestige on account of their participation in the freedom movement. But as older leadership began to vanish and the state's capacity to cope with increasing demands began to shrink, the political system began to show signs of crisis; private initiative was stifled and the state machinery became corrupt.

Today, as per the third view of the nature of state activity the emphasis is on private production and social use. The idea is that the state should not manage the economic activities itself; it should act as a facilitator or regulator only. A new relationship is emerging between the state and corporations on the one hand and the state and the agriculture on the other. It is being increasingly felt that more we allow private competition and initiative to flourish, the better will be the growth of our economy. Competition will make the economic system more efficient and productive. But the emphasis on competition is tied to the idea of the state as regulator and facilitator. It is the duty of the state to ensure that terms of competition and socio-economic engagement are just and fair. John Rawls particularly highlighted this view in his book '*A Theory of Justice*'. One of the basic conditions of the success of this

model is that state must ensure equal opportunities to all. The earlier system tried to achieve this in the form of subsidies and reservations, which created a patron-client relationship between the state, and others affected by its decision (particularly the weaker section). The new model insists that the state must make maximum investment in education and health. These are basic requirements without which there cannot be equality of opportunity essential for a fair justice in society. It is also being felt that the state must ensure that economic development does not play havoc with our environment. In fact, it is the duty of the state to provide basic safety net to all its citizens.

Against the above backdrop, a third view of state-activity has recently come into prominence. This view has grown as a result of globalisation on one hand and frustration of workers with the welfare economy on the other. There is also a movement towards integration of economy of developing countries with the world economy. It is believed that market economy can stimulate economic growth much better than what is possible under either welfare or socialist model. It is argued that acceleration in the rate of economic growth can reduce poverty by trickle down effect. It would also lead to better political managements.

## **GLOBALISATION**

As mentioned above, in recent years there is going on a process of 'globalisation'; and this has affected the nature of state activity.

Globalisation often means different things to different people. To some it means a brave new world where there are no barriers. For others it implies a process of neo-colonialism in which ultimately the affluent countries will dominate.

Both the views take extreme positions. Globalisation is a process in which effective integration of economies takes place through exchange of ideas, information, technologies, goods and services. It is a product of the technological revolution in recent years and implies faster movement of capital, goods and services as a result of increase in speed of communication. The essence of globalisation is connectivity. Integration can have several dimensions — social, cultural, political and economic.

There are apprehensions about globalisation. Most of the apprehensions flow from the prospect of cultural and social integration endangering local customs and traditions. But in today's world there is no escape from it because the impact of economic integration of capital and finance, goods and services as a result of changes in technology, is all pervading.

Here it will not be out of place to mention that globalisation is not new factor. It started much earlier. During 1870 to 1940, there was rapid integration of economics, in terms of trade. It was in the inter-war period that tariff barriers were created by states to protect local industries. However, the pace of technology in recent years again accelerated interaction between states. In fact, most economists are of the view that international trade is in general beneficial

to all, including the developing countries. For instance, the inflow of foreign capital has made a significant impact on East Asian Economies.

If developing countries really want to reap full benefit from the process of globalisation, the states in these countries will have to gear themselves up for different roles. They will have to ensure that their economies reach full potential. They are also required to regulate inflow or outflow of foreign exchange so that sudden fluctuations do not create crisis in economy as it did in East Asian Economies recently.

The process of globalisation has given rise to the World Trade Organisation (WTO) entrusted with the responsibility of evolving an appropriate framework of free and fair economic transactions. While the developed countries have pleaded for free trade, they have not always been 'fair' in the sense that their trade barriers remain higher on many products. For instance, in some of the developed countries major food products have tariff barriers exceeding 100 per cent.

In any case, since globalisation is linked to changes in technology, it is inevitable. The developing states can derive maximum benefit only by negotiating as hard as they can in the fields of environment, labour standards and protection of indigenous knowledge and products. They will have to strengthen their patent regimes. But more than that the state will have to ensure rapid economic development at home to be able to compete internationally. For instance, while in the field of information technology, transfer of skill would mean migration of information experts, India will have to ensure that the advantage it has continues, and is not undermined. Globalisation also makes it incumbent on the state to provide safety to the poor and weaker sections of society by investing more in education, health and environment. This will surely strengthen equity at home and ability of the local industry and production to compete abroad. Indeed, the states are increasingly required to provide a human face to the entire process of globalisation.

### EXERCISES

1. "State is a-necessary institution". State three reasons in support of this statement.
2. Explain the role of state according to Kautilya.
3. State the causes for the changed role of state in the twentieth century.
4. Mention the features of a *Laissez-faire* state.
5. Write short notes on:
  - (i) Welfare State;
  - (ii) 'License-permit raj';
  - (iii) Globalisation.



---

---

**UNIT III**  
**COMPARATIVE POLITICS**

---

---

notesclues.com

www.notesclues.com

notesclues.com

**CHAPTER 9****Approaches to the Study of Comparative Politics:  
Traditional and Modern****WHAT IS POLITICS?**

**I**N ancient Greece the unit of administration was 'City-State'; and it was known as 'Polis'. The word politics/political science emerged out of this meaning of the state (Polis). Thus, Politics/Political science is the study of, or knowledge of, the state (Polis). This nomenclature has since continued, although now we are living in much bigger states having wide territorial boundaries and large population.

In a wider sense Politics, Political Science, Political Theory and Political Philosophy—all conceived with the knowledge and study of the state—are used in synonymous terms. However, if we see minutely we will find some fine distinction between these terms. Politics may be used in a general sense. Whereas Political Theory is a set of generalisations on issues concerning state. Political philosophy denotes reflections on those issues on the basis of ethics and metaphysics. Again, whereas political philosophy deals with *what ought to be* regarding matters relating to the state, political science deals with *what is* regarding those matters. Political science

is empirical; and empirical method is scientific.

**COMPARATIVE POLITICS**

Comparative Politics is an important component of contemporary Political Science. It helps in the study of political issues in a scientific and systematic manner. The scope and approaches to the study of comparative politics are getting widened day by day because of the new development in the international arena.

Comparative politics is mostly concerned with a comparative analysis of political institutions, political processes, ideological foundations, norms and societal frameworks of different political systems. There is a distinction between comparative politics and comparative governments. Comparative government refers to the deliberations on studies of different forms of state systems, their institutional framework and functions, and their constitutional background and formulations. On the other hand, comparative politics is more concerned with non-state institutions, political

processes and behaviour, societal structures, norms and values. Thus, the scope and framework of comparative politics is wide and comprehensive in nature.

Aristotle is acknowledged as the father of Comparative Politics. He was more concerned with an historical examination of legal institutions of states. But, in his studies on governments, not much attention was given to the analysis of informal institutions of the political systems such as tribes, communities, norms and behaviours of social groups and interest agencies, and belief patterns of the ruling elites.

### **APPROACHES: ITS MEANING**

In simple terms an approach may be defined as a way of looking at and then explaining a particular phenomenon. The perspective may be broad enough to cover a vast area like politics of an entire country or it may be very small involving just an aspect of local, regional, national and international politics.

There are many approaches to the study of politics; and sometimes different approaches overlap each other. However, in a broad sense these can be classified under two heads: Traditional and Modern. Traditional approaches are speculative and prescriptive in nature. In contrast modern approaches are empirical and scientific.

In short, traditional approaches include: (1) Philosophical, (2) Historical, (3) Legal, (4) Institutional.

Modern approaches include: (1) Behavioural approach, (2) Systems approaches with its offshoot in the form

of structural functional and input-output approaches.

### **TRADITIONAL APPROACHES**

#### **(a) Philosophical Approach or Philosophical-Ethical Approach**

This is the oldest approach to the study of politics. The philosophical approach is normative in character. Here the study of state, government and the people is inextricably linked with the pursuit of certain goals, morals, truths or high principles. Plato, Rousseau, Kant, Hegel, Leo Strauss, et al. pursue this approach.

The philosophical approach is criticised for being too abstract; it takes us far away from the world of reality and is impracticable. However, it can be appreciated on the basis that protagonists of this approach put before us certain 'goals', which might be unattainable; but in trying to reach those goals our present standards would definitely improve, even though we may not reach the 'goal'.

#### **(b) Historical Approach**

The historical approach became popular in the last quarter of the 19th century. It is based on the idea that in order to have proper understanding of political institutions and processes, it is necessary to have a clear understanding of the historical background of those institutions. Its merit is that it seeks to understand the state and its institutions in their process of change. But in its search of theories and general trends, it misses the central role of individuals and institutions in the process,

and knowledge remains static and tradition bound.

However, the significance of the historical approach cannot be denied. It has its importance in studying the relevance of the origin and growth of political institutions. G.H. Sabine, McIlwain, A.J. Carlyle, Catlin, Dunning and others follow this approach. Historical approaches thus, becomes useful in understanding the views of great thinkers from Plato and Aristotle in ancient times to Lasswell, Rawls, Nozick and others in the present times.

#### (c) **Legal approach or Legal-juridical approach**

In this approach the study of politics is linked with the study of legal and juridical aspects of the state. Here the theme of law and justice is not treated merely as a matter of jurisprudence. Political theorists belonging to this category look at the state as a maintainer of an effective and equitable system of law and order. Thus, this approach treats the state primarily as an organisation for the creation and enforcement of law.

Jean Bodin and Hobbes who propounded the theory of sovereignty may be said to be the early supporters of this approach; because for both the thinkers the sovereign is the highest law-maker and his command is law. The works of Bentham, Austin and A.V. Dicey may also come within this category.

This approach may be criticised on the ground that law embraces only one aspect of people's life and, as such, it cannot cover the entire behaviour of a political man.

#### (d) **Institutional approach or Institutional - structural approaches**

The experts who advocate this approach want the scope of comparative politics to be confined to the constitutional provisions of the formal institutions such as legislature, executive and judiciary. It also emphasises on the comparative analysis of political institutions.

The institutional approach was very popular during the first quarter of the twentieth century. The protagonists of this approach were Walter Bagehot, James Bryce, Giovanni Sartori et al.

This approach is criticised for being too narrow. It ignores the role of individuals who constitute and operate the formal and informal structures of a political system. It also does not analyse informal organisations of political systems such as pressure groups, nor does it give any importance to the social context in which institutions function. It is also argued that the institutional approach was strongly culture bound, as it was mainly an analysis of institutions of Europe and America.

However, this approach has come to have an importance of its own in an indirect way. It is assimilated into the Behavioural approach about which you are going to study now. Moreover, this approach is still important in the sense that it draws our attention to the role of formal rules and institutions.

### **MODERN APPROACHES**

#### (a) **Behavioural approach**

You have learnt above about four types of traditional approaches. All those are

normative approaches, and are value-laden. Critics feel that value-laden approach becomes too idealistic and utopian, and therefore, it becomes impracticable. Science deals with facts and not with values. The protagonists of modern approach, therefore, insist on the use of scientific method to explain matters relating to Politics. Scientific approach is marked by an empirical investigation of the relevant data. It uses the scientific method of observation, quantification, generalisation and integration.

The modern approach finds its best manifestation in behaviouralism. It believes that observing the outward behaviour of political actors and political institutions, and analysing their behaviour by scientific method can acquire the knowledge of political system. It draws heavily upon sociological and psychological approaches. A leading German sociologist, Max Weber has treated sociology as the basis of politics. Similarly, those subscribing to psychological approach try to study and explain political institutions and phenomenon through psychological laws. The tools of psycho-analysis, they say, can be used to the study of political behaviour.

The behavioural revolution emerged in the USA in the second quarter of the twentieth century. The main protagonists of behavioural approach are — Charles Merriam, Heinz Eulav, Robert Dahl, Lasswell, David Easton and Almond. Some of the main characteristics of Behavioural approach are:

1. They study politics by focussing attention on the 'Individual' and 'Group' behaviour and on political processes.

2. They advocate a new method. They insist upon survey research.

3. Their method is inter-disciplinary. It means they largely borrow from the various disciplines of social and natural sciences.

The central assumption of the behavioural approach is, to quote Eulan, "the root is man", Institutions only provide the framework in which political actors, (i.e. individuals), play their respective roles, and it is this interplay of political actors which determines the framework.

The behavioural approach indeed helps to provide us greater insight into political process and how ordinarily individuals participate in it. But, while it helps us to understand public opinion, pressure groups and elections and quantifies the results of our study, it leaves us poorer when it comes to the study of institutions or processes, which cannot be easily quantified. In a sense, both behavioural and institutional approaches represent two extremes.

#### (b) System analysis approach

##### *Input-Output and Structural-Functional approach*

System's analysis is one of the major aspect of behavioural approach. Behaviouralists study 'Political system' and not the state. System is defined as the 'set of elements interacting with each other'. A political analyst tries to know,

- (1) The function of the political system,
- (2) The structure of the political system, and
- (3) Under which conditions the system works.

To know the above the system analysts use two types of approaches:

- (1) Input-Output, and
- (2) Structural-Functional.

### **Input-Output approach**

This approach is popularised by David Easton. In his construction of an input-output framework, Easton was influenced by the new 'communications sciences'. Here the idea is that a political system has feedback mechanisms, which are capable of transmitting information of a positive or a negative kind. Through feedback two types of input go to the political system 'demand' and 'support'. If there are too many demands that go to the system and the government is unable to cope with them, the system breaks down. But, if the people support its rules, the system survives and becomes stable. Easton's analysis of the working of the political system is dynamic, whereas Almond's analysis is static.

### **The Structural-Functional approach**

It is a response to the failure of the institutional approach. The Institutional approach studies comparative politics in terms of study of institutions such as legislature, executive and judiciary. Its assumptions are that these institutions are more or less stable with fixed boundaries. This analysis, it is argued, is not adequate in explaining situations, which are constantly in a process of change, especially in the world of developing countries. Since institutional arrangements in these countries are fluid, the important issue is to identify certain political functions

which any political system must perform if it is to survive. It examines the question of survival and efficiency of institutions in the context of political system as a whole. The leading exponents of this approach are Almond and Powell who have emphasised that the three functions viz. political recruitment, political socialisation and political communication are concerned with the maintenance of the system. They have also observed that these functions lead to the convertibility of demands into policy making and policy implementation. According to them, demands should be converted into authoritative decisions and policies.

The functional approach is an important attempt to broaden the conceptual base of comparative politics. It provides a culture free approach to comparative politics as it seeks to understand politics in terms of factors, which provide stability and efficiency. However, it has been criticised to be too conservative an approach. It is argued that it ignores the fact of conflict and change in political life, specially in the context of the developing countries. In these countries, because of the prevalence of perpetual poverty, people are consequently interested in the process of change rather than stability. This can hardly be accommodated in the functionalist framework.

### **(c) Marxist approach**

It will not be out of place here for you to know about the Marxist approach, which is basically different from both traditional and modern approaches. Marxism provides a powerful historical

framework to examine political systems and processes in terms of class conflict. Marx uses the methods of dialectical materialism and historical materialism to justify his thesis that there are only two classes in a society—those who own the means of production (the rich) and those who depend on the labour power of their body to survive (the poor). The relations between these two classes are that of conflict; and through this conflict (dialectics) history progresses until it reaches the stage of classless and stateless society. (You will learn more about Marxism in one of the last chapters of this book).

Marxist approach is different from the 'behavioural' approach. Whereas behavioural approach defends the present system (western) as good and seeks to defend the *status quo*, the Marxist approach rejects the present system (western) as unjust and desires to change it.

Summing up our study of traditional and modern approaches, it may be

observed that sometimes there is a sort of overlapping between the two. For example, there are traces of empiricism in Aristotle's philosophy in the ancient times. Similarly, there are traces of relative-values in the scheme of David Easton in modern times. It follows that several studies to the study of politics are inter-related in some respects.

In certain quarters, the study of political institutions and functions is being supplemented by policy analysis in which the emphasis is on the substantive issues of polity. However, every approach has its respective adherents. Today, a political scientist draws upon them in an effective manner. He tends to explain institutions and processes, collective decisions and power relationships, as a part of wider social context having a history of their own. In fact, the area of comparative politics has become so widespread, that it covers all aspects of a political system, both formal and informal, quantitative as well as qualitative.

### EXERCISES

1. What do you understand by Comparative Politics?
2. Explain any two Traditional Approaches to the study of Comparative Governments.
3. Describe Modern Approaches to the study of Comparative Politics.
4. Write short notes on:
  - (i) Philosophical Approach;
  - (ii) Behavioural Approach;
  - (iii) Marxist Approach.



**CHAPTER 10****Political Socialisation, Political Participation  
and Political Development****POLITICAL SOCIALISATION**

**A**NALYSING the concepts of political system one often wonders as to how political culture evolves and what it is? How do people develop a particular set of beliefs and orientations? How do these beliefs and attitudes travel from one generation to another? The process by which a particular set of attitudes, belief and orientations is passed on from one generation to another is known as political socialisation. It is study of "what, when and how people learn about politics". Inter-generational continuity is the essence of political culture. The willingness of people to accept new ideas and beliefs is a matter of learnt behaviour. Thus, the learning process to acquire existing political culture is known as political socialisation. Every learning is not a part of socialisations. Learning that has social relevance is a part of the process of socialisation. Individuals acquire certain social obligations through ordinary course of interactions. Process of political socialisations is not necessarily a conscious process.

Political socialisation continues throughout one's life. Various factors such as international developments, domestic transformations, historical events, and social stirrings shape the process of political socialisation.

There is a linkage between political culture and political socialisation. Political socialisation is the process by which political cultures are formed, maintained and changed. Through this process individuals develop their orientations. When the totalitarian political elites try to revise the accounts of history, they are simply attempting to shape and control the process of creation of political socialisation. Thus, it is important to study the process of political socialisation in order to understand political stability and development of political system.

Attitudes of an individual towards political culture go on changing throughout his lifetime. It is a continuous process. A number of events throughout one's own life time shape and guide one's own orientations.

Often the process of political socialisation takes the form of either manifest or latent transmission. The

process of manifest transmission implies explicit communication of information, values or feelings regarding political objectives and institutions. The teaching of civics syllabus in the schools is an example of manifest political socialisation. Latent political socialisation process implies transmission of non-political attitudes towards prevalent institutions in a political system. It involves the fundamental aspects of culture in a political system. Attitudes and orientations towards cultural framework of a political system, in general, might affect a child's attitude of accommodation or aggression in the systemic interactions.

When an individual, in order to influence his friends, family, church, teachers or some other agencies, learns explicitly about an ideology or the functioning of a government or of policies, the process is known as direct or manifest political socialisation. If, on the other hand, an individual develops an attitude of mind towards authorities, in general, in the early stage, which subsequently gets transformed into a political orientation or motivation, the process is known as the process of latent or indirect political socialisation. The process of direct political socialisation gets manifested through imitation, anticipatory behaviour, political education, or political participation. The latent or indirect process of political socialisation gets manifested through interpersonal interactions, which lead to transmission of values, attitudes or ideas through the personal influence of individuals.

Political socialisation could be imparted through direct political training and education. In this process, the imparting institution or organisation takes the initiative. Most of the organisations and institutions have their own formal and informal channels to impart their ideology and orientations. The techniques like annual political gatherings by political parties, emphasis on civic courses in Great Britain, political circuses in Guinea, an initiation ceremony among the Masai in East Africa and propaganda rallies in the public places, are some of the examples of direct political socialisation. Manifest political socialisation may take place through an individual's own experience with political process, political elites, structures and events. Latent political socialisation generally takes place through interpersonal transference, for example, a child born and brought up in an authoritarian climate is most likely to learn an attitude of submission to authority.

### **FACTORS OF POLITICAL SOCIALISATION**

Political socialisation takes place through a variety of institutions and situations. These are family, peer groups, educational institutions, secondary groups/such as work place, the mass media, government and political party machineries.

#### **Family**

Family is the key factor of political socialisation process. It is through family that an individual's political

character is formed and developed. Family helps in transmitting values from one generation to another. As the child receives his material and emotional helps from the family, it is but natural that the child gets deeply influenced by the political beliefs and attitudes of the members of the family. Parents mostly become role models of their children.

One must not forget that political socialisation at this level is generally conservative in nature. A child is deeply influenced to preserve and continue its family's traditional ideas and practices. Though family has a great role in shaping some of the basic traits of children, particularly their attitude towards authority, obedience to the decision-making institutions, political ideologies and parties, these orientations get often substantially changed in the later stages. As the child grows into adulthood, its attitude towards society and political process gets substantially modified because of impacts of other agents of political socialisation.

**Peer Groups**

Whereas family relationship is hierarchical, the relationship between a growing child and the members of the peer group is non-hierarchical in nature. This may be the reason why peer groups have a substantial role to play in the process of political socialisation. The peer groups consist of childhood playgroups, friendship organisations, work groups and the like. Political socialisation at this stage

assumes new dimensions. Peer groups prepare individuals to face emerging political climate and if necessary, for specific political roles. Peer groups help in developing an intimate emotional relationship between an individual and peer group members. It is often considered as an important agent of political socialisation. Their role vis-a-vis family as agents of political socialisation varies from political system to political system. In countries like France, Belgium and Germany, the families have control over adolescents for a longer period, whereas in Britain and the United States, the families have a lesser control over their children.

**Educational Institutions**

Educational institutions such as schools, colleges and universities are other important agents of political socialisation. These institutions participate in the political socialisation process both directly and indirectly. Direct political socialisation takes place through curriculum. The students are taught about national movements, national traditions, and sometimes about particular ideologies. The school and university experiences help in the process of latent political socialisation. The modes of participation at this level help in the formation of attitudes and values. The students' movement in France in 1968, American students' opposition to the Vietnam War and the spectre of Naxalite movement in the Indian universities in the late 1960s are some of the examples of political socialisation.

## Secondary Groups

Secondary groups provide apprenticeship for political role in the society. In a developed political system secondary groups play more important role in the process of political socialisation. There are three types of secondary groups. First, there are secondary groups with distinct political motivations. These are political parties and political youth organisations. These groups provide training in political ideology, mobilisation of political actions and recruitment of political leaders. The second type of secondary groups is instituted for non-political purposes such as work place. However, these groups carry on political education along with their specific activities. One could speak of various labour unions in this regard. Although a labour union is basically involved with collective bargaining and welfare of its members, it also provides political education and training to its members. The third type of secondary groups neither provides any political education to its members nor do they have any political character. But mere participation in their activities provides political orientations. This is an example of latent political socialisation. Clubs, sports association, cultural association, etc. can be cited as examples of this type of secondary groups.

## Mass Media

The communication and information technology has enhanced the role of mass media as agents of political

socialisation. The role of mass media such as radio, television, newspapers, and magazines varies with the social and political structure of political systems. The mass media often help in transmitting values and ideas that help in the continuation of the existing establishments. Mass media have been mostly used by ruling elites in the developing countries to win masses in their favour.

## Government and Political Parties

An individual's continuous interactions with members of political parties and governmental personnel, and sometimes through his direct contacts with the government organisations, help in reinforcing his orientation and attitudes towards political issues and policies acquired during his early years. Sometimes government directly helps the process of political socialisation. Through political parties, people have direct involvement in the political process of the society. People get politically socialised and indoctrinated by political parties. It is only through political parties that radical social and political changes could be brought about in the civil society.

In conclusion, one might state that the stability of a political system is deeply interlinked with the greater cohesion and complementarity among the agents of political socialisation. It is because the process of political socialisation is a continuous one; some amount of disharmony among the agents of political socialisation is but natural.

### POLITICAL PARTICIPATION

Political participation is the area of social importance to the analysis and evaluation of every political system. Whatever may be the pattern of political system, political authorities would always be keen to ensure political participation of masses in the process of governance. Even in modern non-democratic political systems, authoritarian rulers always highlight the idea of political participation of masses. The idea of political participation is given greater importance in the democratic systems of governance. Through this process of political participation a close relationship is established between the authorities and the people.

The study of political participation implies the study of actual involvement of people in the decision-making process rather than popular attitude of becoming involved. It studies all political actions by groups and individuals for influencing the formulation and implementation of public policies. It deals with the level of participation of citizens, who happen to be the people most likely to participate.

One of the salient features of liberal democracies is that there are different forms of participation. Voting in election is only one of the forms in which a majority of the electorate participates. But there are other forms of participation such as through interest groups election campaigns, political parties and involvement in governmental activities in which only a

small number of individuals actually participate. Interestingly, the process of participation differs from society to society. In some societies, it also takes the form of political activities such as political protests, including even its illegal and violent forms. Indeed, boycotts and strikes have emerged as some of the powerful devices to influence the system. However, in most countries violence to others or damage to public property is condemned as illegal, as such activities tend to erode the very foundations of the framework on which the political system stands. That is why the terrorist violence is condemned universally.

Some political scientists have emphasised the concepts of "hierarchy of political involvement" such as "spectator activities" and "gladiatorial activities". 'Spectator activities' is confined to voting. The 'gladiatorial activities' involve soliciting of political funds, holding public or party office. It is clear that the population cannot be divided into these two watertight compartments. People participate in a variety of ways ranging from traditional forms to such as voting to protest and mass demonstrations. Indeed, recent studies in West European and Scandinavian countries show that the traditional forms of democratic expression and political activity are on the decline. People have become more critical of politicians and political systems, and are more interested in non-institutionalised forms of political action to pursue their objectives and goals.

The new developments in information and communication technology have also transformed the nature of participation. The computer-mediated communication facilities have created new forms of political participation of citizens at both local and national levels. Today, people vote through electronic machines. The computer technology enables people to communicate their views to the government in a rapid manner.

The question however, arises, how do we explain the different levels of participation. Why are some people more involved than others? The differences in participation are generally explained in terms of economic and political resources as well as interest of the participants. Whereas Economic resources remain confined to property, political resources would include factors such as education and access to information. They build capacities in the individual concerned to express and promote their own opinions and interests forcefully to powers that be. Indeed, these sections of the people generally have greater involvement in the political process in comparison to the disadvantaged sections. The former acquires greater vested interest in the system, as their education and resources help them to pursue their interests with a greater vigour. That is why; it is generally believed that democracy is a middle class or upper middle class phenomenon. That is also the reason why political participation tends to reinforce existing inequalities.

Yet the patterns of participation affect each one of us in a phenomenal

way. While the middle and upper classes participate because they have a stake in the system, the lower classes are mobilized in the name of greater economic security; or to put it crudely, in the name of bread and butter or such slogans as Indira Gandhi's "*Garibi Hatao*". But ultimately the success of a liberal democracy depends on the kind of stake each individual citizen acquires in the system as a whole. A system, in which public resources are easily channelised for private use by the middle and upper classes, will definitely reinforce existing economic inequalities and hence the level of commitment which ordinary citizens will have for the political system will be much less, if not minimal. It is this characteristic which distinguishes political culture of developed countries such as the USA from that of ours. We have not yet been able to develop a process of participation in which each citizen may feel that he or she has a stake in the survival and the continuance of the system.

There is participation in the authoritarian regimes too. But it is different than that of the liberal democracies. In a state like China, it involves expressing support for the government rather than an opportunity to vote it out of power. The system in the states like China functions in such a way that there is a massive mass mobilisation in support of the poll. Although powers are confined in the central committees, in practice citizens are allowed participation in the whole range of local bodies. In fact, there is an immediate involvement of workers

in matters that directly affect them. Some of these countries have, therefore, been able to develop highly successful co-operative movements. Even at the party level, there is direct involvement of the participants who are recruited from peasants and workers on the one hand and bureaucratic, managerial class on the other. In China, particularly, the earlier aging generation is giving way to new generation of well-educated and technically trained leadership. The result is that like liberal democracies, the scope of participation here is also linked to one's education and resources.

### **POLITICAL DEVELOPMENT**

The term 'political development' entered the domain of Political Science in 1950s. With the emergence of a vast number of independent countries of the developing world scholarly interest among the political scientists emerged to study the development process of the developing countries. A leading political scientist Gabriel A Almond observed that the concept of political development should be analysed and discussed as a 'moral' ethical and political 'good' among the developing countries."

In fact, during late 1950s and early 1960s there was an academic interest throughout the world to put emphasis on the cross-polity studies of the newly independent nations of Asia, Africa and Latin America. Huge amounts of statistical and quantitative data on the social, political, economic and

demographic aspects of these nations were collected to analyse their attitudes, values and behaviour patterns. There has been no unanimity among the social scientists regarding the conceptual frameworks of political development. Sociologists, Economists, historians, political scientists and anthropologists have tried to analyse the concept of political development from their own respective angles. Most of these political and social scientists, however, have emphasised on the pattern of development process of the developed countries, particularly America, as the model to be followed by the developing countries for their political development process.

According to Rostow, the norms of political behaviour and institutional apparatus of the developed countries have to be followed by the developing countries for their own development. He was of the opinion that the industrial societies are the "pattern-setters of political development for other societies". Edward Shiller treated the concept of political development with the nation-state building process on equal footings.

Most of the authorities on political development have looked at the concept of political development from the point of view of the American development process. America's development from the phase of incoherent homogeneity to coherent heterogeneity has often been cited as a model of political development for the developing countries. Lucian W. Pye who is considered an authority on the subject has identified political development with three major themes.

These themes are: equality in political life, political capacity and government performances, differentiation and specialisation of structures. According to Pye, increasing differentiation and specialisation would lead to greater secularisation of society.

Samuel P. Huntington has provided an improved version of Pye's ethnocentric model of development. He observed that the maintenance of political stability should be considered as the ultimate goal of political development. He highlighted two areas as the basic elements of political development. These were: a high degree of institutionalisation within a political system and an increasing level of popular participation. According to him, a high degree of institutionalisation, within a polity is well reflected by its high levels of adaptability, complexity, autonomy and coherence. On the other hand, increasing levels of popular participation in the system would be guaranteed through their access to the decision-making process at every level of social structures. He is of the opinion that the stability within a system could be understood as the product of interaction between levels of institutionalisation and popular participation.

Economists like Ellis were of the opinion that political development could be discussed as the pre-requisite of economic development. Some have identified it as a synonym of political modernisation. Others have seen it as a symbol of industrial society,

administrative and legal development, building of democracy, stability and orderly change, mobilisation of power, mass participation and so on.

The concept of political development has undergone changes at different periods of societal transformations. In the 1980s, scholars like Organski laid emphasis on the process of systematic empirical validation of the concept of political development. He defined it as increasing governmental efficiency in the use of human and material resources of the nation for the common good and also highlighted the notion of national political capacity as the core aspects of political development. The concept of political capacity referred only to two basic areas of development: ability of a government to collect revenues from its subjects to implement its preferred policies and its ability to mobilise human resources.

During 1990s, authorities like Robert W. Jackman, in their discussion on political development of political systems, emphasised on system's capacity to create legitimate political institutions. Legitimacy is needed for the structure to implement power relationship. This legitimacy could be reflected in system's ability to resolve conflicts without resorting to use of force against domestic political opposition.

While discussing the concept of political development, it could be understood that any talk on adoption of universal strategies in the areas of political development might be bad for the developing countries. As these



might create illusions in the minds of people-illusions which might not have any relationship with the socio-economic structures and conditions of their countries. This does not follow that the outside models are always irrelevant.

Process of development cannot be separated from the interests of people. The political development process of India has failed to take note of these aspects. Marx's emphasis on conquering the "kingdom of freedom" had tremendous influence on the policy programmes of a number of developing countries. Mao declared as early as 1940 that if Marxism was to be useful then "it must be combined with specific national characteristics and acquire a definite national form."

The exponents of the uni-directional models of development have to realise that life grows in richness by diversity. The developing countries have to link the historical aspect and peculiar characteristics of their countries with the process of the respective political development programmes.

In conclusion, we can say that there are three basic elements in the light of which one can formulate a more satisfactory view of political development. First, any concept of political development has to relate itself with the problems of economic backwardness and dependency. Every political system has to be judged from the point of view of its ability to ensure justice, equality and productivity. Second, any theory should reconcile between empirical and normative behaviour of the system, to emphasise right conduct with good society. The classical database regarding an ideal relationship between the individual and society has to be reactivated. And lastly, the concept of political development has to be judged in terms of total objective situations in the concerned political system. Political development is not an isolated phenomenon. All the western ideals have to be integrated with the socio economic realities of the developing countries.

**EXERCISES**

1. What do you understand by Political Socialisation?
2. Describe the factors that contribute to the process of Political Socialisation.
3. Analyse the meaning and importance of political participation.
4. Explain the term political development.
5. Write short notes on:
  - (i) Peer group;
  - (ii) Mass media;
  - (iii) Lucian W. Pye's concept of political development.

## CHAPTER 11

### Modes of Representation

**I**N the contemporary political systems, democracy is identified with liberalism. This was not so in the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries. The classical liberalism then was concerned with the principles of capitalist market economy. It emphasised on individuals right to unlimited acquisition of property. In a state, property qualification was considered as an essential condition to participate in the process of political representation. Subsequently because of historical reasons classical liberalism, which was considered to be basically antithetical to democratic norms and processes in the formative phase became an essential partner of democracy. Capitalism and market economy gave birth to large scale industrialisation and urbanisation process. The demand of the working class movement to participate in the decision-making process of the political system gave a new momentum to the concept of democracy and widened its horizon. The liberal state thus became a combination of free market economy and the principles of universal adult franchise. C.B. McPherson observed,

“until the nineteenth century liberal theory, like the liberal state, was not at all democratic, much of it was specifically anti-democratic”. Today the term ‘democracy’ is widely understood as the synonym of ‘representative democracy’. Under the system of representative democracy people have a right to choose their representatives through periodic elections based on the principles of universal adult franchise. Under this system, discrimination based on caste, creed, religion, language and culture is generally prohibited. The prescribed age for participating in the periodic general elections varies from country to country. In India the prescribed age for participating in the general election is eighteen whereas in Britain and some other countries it is twenty-one. In some of the countries, the citizens were compelled by law to participate in voting during the general elections, such as the Netherlands (1917) and Belgium (1893).

There are two alternative systems of representations: (a) territorial representation and (b) functional representation. The territorial

representation is also known as geographical representation. Under this system, the whole country is divided into nearly equal population based constituencies. The functional representation highlights representation of occupation or functions. People belonging to different occupations and functions are allowed to have their representatives on this basis. Although the territorial representation system enables people to have a close relationship with their representatives, sometimes, under this system, local issues are given preference over national issues.

When one representative represents a constituency, it is called a single-member constituency. Constituencies being represented by more than one representative are called multi-member constituencies. In India, before independence, we had separate constituencies for minorities and special interest groups.

According to Professor Shephard, there are three theories of representation. These are primitive tribal theory, the feudal theory and ethical theory. The political practice followed during the Greek city-state days is known as tribal theory of representation. Under this system, the right to vote was considered as the necessary condition for the membership of the state. The feudal theory highlights the property condition of voting rights in a state. The ethical theory considers voting rights as a natural and inherent right of every citizen.

## THEORIES OF REPRESENTATION

There have been different opinions regarding the role of the representatives in the decision-making process. Some favour a limited role for the representatives whereas others advocate their control over the entire process of policy-making. Different theories of representation try to analyse this from different angles.

### Authoritarian Theory of Representation

The main advocates of this theory were Thomas Hobbes and Alexander Hamilton. The theory highlights the role of order and authority represented by executive. The representatives of the people have a limited role to play. This theory emphasises on the superior knowledge and wisdom of the politicians. There is no provision for public control. Hobbes was particularly in favour of the authority of the monarch. In Hobbes' theory of hypothetical social contract, the individuals in the state of nature contract with each other that each one of them agree to give all his powers of governance to the particular person or group of persons (that is the monarch/parliament) so that by assuming the combined power of all it would protect the life and property of all its members. Thus, the monarch/parliament is created by a democratic method; the basis is the consent of each individual who have formed the state; but after assuming power the monarch/parliament becomes all-powerful.

### **Radical Theory of Representation**

The main supporters of this theory are Rousseau and the proponents of the New Left. This theory does not believe in the system of representative government. It strongly believes in the direct participation of people in the process of governance. Direct participation in the law-making process is known as direct democracy. In other words, in a direct democracy citizens themselves participate in decision-making, and not through their chosen representatives. But such direct representation is possible only in small units. In ancient times it was possible in the City-State of Athens. Today, in Switzerland there is provision for Plebiscite and Recall. These are factors relating to Direct Democracy.

### **Mirror Theory of Representation**

Chief advocates of this theory were John Locke and Thomas Jefferson. It highlights the idea that legislatures must be the mirror image of the society. The representatives are considered as agents of people and are to translate demands of their constituents into policy framework. The theory has a strong faith in the wisdom and capability of the masses. It was based on the principle of equality.

### **Elitist Theory of Representation**

It believes that once elected, the representative has a special responsibility to provide leadership to the masses. They are not mere recipients of the input provided by the

electorate but as agents of change what they think would be best for the society. It is alleged that the theory is undemocratic in the sense that it believes on the wisdom of an elitist group of politicians. It considers this group as the custodian of public interest. The conservative theory of representation does not encourage popular participation in the process of governance. But in society in which there is illiteracy and poverty and where people are not in a position to understand complicated issues, the representative should be able to rise above narrow sectarian interest and take a view of the nation as a whole. This view is particularly significant in a country like ours, which is divided in terms of language, religion, caste and class.

However, the representative should not become a prisoner of vested or sectarian interest, it is necessary that the representation should be able to rise above various particularisms and take a holistic view of things in the context of the nation as a whole. The contemporary decision-making process and pattern of governance is so complicated that it may not be possible to involve people in general to follow the form of Direct Democracy. Today a representative has an extremely complicated task. On the one hand he must voice the wishes of the people he represents and on the other he has the special responsibility to shape these wishes in conformity with the overall interest of the society.

Proper representation is the central point for the successful working of a

democratic system. According to the classical definition of democracy, it is a Government of the people, for the people, and by the people. If that is so, we the people have to be extra vigilant for its successful working. This demands proper and national representation of the people, which in turn involves an enlightened public opinion and educated citizens. It is therefore said that democracy is not only a type of government it is also a way of life.

**EXERCISES**

1. What are the various theories of representations?
2. Mention two alternative systems of representation.
3. Describe the importance of representation in a democratic system.
4. Write short notes on:
  - (i) Functional Representation;
  - (ii) Direct Democracy;
  - (iii) Elitist theory of Representation.

www.notesclues.com

notesclues.com

www.notesclues.com

notesclues.com

---

---

**UNIT IV**  
**MAJOR POLITICAL THEORIES**

---

---

notesclues.com

www.notesclues.com

notesclues.com



## CHAPTER 12

---

# Liberalism

### EMERGENCE AND DEVELOPMENT

**L**IBERALISM is a doctrine that emerged out of the Enlightenment, the Glorious Revolution in England and the French Revolution. Each of these events embodied one major premise of liberalism. From the enlightenment emerged the view that there are no moral goals, which we know for certain to be absolutely right, and therefore to impose any particular way of life on the citizen of a state is wrong. From the Glorious Revolution emerged the view that the divine right of any kind of rule could not be justified and from the French Revolution the claim that the individual liberty is so sacred that no authority can violate it. It was a response to monarchical power, which claimed absolute authority in the name of the divine right of kings. In England it was a result of a reaction of the bourgeoisie against the power of the king to tax the subjects without the consent of the Parliament. In France it was a reaction against monarchy, which tried to prevent a discussion and debate on political issues. The French bourgeoisie expressed its aspirations in the famous phrase "liberty, equality

and fraternity". The bourgeoisie consisted mainly of businessmen, shop owners, merchants, bankers, intellectuals and professionals.

These classes wanted an end to the period of feudal anarchy where the nobles were constantly at war with one another. The classes were more interested in capital accumulation. Anarchy in society was not conducive to it. In the place of *mercantalism* they wanted economic system of free trade based on the principle of *laissez-faire*. These classes also wanted an end to the outmoded economic controls on trade, capital investment and business growth. They pleaded for the abolition of inherited privileges that distinguished aristocracy from the bourgeoisie. They sought the supremacy of Parliament. Montesquieu's *The Spirit of Laws*, Bentham's *Fragment on Government* and Smith's *Wealth of Nations* were a series of landmarks in the evolution of liberalism.

Liberals argued that each individual was a rational citizen capable of taking ones own decision. A good society was one in which their satisfaction or interests were maximised. Society was

merely conceived as a conglomeration of individuals who rationally calculated their interests and sought power to that end. There was no such thing as social good or common good or public welfare apart from the good of the individuals composing society. All that the society had was a collection of individuals with their own private interests.

Such interests were sought to be maximised through increased production and market mechanism. These were based on twin concepts of individual enterprise and the unlimited right to property. There was to be free competition. This competition determined the nature of production, the prices of the goods produced and the structure of human relationship as producers, buyers and consumers. Market was the chief motivating force for the pursuit of all values. The individual took decisions on the basis of one's perception of its own individual interest. Liberals argued that if the individuals were allowed to pursue their rationally calculated interests, there would be equilibrium in society, and prices would then tend 'to be just what would induce buyers to buy what was produced, and producers to produce what would be bought'. This was expressed in Adam Smith's concept of "*invisible hand*." It meant that the general welfare was a function of their own acquisitive instinct. The state became rich in proportion to every member becoming rich individually. The divergent and conflicting interests were automatically harmonised as a result of it. Human beings were

considered free in proportion to what has been, called "proprietor of their own person". Politics was conceived as autonomous, capable of rising above narrow vested interests. It was believed that some central organisation was required to regulate human relationships in society. The state represents this organisation. It was brought into existence to hold the ring for the pursuit of their interests by the individuals. The functions of the state were minimised. The task of the government was merely to reconcile conflicting interests. It was 'a necessary evil'. And, therefore, as Bentham argued, best government was the one which governed the least. The basic function of the government was to ensure our natural right to private property. Locke gave expression to this idea. Government had no right to exist if it failed to do so. The private interests sought to promote themselves through the institutional mechanism of competitive democracy.

The doctrine of liberty was tied to doctrine of equality. The words 'Liberty, Equality and Fraternity' were embodied in the French Revolution. The American Declaration of Independence also embodied the same ideas. But these liberals were conscious of the substantial differences among individuals. What they meant was an equal opportunity to prove their worth. They rejected the aristocratic claim on the basis of birth or heredity. It must be noted that their claim to equality was only a political claim. They did not believe in economic equality. Certain

sections indeed believed that economic inequality was not only inevitable but also positively good for all concerned.

In the second phase, this doctrine was modified in the later half of the nineteenth century by thinkers like J.S. Mill and T.H. Green. They believed that the interests of the individuals were tied to social interests. They linked up the idea of the individual good to the common good. Green recognised the existence of people who enjoyed less liberty than was enjoyed by slaves in the ancient world. It was noticed that the rich were becoming richer and the poor proportionately poorer. As a result of Industrial Revolution, monopolistic tendencies began to emerge. Control over economic life appeared to be passing into the hands of a few economically powerful persons.

Both Mill and Green, and Ranade in our own country, realised that each individual was entitled to equal opportunity. All of them moved to and fro between the individual and the community. Green insisted that individual freedom and fulfilment were attainable only through society. "There is a work of moral liberation", pleaded Green, "which society, through its various agencies is constantly carrying on for the individual". These liberals pleaded that the problem of distribution demanded an active interference of the state in the economic life of society. The state was a community of communities. It was expected to enforce standards of cleanliness and health. It was expected to ensure that large masses of

humanity did not have to live in conditions of poverty and squalor. State was required to bring about conditions in which there were chances of equal development of all. Ranade favoured the idea that the state must redistribute wealth in society by providing equality of opportunity and prospects of full employment to all.

This new version of liberalism rightly emphasised that whenever the individual found social experience frustrating, one had a right to expect that the state would come to its rescue. Society must provide opportunities not merely for increase of wealth but also for development of total human personality. The concept of welfare state is a product of this line of thinking. In 1930s, Roosevelt initiated 'New Deal Programmes' on similar lines. The governments were expected to ensure the end of domination by a property owning bourgeoisie and maximise individual opportunity. They discarded the concept of free market as a guarantee of economic efficiency. The "invisible hand" may have importance in a system of equal competition but it did not have much relevance to an economic system in which there was grave inequality. The decisions of a very small number of business houses affected the life pattern of all individuals.

The welfare state thus tried to make education widely available. It regulated hours and work, wages and working conditions of labour, tried to curb employment of children in factories and monopolistic tendencies in economy. It

was accepted that enlargement of economic liberty was necessary for a proper enjoyment of political or civil liberty by all. There was a change in liberal concept of justice. Rawls has expressed the idea thus: the state must so arrange the scheme of benefits and burdens so that the least advantaged may share the resources of the fortunate. The revolution in the economic thought was brought about by John Maynard Keynes (1883-1946) and the report of Lord Beveridge on social insurance. The social insurance was treated as a part of a comprehensive policy of social progress. It was an attack on want. The state in organising security, argued Beveridge, should not stifle incentive and opportunity. While the state should try to secure notional minimum for all, it should leave enough room for voluntary action. In India the Mahalonobis approach followed much the same policy. Tentative, piecemeal and adhoc attempts to change economy lost their appeal. People began to favour more comprehensive plans. They began to expect the state to work for full employment and planned economic growth, what Roosevelt described as freedom from want and Indira Gandhi as "Garibi Hatao". The state tried to correct social and cultural disadvantages. The ideal of the welfare state is thus the climax of the development of the ideals of human equality, liberty and justice.

### **TENSIONS IN LIBERALISM**

There is a basic tension in liberalism. On the one hand, it is wedded to the

market concept of society, to the unlimited right of man to the acquisition of property and ultimately to inequality. On the other hand, it seeks to curb the right to property for the common good and to provide equal opportunities to all. The claim that a market society maximises utilities has been challenged by various contemporary thinkers. McPherson has instead argued that true development for man consists in the development of his powers. According to him the earlier liberal view is contradictory in two ways. There is a tension between the view of man as "desirer of utilities" and man as "enjoyer and developer" of his powers. This has led to the confusion between unlimited right to property, to capitalist economy and ultimately to inequality and an egalitarian view on the other hand. So far it has not been possible to combine the two. The tragedy of the welfare state is that despite its faith in the ideas that the state must provide opportunities for not merely an increase in wealth but also for development of total human personality, in practice, it still tends to treat the maximisation of utilities and profit as final. The major drawback of the welfare state is that it could not change the social structure in any fundamental way. The state provides subsidies, controls competition, monopoly, land use and labour use. But the prices are still a response to calculated decisions of the few who control economic power in society. Prices still control production of goods. They also determine their allocation.

This enables big corporations not only to determine prices but also control tastes and life-styles.

Social living is an organic process in which life of the concrete individual has to be enriched by an increase in ones power to enjoy the out-side world. A liberal society maximises utilities, but does very little to maximise our powers or make us into a better human being. We are constantly controlled and dominated by market forces. Moreover, public ownership and nationalisation have led to bureaucratisation and corruption in public life.

### **EMPIRICAL LIBERALISM**

A word must be said about empirical liberalism. Mill and Green emphasised the moral dimension of democracy. They valued it because they thought that it was the most effective instrument for the improvement of mankind. But the empirical liberals like Schumpeter and Dahl treat democracy as a mechanism to bring about equilibrium in society. They are not concerned with moral issues. They regard the ideas of Mill and others as utopian. For them democracy is essentially a competition between two or more elite groups for power to govern society. Some American political scientists even regard a low level of citizen participation as essential for the maintenance of equilibrium. For the nineteenth century theorists democracy was a humanist aspiration. For their counterparts in the mid-

twentieth century America, it is essentially a market-equilibrium system. This view has a built in conservative bias. For it, whatever works is right, the existing system has somehow to be worked out. The concept of the market swallows up the concept of justice and equality. There has been some resurgence of libertarian doctrines in the name of human dignity and autonomy recently. This is leading liberalism on the one hand to the nineteenth century individualism and on the other to a concept of justice. The later trend has become significant. The nineteenth century liberalism emphasised liberty. The early twentieth century replaced liberty by equality. Now both are being synthesised and transformed by a concept of justice in terms of the Aristotelian ideal of character, self-knowledge, virtue and good-life. Society is being viewed as a community of individuals. These individuals too have autonomy of their own. It is being argued that the community ought to be based on a strong sense of a shared self-understanding of citizens about virtue and good life. This self-understanding must be embodied in the institutional arrangements of a pluralist society in which there are a variety of associations to satisfy our different needs. It must lead to a politics which enables us to, "know a good in common that we cannot know alone" in the manner of friendship.

**EXERCISES**

1. What do you understand by Liberalism?
2. Trace the modification of the doctrine of liberalism in the later half of the 19th century.
3. Discuss the basic tension in Liberalism.
4. Explain Empirical Liberalism.

www.notesclues.com

## CHAPTER 13

---

# Socialism

### GENESIS AND DEVELOPMENT

IT is not easy to define socialism. Its definitions are numerous. As an ideology it includes a variety of doctrines such as anarchism, syndicalism, and democratic socialism. There are many types of socialism in terms of their political orientations. Some of them have been authoritarian, others democratic. There have also been many types of socialism in terms of economic organisation. Some economies have been highly centralised, while some others completely decentralised. They all stand for equality but differ on the meaning attached to it.

Before defining socialism, it is necessary to see how did it emerge in modern times. It emerged as a reaction to the rise and development of capitalism. *Laissez-faire* doctrine led to great difficulties in society. By the middle of the nineteenth century, the doctrine had gathered a great following. By then, England had become the first industrial nation of the world. The prosperity of the Victorian England was there. People were convinced that competition increases efficiency and

wealth. They regarded the 'survival of the fittest' as the unquestionable law of nature. But by the end of the nineteenth century, the fallacies of the doctrine became evident. The economic power got concentrated into the hands of a few. The majority lived in conditions of dire poverty. They had no freedom of choice because they were completely dependent on their wages even for bare survival. They were not even in a position to decide what they wanted because they lacked education. It was also realised that there was not much truth in the doctrine of 'harmony of interests'. The industrialist was busy serving his own interest; he did not care much for the interest of the community as a whole. In the medieval world, there was a certain consensus about fair price. But now there could be no such thing as fair price. Prices were regulated by economic and not by moral laws. People began to realise that if everyone was allowed to conduct his business in his own way, the law of the jungle would prevail.

Even the competition did not yield results as expected. It defeated its own purpose. It did increase the efficiency of economic enterprise during the early

stages. But very soon as bigger organisations began to monopolise economic power, the smaller organisations were crushed out. We can see the impact of capitalism even in India where most of the economy is in the hands of a few leading industrial houses. Thus, capitalism itself limited the freedom of the entrepreneur.

Capitalism indeed increased the wealth of the nation. It led to unprecedented prosperity in Europe. Real wages went up. But very soon markets were flooded with goods. As the competition increased, the system began to face crises. Production reached a saturation point. People began to apprehend that there might be a situation in which there were all sellers' and no buyers. Cycles of boom and depression, known as trade cycles, became frequent. Unemployment was a common phenomenon. People began to realise why there was so much of poverty in the midst of plenty. Some of these reasons led Karl Marx to prophesy that capitalism contained within itself seeds of its own destruction. Socialism believed that capitalism is a negation of egalitarianism, it is inefficient and disregards — justice and happiness.

### CHARACTERISTICS

Socialism means the following inter-connected things:

- (a) an egalitarian society,
- (b) satisfaction of basic needs,
- (c) common ownership of vital instruments of production, and
- (d) ideal of service.

#### (a) Egalitarian society

Socialism insists on what G.D.H. Cole called human fellowship, which denies or expels distinction of class, caste or colour. It aims at reasonable equality in society so that all are able to face each other on equal terms. It holds that there can be no genuine liberty without equality. Freedom cannot survive without security.

#### (b) Satisfaction of basic needs

It flows from the first. Socialists argue that the motive of profit ought to be replaced by the motive of service. Value should be decided by use and not by terms of exchange. What must be distributed depends not on where it will fetch the highest price but where it is most needed. The wealth of the state ought to be so distributed that even the poorest can afford to satisfy his basic needs. We must ensure sufficiency to all before surplus is available to.

#### (c) Common ownership

Socialism believes in common ownership and control of means of production, e.g. land, power and banks. These should be administered in the interest of the whole rather than of the parts. Happiness of all is to be preferred to the happiness of the few. Socialists believe that from economic point of view an industry which is collectively owned will be more efficient and from the moral point of view more satisfying. It believes that inequality of wealth leads to inequality of opportunity. The system of recruitment



does not ensure the selection of the best. The children of the rich have opportunities which are often denied to those of the poor who thus start life with initial disadvantage. Such a condition of inequality is dangerous to the stability of the state. Such inequality destroys initiative and is therefore inhuman.

**(d) Ideal of Service**

Socialism emphasises the responsibility of all citizens to the common good or general welfare. It protests against the harsh materialism and individualism of classical liberals. A capitalist society produces ugly conditions. It insists on too much specialisation. It deprives the artisan of his pride in his work. In the feudal period the craftsman used to make a complete thing all by himself. It used to be a matter of joy for him to find a reflection of his creative endeavours in it. But now man has been reduced to the status of a cog in the machine. Instead of producing a complete thing, he only produces a small part of it. He may not even know where the part he has produced would fit in. He becomes no more than a link in chain of production. But he is further condemned to live in slums or to be condemned to stand in the market for weeks or months with the hope that his labour will be needed. He feels disgusted under these conditions of modern industry. The worker ceases to be a human being. It is this feature of the capitalist society against which Marx, Ruskin, Morris, Laski and Gandhi spoke. Gandhi denounced

capitalism as immoral because it condones and even glorifies greed and avarice.

The terms Socialism and Communism are often used interchangeably. That is largely because of the powerful influence of Karl Marx and yet one must distinguish between the two because communism has become distinct ideology with a certain set of mixed doctrines, whereas socialism still remains largely a tendency, a label for a wide variety of doctrines. Communism in a sense is also a variety of socialism. We will discuss it in detail in the next chapter. Suffice is to say that communism, as articulated by Marx, is based on a certain view of what human history will be, whereas socialism is more a moral imperative; it deals with, what it ought to be. Socialists are also aware of the potential within capitalist arrangements towards the greater equality. They all reject the dictum of the 'dictatorship of the proletariat'. For them, the revolution is not inevitable or necessary. Gradualism is the watchword of democratic socialism. Necessary and relevant reforms can be made within the existing democratic framework.

Further, Marxism pinned its faith in a violent revolution. Marx did concede the possibility of a peaceful change in countries like Great Britain. But, on the whole, he thought that overthrow of the capitalist system would not be possible without violence because no ruling class gives-up power on its own. Democratic socialism, on the other

hand, emphasises peaceful changes through the instrumentality of parliamentary democracy. This naturally implies that both have a different view of the nature and role of state. For Marx the state was an instrument of domination in the hands of the capitalists. The capitalist class used it to exploit and oppress the masses. On the contrary, socialists regarded it as autonomous of economic forces. They thought that it had enough potential to bring about redistribution of economic and political power in society. The Chartist movement in the mid-nineteenth century Britain and the Guild and Fabian socialists of the early twentieth century, all rejected revolutionary tactics. They opted instead extension of Suffrage (Chartists); protective state (Democratic Socialists); state as an instrument of reform (Fabian Socialism); producer state in which industries governed themselves (Syndicalism); and governance through Trade Union Organisations (Guild Socialism).

In India, we were appreciative of socialism soon after we gained Independence. Most of our National leaders like Nehru, Jai Prakash Narayan and Lohia championed the cause of socialism. It was in this context that socialistic pattern of society was declared as one of the goals of planned economy. At that time India tried to combine democracy with Fabian kind of collective controls leading to regulations of imports and exports, Curbs on production of consumer goods and licensing of industrial set-

up. Removal of poverty and attainment of economic self-reliance were accepted as the two major task before the Indian state. Nehru tried to promote collective sector by greater state interference in economic life to mobilise resources and enhance employment opportunities. However, now India is following the goals of globalisation, liberalisation and privatisation.

Steps were also taken to nationalise basic industries like Coal, Steel, Banks and Power. India has also undertaken programmes for public housing, medical care, adult education, land reforms, etc. but this socialism was socialistic to the extent that the state redistributed some resources; it is not socialistic in the classical sense defined above.

There is a growing realisation that some kind of socialism is necessary. But, we have also learnt that mere provision of welfare services and government regulations do not lead to socialism. Indeed in certain quarters it has led to centralisation and bureaucratisation. Socialists like Jai Prakash Narayan, Ram Manohar Lohia or Roger Garaudy vehemently pleaded for diffusion of political power and decentralisation of economy. Centralised planning creates a uniform system of economic development, which does not fully take into account local variations of individual aspirations. In a good society duties ought to be related to personal capacities, aptitudes, and rewards, and to the contribution one makes to general life. A realisation of complexities of social life.

and importance of different groups are expected to save socialism from the errors of over-centralisation, bureaucratisation and uniformism. We must identify human needs and create a large number of centres of decision-making, capable of promoting economic and political initiatives at different levels. How such a principle can be put into practice is the single most important challenge to socialism of our times.

It has also been realised that public ownership and economic subsidies only help big corporations in increasing their profits. They reduce the risks of business competition. Even the system

of progressive taxation is alleged to favour the super-rich over the wage earner. It has contributed very little to redistribution of the wealth of the super-rich among the masses. It has mostly meant redistribution of wealth among middle classes themselves.

Socialism will have to transform itself before it achieves its goals in practice. May be, it will be required to achieve some sort of a balance with liberalism on the one hand and Marxism on the other, individual initiative and justice on the one hand and supervening class conflict on the other.

### EXERCISES

1. Describe the main characteristics of Socialism.
2. Distinguish between Socialism and Communism.
3. What socialistic steps have been taken in India?
4. Write short notes on :
  - (i) Egalitarian Society;
  - (ii) Democratic Socialism;
  - (iii) Guild Socialism.

## CHAPTER 14

# Marxism

### GENESIS

BY the end of the sixteenth century the factory system was well-established in England. The hand-worker struggled in vain against machine made goods. He was forced to give up his work and enter a factory as a worker. The new system created a lot of hardships for the workers. They often worked for sixteen to eighteen hours a day. The textile mills did not have proper conditions of sanitation and health. Outside the factory, these workmen lived in slums and crowded localities. Since most of them had migrated to cities from small rural communities they had lost their roots. The factories separated them apart from their families and a community reducing them to almost cogs in the machine which remaining beyond their control.

The early socialists like Saint Simon, Robert Owen were horrified at these conditions. Marx was one of the most powerful thinkers who understood the havoc which early industrialisation had brought about. This is clearly evident in the *Communist Manifesto* he wrote with Fredrick Engels. He was also keen

to transform society on human lines. His search was essentially for a human social order. He brought into light the dilemmas of society working on the principles of profits, competition and *laissez-faire*. He pointed out that the source of misery and alienation lay in the capitalist system working on these principles.

### TENETS OF MARXISM

The main tenets of Marxism are:

- (i) Dialectical Materialism,
- (ii) Historical Materialism,
- (iii) Class Struggle,
- (iv) Critique of Capitalism,
- (v) Revolution and Dictatorship of the proletariat,
- (vi) Emergence of Classless Society.

#### (i) Dialectical Materialism

Marx agreed with Hegel that history is a process but disagreed about the nature of the process. While Hegel interpreted human history in terms of the primacy of ideas and consciousness, Marx did so in terms of the primacy of the material forces. According to him, the agents of change are means of production and the mode of production.

Mode of production is the way in which means of production are used. The means are the tools or techniques by which economic production takes place. Human labour and organisation are also examples of means. The mode is the way in which the ruling classes use their means for their own interest. The mode of production, therefore, includes both relations of production and means of production. The ruling classes use their control over means of production to exercise control over the entire social system. In *A Contribution to the Critique of Political Economy* Marx declared that the history of society is the history of material production and of the contradiction between the material productive forces and the relations of production which arise on their basis. This contradiction is resolved through class struggle.

Marx shared with Hegel the idea that history is the working out of the dialectical relationship. Hegel's theory of dialectics remained confined to the realm of ideas only, Karl Marx stressed the role of economic factors in the process of dialectics. To Marx, it is the working out of the tension between nature and man, successive social formations and competing social classes. Dialectics is a process which characterises historical change in which at any point of time one set of forces can be identified as thesis, another as anti-thesis and the third one as the synthesis. A thesis (such as feudalism) is confronted by antithesis (such as capitalism), which is transferred to the next phase of development, through

class action, to socialism (synthesis). The synthesis combines the best characteristic of both thesis and antithesis. Each stage in the process is transitional and its emergence pre-supposes that in due course it will give place to another.

## (ii) Historical Materialism

It is the application of dialectical materialism to society. Like Hegel, Marx also made history all embracing context of human activity. But following Feuerbach, Marx argued that man is constituted by his desires, his work and the economic system of which he is a part. For him economic activity determines the basis of all other activities. The political system, juridical ideas and moral concepts are all derived from the way in which economic activity is structured. Social existence is essentially a series of production relations corresponding to definite mode of production. In *Critique of Political Economy* Marx distinguished between economic base (production relation) and the super-structure (culture, politics, philosophy, literature).

History, according to Marx, is a record of the self-development of productive forces. Each state is characterized by social formation which has its own distinct mode of production. When one social framework is replaced by another, one definite mode of production is replaced by another. In the sequence of these social frameworks, there are the primitive society, the slave society, the feudal

society, the bourgeoisie, and finally the classless society of the future. This will be the culmination of human progress and lead to man's complete emancipation from exploitation of man by man. Thus, with change in mode of production, social framework itself changed in the process and a new social formation comes into existence. It is objectively rated to be superior to the earlier social formation because it brings relations of production in line with change in forces of production.

### (iii) Class Struggle

Marx emphasises the existence of a permanent condition of social conflict between economic classes (haves and have-nots). The changes in technology and specialisation of functions lead to differences in status, wealth and political power. New economic classes emerge. Some own means of production, others live by them. Very soon there is an inevitable conflict between these two antagonistic classes. Marx and Engels wrote in the *Communist Manifesto* "All hitherto history is the history of class struggles." The conflict is there because those, who own the means of production, exploit the workers poor economic conditions to their own advantage. They give minimum possible wages to the workers and extract maximum possible labour. In the capitalist society, the society comes to be divided into two antagonistic classes, viz. 'bourgeoisie' or those who own property and the 'proletariat' or those who do not own

any property but are much larger in number and yet, are perpetually exploited by the bourgeoisie. In course of time, the conflict becomes intense because the workers live below the subsistence level. They are unable to buy goods, which the industrial system produces.

The state at a particular time is in the hands of the economically dominant class. Political power is the function of economic power. As economic power shuffles from feudal class to the bourgeoisie, the system of kingship gives way to the representative democracy which is controlled by entrepreneurs. The ideology of divine right of kings gives place to modern liberalism. The ideology is used to consolidate the domination of the dominant class on the structure of power, specially law, police and judicial apparatus. The state becomes an instrument in the hands of the economically dominant class to exploit the working class.

### (iv) Critique of Capitalism

The most enduring part of what Marx wrote, specially in *Das Capital* was his critique of capitalism. Any other writer in its moral fervour and systematic analysis has not surpassed it. He argued that the basic contradiction in the capitalist system is that while, on the one hand, it increases interdependence of works as a result of the development of factory system, on the other, it leads to concentration of economic power in the hands of private

interests. Thus, while the organization of production is social, the distribution is private. Marx was convinced that the decline of capitalism is inevitable. What distinguishes his thought from his predecessors' is precisely the belief in the dialectical process of history.

Another drawback of the capitalist society is that it generates a pattern of immense inequality. An overwhelming majority of people suffer from poverty and want. The capitalist system is based on the toil of the workers. And yet, they are the worst victims. They are also those, who receive much less of what they produce. Some live in luxury by making others live in poverty. The only way of determining value of a thing was by calculating the labour necessary to produce it. The worker, and not the capitalist, produces the value and yet he is deprived of his share and is paid minimal wages. The capitalist takes the surplus away from the worker. Therefore, the difference between the production value and the exchange value becomes 'surplus value' which according to Marx becomes a vehicle of exploitation of workers by the capitalists. The capitalists, too, compete with each other in a headlong pursuit of profit.

One feature of capitalism is that it brings workers together and creates a sense of community in them. In the feudal period the workers lived in isolated circumstances. Goods were produced privately. A modern factory brings them together and creates class consciousness in them, finally paving way for class action leading to revolution. Initially, Marx thought that the revolution would be violent. But later, specially, after 1848, he modified his views to incorporate the possibility of other roads to revolution. Transition to socialism would vary according to socio-economic conditions of a particular country. Marx cited the example of England where transition to socialism might be more peaceful.

The fundamental contradiction of capitalism is that while it has led to worker interdependency through the factory system, it has failed to distribute wealth in the interest of all. The socialisation of the means of production cannot be combined with a system of private profit. This contradiction is best understood in the context of the characteristics of both feudalism and socialism.

	Feudalism (thesis)	Capitalism (antithesis)	Socialism (synthesis)
Organisation of Production	Private	Social	Social
Principle of Distribution	Private	Private	social

### (v) **Revolution and Dictatorship of the Proletariat**

Once the socialist revolution takes place, the power passes into the hands of the proletariat and bourgeoisie. democracy is replaced by the dictatorship of the proletariat. It is under this dictatorship that a true democracy is established for it is essentially a government of an overwhelming majority of the working class against the minority of exploiters. The proletariat would seize power to liquidate the last remnants of the bourgeoisie order by establishing state control of all means of production and by making all citizens equal participants in the new social framework.

### (vi) **Emergence of Classless Society**

Once, the bourgeoisie is completely liquidated, the state would wither away and a new society will be ushered in, in which there will be no state, no classes. In such a society each would contribute according to his capacity and receive according to his needs. Marx believed that the new man would naturally and spontaneously identify his own interests with the general interest in society. It must be mentioned here that beyond these utopian ideas, Marx says very little about the future society. His main concern was to produce a powerful critique of the capitalist system. He focussed our attention on the idea that the source of servitude and alienation lay in the

capitalist system. Man is both an object exploited by the system and a subject who becomes conscious of his plight and servitude, and revolts against the system as it leads to monopoly capitalism, inequality, class struggle and pauperisation of the masses.

### **LIMITATIONS OF MARXISM**

Marx, however, did not adequately grasp the significance of nationalist and patriotic sentiments. His doctrine, in this sense, was ethnocentric. He understood some of the deeper moral issues of capitalist society. He understood classes and their conflict but had no adequate idea of other societies and their peculiar institutions and practices. These institutions and practices often cut across class solidarity. He also underestimated the capacity of capitalism to change itself. Most of the industrialised nations in the west have tended to domesticate conflict rather than develop on the lines Marx prophesied. In some of these democracies, the state itself has tended to intervene in favour of the least advantaged. In another sense, his prophecy has not come true. Marx believed that revolutions will come in the most advanced capitalist countries, whereas, in fact, they have been caused in the backward, under-developed capitalist societies.

In characterising the state as an instrument of class domination, Marx also ignored that no state can survive for long unless it rises above the particular interests and works for wider



interests of society. The state alone provides a framework for better and organised living. It alone records our claims and counter-claims. In any efficiently functioning system, the particular interest must be limited by some consideration of public good. Without it the system would disintegrate. The regulation of special interest is one of the most important functions of the state activity. In fact, Marxism did not have a theory of state. Lenin had to invent one in order to create a framework of order in Russia. Indeed, capitalist system was bad enough. And it was only with the help of political power that it could be changed, modified or replaced. It is the state, alone which can stand for the general good. A capitalist state might be replaced by a proletarian one, but all the same we do require a state in the sense of machinery entrusted with the task of coordination in society.

## LENIN AND MAO

The country where the first Marxist revolution took place was Russia and the ideological leader was V.I. Lenin (1870-1924). In a pamphlet *what is to be done?* (1902), Lenin repudiated the doctrine of the inevitable decline of capitalism. Marx had believed that changes in economic system would automatically lead to changes in the super-structure of society and politics. He had declared that while handmill gives us a feudal society, the steel mill gives us a capitalist one. Lenin did not accept this doctrine. According to him,

while workers were capable of trade union consciousness, they did not have the urge to develop a revolutionary agency helping them to have it. In the absence of the agency all that the workers wanted was an increase in wages through the mechanism of trade union activity. The revolutionary consciousness could only be brought about by a class of professional revolutionaries, the *avant garde* who operate from without. The class of professional revolutionaries would find its expression in the party. He, therefore, substituted active intervention of a highly disciplined party for objective forces of Marxian history.

Lenin also tried to explain why socialist revolution, as Marx had predicted, had failed to materialise in the West. In 1916 Lenin published *Imperialism: The Highest Stage of Capitalism* in which he argued that monopoly capitalism inevitably leads to national and international cartels of trusts and monopolies. He was convinced that the basic tendency of the capitalist system was the same. What had happened to obscure this was the fact of acquisition of colonies by the rich countries. These countries brought raw materials from their colonies and sold finished products to them. This had led to internationalisation of "surplus value" and increasing prosperity of the capitalists. The capitalists tried to share their spoils with workers of their respective countries by giving them increasing concessions in working conditions and more wages. This was an outcome of their concern for their

own safety. These concessions had produced a "petty bourgeoisie" illusion among workers. It had created a false consciousness among labour leaders who had turned themselves into 'labour aristocracy,' corrupted by high wages paid to them from the outcome of the exploitation of colonies. They developed vested interests in the maintenance of the status quo.

Lenin prophesied that revolution was most likely to occur in Russia, which was the weakest link in the capitalist chain.

In China Mao Ze Dong was largely responsible for the revolution. He created peasant-based armies. Once in power, he tried to bring about basic industrialisation and increase in agricultural production through collectivisation. Marx had seen communism coming in the wake of advanced capitalism. Mao saw communism essentially as communisation of productive process and elimination of private property. He tried to combine Marxism with specific, natural characteristics of China. His emphasis was on politicisation rather than professionalisation.

### **TENSION IN CONTEMPORARY MARXISM**

Marxism in Russia was able to create a framework necessary for the achievement of a modern state of a different nature. It was able to bring about necessary changes in the age-old pattern of society and create an industrial system leading to national

growth of 8 per cent. But the state of revolutionary idea did not last long. Both Russia and China like all societies which preceded them, developed their own ruling classes obsessed with power towards greater bureaucratisation and party control. Both bureaucracy and party tried to secure to themselves certain privileges and since there is a fusion of party and the state, the former has complete control over society. Stalin abolished even intra party discussions and reserved the final right of interpretation to himself. Once the ideology was institutionalised it was ritualised and tended to be identified with status quo.

People have begun to realise that while the goals of communism had an element of nobility about them, the system as a whole failed to create an institutional mechanism against the misuse of power. Power in itself is not bad. In fact, in certain situations it can be a source of positive good. Problems of poverty sometimes require active state intervention. But in the absence of proper safeguards in the form of a proper system of accountability, the leaders or the party and bureaucracy assume the sole right of decision-making, settling all problems in the name of the people, and in some cases, even in opposition to them. Every attack on freedom is baptised in the name of ideology or class.

As a result, the Communist Movement drifted towards a decline, which was discernible for the first time when a rift between the Russian and Chinese communists came on surface.

Soon after 1960, problems began to emanate and unpopular situations arose in the communist countries of Eastern and Central Europe. On the other hand, during the seventies, trend towards Euro-communism led by the Communist Party of Italy adopted a reconciliatory attitude supporting parliamentary institutions and reforms rather than revolution. Rapid changes took place in Eastern Europe, as well as in China and Russia.

In China, movements for a larger democracy were launched in 1979 and 1986. In June 1989 several agitators were shot dead at the Tiananmen Square during a students' rally. In the Soviet Union reform movement initiated by Mikhail Gorbachev marked the beginning of the end of the communist movement not only in Europe but almost the world over. Ultimately in December 1991, the Soviet Union was disintegrated. The disintegration of the Soviet Union did not mean the disintegration of the Marxist ideology

99  
itself. With the decline of the Soviet Union the communist/socialist system collapsed in the European countries one after another. The economy of all these countries was in a shattered condition. In Russia, the prices of consumer goods registered a 350 fold shoot up and ninety per cent of the people were thrown below the poverty line. Therefore, a change in the political system brought in its train a quick transformation in economy. Changing trends in the forces of marketism, openness in economies and shifting emphasis on privatisation were increasingly visible. Even in the Communist/Socialist China, there are clear indications of liberalism and openness in economy. These developments have compelled the Marxists to give a deeper thought on the organisation of social relations. Now a question is being raised whether Marxism has been a dogma for the liberation of mankind. Its relevance as an alternative ideology before the world is no more unquestioned.

### EXERCISES

1. Define Marxism.
2. Explain the theory of Historical Materialism.
3. Is Marxism relevant today?
4. Discuss Lenin's contribution to Marxism.
5. Write short notes on:
  - (i) Dialectical Materialism;
  - (ii) Theory of class struggle;
  - (iii) Classless society.

## CHAPTER 15

---

### Fascism

#### GENESIS

UNLIKE communism, fascism was not a well-knit doctrine. It was more of an attitude. It had to be all things to all men to increase its appeal to masses. Fascist leaders often defended their lack of a well-defined doctrine on the ground that it was more 'a policy of action'. *Mussolini* said, "we do not believe in dogmatic programmes, in that kind of rigid frame which is supposed to contain and sacrifice the changeable, changing and complex reality... Doctrine, beautifully defined and carefully elucidated with headlines and paragraphs, might be lacking; but there was to take its place something more decisive....faith".

Fascism was essentially a product of the forces released as a result of World War. Italy was denied its principal territorial claims at the Paris Conference after the World War I. It felt that it had been betrayed by the allies. After World War I, the economic situation also deteriorated. Unemployment increased. Successive parliaments were unrepresentative, corrupt and inefficient. People had grown sceptic. Strikes were frequent. A

general feeling of crisis prevailed throughout the country. The Government of the day failed. The socialists could replace it but did not muster enough courage. In the meanwhile fascists under the leadership of *Benito Mussolini* (1883-1945) began to take advantage of this situation. He thought that nationalism was far more potent than communism. In October, 1922, he decided to march on Rome. The march ended with *Mussolini's* appointment as Premier. Without caring much for political institutions, he began to transform the entire system into personal dictatorship.

The post-war situation in Germany was even worse. Germany had been defeated. The war guilt clause severely indicted Germany. It put sole responsibility for the war on Germany. The allied powers refused to permit the German Republic to make any drastic changes in the economic structure of the state. German territories were ceded to France, Poland, Denmark and Belgium. Rhineland was occupied to ensure German payment of reparations to allies specially France. The country was politically divided. It was smarting under international humiliation.

Nationalist Socialist German worker's Party (NSDAP or NAZI) under the leadership of Adolf Hitler (1889-1945) exploited this situation. As the economic situation deteriorated and the number of unemployed increased, the rank of the party swelled. In the election of July, 1932, the Nazi poll leapt to 37 per cent of the total. President Hindenburg appointed Hitler Reich Chancellor in January, 1933. He calculated that induction into office would curb his radical activities, to counter this calculation; he ordered a plebiscite in March 1933. The Government secured 52 per cent of the votes cast; and this established him firmly. Then he successfully engineered parliamentary and electoral support by intimidating his rivals.

Both Hitler and Mussolini tried to organise a new regime and restore order in their respective countries. Both were convinced of the weaknesses of liberal democracies. They hated intense factionalism of competing parties. They were alike in their hatred of foreign governments as well as of communism at home. Both tried to transcend class-conflict in the name of greater and higher ideal of nationalism.

Fascists argued that the state is the nation. It is identified with society. It has its own life. Nothing has any value or significance outside the state. It alone has the capacity to synthesise value, interpret, develop and give expression to every aspect of life. Liberals start with the individuals, and view the state from their perspectives. Fascist theory starts from the opposite point of view. It

107  
argues that man is a social animal. He cannot live apart from larger organism called the Nation State. If he is selfish, he is anti-social. The state has every right to correct him. The individual is just a cell in this organism. It is only by remaining as such that he can find his true freedom. He is free only when he identifies himself with the state.

Once it is recognised that the state is the organism and individual is merely a cell, it is easy to conclude that the cell is expendable for the sake of the whole. The state becomes something more than the individuals who compose it. The state, as conceived by them, is a spiritual and moral fact in itself. Mussolini declared, "The Italian Nation, is an organism with purposes, a life and means of action transcending in power and duration, those individuals singly or grouped, which compose it. It is a moral, political and economic unity which realises itself in the Fascist State". Thus, in the name of the nation-state fascists were able to deny individuality, natural rights and judicial independence that characterise political institutions in Western Europe.

Fascism is also authoritarian. It accepts rigid hierarchy in social organisation. If the state is society, the leader is its brain. He assesses the needs of the body and decides how best to satisfy them. He, in a sense, interprets the general will of society. He has the sole authority to decide for society.

The individual is merely a cell. He must accept the dictates of the leader. He has duties to perform but no rights to enjoy. The judgment of the leader is

infallible. It cannot be disputed. Hence, representative democracy has no place in a Fascist system. It must be replaced by the government of the leader and others appointed by the leader. The leader alone can provide corrective measures to what is happening in society. Fascists called their leader Duce and the Nazis Fuhrer.

### THE DOCTRINE

It is a doctrine, which believes that the state is not subject to any moral laws. The state is the supreme custodian of morality itself. It is the supreme community. "Mussolini is always right" was one of the maxims of the party, whose motto was "To Believe, To Obey, To Fight". In this, slogan, Fascism virtually identified itself with an important element of Christianity. It considered religion as the manifestation of the deepest in man. It sought to defend and protect it. This view largely explains the cordial relations Mussolini had with the Pope. Extreme Nazism tried to create a state church but did not succeed much.

Fascism rejected democracy based on the rule of the majority. It denied that numbers alone can govern by means of periodical consultation. The receptivity of the masses is very limited, their intelligence is small. The principle of equality is replaced by the principle of one man leadership or the Nietzschean doctrine of the superman. The pattern of democracy is that of a pyramid balanced on its apex.

This principle is supposed to apply to all branches of life. In industry, for

example, the employer was the leader of the factory and the workers his followers. It is for this reason that communists hated fascists. They thought the equation of the employer to the leader and workers to the followers in the German Labour Code was nothing but a smoke screen to hide the totalitarian designs of the capitalists. For them fascism was the last desperate attempt of capitalism to save itself, it was not so much capitalism in decay as capitalism fighting for life. Fascism adopted a clever posture. It dissolved all working class organisations. It also limited the initiative of the employers. It accepted capitalism and yet stressed its subordination to the ideal of welfare state. Hitler declared that it was the duty of the state to see that "capital remains the servant of the nation". Both tried to advance their own idea of corporate state. Based on Hegel's concept of three classes — the agricultural, the industrial and the universal or governing, Mussolini argued that these classes were not antagonistic in the Marxian sense but were complementary to each other. Each class was accepted by the state as having the right to pursue its own welfare. Labour must do its job, the employers theirs. The third element, that is party, must govern both. Both workers and capitalists are subservient to it. It was hoped that such a state would abolish class conflict and create harmony.

The doctrine of political and moral supremacy of the state meant the rise

of militant nationalism in both these countries. Both denied the possibility or even the utility of perpetual peace. War brings up to its highest tension all human energy and brings out the best in all. "In internal warfare, mankind has become great", declared Hitler, "in external peace mankind would be ruined". Both Hitler and Mussolini dreamt of new empires.

Most reprehensible feature of German fascism was the Aryan race theory. Hitler declared that Aryans are superior to every other race in the world and hence most fit to govern. The fundamental aim of his regime was to ensure the purity of the Aryan race. In the name of this doctrine, he unleashed a war against the Jews. They were sent to gas chambers and mercilessly killed. By defending himself against the Jews, Hitler thought he was doing God's work. The whole character and education of the Nazi regime was supposed to find its apex in racial instruction. "It must brand the sense of race and feeling of race", said Hitler, "on the instincts and the understanding of the hearts and brains of the youth entrusted to it". Naturally, Mussolini did not share this view of the existence of pure races.

### **DIFFERENT VIEWPOINTS**

It would be proper here to analyse four viewpoints regarding Fascism. First, a number of exponents have depicted Fascism as a danger to liberal economy. They opine that liberal political values as well as institutions

103  
have failed to deliver goods. As a result of this failure, Fascism has been able to take the place of capitalism. Second, some critics have equated it with a totalitarian system. They regard it as a fore-runner of totalitarianism. Fascism lays stress on total restraint on citizens where privatisation finds no place. As Mussolini has said: "Everything is written in the state. There is nothing outside it. There is nothing against it". Such commentators were quite popular during the Cold War period when Fascism - Communism co-relationship was justified. Nazi-Soviet Pact was given a wide acclaim. Points of similarities were drawn between Hitler's attempt for improving the race and Stalin's 'purification' drive. In a system like this fear and suppression were of prime importance. Efforts were made to bring closer the perceptions of Fascism and Communism. However, the ideologies as well as their premises have been fundamentally different. Fascism safeguards the interests of the middle class people and supports traditional institutions like Church and army, where as communism has been opposing these values. Third, in the sixth decade of the 20th century, Fascism was described as radicalism of the rightists. Traditional views were put forward and encouraged. In a bid to present Fascism as rightist, it was projected as a continuum from the past. The political ideology assumed significance in such an explanation. Fourth, Fascists often quoted writings of Rousseau, Hegel, Nietzsche to legitimise their beliefs and action. It was

only opportunism which made them do it. Otherwise it is doubtful whether they really appreciated the profundity of Hegel or Rousseau or Nietzsche.

In any case, once they captured power, they destroyed socialists, communists, recalcitrant members of bureaucracy, trade unions, Jews and all those who opposed paramilitary forces. They centralised the powers of the state, eliminated rights, in the name of the supremacy of the common good. Their economic policy was indeed a success to some extent. Both in Italy and Germany, the aim was self-sufficiency and much progress was made in that direction. The economic crisis had hit both the countries and there were signs of some recovery. Both were able to unite their respective countries. They restored their nations to the status of first class powers. Both instilled new hopes into masses. One has to see the war movies to appreciate how great their impact was on the psychology of all.

Various political writings have explained Fascism in different ways. Of these, the following four view points stand out prominently.

- (i) Fascism as a menace to the liberal states,
- (ii) Fascism as a protagonist of radical totalitarian state,
- (iii) Fascism as a radical rightist ideology,
- (iv) Fascism as a revolt against modernism.

Fascism can be evaluated from three points of view — as an ideology, as a movement and as a system of

government. Ideologically, it was against humanism. It was anti-humanitarian and sought to destroy some of the most cherished human values—rights and interests, freedom and equality in the name of the supremacy of the nation-state.

Looking at from the ideological point of view, it can be said that while liberalism destroys unity in the name of the individual interest, Fascism destroys the individual in the name of the state. The individual becomes expendable for the sake of the state and can be sacrificed at its alter. The 'nation state' is important but it cannot be identified with the government because for all practical purposes the government merely consists of a group of people who speak in the name of the state. The more we glorify the state, the more we glorify the persons who claim to speak in its name and hence, the more we pave the way for the emergence of dictatorship. Society is composed of various wholes. The interest of the state is not always superior to the interest of the individual. That is why the *Mahabharata* declared that for the sake of the village an individual may be sacrificed, for the interest of the province the village may be sacrificed, for the sake of the country the province may be sacrificed, but for the sake of the individual soul even the whole world may be abandoned. Moreover, the state as a whole is not alone. There are other states which have an identity of their own. No whole has a right to trample on the freedom of other wholes. No state has a right to destroy other states.



Again, while evaluating it from the standpoint of a system of Government, it may be observed that a Government based on a denial of human rights and interests cannot last long. Dictators are forced to keep up nations to high emotional pitch. In order to do so they devise various methods of rewards and punishment to perpetuate themselves in power. Hitler did so by irrational propaganda and the use of myths and symbols and the repetition of slogans. Such a policy leads inevitably to violence at home and wars abroad. The story of the rise and fall of fascism demonstrates the truth of the statement.

As a movement, Fascism appeared in Italy after the First World War. With the advent of Mussolini in 1922, the movement got momentum. After sometime Hitler came upon the stage in Germany and Fascism set its foot in many countries. The Fascist movement

swiftly spread to Austria, Hungary, Rumania and Spain. But after the second World War, Fascism was totally repudiated. It was realised that Fascism, specially military expansionism and violation of human rights, was an outcome of Hitler's policy. That is why, the Fascist block was not only completely annihilated, but also totally rejected, condemned and criticised.

If we evaluate Fascism as a political system, we find that it is based on the concept of one party, one man and police domination. It is a system where political and social activities are controlled by the state. In the international sphere, the Fascist administrative formations have been expansionist and aggressive, consequently posing danger to Human Rights, administrative systems and national existence. The Second World War was an outcome of this policy.

**EXERCISES**

1. Explain the meaning of Fascism.
2. Mention any four weaknesses of the Fascist doctrine.
3. Fascism and democracy do not see eye to eye with each other. Comment.
4. Describe the main characteristics of Fascism.
5. Write short notes on:
  - (i) Fascism and Capitalism;
  - (ii) Fascism from ideological point of view;
  - (iii) Aryan race theory in German Fascism.

## CHAPTER 16

# Gandhism

**G**ANDHI was the supreme leader of the nationalist movement. He was also a thinker who challenged most of the assumptions and beliefs of his time. The national movement before him was confined to a few sections of society. He turned it into a mass movement. His strategy of political action largely determined the form of national protest and struggle against the British. The idea of *Swadeshi* and *boycott* had been formulated earlier. But he gave them a unique meaning by integrating them with the idea of a non-violent *satyagraha*. His political strategy attempted to bring all sections of Indian society into the nationalist struggle.

His views are known as Gandhism but he himself denied that there was anything as "Gandhism". But there are a set of ideas in him which are original and which have exercised enormous influence on different people in the same way as other ideologies have. His writings are diffuse and repetitive, except in *Hind Swaraj* which he wrote before he plunged into the national movement. But, despite this, his writings have a coherent vision of man and society.

Some of his important ideas can be summarised under five heads: (i) critique of western civilisation, (ii) Gandhi's views on Democracy (iii) freedom and the state, (iv) freedom and economic organisation, (v) methods of conflict resolution.

### CRITIQUE OF WESTERN CIVILISATION

Gandhi like Vivekananda and other leaders of the Indian Renaissance criticised the western civilisation. According to him it was based on calculated rational self-interest, which was totally disruptive of human relationships. He admired Indian civilisation, which according to him had a more satisfactory view of man's place in the cosmos. It had given due importance to spiritualism and man's search for the soul. He was convinced that the pursuit of self-interest in the form of material interest would increase conflict in society. He believed in the ancient ideas of simple, moral, pious life. This does not mean that he admired everything Indian. He revolted against the exploitation of the scheduled castes

and did more than anyone else for the improvement of their status.

Gandhi also did not like political democracy as it prevailed in the West. He dismissed liberal democracy as 'a fish market' in which people compete for their self-interest. He of course believed that the government ought to be based on the consent of the people but he, hated to see the state as the rule of the selfish individuals. According to him, democracy, as practised in Britain, was bad because it believed in counting heads. Those who used 51 per cent votes ruled. He wanted that in a democracy the weakest should have the same opportunity as the strongest. He complained that democracy had come to mean party rule, or to be more exact, rule in the hands of the Prime Minister who often lacks honesty of purpose. In it, he held that each party thrives on bargains regardless of their consequences for all.

His reaction against the industrial civilisation, which he detested as immoral, had also a pragmatic reason. Ours is a predominantly rural society. Most people depend on agriculture. He thought that the introduction of labour-saving devices in such a society would play havoc with life of the people. However, with advancing age his opposition to technology decreased. He began to welcome any technology which did not increase unemployment and destroy village craft and the simplicity of village life.

## VIEWS ON DEMOCRACY

107

In *Hind Swaraj* (1909), Gandhi had taken an extremely negative view of the value or role of the institutions of modern civilisation, namely, the parliament, law-courts, the police, the military, machinery, hospitals, railways, etc. These institutions of modern civilisation, he said, were divorced from morality, whereas, by contrast, "the tendency of Indian civilisation is to elevate the moral being". Accordingly, in place of the institutions of modern, western civilisation, he put forward an alternative ideal of "real home rule...viz, self-rule and self-control" by the individuals in accordance with the spiritual values of truth and non-violence.

However, within a year of his active involvement in mobilising the Indian masses into the freedom struggle, Gandhi made a partial revision of his earlier views on the institutions of modern civilisation. That revision was due not only to his active involvement in the freedom struggle but also to the criticisms which many political thinkers and political leaders had made of Gandhi's booklet. At any rate, within about a year of his final return to India from South Africa in 1915, Gandhi came to adopt a rather positive attitude toward the institutions of modern life, including the parliament, law-courts, machinery, railways and hospitals. Rather than dismissing them outright as he had done in his *Hind Swaraj*, he now reluctantly

included them in what he called his "pardonable programme for the attainment of parliamentary *swaraj*".

As to the organisational features of "parliamentary *swaraj*", Gandhi preferred it to be a village-based, decentralised set-up, in which all but the lowest level of government was to be indirectly elected by the immediately lower level. This decentralised, village-based model of parliamentary/democratic *swaraj* was not the model that was favoured by the Congress and adopted by the Indian Constitution. The Constitution, however, does incorporate some so-called Gandhian institutions such as the village panchayats. Moreover, the personal and civil liberties as well as the democratic rights components of the liberal-democratic political philosophy of the Constitution are basic to Gandhi's own moral-political philosophy.

### **FREEDOM AND THE STATE**

Gandhi looked upon an increase in the power of the state with the greatest fear. All increase in the power of the state, according to him, was detrimental to individuality. For him the state represented "violence in a concentrated form". He said: "The individual has a soul, but the state is a soulless machine, it can never be weaned from violence to which it owes its existence". He too believed in *Swaraaj* as a condition in which the individual would be complete master of himself. He often contrasted spiritual dominance of Indian society with political dominance of the West. For

him, while the west prized "brute force", the ancient Indian society glorified kings who considered their own swords as "inferior to the sword of ethic".

He postulated a non-violent state based on the willing consent of the people and representing the near unanimity in society. He was convinced that if India was to evolve along non-violent lines, it would have to decentralise power because "centralisation as a system is inconsistent with a non-violent structure of society". He was not only against centralisation of political power but was also against the centralization of economic power. He was against industries based on large-scale production and later large-scale control. In a centralised state, Gandhi thought, there was bound to be a conflict between the rich and the poor. Decentralisation, on the other hand, would make people responsible and non-violent. It would foster feelings of co-operation.

Gandhi's ideal state would be completely self-regulated. In such a state, he thought, everyone would be his own ruler. He will rule himself in such a manner that he will never be a hindrance to his neighbour. It is for this reason that he admired *Ramrajya* which personified the idea of self-help, sacrifice, and discipline. He even regarded Abu Baker and Hazrat Uman like Rama. But he was quite aware that it was not possible to create such a state in the immediate future. One of the obstacles were inequalities "in which few roll in riches and the masses do not

get even enough to eat". Therefore, he conceded that in the present circumstances coercion could be used in extreme cases. But he was convinced that a state is good in which people are governed the least.

He thought the village Republics working in terms of panchayats would develop the spontaneous energies of the people while training them in co-operative action. He, therefore, pleaded that panchayats should be given full powers. Every village had to be self-sustained and capable of managing its own affairs. Gandhi praised this system because in it everyone knows his wants and also realises that "no one should want anything that others cannot have with equal labour". He summed up his society thus: "In this structure composed of innumerable villages, there will be ever widening, never ascending circles. Life will not be a pyramid with the apex sustained by the bottom... But it will be an oceanic circle whose centre will be the individual always ready to perish for the circle of villages, till at last the whole becomes one life composed of individuals". He further said that the outermost circumference will, not wield power to crush the inner circle but will give strength to all within and derive its own strength from it.

## **FREEDOM AND ECONOMIC ORGANISATION**

Like Marx he put emphasis on labour. He believed it to be the real wealth which gives rise to money. He thought, "The real owner of wealth is one who

109  
puts in certain amount of labour with conscious productive aim". He believed that one should not eat even a single meal without doing some labour. He thought that such an attitude would foster economic independence, which in turn will make us fearless and increase the national character.

He totally, repudiated property. He always thought that property was an obstacle in the realisation of God. After a theft he quoted a verse of Premchand to Gangabehari: "It is a blessing that chains have broken, it will be easier for me to find Shri Gopal". Gandhi was, however, conscious that such a position was impractical. He, therefore, declared that if property is "lawfully acquired", it is entitled to protection.

It is in this context that he called upon the Capitalists and Zamindars to become trustees. He argued that they should regard tenants and workers as co-proprietors. The zamindar should hold his Zamindari or industry in trust for them. He admitted that absolute trusteeship was unattainable. But he was convinced that if we strive for it we would go a long way in realizing a better state of equality on earth than by any other method. For him change of heart was the answer.

How about state ownership? Isn't it better than private ownership? Gandhi admitted that it was better but he rejected it on the grounds of violence. He was convinced that "if the state suppressed capitalism by violence, it will be caught in the coils of violence itself, and will fail to develop non-violence at any time. But if the

Zamindar or Capitalist refused to become trustees, and the state ownership became unavoidable, he would support a minimum of state ownership".

## METHODS OF CONFLICT

### RESOLUTION

Gandhi emphasised the need to harness the forces of love as against hatred. He insisted on non-violence and *Satyagraha* over the concepts of boycott and passive resistance. He wrote that means to be means must always be clean. For him *ahimsa* is our supreme duty. If we take care of the means, we shall definitely reach the end sooner or later. He had derived his ideas from Thoreau, Emerson, Tolstoy and the Jain tradition. He was also influenced by the *Sermon on the Mount*. He was convinced that what was required was to educate a man in truth and non-violence, and by truth, man will transform material conditions for the good of all. Material conditions and individual character are two sides of the same coin in which, according to Gandhi, the individual character had a greater precedence because it alone has the capacity to transform material conditions on a permanent basis. A change of material conditions without corresponding change of heart will not yield results. Both trusteeship and *satyagraha* were such methods.

*Satyagraha* consists of two words, i.e. *Satya*, which means 'truth' and *Agraha*, which means 'force', 'request' or 'strength'. All practitioners of

*Satyagraha* should oppose violence by non-violence as well as by the strength of his moral convictions. According to Gandhi, it was not merely a way of resisting authority but also a way of using love and moral strength to vindicate truth in society. Gandhi was convinced that violence inflicts injury on others. On the other hand, use of *Satyagraha* may involve suffering of the *Satyagrahi* himself. The *Satyagrahi* does not merely try to win but seeks the larger good or truth which Gandhi thought was God himself. However, if there was a choice between violence and cowardice, Gandhi always favoured the former.

*Satagraha* is the name of Gandhian non-violent way of political action to resist and transform untruthful and violent systems of social or political power. According to Gandhi, the distinctive features of *Satagraha*, in comparison with "passive resistance", are as follows:

- (i) While the passive resisters harbour hatred toward their adversaries, the *satyagrahis* view their opponents with love.
- (ii) The passive resisters, unlike the *satyagrahis*, may harass and injure their opponents.
- (iii) *Satyagraha*, unlike passive resistance, can be offered even to one's nearest and dearest ones.
- (iv) Passive resistance is a resistance by the weak and helpless, and it does not exclude the use of violence, whereas *satyagraha* is a moral-political action by the strong, and it excludes the use of violence.

The various methods of *satyagraha* are: (1) purificatory actions by the *Satyagrahis*, such as pledges, prayers and fasts; (2) acts of non-cooperation, such as boycott, strikes, *hartal*, fasting and *hijrat* (i.e. voluntary emigration); (3) acts of civil disobedience, such as picketing, non-payment of taxes and defiance of specific laws; and (4) a constructive programme of social reform and social service, such as the promotion of inter-communal unity, the removal of untouchability, adult education, and the removal of economic and social inequalities.

Gandhi provided a severe indictment of the state, property and industrialisation. He also provided an alternative set of values and institutions. The whole basis of society with its inequalities, coercive state and competitive capitalist is vicious. He declared, "If plain life is worth living, then the attempt is worth making". His numerous ideas are vague, his realism as a political strategist is amply contrasted with idealism in his thoughts. But there is no doubt that Gandhi raised almost all the important questions which confront modern civilisation, namely, the question of increase in state power, bureaucratic oppression, increasing use of violence, the unfortunate consequences of big technology, etc. His critique of the modern civilisation is full of great insights. His ideas on the relationship between means and ends are particularly thoughtful. No one has a better case on these points than Gandhi. His greatest contribution was

his emphasis on decentralisation of economic and political power. Our Directive Principles of State Policy insist on the introduction of this idea. Moreover, social scientists world over are keen to articulate and explain the Gandhian alternatives to the current ills of development. These efforts amply justify the relevance of Gandhi to the contemporary world.

Gandhi, however, did not adequately develop an alternative institutional strategy, which could link up his ideas with practice in modern times. For example, in advancing the idea of trusteeship, he did not realise the appalling selfishness of the capitalists. That is one reason why when India became free people found it difficult to translate his ideas into concrete structures. While he convinced the people about the merits of the political struggle he waged, he did not sufficiently develop his idea to make it clear to them the linkages his ideas could have with the creation of a new political and economic order. It is for this reason that while some of his followers turned to European socialism for inspiration, the others to the *Sarvodaya* philosophy of communitarian life based on non-violence. However, it was his great achievement that he highlighted the problems of the twentieth century by insisting that politics, industry and technology should be subordinated to the ideals of life. It is for this reason that while some of us can disagree with Gandhi, none can ignore him.

**EXERCISES**

1. On what grounds has Gandhi criticised the Western Civilisation.
2. Describe Gandhi's view on democracy and state.
3. Explain conflict resolution. Describe Gandhian method of resolving the conflict resolution.
4. Describe Gandhi's concept of political and economic decentralisation.
5. Write short notes on:
  - (i) Parliamentary Swaraj;
  - (ii) *Satyagraha* and Passive Resistance;
  - (iii) Techniques of *Satyagraha*.

www.notesclues.com



## CHAPTER 17

### Humanism

THE concept of Humanism refers primarily to a system of thought, which focusses on the autonomy of the individual. The term Humanism has several meanings. But generally speaking, it is a doctrine according to which, to quote Tzvetan Todorov, "man is point of departure and point of reference of human action". The word "humanist" figures perhaps first time in the writings of the French thinker Montaigne when he contrasts his own thought with that of theologians. Humanism was a product of Renaissance and Enlightenment in Europe and finds its fullest expression in the American and French Revolutions.

The concise *Oxford Dictionary* defines Humanism as follows: "An outlook or system of thought concerned with human rather than divine or super natural matters. A belief or outlook emphasising common human needs and seeking solely rational ways of solving human problems, and concerned with mankind as responsible and progressive intellectual beings."

Humanists believe in the potentiality of human beings. They

suggest that human being has great potentiality and if developed fully one can reach to the greatest height, provided, of course, one gets proper opportunities to develop. Humanists also have faith in the good nature of human being. Gandhi, Russell and Tolstoy were great humanists of the twentieth century. In his early writings Marx was also a humanist. Early writings of Marx include Economic and Philosophical Manuscripts (1842), written much before the publication of Communist Manifesto (1848). M.N. Roy was a humanist: we'll learn about his humanism a few pages ahead. His ideational journey was long. He began his journey from Marxism and ended it with Radical Humanism.

In the Middle Ages human beings were subordinated to God. They had access to secrets of nature but in ultimate analysis their submission to God was total. Renaissance and Enlightenment brought about a change in this perspective. Man became the centre of the universe. He now would have the possibility to will freely and to be his own masters. He would have the freedom to choose a life for himself and his fellow human beings rather than

being dictated either by traditions or by God. This meant that henceforth he would have freedom to choose his home, profession and also to deviate from traditions or canons of religious texts. Religion did continue to play an important role. But the significant change that occurred was that man had the right to make a distinction between true and false, right and wrong, just and unjust, and good and bad.

In humanist thought, man becomes free in his private life. He was not only unique but also different and could not be reduced to the other. He also acquired inherent natural right to decide the rules of moral living. Later another component was added to this when man claimed freedom in the public domain also and asserted the right to choose his political regime. Thus, democracy became the only legitimate form of Government. The movement reached its zenith towards the end of the eighteenth century, in the American and French Revolutions. Both the revolutions were inspired by the idea that no authority, be it tradition, family or the state, is superior to the will of man.

As a result of these changes, three major orientations emerged.

### I. MATERIALISM

Since God's existence is doubtful and human beings are in complete charge of themselves, they will decide their own values. They will be materialists. Modern science emphasises the role of reason and its capacity to penetrate all

the secrets of nature and history. Science leads to technology, to the idea that we cannot only understand nature but also transform it according to our will.

### II. INDIVIDUALISM

Since the weight of tradition and family ties circumscribes one's freedom, the individual must assert its individual autonomy and make choices according to one's own interest. Freedom is the most precious gift of Renaissance and we must preserve it at any cost. It is not that every one has accepted this position in totality. For instance, conservatives would still cling to the value of the family and the tradition. There are others who would like to abandon the values of shared life. But humanists insist that while objectively man shares the same condition, in the inter-subjective relations, to quote Todorov, "everyone occupies a unique position; in communion with oneself, everyone is alone, and responsible for his actions". The final decision in all matters now rests with the individual. One must affirm life, assert one's power and relentlessly pursue one's own interest in relation to others.

### III. DEMOCRATISM

Since man has the capacity to decide true and false as he is endowed with reason, he has a right to choose his political regime. Democracy is the only legitimate form of government as it is based on the idea of willing subjects.

Humanist thought tells us a little about economic policies of the way in which the state institutions should be organised. Humanism is content to provide a guiding perspective around the principles of toleration and pluralism. According to them there is no paradise; the world is imperfect and human beings have to make the best of it.

In India, M.N.Roy gave a clear expression to the idea of humanism. He regarded man as central, he wrote "freedom is the supreme value because the urge for freedom is the essence of human existence." Roy accepted humanism because humanists had always approached life from the assumption of the sovereignty of man. It is man's unique capacity of knowing, as distinct from the common biological activity of being aware, which endows him with powers, not to rule over others, but to create freedom for the benefit of humanity.

It is to the credit of the humanist thought that we have moved away from the aristocratic to the democratic age in which all man are treated as free and equal. It has made us aware of need to make an individual autonomous not only of God but of all larger aggregates as well as ideologies which tend to subordinate the individual to either a hypothetical vision of history or vague universal concepts such as race or nationalism. The emphasis on history

as a determining principle finally led to communism and atrocities associated with some of the communist regimes in the name of class war. The emphasis on race and nationalism culminated in the fascist regimes, which completely sacrificed the individual at the altar of the state. Humanism also rejects technological domination. Machines are made to serve human beings and not vice-versa.

The importance of humanism lies in the fact that it asserts the autonomy of the individual. It is true that this individual does not live in isolation, but only in relation to others. What is valuable in humanism is its insistence that in the ultimate analysis, it is individual's own uniqueness and resultant moral worth, which is important. All citizens are equal members of the society. What counts is not their resemblance but uniqueness and diversity. Humanism believes that society consists of individuals, good and bad; those who can co-operate and those who cannot and those who can inflict injury and those who cannot. All of them can co-exist in a framework of plurality. The state should protect them all and should be so organised that the individual becomes an end in itself. The state, science, technology, etc. are all means to an end namely to enable individuals to flourish; they are not ends in themselves; they cannot be allowed to dominate human life.

**EXERCISES**

1. What is 'Humanism'?
2. Explain M.N.Roy's idea on 'Humanism'.
3. Explain the following in relation to 'Humanism':
  - (i) Materialism;
  - (ii) Individualism;
  - (iii) Democratism.

---

---

## Glossary

**Bourgeoisie:** A French term signifying 'citizen class'. The term is frequently used by Marxist socialists to denote the class of proprietors (other than agricultural), capitalists, manufacturers, merchants, persons with a business of their own and members of liberal professions as opposed to the 'proletariat' who live only by selling their labour.

**Capitalism:** A type of economic system which precedes socialism or communism. It is based on private ownership of the means of production and on the exploitation of the wage labour.

**Chartist Movement:** A British working-class radical movement during 1838-50. The movement brought about a "people's charter" which proposed among other things; universal manhood suffrage, equal electoral districts, votes by ballot, annual parliament, abolition of the property qualification for M.Ps and paid M.Ps. O' Conner was the most influential figure of the chartist movement.

**Democratic Socialism:** A mixed ideology aiming at bringing about socialism through democratic means. The ideology was consciously articulated by Nehru and endorsed by the Indian Parliament from time to time.

**Ethnocratic:** Evaluating other races and cultures by criteria specific to one's own.

**Elite:** Denotes a group of persons who hold positions of eminence in society. The term is also used to refer to leaders in different fields, e.g. political elite.

**Fabian Socialism:** Originated in 1887 under the auspices of the Fabian Society. It proposed the use of existing party and parliamentary machinery for accomplishing practical reforms gradually leading to the elimination of poverty and establishment of community ownership of means of production and land.

**Guild Socialism:** A co-operative form of socialism combining large scale state ownership of the means of production with their administration by guilds (unions trade). It originated in England around 1900 A.D. and its chief exponent was G.D.H. Cole.

**Humanism:** An outlook or system of thought concerned with human rather than divine or supernatural matters.

**Human Rights:** Human rights are modern and secular version of natural rights. Human beings are entitled to these rights by virtue of being human. These rights are 'universal' in the sense that they belong to all humans and not only to members of any particular state, race, religion, gender or other group.

**Laissez-faire:** Denotes non-intervention by the state in the economic activities of individuals.

**Liberalism:** An ideology based on a commitment to individualism, consent and toleration; modern liberalism differs from classical liberalism.

**Political Development:** The concept of political development became popular after the emergence of the 3rd world countries. This concept is analysed and discussed as a 'moral' ethical and political, 'good' among the developing countries.

**Political Participation:** Through this process of political participation a close relationship is established between the authorities and the people. Political authorities here are always keen to ensure participation of masses in the process of governance.

**Political Socialisation:** The process by which a particular set of attitudes, beliefs and orientations is passed on from one generation to another is known as political socialisation. In other words, it is a study of "what, when and how people learn about politics".

**Proletariat:** In ancient Rome the property-less class which served the state by producing children *proles*. However, the most prevalent usage refers to the one developed by Marx. In this sense proletariat includes those in industry, agriculture and intellectual posts who live by the sale of their labour, as opposed to the capitalist bourgeoisie.

**State of Nature:** State of nature suggests a pre-civil and pre-political state of human existence in which human relations were governed by the law of nature. To some such a state was pre-social also. The state of nature was either too idyllic or too inconvenient to last long. Hence, men soon abandoned the state of nature and set up a political society.

**Syndicalism:** A movement of labour unions which favoured "direct action" culminating in a revolutionary general strike to secure workers' ownership and control of industry. It originated under the influence of Robert Owen and acquired its more violent aspects in France besides getting its name from the word 'Syndicate' (union trade).

**Trade Union:** An association of wage earners of workers for the purpose of improving their conditions and protecting their interests.

**Utopia:** It is associated with the ideal state of condition with no imperfection. It means an ideal which is difficult to achieve in reality. The term became famous after Thomas More's description in 1516 of an island with this name.