

B. A. (Hons.) Part III

Philosophy Paper VI (Social and Political Philosophy)

Sl. No.	Title	Unit	Page
1.	Nature of Social Philosophy	1	2
2.	Relation of Social Philosophy to Sociology	2	10
3.	Civic Duty X	3	17
4.	Individual and Society X	4	24
5.	Tradition and Modernity	5	32
6.	Caste and Class	6	40
7.	Marriage and Divorce	7	48
8.	Private Property X	8	58
9.	Doctrine of Trusteeship X	9	67
10.	Nature of Political Philosophy	10	74
11.	Political Philosophy and Political Science X	11	82
12.	Political Concepts : Liberty, Equality, Justice	12	90
13.	Political Concepts : Rights and Duties	13	99
14.	Power, Influence and Authority X	14	109
15.	Political Obligation	15	117
16.	Political Ideology : Democracy	16	126
17.	Political Ideology : Socialism	17	136
18.	Political Ideology : Marxism and Communism	18	145
19.	Political Ideology : Monarchy	19	156
20.	Anarchism X	20	165
21.	Sarvodaya X	21	174
22.	Political Ideology : Satyagraha	22	183

Nature of Social Philosophy**Lesson Structure**

- 1.0 Objective**
- 1.1 Introduction**
- 1.2 Explanation of the Nature of Social Philosophy**
 - 1.2.1 Definition of Social Philosophy**
 - 1.2.2 Main Features of Social Philosophy**
 - 1.2.3 Problems and Scope of Social Philosophy**
 - 1.2.4 Importance of Social Philosophy**
 - 1.2.5 Conclusion**
- 1.3 Summary**
- 1.4 Key words used in the Lesson**
- 1.5 Questions for Exercise**
 - (a) Objective Questions**
 - (b) Short Answer Questions**
 - (c) Long Answer Questions**
- 1.6 Suggested Readings**

1.0 Objective

The main objective behind the discussion of the nature of social philosophy is to acquaint you with this recent branch of philosophy which deals with the different aspects of human society. Although the study of human society is being done from ancient times, it is only recently, during the nineteenth century, that social philosophy as a separate branch of study developed. Hence, it becomes necessary for us to know the definition, nature, scope and importance of social philosophy. It is with this objective that the nature of social philosophy is being discussed here and the chapters have been arranged accordingly.

1.1 Introduction

As stated earlier, it is only in recent times that social philosophy has been recognized as a distinct subject of study. From the history of western philosophy, we come to know that before Socrates, all the thinkers were in search of ultimate reality. But Socrates, Plato, Aristotle and other philosophers did not limit their investigation only to the search for ultimate reality. They wrote on ethics, politics, epistemology etc. Thus, the study of the different aspects of human life began. Later, Locke, Hobbes, Rousseau, Mackenzie, Russell, etc. also contributed to this field. In India, right from the Vedic period, Indian philosophers concentrated their attention on human society and the study of its various aspects. Manu, Yajnavalakya, Kautilya, Vatsyayana have contributed immensely to this field.

Thus, there is no doubt that the study of human society is being done since ancient times but it was only in the 19th century that it was established as a separate science. Social philosophy developed and came to occupy an important place in the field of thoughts.

Each social science had its own conclusions and a need was felt to synthesize the conclusions of various sciences. A need was also felt to evaluate the conclusions of the various sciences. Thus, a subject was required which could synthesize and evaluate the conclusions of various sciences. This subject does not describe the different sciences, but gives the ideal which human beings have to attain in life. This subject came to be known as social philosophy. It is philosophy that critically evaluates our conclusions and gives the ideal, the goal which we have to attain in life and because in this case, philosophy has to evaluate the conclusions of the social sciences, hence, this subject came to be known as "Social Philosophy".

1.2 Explanation of the Nature of Social Philosophy

Social philosophy studies the meaning, purpose and value in changing human society. It is a philosophy of social values and so it is a normative science as distinguished from the descriptive sciences. Descriptive sciences like political science, economics, physics, chemistry, etc. describe the phenomena as it is, whereas normative sciences like ethics, logic, etc. describe a thing as it ought to be. Normative sciences are concerned with the values, the ideals.

Social philosophy is a normative discipline. It takes the facts from the social sciences but as a normative discipline it states the ideals and values of social life. It formulates ideal rules for social interactions and inter-relations. The social philosopher studies the general good and ideal as found in our social system and suggests means with which to realize these ideals. Hence, social philosophy is a philosophy of social values. In the words of Mackenzie, "Social philosophy in particular, concentrates its

Nature of Social Philosophy

attention on the social unity of mankind, and seeks to interpret the significance of the special aspects of human life with reference to their unity. It thus means mainly the effort to study values, ends, ideals not primarily what exists or has existed or may be expected to exist, but rather the meaning and worth of these modes of existence."

In this way, social philosophy does not discover facts which it takes from other social sciences. Its main function is to examine social values in the light of social facts. By such examination, it presents a harmonious picture of social good. In the words of Prof. Hobhouse, "We set before ourselves a conception of the harmonious fulfilment of human capacity as the substance of happy life, and we have to enquire into the condition of its relations. We consider laws, customs and institutions in respect of their function not merely in maintaining any sort of social life but in maintaining and promoting a harmonious life."

Thus, social philosophy assesses social relations in the light of the supreme ideal. He sees them in a social whole. He verifies the authenticity of the prevailing social methods. Thus, social philosophy is normative in character.

1.2.1 Definition of Social Philosophy

Social philosophy is a combination of two words—social and philosophy. Literally, "it is the philosophy of society". Philosophy is made up of two words—philos and sophia. Philos means 'love' and sophia means 'wisdom' or knowledge. Hence, philosophy means love for knowledge or wisdom. Similarly, society is derived from the Latin word 'socius' which means society. Thus, social philosophy is the philosophy of society.

Philosophy, we know is a rational and critical appreciation of the fact of life and universe. Society is a web or network of social relationships. It is an organization, a system or pattern of relationships among human beings. It may be defined as the total complex of human relationships, a complex of forms and processes, living and growing by interaction. Social philosophy, thus, is a rational and critical appreciation of human society which is perpetually undergoing change.

Thus, social Philosophy deals with human society as a whole. According to Mackenzie, "Social philosophy seeks to explain the nature of society in the light of the principle of social solidarity." In other words, social philosophy tries to determine the meaning of social life. In its work, social philosophy takes help from other social sciences. In fact, no social philosophy can ignore the conclusions of social sciences. Social philosophy, to be practical, should be based on the facts attained by social sciences.

1.2.2 Main Features of Social Philosophy

Social philosophy studies the different aspects of human society from the philosophical point of view. The difference between social philosophy and sociology is very subtle. Till the nineteenth century the problems of social philosophy were discussed

Nature of Social Philosophy

with sociology. It is only in recent years that social philosophy is being studied as a separate branch of study. Although, on the practical level there is not much difference between the two, on the theoretical level they are different. Sociology is a very wide subject which includes an inquiry into the origin of human communities, the study of their various forms, laws, customs, institutions, languages, beliefs, ways of thinking, feeling and acting. In short, it may be said to take all knowledge about human life for its province. Social philosophy is limited in its scope. It evaluates the various conclusions of the social sciences in the light of supreme social values. Hence, it is concerned only with the more important aspects, not with each of them.

Social philosophy is not concerned with creatures other than 'Man', for in the first place, they do not have any society, and in the second place, if at all they have one, their society is fundamentally different from the human society. Social philosophy is not concerned with Nature either, because the relations that exist between the objects of nature are different from the social relations. Thus, the subject of social philosophy is the human society as a whole.

Just as philosophy studies the fundamental conclusions of the sciences, similarly, social philosophy studies the various conclusions of social sciences. As Ginsberg says. " It seeks to disentangle the fundamental categories which they employ, the assumptions, postulates, or presuppositions upon which they rest, and to subject them to analytical scrutiny and constructive re-interpretation."

Like philosophy, social philosophy too, is analytical as well as synthetic. It has thus, two aspects – creative and critical. In its creative aspects, it seeks to discover the supreme values of social relations. Then, the social philosophy evaluates the sociological facts in the light of supreme good of man. He examines the validity of social values. He criticises the methods, presumptions and basic principles of social sciences and presents their interpretations.

Social philosophy gives a synoptic view of society. It looks at every event as a part of the whole from a synoptic viewpoint based on direct perception, institutional learning and logic. The social philosopher resolves the general problems of social sciences and analyses as well as synthesises their postulates and results. Its attitude is liberal, speculative, analytical and rational. It adopts philosophical methods and with their assistance tries to arrive at conclusions.

Social philosophy is normative in character. From what we have discussed earlier, social philosophy is the philosophy of social values. A social philosopher assesses social relations in the light of supreme ideal. He sees them in a social whole. He verifies the authenticity of the prevailing social methods. Thus, it is a normative discipline. Because it is normative, it differs from positive science, such as Sociology, Economics and Political Science.

Thus, social philosophy studies :

- (a) the ideals, values and ends of social life,
- (b) the postulates, pre-suppositions and conclusions of the various social sciences.

But this does not mean that it is not concerned with social facts. It is true that it is not concerned with the historical discussion of social facts. That is why, social philosophy does not show the path for social or political reformation, but it does guide the society or social institutions on the right path.

1.2.3 Problems and Scope of Social Philosophy

Social philosophy is concerned with human society. But the different aspects of man's social life is studied by the different social sciences. Social philosophy tries to unite the conclusions of the social sciences and present a harmony. Besides, it is concerned with social ideals, values and ends. The main problems of social philosophy are as follows :

- (a) Man is a social animal. The question is how can we explain the social aspects of man or what makes a man social. This is an important problem for social philosophy.
- (b) Another problem of social philosophy is to find out the basis of society; whether it is natural or artificial. About this problem of social philosophy, Mackenzie may be quoted as saying, "The problem is still on the whole, the one that was raised at the first beginning - viz., in what sense and to what extent, can human society be properly described as natural." Thus, the main aim of social philosophy is to discover how far the social relations are natural and how far artificial. What are their desirable forms.
- (c) The social sciences study the origin, nature and development of social institutions. Social philosophy finds the base of social institutions, social groups etc.
- (d) Social philosophy is concerned with the end of social institutions, their ideals, etc. It discusses the social customs and traditions, their aims, etc.
- (e) It also discusses the end of the actions of individuals who make up the society. Being a normative discipline it is concerned with values, ideals and means which it tries to determine. A man can attain his ethical ends only in a society. Thus, the problem of social philosophy is to find out which social institutions are helpful to man to attain his end.
- (f) Every social science has its distinct method of study. Social philosophy evaluates these methods.
- (g) Every social science has its distinct method of study. Social philosophy evaluates these methods.

- (h) Our society is changing. Social philosophy studies the causes of social change. It also makes a study of social progress.
- (i) The problems of social morality also come within the scope of social philosophy. Social crimes and punishment for them also come within the scope of social philosophy.
- (j) Social philosophy is also concerned with those theories which lead to social unity. In this context it also studies social impact of language, religion, etc.

Thus, social philosophy is concerned with the different aspects of society. The social philosopher resolves the general problems of social sciences and analyses as well as synthesises their postulates and results. His attitude is liberal, speculative, analytical and rational. He adopts philosophical methods and with their assistance tries to arrive at conclusions.

1.2.4 Importance of Social Philosophy

The nature, problem and scope of social philosophy make its value absolutely clear. The social philosopher examines the basic principles of human behaviour and supreme values of human life and thus prepares a solid ground for social sciences. Just as philosophy provides philosophical basis for physical sciences, social philosophy provides philosophical basis for the social sciences. It studies the philosophical questions involved in social phenomena and processes. It views the problems of the social scientist from the philosophical point of view and evaluates social fact in the light of supreme social life. With regard to the analysis of supreme issues, every social scientist has to consult the social philosopher, for e.g. the impact of Plato's and Aristotle's social philosophy may be seen on the different social scientists. In modern times, American behaviourists, like William James, and the utilitarian philosopher, John Dewey have exercised considerable influence on different social sciences. In short, the value of social philosophy may be stated as follows :

(a) Development in personal life : Because man is a social animal, he has to think about social problems and relations which he cannot do in the absence of social values. Social philosophy formulates and examines the social values concerning man.

(b) Helps in understanding others : Social philosophy shows that an individual cannot attain the values of his life in isolation from social values. It presents the picture of an ideal society in the light of which man's social behaviour can be improved.

(c) Impact on social life : Society is a network of social relations which develop in family, occupation and other institutions. All of them are influenced by social philosophy.

(d) Assists in the cultural development of a nation : Social philosophy influences every aspect of cultural development. A nation's social philosophy reflects the climax of its cultural development. In India, too, the influence of social philosophy on customs, conventions, religions and culture is evident.

(e) Impact on economic life : Social philosophers like Marx and Gandhi have deeply influenced the economic life of millions of people. The social philosophy of each nation influences its economic life.

(f) Impact on political life : Social philosophy examines the rights and duties of the state in the light of the ultimate ends of human life. It influences the forms of government, rights and duties of citizens and importance of laws, etc.

(g) Contribution to education : Social philosophy constructs the philosophical foundations of the educational system. It analyses human nature to find out how far man is naturally social or not so that the syllabi for educational institutions must be prescribed accordingly.

(h) Helps in spreading knowledge : Social philosophy thus, presents a philosophical background to social sciences, and just as without philosophy every knowledge is incomplete, similarly, without social philosophy, social sciences are also incomplete.

1.2.5 Conclusion

Social philosophy, thus, provides a philosophical foundation to social sciences and harmonises the different conclusions of social science. It thus, constructs a total picture of the social sciences.

1.3 Summary

Social Philosophy examines the basic principles of human behaviour and the supreme values of human life. It, thus, prepares a solid ground for social sciences. Different social sciences study different aspects of social life. Social philosophy seeks to harmonise the different conclusions of different social sciences and tries to fill up the chasm amongst them.

Thus, Social Philosophy gives us a complete insight into the nature of social phenomena. In the words of Mackenzie, " It does help us to see what are the guiding principles by which our course has to be directed." Hence, the value of Social Philosophy, like philosophy, lies in explaining the goal of the process of total social evolution. It shows the values on which depends the social progress of man. Though it does not give us a formula for social, political and economic reforms; yet it does explain the guiding principles which determine the course of such reforms. This direction is given in the light of supreme social values.

1.4 Key words used in the Lesson

Social, society, philosophy, social values, social science, clarity, guiding principle, philosophical bases, conclusion, evaluate, normative, human relationship, synoptic view, analytical, constructive, synthesis.

1.5 Questions for Exercise

(a) Objective Questions

1. Social philosophy studies

- (a) social phenomena, relations, traditions, etc.
- (b) society
- (c) the Ideal values and ends of social life.

Answer — (c)

2. Social philosophy is

- (a) analytical
- (b) synthetical
- (c) both analytical and synthetical
- (d) none

Ans. — (c)

(b) Short Answer Questions

1. Discuss the main features of social philosophy.

Answer — Sub-section - 1.2.2

2. What are the main problem of social philosophy ?

Answer — Sub-section - 1.2.3

3. What is the value of social philosophy ? Discuss.

Answer — Sub-section - 1.2.4

(c) Long Answer Questions

- 1. Discuss the nature and scope of social philosophy.
- 2. Explain clearly what is social philosophy. Show the importance of its study.

1.7 Suggested Readings

- (a) G. K. Agarwal : **Principles of Sociology**
- (b) Dr. Vatsyayan : **Social Philosophy**
- (c) J. S. Mackenzie : **Outlines of Social Philosophy**
- (d) Vidya Bhushan & D. R. Sachdeva : **An introduction to Sociology**



Relation of Social Philosophy to Sociology**Lesson Structure**

- 2.0 Objective
- 2.1 Introduction
- 2.2 Explanation of the Relation between Social Philosophy and Sociology
 - 2.2.1 Definition of Social Philosophy and Sociology
 - 2.2.2 Nature of Social Philosophy and Sociology
 - 2.2.3 Relation between Social Philosophy and Sociology
 - 2.2.4 Conclusion
- 2.3 Summary
- 2.4 Key words used in the Lesson
- 2.5 Questions for Exercise
 - (a) Objective Questions
 - (b) Short Answer Questions
 - (c) Long Answer Questions
- 2.6 Suggested Readings

2.0 Objective

Social Philosophy and Sociology are both concerned with the human society. Both study the different aspects of human life, social relationships, social phenomena, etc. Thus, both Social Philosophy and Sociology study the same problems, though from different angles and with different methodology.

The main objective behind the discussion of the relation between Social Philosophy and Sociology is to analyze the nature and character of the two branches of knowledge and to find out the similarities and differences between them. This will help in enhancing our knowledge of social philosophy, which has developed as a separate branch of study only recently.

2.1 Introduction

Social philosophy, as we have learnt from the previous chapter, is a critical analysis of social facts and values. It is a philosophy of social life. It studies the meaning, purpose and value in the changing human society. Because it is a philosophy of social values, it is a normative science.

Sociology is that social science which also studies the society. Sociology studies the forms and kinds of human relations in society, of other social relations and of social events. It studies the following aspects of social life : social traditions, processes and behaviour, forms of social events and their inter-relations, impact of social forces on social relations etc.

Thus both social philosophy and sociology are concerned with the human society. Both study the different aspects of human society. So, the problem is the same for both. The question is how both these branches of knowledge handle these problems.

In this chapter, we shall see how both social philosophy and sociology approach their subject of study, what is the method of their study, what are the aspects of society which they emphasize etc.

In the end, we shall conclude by trying to establish a relation between social philosophy and sociology.

2.2 Explanation of the Relation between Social Philosophy and Sociology

As discussed earlier, both social philosophy and sociology are concerned with human society. Sociology is the science of society which studies social relationships. Thus sociology has a number of branches dealing with different aspects of human life. The different branches collect facts on the basis of experience and analyze them. Thus, sociology is a factual and analytical science.

Social Philosophy also deals with society but being a normative science it studies the meaning, purpose and value in changing human society. It gives a synoptic picture of social good by examining social values in the light of social facts.

For example, sociology will collect facts of about marriage and divorce. It will discuss the concepts of marriage and divorce. But what is the value of marriage and why should divorce be avoided is the problem of social philosophy.

Thus both social philosophy and sociology study the same problems but from different angles and with different methodology.

2.2.1 Definition of Social Philosophy and Sociology

Social philosophy is a combination of two words : social and philosophy. Literally,

Relation of Social Philosophy to Sociology

it means the philosophy of society. Now the question is what is philosophy and what is society. Philosophy, as we know, is a rational and critical study of the facts of the universe. Society is a network of social relations, social facts. Hence, social philosophy is a critical analysis of social facts and values. It is a philosophy of social life. Social philosophy is the thoughtful consideration of human society which is perpetually undergoing change. It studies the meaning, purpose and value in the changing human society. It is a philosophy of social values and so it is a normative science. As Prof. Mackenzie says, "It, thus, means mainly the effort to study values, ends and ideals, not previously what exists but rather the meaning and modes of existence. "Social Philosophy does not discover facts which it takes from other social sciences. " Its main function is to examine social values in the light of social facts. By such examination it presents a harmonious picture of social good.

"Social Philosophy", as Mackenzie says, "concentrates its attention on the social unity of mankind, and seeks to interpret the significance of the special aspects of human life with reference to that unity. "Thus, all aspects of human life are included in the scope of social philosophy. The main problem of social philosophy is to discover the philosophical foundations of the society.

Sociology is a more or less systematic body of knowledge emerging late among the scientific disciplines. The major problems in sociological theory broadly concerned recur in the writings of learned men of all periods. But it was not until late 19th century that attempts were made to organise the problems of sociology into a science.

Sociology has been defined in various ways. According to Ginsberg, Ward, Odion and Giddings, "Society is the science of society." Maclver, Page and Max Weber define it as the study of social relations. Young, Bennet, Tunin, Sorokin and Green describe it as the study of social life and phenomena.

In the words of Mackenzie, "Sociology besides being open to some linguistic objection, is a somewhat vague term, and may be regarded as covering a very comprehensive field. It includes an inquiry into the origins of human communities, the study of their various forms, laws, customs, institutions, language, beliefs, ways of thinking, feeling and acting."

Giddings says, "Sociology is the systematic description and explanation of society viewed as a whole".

L. F. Ward says, "Sociology is the scientific study of society."

In short, it may be said that all knowledge about human life can be included in the province of sociology. It has to deal with such diverse problems as those of economics, politics, religion, eugenics, education, morality, etc. The scope of sociology is

Relation of Social Philosophy to Sociology

characterised by two schools — formal and synthetic. According to Park, Burgess, Tonnies, Stammler, Kant and George Simmel who uphold the formal school, sociology studies not only the social phenomena, relations and duties but their forms. Simmel holds, " Sociology is the science of the form of human inter relations." In brief, sociology is that social science which studies the forms and kinds of human relations in society, of other social relation and of social events. In modern times, the former is a more acceptable school of thought than the latter. The synthetic school treats sociology as encyclopaedia and synoptic. It seeks to make sociology a synthesis of social science and a general science. In other words, sociology is the science of social sciences. It includes all the aspects of society. As K. Motuianai says, "Sociology, thus, seeks to see life full and see it whole." Thus, in fact, sociology includes all the subjects which are studied sociologically. It studies social traditions, processes and behaviour, forms of social events and their inter-relations, impact of social forces on social relations.

2.2.2 Nature of Social Philosophy and Sociology

Both social philosophy and sociology are concerned with human society. Social philosophy studies

- (i) the ideals, values and end of social life.
- (ii) the postulates, presuppositions and conclusions of the various social sciences.

It examines the basic principles of human behaviour and the supreme values of human life, and thus prepares a solid ground for social sciences.

Sociology, on the other hand, studies the social system and their sub-systems, social institutions and social structure, social aggregates, relationships, groups and organisation. Sociologists are interested in the analytical properties of these sociological units and treats the relationship among them as problematic. Thus, sociologists are interested in such properties of the process of institutionalization as legitimation, consensus and stratification such as coercion and processes of groups or organizations, such as their capacity to take collective action onwards.

2.2.3 Relation between Social Philosophy and Sociology

Having seen the definition, scope and nature of both social philosophy and sociology we are now in a position to discuss their relationship.

Both social philosophy and sociology are concerned with human society. Sociology is the science of society which studies social relationships. Thus, sociology has a number of branches dealing with different aspects of human life. The different branches collect facts on the basis of experience and analyze them. Thus, sociology is a factual and analytical science. Social philosophy also deals with the society but it being a normative science studies the meaning, purpose and value in changing human society. It gives a synoptic or harmonious picture of social good by examining social values in the light of social facts.

Relation of Social Philosophy to Sociology

Thus, both social philosophy and sociology study the same problems from different angles and with different methodology.

Difference : The following are the fundamental differences between the two :

(i) The subjects of study in social philosophy and sociology are different. Whereas social philosophy studies human values, sociology examines social relations, processes, events and the facts related to it. If at all sociology considers social values, it considers them as facts.

(ii) The approach of sociology is factual while that of social philosophy is axiological. Sociology describes social relations as they are but social philosophy evaluates them in the light of supreme human ideals and values.

(iii) The method of sociology is scientific whereas that of social philosophy is philosophical. Social philosophy looks at every event as a part of the whole from a synoptic viewpoint based on direct perception, intuitional learning and logic. Hence, it is critical, not merely descriptive. Sociology being an objective and analytic science, mainly makes use of the empirical method for the analysis, explanation and interpretations of social phenomena. Social philosophy, on the other hand, attempts to give a philosophical implication of the generalization. So. P. A. Sorokin aptly points out that the studies of Sociology represent the basis for deciding whether a particular philosophical generalization is valid or not.

Sociology emphasizes the creative and constructive aspects of social events while social philosophy tries to discover the meaning and motivations of social processes. Sociology studies the problems but social philosophy determines the place of human society in the cosmos. Whereas sociology attaches importance to facts, methods related thereto, social philosophy is concerned with values and their method.

(v) Thus, while sociology is factual, social philosophy is critical and normative.

(vi) Sociology analyses facts, while social philosophy synthesises social theories. Thus while the former is analytic, the latter is synthetic.

(vii) Like every science sociology has its necessary postulates. Social philosophy evaluates the necessary concepts and postulates of sociology.

(viii) Whereas sociology mainly employs the operational method for the study of social phenomena, social philosophy primarily makes use of the valuational method for the interpretation of social processes.

(ix) Whereas sociology emphasizes the structural and functional aspects of social phenomena and is mainly concerned with the study of a specified problem of a society or a particular aspect of society, social philosophy emphasizes the teleological and meaning aspects of social processes. It is concerned with the study of the meaning, purpose and value in all types of social relations and social system.

2.2.4 Conclusion

Social philosophy and sociology, as we have seen earlier, are similar in many ways and also different in many ways. But, though differing from each other, there is a very close and intimate relation between sociology and social philosophy. Social philosophy has developed side by side with sociology. The valid conclusions of sociology have philosophical significance. The advancement of sociology as a science prepares the way for the development of social philosophy as an advanced meta-theory of society. It is obvious, then, that here is overlapping between the scope of sociology and that of social philosophy. That is the reason why most of the sociologists are also social philosophers in the advanced stages of their thought and theoretical development. Social philosophers, in their turn, never remain totally impervious to the developments in the field of sociology. In advanced stages of theoretical development the fusion and merging of sociology and social philosophy are inevitable.

2.3 Summary

Thus, we find that both sociology and social philosophy are complementary to each other. Sociology does not determine the supreme end of man it takes from social philosophy. Similarly, social philosophy depends upon sociology for facts concerning social phenomena. Social philosophy without sociology or sociology without social philosophy would be incomplete.

As F. J. Wright says, "Sociology is applied social science, social philosophy is the consideration of right and wrong in their application."

Thus, both the social philosopher and the sociologist need to cooperate while being aware of their own limitations.

2.4 Key words used in the Lesson

Social philosophy, Sociology, normative, critical, axiological, teleological, factual, harmonious, analytical, institutionalization, communities, customs, institutions, synthetic, meta-theory, functional evaluates, postulates, valuational, theoretical, advanced.

2.5 Questions for Exercise

(a) Objective Questions

1. Sociology is

- (a) a factual science
- (b) factual and analytical science

Relation of Social Philosophy to Sociology

- (c) a critical and normative science
- (d) none of the above

Answer — (b)

2. Both social philosophy and sociology are

- (a) similar to each other
- (b) different from each other
- (c) complementary to each other
- (d) none of the above

Answer — (c)

(b) Short Answer Questions

1. Define social philosophy and sociology

Ans. — Sub-section 2.2.1

2. State the differences between social philosophy and sociology.

Ans. — Sub-section 2.2.3

(c) Long Answer Questions

1. Explain the relation between social philosophy and sociology.
2. Discuss how social philosophy and sociology are complementary to each other.

2.7 Suggested Readings

- | | | |
|-----------------------------------|---|--------------------------------------|
| 1. G. K. Agarwal | : | Principles of Sociology |
| 2. J. S. Mackenzie | : | Outlines of Social Philosophy |
| 3. Dr. Vatsyayana | : | Social Philosophy |
| 4. Vidya Bhushan & D. R. Sachdeva | : | An Introduction to Sociology |



Civic Duty**Lesson Structure**

- 3.0 Objective**
- 3.1 Introduction**
- 3.2 Explanation of the nature of civic duties — relation with rights**
 - 3.2.1 Definition of Civic Duty**
 - 3.2.2 Kinds of Civic Duties**
 - 3.2.3 Hindrances in the performance of civic duties**
 - 3.2.4 Conclusion**
- 3.3 Summary**
- 3.4 Key words used in the Lesson**
- 3.5 Questions for Exercise**
 - (a) Objective Questions**
 - (b) Short Answer Questions**
 - (c) Long Answer Questions**
- 3.6 Suggested Readings**

3.0 Objective

The main objective behind the discussion of 'civic duty' is to make us aware of what exactly it means as well as to make us familiar with our various civic duties. All of us are citizens living in a state. Most of the states are welfare states. The aim of the states is the welfare of its citizens. Thus, the state has certain duties towards the citizens and the citizens, in turn, have certain duties towards the state or towards themselves, etc. The duties of the citizens of the state are called civic duties. This lesson aims at defining "civic duties" as well as enumerating them. We shall also consider the obstacles that come in the way of performing civic duties.

Civic Duty

individual is a citizen of a country, no individual is independent of the state or society, hence civic duties are applicable to all citizens.

Civic duties are no special kind of duties. There is no special field of civic duty nor any special time for it. It is just like any other duty of an individual. It is said that beyond the field of civic duty, a person has no other duty.

As we have seen earlier, rights and duties go hand in hand. The two are interdependent. If I have a right, the enjoyment of my right implies a duty on the part of others. And as my right implies a duty on the part of others, the larger number of rights I enjoy, the greater must be the number of duties imposed on others and vice versa. I have my rights against the state, society and individuals and hence, I have my duties to them all.

In the words of L. T. Hobhouse, "Rights and duties, then, are conditions of social welfare, or as we define such welfare, of a life of harmony to this welfare, every member of the community stands in a double relation. He has its share in it. This is the sum of his rights. He has to contribute his share. That is the sum of his duty. "Rights without duties are like men without shadows, they only exist in fairy tales,"

Thus, the right of an individual implies his duty to exercise his right in a proper way. The object of rights is not to satisfy the whims and caprices of individuals. Rights are intended to serve some moral purpose. An individual must use his right in such a way that the higher interest of society as a whole does not suffer.

Therefore, being citizens if we have certain rights, we ought to perform certain duties, too. The special feature of civic duty is that the person has to have a knowledge of it and should perform it sincerely.

3.2.2 Kinds of Civic Duties

Civic duties are of various kinds :

(a) Duty towards oneself — Every citizen owes a duty to himself to maintain good health. It cannot be denied that without physical fitness, he cannot make his full contribution to society. There is every likelihood of his ignoring all those which he must perform in the interest of his family, locality and the country. The importance of a sound mind in a sound body must be emphasized. If every individual is physically, mentally and morally fit society is bound to achieve a lot.

(b) Duties towards the family — Every citizen owes certain duties to the members of his family. If he is a married man, he must look after his wife and children. He must give his children the best of education. He must aim at making them ideal citizens of whom he himself and his country can be proud. That citizen is a criminal who indulges in the luxury of having children but ignores their proper training. It is the duty of society to look down upon such a person and make him realise that he is an object of contempt and not of respect.

(c) Duties towards neighbours — Every citizen owes certain duties to his neighbours. He must not hate but love them. He must be willing to extend his hand of co-operation to them. He must share their worries and joys. His relations with his neighbours can add to his own happiness.

A good citizen must not be satisfied with his own progress only or the progress of his family but he has to see to the progress of his neighbour. In fact, he must look to the welfare of the locality in which he lives.

(d) Duty towards the state — A person has a duty towards the state in which he is born and brought up and in which he has the privilege to live. He has to love the state and the people living in it. He owes allegiance to the state in which he lives and that allegiance must be the highest. It is true that an individual owes certain duties to his family, religion, province and other associations, but his duty towards the state stands above all other duties. Whenever there is a conflict of loyalties the state must be given the first place. It is the neglect of this principle in India which is responsible for our humiliation in the past and if we neglect it in the future, we are bound to suffer. Thus, the citizen has an important duty towards the state.

(d) Duty towards one's country — It is the duty of every citizen to obey the laws of his country. Every citizen should practise the habit of obeying the law. This does not mean that he should not criticise any law even if it is unhealthy or arbitrary. The sovereignty of India rests with the people of the country and they have the right to demand a change in the law. They can agitate for this in a constitutional manner. But so long as the law remains in the statute book, it is the duty of all citizens to obey it.

It is also the duty of all citizens to pay taxes to the state according to their capacity. A democratic government is the most expensive form of government and no wonder, there is need for a lot of money to run the machinery of the government in such a way as to add to the good of the society as a whole. Thus, if the people want to have a government of their own, they have to pay more taxes.

Every good citizen must be public spirited. He must be happy and proud to help every member of his country to the best of ability and his capacity. It is only when the citizens are self-sacrificing that the nation progresses or grows. One must subordinate his private interests to those of others and must try to promote the welfare of the society.

Every citizen has a duty to make an honest exercise of the right to vote. He should vote only those persons who would work for the good of the society and not for their selfish interests. We must always remember that the successful working of democracy depends on the honest exercise of the right to vote by every individual. A country whose voters are dishonest and corrupt is bound to suffer.

Civic Duty

Democracy works well if people are wide awake and make an honest exercise and intelligent use of the right to vote because the persons they elect form the government of the country and if the elected persons are good, the country and people will be happy and they will prosper, otherwise there is no hope for the country and the people.

(e) Duty towards public officials — A good citizen always helps the public officials in discharging their duties. It is written in the code of criminal procedure in India that it is the duty of every individual to bring to the notice of authorities any information which he may have regarding the commission or any attempt to commit certain offences. If the people do not help the police no offender can be convicted as there will be no evidence to prove his guilt.

(f) Duty to resist injustice — It is the duty of every citizen to resist injustice from every quarter. All the unjust acts of the state and individual must be resisted. Only then can we hope to have a good administration.

(g) Duty towards having tolerance — All citizens must develop a spirit of toleration towards one another. They should not only love those who agree with but also those who disagree with them. Unless we learn to tolerate the different views of others, the progress of the society and the state is not possible. Without such a spirit, we cannot have a prosperous India.

(h) Duty to work hard — Every citizen owes a duty to work hard. Idlers and parasites must be condemned. It is rightly said that those who do not work hard have no right to eat.

(i) Duty towards local bodies — It is also the duty of every citizen to help the various local bodies in the country. Even if that involves a waste of money and time, the duty must be performed happily and willingly. The central government cannot be expected to look to the workings of every small local body. The citizens should themselves have local knowledge and local interests. It must not be forgotten that the success of democracy very much depends on the people having acquired training in the art of administration by serving on the local bodies for some years.

(j) Duty towards other religions — Every citizen has the duty to respect the religion or religious beliefs of others and not to interfere in their religious beliefs. They have a duty to tolerate the religions of others.

The above are the various kinds of civic duties which every citizen ought to perform. But in the performance of these duties hindrances and obstacles may arise.

3.2.3 Hindrances in the Performance of Civic Duties

There are two obstacles in the performance of one's civic duties :

(i) Ignorance (ii) Contradictions among duties.

(i) Ignorance — A person can perform his civic duties only when he has a proper knowledge of his civic duties and his relationship with the society. One who is ignorant of his civic duties can not think of performing them.

The cause of ignorance is lack of proper knowledge and education. In many cases, poverty becomes the cause of not being able to receive proper education.

Lack of proper education makes a person selfish. He becomes indifferent towards the society. He grows superstitious. As a result, he is not able to perform his civic duties.

(ii) Contradiction among duties — Sometimes two duties contradict each other so that one is not able to decide which duty to perform and which to neglect. In such a situation it becomes different for a person to perform his duties. Sometimes contradiction arises in showing loyalties. For e.g. whether to serve the family or the neighbour. Again, it may become difficult to decide whether to serve the country or the province. In such a situation it is difficult for a person to perform his duties.

As a matter of fact, there is no contradiction among duties. A person should be conscientious enough to decide which duty to perform and when.

3.2.4 Conclusion

Thus, there should be no contradiction in duties because duties imply dutifulness and sincerity. True citizenship implies working with knowledge and sincerity and working in the interest of the society and state. Hence, a person should perform his duties sincerely.

3.3 Summary

Civic duty is thus the duty of citizens living in a state. Just as a person enjoys his rights so should he perform his duties. Rights and duties go hand in hand.

Rights and duties are relative even in society. It is society which gives rights to the people and imposes duties for a proper regard for rights. Rights are not absolute. Society gives rights to people only on the condition that they make themselves deserving of them by doing their duties. Thus, rights and duties are two aspects of the same moral law.

3.4 Key words used in the Lesson

Rights, duties, interdependent, citizen, society, obligation, allegiance, welfare, Individual, physically, mentally, education, indulge, criminal, contempt, neighbours, loyalties, humiliation, sovereignty, constitutional, expensive, democratic, public-spirited, injustice, condemn, parasite, tolerance, local bodies.

3.5 Questions for Exercise

(a) Objective Questions

1. Rights and duties are

- (a) independent
- (b) interdependent
- (c) none of the above

Answer — (b)

2. Civic duties are

- (a) duty of a person towards himself
- (b) duty of person towards his neighbour
- (c) duty of person towards his country
- (d) all the above

Answer — (d)

(b) Short Answer Questions

1. What are civic duties ?

Ans. — See sub-section 3.2.1

2. How are rights and duties interdependent ? Discuss.

Ans. — See sub-section 3.2, 3.3, 3.4

3. Discuss the obstacles in the performance of civic duties.

Ans. — See sub-section 3.2.3

(c) Long Answer Questions

- 1. What are civic duties ? Enumerate them.
- 2. Why should every citizen perform his civic duties ? Give reasons for your answer.

3.6 Suggested Readings

- 1. Dr. Vatsyayan : **Social Philosophy**
- 2. G. S. Mackenzie : **Oulines of Social Philosophy**
- 3. G. K. Agarwal : **Principles of Sociology**



Individual and Society**Lesson Structure**

- 4.0 Objective
- 4.1 Introduction
- 4.2 Relation between individual and society
 - 4.2.1 Importance of the relation between individual and society
 - 4.2.2 Theories and their criticisms regarding the importance of individual and society
 - 4.2.3 Real relation between individual & society
 - 4.2.4 Conclusion
- 4.3 Summary
- 4.4 Key words used in the Lesson
- 4.5 Questions for Exercise
 - (a) Objective Questions
 - (b) Short Answer Questions
 - (c) Long Answer Questions
- 4.6 Suggested Readings

4.0 Objective

The relationship between individual and society is an important problem for social philosophers. They have tried to solve this problem by examining the various important theories that have been put forward by different thinkers.

Our main objective behind the discussion of this topic is to find out the real relationship between individual and society. Therefore, we shall first see the importance of individual for society or the importance of the society for the individual. Then we shall discuss the various theories which have different views regarding the importance of the individual and the society. Some of the theories uphold that the individual is important for the society and according to some others the society is important for the individual. Lastly we shall establish the real relationship between the individual and society.

4.1 Introduction

Society, as we know, is a system or web of social relationships. According to Ginsberg, "A society is a collection of individuals united by certain relations or modes of behaviour which mark them off from others who do not enter these relations or who differ from them in behaviour." Similarly, Giddings says, "Society is the union itself, the organisation, the sum of formal relations in which associating individuals are bound together." In this way Ginsberg and Giddings both accept society as an organised group of individuals bound together by certain relations based upon and pertaining to the family, race, class and other institutions.

It, thus, becomes clear that society and individual are closely related. It is said that man is a social animal because man cannot live alone or without a society. Aristotle used to say, "A man who can live alone can either be a God or a beast." Hence society is essential for an individual. Similarly, individuals are important for society because in their absence society has no meaning, no existence. Hence, individual is important for society and vice versa. But what actually is the relationship between individual and society will become clear from the various theories given by thinkers regarding the relationship between the two.

4.2 Relationship between Individual and Society

The relationship between individual and society is an important issue before social thinkers and many theories have been put forward in this connection. Since ancient times, social philosophers have been thinking over this problem. A big controversy has developed among thinkers regarding the question of mutual relationship between individual and society, but all agree that this relation is an intimate and close one.

Social philosophers are not unanimous regarding the question as to which precedes the other. According to some thinkers, the society precedes the individual because society is not an exclusive characteristic of human beings; it is also found in animals. Its life is longer than that of the individual because individuals may come and go but society goes on continually. According to some other thinkers, individuals precede society because it is they who form the society. Thus, a big controversy has developed among thinkers regarding the question of mutual relationship between the individual and society which we shall discuss in this lesson.

4.2.1 Importance of the relation between Individual and Society

Those who uphold that the society precedes the individuals regard the society as more important than the individual and those who uphold that the individual precedes the society accept the importance of the individual to that of the society.

But before entering into this controversy, let us first see what are the views of different thinkers concerning the individual and the society.

Individuals, as we know, constitute a society. The society has no existence in the absence of individuals of which it is formed. Individuals constitute and influence society.

Society, on the other hand, is a system or organisation of the relations or activities among individuals. Society is a web of social relationships. It is the society that makes individuals cultured. The child's personality depends to a large extent on his social environment. Almost everything he learns is acquired from society. Only the capacity of learning is his own. It is in society that his self or ego develops whereby he is called a human being.

Thus, it appears that both the individual and society are necessary for each other. But we have to see what social philosophers have to say about the relation between individual and society. We have to see in what respects an individual is called a social animal, how an individual is important for the society and how the society is important for the individual.

For this we shall critically examine the various theories given by thinkers concerning the relationship between individual and society.

4.2.2 Theories and their criticisms regarding the importance of individual and society

(a) Individualistic or Mechanistic Theory — According to this theory every individual of a society is a self-dependent unit. One individual does not depend upon another individual. According to this theory individuals have formed the society for the fulfilment of common interests. Thus, society is a collection of individuals. The society is not a natural institution but an artificial one. Man is born free. All men are equal. Individuals made a mutual agreement and created society giving it certain rights and authorities, mainly protecting the individuals or human beings. This theory is also known as social contract theory.

The main supporters of this theory are Hobbes, Locke, Rousseau, etc. In the seventeenth century, Thomas Hobbes, writing in his famous book "Leviathan" maintained that society was concerned to protect man from his irresponsible and animal as well as egoistic tendencies. According to Adam Smith and his followers, society is an artificial device created to foster a mutual economy. In the eighteenth century the French philosopher, Rousseau, supported the theory that individuals came to an understanding and formed society deliberately. Among the other supporters of this theory were John Locke and Hobhouse.

According to this theory, in nature all men are born equal. Individuals precede society. They have some rights even outside society. Individuals made a mutual agreement and created society. Thus, society is an artificial creation which can exercise control over the rights of the individuals only to the extent to which it has been granted rights.

Because the society is regarded as an artificial creation and the individuals are related to the society only externally just as a machine is related to its parts, therefore, this theory is called "Mechanistic Theory". It is also called the "Individualistic Theory", because according to this theory the individual is more important than the society. The society is only a means to the fulfilment of the interests of man.

Criticism of the Individualistic or Mechanistic Theory

This theory is based on the social contract theory and has all the drawbacks of the social contract theory. Maclver and the modern sociologists look upon the social contract theory as illusory. The theory is based neither on historical facts nor on logical grounds. Its conception of the individual apart from the society is also not correct. Also, its conception of the individual as preceding the formation of society is also not correct because socialization is necessary for the development of personality. Maclver has written that the question of society preceding the individual and vice versa does not arise because both have been together from the very beginning. The society is inherent in man's nature. He cannot live apart from the society and wherever men stay together there exists the society.

Thus, both individual and society are interdependent. The conception of the Individualistic theory that man is selfish and likes to remain independent is also not correct. Man is both egoistic and athiestic.

The view of the Individualistic theory that freedom and determinism are contradictory is illusory. Freedom does not mean absence of any type of restraint. Such freedom will be harmful in the interest of society. It is true that freedom is essential for all-round development of an individual but freedom does not mean just thinking about oneself and doing whatever one pleases.

Thus, the Individualistic or Mechanistic Theory suffers from the above defects.

(b) Organic Theory — According to this theory, society is an organism whose structure and functioning resemble those of the human beings and which also develops according to the same laws. Just as the human organism has different parts, similarly the cells or parts of the society which are also an organism are the individuals. Associations and institutions are its arteries. In the words of Spencer, social structure can be compared to an animal body whose system of nutrition has its counterpart in society in the industrial and agricultural systems, the circulatory system with the heart, arteries and veins, corresponds to the communication and transport system of the nation, the nervous system to the government and so on.

According to the organic theory, the society is not a mechanical organisation of individuals. Society is a unit of mutually dependent parts or the individuals. Individual is not an independent unit. The society is a unit. The individuals cannot exist apart from

the society just as the parts of the body cannot exist in the absence of the body. Just as the development and growth of the living body depend upon the health conditions of that body, so do the development and progress of the society depend on the dutifulness of the individuals.

Thus, according to the organic theory the individuals and society are not externally related, they are related internally. The society is not an artificial creation, it is natural. The individual depends upon the society. He cannot remain apart from the society.

This theory rejects the mechanistic theory. The supporters of this theory are Alvert Shaffle, Herbert Spencer, Prof. Alexander, Sir Laski Stephan and the evolutionists. All these thinkers emphasize the organic unity of the society. According to the supporters of this theory, the society is compared to a living organism which develops according to the same laws as that of the organism.

Criticism of the Organic Theory:— The main defect of the theory lies in reducing the relation of the individual and society to the relation between the cell and the body. The two relations do not permit of analogy, since there are clear differences between them. The individual is a conscious being. He has his own brain, and he himself thinks and contemplates. On the other hand, the cells of the body do not have any consciousness of their own. They have no individual existence apart from the body. Therefore, it is incorrect to say that the society is an organism of individuals. We can compare the society to an organism in the sense that it is a social system, the individuals are mutually dependent on each other.

The organic theory lays more importance on society than on individuals. In Plato's Republic the error of regarding the individual interest of the society has already been committed. But this view is one - sided. Both the individual and society are important.

Although the organic theory regards the society as similar to the living organism, this does not adequately support this theory. In spite of many similarities, there are a number of differences between the society and the individuals.

Herbert Spencer who is a supporter of this theory also says that there are a number of differences between the two. The feelings and passions of individuals cannot be the feelings of the society. The society does not have the brain to think or the sense organs to feel which the individual possesses.

In the words of Maclver, "The only experience we know is the experience of individuals, and it is only in the light of their interest, their hopes and their fears that we assign any function and any goal to society. When we speak of the group interest we only mean the interest in the group which any of the members feel."

(C) Idealistic and Group Mind Theory — The Idealistic and the group mind theories look upon society as a mind. In the words of Plato, "Civil society is a mind writ

large." According to this theory, the society is a great mind. It is not only an aggregate of individual minds, the society is a separate mind, distinct from the individual minds. Among the supporters of this theory are Green, Bradley, Bosanquet of England; Hegel, Emerson of America and Wundt and Wagner of Germany, Durkheim, etc.

Hegel writes "Society as manifested in the state, is a natural organism representing a phase of the historical world process or Absolute. The state, not the individual is the real person..... The individual has reality only in so far as he is a member of the state." Durkheim writes, "Social mind is an existence distinct (not apart) from the minds of the individuals, and is superior to them. The mind or collective consciousness is the higher form of psychic life. It tends to absorb the individual mind from which it differs not only in the richness of content but also in kind." Macdougel also upholds the idea of Group Mind.

According to these thinkers the developed form of the human society is the state. There is no difference between the state and the society because both manifest the common consciousness of the individuals or the citizen.

Criticism of the Idealistic Theory

The conception of the social mind is doubtful. The view of Hegel that society is the manifestation of the Absolute Consciousness and that the individuals cannot exist without the society cannot be proved on the basis of experience.

Macdougel's view of "Group Mind" is also not clear. How can the minds of different individuals together form the "Group Mind". Similar difficulty arises in the idea of group-consciousness. These thinkers commit the fallacy of regarding mental processes as mental element. Maclver has rightly said that it is not possible to find a sum total of human-minds or human consciousness.

Thus although the idea of "Group Mind" cannot be rejected, this view is doubtful.

4.2.3 Real Relation Between Individual and Society

The relation between individual and society is neither mechanical nor organic nor idealistic nor mental. All the theories though trying to emphasize the relation between the individual and society are one-sided. In the words of Maclver and Page, "No one can really be an absolute individualist, any more than anyone can be an absolute socialist, for the individual and society interact on one another and depend on one another."

Thus, the real relation between the individual and society is that of interdependence. Both are important and necessary for each other. Neither the individual can remain apart from the society nor the society can exist in the absence of individuals.

4.2.4 Conclusion

Thus, individual and society are related internally. Both are interdependent, Neither

the individual can live apart from the society nor the society can exist without the individuals. The society is a spiritual unity of individuals.

4.3 Summary

From the above discussion we come to the conclusion that there is an intimate relation between the individual and society. The existence and development of both depends on each other.

According to thinkers, the relationship between individual and society is similar to the relation between whole and parts. Just as the whole cannot exist without the parts and the whole cannot manifest itself in the absence of the parts, similarly the individual cannot live apart from the society nor can the society exist without the individuals.

It, thus, becomes clear that the individual and society are equally important. Neither the individual is more important than the society, nor the society is more important than the individual. There is no conflict between the social good and the individual good. The two are interdependent.

4.4 Key words used in the Lesson

Individual, society, relationship, precedes, controversy, influence, individualistic or mechanistic theory, self-dependent, mutual agreement, social contract, artificial creation, freedom, determinism, organic, circulatory system, arteries, veins, communication, nervous system, Idealistic, Group Mind, manifestation, consciousness, interdependent, spiritual unity.

4.5 Questions for Exercise

(a) Objective questions

1. The society precedes the individual.

- (a) False
- (b) True
- (c) Neither true nor false

Answer — (a)

2. The individual and society are necessary for each other.

- (a) False
- (b) True
- (c) Neither true nor false

Answer — (b)

(c) Short Answer Questions

1. Discuss the Individualistic or Mechanistic theory

Answer — See 4.2.2

2. Critically examine the organic theory regarding the relationship between individual and society.

Answer — See 4.2.2

(c) Long Answer Questions

1. Discuss critically the relationship between individual and society.
2. How are individual and society interdependent? Discuss.

4.6 Suggested Readings

- | | | |
|-----------------------------------|---|--|
| 1. G. K. Agarwal | : | Introductory Sociology |
| 2. A. K. Verma | : | Prarabhika Samaj Evam Rajniti Darshan |
| 3. Dr. Vatsyayana | : | Social Philosophy |
| 4. Vidya Bhushan & D. R. Sachdeva | : | Introduction to Sociology |



Tradition and Modernity

Lesson Structure

- 5.0 Objective
- 5.1 Introduction
- 5.2 Tradition and Modernity
 - 5.2.1 Definition of tradition
 - 5.2.2 Importance of tradition
 - 5.2.3 Definition of modernity
 - 5.2.4 Implication of modernity
 - 5.2.5 Relation between tradition and modernity
 - 5.2.6 Conclusion
- 5.3 Summary
- 5.4 Key words used in the Lesson
- 5.5 Questions for Exercise ◆◆◆
 - (a) Objective Questions
 - (b) Short Answer Questions
 - (c) Long Answer Questions
- 5.6 Suggested Readings

5.0 Objective

Tradition and modernity are the two terms which have exercised considerable influence on the personality of each and every individual living in a society. Hence, it is essential that we become acquainted with these terms. The main objective behind the discussion of this lesson is to give us a clear conception of the terms "tradition" and "modernity". For this, we shall first of all discuss the meaning and definition of the term 'tradition'. Then we shall see its importance. Secondly, we shall discuss the meaning and definition of modernity. We shall, then, see the implication of modernity. After this we shall compare tradition and modernity to see their differences or similarities. Lastly, we shall conclude by giving a short account of the actual relation between tradition and modernity.

5.1 Introduction

Tradition and modernity are two important factors of social change which exercise great influence over man's behaviour in society. Human life is the product of two kinds of inheritance — biological and social. Every person inherits the physical and mental characteristics from his parents. But besides the mental and physical characteristics every individual inherits something from his society too. He acquires food, clothing, shelter, education, etc. from society. In other words, the kind of food a person eats, or the clothes he wears or the type of education he gets are all inherited from the society. Not only this, his language, customs, habits, thought, religion, law, etc. are also acquired by the society. All these are called social heritage. Whatever is inherited from the society is called "social heritage".

Thus, all the biological and social characteristics handed over from one generation to another are tradition. Modernity, on the other hand, is the effect of the different social, biological, material, cultural or technical changes that have taken place during the numerous years.

5.2 Tradition and Modernity

As seen earlier, tradition is the social heritage which is handed down from one generation to another. Tradition shapes customs, behaviours or habits, language, culture, ideas and even our food, clothing and shelter.

Modernity is related to the problem of change. We know that with the passage of time change has taken place in every sphere of our lives. There have been biological and material changes, technical and cultural changes, change in the manner of living, eating, clothing or dressing up etc. Modernity is the effect of all these changes.

Now, the question is what is the relation between tradition and modernity. At the first sight, both tradition and modernity appear to be absolutely contradictory terms because tradition is related to the past whereas modernity is related to the present. Tradition is acquired naturally whereas modernity is either acquired or imposed. Tradition makes our behaviour simple whereas modernity makes it complex. There are many other differences between tradition and modernity.

But it is not that tradition and modernity are watertight compartments having no relation to each other. Tradition and modernity both control the behaviour of the people. Also modernity is never a denial of tradition. Hence, tradition and modernity are related to each other.

5.2.1 Definition of Tradition

Tradition is an important part of man's social heritage. Tradition is inclusive of all these social laws that are handed down from generation to generation. Tradition is historically shaped customs, rites, social precepts, ideas, values, rules of conduct, etc. handed down from generation to generation. Tradition keeps alive knowledge of the group.

In the words of Ginsberg, "By tradition is meant the sum of all ideas, habits and customs that belong to a people and are transmitted from one generation to another."

Yogendra Singh holds, "Tradition is the cumulative heritage of a society which permeates through all levels of social organisation, e.g. the value-system, the social structure and the structure of the personality."

Thus in the form of tradition one generation receives from its predecessors such things as diet, habit, mode of living, folkways, mode of conduct, beliefs, fashions, habits, etc. It is in this way that tradition serves to maintain a link between various generations.

Some scholars have taken tradition in the wider sense as including only social heritage. But tradition includes biological heritage also because here we transfer the characteristics of the past to the coming generation which determine the behaviour of the person.

Some thinkers believe that tradition and social heritage are not the same. Tradition is a part of social heritage which includes two kinds of factors.

(a) Material things comprising food, clothing and shelter

(b) Non-material things like one's religion, made of ideas, habit, customs, etc. This non-material part of social heritage is called tradition. That is why the modes of thinking and behaving acquired by the society and which is handed over from one generation to another is called "tradition".

According to Janes Drever, "Tradition is that collection of law, customs, story and proverbs which are verbally transferred from one generation to another."

Traditions are not exactly same as customs. They differ from customs in respect that traditions are the customs that the society inherits from its preceding social group from which it is derived.

5.2.2 Importance of Tradition

The importance of tradition is manifold :

(1) Traditions have their own importance in human life. Traditions are ready-made norms of behaviour acquired by itself from childhood. Thus, traditions make social behaviour simple. On the basis of tradition society can solve new situations or problems with simplicity and ease.

Tradition and Modernity

(2) Traditions guide and shape our behaviour. Due to tradition a person is inclined or has a tendency to act according to established norms.

(3) Traditions prove efficacious in solving matters of gravity like marriage, etc. and reduce mental tension.

(4) The sense of security is implicit in tradition. Traditions are those successful social laws that are handed over from one generation to another. Thus, traditions give a sense of security and comfort to those who act on it.

(5) Economy of time and effort — When the modes of behaviour are borrowed from tradition, their learning conserves less time and energy as it avoids the necessity of taking the longer method of trial and error. The energy thus saved can be used for other creative purposes.

(6) Traditions serve to maintain a synthesis and conformity in the behaviour of individual members of society. This strengthens the social organisation and helps to keep the system of society intact.

(7) Development of national character – When all members of the nation choose to emulate the tradition, national character develops. This further makes the nation organised and systematic.

In this way, we find that the value of tradition is immense. It acts as a bond between the members of the society or the citizens of a nation.

5.2.3 Definition of Modernity

In every society change keeps on taking place. There are different factors of social change. Some are natural and some man-made. Biological and material factors are natural while technical and cultural factors are man-made. All these factors are inter-related. There can be technical changes and cultural changes due to natural factors and sometimes, there can be biological and physical or cultural factors.

The effect of the above changes occurs not only in the constitution of society but also in the social values. Again both of these influence each other. In this way, social change goes on.

Modernity is thus, a system of ideas, values and system of institutions. Modernity is related to the problem of change. Changes are of many kinds, so the question is among these changes which is to be termed as modernity. In India we find that changes have not taken place in a natural way as we find in Japan but changes have been imposed from outside, i.e., from foreign rulers English and others. When the foreign rule ended in India, the people of the country voluntarily proceeded towards modernity. The foreign rule influenced the Indian society in two ways :

(i) Traditionalists gave importance to established values.

(ii) Some people adopted the western culture and westernisation took place in the society.

From the seventeenth to nineteenth century in the countries of western Europe and Northern America, in the twentieth century in the countries of South America, Asia and Africa many types of social, economic, cultural changes took place which can commonly be called "modernisation". Many traditions were left in the process of modernisation. That is why the term 'modernity' is used as a contrary concept of tradition.

So, modernity is a tendency or inclination which is related to changes. These changes have come mainly due to technical advancement or industrialization and this has also influenced our mental thinking.

Modernity is a multi-dimensional process. It has no definite path or model. Previously, western countries were regarded as the model of modernity. But today, Russia, China, Japan are regarded as the ideal of modernity. In India where on one hand, democratic secularism has been accepted, on the other, Russia has been regarded as the model for socialism.

Sometimes the word "modernity" is used in the progressive direction, e.g. in the context of any religious institution it is said that it is being modernized, which means that it is striving towards higher values.

5.2.4 Implication of Modernity

The following are the implications of modernity

(1) Scholars clearly point out that modernity and modernization are not the same thing. Modernization is a process denoting a movement from a traditional order to a certain desired type of technology and associated forms of social structure. On the other hand, secularism, inclination towards the search for truth, to regard everyone as equal, acceptance of rational thinking are the characteristics of modernity. It is quite possible that we may be advancing in the direction of modernization but still in the absence of above characteristics we cannot be called "modern" in the true sense.

(2) Some thinkers have taken "modernity" to mean "westernization". But "westernization" and "modernity" are not the same thing because the concept of modernity is much wider. Simply copying the west is not modernity. Such a view is misleading. Westernization can be one of the factors of modernity but both are not synonyms. For example, it is true that the process of westernization has been very helpful in directing the social change in Indian life and it has also helped industrialization and urbanization. But mere copying the west cannot be called 'modernity'.

(3) Another important fact to be mentioned is that many countries want to accept the term "modernity", but they hate the term "westernization" which stands for the evils of Imperialism. Thus, the meaning of 'westernization' is not an indicator of evil or goodness but modernity is taken in the sense of goodness.

(4) Some sociologists present the concept of culture in relation to modernity. According to them, culture does not only mean the acceptance of new folkways, but also the expression of new thoughts and values. We find that in India many backward castes are changing their life style, customs, religious practices in accordance with those of higher castes, which can be called cultural development. Thus, a developed understanding of art, literature, music, etc. is called culture. In the Indian rural society, it has a great influence. In modernity the elements of culture are also present.

(5) Universalism is also an element of modernity when there is a high classical development in the traditional methods and culture. That process is called universal.

(6) Thus, all these prove that modernity is not an indicator of change in social reconstruction only, it is also change in value. Modernity is an indicator of two facts : (i) Rationalised critical view (ii) Secular view. Both these lead to changes which are the characteristic features of modernity.

5.2.5 Relation between Tradition and Modernity

Tradition and modernity are relative terms. So let, us see the relation between them.

(i) Traditions are social heritage. They are related to the past, modernity is related to the present only.

(ii) Traditions make our behaviour simple. Modernity makes it complex.

(iii) Tradition produces uniformity in the social or personal life. Modernity produces diversity.

(iv) Traditions are naturally acquired; modernity is either imposed or is acquired as a result of efforts.

(v) Traditions encourage dogmatism or blind faith; modernity encourages critical tendency.

(vi) Traditions strongly approve of religious faith and superstitions whereas modernity encourages secularism.

(vii) Traditions give importance to inherited past whereas modernity gives importance to acquired positions.

(viii) Modernity upholds the theory of freedom of will and is based on philosophical ground whereas traditions uphold the theory of determinism.

(ix) Traditions believe in absolute values whereas modernity does not regard values as absolute because values according to them change with time.

(x) Tradition and modernity both control the behaviour of the people.

Thus we have seen ten important points of relation between tradition and modernity.

5.2.6 Conclusion

After studying the definitions of and relations between tradition and modernity, we come to the conclusion, that tradition and modernity differ in a number of respects. We find that any norm which is traditional cannot be called modern and any norm that is modern cannot be called traditional. Hence, the two appear to be contrary terms.

But this does not mean that modernity is a denial of tradition. Modernity is a denial of dogmatism and blind faith inherent in tradition. For e.g. belief in God is a traditional idea but modernity does not demand that we give up this belief in God though we should avoid the dogmatism and blind faith attached to it.

5.3 Summary

Thus tradition and modernity though, differing from each other, are two important factors of social change which exercise great influence on man's behaviour in society. Hence, both are important for us. But we should not accept them blindly. With a rational and critical mind we should accept tradition and modernity in such a way that they help in the total development of our personality.

5.4 Key words used in the Lesson

Tradition, modernity, social heritage, social change, generation, customs, values, habits, behaviour, material, non-material, biological, national character, modernisation, secularism, westernization, goodness, dogmatism, blind faith, freedom, determinism, acquired, imposed.

5.5 Questions for Exercise

(a) Objective questions

1. Traditions are related to the

- (a) present
- (b) past
- (c) future
- (d) none of the above

Answer — (b)

2. Modernity upholds

- (a) freedom
- (b) determinism
- (c) both
- (d) none

Answer — (a)

(b) Short Answer Questions

1. What is tradition ? Discuss its importance.

Ans. — See 5.2.1 and 5.2.2

2. What is modernity ? Discuss its implication.

Ans. — See 5.2.3 and 5.2.4

(c) Long Answer Questions

- 1. Discuss the relation between tradition and modernity.
- 2. Is modernity a denial of tradition ? Discuss.

5.6 Suggested Readings

- 1. Vidya Bhushan & D. R. Sachdeva : **An Introduction to Sociology**
- 2. A. K. Verma : **Prarambhika Samaj evam Rajniti Darshan**



6.1 Introduction

There is no society in the world which is not divided into various groups. In other words, although the basis of this variety differs in different societies, there is no doubt in the fact that every society is divided into castes and classes. In primitive society this classification was done on the basis of gender, age, strength, etc. In the modern society, the basis of this variety is education, wealth, personal efficiency and calibre.

Similarly, in India also we find that society is divided into various castes and classes. Caste-system is the foundation of Indian society. Caste-system is the main basis of the construction of Hindu society. It is prevalent in Indian society since ancient times and has gained firm roots here. In this context Kingsley Davis says that caste-system is prevalent in every society in the world and it has influenced almost all men of all religions.

The second form of social stratification is class-system. When the members of different groups are based not on birth but on wealth, actions, age, education, occupation, etc. then such a system is called "Class System".

Thus, caste and class are the two important forms of social stratification.

6.2 Distinction between Caste and Class

Caste and Class are the two main forms of social stratification. Both indicate the status and position of individual in a society. In this sense both are similar, but there are a number of differences between the two. Whereas caste is based on birth class is based on work. Caste is a closed group whereas class is open, meaning that a person can change his class according to his ability or actions. Caste is static but not class. Class-system does not hinder democracy whereas caste-system does. An individual has greater freedom in a class. In caste-system there are greater strict restrictions in marriage, etc. whereas there are no strict laws in class system.

Hence, caste and class, though forms of social stratification, are different in many ways. But before dealing with their distinctions in detail, we shall first see the meaning, definition and characteristics of both caste and class.

6.2.1 Meaning and Definition of Caste

The word 'caste' is used in everyday life and we use it to distinguish one person from another. We say that such and such a person belongs to a particular caste. In saying this we generally mean to convey that he is born of parents or is a member of the family said to belong to a particular caste. In this way, we find caste is a hereditary group. But this definition is not adequate. Let us see how sociologists define caste-system :—

(a) **Mazumdar and Madan** — "Caste is a closed class".

(b) **S. V. Ketkar** — "Caste is a social group having two characteristics – (i) membership is confined to those who are born of members, and includes all persons so born, (ii) The members are forbidden by an inexorable social law to marry outside the group."

(c) **C. H. Cooley** — "When a class is somewhat strictly hereditary we may call it a caste."

(d) **E. Blunt** — "A caste is an endogamous group, a collection of endogamous groups, bearing a common name, membership of which is hereditary—imposing on its members certain restrictions in the matter of social intercourse—either following a common traditional occupation or claiming a common origin, and generally regarded as forming a single homogenous community."

(e) **A. W. Green** — "Caste is a system of stratification in which mobility, movement up and down the status ladder, at least ideally may not occur. A person's ascribed status is his lifetime status. Birth determines one's occupation, place of residence, style of life, personal associates, and the group from among whom one must find a mate."

Among the definitions given above that of Green appears to be most complete. On the basis of all the definitions we can say that caste is a hereditary, endogamous group which decides the individual's status, his food-habit, marriage, profession etc. in the social stratification.

6.2.2 Characteristics of Caste System

Modern thinkers like Hutton, Ghurye, N. K. Dutt have discussed the following characteristics of caste system.

(i) **Determination by birth** — The membership of caste is determined by birth. A person remains the member of the caste into which he is born and his membership does not undergo any change even if change takes place in his status, occupation, education, wealth, etc.

(ii) **Rules and regulations concerning food** — Each individual caste has its own laws which govern the food habits of its members.

(iii) **Definite Occupation** — In the Hindu scriptures there is a mention of the occupation of all the varnas. According to Manu, the functions of the Brahmins, Kshatriyas, Vaishyas and Shudras were definite. Having developed from varna system the occupations in caste system are definite. In Hindu society, even today in most cases the son of a blacksmith pursues the occupation of his father, the son of a carpenter becomes a carpenter while the son of a shoe-maker becomes a shoe-maker.

(iv) **Endogamous group** — The majority of persons marry only within their caste, Brahmin, Kshatriya, Vaishya and Shudra all marry within their respective castes. Westernack has considered this to be the chief characteristic of the caste-system.

(v) **Rules concerning status and touchability** — The various castes in the Hindu society are divided into a hierarchy of ascent and descent one above the other. In this hierarchy the Brahmins have the highest and the untouchables the lowest position.

(vi) **Rules concerning tradition, folkways, customs, etc.** — Every caste has its own customs and traditions regarding birth ceremony, marriage ceremony or the rites to be performed on the death of a person, etc.

The above mentioned characteristics of the caste system do not take into account the numerous variations presently taking place in the caste system. In fact, it is very difficult to give a precise definition of caste system or to lay down its specific character. In modern times it is not very difficult to change one's caste. On the basis of wealth, prestige, power, status, one can enter into another caste. Many people have even started excluding their caste name from the name they use. In this way caste is continually taking the shape of class and casteism is growing in the form of classism.

6.2.3 Meaning And Definition of Class

The second form of social stratification is class system. When the membership of different groups is based not on birth but on wealth, actions, age, education, occupation etc. then such a system is called "Class-system." Like wealthy class, educated class, chemical class, etc. Karl Marx used to call men "Class-animal". We find that in different social classes, class-consciousness is to be found. Without class-consciousness, a class cannot be formed. In modern times the importance of class system is increasing day by day.

Definition of Class

Maclver and Page — "A social class is any portion of community marked off the rest by social status."

Ogburn and Nimkoff — "A social class is the aggregate of persons having essentially the same social status in a given society."

Hoebel — "A social class is a group within society whose members hold a number of distinctive statuses in common and who, through the operation of the roles associated with these statuses, develop an awareness of their like interests as against the unlike traits and interest of other groups."

Gisbert — "A social class is a category or group of persons having a definite status in a society which permanently determines the relation to other groups."

On the basis of the above definitions we determine the main characteristics of class.

6.2.4 Chief characteristics of Class System

(i) **Hierarchy of status group** — The structure of the different classes within a society is like a pyramid. There are very few people in the highest class whereas in the lowest class the number of people is the highest. The highest class has lesser people but their prestige and social status is the highest; the lower classes are greater in number but their prestige is the lowest. In between these two classes is the middle class.

(ii) **Occupation** — Occupation is considered to be the basis of class division. According to this view, individuals in superior occupation are treated as superior class people whereas those in inferior occupations are treated as inferior class people.

(iii) **Manual Labour** — Veblen looks upon manual labour as the basis of class-consciousness. People indulging in manual labour are looked upon as belonging to an inferior class while those engaged in administration, sports, war, religion and other activities are treated as belonging to superior class.

(iv) **Not based on birth** — Class-system is not based on birth. It does not depend upon caste. In other words, the membership of a particular class does not depend on the caste or family to which he is born. If a person is born in a high family or high caste but is not capable or efficient to maintain it he descends to a small class or low class. On the other hand, a person born in a low class and being efficient can rise and go up or ascend to a high class.

(v) **Life opportunity** — People belonging to a particular class have similar life opportunities. The life style of one class is different from the life style of another. The family relations, marital relatives, place of residence, customs, etc. are limited to a particular class.

(vi) **Multiple factors** — Cattell believes class-consciousness to be the sum total of five factors — prestige rating, mean I. Q., average income, education of some years and the amount of birth restriction. But class-consciousness is not based on these factors only. It continually changes according to circumstances.

Thus, the views of Karl Marx and Engels that class is based only on economic differences stand refuted because we find that besides economic differences class consciousness is also an important element in class-distinction and that factors of class-consciousness change continually.

6.2.5 Distinction between Caste and Class

Caste and class are the two main forms of social stratification. Both caste and class indicate the status and position of individual in a society. So, from this point of view there is similarity. But as we know a social class is a group of people who maintain or share external and internal similarity.

External congruence or similarity is of class, custom language and other cultural factors. Internal similarity is the similarity of thoughts, ideals and most of all unity of community sentiment. From these points of view we can enumerate the differences between caste and class as under —

(i) Caste is based on birth and class on work — The membership of caste is based on birth, so that a person can become a member of a particular caste. Thus we find people of different ability, status, position, etc. being members of the same caste. On the contrary, the membership of class is based on the same status, ability, prestige, etc.

(ii) Caste is a close group whereas class is open — There is a closed stratification in caste, meaning that a person cannot rise above his caste. Once a person is born in a particular caste, he has to remain for ever in that caste. The work of a Brahmin, for example, is to give education, to worship and to study the scriptures, but if a Vaishya or Shudra studies all the scriptures and becomes very well – educated even then he cannot become a Brahmin. That is why caste is said to be a closed group. On the contrary, there is open stratification in class, meaning that a person can change his class according to his ability or actions.

(iii) Occupation of caste is fixed but not of class — Within the caste system, the occupations of the people are fixed on traditions and established conventions. On the contrary, the occupation of class is not permanent or fixed. A person can change his occupation according to his ability and economic strength.

(iv) Consciousness — The members of a class are class-conscious, whereas there is no need for subjective consciousness in members of caste.

(v) Caste is endogamous group but class is not — Within the caste system a person cannot marry outside his caste, otherwise he is boycotted. But within a class there is no such strict law.

(vi) The membership of caste is ascribed whereas that of class of acquired — The membership of caste is ascribed because a person has to make no effort for it. He gets it by birth. On the contrary, if a person is keen on becoming the member of a particular class, he has to work for it. In this sense, it is said that membership of class is acquired.

(v) Caste is static but not class — Because the membership of class is related to the socio-economic conditions, there is always scope for change. The socio-economic condition of a country also influences the class system. In comparison with this, caste system is more static and permanent for there are very little chances for change.

(vi) Hierarchy or structure in caste-system is more definite and clear-cut than in a class — In caste system the hierarchy is clear-cut, the Brahmins being on the top, then Kshatriyas, Vaishyas, Shudras. In a class, though classification is done on the basis of socio-economic conditions, yet it becomes difficult to distinguish between high class and low class.

(vii) Class System does not hinder democracy but caste system does hinder democracy — An individual has greater freedom in a class whereas in the caste system there are more restrictions.

(viii) There is comparatively less social distance in classes but more social distance between castes — Because caste is a closed group, there is a lot of distance between members of one caste and those of another. On the contrary, though there is difference in life style and standard of living among different classes, there is not much distance among them. They mix with each other if they want.

Thus caste and class differ in many respects.

6.2.6 Conclusion

From the above discussion, we come to the conclusion that caste system has more strict laws compared to class. We also know that efforts have been made to relax these strict laws which have started bearing results because we find, now-a-days, that people of all the castes are trying to mix freely so that the distance between them is reduced. A number of inter-caste marriages are also taking place. On the contrary, we find that people of different classes are moving away from each other. People of higher class try to keep themselves aloof and do not want to mix with those of lower class. Thus, in modern times due to the impact of education the laws regulating caste and class systems have changed considerably.

6.3 Summary

Thus we have seen that caste and class are two main forms of social stratification. Caste is described as "closed stratification" whereas class is termed as "open stratification." Both have their own special characteristics. They differ from each other in several respects. But both indicate the status and position of an individual living in a society.

6.4 Key words used in the Lesson

Caste, Class, stratification, groups, personal efficiency, calibre, closed, endogamous, hereditary, occupation, status, prestige, class-consciousness, manual labour, membership, external and internal similarity, open stratification, closed stratification, hierarchy.

6.5 Questions for exercise

(a) Objective Questions

1. Caste system is

- (a) open stratification
- (b) closed stratification
- (c) both
- (d) neither

Answer — (b)

2. Class consciousness is predominant in

- (a) caste system
- (b) class
- (c) society
- (d) none

Answer — (b)

(b) Short Answer Questions

1. Define caste and enumerate its chief characteristics.

Answer — Sub-section 6.2.1 and 6.2.2

2. Define class. What are its main features ?

Answer — Sub-section 6.2.3 and 6.2.4

(c) Long Answer Questions

- 1. Distinguish between caste and class.
- 2. Caste is closed stratification and class is open stratification. Discuss critically.

6.6 Suggested Readings

- 1. G. K. Agarwal : **Principles of Sociology**
- 2. Dr. Vatsyayan : **Social Philosophy**
- 3. Ashok Kumar Verma : **Prarambhika Samaj evam Rajniti Darshan**
- 4. D. N. Mazumdar & T. N. Madan : **An Introduction to Social Anthropology**



7.1 Introduction

Marriage is that important social institution which is the basis of establishing a family. In other words, family is an association and marriage is its institution. The two supplement each other.

Social Philosophy is chiefly concerned with the study of social relations i.e. its nature, forms, functions, problems, dealings and progress. Man has always lived in society and being in family is the only proper way to live in society. Although the human family is linked to a whole network of social institutions in society, its closest association is with the supporting institution of marriage which formalises and regularises the relationship between members of a family.

In other words, marriage gives the assent to a male and a female to enter into sex relations, to produce children and to establish a family. Sex relations without marriage are not accepted by the society. Being illegal these are looked down upon by the society.

Hence, marriage is the method accepted by the society for producing children and establishing a family. Marriage unites the male and female as far as possible into a permanent relationship either by the exchange of rings or by religious ceremony, etc.

Divorce, on the other hand, is the act by which the husband and the wife are separated from each other.

7.2 Significance of Marriage and Divorce

As discussed earlier, marriage is that institution which gives sanction to a male and female to have sex relations, to produce children and to establish a household. Thus, the significance of marriage is that it is a socially sanctioned union of male and female. It is a relatively permanent union of a male and a female. It is the basis for the establishment of a family. It is the result of a civil or religious ceremony. Hence, it has the sanction or approval of the society. It is accepted as an important social institution because it helps in the achievement of important objectives.

Divorce, on the other hand, is the separation of the husband and wife due to different reasons. If the aim of marriage is not fulfilled, if the husband and the wife are dissatisfied with each other due to various reasons and if they want to be separated, the institution which helps them in these cases is "divorce".

The idea of divorce has been rejected by many thinkers because they consider marriage to be a permanent bond. But in some cases like when the wife is being tortured immensely by the husband or if any of the two is an insane person, divorce comes as a great help to the sufferer.

7.2.1 Meaning of Marriage, its Aim & Purpose

The sociologists, anthropologists and social philosophers have defined marriage variously. Westermack offers a classic definition of marriage upheld by all social thinkers. In his words, "Marriage is a relation of one or more men to one or more women which is recognised by custom or law, and involves certain rights and duties both in the case of parties entering the union and in the case of children of it."

Lewis defines marriage as "a relatively permanent bond between permissible mates."

Malinowski defines marriage as "contract for the production and maintenance of children".

According to Horton and Hunt, "Marriage is the approved social pattern whereby two or more persons establish a family."

Mazumdar, H. T. defines marriage as "a socially sanctioned union of male and female, or as a secondary institution devised by society to sanction the union and mating of male and female, for purposes of

- (a) establishing a household
- (b) entering into sex relations
- (c) procreating and
- (d) providing care for the offspring.

Thus, from the above definitions the following characteristics of marriage follow :

- (1) Marriage is a means of contact between persons of opposite sex.
- (2) It is the result of civil or religious ceremony.
- (3) In it the male and the female get the right of mutual relationship in economic, social and biological spheres.

This broad based definition of marriage covers this institution as it is found in Hindus, Muslims, Christians and Tribals in India.

Thus, marriage is the method sanctioned by the society for producing children and establishing a family. So, the first aim and purpose of marriage is biological, that is, sex satisfaction. Marriage also puts a restriction on it so that order, peace and security are established in society. It is also good from the point of view of health. Secondly, it helps in the establishment of a family. Husband, wife and their children form a family and many families form a society. Even if children are not born the family is there. In the family the feelings of love, compassion, cooperation, tolerance, friendship develop which are important for a healthy society.

Thus, marriage is important in many respects.

7.2.2 Forms of Marriage, their Causes, Advantages and Disadvantages

In almost all the societies one or the other forms of marriage exists. Its forms and function change according to change in culture. The main forms of marriage are

(1) Monogamy — One man one wife—under monogamy one man marries one wife. This is the leading form of marriage to be found in all societies.

Advantages :

(a) It produces the highest type of affection and sincere devotion.

(b) The children are well looked after because both father and mother give earnest attention to them.

(c) The old parents receive care from their children.

Malinowski says, "Monogamy is, has been, and will remain the only true type of marriage."

(2) Polygamy or Polygyny — One husband marries wives – Under this system one man has two or more wives at a time. Polygyny is found among Eskimo tribes, Grow and Afdatsa of North America and African Negroes. In India, till today it exists among Muslims and also among Hindus. Westernmack has mentioned the following causes of polygamy :

(i) Enforced celibacy during the period of pregnancy.

(ii) Early ageing of females.

(iii) Desire for variety.

(iv) To obtain more children.

(v) Social Prestige.

(vi) Economic necessity, that is, to get cheap labour in the form of wives.

Advantages of polygamy

(i) It checks prostitution because man can satisfy his sex desires in a better way within the confines of marriage.

(ii) It gives healthy children to society.

(iii) Children are looked after better by several women.

Disadvantages

(i) It increases economic burden on the head of the family.

(ii) There are many children to be looked after.

(iii) It creates jealousy among wives and children.

(iv) It destroys family happiness.

(3) Polyandry — One wife, many husbands – Polyandry is a form of marriage wherein one woman has more than one man at a given time. In Hindu mythology we find that the five brothers called pandavas shared the same wife. Polyandry is said to exist in some tribes as Namib Bushmen, the Yaruro of Venezuela, the Hengua of Elchaco, the Singhalese, the Mundas and some ancient tribes of the Malaya peninsula. It is a rare type of marriage.

Polyandry has two forms :

(i) Fraternal Polyandry — In this form of polyandry one wife is regarded as the wife of all brothers who have sexual relation with her and the children are treated as the offspring of the eldest brother. Such a form existed among the Todas.

(ii) Non-fraternal Polyandry — In this one woman has many husbands who may not necessarily be brothers.

Causes of Polyandry are :

- (a) Poverty
- (b) Lesser number of women
- (c) High Bride Price
- (d) Population Control
- (e) Backwardness
- (f) Joint family

Advantages of Polyandry are :

- (i) It controls the growth of population.
- (ii) The family property does not get divided
- (iii) It strengthens the economic position of the family
- (iv) The members feel close and secure.

Disadvantages of Polyandry are :

- (i) It adversely affects the health of the woman who has to satisfy the desire of several husbands.
- (ii) It leads to sterility.
- (iii) It may diminish population
- (iv) Divorce is easy to get

(4) Endogamy — It is that form of marriage in which one must marry within one's own caste or group but not one's own close kin. Hence, marriage outside the group is prohibited. For e.g. in India, a Brahman can marry only a Brahman and not only that he can marry only a Brahman of his own sub-caste.

Causes of Endogamy :

- (i) Policy of separation among castes
- (ii) To keep wealth in the group
- (iii) Religious differences
- (iv) Racial or cultural differences.
- (v) Sense of superiority or inferiority.
- (vi) Geographic separation.

Advantages of Endogamy :

- (i) Fosters the sense of unity within the group.
- (ii) Keeps women happy.
- (iii) Keeps wealth and prosperity within the group.
- (iv) Keeps the business secrets of the group intact.
- (v) Preserves the purity in group.
- (vi) Preserves group homogeneity.

Disadvantages of Endogamy :

- (i) Endogamy shatters national unity for it emphasises group feeling which creates communalism.
- (ii) it generates hatred and jealousy among group.
- (iii) It encourages casteism.
- (iv) It limits the field of mate-selection.
- (v) It encourages dowry-system, bride-suicide, etc.

In view of the above defects, it has become necessary both in national and international interest, that the endogamous marriage be made void which is being done by the influence of modern western thought and civilization.

(5) Exogamy — In this type, marriage is done outside the group. A man must not only seek a wife out of his own clan but also must avoid the clans of all the grandparents. All people prohibit marriage between individuals having certain degree of blood of affinal relationships.

Causes — According to Westermack, the most important cause of exogamy is

- (i) The presence of sexual indifference between near related persons.
- (ii) If marriage takes place within the same group then it leads to a confusion of generation for there would arise a family within a family.

Advantages of Exogamy :

- (i) It is approved from the biological viewpoint for it leads to healthy and intelligent offspring.
- (ii) It avoids the confusion of the generation for if marriages take place in the same group these would lead to a family within a family.
- (iii) Leads to reduction of sexual rivalry and jealousy.
- (iv) Consolidates the family as a cooperative social group and strengthens the society.
- (v) Promotes the strengthening of the society as a whole.

Disadvantages of Exogamy :

- (i) The scope for the choice of the bride and the groom becomes very limited.
- (ii) It encourages dowry resulting in unhappy married life.
- (iii) Dowry leads to suicide of young women.
- (iv) Delayed marriage leads to illicit sex relationship.

As a result of these defects the laws of exogamous marriage in Hindu society are breaking down.

(6) Inter-caste Marriage — Inter-caste marriage means the union of a man and a woman belonging to two different castes. According to sociologists, inter-caste marriage existed in ancient India.

The biggest advantage of inter-caste marriage is that it helps to eliminate or remove such evils as dowry, bride price, unsuited marriage, etc.

The disadvantages of inter-caste marriage are illicit sex relations, total elimination of purity and cultural differences between various castes.

The influence of western culture has led to the encouragement of inter-caste marriage.

Having discussed the different forms of marriage, let us now examine the grounds for the success of marriage.

7.2.3 Success of Marriage

The success of marriage lies in the social philosophy where both male and female consider each other as ends in themselves and not as mere means for their own selfish good. The institution of marriage should not be based on mere legal, social, economic or political sanctions but rather upon psychological, moral and spiritual needs. The husband and the wife should possess the spirit of toleration which is a solid foundation of the institution of marriage. Hence whether it is love marriage or arranged marriage the above conditions should be present for the success of marriage.

A happy married life only can lead to the progress of the society as a whole.

7.2.4 Divorce

In many modern and civilized societies divorce is accepted as part of the institution of marriage. It is said that marriage is a mutual relationship between a male and a female which is approved by the society for the achievement of some goals. But if these goals are not achieved then marriage has no significance. In such a situation marriage has to break up and divorce is that institution which helps in such a case. Divorce separates the husband and the wife forever and gives them the right to establish their household separately.

But in the Hindu law there was no such thing as divorce because the Hindu shastras regarded marriage as a bond never indissoluble in life. The custom of divorce existed only among the lower castes. But the Hindu Marriage Act of 1955 has recognized the right of a Hindu woman to divorce her husband. Under section 13 of the Act any marriage solemnized whether before or after the commencement of this Act may, on a petition presented by either the husband or the wife, be dissolved by a decree of divorce on the ground that the other party

- (a) is living in adultery; or
- (b) has ceased to be a Hindu by conversion to another religion or
- (c) has been incurably of unsound mind for a continuous period of not less than three years.
- (d) has renounced the world by entering into a religious order and so on.

In the Muslim community also there is provision for divorce.

Thus divorce is the separation of the husband and wife for ever.

With regard to divorce we find three views :

(i) Traditional View — According to some thinkers marital relation is not only a contract or a physical union but it is the union of two souls which goes on birth after birth. Therefore, divorce is not acceptable. Such view is dogmatic and results in accepting unbearable married life. According to these thinkers divorce obstructs in the moral development of the children. Hence, it is not permissible.

(ii) Fundamentalist View — According to this view, marriage is concerned with the personal life; it is a contract and if the husband and the wife are willing they can take divorce. If their marital life is not happy, the husband and the wife should take divorce. This system is to be found in Russia. But this view also can not be accepted because it makes married life and the family a temporary association which has no permanency and can be changed according to one's free will.

(iii) Liberal View — According to this view, marital relation is a necessary one but when the question of divorce arises, we should keep in mind its utility. First of all,

Marriage and Divorce

effort should be made so that the husband and the wife try to make an understanding and live in cordial atmosphere. But even when this does not bring any result, then only should they take divorce. It seems that the liberal view is a synthesis of the first two views.

It is generally believed that divorce is the best solution for an unhappy married life. But Miss Waller in her book, "The Old Love and the new" and Miss Groves in her book "Marriage" have written about the sad plight of the divorcees. These books clarify that divorce is not the solution for an unhappy married life.

Hence divorce should be avoided as far as possible.

7.2.5 Conclusion

Divorce should be taken only in very exceptional cases when it is absolutely impossible for the husband and the wife to live together. Although according to some thinkers, divorce has helped the women to develop a feeling of independence and make them feel equal partners, it may be said that divorce should not be easily granted by the courts. Divorce has serious repercussions on family life and causes instability of family. Hence efforts should be made to bring reunion between husband and wife and divorce should be avoided.

7.3 Summary

Thus we see that marriage apart from being an important social institution is also a sacred act. It is said that "marriages are made in heaven" meaning that marriages take place according to God's will. Hence, it becomes our duty to accept God's will and to spend our married life in love and tolerance. A situation for divorce should never take place.

7.4 Key words used in the Lesson

Marriage, social institution, association, contract, permanent bond, polyandry, polygamy, polygyny, monogamy, endogamy, exogamy, inter-caste marriage, spiritual needs, adultery, divorce, reunion, biological, progeny.

7.5 Questions for Exercise

(a) Objective questions

1. Marriage is

- (a) a social institution
- (b) a political institution
- (c) an economic institution

(d) none

Answer — (a)

2. Divorce should be

- (a) allowed
- (b) not allowed
- (c) avoided
- (d) none

Answer — (c)

(b) Short Answer Questions

1. Discuss the meaning and significance of marriage.

Ans. — See 7.2.1

2. Discuss the conditions necessary for the success of marriage.

Ans. — See 7.2.3

3. What do you mean by divorce ? Discuss.

Ans. — See 7.2.4

(c) Long Answer Questions

- 1. What is marriage ? Discuss its various forms.
- 2. Discuss critically the institution of marriage and divorce.

7.6 Suggested Readings

- 1. Dr. Vatsyayan : **Social Philosophy**
- 2. A. K. Verma : **Prarambhika Samaj Evam Rajniti Darshan**
- 3. G. K. Agarwal : **Indian Social Institutions**
- 4. Vidya Bhushan &
D. R. Sachdeva : **An Introduction to Sociology**
- 5. D. N. Mazumdar &
T. N. Madan : **An Introduction to Social Anthropology**



Private Property**Lesson structure**

- 8.0 Objective
- 8.1 Introduction
- 8.2 Importance of Private Property
 - 8.2.1 Meaning and Nature of Property
 - 8.2.2 Kinds of Property
 - 8.2.3 Origin and Development of the Institution of Private Property
 - 8.2.4 Different Theories regarding Private Property
 - 8.2.5 Merits of Private Property
 - 8.2.6 Demerits of Private Property
 - 8.2.7 Conclusion
- 8.3 Summary
- 8.4 Key words used in the Lesson
- 8.5 Questions for Exercise
 - (a) Objective Questions
 - (b) Short Answer Questions
 - (c) Long Answer Questions
- 8.6 Suggested Readings

8.0 Objective

The institution of private property is very old. A number of questions regarding the meaning, nature, origin and development of the institution of private property arise in our minds. This lesson will help you to find answers to all these questions. We shall first discuss the meaning and nature of 'property' in general. Then, we shall discuss the different kinds of property. After this, we shall discuss the origin and development of private property and the different theories regarding the institution of private property. Lastly, we shall discuss the merits and demerits of private property. In the end, we shall conclude with comments on private property.

8.1 Introduction

The concept of property has played a vital role in the evolution of state and civilization. It has been asserted that the institution of private property existed even prior to the evolution of the state. But a number of questions come to our mind. That is : what reason can a man give for calling a thing his own. How are we going to distinguish valid claims of ownership from those which are unjust ? A history of answers to these questions is the history of the theory of property.

As it is, property is necessary for every human being. In modern times property is related to every aspect of human life and even social life. Without property, it is impossible to live in this world. Hence, it is essential for us to have to have a clear idea of the meaning and nature of property, its different kinds, its merits and demerits, etc. all of which shall be dealt with in this lesson.

8.2 Importance of Private Property

Property has been described as a "bundle of rights". It is the exclusive right of an individual or individuals over the things which he or they are entitled to.

There are three forms of property—private, quasi-public and public.

When the owner has control over his property, it is said to be his private property. According to the advocates of private property, gives man a security and opens avenues for the enrichment of his personality. It gives power to an individual so that he can work to the best of his ability. It is said that the fate of a propertyless man is no better than that of a slave. Hence, it is important that a person must have private property.

But before going into details regarding the merits of private property, let us first study the meaning, definition and nature of 'property' in general.

8.2.1 Meaning and Nature of Property

It is difficult to give a precise definition of the term "property" in view of the fact that its real meaning and nature vary with developments in the spheres of science and technology as well as with the views of men in regard to their social and economic philosophy. As a result, the term would have one meaning in the primitive society with a simple agricultural economy and quite another in a highly developed technological society ever finding new and developed methods of controlling resources and using the end products for the community proposed in hundred ways. It is only in a loose manner that property is defined as "a bundle of rights" which the owner possesses and enjoys as a matter of his claim to the exclusion of others, though subject to the laws of social behaviour.

Private Property

Property is derived from the Latin word "propriates" which means 'one's own'. Thus, the material goods which are exclusively owned by a person are called "property".

According to Asirvatham, "Property can be defined as the control of man over things, or an appropriation of material objects recognised by society".

According to Sidgwick, "The right to property when used without qualification means the complete right of exclusive use including the right to destroy, the right to alienate, but not necessarily the right to bequest."

Ginsberg says, "Property means the mutual interaction between individual and the group regarding their mutual rights and responsibilities."

Thus from the above definitions of the term "property" we find that it has two essential ingredients :

- (i) individual's right in exclusion to that of others, and
- (ii) use and enjoyment of this right subject to the norms of social welfare.

Thus, by property, we mean generally "an exclusive right to control an economic good."

Important Points Regarding the Nature of Property

(i) Property is a private affair. It implies a right of the person to exclude others. The owner of an object is entitled to the exclusion of other private persons to decide what shall be done with it, except as he is limited by law or by some voluntary agreement.

(ii) Property is a public affair as well. The property belonging to a municipality, local or state government, roads, bridges, parks, hospitals, temples, railways are all public properties.

(iii) Property has both individual and social sides. In the former aspect it relates to the exclusive possession of an individual over some objects whether material or immaterial, whereby he may make use of his right in exclusion to the claim of others, though subject to the norms of social behaviour; in the latter case, it relates to the authority of the state that may impose reasonable restrictions in the name of general good. For e.g. the power of the state to levy tax on private property, or implement the rule of estate duty, or to make nationalisation.

(iv) Transferability and Legal Acceptance are important elements of property.

8.2.2 Kinds of Property

Broadly speaking, there are three kinds of property—private, quasi-public and public.

In certain cases when the owner has control over his property whether limited by the law of the land, it is his private property. It may, however, be emphasized that due to change in the character of the society, the concept of property has also changed so

much so that what we generally call private property is no longer "private," as it was in the previous centuries. The most remarkable change in the character of private property is that it is now being seen as a right to a revenue or an income rather than as a right in specific material things. The most remarkable change in the character of private property is that it is now being seen as a right to a revenue or an income, rather than as a right in specific material things.

The emergence of the welfare state has created new forms of property. The government issues licences to the private entrepreneurs to run some industry. It also holds hundreds of acres of land for mining or other purposes which are available for utilisation by private individuals by way of lease. Such property is described as "quasi-private" or "quasi-public".

Then, there is the state property that may be described as public or common property. For e.g. the property belonging to a municipality, local or state government, roads, bridges, parks, hospitals, temples, railways are all public properties.

8.2.3 Origin and Development of the Institution of Private Property

It will be wrong to assume that the concept of private property came into existence with the coming of man. For millions of years human beings lived in primitive communist societies without private property. Men lived with common properties in primitive societies. This was the age of "Primitive Communism". Engles, Spencer, Hobbes, support this view.

The concept of private property developed with the development of animal husbandry, agriculture and with the invention of currency. The land became private, the quest for property was the speciality of civilization and ownership of private property became the criterion for being called civilized. With the development of the instrument of production and economic system, the character and the form of property also changed. For machines, capital was needed and whatever people had spent or the capital took the form of private property or individual property.

From this two factors originated :

- (i) The very nature of property is relative and changing.
- (ii) Property developed in the form of consumer goods and for our own pleasure is personal property.

Originally, private property was the means of the fulfilment of individual needs but gradually as society developed and people became more conscious, the individual property took the form of capitalism. To get rid of this socialism appeared. Property is not for one person but for the whole society.

8.2.4 Theories concerning Private Property

Private property, as we have seen above, is that over which the owner has exclusive control. Now there are many theories which have given their own views regarding the institution of private property.

1. Liberal Theory of Property — The supporters of this theory are Locke, Laski, etc. who justify private property on the following grounds :

On the psychological basis it is said that private property is necessary as an incentive to work. On the moral basis it is said that property is the reward of the labour and ability of men and one who has earned property by working hard, has a moral claim to it. On the social basis it is said that the right to property increases the essential social virtues like love towards family and charity. Without property man will feel insecure and powerless. On the economic basis, without private property, capital and investment, there can be no production in the society. On the historical basis private property has existed since time immemorial and the division of society into the rich and the poor has always been there. However, it is said that property has contributed to the development of human civilization.

2. Marxian Theory of Property : The Marxist theory of property is a revolutionary theory of the abolition of private property and the establishment of a classless communist society in which private ownership of the means of production will be replaced by social ownership. It wants to abolish private property to make its benefits available to all members of the society. Marx divides property into two groups :

(i) Individual

(ii) Personal

(i) Individual Property — Man by his own effort accords wealth for himself or for his living, that is, by becoming an engineer or a doctor or a teacher etc. In ancient times it had no importance but gradually as society developed, his wants and desires also developed and thus individual property acquired its importance. In Russia also, after the revolution, much importance was given to individual property and protection was given to individual property by law.

(ii) Personal Property — It means property accumulated not through one's own effort. This is earned through somebody's skill or labour. It depends on the exploitation of labour class. This is the root source of capitalism.

Thus, when the Marxist view of property is analyzed it should be understood only as private ownership of the means of production. The identification of private property with personal property would be misleading.

The liberalist does not accept the Marxist view that private property should be

abolished; it rather maintains that some evils of unlimited right to private property should be checked through social and state regulation.

3. Individualistic Theory — Man is considered to be the supreme being or Param Purushartha. Man has got complete freedom for the development of his self and to acquire wealth. In the language of Economics, it is not very consistent because it leads towards capitalism.

4. Theory of Rights — According to this theory whatever is used by one is one's own possession and it should be accepted by the whole society. Every individual has the right to his property and also to use it as his own personal asset. But there are practical difficulties in this theory. Then there will be no peace in the society. Rousseau says :

- (i) No land should be possessed by anybody.
- (ii) One should earn that much which can fulfil one's needs.
- (iii) Labour should be the very basis of right.

5. Legal Theory —Locke says that we have a right to individual property because it is approved by law. But this is also inconsistent because property cannot be justified or unjustified only on the basis of law. Law is not the only justification of property.

6. Idealist Theory — According to this theory, property is essential for the perfection of the individual, for the development of his personality. Kant, Hegel, Green support this view. But like other theories this theory is not justified because it makes the individual selfish and isolates man from the society. An individual cannot have his existence apart from the society.

So, property is a relative and not an absolute concept. Development of the individual is consistent with the development of society.

7. Labour Theory — According to this theory, one who labours or makes efforts has a right to acquire property. This also is not a correct theory because through this bitterness prevails in society as each person has different skill, capacity and needs. This theory will lead to the origin of complexes in people.

8. Socialistic Theory — According to this theory, the system of private property should be subject to the norm of social good. It criticised the capitalist system and emphasized the linking of the institution of property so as to enrich his personality. He warned that greater disparities of wealth were incompatible with the system of democracy and in case, the wide gulf was not bridged revolution would supervene to alter the balance.

Thus, we have discussed the different theories put forward by thinkers who advocate private property. Now we are in a position to examine it critically, to analyze its merits and demerits.

8.2.5 Merits of Private Property

The protagonists of the institution of private property say that it gives man a sense of security and opens avenues for the enrichment of his personality.

Private property helps in the self-development or self-manifestation of man. It satisfies the fundamental needs of man and gives him opportunities to achieve the higher aims in life. It also relieves him of the tension to come in the future. It is said that the fate of a propertyless man is no better than that of a slave.

In ancient times, Aristotle admired private property as rendering power to a person by which he could be liberal and hospitable. According to thinkers, private property develops such virtues in a person as love, compassion, kindness for his family members etc. These virtues, in turn, are good for social life.

Individualists like Mill and Ricardo hold property as the best incentive for a person whereby he can produce more wealth. It is also the incentive for a person to work hard.

Locke appreciated property as being the result of man's labour and upheld it as his natural right.

Hegel, Green etc. hold that property is necessary for the free play of a capacity that can be exerted for common benefit.

8.2.6 Demerits of Private Property

Whereas on the one hand the institution of private property has been praised by some thinkers, on the other, it has been criticised bitterly by some others.

The stoics denounced property as a source of evil existence.

Plato also rejected the idea of private property and laid down the doctrine of communism in property.

According to critics, private property makes it a means of enjoyment for the owner. It makes him lazy so that he begins to shirk from labour.

The subject of private property was vehemently criticised by the anarchists in the nineteenth century. Proudhon called property "theft of labour". Marx denounced private property as being a source of exploitation. Socialists are also against the institution of private property. Ashirvatham describes their views as follows, "Values have been vulgarised to a large extent, and there is widespread tendency to worship power and wealth."

The institution of private property is also criticised from the standpoint of the role of money in the politics of a country. There are evil effects of property on the politics of the country. It is said that power is shared and exercised by the men of "black money" with the result that democracy degenerates itself into plutocracy.

Thus, the institution of private property is not free from defects.

8.2.7 Conclusion

We can conclude by saying that the idea of property should be integrated with the idea of public functions and responsibilities of man. If a Ford or a Rockefeller is able to use his wealth in the production of greater wealth for the service of mankind, we would let him have it. If on the other hand, he uses it for utterly selfish ends or abuses it in other ways, we would by means of law or public opinion or by both make it impossible for him to hold it. (Ashirvatham).

8.3 Summary

Thus we have seen that the concept of private property developed later with the development of animal husbandary, agriculture and with the invention of currency. Many theories were propounded regarding the validity of private property. Some of these uphold the institution of private property saying that it contributes to individual development as well as to the development of human civilization. But some thinkers are against the idea of private property and they want the abolition of private property to make its benefits available to all members of the society as set forth by the Marxists or the communists.

Both the sides have given strong arguments showing the merits and demerits of private property. Whatever may be the view of thinkers, there is no doubt that private property gives man a sense of security and opens avenues for the enrichment of his personality. Besides, it is the best incentive for a person to work hard. Hence, private property is no evil. The only consideration is that a person should not forget his rights and duties associated with property. Private property should never become a source of exploitation or should not lead to capitalism.

8.4 Key words used in the Lesson

Private, property, public, quasi-public, institution, ownership, civilization, private affair, primitive society, capital, enterprise, revolution, abolition, capitalism, state regulation, justification, personality, labour, socialistic theory, protagonists, security, incentive, communism, responsibilities.

8.5 Questions for Exercise

(a) Objective Questions

1. Property is a

- (a) private affair

- (b) public affair
- (c) both private and public affair
- (d) none

Ans. — (c)

2. Private property gives man

- (a) a sense of security and an incentive to work
- (b) no sense of security
- (c) no incentive to work
- (d) means to achieve selfish ends.

(b) Short Answer Questions

1. Discuss the meaning and nature of property.

Answer — See 8.2.1 and 8.2.2

2. What are the different kinds of property ? Discuss.

Answer — See 8.2.3

3. Enumerate the merits and demerits of private property.

Answer — See 8.2.5 and 8.2.6

(c) Long Answer Questions

- 1. What is private property ? Discuss the different theories regarding private property.
- 2. Discuss critically the institution of private property.

8.6 Suggested Readings

- 1. J. C. Johari : **Contemporary Political Theory**
- 2. M. P. Jain : **Political Theory**
- 3. Ashok Kumar Verma : **Prarambhika Samaj evam Rajniti**
- 4. Vidya Bhushan &
D. R. Sachdeva : **An Introduction to Sociology**



Doctrine of Trusteeship**Lesson Structure****9.0 Objective****9.1 Introduction****9.2 Idea behind the Doctrine of Trusteeship****9.2.1 Main Features of the Doctrine of Trusteeship****9.2.2 Comparison between Marxism and Gandhism****9.2.3 Merits of the Doctrine of Trusteeship****9.2.4 Demerits of the Doctrine of Trusteeship****9.2.5 Conclusion****9.3 Summary****9.4 Key words used in the Lesson****9.5 Questions for Exercise****(a) Objective Questions****(b) Short Answer Questions****(c) Long Answer Questions****9.6 Suggested Readings****9.0 Objective**

The conception of trusteeship was given by Gandhiji in order to bridge the gulf between the rich and the poor. But the question is whether the doctrine of trusteeship is a new idea enunciated by Gandhiji or whether it is an old one. It is also worth knowing what has Gandhiji to say in his doctrine of trusteeship. This Lesson has been prepared with these objectives in view. We shall first give an introduction to the doctrine of trusteeship. We shall then discuss its different aspects. Thirdly, we shall compare between Marxism and Gandhism. Lastly, we shall discuss the merits and demerits of the doctrine of trusteeship.

Doctrine of Trusteeship

ownership of property or should change their attitude towards property. They should act not as proprietors but as trustees of property.

The profit motive was to be absent in trusteeship. Trustees may get remuneration for their work done through common consent of the workers and the state. There should be equality between the pay of the trustees and the workers and should not normally be more than the latter. The trustees would use their managerial skill, talent and enterprise of labour not for themselves but as trustee for the good of the society. Thus, the present inequality between the capitalists and the workers would come to an end and the labourers will have ample food, clothing, necessary education, proper medical assistance, etc.

Such a theory of trusteeship did not envisage class antagonism or it was not contrary to the interests of the capitalist, but it sought common good through class-collaboration and class co-ordination. This was a firm step towards classless democracy in which everyone will perform some form of productive physical labour and there will be no exploiters leading to complete economic equality between the capitalists and the labour.

Hence, Gandhiji's trusteeship did not recognise hereditary inheritance of property. "A trustee has no heir but the public", said Gandhiji. He visualised a transition or transformation from individual ownership to community or trust ownership in the long run.

Thus, through trusteeship, Gandhiji wanted to establish an equitable economic order through a proper scheme of distribution. He recognized private property as an unnecessary evil at its worst and in so far as it served the interests of the society at its best. Gandhiji felt that trusteeship was a potent weapon to remove the ills of a capitalistic society by transforming it into an egalitarian society based on justice and free play.

Thus Gandhiji's scheme of trusteeship may be summed up as follows :

(i) Gandhiji was of the firm opinion that by nature all human beings were equal and so there should not be any economic discrimination or disparity among different individuals in respect of income, consumption and other basic necessities of life.

(ii) Gandhiji firmly believed in man's capacity for goodness, amiability of human nature, moral consciousness of man, transformation of heart, etc. Non-violence in thought and behaviour was the main spirit of his theory of trusteeship.

(iii) Trusteeship provided a means of transforming the present capitalist order of society into an egalitarian one.

(iv) It does not recognize any private ownership of property in as much as it may be permitted by society for its welfare.

(v) It does not exclude legislative regulation of ownership.

(vi) Thus, under state-regulated trusteeship an individual will not be free to hold or use his wealth for selfish satisfaction or in disregard of the interest of the society.

(vii) The difference between minimum and maximum incomes should be reasonable and equitable and variable from time to time so much so that the tendency should be towards obliteration of differences.

(viii) Under the Gandhian economic order the character of the production will be determined by social necessity and not by personal whim or greed.

Hence, Gandhiji's doctrine of trusteeship has its own special characteristics.

9.2.2 Comparison between Marxism and Gandhism

At first sight it seems that Gandhiji's views are similar to those of the famous German thinker, Karl Marx. Both aimed at the establishment of classless society but while Marx advocated violence, class war and revolution, Gandhiji advocated non-violence to achieve the end. Gandhiji favoured non-violence because he said that even if the labourers win in getting some comforts through violence they will not get any real happiness for then the capitalists would invent new ways of creating hindrances for the spread of such a movement. Secondly, the labourers united only by a feeling of common enmity would destroy one another out of personal ambition when they come to power, like the capitalists.

Being a spiritualist, Gandhiji believed in reformation by moral and religious appeal and change of heart which gradually gathers greater force and spreads by the power of its noble example to all parts of the world. Marx, on the other hand, regarded religion as the opium of the people.

Marxism believes in the socialisation of the means of production, whereas Gandhiji wanted the capitalists to become the trustees of national wealth.

Marxism believed in the destruction of the capitalist class. Unlike Marxism, the objective of Gandhiji's trusteeship was to destroy capitalism and not the capitalists.

9.2.3 Merits of the Doctrine of Trusteeship

Gandhiji's idea of a classless society or the idea of bridging the gap between the rich and the poor by an equitable distribution of wealth is no doubt, an ideal of a society.

The concept of trusteeship economy which Gandhiji built up systematically was a pioneering effort on his part. His trusteeship can be regarded as an economic thought superior to democratic socialism because it does not sacrifice the individual at the altar of the state.

Gandhiji's doctrine of trusteeship is based on non-violence because it advocates non-violent means for the abolition of private property and the establishment of an egalitarian society.

9.2.4 Demerits of the Doctrine of Trusteeship

Political commentators have severely criticized Gandhiji's doctrine of trusteeship on the following grounds :

(1) The theory is based on unsound psychology. He underestimated the powerful play of psychological factors like human greed and acquisitiveness in the material world. Man is essentially selfish by nature. To think that rich will share or use their wealth for the good of others voluntarily and without interference from the state is to expect too much from them.

(2) The destruction of capitalism and not capitalists is meaningless and irrational and a contradiction in terms. For if the capitalist system is abolished, the capitalists would automatically be exterminated along with the system because they constitute an integral part of that system.

(3) Critics argue that Gandhiji sought an artificial or unhistorical solution to their economic problem when he said that economic inequality can be eliminated by appealing to the moral consciousness of the capitalists. Historical evidence like feudalism is not in favour of this theory.

(4) By his doctrine of trusteeship, Gandhiji believed that non-violence and non-cooperation could build an equalitarian socio-economic order. But one glance at the situation prevailing in the contemporary world proves that there can be no peaceful transformation of society without war, conquest or revolution.

(5) Gandhiji emphasized that the rich should practise renunciation, self-purification and simplicity and work as trustees for common good. They say that Gandhi overgeneralised his personal experience of simplicity and asceticism and built his theory of trusteeship on it. Thus, Gandhiji's theory of trusteeship was built on weak and shaky foundations.

(6) Gandhiji's theory is totally utopian or unpractical. Gandhiji in his own lifetime could not convince even one capitalist to act as trustees of his wealth for the good of the people. Thus, at the most, Gandhiji's trusteeship theory remains utopian because in essence, the theory and practice of trusteeship were neither clearly developed into a philosophical system nor a functionally relevant theory that was capable of being put into practice.

(7) Besides being a theory of considerable antiquity, the trusteeship theory has hindered the socioeconomic transformation of a traditional society into a modern industrial order.

Thus critics have severely criticised the Doctrine of Trusteeship as propounded by Mahatma Gandhi.

9.2.5 Conclusion

Summing up, we can say that absolute trusteeship is unattainable and therefore Gandhi's concept of trusteeship may appear to be irrelevant, abstract, utopian, unpractical to the people of modern age but this does not mean that it is absolutely useless. It tries to find a solution to the ever-growing disparity between the rich and the poor, the haves and the have-nots. It points to an ideal towards which everyone of us can strive. At least some persons in the past and some during present times have tried to follow the doctrine of trusteeship to a certain extent.

The fact that Vinoba Bhave has been able to secure four and a half million acres of land as voluntary gift from land owners gives some hope for the future. In fact, the trusteeship theory cannot become a reality without a thorough social awakening brought about by scholars and government policy makers so that an equitable and stable socio-economic order can be ushered in as early as possible.

9.3 Summary

Gandhiji, being a spiritualist, believed in reformation of the people in the society by moral and religious appeal and change of the heart. He presented his scheme of trusteeship to put an end to the system of private property and to bring about economic equality in the society.

We should never forget that the primary aim behind this theory of trusteeship was Gandhi's genuine desire to establish a cordial relation among all sections of the society. Gandhi's economic ideas have to be given serious consideration for solving the pressing socio-economic problems in an undeveloped country like India. It is very rightly said, "Gandhiji is still a living challenge to the economic thinking, planning and action not only in his own country but also in all the countries of the world."

9.4 Key words used in the Lesson

Doctrine, trusteeship, aparigraha, moralistic idea, trustee, equitable distribution, equalitarian society, class-collaboration, classless democracy, economic discrimination, non-violence, ownership, reformation, capitalists, Socio-economic order, ascetism.

9.5 Questions for Exercise

(a) Objective Questions

1. The Doctrine of trusteeship was given by

- (a) Gandhiji
- (b) Jawahar Lal Nehru

Doctrine of Trusteeship

- (c) Karl Marx
- (d) Swami Vivekananda

Ans. — (a)

2. Gandhiji's doctrine of trusteeship is

- (a) practical
- (b) utopia
- (c) both
- (d) none

Ans. — (b)

(b) Short Answer Questions

1. Compare Gandhiji's economic ideas with those of Marx.

Ans. — See 9.2.2

2. Discuss the main features of the doctrine of trusteeship.

Ans. — See 9.2.1

(c) Long Answer Questions

1. Discuss critically Gandhiji's doctrine of trusteeship.
2. Is Gandhiji's doctrine of trusteeship practical ? Discuss.

9.6 Suggested Readings

1. A. C. Kapur : Principles of Political Science
2. A. K. Verma : Prarambhika Samaj evam Rajniti Darshan



Nature of Political Philosophy**Lesson Structure**

- 10.0 Objective
- 10.1 Introduction
- 10.2 Nature of Political Philosophy
 - 10.2.1 Definition of Political Science
 - 10.2.2 Definition of Political Philosophy
 - 10.2.3 Nature of Political Philosophy
 - 10.2.4 Problems of Political Philosophy
 - 10.2.5 Attitude of the Political Philosopher
 - 10.2.6 Method of Political Philosophy
 - 10.2.7 Conclusion
- 10.3 Summary
- 10.4 Key words used in the Lesson
- 10.5 Questions for Exercise
 - (a) Objective Questions
 - (b) Short Answer Questions
 - (c) Long Answer Questions
- 10.6 Suggested Readings

10.0 Objective

The main objective behind discussing this lesson is to have a clear idea about the nature of political philosophy. For this, first of all, we have to know the definition, scope and nature of political science because political philosophy depends on political science for facts, concepts, beliefs, etc. Then, we shall see the various definitions given by thinkers of political philosophy. After this, we shall discuss the nature of political philosophy, its problems, the attitude of a political philosopher and the method of political philosophy. In the end, we shall conclude with a short account of the exact nature of political philosophy.