

10.1 Introduction

The terms "political theory" and "political philosophy" are often used interchangeably, but there is a recognizable difference between the theoretical work of political scientists and that of political philosopher just as there is a recognizable difference between sociological theory and social philosophy.

In the wider sense, sociology or social studies include the study of politics, and deals with everything that has to do with the activities of men in society. In the narrower sense, social or sociological studies are confined to those areas of social activity that do not form the subject matter of other social sciences such as political science or economics, etc. It is evident that social philosophy is of broader scope than political philosophy and can indeed be said to include it. Similarly, social or sociological theory is of broader scope than the theory of political science.

Social and political theory is theory in the scientific sense of the term. Its aim is explanation. It generalizes on the evidence of factual instances or on the facts of experience.

Social and political philosophy are different. Whereas scientific theories are 'positive', philosophy is normative. Scientific theory deals with positive facts, with what is in fact the case. Philosophical theory is normative setting up norms and ideals.

Political philosophy sets up norms and ideal standards for state and government telling us what ought to be the case.

Hence, political philosophy is a philosophical study of the facts of political science.

10.2 Nature of Political Philosophy

Political philosophy is a branch of philosophy in which philosophical thinking is applied to ideas about the state and government. When politics is studied from the scientific point of view, it is called "political science", and when studied from the philosophical point of view it is called political philosophy.

Philosophy has taken many different forms and in all its forms, it has two main aims:

- (a) the clarification of concepts
- (b) the critical evaluation of beliefs.

Political philosophy too, aims at the clarification of political concepts as well as the critical evaluation of political beliefs. Thus, political philosophy depends upon political sciences for facts, concepts and beliefs. After clarifying the political concepts, facts and beliefs, political philosophy critically evaluates them. By doing so, political philosophy

Nature of Political Philosophy

determines the ideals and values of the state and the government. It determines the ideal standards for the state and government.

That is why political philosophy is called "normative" for it sets up the "ideals" or "norms" for the state and the government.

But before going into detail regarding the nature of political philosophy, let us first see the definitions and scope of political science and political philosophy.

10.2.1 Definition of Political Science

Political science studies the political life of man and its related groups and institutions.

Aristotle defines politics as the science of state. According to Charles Hyneman, "It corresponds to that part of affairs of the state which centres in government and that kind or part of government which speaks to law."

A succinct definition of political science is given by Paul Janet, a distinguished French writer, who says that political science is "that part of social science which treats of the foundations of the state and the principles of government."

Thus political science studies about the political institutions, about the formation of the government, and public administration and about international law.

In a comprehensive sense, the term politics covers the entire subject matter included in political science such as political theory, government and public administration, international law, international politics and international organisation.

Having seen the definition and scope of political science, let us now see the definition and scope of political philosophy.

10.2.2 Definition of Political Philosophy

In a general sense, philosophy is the "science of wisdom". To Plato and Aristotle, it is "search for truth". Obviously, the field of philosophy is so vast that it tries to explain not something but everything—the universe, the macrocosms and the microcosms. It examines not only what is but also what ought to be, or ought to be done, or to be approved. Hence, philosophy is the rational and critical appreciation of the facts of life and universe.

In the words of John Dewey, "Whenever philosophy has been taken seriously it has always been assumed that it signified achieving a wisdom that would influence the conduct of life."

Thus, political philosophy is the rational and critical appreciation of political facts or facts concerning the state and government. As V. P. Varma writes, "Political philosophy is the rational synthesis of political speculations, maxims and postulates, norms, opinions,

Nature of Political Philosophy

information and generalisations into coherent knowledge. From philosophy it adopts a rational or thoughtful approach to political problems. From philosophy again it takes a synthetic or comprehensive orientation and standpoint."

Hallowell says, "It is one of the principal tasks of political philosophy to bring men's political beliefs to self-consciousness and to subject them to the scrutiny of reason."

Thus, political philosophy is a philosophical attempt to solve political problems through philosophical methods, from a philosophical attitude and arriving at philosophical conclusions or results.

10.2.3 Nature of Political Philosophy

From the above definitions, it is clear that political philosophy is concerned with the beginning and end of political life. It studies the end, ideal and values of the state.

Political philosophy has two aspects — constructive or creative aspect and critical or evaluative aspect.

In its critical aspect it evaluates the theories and methods of political science and in its constructive aspect it deals with the reality of political ideals.

In both its aspects political philosophy needs facts from political science. Hence, both political science and political philosophy are complementary.

D. D. Raphael while discussing the nature of political philosophy says that it has two aims :

- (a) the clarification of concepts.
- (b) the critical evaluation of beliefs.

The aim of political philosophy is the clarification of political concepts. To test the logical consistency of any belief the meaning of the terms used must be clear. A concept is a general idea. Consequently, a good deal of philosophy is concerned with the meaning of general ideas or concepts. Those philosophers of the present day who consider that the critical evaluation of beliefs is a misguided or impracticable pursuit for philosophy, also hold that the clarification of concept is the only task that philosophy can perform. For them, therefore, clarification of the concept is the central business of philosophy.

A concept is a general idea or notion that applies to a number of things. By general words, it is meant words that refer to a number of things, e.g. the word "student" is a general word which is applicable to every student whereas the name "Socrates" refers to only one person. Philosophical problems are concerned with concepts that are very general. Political philosophy aims at the classification of such general concepts as democracy, justice, freedom, etc.

In Political philosophy general ideas are analyzed, synthesised and improved. By analysis of a concept is meant specifying its elements, often by means of definition, for e.g., one can analyze or define sovereignty as supreme legal authority, specifying the three essential elements, often by way of definition. By synthesis of concept is meant showing the logical relationships whereby one concept implies or is implied by another. By improvement of a concept is meant recommending a definition or use that will assist clarity or coherence, for example, one can recommend that the concept of sovereignty should be used only for the legal authority and not for the coercive power of a state.

Thus, political philosophy aims at clarifying the meaning of political concepts.

(b) The second aim of political philosophy is the critical evaluation of beliefs. Critical evaluation of beliefs means giving rational ground for accepting or rejecting certain beliefs which we normally take for granted without thinking of any ground for justification. Philosophy differs from science in that science seeks explanation while philosophy seeks justification. Justification means the giving of rational or justifying grounds either for accepting a belief or for rejecting it. A problem can be raised here that a scientist also adduces evidence and logical argument for or against a hypothesis, hence he is also presenting rational grounds for accepting the hypothesis as true or for rejecting it as false. The answer to this question lies in the fact that the difference between the philosopher and the scientist lies in the form of facts about which rational grounds are given. The aim of science is to find out the cause and give rational grounds for determining the cause of anything. The philosopher is ready to inquire into rational grounds for or against any kind of belief, not just beliefs about causes.

This does not mean that the philosophers turn their attention to any and every belief at any and every time. The need to seek rational grounds usually arises when something has happened to make us doubt the validity of a belief that has previously been taken for granted, but a new belief which appears seems to be incompatible with the old one. In such a situation either the traditional beliefs are rejected or an attempt is made to make both the beliefs compatible with each other. A philosopher by giving rational justification tries to remove the inconsistencies.

Political philosophy is not concerned with such beliefs which are right or good for the human beings or for the society. This is the aim of the political philosopher. In the words of D. D. Raphael, "It is not a question of determining what is true or false, but one of determining what is right or wrong, good or bad."

Political philosophy is also "normative" or "ideological" setting up norms or ideal standards for the state and government. This is said to be the main difference between political philosophy and political science. Political science is positive explaining how governments in fact conduct their affairs and how men in fact behave in the pursuit of

actual political objectives. Political philosophy, on the other hand, sets up norms or ideal standards for society and government telling us what ought to be the case or what ought the state and the government do for e.g. Plato's Republic which depicts an ideal state or government.

Thus political philosophy is also normative in character.

10.2.4 Problems of Political Philosophy

The problems of political philosophy are the philosophical problems of politics. The problems of political philosophy are concerned with the theoretical knowledge of the state and politics, their reality or existence and their values.

Political philosophy studies about the state, its elements, its origin, its relation with society, the people and the government. It critically examines the various political ideologies like those of democracy, monarchy, theocracy, socialism, communalism, sarvodaya and satyagraha. It also examines the various political concepts like those of rights and duties, equality, liberty, sovereignty, justice, power, influence and authority, political delegation, etc.

Hence the problems of political philosophy are the philosophical problems of political science.

10.2.5 Attitude of the Political Philosopher

Starting from wonder or doubt the attitude of the political philosopher is critical, reflective, tolerant, detached, continually progressive, directed by experience and reasoning etc. As V. P. Verma puts it, "Political philosophy in its work of systematization of the results of empirical political researchers will have to be catholic in its orientation and extend its frontiers. This work of synthesis, it is clear, is philosophical in character."

10.2.6 Method of Political Philosophy

The method of political philosophy is obviously philosophical. The most important method used by the philosophers is the rational method, the method of critical reasoning. It is in this sense that philosophy has been called "criticism." This method has been developed by political philosophers since ancient times. As V. P. Verma has said, "Political philosophy, hence, cannot afford to cut off its link with the traditions of the Vedas, the Bhagwadgita, the Manusmriti, Plato's Republic, Aristotle's Politics, Hobbes' Leviathan and Hegel's Philosophy of Rights."

Philosophical method is critical as well as constructive, negative as well as positive. The criticism and the construction, the negative and the positive aspects are complementary to each other. Explaining the positive and the negative aspects of philosophical method, N. V. Joshi clarifies its scope in these words, "Positively, in the political sphere, we are concerned with the best possible organisation of human life and

10.5 Questions for Exercise

(a) Objective Questions

1. Political Philosophy aims at

- (a) clarification of political concepts
- (b) critical evaluation of beliefs
- (c) both
- (d) none

Ans. — (c)

2. Political Philosophy is

- (a) positive
- (b) normative
- (c) both
- (d) none

Ans. — (b)

(b) Short Answer Questions

1. What is Political Philosophy ? Discuss.

Ans. — See 10.2.2

2. What is the method of Political Philosophy ? Discuss.

Ans. — See 10.2.6

3. Discuss the problems of political philosophy.

Ans. — See 10.2.4

(c) Long Answer Questions

- 1. Discuss the nature of political philosophy.
- 2. Define political philosophy. Discuss its problems and approach.

10.6 Suggested Readings

- 1. D. D. Raphael : **Problems of Political Philosophy**
- 2. Ashok Kumar Verma : **Prarambhika Samaj evam Rajniti Darshan**
- 3. J. C. Johari : **Contemporary Political Theory**
- 4. Eddy Ashirvatham
K. K. Mishra : **Political Theory**



Political Philosophy and Political Science**Lesson Structure**

- 11.0 Objective
- 11.1 Introduction
- 11.2 Relation between Political Philosophy and Political Science
 - 11.2.1 Definition and scope of Political Science
 - 11.2.2 Definition and scope of Political Philosophy
 - 11.2.3 Similarity between Political Philosophy and Political Science
 - 11.2.4 Difference between Political Philosophy and Political Science
 - 11.2.5 Conclusion
- 11.3 Summary
- 11.4 Key words used in the Lesson
- 11.5 Questions for Exercise
 - (a) Objective Questions
 - (b) Short Answer Questions
 - (c) Long Answer Questions
- 11.6 Suggested Readings

11.0 Objective

The terms "Political Philosophy" and "Political Science" are used interchangeably. Hence, the main objective behind discussing this lesson is to see what exactly is the relation between the two. Are political science and political philosophy absolutely similar to each other or are they absolutely different from each other? Hence, this lesson aims at discovering the exact relation between political science and political philosophy.

With this objective, we shall first study the definition and scope of political science. Then we shall discuss the definition and scope of political philosophy and examine the similarities and difference between the two. We shall conclude by giving a short account of the relation between political science and political philosophy.

11.1 Introduction

When politics is studied from the scientific point of view, it is called "political science", and when studied from the philosophical point of view it is called "political philosophy". It is the same as when society is studied from the scientific point of view it is called "Sociology" and when studied from the philosophical point of view it is called "social philosophy."

In the wider sense, social studies include the study of politics, embracing everything that has to do with the activities of men in society. In the narrower sense, social or sociological studies are confined to those areas of social activity that do not form the subject matter of other social sciences like political science, economics, etc. But, this much is evident that social philosophy is of broader scope than political philosophy and can be said to include it. Likewise social or sociological theory is of broader scope than the theory of political science.

Political science is the study of government and state of public administration, of international law, international politics and international organisation. Political philosophy is the rational and critical appreciation of political facts or facts concerning the state and government. Thus both political science and political philosophy study the same problems. Both deal with the ideas about the state and government. So the question is whether political science and political philosophy are similar to or different from each other. We shall seek an answer to this question when we discuss the relation between political science and political philosophy.

11.2 Relation between Political Philosophy and Political Science

Political Philosophy and Political science both study political facts concerning the state and government. Hence, the problems are same for both these branches of study. The difference is in their scope, methodology, function, approach. etc.

As it is, the scientific theories only aim at explanation and generalisation. On the evidence of factual instances, they form hypothesis which are tested to establish general laws. Therefore, scientific theories are positive whereas philosophical theories are normative. What is meant by this is that scientific theories deal with positive facts, with what is in fact the case; while the philosophical kind of theory is really a doctrine, or an "ideology" setting up "norms" or ideal standards for society and government, telling us what ought to be the case, or what we ought to do.

Thus, whereas political science is positive or descriptive in character, political philosophy is normative. Likewise there are other differences too between political science and political philosophy which we shall consider later.

Political philosophy is the rational and critical appreciation of political facts or facts concerning the state and government. As V. P. Varma writes, "Political Philosophy is the rational synthesis of political speculation, maxims and postulates, norms, opinions, information and generalisation into coherent knowledge. From philosophy it adopts a rational or thoughtful approach to political problems. From philosophy again, it takes a synthetic or comprehensive orientation and standpoint.

Hallowell says, "It is one of the principal tasks of political philosophy to bring men's political beliefs to self-consciousness and to subject them to the scrutiny of reason."

Thus, political philosophy is a philosophical attempt to solve political problems through philosophical methods from a philosophical attitude and arriving at philosophical conclusions or results.

11.2.3 Similarity between Political Philosophy and Political science

From the definitions of political science and political philosophy given above, it becomes clear that both political science and political philosophy deal with the ideas about the state and government. Both study the political ideologies like those of Marxism, communism, socialism, sarvodaya, satyagraha, etc. Both study political concepts like equality, liberty, rights and duties, justice, power, etc.

But though both political science and political philosophy study the same problems, their scope, methodology, function and approaches differ very much from one another.

11.2.4 Difference between Political Philosophy and Political Science

The following are the fundamental differences between political philosophy and political science.

(i) Different subjects of study — In the case of political science, we are concerned with not only the views of the political thinkers of the past or present but also with the practical working of the government in the past and the present. In political science we give equal attention to the machinery of government and its actual working in different countries. However, this is not the case with political philosophy. It is primarily concerned with the theoretical side alone. It does not deal with practical working.

According to Gettel, "Political science is concerned with the historical survey of the origin, development and evolution of the state, the development of political theories and ideals, the analysis and fundamental nature of the state, its organisation, its relation to individuals who compose it and its relation to other states. It is different from political philosophy which deals only with some of these things. The view of Sidgwick is that political science is concerned with constructing on the basis of certain established laws, between persons governing them and the governed, in a society composed of civilized men as we know them. But political philosophy is concerned only with the thinkings of the great political philosophers.

Thus, political philosophy "is not so much concerned with political institutions as it is with the ideas and aspirations that are embodied in these institutions. It looks behind the surface of political events and institutions in an effort to discover the underlying motives, beliefs and aspirations that brought those institutions and events about. It looks behind the superficial struggle for power in an effort to determine why this struggle is taking place and where is it leading. It is not so much interested in how things occur as it is in what occurs and why." Hence the philosopher is only concerned with the how and why of things. Its main concern is to define and clarify the concepts of political science.

As such, the scope of political science is wider than that of political philosophy.

(ii) Different Functions — The function of political science is pragmatic because it deals with the practical working of the machinery of the state, which is the government. The function of philosophy is critical evaluation of beliefs. Political Philosophy aims at the clarification of concepts for the purpose of the critical evaluation of belief. The most important function of political philosophy is the critical evaluation of traditional norms, values, ideas and ideals within its fields. The political philosopher not only examines these from the standard of his own times but also assesses its internal coherence as well as its consistency with established ideas, norms and values. Examples of the function may be found in the writings of almost all contemporary Indian philosophers like Ram Mohan Roy, Dayanand Saraswati, M. K. Gandhi, Vivekananda and Sri Aurobindo. This critical function was even more important in the writings of modern western philosophers like Voltaire, Karl Marx, Kropotkin, etc.

Political Philosophy has yet another function, that is, constructive function. While the political philosopher criticises the traditional myths and stories, he has also to present a positive philosophy. This constructive function leads to stabilisation of values, helps in strengthening democracy, socialism, communism, etc. Summing up, the role of political philosophy in Indian context, V. P. Varma says, "Indian political philosophers have to learn from experiences of Indian history. They cannot cut themselves away from a vital concern with social and political norms, values and ideals. They have to make efforts for conserving the five basic values. Political Philosophy in India, has thus, to play various roles."

(iii) Different Approaches — The approach of political science is factual or descriptive while that of political philosophy is speculative, ethical or axiological. Political science describes political facts as they are but political philosophy evaluates them in the light of supreme human ideals and values. Here the study of state, government power and man as a political being is linked with the pursuit of certain goals, morals, truths or high principles supposed to be underlying all knowledge and reality. That is why the great works of Plato, More, Bacon, Rousseau, Kant, Hegel, Green, Bosanquet, etc. take the study of politics to a very high level of abstraction and they also try to mix up the system of values with certain high norms of an ideal social and political order.

That is why, it is said that while political science is a positive or descriptive science in that it deals with positive facts and describes them as they are, political philosophy, on the other hand, is a normative science in that it sets up norms or ideal standards for the state and government telling us what ought to be the case, or what we ought to do.

Political Philosophy critically evaluates the concepts used in political science to promote a better understanding of general political concepts such as equality, liberty, justice, etc.

(iv) Different Methods — The method of political science is scientific method. It uses the methods of observation, experiment, analogy, etc.

Political Philosophy looks at every political event or political fact as a part of the whole from a synoptic viewpoint based on direct perception, intuitional learning and logic. Hence it is critical or speculative method.

(v) They Emphasize Different Things — Political science emphasizes the creative and constructive aspects of political events while political philosophy tries to discover the meaning and motivations of political events. Political science studies the political problems, but political philosophy determines ideal standards for the state and government. While political science attaches importance to facts and methods related to it, political philosophy is concerned with values and their methods.

Thus, we have seen the main points of difference between political science and political philosophy.

11.2.5 Conclusion

So we can conclude by saying that the difference between political philosophy and political science or theory may be stressed on this point that while a philosopher may be a theorist, a theorist may not necessarily be a philosopher. For example, eminent American writers like Charles Merriam and Harold Lasswell are leading analysts and theorists, they are not great philosophers like Hobbes and Locke. It is true that both political theorists and philosophers deal with significant political themes like nature and purpose of political authority, liberty, equality, rights, justice, power etc., the difference between the two hinges on the point that a philosopher is concerned with the how and why of things so as to offer a rational explanation of them. Different from this, the field of a political theorist is wider. He has to explain the nature and dimensions of political facts. Besides, political philosophy is only abstract or speculative whereas political science or theory may be both abstract or speculative and concrete or empirical. It is well pointed out. "Political Philosophy thus broadens and at the same time narrows the field of political theory by continuing to eliminate much from contemporary political theory.

11.3 Summary

Having seen the difference between political science and political philosophy, we find that according to some thinkers who emphasize the synthetic aspect of political science all the functions of political philosophy can be done by political science and hence the former is useless. But this view overlooks the difference between a descriptive science which is Political Science and a normative science which is political philosophy. Political Science is fact-oriented but political philosophy is value-oriented.

A science studies facts only, it does not determine values for this job comes within the scope not of science, but of philosophy. Political Philosophy formulates the ideal of state and government by criticising the existing form of state and government. Hence, for this political science has to depend on political philosophy.

Similarly, political philosophy is dependent on political science. A political philosopher cannot work in a vacuum. He has to take into consideration the actual political institutions of a country. Dr. Finer says, "Since political achievement is for men and through men, political achievement is through institutions which are nothing but men acting more or less deliberately in a fairly durable concert for the attainment of a considered complex of ends. A political philosopher is not concerned with an end but also with the ways and means. Plato started with his ideal of justice and to achieve that he had to provide for institutions under which alone justice could be achieved. Locke was in search of happiness and for that purpose, he advocated government by consent. Dunning says, "The happiness and security of the individual figure is not essential to the perpetuity of a government, but is the end for which alone the government is ever called into existence."

Thus we find that both political science and political philosophy are complementary to each other. Political science does not determine the ideal or value of the state or government which it takes from political philosophy. Political philosophy depends on political science for facts. Thus both are interdependent and complementary.

11.4 Key words used in the Lesson

Public administration, international law, international politics, international organisations, thoughtful approach, practical, intuitional learning, normative, fact-oriented, value-oriented, interdependent.

11.5 Questions for Exercise

(a) Objective Questions

1. Political Philosophy is :

- (a) fact oriented

- (b) value oriented
- (c) both
- (d) none

Ans. — (b)

2. Political science and Political philosophy are

- (a) different from each other
- (b) similar to each other
- (c) interdependent and complementary
- (d) none

Ans. — (c)

(b) Short Answer Questions

1. Discuss the definition and scope of Political Science.

Ans. — See 11.2.1

2. Discuss the definition and function of political philosophy.

Ans. — See 11.2.2

3. What are the differences between political science and political philosophy? Enumerate.

Ans. — See 11.2.4

(c) Long Answer Questions

- 1. Discuss critically the relation between political science and political philosophy.
- 2. Political Science and Political Philosophy are interdependent. Discuss.

11.7 Suggested Readings

- 1. J. C. Johari **Contemporary Political Theory**
- 2. D. D. Raphael **Problems of Political Philosophy**
- 3. Eddy Ashirvatham **Political Theory**
- 4. Ashok Kumar Verma **Prarambhika Samaj evam Rajniti Darshan**



Political Concepts : Liberty, Equality, Justice**Lesson Structure**

- 12.0 Objective
- 12.1 Introduction
- 12.2 Relation between liberty, equality and justice
 - 12.2.1 Meaning and Definition of "Liberty"
 - 12.2.2 Kinds of Liberty
 - 12.2.3 Meaning and Definition of "Equality"
 - 12.2.4 Kinds of Equality
 - 12.2.5 Meaning and Definition of "Justice"
 - 12.2.6 Characteristics of Justice and Development of the Concept of Justice
 - 12.2.7 Kinds or Dimensions of Justice
 - 12.2.8 Relation between Liberty, Equality and Justice
 - 12.2.9 Conclusion
- 12.3 Summary
- 12.4 Key words used in the Lesson
- 12.5 Questions for Exercise
 - (a) Objective Questions
 - (b) Short Answer Questions
 - (c) Long Answer Questions
- 12.6 Suggested Readings

12.0 Objective

Liberty, equality and justice are important political concepts. They have great importance in political philosophy because without these concepts political science will have no meaning. Hence the main objective here is to find out the meaning and definition

of these terms so as to have a clear idea of them. So first we shall discuss the meaning and definition of the term "Liberty", its various kinds, etc. Then we shall discuss the meaning and definition of the term 'equality', its various kinds, etc. After this, we shall discuss the meaning and definition of the term "Justice". Lastly, we shall try to establish a relationship between liberty, equality and justice. We shall conclude with comments on the importance of these concepts.

12.1 Introduction

The concept of "Liberty" occupies an important place in the field of political philosophy. Liberty is the natural right of man. The concept of liberty that exists in this modern age is the gift of the French Revolution. In our national struggle also, the concept of liberty was highlighted in the motto 'Freedom is our birthright'. Just as the subject of rights is connected with the concept of freedom, so also the concept of liberty is closely connected with the concept of right. As Laski says, "Without rights there cannot be liberty because without rights, men are the subjects of law unrelated to the needs of personality."

Like the concept of liberty, the concept of equality is an important theme of normative political theory. Also like liberty it is a concept which cannot be studied in isolation to other related concepts. That is why political thinkers as well as revolutionaries regard it as an important part for their movement for liberty and social transformation.

Similarly, the concept of justice also occupies a prominent place in politics, philosophy, law and ethics and scholars have assigned it an important place in their writings since the earliest times. However, like many other concepts of political theory, the scholars are confronted with the problem of offering a precise definition of the term "justice".

Hence, liberty, equality and justice are important political concepts.

12.2 Relation between Liberty, Equality and Justice

The concepts of liberty, equality and justice are closely connected with each other. It is said that liberty and equality are the two pillars on which the concept of justice rests. As we shall see later in this lesson there can be no liberty if the norms of equality are violated and there can be no equality if there is no justice. Thus, liberty, equality and justice are inter-linked.

Their relation will become more clear when we discuss each of them separately.

12.2.1 Meaning and Definition of Liberty

The term "Liberty" comes from the word "liber" meaning "free". But it has not meant the same thing for all the political thinkers in the realm of political philosophy. Laski defines liberty as "the absence of restraint upon the existence of these social conditions which in modern civilization are the necessary guarantees of individual happiness. "The view of the Anarchists, the Individualists, the Syndicalists and many others is that liberty and sovereignty are opposed to each other. Hobhouse says, "The liberty of each must, on the principle of common good, be limited by the rights of all. In general, my rights are my liberties and in protecting my rights, the community secures my liberties."

Two Aspects of Liberty — A reference has to be made to two aspects of liberty— positive and negative. As regards the positive aspect, that implies the right of an individual to have all those positive conditions which can enable him to enjoy liberty and in the absence of which liberty becomes hollow and meaningless. The negative aspect of liberty means that there are no reasonable restrictions on the actions of individuals.

12.2.2 Kinds of Liberty

Simply stated, liberty implies, "a state of freedom specially opposed to political subjection, imprisonment or slavery." However, in a wider sense, it is a multiple concept that can be understood clearly if we look at its specific varieties. They are :

(1) Natural Liberty — It implies complete freedom for a man to do what he wills. It is sometimes used in the sense of licence. Such a liberty could not be real for there was none to guarantee it.

(2) Social or Civil Liberty — It is the liberty enjoyed by the individual in society. Thus, civil as social liberty consists in the rights and privileges that the society recognises and the state protects in the sphere of private and public life of an individual.

(i) Political Liberty — It means that people have a share in the administration of the state or country and the government is carried on according to their wishes. It implies freedom to exercise franchise and free supply of news.

(ii) Economic Liberty — It means "security and opportunity to find reasonable significance in earning one's daily bread. "Every individual must have the right to work a reasonable number of hours of work and adequate wages.

(iii) Domestic Liberty — It implies a responsible position of the wife and the children, freedom to enter into matrimonial alliances, etc.

(iv) National Liberty — It implies the independence of a country, exercise or patriotism, etc.

(v) International Liberty — It implies renunciation of war, abandonment of the use of force, limitation of armaments, etc.

(vi) Personal Liberty — It implies the amount of liberty which is considered to be essential for the development of the personalities of the individuals.

(3) Moral Liberty — It implies the right of an individual to act according to his conscience.

Safeguards of Liberty

Liberty can be safeguarded in many ways —

(i) The legal system of the country usually provides for all those safeguards which help individual to be free and punish those who in any way attack his liberty.

(ii) The liberty of the people is safeguarded by the constitution of the country which embodies the fundamental rights of citizens.

(iii) Sometimes, it is maintained that the separation of powers guarantee liberty to individual.

(iv) It is contended that if the people are to enjoy liberty, there must not be any special privileges.

(v) The people must be vigilant or watchful that they do not tolerate any violence of their liberty. Lord Bryce says, "Eternal vigilance is the price of liberty."

(vi) Freedom of press is also essential for the safeguard of liberty.

(vii) The existence of a democratic form of government also helps the cause of liberty. A totalitarian regime is the very negation of liberty.

In the ultimate analysis the best safeguard for liberty is the love of the people for liberty. De Tocqueville says, "There are nations which have tirelessly pursued freedom through every kind of peril and hardship. They loved it not for its material benefit, they regard freedom itself as a gift so precious and so necessary that no other could console them for the loss of everything else."

12.2.3 Meaning and Definition of the term "Equality"

The idea of equality lacks a possible definition. It is a multi-dimensional concept. Realising this difficulty, an eminent English political scientist like Laski has confessed that, "No idea is more difficult in the whole realm of political science than the concept of equality." Sir Ernest Barker says, "Equality is a protean notion, it changes its shape and assumes new form with a ready facility. "Equality can best be defined as" equal condition guaranteed to each for making the best of himself". Accordingly, it means that whatever conditions are guaranteed to me, in the form of rights, shall also in the same measure, be guaranteed to others, and that whatever rights are given to others shall also be given to me."

Strictly speaking, equality does not mean identical treatment to all or identity of reward, because this is not possible. That is why Laski says, "Undoubtedly, it implies a certain levelling process. It means that no man shall be placed in society that he can over-reach his neighbour to the extent that it constitutes a denial of the latter's citizenship."

Two Aspects of Liberty :

(1) Positive Aspect — Equality means the provision of adequate opportunities for all. However, adequate opportunities do not mean equal opportunities.

(2) Negative Aspect — Equality means the absence of special privileges, that is, there should be no discrimination on grounds of religion, caste, colour, wealth, etc.

12.2.4 Kinds of Equality

(1) Natural Equality — It implies that nature has made all men equal. It may be said that the concept of natural or moral equality is just an ideal.

(2) Social Equality — Here equality means that rights of all should be equal, that all should be treated equally in the eye of law. In other words, no discrimination should be made on artificial grounds.

(3) Political Equality — It means access of everyone to the avenues of power. Thus, every adult citizen must have the right to vote, to be elected, to hold public office. etc.

(4) Economic Equality — It is equality in the realm of economic power. There should be no concentration of wealth in the hands of a few, etc.

(5) Legal Equality — It implies equality before law, equal protection of law to all, availability of justice at a low cost, etc.

(6) International Equality — It implies equal treatment to all nations. No discrimination should be made among nations on grounds of demographic, geographical, economic or military potential.

Thus we can conclude by saying that equality implies equal opportunities for all and absence of special privileges.

12.2.5 Meaning and Definition of Justice

D. D. Raphael says "To call something just is to express approval of it as being right in a specific way, but to pin down the specific character is not so easy. Justice is a complex concept."

The word "justice" is derived from the Latin term "justitia" which means joining or fitting, an idea of bond or tie. Primarily, the joining or fitting implied in the idea of justice is that there is a bond or a tie between man and man in an organised system of human relations. C. F. Narriam says, "Justice consists in a system of understanding and procedure through which each is accorded what is agreed upon as fair."

According to Benn and Petves, "Justice is to treat all men alike except where there are relevant difference between them." As Barker says, "Justice is the reconciler and the synthesiser of political values; it is their union in an adjusted and integrated whole."

12.2.6 Characteristics of Justice and Development of the Concept of Justice

(1) Firstly, the concept of justice implies an examination as to how various human beings are treated.

(2) It implies that no discrimination should be made amongst the various members of society on the basis of religion, sex, place of birth, etc.

(3) Justice also does permit some sort of discrimination on reasonable grounds. For e.g. special preference promised to the backward classes under the Indian constitution does not violate the concept of justice.

(4) Justice emphasizes the importance of personal dignity and all those actions which restrict the rights and freedom of the individual in the larger interest of the members of society.

Development of the Concept of Justice

The earliest concept of justice which prevailed among the ancient tribes was based on the principle of 'tit for tat'. The sophists defined justice as the interest of the stronger. The idealist theory of justice first conceived by Plato emphasized that justice was a virtue. Aristotle held that justice consists in an equality of proportion between person and things assigned to them.

Since the French Revolution, the modern liberal society recognizes liberty, equality and fraternity as three supreme values necessary for a just system of human relations. Hume and Bentham aimed at the greatest happiness of the greatest number. Marx and Engels gave a new interpretation of the concept of justice by saying that justice could be possible only if the capitalist system of production was replaced by a socialist system where there was equitable distribution of property, income etc. Finally, Laski and MacIver hold that justice implies the synthesis of relation between various individuals and the social system.

12.2.7 Kinds or Dimensions of Justice

The concept of justice has four-fold dimensions, i.e., legal, political, social and economic.

(1) Legal Justice — It is related to the law-making process and the judicial system of society. It also implies the legislation of just or rational laws and their faithful observance. When the Indian constitution abolished untouchability it was a legal way of promoting justice. In short legal justice implies "equality before law" as well as "equal protection before law."

(2) Political Justice — In simple terms, political justice means equal or fair and free participation of all in the political life of the country. For example, the grant of universal adult franchise.

(3) Social Justice — It means the elimination of all kinds of discrimination and privileges based on birth, race, caste, creed, sex, colour, etc. and availability of equal social opportunities for the development of personality to all people in society. It implies the doing away to social evils prevailing in the society.

(4) Economic Justice — Economic justice is viewed from two angles— (i) Liberal (ii) Marxist. Liberals hold that the ends of economic justice would be met if the state could meet the basic economic needs of the people, reduce the disparities in income and provide equality of opportunity to all. According to Marxists, economy, justice can be possible only in a classless society with the dictatorship of the proletariat in which there is the principle of "each according to his capacity" to "each according to his needs."

Having discussed the types of justice, we find that there are two aspects of justice — the broader and the narrower. In the broader sense, justice is viewed not only from legal but from moral, social, economic and political angles, that is with the total behaviour in a society. The narrower aspect of justice is associated with the legal system and the legal process in society.

12.2.8 Relation between Liberty, Equality and Justice

A very intimate relationship exists between liberty, equality and justice. Justice is, in word, the general right ordering an adjustment of social relations by the authority of the state. Justice demands that the people shall have a share in the administration of their country and be free from starvation, poverty, unemployment etc. In fact, liberty and equality are the two pillars on which the concept of justice rests.

Thus, the concepts of liberty, equality and justice are closely connected with each other.

12.2.9 Conclusion

We can conclude by saying that liberty, equality and justice are very important political concepts and they are intimately related to each other. That society which grants civic, social and economic liberties to its citizens is just society. The ideal of justice is integrally connected with the norms of liberty and equality. It is law, liberty, equality and rights that constitute the essential link or bond of all political values. For instance, there can be no liberty if the norms of equality are violated and there can be no equality if there is no justice. Justice is the reconciler or synthesiser of political values. Hence, we can conclude by saying that liberty, equality and justice are interdependent and contributory.

12.3 Summary

Thus we have seen that equality, liberty and justice are the three important concepts which political philosophers often make use of. Liberty means the absence of restraint upon the existence of those social conditions which in modern society are necessary for individual happiness. Equality means equal conditions guaranteed to each for making the best of himself and justice means that no discrimination should be made on grounds of caste, class, sex, religion, etc.

Thus, all these three concepts are inter-linked. There can be no liberty if the norms of equality are violated and there can be no equality if there is no justice. Hence all the three — liberty, equality and justice are interdependent.

12.4 Key words used in the Lesson

Liberty, equality, justice, political, philosophy security, interdependence, safeguard, revolutionaries, social transformation, multi-dimensional concept, citizenship, discrimination, political values.

12.5 Questions for Exercise

(a) Objective Questions

1. Liberty means

- (a) absence of all restrictions
- (b) absence of restraint upon conditions necessary for happy life.
- (c) some restrictions

Ans. — (b)

2. Equality means

- (a) equal treatment to all
- (b) equal opportunities for all
- (c) equal condition guaranteed to each for making the best of himself.

Ans. — (c)

(b) Short Answer questions

1. What do you mean by liberty? What are its various kinds?

Ans. — See 12.2.1 and 12.2.2

2. What is equality? Discuss the specific kinds of equality.

Ans. — See 12.2.3 and 12.2.4

Political Concepts : Rights and Duties**Lesson Structure**

- 13.0 Objective
- 13.1 Introduction
- 13.2 Relation between rights and duties
 - 13.2.1 Definition of the term "Rights"
 - 13.2.2 Characteristics of Rights
 - 13.2.3 Kinds of Rights
 - 13.2.4 Theories concerning Rights
 - 13.2.5 How to Safeguard Rights
 - 13.2.6 Meaning and Defintion of "Duties"
 - 13.2.7 Kinds of Duties
 - 13.2.8 Relation Between Rights and Duties
 - 13.2.9 Conclusion
- 13.3 Summary
- 13.4 Key words used in the Lesson
- 13.5 Questions for Exercise
 - 13.5.1 Objective Questions
 - 13.5.2 Short Answer Questions
 - 13.5.3 Long Answer Questions
- 13.6 Suggested Readings

13.0 Objective

The concept of rights finds its broad manifestation in the liberties of the individual on the one hand and in the scope of state activity on the other. Rights are co-relative with duties. The main objective behind discussing this topic is to find out the relation between rights and duties. In the first and second part we shall discuss the meaning, definition and main characteristics of 'rights'. Then we shall study the theories concerning

them. Also we shall see how rights can be safeguarded. Then we shall discuss the meaning and definition of duties, its various kinds, etc. Lastly, we shall study the relation between rights and duties.

13.1 Introduction

The purpose of normative political theory is to prescribe conduct according to rules and to discover what contributes to the happiness of man as well as to the development of his personality. Rights occupy a significance of their own in view of the fact that such a subject necessarily involves within its fold a discussion of the individual liberty vis a vis state authority. That is why Laski says, "Without rights there cannot be liberty" and that "every state is known by the rights it maintains."

Simply stated, a right is a claim of an individual recognised by the society and the state. Hence, a proper definition of the term "rights" has three ingredients. Firstly, it is a claim of the individual but it is disinterested desire or claim. It is something which is capable of universal application. Secondly, the claim of the individual should receive recognition by the community. Finally, they should also be recognised politically, that is, they should be protected by the state.

Rights imply duties. Rights and duties go together. I have my rights against the state, society and individuals and I have my duties to them all.

Hence, rights and duties are closely related to each other.

13.2 Relation between Rights and Duties

Rights and duties are correlative conceptions, that is to say, every right carries with it a corresponding obligation. They are like two sides of the same coin. Rights depend upon duties. "It is only in the world of duties that rights have significance." I have my rights against the society, the people living in the society, the state, etc. and hence, I owe my duties towards them all.

But before going into details regarding the interdependence of rights and duties, let us first examine their meanings, definitions, kinds, etc.

13.2.1 Definition of the Term "Rights."

Various political thinkers have defined the term 'rights' as follows :

(1) Laski — "Rights are those conditions of social life without which no man can be his best self".

(2) Srinivas Shastri — "In its essence, a right is an arrangement, rule or practice sanctioned by law of the community and conducive to the highest moral good of the citizen."

(3) Green — "A right is a power claimed and recognised as contributory to common good."

(4) Bosanquet — "We have a right to the means that are necessary to the development of our lives in the direction of the highest good of community of which we are a part."

13.2.2 Characteristics of Rights

From the above definitions of "Rights" we find the following characteristics :

(i) A right is a claim of an individual recognised by the society and the state.

(a) Thus, firstly a right is a claim of an individual. But what an individual wills must be of common interest.

(b) Secondly, rights should be recognised by the society or the community.

(c) Thirdly, rights should have political recognition too, i.e. these should be upheld by the state.

Rights, therefore, have a threefold character. They are ethical when we deal with claims of the individuals based on their real will and, therefore, recognized by the community. They are legal when translated into law by the state. In the sphere of politics we are concerned with moral rights which would be enforced legally if law were what it ought to be.

(ii) Rights in sense have a pre-political character; they may be independent of the state but not of the society. They are there whether recognised by the state or not.

(iii) Rights have a natural and social utilitarian character.

(iv) Rights are not mere abstract entities, they need practice.

(v) Thus, the issue of rights and duties come in, Rights are organically bound up with duties. Rights and duties are two sides of the same coin, since rights prescribe the rules of behaviour. In doing so, they are said to impose duties or obligation.

(vi) Rights are not absolute. If circumstances demand that certain restrictions must be put on the enjoyment of certain rights so that the higher interest of the society may be secured.

(vii) Rights are also concerned with the function of the state. In theory, rights of the individual and functions of the state may be separate, in practice they are not.

(viii) The subject of rights is necessarily related with other important themes like liberty, law, justice and sovereignty.

13.2.3 Kinds of Rights

(i) Moral Rights — Moral rights are those rights which are based on the moral sense of the people and the conscience of the community. For example, the teacher has the moral right to be respected by the community.

(ii) Legal Rights — According to Dr. Leacock, a legal right is a privilege or immunity enjoyed by a citizen against any of his fellow citizens granted by the sovereign power of the state and upheld by the state." Legal rights are embodied in the law of the country and are recognized by the state and the police.

Legal Rights are of three kinds :—

(a) Civil Rights — These relate to the essential conditions of a civilized life and relate to the person and property of the individual the most important is civil right to life.

(b) Political Rights — These relate to man's participation in the affairs of the state e.g. the right to vote.

(c) Economic Rights — These are three in number – right to work, right to adequate wages and right to reasonable hours of work.

(iii) Human Rights — A modified version of what was once called "natural rights" together with certain civil rights has assumed a significance of its own ever since the universal declaration of human rights by the Human Rights Commission and their adoption by the General Assembly of the United Nations in 1948 e.g. it holds that all human beings are born free and equal in dignity and right.

(iv) Fundamental Rights — They are the rights of the individuals incorporated in the Constitution of a country. They are the inherent rights because they mean life itself. The Fundamental Rights are incorporated in Part III of the Indian Constitution, e.g. right to equality, right to freedom, etc.

Apart from these rights, Laski mentions some particular rights. To him, these rights pertain to the civil, political and economic spheres and they may be enumerated as under :

- (1) Every citizen should have the right to work.
- (2) Every citizen should have the right to adequate wages.
- (3) Every citizen should have the right to reasonable hours of work.
- (4) Every citizen should have the right to education.
- (5) Every citizen should have the right to share in the political power.
- (6) Every citizen should have the right to property.
- (7) Every citizen should have the right to form association and organise public meetings.

(8) Every citizen should have the right to speech and expression.

(9) Every citizen should have a right to industrial self-government.

(10) Every citizen should have the right to equality before law so that he may get justice without discrimination.

Although Laski has enumerated these particular rights, we can say that all these particular rights are included in the political, civil, human and economic rights that we have discussed earlier.

13.2.4 Theories Concerning Rights

From time to time various theories have been put forward regarding the nature of rights :

(1) Natural Theory of Rights — John Locke was the main exponent of this theory. According to him, the people in the state of nature had the right to life, liberty and property. But the origin of this theory goes back to ancient Greece. However, the exposition of this idea took a very prominent shape in the 17th century when Spinoza, Hobbes and Locke gave their views regarding the natural rights of men. The American Declaration of Rights of Man stated that men are created equal and they are endowed by their creator with certain inalienable rights, that among these are the right to life liberty and the pursuit of happiness. Similarly, the French Declaration of the Rights of man also upheld these natural rights.

But the nineteenth century witnessed a vehement attack on the theory of natural rights, first by the utilitarians like Bentham and Mill and then by the idealists like Green and Bosanquet. The critics of natural theory say that there is no universal concept of natural right. The theory of natural rights does not reconcile liberty and equality. Moreover, there can be no rights until they are recognized and upheld by the state. Dr. Bosanquet says, "A right is a claim recognized by the society and enforced by the state."

(2) Legal Theory of Rights — According to this theory rights are created and maintained by the state. The state is the only source of rights and their maintenance depends upon the will and authority of the state. It may be traced to the view of Hobbes, Bentham but its representation is to be found in the writings of Austin.

Critics point out that the legal theory of rights is a very narrow one. The state or the law is not the only source of rights. The rights themselves exist whether they are legal or not. Customs, traditions, history and morality also play their part.

(3) Historical Theory of Rights — According to this theory, rights are the product of history. They are rights which have been recognized for generations in the form of customs and traditions and they have come to have a sanctity of their own. Burke says that while French Revolution was based on the abstract rights of man, English Revolution

was based on the customary rights of English men. It is true that a number of rights have their roots in custom all but not all our rights can be traced back to ancient customs.

(4) Social Welfare Theory — It implies that rights are the creation of society in as much as they are based on the consideration of common welfare. Rights aim at the goods of the individual. Laski says, "We have rights so that we may contribute to common good and only those rights should be recognized without which society does not realize its highest end. "The utilitarians like Mill and Bentham support this theory.

Critics point out that though public welfare is a good test of rights, it is difficult to define them – one cannot say whether it means the greatest happiness of the greatest number.

(5) Idealist Theory of Rights — It defines rights as those which are really necessary to the maintenance of material conditions essential to the existence and perfection of human personality. In other words, a right is a claim based on the rational will of man and for the reason, first recognized by the society and then translated into law by the state. The supporters are Green and Bosanquet.

Critics say that while the importance of the state is recognized the importance of the individual is finished or demolished.

Thus we come to the conclusion that a combination of Social Welfare Theory and the Idealist Theory serves the need. Eddy Asirvatham writes in his book, "Political Theory" — "It is conceivable that to a very large extent the social welfare theory and the idealistic theory, in their relation to rights will go hand in hand because individual good and social good are intimately related. Laski is right in saying, "I do not exist solely for the state, but neither does the state exist solely for me. "They exist for one another and promote each other's good."

13.2.5 How to Safeguard Rights

There is a difference of opinion regarding the best method of guaranteeing rights, to individuals. The view of one school of thought is that the easiest method of protecting the rights is to embody them in a written constitution. However, experience does not support this view. It has been found that the embodiment of rights in a written constitution is no guarantee that rights will remain secure even in times of national emergency and periods of storm and stress. Laski rightly says, "Rights are not merely, or even greatly, a matter of the written record."

Thus, mere conferment of rights on the citizens is not sufficient. What, in addition, is required is that there should be proper safeguard for their realisation. They are as follows :—

Political Concepts : Rights and Duties

(1) The most important rights of the citizens provided by the basic law of land is called "fundamental rights". By including such right in the category of fundamental rights, the state accords them constitutional protection and empowers the courts to issue prerogative writs for their enforcement.

(2) Another safeguard is the rule of law. It ensures equality before law and its equal protection. It ensures personal liberty so that no person can be arrested without cause.

(3) There should be free and honest press so that people have a straightforward dissemination of news. A free press is also required for rights of the people. Newspapers are the best to check political desposition.

(4) The state should observe the principle of decentralisation of powers. That is, the organs which exercise power must not be concentrated at a single point but should be decentralised in local and regional governments, etc.

(5) The government organs should be surrounded by consultative agencies. The departments of the government should, therefore, consult the concerned organisations before coming to a decision.

(6) Also the state should not extend its area of activity into the legitimate domains of voluntary groups. The most important safeguard, however, is eternal vigilance. People must be vigilant to fight for their liberty.

A stronger and more effective public opinion is a better safeguard for the guarantee of rights than any other method.

13.2.6 Meaning and Definition of Duties :

Rights are co-relative with duties. The number of rights possessed by an individual must correspond to the contribution which he makes to the society. e.g. the governor of state is entitled to have more rights than his peon because his contribution is definitely greater than that of his peon. He who does not perform duties cannot enjoy rights any more than he who does not work has a right to his food.

Rights imply duties Rights and duties go together. One cannot exist without the others. If I have a right, the enjoyment of my right implies a duty on the part of others. I have my rights against the state, society and individuals, and hence I owe my duties to them all.

L. T. Hobhouse says, "Rights and duties then are conditions of social welfare, or as we define such welfares of a life of harmony. To this welfare every member of the community stands in a double relation. He has a share in it. This is the sum of his rights. He has to contribute his share. That is the sum of his duty."

13.2.7 Kinds of Duties

The following are the duties which citizens in general are required to perform in modern society:

(1) Every citizen owes a duty to himself to maintain good health. A sickly person is a burden to society. If every person is fit physically, mentally and morally, the society is bound to achieve a lot.

(2) Every citizen owes certain duties to members of his family. If he is married he has to look after his wife and children.

(3) Every citizen owes certain duties to his neighbours. He must love and cooperate with them.

(4) Every citizen owes certain duties towards the state.

(5) It is the duty of every citizen to obey the law of the country.

(6) All citizens must pay taxes to the state according to their capacity.

(7) Every good citizen must be public spirited. He must be happy and proud to help every member of his country to the best of his ability.

(8) Every citizen owes a duty to make an honest exercise of his right to vote.

(9) A good citizen owes a duty to help the public officials in the performance of their duties.

(10) It is the duty of every citizen to resist injustice from every quarter.

(11) All citizens must develop a spirit of toleration towards one another.

(12) Every citizen owes a duty to his country to work hard.

(13) It is the duty of every citizen to serve on the various local bodies in his country.

Thus a citizen has duties in proportion to his rights.

13.2.8 Relation between rights and duties

The relation between rights and duties has specifically been stated in the words of Dr. Beni Prasad, "Rights and duties are inter-dependent, they are two aspects of the same thing. If one looks at them from one's own standard, they are rights. If one looks at them from the standard of others, they are duties. Both are social and both are, in substance, conditions of right to be secured to all members of society. It is futile to consider whether rights are prior to duties or vice-versa. They are counterparts of each other."

13.2.9 Conclusion

We can, thus, conclude by saying that the right of an individual and his duties are interdependent. Rights and duties are correlative conceptions, that is to say, every right

carries with it a corresponding obligation. They are like the two sides of a coin. Rights depend upon duties. "It is only in the world of duties that rights have significance".

13.3 Summary

We have seen that rights and duties are important political concepts. Apart from being political concepts, they have great importance in the lives of individuals. Rights give liberties to an individual and duties are the contributions made by an individual. Both are correlative terms. Rights are correlative with duties. The number of rights possessed by an individual must correspond to the contribution which he makes to the society and the state.

In a nutshell, we can say that rights and duties go together hand in hand. They are inter-dependent.

13.4 Key words used in the Lesson

Normative political theory, ethical, pre-political character, legal rights, human rights, fundamental rights, political rights, economic rights, moral debt, decentralisation.

13.5 Questions for Exercise

(a) Objective Questions

1. A right

- (a) is a claim of an individual
- (b) should be recognized by the society
- (c) should have political recognition
- (d) All the above

Ans. — (d)

2. Duties are

- (a) independent of rights
- (b) correlative with rights
- (c) both
- (d) none

Ans. — (b)

(b) Short Answer Questions

1. Enumerate the chief characteristics of rights.

Ans. — See 13.2.2

Power, Influence and Authority**Lesson Structure**

- 14.0 Objective
- 14.1 Introduction
- 14.2 Relation between Power, Influence and Authority
 - 14.2.1 Meaning and Definition of Power
 - 14.2.2 Theories of Power
 - 14.2.3 Kinds of Power
 - 14.2.4 Meaning of Influence
 - 14.2.5 Meaning of Authority
 - 14.2.6 Relation between Power, Influence & Authority
 - 14.2.7 Criticism of Power Theory
 - 14.2.8 Conclusion
- 14.3 Summary
- 14.4 Key words used in the Lesson
- 14.5 Questions for Exercise
 - (a) Objective Questions
 - (b) Short Answer Questions
 - (c) Long Answer Questions
- 14.6 Suggested Readings

14.0 Objective

Power, influence and authority appear to be identical terms although they are not the same. There is considerable difference between them. So our main objective in this lesson is to have a clear conception of power, influence and authority. For this we shall first study the meaning and definition of power, and then various theories concerning power. We shall also analyse the different kinds of power. Next we shall discuss the meaning of influence and authority. In the end we shall analyse the relationship between power, influence and authority to see whether they are same or are different.

14.1 Introduction

Power is one of the key concepts in political theory. Recently, the idea of power has assumed an importance of its own in the realm of political thought. The reason for this should be traced to the fact that the meaning of politics has changed from one of being a study of state and government to that of being a study of power. As Curtis says, "Politics is an organised dispute about power and its use, involving choice among competing values, ideas, persons, interests and demand."

The word "power" is used in different senses. Power is ascribed to different things on different grounds. For instance, we speak of horse power, power of ideas, economic power, power of social status, healing power, brain power, purchasing power, executive power military power, etc. The common thread among all is that the term 'power' behaves in much the same way as the word 'ability' or 'capacity'.

Often power is used interchangeably with words like influence, authority, force, etc. According to many thinkers this is not correct because we cannot equate power with either influence or authority.

Influence represents the sublimation of power whereas authority represents the moralisation of power which will become clear later.

14.2 Relation between Power, Influence and Authority

The word 'power' becomes interchangeable with several related terms like control, influence, authority, force, might, persuasion, coercion, etc. irrespective of the fact that different writers make use of different terms at different places and in different situations. Influence is not the same as power nor is authority the same as power. Although in some respects they may resemble each other, power is not the same as influence and authority.

We shall discuss their relation in detail later in this lesson. But before that we shall study the meaning and definition of power, its various kinds, different theories, etc.

14.2.1 Meaning and Definition of Power

The word 'power' is derived from the Latin word 'potestas' and the French word 'pouvoir', both of which are derived from the verb 'to be able'. Hence, according to D. D. Raphael, "The most general meaning of power is simple ability or capacity."

Owing to the multiple meanings of the term 'power' as used in social, economic political, psychological, sociological and spiritual contexts; philosophers and political scientists find great difficulty in defining power.

Power has been defined by Wiseman as 'the ability to get one's wishes carried out despite opposition'. Guild and Palmer say, "By power we mean the ability to affect or control the decisions, policies, values or fortunes of others.'

Implications : The following implications may follow from the above description —

- (1) Power is a social and not merely a political or economic phenomenon.
- (2) Power is latent force, force is manifest power and authority is institutionalized power.
- (3) Power which as its incidence only in social opposition of some kind, appears in different ways in informal organisation and in unorganised community.
- (4) The sources and necessary components of power reside in combination of members, social organisation and resources.
- (5) It is important to distinguish power from prestige, influence, dominance, rights, force and authority as they are not synonymous terms.

Supporters — Though the supporters of the view can be traced back to ancient as well as medieval periods, the view has gained currency mainly in the 20th century. The great Greek historian Thucydides, in Plato's Republic Thrasymachus, Machiavelli in the 16th century all gave importance to power.

Among the prominent supporters of the power view in contemporary times are Max Weber, Ceteris, Russell, Lasswell, Merriam, Kaplan, Watkins, etc. They regard politics as power and it is said to be the sole object of politics.

14.2.2 Theories of Power

Boadly speaking there are three main theories of power :

- (1) Liberal – Democratic Theory
- (2) Marxian Theory
- (3) Elite Theory

(1) Liberal–Democratic Theory — According to this theory, power has two important aspects — developmental and extractive, which may be called normative or ethical and empirical or applied dimensions respectively. As normative dimension power means the ability of an individual to develop human capacities or personality and is called developmental power. In the empirical sense, power means the ability to extract advantages from the like abilities of others and therefore, it is called extractive power. Machiavelli, Hobbes, Max Weber, Lasswell support the empirical dimension of extractive power.

(2) Marxian Theory — In this theory power is treated as an instrument that connects economics or means of production with politics, i.e. the ruling class. Political power or class power in the strict Marxian sense, is the general and pervasive power which a dominant class exercises in order to maintain and defend its predominance in the civil society. The winning of political power is vital to the ultimate success of the working class who continue to be mercilessly exploited by the capitalists. Like politics, power also becomes a transient phenomenon.

(3) Elite Theory — A clear contradiction of the Marxian theory of power can be seen in the elite theory which insists that power flows not from the ownership of property but from political and bureaucratic organisations. It argues that politics cannot be properly studied without identifying the ruling class and measuring their respective roles.

The classic expression of this theory is contained in the works of Gaetano Mosca who argues that "in all societies.....two classes of people appear a class that rules and a class that is ruled." The political class or the ruling class enjoys legal authority as an organised minority, which is termed the "bureaucratic state." Democracy, therefore, becomes the rule of an organised minority.

14.2.3 Kinds of Power

In a society generally three kinds of power are not important :—

(1) Political Power — It is the power to make policies, power to influence policy-making, power to implement policies and power to punish those who disobey these socio-economic and political policies. Political power is concerned with the maintenance of law and order, peace, security and justice in society. In a society political power generally resides in the police, the military, bureaucracy, judiciary, politicians, lawyers, legislatures, political parties and the executive.

(2) Economic Power — According to this view, economic power in a society does not reside with the owners of capital but has come into the hands of managers who manage the industries or control the capital. Thus, it has been called Managerial Revolution or Managerialism.

But Marxism holds that economic power is possessed by those who are the owners of the means of production and not with the managers of capital, because managers are not distinct part of the capital class. They are puppets in the hands of the capitalist class. Political and economic powers are related in an inseparable way. Thus, economic and political power reside with the same class which controls the means of production.

(3) Ideological Power — Ideological power helps the ruling class in maintaining the legitimacy of its political power. The ideological power of the state rests with the church, the political parties, the unions, the school, the mass-media of newspapers, radio, T. V. and from a certain viewpoint of the family. Thus ideological power helps in

controlling or manipulating the public opinion in favour of the ruling class or serve their interests. But when the ideological power of the ruling class is challenged by the ideological power of other classes it leads to a revolution.

However, the supporters of the power view of politics do not recognize the relation between political, economic and ideological powers.

14.2.4 Meaning of Influence

If force stands on one extreme, influence on the other, it represents the sublimation of power. It is a category which represents the indeterminate exercise of power. It may be due to social prestige, intellectual eminence, moral worth and the like. More or less, it is an amorphous entity. The most important feature of distinction between the two is that while influence is pervasive, power is coercive. We submit voluntarily to influence, while power requires submission.

14.2.5 Meaning of Authority

Authority represents the moralisation of power. It may also include the legitimisation of power through the provision of legal sanctions to it and through becoming rooted in the traditions, historical institutions, etc. Legal sanctions, statutes, commands, writs, rules regulations, bye-laws, etc. represent the technique of authority.

In simpler terms, to have authority means to have the right to do something. Authority to give orders is this kind of right. If I have a driving licence, I have a right, or have been authorized, been given formal permission to drive a car. Here 'I have a right to' simply means 'I may'. But when a Minister of the Crown is authorised to make regulations, this not only allows him to do something but also imposes an obligation on citizens to conform to the regulation that he may make.

14.2.6 Relation between Power, Influence and Authority

Due to the looseness of usage many times power is used interchangeably with influence and authority. In the words of J. C. Johari, "Power is often identified with other related themes like influence, authority, coercion, control, domination, persuasion, force, etc." Whereas on the one hand, some writers equate power with the above themes, some others warn against the insidious tendency of equating power with other kindred themes like influence and authority.

Recent writers of the United States like Harold Lasswell, Abraham Kaplan and Robert A. Dahl have taken politics as the "study of the influence and the influential." But there are many other political thinkers who regard power as distinct from influence. Highlighting their view, J. C. Johari says, "The most important feature of distinction between the two is that while influence is pervasive, power is coercive. We submit voluntarily to influence, while power requires submission."

Similarly, power is used interchangeably with authority which it is not. Max Weber says that power and authority are different things in as much as the latter invariably conveys within its fold the sense of legitimacy. It is important to be clear about the distinction between power and authority, since they are often confused, in language as well as thought. We speak of a statute giving a Minister "power" to do this or that, when we mean giving him authority. D. D. Raphael says, "Anybody has the power of ability to issue a command, but not everyone is authorized or entitled to do so in particular circumstances, and not everyone is either able or entitled to have his commands carried out." The same thing is said by J. C. Johari, "Authority is essentially the institutional code within which the use of power as a medium is organised and legitimised." Power is often confused with authority due to several reasons.

(a) One of the grounds is that the person with power holds a special office. This means that he has the authority by virtue of his office. If a man holds a position of authority and is able by virtue of that position to get others to do what he tells them to do, his power is the exercise of authority. That is why power can be used to mean authority.

(b) To have authority to do something is to have the right to do it. A right of action may be thought of as a power in the sense of being a facility to do something.

So, there are many instances or reasons for confusing power with authority. But authority can exist without power; authority implies a right of making other people do as he requires. Similarly, power can exist without authority when power is taken in the sense of coercive power. One who exercises coercive power is able to make others do as he wills, not because they acknowledge his right, still less because he has right, but because they fear the consequences of disobedience. They are forced to obey; obedience to authority is due to obligation but obedience to coercive power is necessary.

14.2.7 Criticism of Power Theory

Certain critical observations have been made about the concept of power. These are :—

(a) Power is one of the key concepts in political theory. The political scientists regard politics as a stand of power or a "Kissa Kursi Ka". According to critics when the problem of coping with resistance or opposition arises, the question of the role of coercive measures including the use of physical force becomes necessary. But the liberals criticise this power view and say that power may be an aspect in the study of politics but politics should be mainly concerned with social welfare or public good.

(b) The concept of political power has both normative and empirical dimensions. On the normative basis it is said that power is a value free concept but politics is based on principles and values and should be normative. In politics power should be used in the sense of persuasion, manipulation, influence, etc., so that it does not become coercive.

(c) The Marxian theory of power is criticised on the ground that the source of power lies not only in the realm of economics but also very much in the forces of psychology and sociology.

There are some of the critical observations made on the concept of power.

14.2.8 Conclusion

In conclusion, it may be said that power, no doubt, is an important aspect in political study but it cannot be the sole basis of it. Power is a means but not an end in itself. Political power should be properly used as a means so that "maximisation of democracy or the development of the society as a whole takes place in the end.

14.3 Summary

In this way, we have studied the concept of 'power' in political philosophy. We have seen that the term 'power' has different aspects — normative or ethical and empirical or applied. There are different kinds of power — political, economic, ideological, etc.

We also have seen that power is sometimes used interchangeably with influence and authority. But influence and authority are not absolutely the same as power. There are certain subtle differences among them.

Lastly, we have seen that power has been criticised on the ground that it leads to coercion, use of physical force, etc. Hence, power should be used carefully and it should always be remembered that power is a means and not an end in itself.

14.4 Key words used in the Lesson

Power, influence, authority, development, extractive, normative, empirical, transient phenomenon, bureaucracy, managerialism, ideological, coercion, manipulation, legal sanctions, institutional code.

14.5 Questions for Exercise

(a) Objective Questions

1. Power means

- (a) political power
- (b) economic power
- (c) ideological power
- (d) all the above

Ans. — (d)

2. Power is

- (a) same as influence and authority
- (b) Different from influence and authority
- (c) same as obligation
- (d) none of the above.

Ans. — (b)

(b) Short Answer Questions

1. What do mean by power ? Define giving implications of the definitions.

Ans. — See 14.2.1

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

Ans. — See 14.2.3

3. Clarify the meanings of influence and authority.

Ans. — See 14.2.4 and 14.2.5

(c) Long Answer Questions

- 1. Define power and discuss its various types.
- 2. Discuss the relation between power, influence and authority.
- 3. Discuss critically 'power' as a political concept.

14.6 Suggested Readings

- 1. D. D. Raphael : **Problems of Political Philosophy**
- 2. M. P. Jain : **Political Theory**
- 3. J. C. Johari : **Contemporary Political Theory**



Political Obligation**Lesson structure**

- 15.0 Objective
- 15.1 Introduction
- 15.2 Grounds For Political Obligation
 - 15.2.1 Meaning and Nature of Political Obligation
 - 15.2.2 Characteristics of Political Obligation
 - 15.2.3 Theories Regarding Political Obligation
 - 15.2.4 Limits of Political Obligation
 - 15.2.5 Critical Appreciation
 - 15.2.6 Conclusion
- 15.3 Summary
- 15.4 Key words used in the Lesson
- 15.5 Questions for Exercise
 - (a) Objective Questions
 - (b) Short Answer Questions
 - (c) Long Answer Questions
- 15.6 Suggested Readings

15.0 Objective

Political Obligation means the acceptance of the commands of the "men in authority roles". In other words, it implies that when man is a political creature, he is bound to live under some authority and it becomes his obligation to obey its commands. But the question arises as to why are we bound to obey these commands or what exactly is the meaning of political obligation. It is with the objective of finding an answer to all these questions that we have planned this lesson. After giving an introduction to this topic we shall discuss the important grounds of political obligation. In the following sections we shall discuss the meaning and nature of political obligation, its characteristics and main theories regarding its nature. Then we shall see the limits of political obligation and critically analyze the concept of political obligation. We shall conclude with our own opinion on the topic.

15.1 Introduction

The authority of the state implies that those who exercise it have the right (of action) to issue orders and the right (of recipience) to have those orders obeyed, and that, corresponding to the second right, the citizens have a duty or obligation to obey the orders.

In the world of politics, obligation takes the form of a bond between man as a citizen and the authority under which he lives, "to perform an act, or a number of acts for the governing authority." Hence, when the "authorising rule is a law, and the association a state, we call this political obligation". In other words, accepting the orders of men in authoritative political roles or obeying the law of the state is political obligation.

Thus, political obligation is the obligation of the citizens to obey the orders of the state.

15.2 Grounds for Political Obligation

A question arises : Why does the citizen have a duty to obey the laws of the state ? This is the problem of the grounds for political obligation.

The above question has been answered by a good number of thinkers and statesmen in different ways. The Idealists say that men obey the laws because of their inherent good nature. According to the pragmatists, the answer to this question can be found in the world of experience whereby we may determine the worth and legitimacy of the actions of men in authority roles. However, this question belongs to the realm of liberal political theory.

A simple and obvious answer to this question is : The citizen is obliged to obey the laws of the state because the state has sovereign authority. It follows logically that if the state is authoritative, i.e. has the right to issue orders to its citizens and the right to receive obedience from them, the citizens are obliged to obey orders.

Again a question arises as to why we are obliged to obey the orders of the state. One answer is : we are obliged to obey the orders of the state from fear of the coercive power exercised by the person or body claiming authority. But there are other reasons too, such as general consent, or a rule of hereditary succession, or the possession by the claimant of special personal qualities.

We can now make a distinction between reasons for acknowledging authority.

(1) To acknowledge authority from fear of the use of coercive power is to admit a prudential obligation.

(2) To acknowledge the claim from the thought that it is right to do so is to admit a 'moral obligation.' It is to say that I have a moral duty to obey.

In modern times, it is being felt that there is no contradiction between the above two views. Personal benefit and moral obligation are not contradictory. This view shall become all the more clear when we discuss the theories concerning political obligation.

15.2.1 Meaning and Nature of Political Obligation

The term "obligation" is derived from the Latin word "obligate" implying something that binds men to an engagement of performing what is enjoined. This definition has various connotations. For example, in ethics obligation means that a man has to fulfil or discharge those duties which have been given to him and are acceptable to him by his rational understanding. In the legal realm, obligation requires that a person has to obey the law by which he is tied to some performance. In the world of politics, it implies that when man is a political creature or a citizen, he is bound to live under some authority, it becomes his obligation to obey its commands. Thus when the state as the sovereign authority issues orders to its citizens, the citizens are obliged to obey those orders. This is called "political obligation". According to Benn and Peters, "When the authorising rule is a law, and the association a state, we call this "political obligation."

Thus, political obligation is closely connected with the pattern of man's life in an organised whole. We may say that there can be no life if there is no order, and since order implies obedience, we may also say that there can be no order if there is no acceptance of it. As people cannot play the game of cricket without obeying the rulings of an umpire, they cannot live without accepting the commands of the persons charged with the job of maintaining peace and order in the society.

So the idea of political delegation or acceptance of the commands of men in authority inheres these essential characteristics :

(i) Political obligation relates to government officials that they should perform their functions seriously, honestly and should be public spirited and work in the interest of the society. It also implies that it is the duty of every conscientious person to interest himself seriously in the matter of public affairs i.e. in political questions.

(2) The concept of political obligation involves the maintenance of the belief that the existing social institutions are most appropriate for society.

(3) The idea of political obligation not only informs the people to obey the authority of those who are in power, it also wants that the people should be critical about the way authority is exercised. They should critically examine the actions of their rulers and as Locke, Laski and Green advocate they should demonstrate their resistance and go to the extent of changing the political order.

We can sum up the whole case of political obligation thus in the words of Benn and Peters, "There are good grounds for accepting authority in general but there may be good grounds too for rejecting it in particular cases, if authority derives from a

constitution, there would generally be good grounds for rejecting any exercise of it which was unconstitutional. Again, if its legitimacy depends on the way it is used, an invasion of a sphere where political authority is inappropriate might be grounds for disobedience or, in extreme cases, for resistance."

15.2.3 Theories Regarding Political Obligation

Various theories have been put forth on the subject of political obligation :

(1) The Divine Theory — The divine theory of political obligation is the oldest one. According to this theory, I am obliged to obey the governing authority essentially because I am obliged to obey God and because any governing authority is a delegation of Divine authority.

Such a doctrine is affirmation of the teaching of the Bible. St. Paul said that the authority of the prince comes from God. According to the Divine theory, the king has divine power, he is chosen by God to rule on earth. Hence, he has the claim to be obeyed by his people.

The idea of "divine rights of kings "prevailed throughout the middle ages. But with the advent of new learning the divine rights of kings slowly began to decline because people started resisting the authority of kings and regarded the right to rebel a divine right also. Since the divine theory of political obligation found its sanction in matters of faith it lost its significance in modern age and received severe criticism at the hands of thinkers like Hobbes, Locke etc who rejected its supernatural premises and traced the source of political obligation in the consent of the individuals.

(2) Consent Theory — The divine theory was replaced by the consent theory according to which the citizens are tied to the governing authority because firstly, he in common with all other citizens, has made a contract with other persons under which that person or persons receive authority in return for protection and service of declaring and enforcing a system of legal rules, and secondly, because he and his fellows are bound by natural law to respect and perform the terms of the contract. (Barker). Thus, according to this theory, the authority of the state is based on the consent of the people.

This theory is based on the idea of social contract propounded by Hobbes, and Locke of England and Rousseau of France. Locke says, "No one can be subjected to the political power of another, without his own consent."

In the words of D. D. Raphael, "The theory of social contract tries to justify political obligation as being based on an implicit promise, like the obligation to obey the rules of voluntary association."

The idea of social contract, took a philosophical form at the hands of Rousseau according to whom political obligation is grounded in the "General Will." According to

Political Obligation

him when man entered the civil state from the state of nature, he was bound to obey the laws of the state because they represent the general will.

Thus, the social contract theory justifies the concept of ruling authority based on the consent of those who are governed. If the government violates the terms of the contract, the people have a right to resist.

Although this theory has its importance in the direction of safeguarding the rights and liberties of the individuals and of checking the arbitrariness of rulers it suffers from the demerit of regarding the state as an artificial creation and government authority as a check on the natural freedom of man.

(3) Prescriptive Theory — According to this theory, both political authority and its obedience are based on "customary rights". On the basis of an analogy between the family and the state, Jean Bodin says that just as the authority of the head of the family, that is, the father is based on the fact of historical prescription, so the authority of the head of the state, that is, the king finds its source in the fact of long possession. Thus, the people obey their rulers because obedience is based on well-established convention or custom and there is no further question about it.

This theory of political obligation which may also be called the conservative theory of political obligation is supported by Hegel, Edmund Burke, Prof. Michael Oakeshott.

All these thinkers trace the source of political obligation to the weight of tradition. Tradition has everything — all its parts and all its details— and everything continues."

Like other theories of political obligation, the prescriptive theory has its own weaknesses.

This theory suffers from the fact that people observe their tradition so long as it has its utility, but they also want change and they try to break them down when their usefulness no longer exists.

(4) Idealistic Theory — The Idealists trace the source of political obligation in the innate rationality of man. Right from Plato and Aristotle to Green and Bosanquet, it is held that man is a political and rational creature and the state as "a self-sufficient community" identical with the whole society. The state represents the social aspirations of all individuals and fulfils all his social needs.

Thus, the source of political obligation is contained in obedience to the state which is not an alien entity. So closely is man's life identified with his state that the two become one. Hence, obedience to one's will and the same to an act of state become alike. Rousseau and Hegel support this view. Green and Bosanquet, too affirm this view.

The idealistic theory of political obligation, is too abstract. It places ordinary things in a highly philosophical form that cannot be understood by a man of average understanding.

Political Obligation

The idea of political obligation is not only concerned with man's obedience to the state, it is also integrally connected with his right to resist the abuse of political authority. The idealists do not want to accept the right of resistance in their theory of political obligation.

This theory advocates blind worship of authority and blind faith in the state which is not proper.

(5) Marxian Theory — The Marxian theory sanctions the case of political non-obligation in the pre-revolutionary stage, total political obligation in the revolutionary stage and eventual conversion into social obligation in the post-revolutionary stage. According to Marx, the state is the oppressor of the exploited masses and hence it needs no reverence. The case of political obligation arises when the "new state" comes into being after the revolution. As the state is now an institution of the whole people, no question of civil disobedience arises.

But, according to Marxian theory, the idea of political obligation ceases to exist with the withering away of the state in the best stage of socialism (Communism) and its final injunction into social obligation.

The Marxian theory is criticised saying that it treats the question of political obligation in a way far away from the real perspective. People who are advised to disobey the "bourgeois state" in all respects are commanded not to disobey the state at all after the inauguration of the new social system. It may also be said that in no social order all people can be expected to behave in a strictly uniform way as Marx says.

Now a question arises as to which theory of political obligation should be treated as the most suitable of all. We can answer that although all the theories have their merits and demerits, we must appreciate that which stands the test of experience, that theory which from the pragmatic point of view desires to contend for truth "as tested by reality and its fruits."

15.2.4 Limits of Political Obligation

While discussing the concept of political obligation, we shall also have to know about the limits of political obligation also. Man are not only obliged to obey the state, they have a right to disobey it under certain conditions.

With respect to disobedience of authority, there are divergent opinions. While the advocates of the 'divine' and 'prescriptive' theories do not allow the right to resist political authority under any condition whatsoever the supporters of "consent" and "idealistic" theories allow for political disobedience in certain exceptional situations. The case of Marxian theory is different. While they advocate total disobedience of the bourgeois state, they advocate total obedience to socialist regime.

The leading English liberal thinkers advocate the following views regarding the right of resistance to political authority :—

(a) According to them the people have the right to resist political authority if a majority of them feel that the action of sovereign is detrimental to the overall interest of the community.

(b) The case of political disobedience is conditional and not absolute. It depends upon the people to decide when the conditions are such that a disobedience of political authority is essential.

(c) The case of resistance of political authority implies that people may resist the bad action of the rulers, they are not justified in taking matters to the extent that the general social order is damaged irreparably.

Hence, political obligation is limited by the above conditions.

15.2.5 Critical Appreciation

From what we have seen of the concept of political obligation, we get the impression that it is a very delicate affair. The supporters of the different theories (divine, prescriptive, consent, etc.) hold divergent views regarding the concept of political obligation as well as the right to resistance.

Not only is the idea of political obligation a delicate affair, it is very difficult to determine its precise nature. This is because the idea of political obligation is not only a political matter but also a moral affair. However, as the norms of morality differ from time to time, from place to place and from people to people, naturally the dimensions of political obligation or conversely speaking, the injunctions of popular resistance also vary in a like manner.

It is generally believed that the existence of a constitutional government secures the case of political obligation. In such a situation, people must obey the order of the state because it conforms to the provisions of the fundamental law of the land—constitution. In case, the government violates the constitution, it should be criticised or even overthrown.

15.2.6 Conclusion

In this way, we are bound to agree to the view of Margaret Mac Donald that "necessary and sufficient grounds for political obligation are not to be found." Even the most widely accepted 'consent' theory has its own weaknesses.

In conclusion, we can say that the ground of political obligation in general depends on the moral ends or objectives of the state. One is morally obliged to obey the law because one has a moral obligation to promote justice and the common good and because state action is an essential means of achieving these ends.

Thus, the theories of justice and the common good combined with the theory of consent give the correct account of the grounds of political obligation in general.

15.3 Summary

Political obligation as we have seen is an answer to the question as to why does the citizen have a duty to obey the laws of the state. In reply to it, it is said that because the state as the sovereign authority issues orders to its citizens, the citizens are obliged to obey those orders. Various theories have been put forth giving reasons to support the view as to why we should obey the orders of the state.

We have also seen that men are not only obliged to obey the state, they have a right to disobey it under certain circumstances.

In the end, we may conclude by saying that we should obey the state as rational and responsible citizens. We should always remember, "Eternal vigilance is the price of liberty."

15.4 Key words used in the Lesson

Political obligation, idealists, pragmatists, individual liberty, sovereign, divine theory, consent theory, contract, artificial creation, Prescriptive theory, convention, Marxian, delicate constitution, resistance.

15.5 Questions for Exercise

(a) Objective Questions

1. Political Obligation means

- (a) obligation to obey the commands of the state
- (b) obligation to obey the commands of the society
- (c) none

Ans. — (a)

2. People have the right to

- (a) resist political authority if necessary
- (b) never resist political authority
- (c) none

Ans. — (a)

(b) Short Answer Questions

1. What do you mean by political delegation ? Discuss.

Ans. — See 15.2.1

2. What is the limit of political obligation ? Discuss.

Ans. — See 15.2.4

3. What are the grounds for political obligation ?

Ans. — See 15.2

(c) Long Answer Questions

1. Discuss critically the concept of political obligation.

2. What are the main theories regarding political obligation ?

15.6 Suggested Readings

- | | | |
|------------------|---|---|
| 1. J. C. Johari | : | Contemporary Political Theory |
| 2. D. D. Raphael | : | Problems of Political Philosophy |



Political Ideology : Democracy**Lesson Structure**

- 16.0 Objective
- 16.1 Introduction
- 16.2 Democracy as the ideal form of government
 - 16.2.1 Meaning and Definition of Democracy
 - 16.2.2 Basic Principles or Requisites of Democracy
 - 16.2.3 Kinds of Democracy
 - 16.2.4 Theories of Democracy
 - 16.2.5 Merits of Democracy
 - 16.2.6 Demerits of Democracy
 - 16.2.7 Conditions for the success of Democracy
 - 16.2.8 Conclusion
- 16.3 Summary
- 16.4 Key words used in the Lesson
- 16.5 Questions for Exercise
 - (a) Objective Questions
 - (b) Short Answer Questions
 - (c) Long Answer Questions
- 16.7 Suggested Readings

16.0 Objective

Democracy as a political ideology sets up the ideal standard of government. Liberty and equality are what distinguish the democratic ideal from other political ideals. In other words, the distinctive feature of a democratic government is to secure maximum liberty for the citizens. For the democrat, liberty goes along with equality.

Hence, the main objective behind discussing this topic is to know the meaning and definition of this most popular form of government. After this we shall discuss the

different kinds of democracy as well as the different theories concerning it. Then we shall discuss the conditions for the success of democracy. We shall also discuss its merits and demerits.

In the end, we shall conclude with our comments on democracy as a political ideology regarding the form of government.

16.1 Introduction

In the beginning itself, we had seen that political philosophy is normative or ideological, setting up norms or ideal standards for society and government. Democracy as a political ideology sets up the ideal standard for government.

Democracy is the most popular form of government. In modern times almost every government claims to be a democracy or at least functioning on a democratic level.

Democracy is a doctrine of "do it yourself" and as someone has remarked, "do it yourself" often comes to "rule it yourself." The democrat is prepared to make his own mistakes rather than be directed by someone else who may have superior wisdom. The underlying idea is that self-direction, choosing for yourself, is far preferable to having decisions made for you, and imposed upon you, by another. This is called "liberty or freedom". For the democrat, liberty goes with equality.

Thus, liberty and equality are the distinctive aims of democracy. The democrat holds that all men have an equal right to liberty and self-direction.

16.2 Democracy as the Ideal form of Government

The distinctive features of a democratic government are to secure maximum of liberty and equality for citizens. Any other government with its rules of law restricts our freedom to do as we please. Democrats recognize the necessity of this, but they believe that, so far as possible, the rules should be self-imposed or in any case should be in accordance with the will and consent of the citizens. If a man imposes a rule on himself or agrees to its imposition by another, he is not being compelled but is acting voluntarily. That is why, it is said that "Democracy is a government of the people, for the people and by the people."

Liberty and equality are the distinctive aims of democracy. For the democrat, liberty goes along with equality. He believes that everybody, or at least every adult, is capable of exercising the power of self-direction and should be given the opportunity to do so. The democrat holds that all men have an equal right to liberty and self-direction.

It is because of these features that democracy is regarded as the ideal form of government.

16.2.1 Meaning and Definition of Democracy

The term "democracy" is derived from the Greek words "demos" and "kratos" meaning people and power respectively. Democracy, thus, means power of the people. It is now regarded as a form of government in which the people rule themselves either directly or indirectly through their representatives. Democracy had originally been a political principle but it has been enlarged in recent times to include social, economic and ethical values. It has been said that democracy is not a mere form of government. It is a type of state as well as an order of society. A democratic state possesses sovereign authority and maintains the power of appointing, controlling and dismissing a government. A democratic society is one in which the spirit of equality and fraternity prevails.

The meaning of democracy is not exhausted even after interpreting it is a form of government, a type of state, and an order of society. Democracy is a way of life. An ideal democrat is generally one who believes in liberty, equality, fraternity and who tries to win others through persuasion, discussion and mutual exchange of views.

Definitions of Democracy — Democracy as a form of government has been defined variously as under :

- (1) Abraham Lincoln — "Democracy as a form of government of the people, for the people and by the people."
- (2) Dicey — "Democracy is that form of government in which the governing body is a large fraction of the entire nation."
- (iii) Seeley — "Democracy is a government in which everyone has a share."
- (iv) Bryce — Democracy is that form of government in which the ruling power of the state is vested not in any particular class or classes but in the members of the community as a whole."

In short, democracy is a form of government in which the people are the ultimate source of power. It is they who rule either directly or indirectly through their elected representatives.

16.2.2 Basic Principles or Requisites of Democracy

The basic principles or requisites of democracy are :—

- (i) Liberty — The most important basis of democracy is liberty or freedom, that is, self-direction or choosing for yourself.
- (ii) Equality — In democracy, there is no disparity among people on the political, economic and social level. Everybody is capable of exercising the power of self-direction and should be given the opportunity to do so.

(iii) Fraternity — Democracy advocates fraternity or brotherhood because it can become successful in a peaceful atmosphere, otherwise, democracy has to face many difficulties.

(iv) Sovereignty — In a democracy, people are the ultimate source of sovereignty.

(v) Fundamental Rights of the People — Democracy advocates fundamental rights because in their absence, the development of an individual is not possible.

(vi) Independence of Judiciary — Democracy requires a free judiciary. Wherever judiciary is not free, the protection of fundamental rights is not possible.

(vii) People are considered as an end and the state as a means — Democracy is a welfare state. The effort of the state is the welfare of the people. Here people are considered as an end and the state as a means. It enshrines the truth that government does not exist for its own sake, but for the enrichment of personality. No government has a right to be called a democracy if it does not bring out the best in man.

(viii) Welfare State — It is because of the above reason that democracy is called a welfare state. In a democracy, special attention is to be paid to the welfare of the people.

(iv) Periodic free election — In a democracy, there are periodic elections when people choose their representatives who form the government. Every adult is given the right to vote irrespective of his class, caste, religion or sex.

(x) Adult franchise — In a democracy, every adult is capable of exercising the power of electing his representative who is to form the government. Adult franchise is the right to vote given to every adult citizen irrespective of his class, caste, sex or religion.

(xi) At least two political parties or pressure group — Another important prerequisite of democracy is that there should be at least two political parties or pressure groups, one that rules and the other its opposition which criticises its wrong deeds.

In this way, all the above principles are important for democracy.

16.2.3 Kinds of Democracy

(i) Pure or Direct Democracy — Pure or direct democracy is a system in which all citizens may join in taking governmental decisions. In other words, when the people themselves directly express their will in public affairs, the type of government is called pure or direct democracy.

It is unpractical except in a very small polity. It was practised, more or less, in the city-state of Athens over a relatively short period. Decisions were taken by the Assembly, the membership of which was open to all adult male citizens (but not to women or slave or alien residents). It is now prevalent in the Forest Cantons of Switzerland.

But, present-day experience shows that democracy of the pure and direct type is an absolutely unattainable ideal. The only type which is possible for us today is the indirect or representative type.

(ii) Indirect Democracy or Representative Democracy — In most democratic states, democracy has meant representative government. In it the will of the state is formulated and expressed not directly by the people themselves, but by their representatives who are periodically elected by the people and are entrusted with the administration of public affairs. Decision on concrete issues is left to the body of elected, representatives, the Legislature, or to a smaller group, the Government or executive, acting with the consent of the Legislature. The indirect form of democracy is to be seen in countries like Britain, U. S. A, France, India, Canada, Japan, Australia, Sri Lanka, New Zealand, Italy, Sweden, etc.

Representative democracy assumes two forms— Presidential and Parliamentary

16.2.4 Theories of Democracy

Broadly speaking, there are two theories of democracy— Liberal and Marxist. Liberalism assumes three forms :

- (a) Classical
- (b) Elitist
- (c) Pluralist

(a) Classical Liberal Theory — According to the classical theory democracy is not merely a political system, rather it is a necessary condition for the all-round development and well-being of the whole community.

Democracy gives us a guarantee that the will of everyone in the community shall be duly considered and that no one shall be neglected in what is done by the government.

(b) The Elitist Theory of Democracy — Mosca propounded the elitist theory of democracy in his famous work 'The Ruling class.' After him Pareto discussed the elitist theory of democracy in his book "Mind and Society". Roberto Michels analysed the elitist role of political parties in a democracy in his book 'Political Parties'. The Elitist Theory holds that political power vests only in the minority or the ruling elite rather than the majority. According to them, society is invariably divided between a minority that rules and a majority which is subject to rule. The minority which is the elite, enjoys all privileges and comforts which are enjoyed by the ruling class.

(c) Pluralist theory of Democracy — Lipset advocates this view of democracy in his book "Political Man." Dahrendorf supports the same view in his "Classes in Industrial Society." Robert Dahl has explained his pluralist theory of democracy in "A Preface to Democratic Theory and Polyarchy."

According to these thinkers, society consists of diverse interest groups and the elite which leads them. Since no group or elite is so powerful as to dominate the government, so that it may implement its decisions completely, hence, policies are made by mutual consultation with various groups. Merchants, industrialists, trade unions, farmers' associations, consumers, politicians, voters and many other groups influence policy making in government.

Thus, pluralists maintain that power in society is shared by many groups. Power is decentralised and it is not enjoyed by the elite only.

II. Marxist Theory of Democracy — Marx was a democratic republican for about two years before his conversion to communism. Marx maintained that true democracy is possible only in a classless society based on economic and social equality. This can be brought about only by the abolition of private property and social ownership of the means of production. True democracy, says Marx, demands the negation of private property. It demands an end to class structure based on the capitalist mode of production. True democracy, he says, is not only anti-class, it is also anti-state. To Marx, a popular revolution is needed to bring about the social order based on true democracy.

16.2.5 Merits of Democracy

Democracy is regarded as the best form of government and its merits can be outlined as follows :

(i) Protects the interests of common man — Democracy gives us a guarantee that the will of everyone in the community shall be duly considered and that no one shall be neglected in what is done by the government.

(ii) It is based on equality — Democracy is based on equality because it considers everyone as equal. All men have an equal right to liberty and self-direction.

(iii) It is the greatest upholder of the lofty ideas of liberty and fraternity — Democracy advocates the principles of liberty, equality and fraternity to enable every individual in the community to attain the highest good possible for him.

(iv) It upholds human dignity — Since in a democracy all are equal and enjoy rights and liberties, it is said that democracy respects the dignity of a person.

(v) It is based on public opinion — Democracy is a large-scale experiment in public-education. Modern democracy and public opinion are very closely intertwined. The extension of franchise, the organisation of political parties and of legislatures constituted on a popular basis have all tended to highlight the importance of public opinion.

(vi) It serves as a training school for good citizenship — Democracy stimulates interest and is informative. It tends to create a higher type of mentality among the people whom it governs. When a general election takes place every reasonable opinion is

given a chance to express itself. Speeches are delivered, articles are written, programmes are outlined, and policies are propounded. The result of all this is a rise in the popular understanding of the problems of government. C. D. Burns writes : "All government is a method of education but the best education is self-education : therefore, the best government is self-government which is democracy.

(vii) It gives political education to the people — From what has been said above, democracy gives political education to the people.

(viii) It raises the moral standard of the people — Democracy ennobles the people. It rests on the principle that what a man earns for himself by his own efforts is of much greater value to him than what is handed down to him by someone else. It is the best aid to self-help and cultivation of individual responsibility.

(ix) It promotes patriotism and national unity — The supreme merit of democracy, says J. S. Mill, lies in the fact that "it promotes a better and higher form of national character than any other polity whatever. "It promotes patriotism and reduces the danger of revolution.

(x) It is an efficient form of government — In a democracy, popular election, popular control and popular responsibility are more likely to ensure a greater degree of efficiency than any other system of government.

(xi) There is social unity in democracy — Since democracy advocates equal opportunities for all and equal rights and liberties for all, there is social unity.

(xii) Democracy reduces the danger of revolution — Democracy is a government by persuasion. Every other form of government rests to a greater extent on force. Democracy believes in discussion and this is the only method which is bound to succeed. Since democratic form of government gives both order and progress, hence all these act as a check on the possibility of revolution.

(xiii) It promotes people's welfare — Democracy is a government of the people, by the people and for the people. Hence, it is bound to promote the welfare of the people.

(xiv) It encourages reforms — Since democracy is based on public opinion, when people feel the necessity they can encourage reforms and changes in the laws of the country.

Hence, democracy as a form of a government has a number of merits as has been stated above.

But this does not mean that it is absolutely free from defects or demerits.

16.2.6 Demerits of Democracy

(i) Democracy is the rule of the incompetent people — In a democracy people who have been elected rule the country irrespective of the fact that they have any training or expert knowledge about the government. Leaders of ability are often not chosen.

(ii) It gives more importance to quantity than to quality — In a democracy votes are counted and not weighed. It is a government by the crowds. It makes the majority supreme, even if the minority may have greater knowledge and better judgement.

(iii) Democracy is a very expensive form of government — Money which should be spent for productive purposes is spent on electioneering and nursing the constituency.

(iv) Capitalists have great influence upon democracy — Since the capitalists give monetary support to those who stand in the election, they greatly influence the government.

(v) Political parties spoil the harmonious atmosphere and corruption becomes rampant — Since democracy is a multiparty system, the harmony of the nation is disturbed because every party is keen on achieving its own selfish ends and corruption becomes prevalent in society.

(vi) It hinders the progress of civilization and culture — As corruption becomes rampant in society due to the above reasons, the culture and civilization of the country receives a great setback.

(vii) Bribery and corruption are the common abuses of democracy — In his chapter on "The Money Power in Politics", Bryce shows that there are several instances of electors, members of legislatures, administrative officials and even judicial officials indulging in illicit gains.

(viii) The government is not stable due to multiple party system — Due to multiparty system and the system of horse-trading, the government becomes unstable and frequent elections take place.

(ix) People's will a myth — To assume that representatives always represent the will of the people is a mistake.

(x) Degeneration of moral standard — Critics say that in a democracy there is always a temptation to falsify. The main aim of the politicians is to catch votes.

(xi) Democracy is a process of diseducation rather than of education — It flatters people and engenders in them a false sense of equality. Every man thinks that he is as good as anybody else for the governance of his country.

(xii) Incompetence of people — People think that they are capable of governing the country as anybody else. Democracy calls for no special effort and training. It makes people think too well for themselves.

(xiv) Slowness — In a democracy, the process of law-making or amending the law is time-taking and very slow.

(xv) Democracy is not friendly to liberty and individuality — There are many instances in democratic countries where the representatives of the people are interested only in obtaining favour of their electorate. They are least interested in the liberty and individuality of the people.

Thus, democracy has a number of demerits. But this does not mean that democracy is a bad form of government. We should always remember that no other form of government is as good as democracy.

16.2.7 Conditions for the Successful Working of Democracy

(1) If democracy is to work successfully, the first important condition is the inculcation of faith in certain fundamental democratic principles. Among these principles the most important is to give a place to the value of every human being.

(2) Without popular education, democracy cannot be successful. Education helps a person to be well-informed, balanced and discriminating.

(3) No democracy can endure long unless both leaders and people possess clean hands and pure heart.

(4) The successful working of democracy these days requires that there should be no great wealth on the one hand and no abject poverty on the other.

(5) For the success of democracy caste and class difference and social distance between one person and another should be minimized.

(6) If democracy is to succeed, there is need for carefully selected leaders.

(7) Too many popular elections are not conducive to the successful operation of democracy.

(8) Freedom of press and easy access to unbiased and accurate information is also necessary for the success of democracy.

(9) A sound public opinion is an important condition for the success of democracy.

(10) If eternal vigilance is the price of liberty, it is equally the price of democracy.

16.2.8 Conclusion

Thus we have seen the merits and demerits of democracy as well as the conditions for its success. Democracy, no doubt, is the most suitable form of government embodying sound principles. The evils which we see in it can be overcome by proper education, morality, vigilance, reflection and experience. The progress of democracy seems irresistible because no other form of government guarantees all those rights and freedoms that one enjoys in democracy.

16.3 Summary

Democracy is a government of the people, for the people and by the people. It is the most popular form of government which is surviving till to day. Liberty and equality are the two basic principles of democracy. Democracy has its own merits. Although democracy is blamed today for many of its drawbacks, yet as Lowell maintains, "no form of government is a panacea for all human ills." The evils of democracy can be removed

by education of public opinion, morality, vigilance, etc. But, no other form of government is as good as democracy. That is why, democracy has had the greatest length of life.

16.4 Key words used in the Lesson

Democracy, equality, liberty, fraternity, ethical values, persuasion, discussion, fundamental rights, party system.

16.5 Questions For Exercises

(a) Objective Questions

1. Democracy is a

- (a) popular form of government
- (b) unpopular form of government
- (c) not very popular form of government

Ans. — (a)

2. The condition for the success of democracy is

- (a) a sound public opinion
- (b) a high moral standard of the people
- (c) eternal vigilance
- (d) all the above

Ans. — (d)

(b) Short Answer Questions

1. What are the basic principles of democracy ? Discuss.

Ans. — See 16.2.2

2. Write a note on the different kinds of democracy.

Ans. — See 16.2.3

3. What are the different theories of democracy ?

Ans. — See 16.2.4

(c) Long Answer Questions

- 1. Define democracy. Discuss the merits and demerits of democracy.
- 2. What are the conditions for the success of democracy ? Enumerate.

16.6 Suggested Readings

- 1. K. K. Mishra (Ed.) : **Political Theory – Eddy Asirvatham**
- 2. D. D. Raphael : **Problems of Political Philosophy**
- 3. M. P. Jain : **Political Theory**



Political Ideology : Socialism**Lesson structure**

- 17.0 Objective
- 17.1 Introduction
- 17.2 Socialism as a Political Ideology
 - 17.2.1 Meaning of the term "Socialism"
 - 17.2.2 Definition of "Socialism"
 - 17.2.3 Main Features of Socialism
 - 17.2.4 Development of Socialism and its Exponents
 - 17.2.5 Merits of Socialism
 - 17.2.6 Demerits of Socialism
 - 17.2.7 Conclusion
- 17.3 Summary
- 17.4 Key words used in the Lesson
- 17.5 Questions for Exercise
 - (a) Objective Questions
 - (b) Short Answer Questions
 - (c) Long Answer Questions
- 17.6 Suggested Readings

17.0 Objective

In the contemporary world "Socialism" stands as a popular political ideology and a great revolution. Hence, it is important to know the meaning and definition of the term "Socialism". It is with this objective that we have arranged this lesson. Firstly, we shall study the meaning and definition of the term "Socialism". Then, we shall examine the main features, its development, etc. We shall also discuss the various forms of socialism together with their exponents. After this, we shall critically examine 'socialism' as political ideology, its merits and demerits.

17.1 Introduction

Socialism as a theory of economic and social reconstruction is quite recent, yet it is not altogether a new thing. The word socialism, according to Kirkup, was first used in "Poor Man's Guardian in 1833. In 1835, a society, which received the name of the Association of all Classes of all Nations, was founded under the guidance of Robert Owen (1771-1858), a successful capitalist and the words "socialists and socialism" became current during the discussions which arose there. The term was soon afterwards borrowed from England by a distinguished French writer, Reybaud and he discussed the theories of Saint Simon, Fourier and Owen.

Socialism is the legitimate child of two great revolutions, the Industrial Revolution in England and the French Enlightenment. Robert Owen had grown up in the midst of the Industrial Revolution and he was deeply conscious of the enormous abuses of factory system. Saint Simon had experienced the abuses of feudalism. Marx and Engels also were against the capitalist order.

These thinkers aimed at the reconstruction of society so as to put an end to the process of profit making by the capitalists and to establish economic equality for all.

17.2 Socialism as a Political Ideology

Socialism aims at the establishment of social justice. The ideal of the socialists, to whatever variety they belong, is removal of poverty and privileges, vice and crime and other social evils from which the society suffers today and to establish a new social and economic order where there will exist equal opportunities for all so that they can bring out the best in themselves.

Hence, socialism as a political ideology aims at :

- (i) a criticism of the existing society.
- (ii) a philosophy of social evolution.
- (iii) a social forecast or ideal.
- (iv) the attainment of the ideal.

In other words, every socialist has to consider the above four points while giving his philosophy of socialism. Thus, we see that the aim of socialism is to establish social justice by means of social ownership of all the sources of wealth so as to secure a more equitable distribution of the means and appliances of happiness.

17.2.1 Meaning of the term "Socialism"

The term "socialism" is derived from the word "socius" which means society. Socialism is concerned with society and it is the justice of the capitalist system that has

inspired it. It is a reaction against the social and economic anarchy that the capitalist system has produced. It is a revolt against the exploitation of man by man and of child in field, factory, mine and workshop. It is a protest against the building of an economic and social system on the incentive of profit, not service. It is a challenge to competition which has degraded the working man and his family, starved many to keep a few in luxury, divided society into two classes—haves and have nots—and dragged mankind into perpetual conflicts and war.

In a nutshell, socialism aims at establishing social justice.

17.2.2 Definition of "Socialism"

It is difficult to define the term "socialism". Regarding the difficulty of defining socialism, Ramsay Muir says, "It is a chameleon like creed. It changes its colour according to its environment." Similarly Joad writes, "Socialism is like a hat that has lost its shape because everybody wears it."

This difficulty arises due to the fact that the term "socialism" is used to denote both political movement and a body of doctrines—economic and political. Socialism is also used for a particular set up and a way of life.

Socialism has been variously defined as :

(i) Encyclopedia Britannica — Socialism is that policy or theory which aims at securing by the action of the central democratic authority a better distribution and in due subordination a better production of wealth than now prevails.

(ii) Laski — "It implies such a control of the production and distribution of wealth as will enable the average citizens to have access to the resources, material and spiritual, which will enable him at least potentially to be at his best."

(iii) Dr. A Appadorai — "Socialism may be defined as a theory and movement aiming at the collective organization of the community in the interests of the mass of the people through the common ownership and collective control of the means of production and exchange."

17.2.3 Main features of Socialism

All socialists, irrespective of their alignment with any school of socialism, accept the following features :

(i) Socialism puts more emphasis on society than on individuals. It aims at the collective organisation of the community in the interests of the mass of people.

(ii) Socialism stands for the elimination of capitalism which is based on profit-making.

(iii) Socialism seeks to eliminate unhealthy and anti-social forms of competition for the sake of mere profit.

(iv) Socialism advocates virtual economic equality to all. According to its advocates, socialism envisages a social system in which no one is so much richer and poorer than his neighbours as to be unable to mix with them on equal terms.

(v) It advocates abolition of private enterprise and private property.

(vi) It advocates public control of the means of production the common ownership and use of all the vital instruments of production.

(vii) Socialist regime seeks to create a good character and a better standard of values. It puts an obligation upon all citizens to serve one another according to their capacities.

Thus, the socialist challenge to the existing order is primarily moral, though its basis is economic. It is concerned with creating a good social atmosphere by putting an end to the social and economic anarchy which the capitalist system has produced.

17.2.4 Development of Socialism and its Exponents

The Socialists were all agreed on the above point. But on the most important points of detail they differ greatly. They differ as to the form society will take in carrying out the socialist programme, as to the relation of regional and local governments to the central government, and whether there is to be any central government or any government at all. They are also sharply divided on the methods of achieving socialism. Some expect it to come suddenly and completely with a catastrophic revolution, while others expect it to come slowly and gradually through the existing parliamentary institutions. The result is that there have emerged many schools of socialism and each school has its own distinct philosophy.

Saint Simon, Charles Fourier, Robert Owen and others have been termed as Utopian socialists or 'Utopianists' in the Communist Manifesto whereas Marx and Engels regard themselves as "Scientific Socialists."

Utopian Socialism — The seeds of socialistic ideas can first of all be traced to Plato's Republic where he speaks of the abolition of private property of the ruling class. During the middle ages there existed the system of collective property of the church. For starting socialism in England the credit goes to Robert Owen. Robert Owen had grown up in the midst of the industrial revolution and he was deeply conscious of the enormous abuses of the factory system. His dream was to release the individual from the repressions and perversions of a competitive society and the creation of a society that would make an end of crime, poverty and injustice, a society in which the good in human nature could flower in full perfection.

In France, socialistic ideas were conceived by St. Simon. Saint Simon had before him the history of the evil abuses of an idle and privileged feudalism. Revolution had not shaken feudalism in France. What he exactly desired was an industrialist state. The men who were best fitted to organise society for productive labour should rule in it, his aim was the substitution of feudal aristocracy by a working aristocracy of merit.

Charles Fourier was also a French Socialist who held that to promote social happiness, society should be reorganised into independent groups and the individuals should work for pleasure and not for profit.

Due to lack of reality, utopian socialism declined when Karl Marx and Engels preached their philosophy.

Scientific Socialism — The greatest and the most influential name in the history of Socialism is unquestionably Karl Marx. He and his celebrated companion Friedrich Engels are the acknowledged heads of the scientific and revolutionary school of socialism. They condemned the capitalistic society and enunciated the philosophy of socialism for a working man's movement.

Karl Marx's thesis of Socialism is found in the "Communist Manifesto" published in early 1848 and in the three volumes of Das Kapital or "Capital" known as the Bible of the socialists.

The most important of Marx's doctrines may be reduced to three —

- (1) the materialistic conception of history.
- (2) the law of the concentration of capital.
- (3) the class-war.

Marx emphasized that the capitalists who mercilessly exploit the proletariat should be crushed through revolution and there should be socialism of the means of production. This can be achieved only under a socialist society where collective capital will replace private capital, both capitalists and wage-earners disappear, and all persons become cooperating producers.

17.2.5 Merits of Socialism

The following are the merits of socialism —

(i) Upholds the Dignity of Human Personality — Socialism believes in the dignity of human personality and stands for liberty, equality and allows individuals to exercise their talents and enjoy all kinds of rights.

(ii) Upholds Social Good — Socialism puts society above the individual and considers the goods of all or the community as a whole as something superior or more good of the individual.

(iii) Eliminates Evils of Capitalism — Socialism eliminates the evils of capitalism like under-exploitation of the workers, economic inequality, concentration of wealth in the hands of a few, over-production, etc. The socialists propose that land and capital should be placed under social ownership in order to secure a more equitable distribution of the means and appliances of happiness.

(iv) Property as Agency of Service — Socialism eliminates the tyranny or misuse of private property or private enterprises. It advocates public ownership of property.

(v) Socialism is more democratic than capitalism — Socialism advocates economic equality, social justice, liberty and freedom to the individuals which is not present in capitalism.

(vi) More Natural — Socialists claim that socialism is more natural because nature has distributed air, water, light, etc. among all people without any discrimination. Therefore, there should be social control over land and natural resources.

(vii) More Scientific — It is more scientific because it safeguards the interest of the society as a whole and urges the individual to devote himself to the service of community.

(viii) Its character is moral — The socialist challenge to the existing order is primarily moral, though its basis is economic. It puts an obligation upon all citizens to serve one another according to their capacities. Socialism aims at the establishment of social justice.

17.2.6 Demerits of Socialism

The following are the demerits of socialism :

(1) Stepping stone to totalitarianism — According to critics, in the name of socialism, excessive power may be put in the hand of the government or the bureaucracy.

(2) Little incentive to produce or kills individual initiative — As the means of production come under social control the individual initiative to produce gradually decreases.

(3) Inefficiency — Under the socialist structure, the functions of the state would be so much enlarged that it would not be possible for it to discharge those enormous functions efficiently.

(4) Red Tapism and Corruption — As the state undertakes to do what private enterprises generally do, a wide scope for red-tapism and bribery is created.

(5) Socialism will fail in practice — In practice it is very difficult to achieve social justice for all. To accomplish economic equality by common ownership of land and property, to establish peace in society, is not as easy as the socialists believe.

(6) Socialism divides society into two classes — Socialists have divided the society into two classes—the capitalists and workers, the haves and the have-nots. In such a situation we can never think of unity being established between the capitalists and the workers because of their conflicting interests.

(7) Degeneration of character — Due to interference of the states in all the matters of individual interest, the individual freedom is curtailed, leading to degeneration of character. It puts a restriction on individual freedom and deterioration of individual character.

(8) Hardship to consumers — The consumers will have to face hardships under socialism as he will have to adjust his needs to the production and he may be called upon to undergo great hardship and privation.

Thus, we see that socialism suffers from some important drawbacks.

17.2.7 Conclusion

We have seen the merits well as the demerits of socialism. We have seen how under socialism, there will be collective ownership and collective management. Careful planning under socialism will avoid duplication, over-production, unnecessary advertisement and the production of harmful goods. The socialistic ideal aims at the cultivation of a desire for social usefulness and care for others. Collective ownership and collective management, it is claimed, is thoroughly democratic. According to its supporters, socialism is the next step to democracy.

But socialism, it is said, is not conducive to individual progress. The incentive to labour will be destroyed. Socialism will mean a restriction of individual freedom and a deterioration of individual character. Herbert Spencer believes that each member of the community as an individual would be a slave of the community as a whole. Socialism would repress individuality. Genius would be satisfied and citizens would become lethargic. Individual responsibility would be sapped by bureaucracy and departmentalism would become supreme. Besides, socialism is impractical and is very difficult to apply in practice.

Though socialism may be bitterly criticised on account of its drawbacks or its impracticability, as a philosophy it is of a high order. Socialism aims at the welfare and prosperity of "all the people", and so if properly applied, it will change the whole pattern of society ensuring food, peace and security for all. Many of the drawbacks of socialism can be removed. It is definitely better than capitalism and individualism. Today, socialism is to be seen in many parts of the world in one form or other, for instance, in Russia, China, Yugoslavia, Poland, Finland, Romania, Hungary, etc.

17.3 Summary

Socialism regards the society or the state as a positive good. Under socialism there would be common ownership of the means of production and exchange and wages would be according to needs. The ideal of the socialists is, whatever their variety, to remove poverty and privileges, vice and crime and other social evils from which society suffers today, and to establish a new social and economic order where there will exist equal opportunities for all to develop the best in them.

The advocates of socialism are numerous. They have formed their own school and each school has its own distinct philosophy, carries a separate name. But all agree on the socialistic ideal as is propounded by G. D. H. Cole when he says, "Socialism means four closely connected things : a human fellowship which denies and expels distinction of class, a social system in which no one is so much richer and poorer than his neighbours so as to be unable to mix with them on equal terms; the common ownership and use of all the vital instruments of production, and an obligation upon all citizens to serve one another according to their capacities.

Socialism, thus, aims at establishing social justice.

17.4 Key words used in the Lesson

Socialism, Social justice, Political ideology, social reconstruction, collective organisation, common ownership, collective control, economic equality, public control, social and economic anarchy, proletariat, dignity of human personality, private enterprise, concentration of wealth, totalitarianism, bureaucracy, social control, individual freedom, red-tapism, individual incentive, individualism, state-interference.

17.5 Questions for Exercise

(a) Objective questions

1. The aim of socialism is

- (a) equal distribution of wealth
- (b) equal distribution of property
- (c) common ownership of the means of production and economic equality to all
- (d) none

Ans. — (c)

2. The propounders of scientific socialism are :

- (a) Saint Simon and Charles Fourier
- (b) Karl Marx and Engels

(c) Robert Owen and others

(d) None

Ans. — (b)

(b) Short Answer Questions

1. Discuss the meaning and definition of socialism.

Ans. — See 17.2.1 and 17.2.2

2. Discuss the various types of socialism

Ans. — See 17.2.4

(c) Long Answer Questions

1. Discuss critically socialism as a political ideology.

2. What are the salient features of socialism ? Discuss critically.

17.6 Suggested Readings

- | | | |
|-----------------------|---|--|
| 1. A. C. Kapur | : | Principles of Political Science |
| 2. K. K. Mishra (Ed.) | : | Political Theory by Eddy Asirvatham |
| 3. M. P. Jain | : | Political Theory |



Political Ideology : Marxism and Communism

Lesson Structure

- 18.1 Objective
- 18.2 Introduction
- 18.3 Basic Principles of Marxism and Communism
 - 18.3.1 Meaning of the term "Marxism"
 - 18.3.2 Basic Principles of Marxism
 - 18.3.3 Development of Marxism
 - 18.3.4 Merits of Marxism
 - 18.3.5 Demerits of Marxism
 - 18.3.6 Meaning of the term "Communism"
 - 18.3.7 Basic Principles of Communism
 - 18.3.8 Shortcomings of Communism
 - 18.3.9 Conclusion
- 18.4 Summary
- 18.5 Key words used in the Lesson
- 18.6 Questions for Exercise
 - (a) Objective Questions
 - (b) Short Answer Questions
 - (c) Long Answer Questions
- 18.7 Suggested Readings

18.1 Objective

Marxism and Communism have immense importance in the history of social and political philosophy. They are the political ideologies which have set up norms or ideal standards for the society and government. Hence, our main objective is to know the basic principles of Marxism and Communism. With this aim, we shall see the basic

principles of Marxism, its development, merits and demerits. Then, we shall study the meaning and definition of communism. We shall enumerate the basic principles of communism and discuss its supporters. We shall examine the shortcomings or drawbacks in communism. Finally, there will be a critical examination of the theories of Marxism and Communism.

18.2 Introduction

The greatest and the most influential name in the history of socialism is unquestionably of Karl Marx. Modern socialism and communism stem from the same source, that is, Karl Marx who lived from 1818 to 1883. In his lifetime Marx was regarded as the unquestioned leader of the European working class movements. Even today he is considered to be the father of modern socialism. Together with Engels he published "The Manifesto of the Communist Party" in 1848. His monumental work "Das Kapital" (Capital) was published in 1867.

The important influences of Marx's thought were those of Hegel and Feurbach (1804-72). From Hegel he borrowed the idea of the dialectics, which means that progress comes about as a result of an interaction between opposites. From Feurbach, Marx learned that it is not God who creates man but it is man who creates God. In his own words, "Man makes religion; religion does not make man." Religion, he said, is "the opium of the people". According to Marx, God exists only in man's mind.

In this way, marxism as well as communism draws its inspiration from Karl Marx. Marx's communist ideas were interpreted and developed in Russia by Lenin and Stalin and in China by Mao-Tse-Tung.

18.3 Basic Principles of Marxism and Communism

Marxism and communism are an answer to the inherent evils of capitalism which have become more and more apparent in recent times. It is the nemesis of capitalism, the chief features of which are private ownership of the means of production, private enterprise and private profit. Under capitalist system goods are produced not for use, but for profit.

The development of capitalism and industries based on capitalistic mode of production gave birth to a new class— the working class.

Marxism and communism wanted a socialist system with public ownership of the means of production. Marx said that in the long run a classless society will emerge where production will be publicly owned, wealth and property will be abolished and exploitation of the working class will cease.

Thus, the basic principles of Marxism and Communism are the destruction of the capitalist system, establishment of a classless society, collective ownership and a complete control over the economic system.

18. 3.1 Meaning of the term "Marxism"

Marxism is the political ideology given by Karl Marx. Marxism is also known as scientific socialism or communism. As distinguished from the Utopian socialism of Simon, Charles Fourier and Robert Owen, Marx made socialism scientific by establishing a close relationship between it and the dominant scientific theories of the age showing it to be the necessary result of the laws of economics and history.

According to the "Communist Manifesto", Marxism stands as a theory of social reconstruction. As a revolutionary programme or movement, Marxism is an analysis of the struggle, nemesis of capitalism, emergence of proletariat dictatorship and the final establishment of a classless society. In the contemporary world, Marxism stands as a scientific philosophy, revolutionary programme progressive movement of socio-economic and political change. Besides, being a theory, Marxism directs the revolutionary movement to put an end to exploitation and oppression of the proletariat by the capitalists. From whatever aspect, it is to be regarded, the work of Karl Marx is an epoch in the history of social and political philosophy.

18.3.2 Basic Principles of Marxism

1. Dialectical Materialism—The starting point of Marxism is the Hegelian dialectics. To state dialectics in simple language, human progress is made by means of contradictions. It is in the form of thesis, antithesis and synthesis. With dialectics as his starting point, Marx together with the influence of Feurbach developed the theory of dialectical materialism. Dialectics is used by Marx to explain the dynamic growth of human society. For Marx, thesis is capitalism, antithesis the conflict between the capitalists and the proletariat and synthesis is the final stage of classless society.

2. Economic or Materialistic Interpretation of History—According to Marx, progress is dialectical, but its nature is materialistic. He said that history is to be interpreted purely in materialistic terms and not in terms of God, purpose or design.

According to this theory, the real forces that control historical development in all its phases is the material or economic condition of life, especially production. On this basis Marx divides human history in six parts—

- (i) Primitive Communism— common ownership of land as well as handicrafts.
- (ii) Slavery — Private ownership of property and division of labour.
- (iii) Feudalism— society divided into clases (landowners and labourers)
- (iv) Capitalist society—Feudalism gave way to capitalism.

(v) Dictatorship of the Proletariat class—Destruction of capitalism and victory of the proletariats.

(vi) Communist Age—Public ownership of the means of production.

3. The Dynamics of Marx about Social Change—Like Hegel, Marx believed in the inevitable march of man. He said that only a socialist system with public ownership of the means of production can bring into existence a new system of social and economic relations.

4. Marxian analysis of Capitalist order—Marx says that in a capitalist system over-production leads to a crisis and the painful middle class gradually sinks into the proletariat class of waged slavery.

5. The Law of the Concentration of Capital—Marx predicted that as a result of monopolization of rationalization of industry the number of businessmen and capitalists diminishes and capital comes to be concentrated in the hands of few capitalists.

6. The Doctrine of surplus value—According to Marx, labour creates all values, and whatever is left after paying for raw materials and a subsistence wage to the labourer goes into the pocket of the capitalist in the form of profit, rent and interest. This surplus is used by the capitalist to acquire greater quantities of surplus value by expanding production.

Surplus value is 'concealed labour' or 'labour not paid for.' According to Marx, the labourer is not given sufficient wage and the surplus value or profit which should have gone to the labourer is enjoyed by the capitalists.

7. The Doctrine of class war—Marx says, "The history of hitherto existing society is the history of class war. Capitalism contains within itself the seeds of its own decay. Marx pictures human life as a grim struggle between the capitalists and the wage earners.

8. Revolution Inevitable—Marx said, "Force is the mid-wife of every old society pregnant with a new one." He further says, "The proletarians have nothing to lose but their chains. They have a world to win. Working men of all countries unite."

9. Dictatorship of the Proletariat—When this revolution takes place and upper classes and the rich peasants are eliminated there would be a dictatorship of the proletariat. They would capture the army and the rest of the machinery of the state in order to destroy the state and the capitalist system. The ideal of the proletariat statehood will be "..... from each according to his capacity to each according to the need."

10. The Communist stage of classless society—Marx says that in the long run a classless society will emerge where production will be publicly owned, wealth and property stands and exploitation will cease.

11. The withering away of the state—When the perfect classless society is established the state will gradually wither or fade.

12. Disappearance of the Family, Religion etc.—According to Marxist theory, since private family and private property came together they are bound to disappear together. With the disappearance of the family, private property will also disappear. Marx says that beneath the cover of religion, companies, banks, trusts, empires, etc. keep on exploiting the working class. So religion is used as the "opium of the people."

The above principles are the basic tenets of Marxism.

18.3.3 Development of Marxism

The history of the development of Marxism has its own importance. It is said that philosophies are not wild plants growing in the minds of philosophers. The development of capitalism and industries based on capitalistic mode of production gave birth to a new class—the working class. The Industrial Revolution in Britain and the French Revolution prepared the ground for the socialist thought of More, Simon, Robert Owen, etc. Noting the failure of utopian socialism, Marx influenced by the French Enlightenment, English economists, Hegelian Dialectics, Feurbach's materialism and utopian socialism, gave the theory of "scientific socialism."

Thus, "scientific socialism" of Marx came to be known as Marxism. Karl Marx and his friend collaborator, Friedrich Engels, thesis on socialism is found in the "Communist Manifesto" and the three volumes of "Das Kapital" known as the Bible of the Socialists. We have already discussed the main principles of Marxism. Let us see its merits.

18.3.4 Merits of Marxism

The following are the merits of Marxism :

1. A tremendous force—Karl Marx's philosophy had a tremendous effect over millions of people.

2. Hope to workers—At a time when workers were being mercilessly exploited by the capitalists and were in dire need of a leader, Marx gave a clarion call to the workers of the world to unite against their exploiters. This gave to the workers a new ray of hope.

3. Clear-cut theory—Marx provided a clear-cut theory which could not be given by leaders of democratic socialism. His theory caught the imagination of workers particularly in countries where capitalists exploited the have-nots.

4. Terror to exploiters—Marxism by its tremendous appeal and enlightening of the workers became a terror capitalism.

5. Practical—Marxism is not a theory; there is an equal emphasis on practice. Marxism does not merely present the interpretation of society but it is a revolutionary

message. Marx chalked out a revolutionary programme by which the workers could win over their exploiters.

But in spite of these merits, Marxism has some shortcomings too.

18.3.5 Demerits of Marxism

1. Non-economic factors ignored—It is wrong to assume that the economic factor is the only factor in man's life or in the interpretation of history. According to critics, Marxian approach to history is very narrow as it exaggerates the economic factor in man's life and ignores other factors like the spiritual, psychological, geographical, etc.

2. Marxism is too abstract and doctrinaire—It is a rapid generalization on the basis of slender evidence. Several of Marx's predictions, such as the poor becoming poorer and poorer, have not come true. On the contrary, their condition has improved today due to the establishment of a welfare state.

3. State is not withering away—Marxism is mistaken in assuming "the withering away of the state." As a matter of fact, the communist states of today are daily increasing in power and authority.

4. Class-war concept misleading—Marx is wrong in giving undue prominence to class war. A classless society brought about by strife and annihilation of the opposite group is not worth the trouble.

5. Surplus value wrong—Marx flatters the workers wrongly by teaching them about surplus value. He completely ignores other factors of production like capital, machinery, etc.

6. Marxism unpeaceful—Marxism advocates revolution. He believes in overthrowing the existing government by conspiracy, sabotage and violence. It is wrong to assume that important changes are accomplished by force.

7. Marxism fails to take into account the forces of nationalism and even racialism—World War I and World War II have proved conclusively that the working men of the world do not all unite together in putting down wars which are largely capitalistic in character.

8. Marx's theory of classless society is like a utopian dream—It is not possible to think of a classless society as Marx felt.

9. Injustice to Religion—Instead of criticising those who have put religion to wrong use, Marx has criticised religion saying that it is the opium of the people.

10. Gospel of hatred—Through his principles of dialectical materialism, historical materialism and class war, Marx generates hatred and fanaticism.