

**Institute of Distance and Open Learning
Gauhati University**

**MA in Political Science
(2nd Semester)**

**Paper V
Political Theory II**

**Block 1
Classical Ideas**



Contents:

Block Introduction–

Unit 1 : Liberty and Equality

Unit 2 : Justice

Unit 3 : Democracy

Unit 4 : State and Citizenship

Contributors:

Barnalee Choudhury (Units 1 & 2)	Lecturer in Political Science IDOL, GU
Chayanika Sarma (Units 3 & half of 4)	Guest Lecturer in Political Science IDOL, GU
Dipankar Saikia (Half of unit 4)	Guest Lecturer in Political Science IDOL, GU

Course Co-ordination

Dr. Kandarpa Das	:	Director IDOL, GU
Barnalee Choudhury	:	Lecturer in Political Science IDOL, GU

Editorial Team

Content Editing	:	Dr. Subhrajee Konwar Senior Lecturer, Dept. of Political Science Gauhati University
	:	Barnalee Choudhury Lecturer in Political Science IDOL, GU
Format Editing	:	Dipankar Saikia Guest Lecturer in Political Science IDOL, GU
Language Editing	:	Shanghamitra De Guest Lecturer in English IDOL, GU

Cover Page Designing:

Kaushik Sarma	:	Graphic Designer CET, IITG
---------------	---	-------------------------------

January, 2011

© Institute of Distance and Open Learning, Gauhati University. All rights reserved. No part of this work may be reproduced in any form, by mimeograph or any other means, without permission in writing from the Institute of Distance and Open Learning, Gauhati University. Further information about the Institute of Distance and Open Learning, Gauhati University courses may be obtained from the University's office at IDOL Building, Gauhati University, Guwahati-14. Published on behalf of the Institute of Distance and Open Learning, Gauhati University by Dr. Kandarpa Das, Director and printed at Maliyata Offset Press, Mirza. Copies printed 1000.

Acknowledgement

The Institute of Distance and Open Learning, Gauhati University duly acknowledges the financial assistance from the Distance Education Council, IGNOU, New Delhi for preparation of this material.

Block Introduction:

In this block we are going to discuss the classical ideas like liberty, equality, justice, democracy, state and citizenship. These ideas are not the passive reflection of vested interests but inspire and guide political action as well as influence material life. People do not see the world as it really is, but only as they expect it to be. Whether consciously or unconsciously, everyone subscribes to a set of beliefs and values to guide their behaviour and influence their conduct. These ideas are invoked in order to justify or denounce a particular way of social, economic or political organization. The idea of liberty has inspired many revolutionary struggles against despotism and foreign regimes. Liberty is the chief driving force in the great events like the War of American independence and the French revolution. Without liberty, the individual loses his potentiality to develop his personality. Therefore, liberty has a sacrosanct value which must be protected at any cost. It is significant that the struggle for liberty is always accompanied by the philosophy of equality. For instance, when the oppressed sections rise against their oppressors, they basically demand equality by challenging the superiority of their oppressors. The principle of liberty implies 'equal' liberty or freedom for everyone. In the contemporary world, the concept of equality rests on the guarantee of equality in status and opportunities, equality in the eye of laws, equal treatment under equal circumstances. The concept of justice is equally important as justice is concerned with the allocation of benefits as well as burdens. Liberty is the first condition of justice and bondage has always been regarded as unjust. When the Americans revolted against the British government in the last quarter of the 18th century, their revolt was considered to be just. The struggle for equality starts when there is a feeling that the prevailing inequality is unjust and based on exploitation. Democracy is an ideal social system founded on discipline and individual liberty and aims at the fullest development of the individual talents and qualities by safeguarding individual liberties and rights. Democracy is based on the principle of political equality which in turn is based on economic and social equality. Without socio-economic equality, there can be no democracy and without democracy there can be no liberty. In a democratic state, an individual needs both liberty and equality because equality without liberty has little value and without equality, liberty cannot have a proper basis. The concept of the state has emerged as the central theme of traditional political

theory. The state is a social institution which evolves according to the socio-economic condition of society. Membership of state is one of the important elements of citizenship.

In the first unit of this block we are going to deal with the concept of liberty and equality. Liberty is the condition in which an individual has the right to behave according to one's own personal responsibility and free will. Liberty and equality, taken together, describe the condition of human emancipation.

The second unit of this block deals with the idea of justice. Justice denotes the quality of being just, right or reasonable. The traditional concept of justice focused on the 'just man'. The modern idea of justice is applied to various aspects of social life which resulted in the legal, political and socio-economic notions of justice.

The third unit emphasizes the concept of democracy. Democracy generally means the government by the majority people. As a concept it has originated in ancient Greece. Democracy in ancient Greece was direct participatory in the sense that people directly took part in the affairs of the state. There is another type of democracy called the liberal democracy based on free and fair election. It is a kind of representative democracy.

The fourth unit of this block mainly deals with the ideas like state and citizenship. In this unit we shall discuss the concept of state as a political association. The unit is an attempt to explore the ideas regarding the origin of the state. The unit also deals with the concept like citizenship which is the major elements for a state. In other words we can say that the unit examines the state and its various components.

The block consists of the following four units—

Unit 1: Liberty and Equality

Unit 2: Justice

Unit 3: Democracy

Unit 4: State and Citizenship

Unit 1

Liberty and Equality

Contents:

- 1.1 Introduction**
- 1.2 Objectives**
- 1.3 Meaning and Definition of Liberty**
- 1.4 Evolution of the Concept of Liberty**
- 1.5 Types of Liberty**
- 1.6 Negative and Positive Liberty**
- 1.7 Meaning and Evolution of the Concept of Equality**
- 1.8 Types of Equality**
- 1.9 Relationships between Liberty and Equality**
- 1.10 Summing Up**
- 1.11 References and Suggested Readings**

1.1 Introduction

Liberty and equality discussed by different political thinkers are important concepts in Political Science. The significance of liberty and equality is central to the study of Political Science because human history can be seen as the struggle to establish equality and enjoy liberty. This unit makes an attempt to introduce you to the concepts of liberty and equality. Liberty stands for freedom of the individuals in a society which is required to lead a dignified human life. Moreover, it helps you to understand the evolution of both the concepts and different types of liberty and equality. This unit also focuses on positive and negative liberty and the relationship between liberty and equality.

1.2 Objectives

As stated, the concepts of liberty and equality enabling an individual to enjoy a free and dignified life in the social sphere are central to human society. After

reading this unit you will be able to

- *define* liberty and equality
- *discuss* the evolution of the concepts of liberty and equality
- *explain* various types of liberty and equality
- *trace* the relationship between liberty and equality

1.3 Meaning and Definition of Liberty

It is already known to you that the concept of liberty occupies a significant position in Political Science. Liberty is defined by different political thinkers. J.S. Mill defines liberty as protection against the tyranny of political rules. The term 'liberty' is derived from the Latin word Liber which means free. Hence, we can say that liberty cannot be regarded as only a philosophical or legal concept; rather it is a necessity of every individual to lead a dignified life in the society.

As has been mentioned earlier, many political thinkers in different ages have dealt with the concept of liberty. Gilchrist holds the view that, "everyone has a vague notion of liberty of some kind and a desire for it, but among ten people using the word, perhaps no two will be able to say exactly what they mean, or, if they do say it, will agree with each other in their definition." (*Principles of Political Science* 1961: 119). G. D. H Cole defines liberty as the freedom of the individual to express without external hindrances to personality. According to Laski, liberty is the absence of restraint upon the existence of those social conditions which in modern civilizations are the necessary guarantees of individual happiness. He further believes that liberty is the eager maintenance of that atmosphere in which men have the opportunity to be their best selves. He also believes that there is a very close relationship between rights and liberties. Laski refuses the idea that liberty is the absence of restraints. According to him, liberty can be classified in three parts: private, political and economic. Private liberty stands for freedom in those areas which mainly affects the concerned individual. Political liberty is the power to be active in the affairs of the state.

F. A. Hayek has used the term 'liberty' and 'freedom' interchangeably. According to him a man enjoys liberty or freedom when he is subject to coercion by the arbitrary will of another. He differentiates individual freedom from 'political freedom', 'inner freedom' and 'freedom as power'. He further

believes that political freedom denotes participation of men in the choice of their government, in the process of legislation and administration. Inner freedom denotes the extent to which a person is guided in his actions by his own considered will rather than circumstance, while freedom as power stands for the power to satisfy our wishes. Hence, we can say that Hayek identifies freedom as 'freedom from constraints of the state'. He believes that individuals have different capacities, skills and abilities which result in inequalities. He further opines that if individuals are treated equally in such a circumstance, it will lead to material inequality. According to him, everybody in the society should enjoy freedom, if not equally, at least to some extent.

From the above discussions it can be said that there are three requisites of liberty. They are----- harmonious balance of personality, absence of restraint and organizational opportunities for the exercise of a continuous initiative. In modern time, liberty cannot be understood as unlimited or unrestraint freedom. Liberty within the state is a relative and regulated liberty. A state has to take into consideration the fact that each individual is entitled to enjoy liberty which cannot be curtailed by one's absolute freedom. At the same time, regulation of liberty implies the recognition of authority of the state over the individual. Because of this, there is always conflict between liberty and authority. Many thinkers are of the view that absolute liberty is harmful for the individuals. Likewise, absolute authority of the state is also harmful for the society. One man's liberty is restricted by the liberty of another individual in the society. In the negative way, one man's liberty should not become an obstruction in the enjoyment of liberty by others.

Stop to Consider

Liberty and Authority

Liberty and authority are two closely connected concepts of modern society. Though liberty stands for freedom, it does not guarantee unlimited freedom. Liberty of the individuals has to be restricted by a measure of equal liberty to be enjoyed by others. In other words, a person's liberty should not be obstructed by the enjoyment of liberty by another person. For example, a driver's freedom to drive at any speed in any direction at his own whim would endanger the life and liberty of all the users of the road. Therefore, it is necessary to regulate freedom in such a way that none shall use his freedom so as to destroy the freedom of others. Earnest Barker is of the view that, 'the need of liberty for each is necessarily

qualified and conditioned by the need of liberty for all'. He further opines that, 'the liberty of the owner of capital to determine the conditions of work in the factory which he owns is a relative liberty which must be adjusted to the liberty of the worker to do his work under such conditions as leave him still a free agent and give him also a share in the determination of the conditions of work'. Thus, liberty is regulated by authority in the modern society.

1.4 Evolution of the Concept of Liberty

Before discussing the evolution of the concept of liberty, it is pertinent to mention here that the concept of liberty as we understand today was absent in the earlier period. This concept has evolved through various stages and many political thinkers have contributed towards shaping the concept of liberty. Greek philosopher Plato refused the idea of liberty which gives the individual the right to go against the state. The medieval period marked by the ideas of salvation and freedom of soul did not advocate for the liberty emphasized in the modern period.

While tracing the history of the struggle for liberty, it is found that struggle for liberty started in the seventeenth century Europe during the period of Industrial Revolution. During this period, liberty was mainly perceived in the negative sense. We all know that industrial revolution is responsible for the major changes in the economic sphere in Europe as it paved the way for the establishment of capitalism by replacing feudalism. During the period of Industrial Revolution, it was believed that 'everyone knows his interest best' and therefore the state should not interfere in deciding the ends and purposes of the individuals. Hence, the champions of negative liberty believed in the individual choices of resources and techniques as well as the choice of parties to deal with in their transactions.

Renaissance opened up a new phase in the history of political thought. After renaissance, liberty assumed a different dimension and people started viewing it in a multidimensional way. Renaissance has particularly emphasized negative liberty which believes in the absence of restraints by the state.

The early liberals who stood for liberty in all spheres insisted that the law must enforce all contracts. Since every individual is the best judge of his own interest, he can decide before entering any contract. Such a belief gave rise to the notion of negative liberty which stood for 'a free market

society'. It is further believed that the individuals can develop their best in a free atmosphere without restriction. In this way, during the period of Industrial Revolution liberty was examined mainly from economic perspective emphasizing freedom of trade, freedom of enterprise, freedom of contract etc. It also viewed state as a necessary evil which was required not to interfere with the natural liberty of men. The main function of the state according to the advocates of negative liberty is to maintain the liberty of the individuals by protecting their life and property from the onslaught of other individuals. Initially, Mill was a supporter of laissez faire individualism, but later he realized the weaknesses of this theory and tried to modify it. He strongly believed that the working classes were deprived of their due share in a capitalist economy guided by laissez faire. It led to the emergence of the concept of positive liberty. While discussing liberty of the individuals and the functions of the state, Mill draws a distinction between the two types of actions of men. They are----- (a). self-regarding actions where the effect is confined to the individual himself (b). other regarding actions which affect others. According to Mill, an individual freedom for his conduct in terms of self-regarding actions while the community enjoys the right to coerce the individual if his conduct is prejudiced and affects welfare in terms of other-regarding actions.

In the modern period, positive liberty is considered as an essential complement of negative liberty. However, many of the political thinkers still emphasize negative liberty. Isaiah Berlin, F.A. Hayek, Milton Friedman are some of the prominent scholars who emphasize the importance of negative liberty. Berlin in his book Two Concepts of Liberty, distinguishes between positive and negative liberty.

SAQ:

Define liberty. Do you think 'liberty' and 'freedom' can be used interchangeably. (20+60 words)

.....
.....
.....
.....
.....

1.5 Types of Liberty

Already you have learnt that after a prolonged process of evolution liberty gets its present status which stands for the freedom of the individuals. In this context it is worth mentioning here that liberty does not mean ultimate freedom. We can enjoy liberty under the norms of the concerned state. Since the inception of the concept, scholars are trying to categorize liberty. On the basis of that we can point out the following types of liberty.

- ***Natural Liberty:*** Natural liberty refers to the kind of liberty which believes that man is by nature free. However, with the emergence of civilization, men have become subject to some kind of bondage in the society. Rousseau is the main advocator of natural liberty. According to him, 'Man is born free but everywhere he is in chains.' Thus, natural liberty stands for the freedom of the individuals they enjoy naturally.
- ***Personal Liberty:*** Every individual likes to enjoy some kind of personal freedom. Mill is an advocate of personal freedom and he believes that the individuals should be free to experiment with his life as long as his actions do not affect others. Like Mill Rousseau also supports personal liberty and opines that, to renounce liberty is to renounce being a man, to surrender the rights of humanity and even its duties.
- ***National Liberty:*** National liberty stands for freedom from the control of foreign nations which in turn helps to ensure other types of liberties in the fullest sense. Therefore liberty can be understood in terms of national independence also.
- ***Constitutional Liberty:*** Liberty is also understood as the establishment of democracy or popular government. In this sense liberty refers to the government elected and responsible to the common masses. This form of liberty is known as 'Constitutional Liberty'.
- ***Civil Liberty:*** It stands for liberty in the social life. Thus civil liberty is comprehensive as it includes various rights and privileges guaranteed by the state like freedom of the person, equality before law, security of private property, freedom of opinion and expression and freedom of conscience. Civil liberty safeguards the individuals in the society against the encroachment of their rights. J. S Mill who is considered

as the ardent supporter of liberty emphasized on the freedom of thought of thought and belief in his famous work *On Liberty*. Civil liberty, according to Barker, is the liberty of man in the capacity of an individual person i.e. his personal liberty.

As expressed in three somewhat differently expressed articles it includes - physical freedom from injury or threat to the life, health, and movement of the body; intellectual freedom for the expression of thought and belief; and practical freedom of the play of will and the exercise of choice in the general field of contractual action and relations with other persons (*Principles of Social and Political Theory*, Pp. 146-47).

- ***Political Liberty:*** Political liberty gives the individuals an opportunity to take part in the administration of the state. Here it can be said that while a man enjoys civil liberty as a member of the society, he enjoys political liberty as a citizen of the political community. Barker has viewed political liberty as a liberty of constituting and controlling government by a general act of choice or election in which we all freely share on the basis of universal suffrage; controlling it by a general and continuous process of discussion in which we all freely share according to our capacities. (*Principles of Social and Political Theory*, pp.147). Therefore, it can be concluded here that political liberty stands for the rights like the right of franchise and the right to stand for public offices. Thus, it gives the people the right to be represented in decision-making bodies. It also gives the citizens the right to influence the decisions by articulating their views and opinions. However, it is worth mentioning here that mere inclusion of political liberty does not necessarily result in the enjoyment of liberty by the citizens. Because, it is experienced that though the law of a country guarantees political liberty to its citizens, sometimes money power, muscle power and other manipulative powers play important role in influencing political decisions. Hence, we can say that political liberty cannot guarantee total freedom to the individuals in the society.
- ***Economic Liberty:*** Economic liberty ensures just reward or payment to the workers. It also stands for the system which allows the individual to produce these things he is capable of and are required by the society. Economic liberty considers man as a worker either as

manual or a worker using brain, engaged in some gainful occupation or service. Barker is of the view that economic liberty is included in civil liberty. However, it has been observed that economic liberty has been interpreted in different ways by employers and workers. Therefore, it is necessary to protect the weaker group from the domination of the stronger and create the environment for enjoying economic liberty in the society. This liberty of the individuals emphasizes minimizing the economic inequalities.

- **Moral Liberty:** All the above mentioned liberties are meaningless if an individual does not possess moral liberty which ensures him to act according to his rational self.

SAQ:

Do you think that economic liberty is more essential than the political liberty? Give arguments in favour of your answer. (100 words)

.....
.....
.....
.....
.....

1.6 Negative and Positive Liberty

From the above discussions it is clear to you that in common parlance, the terms 'liberty' and 'freedom' are used interchangeably. The concept of liberty has two implications- negative and positive. Liberty is defined as 'absence of restraint' or 'the absence of constraint or coercion'. In this sense, liberty is negative as it implies a negative role to the state, i.e., not to restrict the individual in enjoying their freedom while pursuing their goals. Hence it can be said that negative liberty stands for minimum restraints on the actions of the individuals. The advocates of negative liberty believe that, 'everyone knows his own interest best' and therefore the state should not decide his ends and purposes. The idea of negative liberty led to the emergence of the doctrine of 'laissez-faire' which advocates freedom from government interference in economic affairs. The major advocates of negative liberty

like Adam Smith, Jeremy Bentham and James Mill advocated for minimum function of the state. This view of liberty, also known as liberal-individualist view of liberty, has contributed towards the growth of capitalism in Europe. It considers the state as a necessary evil. The concept of negative liberty was popular in Europe in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries. It was advocated by the middle class who demanded that the state should not interfere in the economic activities of the individuals. Thus, the believers of this notion of liberty are of the view that liberty consisted in the freedom of trade, freedom of enterprise, freedom of contract etc.

Positive liberty on the other hand, refers to the removal of constraints which are the product of social set-up. It aims at extending the opportunity to the individual to pursue his happiness. The concept of positive liberty emerged during the later half of the nineteenth century. Kant, Hegel, Laski, Green and Barker supported this concept of liberty. According to Green, personal liberty should be associated with society, morality, rights and the state. He also emphasized the positive role of the state in creating conditions conducive for enjoying moral freedom. The state should create the condition for the enjoyment of the liberties of the individuals. Laski went to the extent of saying that the state must ensure the welfare of all its citizens and for that it may even curtail the economic liberty of a privileged few. J.S. Mill is a supporter of both positive and negative liberty. According to Mill, there is the possibility of the tyranny of the majority resulting in the denial of liberty to the minorities. He is, therefore, of the view that liberty of the individuals should be protected against the interference of democratic states too. He starts with the assumption that there are two spheres of action of the individual, viz, self-regarding and other-regarding actions. Self-regarding actions imply that every individual must have the liberty to do whatever he pleases and the state and the society do not have the right to interfere in the spheres of individual actions. However, the society and state can interfere in the activities that affect the larger society. He is of the view that an individual can face interference against his will only when his actions harm other members of the society. The individual enjoys absolute right over the activities that concern him only. Hence, according to Mill, 'Over himself, over his own body and mind the individual is sovereign'.

The most important liberties of the individual according to Mill are ---- liberty of thought and expression, belief, faith and worship and liberty of forming associations. Interference of the state and society may act as a hindrance to the development of the personality of the individual. He further holds the view that liberty of thought and discussions are fundamental liberties which cannot be suppressed even by the best governments. He strongly believes that "restraint is an evil. ...leaving people to themselves is always better than controlling them." However, he believes that the state and society can control the individual and his actions if those have harmful effects on the society.

On the other hand, there are certain liberties which demand a positive role of the state. For example, freedom from fear and freedom from want. Thus Mill has conceded a positive role to the state for securing social welfare or for the welfare of the community even at the cost of curbing the liberty of the individuals in some cases. While entrusting positive role, Mill widened the state activities by entrusting the functions like developing a theory of sound taxation and provision of education etc.

However, it is worth mentioning here that the negative and positive liberties are not opposed to each other, rather both are complementary. Negative liberty helps in the growth of individuals which is hampered during the feudal period resulting in the growth of capitalism and increased production. However, after sometime it is realized that the capitalist system is responsible for the miserable conditions of workers and consumers. This system has widened the gap between the rich and the poor. In such a scenario, the advocates of positive liberty come up with new definition of liberty. The socialists and Marxists are of the view that the non-interventionist policy of the state in economic matters curtails the liberty of a group of individuals, particularly the workers who live in abject poverty. The advocates of positive liberty believe that the benefits of liberty should go to both the rich and the poor.

Hence we can say that while negative liberty implies absence of restraints, positive liberty stands for extending the opportunity to the individual for his development. One important distinction between negative and positive liberty can be seen in the context of relations between an individual and the state. According to this view, negative liberty consists in the 'absence of restraint',

i.e., non-interference by the state in certain activities of the individual, to enable him to pursue his own happiness without affecting the freedom of others. On the other hand, positive liberty extends the opportunity to the individuals to pursue his happiness. In modern time, positive freedom deals with the social dimension of freedom. Positive liberty stands for removal of constraints that exist in a social set-up. In this sense, positive liberty will create the environment for enjoyment of freedom equally by the people of different races, religions or caste groups.

Check Your Progress

1. Discuss briefly the evolution of liberty.
2. Write a note on different types of liberty.
3. What do you mean by negative and positive liberty? Discuss Mill's views on positive and negative liberty.

1.7 Meaning and Evolution of the Concept of Equality

The concept of equality came into prominence with the French Revolution of 1789 based on the concepts of 'liberty, equality and fraternity'. The concept of equality is one of the central themes of discussion in politics. According to Aristotle, inequality is a major cause of rebellion in many states. He defines justice as treating equals equally and unequals unequally. In the modern period, equality seeks the correction of the prevailing inequalities. The concept of equality is closely related to the concept of rights.

The concepts of liberty and equality are complementary. Hence, the concept of equality makes the concept of liberty more relevant and substantive. The principle of equality also stands in the way of acquiring unlimited wealth, power and prestige in the society.

Rousseau has drawn a distinction between two types of inequalities existing in social life. They are

a) natural inequality ; **b)** conventional inequality.

Natural inequality may also be considered as physical inequality that consists in the differences of age, health, bodily strength and qualities of mind and

soul. On the otherhand conventional inequalities include inequalities of wealth, prestige and power. From these definitions, it is clear to you that while the first type of equality is not dependent upon human choice and mostly ordained by nature, the second type of inequality is largely man-made.

It is also to be noted here that the demand for equality arises in a situation where inequality exists. Therefore, demand for equality also implies demand for social change. Again, people complain against inequality only when it is thought to be unjust. Thus, demand for equality may not imply absolute equality. Equality does not mean that all material goods, the entire national income or all educational opportunities available in society should be equally distributed among all the members of society. Equality stands for giving equal opportunities for the development of their personal qualities and capacities in the shape of material goods, comforts, education, training etc.

Stop to consider

Equality and Discrimination:

Equality allows discrimination on 'reasonable', 'rational', 'logical' or relevant grounds. Discrimination is made on the ground of special provision for the upliftment of some sections in the society. For example, a progressive taxation system would spare the lower income slabs while tax would go on increasing on the higher slabs. Likewise, provision for social services has to be made according to the needs of various sections, but not according to the amount of taxes. Another such special provision in the case of need is scholarship to the needy students or the economically poor sections. Moreover, the reservation of jobs and other advantages for the weaker sections such as Scheduled Tribes, Scheduled Castes, the women, differently abled are some of the provisions that are made to give special opportunity to the needy people. This type of provision may have a discriminatory nature, but is needed for the development of all sections in the society. Hence, we can say that though these provisions go against the principle of equality, they help in bringing equality in an unequal society.

Scholars are of the view that discrimination in favour of the deprived sections results in discrimination against general category. The champions of 'affirmative action' for the deprived sections argue that a section of the society is deprived of adequate opportunities in the past, they should now be compensated for the loss. They further believe that preferential treatment for the deprived sections will help in fulfilling the objective of equality. The opponents of affirmative

action believe that positive discrimination will be disastrous since it does not respect merit. Some of the opponents hold the belief that such provision for affirmative action will not succeed in ensuring equality in the society as the privileged amongst them will get the benefit. The opponents of affirmative action also believe that sometimes such preferential treatment gives a feeling of inferiority if a person realizes that he/she enjoys the opportunity for preferential treatment and not because of his or her merit.

1.8 Types of Equality

Already you have learnt that as concept equality implies that situation where every body gets equal opportunity regardless of their caste, class, and sex etc. The concept arises because of the existence of inequality among the people. Equality can be considered from different perspectives resulting in different types of equalities. Now, in this section let us discuss different types of equality.

Legal Equality: The principle of equality is first seen as a demand for legal equality which stands for grant of equal legal status to all individuals in society irrespective of their birth, physical and mental capacities and other differences. Rousseau is of the view that extension of legal equality to all citizens is the primary characteristic of every civil society. It is also observed that the idea of legal equality emanates from moral considerations and serves as the basis of equal rights of men. Earnest Barker in his *Principles of Social and Political Theory* argues that the principle of equality means 'whatever conditions are guaranteed to me in the form of rights, shall also, and in the same measure, be guaranteed to others, and that whatever rights are given to others shall also be guaranteed to me'. (p.151)

In the contemporary world legal equality is practiced everywhere in the world. However, in ancient societies the practice of legal equality was absent in many societies. If we take the example of India, it is found that the ancient Hindu scripture Manusmriti prescribed different grades of punishment for the same offence according to caste. Aristotle also recommended differential punishments for the similar offence for freeman and slaves.

Thus, legal equality stands for the equal protection of the law for all citizens. However, it is pointed out that legal equality by itself does not guarantee perfect justice in a society where a big gap exists between the rich and the

poor. Equality before law can benefit all only when everybody can approach the court of law. It is very difficult for the economically poor to approach the court of law and meet the legal expenses. On the other hand it is easy for the wealthier sections, blackmarketeers to engage lawyers for defending their cases in law courts. In other words, we can say that the rich possesses the capacity to hire the services of the most competent and successful lawyers. Moreover, it is also pointed out that the lawyers and judges belonging to the upper strata of society may have the tendency to safeguard the interests of the rich.

Political Equality: It denotes the equality of the political rights of citizens. Political equality supports the right to be represented in decision-making bodies on an equal basis. Thus, it stands for 'one man, one vote'. It also implies that no body is barred from holding political office on grounds of birth, religion, sex etc. It also says that there will be no privileged class in the society entitled to rule. The doctrine of political equality is derived from the general belief that men are capable of political judgments irrespective of his physical and mental capacities, education and wealth etc. It also assumes that political equality gives the platform for the best expression of human beings and influences policy makers to adjust public policy to the requirements of the common good. However, many thinkers doubt the practice of absolute equality in modern democratic state. The advocates of elite theory like Mosca, Pareto and Michels are of the view that ordinary citizens hardly enjoy political power even when they have the right to vote because political power is enjoyed by a governing elite. Laski also holds the similar view when he says that 'political equality is never real unless it is accompanied by virtual economic equality; political power, therefore, is bound to be the hand-maid of economic power.' Marx, on the other hand believes that political equality is unthinkable in a capitalist society. The working class finds it difficult to send proper representatives to the Parliament even if they enjoy voting rights. In modern world, enjoyment of political equality is hindered by the fact that the complexities of administration are handled by bureaucracy over which the common men have no control.

Socio-Economic Equality:

Social equality implies a situation where every citizen enjoys equality of opportunity for the development of the personality irrespective of his social

status. Thus, there should be no distinctions between individual and groups in providing opportunity for development. It also implies that a person's social status should not be determined by his birth. The demand for social equality was made in the 19th century against the aristocratic privileges, slavery, capitalism and social inequalities on the basis of race. In the later period, social equality has been demanded on the basis of sex, caste and colour. The issue of social equality is also linked with the equality of opportunities. It advocates for the creation of new social atmosphere where everyone can enjoy equal opportunity. Thus, social equality also means that nobody should be deprived of entry into public hotel, religious institutions like temples and church.

Social equality is closely connected with economic equality. Despite enjoying legal and political equality, a section of society may not enjoy socio-economic rights. It thus demands for social change in a hierarchical society. It needs mention here that while the idea of legal-political equality can be linked to the growth of early liberalism, the concept of socio-economic equality is put forward as a goal of socialism. Socio-economic equality has widened the concept of equality. It is believed by many thinkers that so long as the principle of equality is not extended to economic sphere, the operation of legal-political equality will continue to serve the interests of the richer class without substantial benefit for the masses.

It has been observed that while the concepts of legal and political equality emerge out of the demand of the new middle class and the industrialist class for acquiring political power, the concept of socio-economic equality emerges to promote the interests of the working class or economically weaker sections. Hence, it can be concluded here that the concept of legal-political equality contributes in replacing feudalism by capitalism while socio-economic equality is meant to promote socialism in order to remove the problems of capitalism. The slogan of socio-economic equality is thus raised in order to carry the missions of progress to its logical conclusion.

Again, socio-economic equality may be distinguished from legal-political equality in terms of its scale of measurement also. While legal equality implies recognition of the 'equal legal personality' in each individual and political equality asserts the 'one man, one vote' principle, socio-economic equality does not insist on 'equal shares for all'. Thus, we can say that while legal-

political equality stands for establishing equality by guaranteeing equality in the field of law and politics, socio-economic equality demands the reduction of inequality according to the prevalent concept of social justice.

Louis Blanc has formulated one ideal condition of socio-economic equality which is, 'from each according to his ability, to each according to his need'. Marx adopts this principle for demanding social justice and to establish universal labour and classless society with some modifications by reframing it as, 'from each according to his ability, to each according to his work'. Thus, socio-economic equality stands for the right to equal satisfaction of basic needs which include state provision for education, employment, other essential social services like cheap transports, community centres, public parks, health facilities etc. Socio-economic equality also includes state regulation of industrial conditions of work, minimum wages, pensions etc.

In modern welfare state, there is a provision for progressive taxation to ensure social equality. It stands for the principle that larger the income or property, the higher the tax.

Stop to Consider

Equality on the basis of Sex and Women's Liberation Movement

The slogan of equality between the sexes assumes prominence during the women's struggle for equal voting rights. In recent times, women's movement is named as 'Women's Lib' which is not restricted to fighting against inequality in political field. Initially, the demand for political as well as legal equality coincided. However, in the later stage, political equality came to be identified with equality, democratic rights of the people and universalisation of franchise, equal freedom to hold and express political opinions without fear or favour and equal right to form associations to influence political decisions. Popularization of the concept of political equality and demand for it by the women led to the establishment of democracy in the Western world. Later, this movement also demanded social and economic equality for women.

SAQ:

Do you think that the notion of socio-economic equality plays an important role in the contemporary world? Give arguments in favour of your answer.(20+40 words)

.....
.....
.....
.....
.....

1.9 Relationship between Liberty and Equality

From the above discussion, it is clear to us that liberty and equality are two closely connected concepts. Many times, they are considered as complementary to each other. Ernest Barker is of the view that the principle of liberty or freedom is the basic principle of politics and that the principle of equality is subsidiary one. However, by saying so, Barker does not seek to minimize the value of equality. He is of the opinion that equality should be applied in order to allow full development of personality of every individual according to their varied interests. Harold Laski in his famous work, *A Grammar of Politics* deals with the relationship between liberty and equality. He does not consider equality as identity of treatment. He further believes that there can be no identity of treatment so long as men are different in want and capacity and need. Liberty and equality are closely linked in legal and political spheres. Historically, it is observed that the demand for liberty is greatly supported by the idea of equality. The demand for liberty often implies the abolition of special privileges of certain groups and hence equality of all citizens in the legal as well as the political sphere.

On the other hand, some advocators of liberty have contested the idea of equality. According to them liberty enables man to acquire unlimited wealth, prestige and power while equality seeks to limit such opportunity. Thus, it discourages initiative and enterprise and blocks social progress. Some thinkers argue that equality in the economic sphere should be restricted to the provision of a minimum subsistence level for each individual. The champions of equality believe that equality stands for equality of opportunity but not identical treatment. It aims for fair share but not equal shares.

Enjoyment of the liberty by the individuals bring conducive atmosphere for the enjoyment of equality of opportunity. It also gives opportunity to enjoy a fair share of the societal resources by all. With the popularization of the concept of positive liberty, it can be said that in the present scenario the duty of a modern state is to make conditions for everyone to enjoy liberty which in turn creates condition of equality.

Check Your Progress

1. What do you mean by equality? Discuss various types of equality.
2. Trace the relationship between liberty and equality.

1.10 Summing Up

After going through this unit, you have comprehended the idea about the concepts like liberty and equality. You have learnt that both these concepts are very important as they help individuals to enjoy a free, healthy and dignified life in the society. This unit has also dealt with the evolution of liberty as well as equality. Moreover, reading of this unit has helped you in understanding different types of liberty and equality. From this unit you have also learnt about the concepts like negative and positive liberty. In the next unit we shall discuss the concept of justice.

1.11 References and Suggested Readings

Political Theory by Eddy Asirvatham and K.K.Misra, S. Chand & Company Ltd., New Delhi, 1936. reprint 2008

Political Theory by N.D.Arora and S.S. Awasthy, Har- Anand Publications Pvt Ltd, New Delhi, 1996, 2004 reprint.

An Introduction to Political Theory by O P Gauba, Macmillan India Ltd. Delhi, 1981, 2004 reprint.

* * *

Unit 2

Justice

Contents:

2.1 Introduction

2.2 Objectives

2.3 Meaning of Justice and Development of the Concept of Justice

2.4 Types of Justice

2.5 Rawls' Theory of Justice

2.5.1 Distributive Justice

2.5.2 Procedural Justice

2.6 Summing Up

2.7 References and Suggested Readings

2.1 Introduction

The concept of justice is important in the field of Political Science. Justice usually implies what is right or reasonable. Therefore, this concept is basically a moral concept with the emphasis on being perfect or just. Justice in contemporary world is concerned with determining logical criteria for the allocation of goods, services, opportunities, benefits, power and honours as well as obligations in society. In this unit, attempt has been made to deal with the meaning as well as different types of justice. Moreover, this unit will also introduce you to the concepts of Rawls' theory of justice apart from distributive justice and procedural justice.

2.2 Objectives

Justice is the idea that ensures a right order in the society. The true meaning of justice can be determined in the light of prevalent social consciousness. After reading this unit you will be able to:

- *discuss* the meaning of justice
- *explain* different types of justice
- *elaborate* the concepts of distributive and procedural justice

2.3 Meaning of Justice and Development of the Concept of Justice

The term 'justice' is derived from the Latin word Jus which means the idea of joining and fitting, the idea of bond or tie. It is mainly concerned with the adjustment of human relations. Justice usually refers to the situation of 'just' or 'right' or 'reasonable'. The term justice suggests the quality of being just or right or reasonable. Justice is opposed to 'unjust' or 'wrong' or 'unreasonable'. The words just, right and reasonable are primarily moral attributes and hence justice is primarily a moral concept. Justice is thus a moral or an ethical idea which embodies an ideal symbolizing perfectness.

It is worth mentioning here that though justice symbolizes absolute truth, it changes from time to time. From this point of view, it can be said that justice is a dynamic idea since the idea of perfectness changes from time to time. What was considered to be just some centuries ago may not be considered so in the present time. Moreover, justice varies from society to society. What is just in Indian society may not be considered just in European society. According to John Rawls, 'justice is the first virtue of social institutions, as truth is the system of thought'. Traditionally, justice was given a divine character, but in the modern times, justice is associated with the concept of fairness. Earnest Barker in his Principles of Social and Political Theory opines that justice is derived from the Latin word jus that embodies the idea of joining and fitting. In the present time we can say that the main source of the idea of justice is 'reason'.

In the previous unit of this block, we have already discussed the relationship between liberty and equality. It needs mention here that the concept of justice is closely associated with concepts like liberty and equality. In a just society, human relationships are guided by reason. The sense of justice helps individuals to recognize the dignity of every human being. It also says that every individual should be treated as equals in the society and there should not be any discrimination on artificial grounds like birth, region, race, religion, culture, gender and economic status etc. In this sense justice is related with equality since equality is also defined as absence of discrimination. Again, a just society is guided by the principle of liberty.

Justice has different dimensions. It is already mentioned that modern concept of justice is different from the traditional one. For Plato, justice means performance of the allotted duties by the members of the society without

interfering in the functions and duties of others. Plato opines that performance of different duties by different groups of citizens is instrumental in building up a just social order. He further believes that justice helps in achieving perfect harmony. However, the modern notion of justice is broader than the traditional one. It is also said that the traditional concept of justice has given rise to the concept of 'social justice'. The concept of social justice opposes the fault in the existing social order, oppressive and exploitative social conditions.

You should also remember here that justice is not defined by outcome but by the fairness of the process leading to that outcome. Justice occurs when the distribution of political power and economic opportunity is as uniform as possible or when the social and political system is as uniform as possible or when the social and political system is such that they tend toward a just distribution even if it is not achieved.

Development of Justice:

The ancient Greek philosophers have dealt with the concept of justice. In fact it can be said that the Greeks were the first to discuss the concept of justice. In the first paper on political theory, you have already studied the concept of justice as discussed by Plato and Aristotle. Both philosophers consider justice as an essential virtue of human beings living together in communities, in villages, cities or nation states. Greek philosopher Socrates believes that justice is preferable to injustice. A just person limits his desires as dissatisfaction leads to unhappiness. He further believes that an unjust person lacks psychological peace. Socrates, thus, rejects the idea of justice as mere convention. Plato's justice is concerned with distribution of responsibilities in accordance to abilities. His view on justice does not take into consideration the distribution of wealth in the society. He does not consider justice as equality. Plato's 'Republic' establishes the fact that justice is a psychic harmony within the individual, the triumph of reason and a bond that cements the individual to the society. Plato talks about the idealist theory of justice and emphasises the moral element of justice. In his concept of ideal state, Plato mentions four virtues: wisdom, courage, temperance or self-control and justice. He also believes that justice resides in the mind of every citizen. According to him, justice is the virtue to be cultivated by the

society through subordination of the irrational masses of producers to the brave class of warriors and the rational class of philosopher kings.

Aristotle divides justice as distributive and rectificatory. Distributive justice is concerned with what people deserve and what one has a right to receive. Rectificatory justice refers to justice of transactions --- 'voluntary matters pertaining to buying, selling or lending' and 'involuntary matters of being a victim of an insult, theft or assassination'. Aristotle links the notion of distributive justice ---- offices and wealth, rewards and dues with the idea of proportionate equality. It means equals deserve equals but unequals deserve unequal.

The main idea in Aristotle's overall argument is the notion of justice as a state of character, a cultivated set of dispositions, attitudes and good habits. It is concerned with good judgement and a sense of fairness. In rectificatory justice, such judgment involves equality, not as proportion but as straightforward equivalence. It involves equality before law. Thus, Aristotle believes that justice denotes an equality of proportion to the degrees to which individuals differ in relevant respects. Plato and Aristotle have discussed justice as an all-encompassing political virtue to establish a good and just society.

In the medieval period, justice is associated with order. According to the Romans, positive laws conforming to higher laws is a perfect justice and right. The liberal view of justice, on the other hand lays greater stress on its legal and political aspects. According to them, the rule of law is the first condition of justice. They also believe that the political system based on justice provides to its citizens civil and political rights and gives them an opportunity to take part in the political process. In the medieval period, justice is viewed as something implanted by God in every human mind that can be preserved through the authority of the Church. Rawls describes justice as the first virtue of social institutions.

According to Cicero, justice is the second of the four principal virtues---- wisdom, justice, courage and temperance which constitutes moral goodness. He considers injustice to be greed and lust for power. In ancient Hindu thought, justice is related with 'dharma' meaning what is right. At the same time it also denotes the duty of an individual. In traditional Hindu society dharma is derived from the caste of his birth.

Hobbes believes that 'just' and 'unjust' gain meaning in relation to law and law is the command of the sovereign. He considers justice to be a product of positive law. Hume rejects the idea that rules of justice are laid down by God or written into the nature of things for human intellect to discover. It is a set of principles governing individual's actions. He defines the rules of justice as conventions whereby material goods like wealth, land, possessions etc. are ascribed to particular individuals, and the virtue of justice consists in respecting this ascription, by refraining from appropriating the good of others. In this sense, justice is an artificial virtue. But at the same time it is vital to human society. Hume further believes that justice is respect for the established rights of others. He holds the opinion that it will be impossible to prevent inequalities because individuals' unequal capacities and talents will allow some to acquire wealth while others cannot. Thus, he rejects the criteria of equality and merit as principle of justice.

Utilitarianism has defended liberal justice by deriving justice from the conceptions of social utility. Mill provides the best known defense of utilitarian approach by surveying various types of actions and situations described as just and unjust. It is also believed that justice as a set of basic moral rules is derived from the moral ideal of social utility.

Utilitarian concept of justice is criticized in the later period by thinkers like Rawls. Rawls in his famous work *A Theory of Justice* outlines the features of his conception in an article entitled *Justice as Fairness* that appeared in 1957. The movements for Civil Rights, liberation of the Blacks, equal rights for the minorities, anti-Vietnam war protests etc. raise questions about individual and minority rights and issues of social justice as well as just and unjust wars. Rawls considers justice as the first virtue of social institutions. He also believes that the existing societies are seldom well-ordered as there usually exists a dispute regarding justice and injustice. Rawls recognizes the importance of productivity to bring out the natural talents in persons. However, at the same time, he also realizes the importance of controlling the market criteria by principles of social justice.

From the above discussions, it is clear that the concept of justice has been used to denote different meanings in different periods. Thus, we can see that the modern concept of justice is different from the traditional concept. The traditional concept of justice is mainly concerned with moral and ethical

aspects and therefore with certain virtues relating to morality. You have already learnt that for Plato and Aristotle, justice in its most general sense, is the essential and concise virtue. In medieval society, justice is associated with order. On the other hand, modern concept of justice emphasizes the realization of certain human values. It is mainly concerned with social justice. Justice is closely associated with respect for rights of the individuals.

2.4 Types of Justice

In the above section we have learnt that justice has been defined by different political thinkers from different perspectives. Therefore, in the present world justice has got different dimensions. Now, let us discuss different types of justice in this section.

- **Legal justice:** Legal justice is mainly concerned with the process of law making and the judicial system. Under this system every individual is entitled to equal protection of laws and impartial justice. The term 'legal justice' has two aspects ----- firstly, justice according to law and secondly, law according to justice. The first aspect examines the principles of administration of justice according to the prevalent law without questioning the validity of law. On the other hand, the second aspect examines the substance of the law itself to ensure that it conforms to the requirements of justice. Barker has viewed legal justice as laws according to justice. He has distinguished between 'positive law' and 'natural law'. Positive law denotes a particular law, i.e. the law defined and declared by each community for its own members; on the other hand, natural law is a universal law which is applicable to all times and for all human beings. It is also pointed out that a law should have both validity and value. An effective law conforms to the principle of justice and is also recognized by the authority of the state. However, it is pertinent to mention here that justice in the legal sphere consists not only in an efficient administration of law, but at the same time it should embody human values according to the prevailing social norms and conditions. Laws that distance itself from social values cannot contribute to the social progress and may be discarded by violent revolutions. Hence, for proper justice the law should be based on human and social values. The legal dimension of justice also implies adherence to a set of declared rules.

- ***Political Justice:*** Political justice is mainly concerned with the actual politics through which the political process attains the principle of justice. It refers to the establishment of democratic institutions in the political life of the community where the interests of all individuals can be taken care of. The legal dimension of justice mainly deals with the role of legal structures like the parliament, the constitution, courts etc. Political justice supports the representative institutions, viz, the legislature and executive constituted on the principle of Universal Adult Franchise. The agencies which are chiefly responsible for the implementation of laws are bureaucracy, political parties, interest groups and various non-governmental organizations who take the initiatives of transforming those legal norms into practical political programmes. It further stands for independence of the judiciary. Thus, it emphasizes the principle of 'rule of law' and opposes arbitrariness of the government. Hence, we can say that a constitutional government is an ingredient of political justice.

In a comprehensive sense, the term political justice denotes restructuring of the entire fabric of social, economic, and political relations. Political justice is also described as a moral principle whose object is the general good. It also implies reorientation of political institutions, political process and political rights according to the current concepts of justice. It is already known to us that political justice advocates for the establishment of democratic institutions in the political life of the community. In this sense, legislature has to be constituted on the principle of universal adult franchise and judiciary should be impartial and independent. Moreover, political justice also stands for the liberty of thought and expression and right to criticize the government and its policies. There is a democratic environment where individuals are free to form associations and interest groups. The liberals consider political justice as a means to enjoy right to vote and equal share in government services.

- ***Socio-Economic Justice:*** The term 'socio-economic justice' combines two important elements: 'social justice' and 'economic justice'. Their combination into 'socio-economic justice' is significant because social life of the community cannot be transformed according to the principle of justice unless the economic relations are suitably

transformed. The term 'economic justice' may be used in the restricted sense or reordering human relations in the economic sphere e.g., relations between employer and worker, between trader and consumer, between landlord and tenant, between moneylender and borrower, etc. so as to eliminate exploitation of the vulnerable sections of society. Economic justice has been interpreted in different ways by the Liberals and the Marxists. The liberals view economic justice as the satisfaction of all economic needs of the people in a society. For that they advocate free market and free competition. Contrary to this, the Marxists believe that economic justice can be established only in a classless society. Therefore, the Marxists advocate for the abolition of private property and overthrowing of the capitalist state by a classless state. They also believe that economic justice cannot be established in a society divided into rich and poor or haves and have-nots.

On the other hand, the term 'social justice' is used more comprehensively so as to include economic justice and also to restore the dignity of human beings who lost it due to lower economic, educational and cultural status. Social justice refers to the elimination of all kinds of discrimination and privileges on the grounds of birth, race, caste, sex etc. In the positive sense social justice implies providing various social opportunities to all the members of a society for their proper development. It emphasizes establishing social equality and social mobility. Hence, we can say that the concept of social justice is closely related with political and economic justice as these two provide the ground for the enjoyment of social justice.

It needs mentioning here that social justice suggests benefits of economic justice and thus it is more economic in nature. Social justice is mainly concerned about the inclusion of the down-trodden. From this point of view, it can be assumed that the term 'social justice' is used to comprehend all three types of justice in the society --- social, economic and political. However, social justice mainly emphasizes the economic aspect because economic disparities affect the foundations of legal and political justice. It tries to ensure that material and moral benefits of social planning are not appropriated by a tiny section and percolates down to the lower, weaker and under-privileged classes of the society.

There is a clear distinction between legal and social justice. While legal justice stands for the punishment of wrongdoing and the compensation of

injury through the creation and enforcement of public set of rules, social justice stands for distribution of benefits and burdens throughout the society. It should be remembered here that legal justice has two aspects. The first aspect covers the conditions under which punishment, according to the nature of the crime, and in the sphere of civic law, adjusts the amount of restitution that is made for injuries. Secondly, it establishes procedures for applying the law namely the principles of a fair trial, rights of appeal and the like. Social justice, on the other hand, deals with matters like regulation of wages and profits, the protection of individuals rights through the legal system, the allocation of housing, medicines, welfare benefits.

Stop to consider

Justice and Equality:

The concept of justice is closely associated with the concept of equality. In modern period, there is equality before law in almost all countries which shows close relationship between justice and equality. Justice demands that all individuals should be treated as equals. But equality is not the final principle of justice. Equality, which generally means absence of discrimination not necessarily leads to justice. The struggle for equality starts when there is a feeling that prevailing inequality is unjust and based on exploitation.

2.5 Rawls' theory of justice

John Rawls has discussed the concept of justice at length in his famous work *A Theory of Justice*. According to him, a good society is characterized by a number of virtues of which justice is the first virtue. Thus, justice is one of the many virtues and it cannot be regarded as the sufficient condition of a good society. He is of the view that the problem of justice consists in ensuring a just distribution of 'primary goods' which include rights and liberties, powers and opportunities, income and wealth, means of self-respect etc. According to him, the first principle of justice is that 'each person is to have an equal right to the most extensive scheme of equal basic liberties compatible with a similar scheme of liberties for others'. He describes his theory of justice as the theory of pure procedural justice. According to Rawls, justice can be categorized in the following order.

- a) Principle of equal liberty suggest that nobody's liberty will be sacrificed for the sake of any other benefit.
- b) Principle of fair equality of opportunity, particularly for acquiring offices and positions.
- c) Difference principle which implies that any departure from equal distribution will bring the greatest benefit to the disadvantaged.

Rawls points out that his two principles of justice are more congruent than utilitarianism with our common sense conviction. For Rawls, values like individual liberty and dignity have an independent status and cannot be derived from the maximization of social good, while for Mill these are derivative. Rawls' principles are egalitarian, unlike perfectionism which is a hierarchical doctrine stating its preference for the extra ordinary.

Rawls has also attempted to discuss the concept of justice from the perspective of social contract theory. The contractual theorists make an attempt to show how self-interested persons with legitimate competing claims arrive at mutually acceptable social arrangements. While doing so, the contractual theorists deal with the origins of the state and the nature of sovereignty. On the other hand, Rawls tries to explain such an attempt from the principles of justice. These ensure just practices and institutions in a society, viewed as a fair system of social co-operation between individuals.

Rawls begins with the assumption that the principle of justice that expresses our moral sentiments is a product of an original agreement in the original position. The persons in the original position are rational, capable of a conception of good and possess a sense of justice. They are rational with a capacity for intelligent pursuit of one's own interests to enter into agreements that they adhere and fulfill.

Rawls has been criticized on the ground that he has justified the continuance of the capitalist system on certain specified conditions. Justice is thus a guide to policy-making. An authority may face resistance if it fails to conform to the norms of justice of that particular society. Marxists contend that Rawls has tried to determine the principle of justice in a hypothetical condition where people are ignorant of the socio- economic realities and therefore

they are deliberately hidden behind a 'veil of ignorance'. However, any deliberations without the knowledge of prevailing social and economic conditions are meaningless. Marxists believe that moral systems should always be analysed in the light of class relations and the patterns of ownership of private property. Justice is very important in a society where there is scarcity of resources like goods, services, and opportunities etc. to satisfy the needs of all. Justice is also important in the open societies where everyone is free to demand equal share on some reasonable ground.

2.5.1 Procedural justice

The advocates of procedural justice believe that it is necessary to determine a just procedure for the allocation of social advantages, viz, goods and services, opportunities and benefits, power and honours; then its outcome will automatically be accepted as just. Viewed from this perspective, the notion of procedural justice is closely related with the tradition of liberalism. It also supports freedom of contract. It further believes that the market mechanism creates necessary conditions for the most efficient use of resources. The main advocates of procedural justice are ---- Herbert Spencer, F.A. Hayek, Milton Friedman and Robert Nozick. The advocates of procedural justice repudiate all discrimination between human beings on all artificial and primordial grounds like caste, creed, race, religion, language, culture etc. However, it has supported minimal influence of the state and open competition in the society. Spencer goes to the extent of saying that the state should not extend any help to the handicapped because support to them will amount to depriving the capable, the prudent and the strong which ultimately will hamper social progress. Thus, Spencer's ideology can be linked with Darwin's principle of 'natural selection' and 'survival of the fittest'. On the other hand, substantive justice argues that the allocation or distribution of social advantages among various sections of society itself should be just. Hayek also supports this view and opines that state should create a positive atmosphere to promote competition. Likewise, Nozick believes that the state has no authority to redistribute the property of its citizens.

Stop To Consider

Principles of Procedural Justice

There are certain principles of procedural justice. The two important principles of procedural justice are-

- There should be consistency in treating the cases. The similar cases should be treated alike.
- Those involved with carrying out the procedures must be impartial. Unbiased decision- makers must carry out the procedures to reach a fair and accurate conclusion.

Procedural justice refers to the idea of fairness which helps in resolving disputes and allocating resources. It is mainly related with the discussions of the administration of justice and legal proceedings. However, procedural justice can be applied to non-legal contexts also involving resolution of conflict as well as distribution of burdens and benefits among different groups. This type of justice also stands for transparency of the processes by which decisions are made. Hence it is different from distributive justice which stands for fairness in the distribution of rights or resources or from retributive justice that stands for fairness in the rectification of wrongs. Procedural justice advocates for hearing all parties before a decision is made to get procedurally fair justice. The supporters of procedural justice believe that fair procedure leads to equitable outcomes.

Hence, it can be said that procedural justice can be examined by focusing on the formal procedures used to make decisions. It is very important in communication and work place since it involves fair procedures and allows the employees to participate in the decision-making process. Procedural justice also gives the opportunity to express employee dissent. Thus, procedural justice ensures greater deal of fairness in the work place. There are six rules that are applied to procedural justice. They are—

- i) Consistence
- ii) Bias Suppression
- iii) Accuracy
- iv) Correctability
- v) Representatives
- vi) Ethicality

In his celebrated work, *A Theory of Justice* John Rawls distinguishes three ideas of procedural justice.

1. **Perfect procedural justice:** it has two characteristics----- a). an independent criterion for what constitutes a fair or just outcome of the procedure b) a procedure that guarantees that the fair outcome will be achieved.
2. **Imperfect procedural justice:** it shares the first characteristics of perfect procedural justice, there is an independent criterion for a fair outcome.
3. **Pure procedural justice:** it describes situations in which there is no criterion for what constitutes a just outcome.

There are different models of procedural justice. They are

- *The Outcome Model:* The outcome model of procedural justice says that the fairness of process depends on the procedure that results in correct outcome.
- *The Balancing Model:* It is experienced that some procedures aiming at producing correct justice is very costly. The balancing model stands for a fair procedure which reflects a fair balance between the costs of the procedure and the benefits it produces. Hence we can say that the balancing approach to procedural fairness is sometimes prepared to accept erroneous verdicts while avoiding extra costs associated with the administration of justice.
- *The Participation Model:* According to this model of procedural justice, the affected should get the chance to participate in the making of a decision. Therefore, this model believes that the parties involved in a trial case should get the opportunity to be present at the trial, to put on evidence etc.

Stop to Consider

Substantive justice

The idea of substantive justice corresponds to the philosophy of socialism. It tries to examine whether the poor and the underprivileged have adequate opportunity to improve their conditions in the society. It further demands that the opportunities of self-development should be extended to the underprivileged,

the weak and deprived sections of the society. Thus, it is found that the idea of substantive justice contradicts the idea of procedural justice. While procedural justice is based upon the idea of liberalism, substantive justice is based upon the idea of socialism.

2.5.2 Distributive justice

Distributive justice is also known as economic justice. This is concerned with fairness in getting everything from goods to attention. It is mainly concerned with allocation of goods and services at a specific time. John Rawls is one of the theorists associated with the concept of distributive justice. It is basically concerned with the pattern of distribution of resources and capital of the human society which is scarce. Its main concern is to distribute it in a way that gives everyone a fair share. Thus, distributive justice is not concerned only with administration of law.

Hence, we can say that distributive justice is concerned with just distribution of goods. It basically deals with distribution of scarce resources in the society. Distributive justice aims at providing fair share to every individual. John Rawls is an ardent supporter of the concept of distributive justice. Through distributive justice, burdens and benefits of the society are distributed equitably among different groups and individuals. Distributive justice can be linked to the concept of human rights, human dignity and the common good. But Nozick holds the view that the concept of distributive justice is inherently misleading as it implies the existence of some central authority who distributes the shares of income and authority to the individuals in the society.

In a modern welfare state, distributive justice is concerned with distributing financial and market benefits as well as providing equitable access to basic health care needs. Proponents of distributive justice hold the belief that societies have a duty towards individuals in need. At the same time, all individuals have duties to help others in need. Many countries in the world have presently been following this concept of justice to deal with various problems of minorities in order to bring equality in society. Advocators of welfare principle believe that not only the material goods, but other welfare measures should also be distributive equitably.

2.6 Summing Up

After going through this unit you are now in a position to discuss the meaning and development of justice. This unit has also helped you in understanding the fact that justice has different dimensions. Moreover, the meaning and interpretation of justice varies from society to society and also from time to time. Therefore, what is considered to be just centuries ago may not be considered so in the present time. Again, from this unit you have also learn that though in the common parlance justice is viewed only from legal perspective, there are various other types of justice like ---- political, socio-economic justice etc. Moreover, this unit has also introduced you to Rawls' conception of justice as well as the concepts of procedural and distributive justice.

2.7 References and Suggested Readings

Political Theory by Eddy Asirvatham and K.K.Misra, S. Chand & Company Ltd., New Delhi, 1936. reprint 2008

Political Theory by N.D.Arora and S.S. Awasthy, Har-Anand Publications Pvt Ltd, New Delhi, 1996, 2004 reprint.

An Introduction to Political Theory by O P Gauba, Macmillan India Ltd. Delhi, 1981, 2004 reprint.

* * *

Unit 3

Democracy

Contents:

- 3.1 Introduction**
- 3.2 Objectives**
- 3.3 Meaning of Democracy**
 - 3.3.1 Principles of Democracy**
- 3.4 Evolution of the Concept of Democracy**
- 3.5 Direct Participatory Democracy**
- 3.6 Liberal Democracy**
- 3.7 Critical Estimate**
- 3.8 Summing Up**
- 3.9 References and Suggested Readings**

3.1 Introduction

Democracy is a multifaceted word having various implications. In the context of politics it emphasizes everyone's share in the government, the economic aspect insists on the abolition of the exploitation and the social aspect seeks to eliminate all distinctions from the society. We can also examine democracy as a moral principle or a way of modern life which aims at the enrichment of personality and dignity. In this unit we are going to discuss the meaning and evolution of the concept of democracy. It is well known that the notion of democracy as a system of government can be traced back to the Greeks. As time passed, democracy occupied a predominant position in our social and political life and became an integral part of human life. In other words, we can describe the journey of democracy as a journey from its perverted form to a universally acceptable goal. In this unit an attempt is also made to explore the various types of democracy such as direct participatory democracy and liberal democracy and discuss the drawbacks labeled against democracy.

3.2 Objectives

In the context of Political Science, democracy can be defined as a form of government in which the government derives power from the people, either directly or through the elected representatives. After going through this unit you will be able to

- *examine* the meaning of democracy
- *understand* the evolution of democracy as a form of government
- *discuss* the various forms of democracy
- *describe* the drawbacks of democracy

3.3 Meaning of Democracy

Democracy has two aspects attached to it. In the narrow sense, democracy implies the rule by the majority and in its broader sense democracy is 'a political status', an 'ethical concept', and a 'social condition'. In this sense, it includes elements like political pluralism, equality before law, right to petition, civil liberties, human rights, civil society etc. However it is very difficult to assign a proper and universally acceptable meaning to the concept democracy. Here in this section we shall discuss the meaning of democracy with reference to the opinion of various prominent scholars.

The term democracy is a synonym of Greek *demokratia* meaning rule of the people. It has been derived from two words *demos* and *kratos* meaning people and power respectively. Though, in 508 BC, Athens experienced a major popular uprising, yet there was no specific and universally accepted definition of democracy during that time. Since ancient times, equality and freedom are considered to be the two most important characteristics of democracy along with the rule by the majority or the majority rule. Again, fair and competitive election is another characteristic of a democracy. You should remember here that freedom of political expression, freedom of speech and freedom of the press which is a feature of democratic state help in informing the citizens about voting and their political rights. In this context, it is important to mention here that popular sovereignty is common in a democratic state but it is not the universal motivating subject for establishing a democracy. Now let us find out some important definitions of democracy forwarded by some prominent scholars—

- J. S. Mill defines democracy as that form of government in which 'the whole people or some numerous portion of them, exercise the governing power through deputies periodically elected by them.'
- Sir John Seeley defines democracy as a government in which everyone has a share.
- G. K. Chesterton says that 'democracy is, in its essence, a government which is in accord with the general will of the governed.'
- Sir Stafford Cripps observes, 'democracy is a system of government in which every adult citizen is equally free to express his views and desires upon all subjects in whatever way he wishes and to influence the majority of his fellow citizens to decide according to those views and desires.'
- Sartori observes, 'a democratic political system is one which makes government responsive and accountable and its effectiveness depends first and foremost on the efficiency and skill of its leadership.'

Stop To Consider

Features of a Democratic Political System

- There is the supremacy of the will of the people.
 - The government is run by those people who are duly elected by the people at the time of elections which are held at periodic intervals.
 - The government is responsible to the people and it aims at social welfare.
 - Political power is a trust of the people in the hands of the government.
 - It is the primary duty of the government to safeguard the rights of the people.
 - There must be responsible and limited government.
 - There must be an independent judiciary and at least two political parties and pressure groups.
- S.M. Lipset says, 'democracy may be defined as a political system which supplies regular constitutional opportunities for changing the government officials and a social mechanism which permits the largest possible part of the population to influence major decisions by choosing among contenders for political office.'

- According to C.B. Macpherson, 'democracy is merely a mechanism for choosing and authorizing government or in some other way getting laws and political decisions made.'
- According to Prof. Dicey, 'democracy is a form of government in which the governing body is a comparatively large fraction of the entire nation.'

Hence it is clear to you that democracy is not a mere form of government. It is a type of state as well as the order of the society. With Abraham Lincoln we can say that democracy is government of the people, by the people and for the people. In short, we can say that in a democratic government the ultimate authority rests with the public. This helps in making the public policy mirror the will of the common people. The thinkers like John Austin, James Bryce, and A.V. Dicey etc. have defined democracy as a form of government in which everyone has a share. But depending on the political and social environment, the form or the system of democracy may differ in different countries. As for example, in USA democracy is supported by the system of separation of power whereas in England parliamentary sovereignty is a popular concept though the independence of judiciary is maintained. The term democracy is typically used in the context of political state. But it can also be used in private organizations.

3.3.1 Principles of Democracy

Democracy is a type of state and a form of government. Democracy is also an order of the society. The spirit of equality and fraternity are the two most important assets of democracy. On the basis of these ideas we can point out the following principles of democracy :

- Democracy is based on the principle of tolerance. It allows every individual to speak, criticize and disagree with others. Each and every individual can develop their separate ideas and it will not be suppressed.
- A democratic state is not in favour of using illegitimate coercion in the name of social welfare.

- Liberty and equality are the two basic principles of democracy. Democracy is based on the principle of majority rule or rule by the majority. But majority rule never means that the minorities will be dominated. The rights of the minorities are never ignored in a democratic state.
- Democracy believes in peaceful constitutional method against the violent method. It aims at the welfare of the people in general.
- Again, democracy is based on the principle of consent and not coercion. Here the ballot has replaced the bullets.

Hence it is clear for you that democracy is now a way of life which provides an opportunity to the common masses to participate in the decision making process of the government. But at the same time, it is pertinent to mention here that only constructive people's participation makes democracy effective and result oriented.

Check Your Progress

1. Fill in the blanks

- a. Democracy is the government ----- the people, ----- the people and ----- the people.
- b. Democracy is based on ----- not on -----.
- c. Democracy is derived from the two Latin words ----- and -----.

2. Discuss the basic principles of Democracy.

3. Mention three features of a democratic institution.

3.4 Evolution of the Concept of Democracy

As stated earlier the term democracy has originated in ancient Greece with the publication of Greek thinker Herodotus' notion of '*isonomia*' or '*equality before law*'. However, we cannot ignore the fact that other cultures like ancient Rome, Europe, North and South America also contributed towards the development of democracy as a concept. The institutions developed during the European middle ages, enlightenment movement, American and French revolution also influenced the concept of representative democracy.

But during that period the right to vote was a very narrow concept mostly based on property consideration. You should remember here that New Zealand was the first nation to grant universal adult suffrage to all its citizens in 1893.

Ancient origins:

It has already been mentioned that the term democracy was introduced for the first time in ancient Greece. The Greek philosophers mentioned about various forms of government such as monarchy, oligarchy as well as democracy. But you should remember that though the idea of democracy developed in ancient Greece, it was considered to be a perverted idea. It needs mention here that thinkers like Plato and Aristotle criticize democracy to a great extent. Plato firmly holds the view that democracy is the third corruption of the ideal state. They are not in favour of the idea of rule by the majority. They hold the view that all the people in a society are not competent enough to take part in the affairs of the government.

In Greek city states, all the citizens are entitled to speak and vote in the assembly. But the Athenian citizenship is meant only for the males and excludes women, slaves, foreigners and even the males below the 20 years of age.

You should remember here that the early Sumerian city states also played a role in the development of democracy. They had represented the primitive democracy. Again, the Iranian people also favoured oligarchy or proto democracy which existed during the 6th century BC. It needs mention here that the republics of India, Sanghas and Ganas also represented democratic institutions during the 6th century BC. But there is only scattered evidence of this fact and no pure historical source survives. When Alexander attacked India, the Greek historian Diodorus mentioned that independent and democratic states used to exist in India. But according to the historians, during that time, the true nature of democracy was not clear and any oligarchic and autonomous states were termed as democratic.

In ancient period, the Roman Republic also helped in the growth of some aspects of democracy. But significantly, only a minority of Romans was citizens. The Romans introduced a system called Gerrymandering in which the votes of the powerful people were given more weight. Consequently, most of the members of the senate came from wealthy and noble family. But we must not forget here that many notable exceptions did occur.

With the fall of the Roman Empire and the coming of the Dark Age in Europe, the barons became very powerful. The people were left with no power and consequently there was no scope for democracy.

Stop To Consider

Salient Features of Democracy in Greek City States

Plato and Aristotle observed the principles of democracy in some of the Greek city states. The salient features of democracy in ancient Greece were-

- Equal participation by all free man in the common affairs of the Polis(city states)
- Arriving at public decisions in an atmosphere of free discussion and
- General respect for the law and the established procedure of the community.

Middle Ages:

In the Middle Ages too democracy as an idea could not develop. The dominance of faith over politics, birth over merit etc. left democracy an impossible thing to achieve. It was only during the late Middle Ages that the idea of democracy gradually began to develop. The characteristic feature of the Middle Ages is that it involves systems like elections or assemblies. But just like the ancient age, even during the Middle Ages only small amount of people were regarded as citizens. To elaborate, we can cite the example of Gopala in Bengal and the Althing in Iceland etc. But these states were better classified as oligarchy as the participation was often restricted to a minority. As mentioned above, the clergy or the feudal lords used to rule most of the regions of the medieval Europe.

You should understand that the Cossack Republics of Ukraine in 16th-17th centuries come closer to the concept of modern democracy. The representatives from various districts of the country elected the hetman which was the highest post in the state. But it needs mention here that Cossack was a military state and the voting rights were granted only to the military people.

In England, the first step towards democracy was the introduction of Magna Carta which restricted the power of the king and protected certain rights of the king's subject. This has contributed to the growth of Parliament in England. Moreover, it also safeguarded the individual freedom against unlawful

imprisonment with right to appeal. De Montfort's Parliament in 1265 was the first elected parliament in England. But in reality, the parliament was elected only by a small minority of the population. Again, the monarch used to call the parliament at his own wish especially when the fund is needed. Gradually the power of the parliament increased. In England the struggle for supremacy between the Stuart kings and the British parliament had come to an end with the Glorious Revolution of 1688. The English Bill of Rights (1689) enacted after the Glorious Revolution codified certain rights and also established the superiority of parliament over the king. In course of time, parliament became more powerful and monarch has been relegated to the position of a figurehead.

18th and 19th centuries:

The concept of democracy started gaining importance during the 18th and 19th centuries. The American constitution adopted in the year 1788 mentioned about an elected government. The American system is based on the principle of natural freedom and equality, though the founding fathers nowhere describe it as democracy. The constitution also protected civil rights and liberties for some.

It needs mention here that during the colonial period only the adult male property owners enjoyed the right to vote. The enslaved African, the free black people and the women were not included in the scheme of citizenship. In America the widespread social, economic and political equality made democracy a way of life. But slavery was a social and economic institution and it existed in many parts of South America. Gradually, the black people started moving from America to different parts of the world where they can enjoy greater freedom and equality and various institutions were also established to support this movement.

You should remember here that by 1840, property was no longer a qualification to exercise the right to vote. Meanwhile the American colonization society (ACS) established the colony of Liberia so that thousands of former African- American slaves and free black people could move to that colony from USA. By the end of the Civil War in late 1860s, the newly freed slaves became the citizen of the state with a nominal right to vote. And finally the passage of the Voting Rights Act of 1965 by the United States Congress after the African- American Civil Rights Movement(1955-68) had secured the full enfranchisement of citizens.

The American Declaration of Independence and French Declaration of Rights of Man resulted in the framing of the first written constitution based on the principles of representative government and the principles of equality of man and popular sovereignty. Again, in France the Declaration of the Rights of Man and of the citizens had been adopted in the year 1789. The first step towards the establishment of democracy in revolutionary France was the election of national convention by all males in 1792. The French revolution of 1789 firmly established the universal male suffrage in France. This establishment of universal male suffrage in France was an important milestone in the history of democracy.

You should remember here that during the mid- 19th century, the Australian colonies started adopting democratic governments. South Australia became the first government in the world to introduce women suffrage in 1861. Consequently, this led to the argument that the married men were given two votes as the wives would vote the same as their husbands.

It has already been mentioned above that New Zealand became the first major nation to achieve the universal adult suffrage in true sense by granting voting rights to its native men in the year 1867, white men in 1879 and women in 1893. However, till 1919, women were not eligible to stand for parliament.

But you should remember here that before the late 19th century democracy as a government was not highly popular and it was often short- lived. Another noticeable feature of that period was the multiplicity of nations claiming to be the first to introduce universal suffrage.

20th century:

In the 20th century, democracy entered its golden age and becomes a passion among the European people. But this golden age came to an end with the rise of dictators like Hitler and Mussolini. The domination of the dictators led the world to the Second World War. You should remember here that during the 20th century the factors like wars, revolutions, decolonization, religious and economic circumstances gradually led to the transition towards liberal democracy. With the end of the First World War and the dissolution of Ottoman and Austro- Hungarian empires, many new nation- states have been created from Europe and these newly independent nation- states adopted democratic government nominally.

Thus, democracy started to gain importance in the 1920s. But the great depression of 30s highly disappointed the people and most of the countries from Europe, Latin America and Asia adopted dictatorship. Fascism and Nazism got momentum during this time and flourished in Nazi Germany, Italy, Spain, Portugal, Brazil, Cuba, Japan etc.

But this trend of Western Europe has undergone a total change with the Second World War. The nations like America, Britain, Austria, Italy etc. were truly been democratized. This also served as the model for the theory of regime change in the later period. As against the democratic bloc, the non- democratic soviet bloc existed and most of the eastern European countries were forced into this bloc. But the war was followed by the process of decolonization and most of the newly independent nations had adopted democratic constitutions. India has since emerged as the world's largest democracy.

Stop To Consider

Welfare State

A welfare state is a state that provides for various types of social services for its citizens which includes free education, public health, poor relief etc. it also protects the cultural heritage such as monuments, museums, libraries, art galleries, botanical gardens, zoological parks etc. it also aims at the intellectual and cultural development of the society. The welfare state undertakes the responsibility of bringing about the material welfare of the people within the framework of democratic political institutions. It provides unemployment reliefs, maternity benefits, old age pensions etc.

After the end of the Second World War, most of the democratic nations had adopted the notion of welfare state and mixed economies. Though by 1960, a great portion of the countries were democratic nations, yet the majority of world population lived in nation experiencing sham elections.

By late 1970s and 80s several nations like Spain, Portugal and even the military nations in South America also adapted civilian rule. It was followed by Argentina, Bolivia, Uruguay, Brazil, Chile etc in the 1990s.

The Soviet Union has collapsed due to the economic depression in 1980s as well as the resentment of communist oppression. It has led to the end of Cold War and liberalization of former Eastern bloc countries. The countries

geographically and culturally close to Western Europe were the most successful among the newly independent democratic nations. Now, these nations are the members of European Union (EU).

In the 1990s, this trend of liberalization has been spread to the nations in Africa especially South Africa. To elaborate, we can cite the example of the Indonesian revolution of 1998, the bulldozer revolution in Yugoslavia, the Rose revolution in Georgia, the Orange revolution in Ukraine, the Cedar revolution in Lebanon, and the Tulip revolution in Kyrgyzstan.

By now, most of the countries in the world are liberal democracies. If it continues then there will be a point where the liberal democratic nation states will become the universal standard form of human society. This theory forms the core of Francis Fukuyama's concept of 'end of history'.

SAQ:

Do you think that democracy provides an opportunity to the people to participate in the decision making process of the Government? (80 words)

.....
.....
.....
.....
.....

3.5 Direct Participatory Democracy

Direct participatory democracy is a kind of democracy in which the citizens directly take part in the decision making process instead of relying on the representatives. It also involves the principle that the decision making power of the people should be proportionate to the effect of the decision upon them. Participatory democracy is direct democracy in the sense that in participatory democracy the citizens are actively involved in all important decisions. Democracy itself means that powers rests in the hands of the people and from that sense all democracies are participatory democracy. It needs mention here that in traditional representative democracy, citizen's participation is limited to voting only. In participatory democracy the

members of a state get the opportunity to take part in the state affairs. It also tries to expand the range of people who can take part in the decision making process.

In this form of democracy, the people who exercise the right to vote also exercise the power to:—

- Change constitutional laws,
- Put forth initiatives, referenda and suggestions for laws,
- Give binding orders to elective officials, such as revoking them before the end of their elected term, or initiating a lawsuit for breaking a campaign promise.

You have already learnt that democracy as a concept originated in ancient Greece. The democracy in Athens during the 5th century BC was known as direct democracy although it was not a true democracy as the women and slaves were excluded from it. The Athenian democracy was direct in the sense that the assembled people in Athens not only took part in the decision making process but also controlled the entire political process.

It is important to mention here that many countries with representative democratic system allows limited direct participatory democracy in the form of initiative, referendum and recall. A referendum is a kind of direct vote granted to the populace. The people in a state may accept or reject a proposal put forwarded by the government through the use of referendum. Initiative is a signed proposal by the people of the state for consideration of laws or amendments. Again, recall empowers the people to remove elected officials from their office before the expiry of their terms.

Modern direct democracy began in Switzerland in the 13th century. In 1874, the Swiss introduced the optional referendum system in their states. Again in 1891, they added the initiative as they felt that the mere power to veto parliament's law was not enough for a direct participatory democracy. It needs mention here that despite being a federal republic, almost half the states provide for citizen- sponsored ballot initiative.

In the 1960s, the youth and student movements in Europe and America adopted direct democracy with enthusiasm. Direct democracy is also adopted by the American new left, the French and British student movements, early women's movements, anti-nuclear and peace movements etc. It was

also a feature of the ecological and community movements during the 1980s and 90s. But the major problem with the direct participatory democracy is that it invites the involvement of maximum number of people and consequently leads to the slowing down of the decision making process. It is applicable only if the active members are below 500.

You should understand that there is a gradual shift towards direct democracy which is evident from the extensive use of referenda in California as well as in Switzerland along with initiative. Direct democracy prevails at cantonal and communal level also. The Vermont town where town meetings are held in March every year to discuss the local issues can be cited as an example. But it needs mention here that most of the examples of direct democracy prevail in its small and weak forms. The world is yet to see a large, fundamental and working example of direct democracy as of yet.

Stop To Consider

Theories of Democracy

There are three important theories of democracy. These are the elitist theory, the pluralist theory and the participatory theory.

- Elitist theory was developed during the 19th century. This theory mainly focuses on the institutions of democracy and realities of the western liberal democratic political system. The basic assumption of this theory is that in every society a minority of the population takes the major decisions in the society. This minority group of population is known as the elites. The elitist theorists are of the view that the general masses are not capable of maintaining the democratic system. Therefore, the elites should take this responsibility. The important advocates of this theory includes Vilfredo Pareto, Gaetano Mosca, Robert Michels, James Burnham, Joseph A. Schumpeter, Raymond Aron, Giovanni Sartori, Karl Mannheim etc. Gaetano Mosca put forwarded his views in his famous book *The Ruling Class*. Vilfredo Pareto also discussed the elitist theory of democracy in his famous work *The Mind and Society*. Both of them held the view that the society is divided between the majority and the minority. The minority is the ruling class and this class changes from time to time. This is also known as Circulation of Elites. Robert Michel, on the other hand, propounded the theory of Iron Law of Oligarchy. He is of view that whatever form of government is adopted, eventually it will be reduced to oligarchy. The elitist theory justifies inequality on the basis of ability, character, capability, experience and wealth.

- The theory of participatory democracy believes that the basic principle of democracy is the participation of people in the state affairs. The participation can be of various forms such as voting, campaigning in the elections and even an act of opposition or public protest. C. B. Macpherson was one of the major advocates of this theory.
- The pluralist theory of democracy emphasizes the role of multi-party system and pressure groups in a political system. Unlike the elitists, the pluralists opine that power is enjoyed by many groups and is not concentrated in the hands of the elites. They hold the view that all the organized groups in the society shall have their share in policy making. According to Robert Dahl, one of the major advocates of pluralist theory, democracy is a political method in which the non-leaders choose their leaders through fair election. He advocates the pluralist theory of democracy in his famous book *A Preface To Democratic Theory*. He also opines that the non-leaders do not exercise power due to non participation and apathy.

Check Your Progress

1. Define direct democracy.
2. Trace the relationship between the people and government in a democratic government.
3. Discuss the evolution of democratic system in the contemporary world.
4. Examine the importance of political party in democracy as stated by the pluralist theory of democracy.

3.6 Liberal Democracy

You have already learnt that direct participatory democracy is one of the forms of democracy. Now let us discuss liberal democracy in brief. Liberal democracy is a kind of representative democracy which is based on the principle of free and fair election as well as competitive political process. In a liberal democracy, every citizen enjoys the right to vote irrespective of their race, gender or property ownership. But from historical perspective, some countries exercising liberal democracy granted limited suffrage to its citizens. In some states, voters may have to register themselves before being allowed to vote. In this context it is pertinent to mention here that all the citizens do not take part in the decision making process through elections.

Only those who actively take part in voting process, participate in the decision making process. Again, in a liberal democracy, the constitution protects the individual liberty and the rights of the minorities as well. Rights like freedom of speech and assembly, freedom of religion, right to private property and privacy, equality before law etc. are protected by the constitution. The constitution guarantees these rights through various institutions and statutory laws.

You should remember here that unlike democratic principles, during the 18th and 19th centuries, classical liberalism refers to property qualification as one of the important criteria for right to vote. In the later phase, the liberal policies are responsible for the promotion of free market economy which in turn bring large- scale industrialization and urbanization. Industrialization helps in the growth of working class as a separate identity. They consequently survive in sub- human conditions which gradually make them conscious of their rights. They start demanding a voice at the decision making level. Therefore, the liberal states are forced to adopt the democratic principles. The outcome of this combination emerges as the liberal democracy. The states of European Union, Norway, Iceland, Switzerland, Japan, Philippines, Russia, Germany, South Korea, Taiwan, United States, Canada, India, Israel, Mexico, South Africa, Australia, New Zealand etc. are some of the liberal democracies in the world. But in countries like Africa and former Soviet Union, many of the officially democratic countries are considered undemocratic as the sitting government influences the election outcomes. Non- democratic governments are common in Middle- East, East Asia and North Africa.

It needs mention here that there are various forms of liberal democracy. For example, federal republic represented by the United States, Brazil, India, Germany etc. or constitutional monarchy represented by Britain, Japan, Canada or Spain. Again, it may have presidential system like United States or Brazil or a parliamentary system like UK. Moreover, there is another form known as semi presidential system like in France or Russia.

You must remember here that liberal democracy has originated in the 18th century Europe known as the age of Enlightenment. During that time, monarchy or the aristocracy were the prevailing forms of government. Democracy was not at all a popular concept as the people believed that

democracies would be inherently unstable and chaotic in their policies. They also believed that human beings by nature were evil and violent. Therefore, they need a strong leader to restrict their destructive impulses. Moreover, it was also believed that the monarchs derive their power directly from God and therefore no one can question their authority.

But a relatively small group of Enlightenment intellectuals have challenged this conventional view. They put forward the argument that human affairs should be guided by reason as well as the principle of liberty and equality. They have firm faith on the equality of man and therefore, oppose the idea of rule by noble blood which has a privileged connection with God. It will make one person superior to other which was opposed to the notion of equality.

It needs mention here that although the Enlightenment liberals put forward the idea of liberal democracy, yet there is a controversial relation between the concepts liberal and democracy. Classical liberalism is highly individualistic and limits the power of the state over the individual. Unlike classical liberalism, democracy is a collectivist idea and it empowers the masses.

You should remember here that these ideas have inspired the American and French revolution by the end of the 18th century and developed into the ideology of liberalism. Unlike the modern liberal democracies, the liberal democracy during that period granted limited voting right to the minority of population. Though the French attempt to establish a liberal democratic state was short-lived, yet these were the models on the basis of which the modern liberal democracy grew up. The government was called the liberal democracies as the supporters of this government were known as liberal democrats.

Stop To Consider

Principles of Liberal Democracy

Liberal democracy consists of certain principles which are as follows–

1. Government by Consent- Democracy is a government based on the consent of the people. The consent must be achieved by rational persuasion through free discussion. In a democracy, every citizen should have the freedom of expression which helps in free discussion. These discussions take place at

two levels- firstly, among the representative members of the assembly and secondly, at the public level where there is direct communication between the leaders and the general public. Mass media like television, newspaper etc also acts as effective communication medium between the leaders and the public.

2. Public Accountability- You have already learnt that liberal democracy is based on the consent of the people. Therefore, the government in a liberal democracy is answerable to the people who create it. John Locke is of the view that the government in a liberal democracy is a trustee of the power of the people. He wants the people to be constantly vigilant so that the government cannot misuse its power. According to Jeremy Bentham, the government may try to maximize their happiness by the misuse of power. So the governors should be made responsible to an electorate which will keep an eye on them so that they cannot misuse their powers.

3. Majority Rule- The third principle of a liberal democracy is the majority rule. Majority rule implies that all the issues in any legislative, executive or regulative bodies should be resolved through voting. It insists on the principle of one man one vote. It means that there will be no discrimination on the basis of religion, race, caste, sex, place of birth, ownership of property and even educational qualification. There will be no privileged section with special weightage nor there will be any unprivileged section whose voice is ignored. There can be restriction of suffrage only on special conditions i.e. cases involving the convicted criminals, mental patients, and persons below a legally fixed age.

4. Recognition of Minority Rights- Majority rule in no way means the suppression of minorities. In a state there are various minority groups like racial, cultural, religious, linguistic minorities. The minorities may fear discrimination or domination by the majority. In a liberal democracy the rights and interests of the minorities are protected through law of the country.

5. Constitutional Government- In a constitutional government, the supreme power is vested in the hands of laws rather than any individual or group of individuals. For the success of democracy a complex set of processes and machineries is needed. A well established law will help in stabilize the democratic government.

When the first liberal democratic model was established, the liberals were regarded as the extremes and it was also believed that the liberals would destroy the international peace and stability. While opposing democracy the monarchists became the defender of traditional values. Their criticism for democracy has been proved justified when Napoleon Bonaparte took control of the young liberal democratic French republic. Consequently,

alliances had been established among the opponents of democracy to prevent the further spread of democratic values. But by 19th century, democracy got widespread momentum and became a dominant value in the international arena.

Most of the European countries started adopting liberal democracy through various kinds of reforms and revolutions. Gradually, monarchy became a peripheral concept and democracy joined the mainstream politics. By the end of the Second World War, democracy become dominant among the theories of government and got widespread popularity among the vast majority of the political spectrum.

SAQ:

Do you consider that the democratic system is best suitable in Indian perspective? (60 words)

.....
.....
.....
.....
.....

3.7 Critical Estimate

Already we have learnt that now democracy transformed itself from a system of government to a way of life. Now democracy becomes the hub of people aspiration and their emotion is attached herewith. Though the democratic ideals are accepted throughout the world it faced severe criticism as follows

1. Democracy is criticized to be a rule by the ignorant and irresponsible majority. Aristotle regarded democracy as a perverted form of government. Mill was of the view that in a democracy, the majority might suppress the minority and there was always a possibility of the tyranny of the majority. The critics also hold the view that in democracy undue importance is given to the quantity rather than quality. Votes are counted and not weighed. The ignorant masses are all powerful and expert knowledge is not considered in most of the cases.

2. According to one group of critics, democracy leads to oligarchy. They also hold the view that all the individuals are not competent enough to choose their representative. Most of the time they chose a leader on the basis of his or her popularity rather than the ability to rule the country. This is certainly harmful to the future of democracy.
3. Party system is an inevitable part of a democracy. But party system creates division, encourages hollowness and insincerity and often leads to invisible oligarchy. The rigid party system often destructs the liberty of the people as they have to choose among the candidates selected by the party without genuinely approving any one of them.
4. The elected representative in a democracy is much more affiliated to the strict party rules and regulations rather than to their electorates. They are committed to the vested interests rather than to the general masses.
5. Democracy is the most expensive form of government. The frequent election procedure in a democracy along with the organization of public opinion and preparation of propaganda involves great deal of money. According to the critics, in a democracy the money which should be used for social and economic development of the country is spent on the elections. Again, there is not only the waste of money but also time and opportunity.
6. In a democracy there is always a temptation to falsify. The political leaders exaggerate the issues to catch votes. Some issues are dominated so cleverly that public do not even get a hint. They use the issues in their favour.

To conclude we can summarize the criticism of democracy in the words of Lord Bryce as follows

- The power of money to pervert administration or legislation.
- The tendency to make politics a gainful profession.
- Extravagance in administration.
- The abuse of the doctrine of equality and failure to appreciate the value of administrative skill.
- The undue power of party organization.

- The tendency of legislators or political officials to play for votes in the passing of laws and in tolerating breaches of laws.

Stop To Consider

Conditions Essential for the Success of Democracy

It has been seen that democracy can work successfully only under certain circumstances. Some conditions are necessary for the success of the democratic states. These are as follows-

- The people should have a sound system of education. Democracy means rule by the majority. The people in a democracy are the masters and therefore, they should be educated so that they can take the right decision.
- In a democracy, the people should be conscious of the community as a whole. The public in a democracy should give more importance to the community interest rather than their private interest.
- Strong and vigorous public opinion is another important condition for the success of democracy.
- Free expression of opinion and free discussion are also conditions for the success of democracy. For the development of strong public opinion, free expression and free discussion are essential.
- The existence of the good leaders is another condition. A far-sighted, enlightened and effective leader is essential for the success of democracy.
- Free, fearless and independent press also helps in the success of a democracy. A free press can criticize the democratic government when something goes wrong.

3.8 Summing Up

After going through this unit now you are in a position to understand that democracy is a form of government, a type of state as well as an order of the society where everyone gets equal share. You have also learnt that in democracy people get an opportunity to take part in the affairs of the state either directly or through their elected representatives. The democracy in ancient Athens was a direct democracy though it was not democracy in the true sense of the term. Again you also find the trace of direct democratic tradition in present Switzerland where every citizen participates through General Assembly. However in a vast country like India, it is impossible to establish the process of direct democratic traditions. In this regard we can

point out that now democracy means the rule of representatives. Sometimes it is also used as a synonym for liberal democracy. Though democracy is widely accepted it is not free from criticism. In this context, we can point out that for an effective democratic system people should be aware of their system which is not possible due to the lack of education and negligence of political parties. Nevertheless it cannot be denied that democracy is the only way of government where a common man gets importance and can participate in the administrative affairs.

3.9 References and Suggested Readings

Political Theory by Eddy Asirvatham and K.K.Misra, S. Chand & Company Ltd., New Delhi, reprint 2008

Political Theory by N.D.Arora and S.S. Awasthy, Har-Anand Publications Pvt Ltd, New Delhi, 1996, 2004 reprint.

An Introduction to Political Theory by O P Gauba, Macmillan India Ltd. Delhi, 1981, 2004 reprint.

Political Theory by V. D. Mahajan, S. Chand & Company Ltd., New Delhi, reprint 2000.

* * *

Unit 4

State and Citizenship

Contents:

- 4.1 Introduction**
- 4.2 Objective**
- 4.3 Meaning of State**
- 4.4 Evolution of modern state**
- 4.5 Challenges to the Sovereignty of the State**
- 4.6 Meaning of Citizenship**
- 4.7 Historical Development of the concept of Citizenship**
- 4.8 Global citizenship**
- 4.9 Summing Up**
- 4.10 References and Suggested Readings**

4.1 Introduction

This unit is an attempt at offering a systematic conceptualization of State. We know that as a human being, we never live in isolation. We live in society with other man, in the midst of members of our family, relatives and friends, and when a society is organized on a political basis in a given territory, and when human beings come together for the fulfillment of common interests of having common code of behaviour or for respecting common set of laws, then the state is formed. In this unit we shall discuss meaning of the state on the basis of some definitions offered by prominent scholars. In this unit an attempt is also made for introducing you with the evolution of modern state system and challenges faced by a sovereign state. You know that citizens are the members of the state. In general sense, citizenship refers to the membership of the political community called the state. Citizens are the members of a state who enjoys all rights and privileges granted by it and also discharge his duties and obligations towards the state and other associations within it. In this unit an attempt has been made to analyze the meaning of citizenship as well as the development of the concept of

citizenship to its modern form. In ancient Greek society, very few inhabitants were considered as citizens. The Romans also did not give much importance to the concept of citizenship. It is only in modern times, with the popularization of the concept of democracy that citizenship become an important concept. An attempt has also been made to explain universal or global citizenship.

4.2 Objective

Since the time immemorial the state is the basic need of human beings and the right of citizenship is the major issue of discussion among the scholars. After reading this unit you will be able to

- *discuss* the meaning and definitions of the citizenship and state
- *describe* the constituent elements of the State
- *analyze* the evolution of modern state system
- *describe* the challenges to state sovereignty
- *analyze* the growth and development of the concept of citizenship
- *explain* the notion of global citizenship

4.3 Meaning of State

The present meaning of the term state did not become popular until the sixteenth century. It was Machiavelli who used the term for the first time in his book The Prince. Since then state occupied a prominent position in the study of Political Science. But lack of uniformity of opinion amongst the scholars regarding the meaning of state makes the term highly controversial. The different meaning assigned to it by different scholars contributes to its complex nature. Let us discuss briefly the meaning and definitions of state forwarded by the scholars.

Meaning and Definitions of State:

As we know when a society is organized on a political basis and when human beings come together for achieving some common goals in a given territory, state emerges. As we stated earlier, Political Science deals with state, the highest of all human associations. The term originated in Greece and the Greeks used the word Polis which nearly means the English term 'State'. But the Greeks used the term Polis for city state. We know that the

modern sense of the term 'State' is used by Machiavelli, and now it becomes an essential element of human life. However, scholars are unable to provide a universally applicable definition of it as state appears in different forms. To elaborate, let us discuss some definitions of state forwarded by the scholars.

Aristotle defined the state as a "union of families and villages having for its end a perfect and self-sufficing life by which we mean a happy and honorable life".

According to Cicero, "the state is a numerous society united by a common sense of right and a mutual participation in advantages".

In 1576, Bodin forwarded his definition on state. For him "state is an association of families and their common possessions, governed by supreme power and reason".

According to Burges, "State is a particular portion of mankind viewed as an organized unit".

Bluntschli defines state as a politically organized people of a definite territory.

According to Woodrow Wilson, the state is, "people organized for law within a definite territory."

As opined by Oppenheim the state exists when a people is settled in a country under its own sovereign government.

But McIver believes that the state is an association acting through laws promulgated by a concerned government with coercive power.

According to Prof. Gilchrist, "the state is a concept of Political Science and a moral reality which exists where a number of people living on a definite territory, are unified under a government which in internal matters is the organ for expressing their sovereignty and in external matters is independent of other government".

But these definitions are incomplete and unable to explain the present form of state. For example, a state needs four elements (People, Government, Sovereignty and Territory), but after carefully analyzing the above definitions we find that these definitions do not accommodate the elements of a state. However Gabriel Almond tries to analyze the state combining these four elements. He uses the term 'Political System' instead of state. His definition

is also known as the modern conception of the state. According to him, "political system is the system of interactions to be found in all independent societies which perform the functions of integration and adaptations by means of employment or threat of employment, of more or less legitimate physical compulsion". Again he describes political system as legitimate, order maintaining or transforming system in the society.

Hence it can be said that state is a political system comprising all the people in a definite territory, under a legitimate government to fulfill their common goals as a whole. Internally it exercises full control over its population and externally it is free to take any decisions. In other words we can say that state is a legal entity.

Stop To Consider

Difference between State and Society:

Society is a term which designates the whole network of various types of relationship. On the other hand, state is a politically organized society. The differences between state and society are as follows:

1. Society arose much earlier than the State.
2. Society is a bond of relationship; it is not bound by territorial frontiers. But state is a politically organized society with clearly marked territorial limits.
3. The scope of society is wider than the state. It is a large group of associations beyond the state border.
4. Government is an essential feature of state, but it is not necessary for the society.

Constituent elements of the State:

As stated in the earlier section state has four essential elements,

1. Population
2. Territory
3. Government, and
4. Sovereignty

Among these elements sovereignty is the most important elements for a state. Without sovereignty no state can be recognized. Let us discuss these elements

1. Population: State is meant for human being and no state can be formed without population. Population is inevitably a basic requirement of the state. But there are no certain limitations of population that a state should have. In this regard J. W. Garner says, "The nearest approach to a safe rule is to say that population must be sufficient to provide a governing body and a number of persons to be governed, and of course sufficient to support a state organization". However Plato puts the ideal number at 5,040. Nevertheless, it does not matter how much population a state have. The main point is the character of the citizens which makes them supportive to their government. It can be said that the nature and character of people can make or mar a state.

2. Territory: The second element of state is territory. Like population, fixed territory is very essential for a state. Obviously there cannot be a state without territory. For example we can say that despite having the desire to form a state and political unity among Jews, the Jews could not have a state of their own until 1948, when Palestine was partitioned between the Jews and the Arabs,. Like population there is no certain limitation of territory that a state can have. For example, Russia has 17,075,000 sq.km of territory but Vatican City has only 0.4 sq.km of territory.

3. Government: After having population and territory the state needs a government to control the population and formulate policy regarding the maintenance of statuesque. Government is the ruling or managing body through which the state expresses its will, enforces it and acts. Hence a state cannot function without the government. A state can opt for any type of government as there is no fixed rule. For example there are many types of government- despotic, democratic, monarchical, republican etc. States can opt any one form of government. To elaborate, England has the system of limited monarchy with parliamentary system of government, USA has presidential form of government, and Monarchy is prevalent in Bhutan.

4. Sovereignty: Sovereignty means supreme power and it is one of the essential elements of a state. It manifests itself in the internal and external fields. It is the basic need of a state. Without Sovereignty no state can be recognized. For example, during the British rule India has population, territory even government too. But India lacked sovereignty and was not regarded as a state. But after independence, after gaining its sovereignty India was recognized as a state.

Hence, it is clear that for the formation of a state we need the above mentioned four elements. The USA, the USSR, India are the examples of full-fledged states having all the four constituent elements. Assam is a part of India, having its population, government and territory but it lacks sovereignty as it comes under the control of Indian Union Government. So, Assam is not a state.

SAQ:

Do you think that without a governmental system a state can be formed? Give arguments in favour of your answer.(100 words)

.....
.....
.....
.....
.....

4.3 Origin of the State

The origin of the state is one of the controversial topics in Political Science which has given rise to much speculation by political scientists. They forward different views through their theories. Here, in this section we are going to discuss three important theories regarding the origin of the state.

Social Contract Theory:

Social contract means an agreement through which society or state is created. It is one of the earliest theories regarding the origin of the state. The theory can be traced back to the Sophists of ancient Greece who argue that the state is an artificial institution which is a result of a contract. In a systematic manner Hobbes, Locke and Rousseau popularized this theory to the study of politics. According to them the state emerged as a result of a deliberate and voluntary agreement among primitive men in a pre social and pre-political age. Let us discuss the social contract theory propounded by these thinkers.

Social Contract Theory of Hobbes:

Hobbes, an English Philosopher forwards his social contract theory regarding the origin of the State in his famous book Leviathan. Before discussing his theory, he examines the state of nature and human nature. He offers a bleak picture of man's condition in a pre social stage. When they were brutal, selfish, egoistic, covetous, rapacious and utterly devoid of the sense of right and wrong. Selfish interest and fear dominate human life and there is no one to control them. Status of a man depends on his physical force. For these reasons, the state of nature is indeed too gloomy and too terrible to continue perpetually and indefinitely because here every man is the enemy of other. So, in order to avoid such horror and anarchical situation, according to Hobbes, men made up their minds to give up their brutal nature along with their natural freedom and form a civil society. They created civil society to protect their life and property and punish the wrong doers and the wicked. So they made a contract of each with all and of all with each, a social covenant or contract. In Hobbes' contract, every man said to every other man, " I authorize and give up my rights to governing myself to this man or this assembly of men (government) on this condition that thou give up thy right to him and authorities all his actions in like manner". According to him, men made only one contract as there is no other contract like governmental contract as stated by Locke. Through his theory, Hobbes argues that state is the result of deliberate human effort. He believes that social contract improves people's way of lives by ensuring peace and setting up morals, laws, values, and compromises. Hobbes is in favour of imposing severe penalties on those who disobey the laws and break the contracts. He also favoures the absolute monarchical system. According to him, it is the best government to control the society.

SAQ:

Do you think it is possible to form a civil society in a pre-social period?

(60 words)

.....
.....
.....

Social Contract Theory of Locke:

Another exponent of social contract theory is John Locke. Like Hobbes, he also discusses the state of nature and human nature before forwarding his view on social contract. However his concept of social contract is much more palatable than Hobbes'. In his book *Two Treatises on Government*, Locke analyzes his theory of Social Contract.

In Locke's theory, we find a quite different picture of the state of nature. In Locke's view, the state of nature is the natural condition of mankind and it is a state of perfect and complete liberty to conduct one's life free from the interference of others. However, there is no authority to impose laws and punish the wrong doers and all are governed by the law of nature. The State of Nature is pre-political, but it is not pre-moral. Human beings are assumed to be equal to one another in such a state, and therefore equally capable of discovering and being bound by the law of nature.

But, in the mean time private property and the greedy nature of people created anarchy in the state of nature. So to preserve their wealth and lives, liberty, and well-being people entered into a contract. But in this context, it is evident to mention here that unlike Hobbes, Locke envisages two contracts. According to him, through the first contract people creates the civil society and through the second contract they create the government which is the limited form of monarchical government .

If we summarize Locke's contracts, we find that by making a contract to leave the State of Nature and form society, people make "one body politic under one government" and submit themselves to the will of that body. One joins such a body, either from its beginnings, or after it has already been established by others, only by explicit consent. Having created a political society and government through their consent, men then gain three things which they lacked in the State of Nature: laws, judges to adjudicate laws, and the executive power necessary to enforce these laws. Each man therefore transfers the power to protect himself and punish transgressors of the Law of Nature to the government created through the contract.

Check Your Progress:

1. What are the four elements of a state?
2. Define state.
3. Examine the social contract theory of Hobbes. Trace the differences between Hobbes and Locke's social contract theories.
4. Mention some characteristics of human beings as depicted on Hobbes' state of nature.
5. Analyse Locke's state of Nature.

Social Contract Theory of Rousseau

Another important figure of social contract theory is Jean Jacques Rousseau who examines his view in his famous book *Social Contract*. Like his predecessors, he also deals with the state of nature and human nature to forward his view regarding the origin of the state. In this context, Rousseau offers a positive picture of state of nature. His primitive men are noble savages, leading a natural, innocent and simple life and experiencing idyllic happiness. People who are kind and sympathetic towards each other are equal, self sufficient and contented.

The rise of population and rise of science and reason, family, private property, social institutions are central to the destruction of the state of idyllic happiness. These factors lead to degeneration of the state of nature and unhappiness, bickering and disorder become the general rule. To get rid of these horrible situations people opt for a social and political contract. In Rousseau's social contract, each individual makes agreement with all, and all with each, giving rise to a civil society, or state in which all depend on all. Unlike Locke, Rousseau envisages only one contract. In his state, government is formed on the basis of people's popular consent. People have the power to dissolve the government which indicates the birth of direct democratic system.

Thus, from the above discussion we can conclude that the social contract implies a situation where the people give up sovereignty to a government or other authority in order to receive or maintain social order through the rule of law. It can also be thought of as an agreement by the governed on a set of rules by which they are governed. Social contract theory is an important notion regarding the origin of the state and to understand the concept that legitimate state authority must be derived from the consent of the ruled.

SAQ:

Make a comparative analysis of the above mentioned social contract theories in terms of similarities and differences. (60 words)

.....
.....
.....
.....
.....

Divine Theory:

In the earlier sections we have discussed the social contract theories regarding the origin of the state. The above discussion conceptualizes the state as a byproduct of an agreement made between people in primitive society. Here in this section, we are going to discuss one of the earliest approaches regarding the origin of the state in the form of Divine Theory which completely rejects the idea of social contract.

The divine theory is almost as old as the state itself, and is universally accepted in the primitive society. It is a well authenticated fact that the early forms of political authority are often connected with unseen powers. Hegel also believes that the state is the march of God on earth. MacIver states that the earliest rulers are a combination of Priest, Magic man, and King.

The basic theme of the theory is that the state is the creation of the God on Earth. Divine theory provides the following three implications regarding the origin of the state:

1. God establishes the state
2. God appoints the King
3. The King is responsible only to God not to the people.

The theory is the supporter of absolute monarchy and the oldest theory of state. We also find the root of this theory in our epics as Mahabharata, Ramayana. According to the Mahabharata, when there was anarchy in the world the people prayed to God for a King and God appointed Manu to rule over them.

According to the Jews, the King owes responsibility to God alone for his acts. There are many references in the Old Testament which state that God appoints, dismisses, and even slays rulers. These references are used by Medieval writers to assert supremacy of the Catholic church over political affairs as the Pope is regarded as a living man closest to God. The Protestant Reformation gives a new impetus to the divine theory. It is declared in the Augsburg Confession that all authority, government, law and order have been created and established by God himself. Bousset advocates the theory of divine origin to support the despotism of Louis XIV. James I, in his book *The Law of Free Monarchies* asserts this theory claiming that Kings derive their authority directly from God. However the theory has lost its popularity by the late 18th century although it is still popular in places such as Czarist Russia until its collapse.

Historical or Evolutionary Theory:

We have already learnt that according to the Divine Theory state is the by product of God. Social contract theory visualizes state as a result of agreement. The lack of focus in these theories led to the emergence of a new theory which explains the origin of the state. This historical or evolutionary theory is the result of the modern sociological, historical and anthropological research. As a realistic, scientific and reasonable theory it explain lucidly how state originates and evolves. .

According to this theory, the state does not rise suddenly. It is not a product of God or contracts. It is a result of human plan at a given time and it takes a long process of evolution. Multiplicities of factors working through different periods create the state. Multiple factors influence human minds to develop loyalty and obedience to a common authority. Consequently the state is created in due course of time. Some influential factors in origin of the sate are kingship, religion, economic needs, force and political consciousness.

4.4 Evolution of ModernState

The modern concept of Nation state is the by product of Westphalian sovereignty based on two things:

1. territoriality and

2. the absence of a role for external agents in domestic structures

Scholars have identified the modern, Western originated, international system of states, multinational corporations, and organizations, as having begun at the Peace of Westphalia in 1648. It has ended the supranational authority on European states. The "Westphalian" doctrine of states as independent agents is bolstered by the rise in 19th century thought of nationalism, under which legitimate states are assumed to correspond to nations defined as a groups of people united by language and culture.

The Peace of Westphalia is an important doctrine of modern state system. It is also defined as the beginning of the international system with which the discipline deals. It mainly deals with

- The principle of the sovereignty of states and the fundamental right of political self determination.
- The principle of (legal) equality between states.
- The principle of non-intervention of one state in the internal affairs of another state.

Check Your Progress:

1. Examine the evolutionary theory as the most relevant theory regarding the origin of the state.
2. Write a note on the evolution of modern nation state system.
3. Mention two differences between Divine origin theory and evolutionary theory of the state.
4. Write a note on the impact of Westphalia treaty in evolution of state.

4.5 Challenges to the Sovereignty of the State

The process of globalization, the evolution of political attitudes, the activities of non-state actors, and emerging standards of governmental performance have changed the complete picture of traditional state system. However the sovereignty of the state faces various challenges. Let us discuss the factors challenging the sovereignty of the state.

1. **Social inequality:** Social inequality is one of the major challenges in front of every sovereign nation. Basically the problem characterizes the Third World countries. Due to the social inequality, aggressive attitudes affect the people leading to mass mobilization of people against the government. For example, in India the North Eastern region faces marginal treatment and consequently many terrorist organizations fighting against the state are formed in this region. These factors restrict the developmental procedures and emerge as threat to the sovereignty of the state.
2. **Communalism:** Communalism stands for over indulgence in one's community at the cost of neglecting others. Communal forces appear to be a threat to the sovereignty of the state as the presence of communal biases destroy the unity and integrity of the nation and bars the developmental activities.
3. **Global terrorism:** Global terrorism has become the most dangerous problem in front of the sovereignty of the state. No countries are free from this evil. For example, we can point out the incident of 26/11 in USA, attacks on Indian Parliament. As observed by Phil Williams, the terrorist groups are operating against the state system and transnational criminal organizations and their networks pose a serious challenge to the most technologically developed states. Well-financed and technologically-refined transnational criminal organizations and networks, unencumbered by the need to remain within the law and capable of shifting their base of operations to the most accommodating country, actively seek to exploit the weak points, or "capacity gaps," in a state's enforcement mechanisms. While developed states may use advanced technology against criminal elements, this technique entails a danger of imposing such harsh restraints upon its citizens' civil liberties that state legitimacy suffers and the quality of civil society decreases. This is a particularly sensitive limitation where democratic forms of government are concerned.
4. **Globalization:** Globalization brings the entire globe under one umbrella. In this context particular attention is paid to the dramatically increased efficiency of handling information, the integration of national economies into global financial markets, the increasing porosity of borders, and

the continuing expansion in the volume of international trade - all the factors that make states progressively more interdependent (or dependent in some cases) upon forces and institutions outside their borders. Although there is no consensus about the cumulative effects of globalization on the state except that they appear to be very wide-ranging, the ability of states to cope with globalization vary considerably.

5. **Increase in the Criminal activity:** increase in the criminal activity makes Williams argue that the severity of the threat of organized crime has become so pronounced that it begins to redefine the idea of a state. He introduces the term "captured state" to describe situations in which criminal influence become so pervasive that the state effectively becomes a partner with organized crime. Some states have essentially been taken over by organized crime and are termed "criminal states." The implication of this trend lies in the creation of a bifurcated world, with captured and criminal states set against sovereign states.
6. **Explosive growth of influential Non-State Actors:** Lester Salamon points out that the explosive growth of influential non-state actors is affecting not only the range of governmental functions, but also the governance of the states. The "new governance" entails a shift away from "programs and policies" thinking towards a "tools and instruments of action" approach. An associated shift in which the nonprofit sector is very significant can be seen in a change from "public sector versus private sector" thinking towards "public sector plus private sector" thinking. This alters the role of the nation-state away from command and control towards negotiation and persuasion. Where governments have traditionally viewed themselves as the exclusive providers of services, they will evolve into managers of services, turning over the provision of certain services to non-state actors better qualified.

Thus from the above discussion, we come to know the threats to sovereignty of the state. Regardless of a fundamental change in the international system, everyone expect states to remain predominant. But this consensus also incorporates the view that, in general, state capacity will decrease as a result of globalization and the increasing influence of non-state actors and their networks.

4.6 Meaning of Citizenship

It has already been mentioned above that in general sense citizenship refers to the membership of the political community called the state. Citizenship implies a membership of the state as well as a legal recognition of the person. All social beings are not citizens but all citizens are social beings. As a social being we are the members of the society. But to become a political being, we need to be a member of a state. This membership may also be acquired by birth. It grants us a legal status and there are well defined rights and duties behind this status. As a social being we have certain rights and responsibilities. But in a state we have a legal sanction. As for instance, our right to vote is a legally recognized right whereas our right to help poor has a social or moral bearing. Aristotle defines citizen as a person who possesses virtues of a law maker as well as a judge. But this definition is not practical at all. Everyone in ancient Greece generally and Athens in particular, was a law maker as they participated in law making. But each one was not a magistrate or an official. As a result, the citizens' body in Greek society was the smallest fraction of the entire population.

The terms 'citizenship' and 'citizen' have been derived from the Latin word *civis* meaning a resident of a city. Therefore, citizen is one who lives in a city and citizenship is the status of the citizen. Citizenship is a symbol which gives recognition to the fact that a citizen is a resident of a city. But this is a very narrow meaning of citizenship and it does not include the modern day characteristics of a citizen. In modern times a citizen owes allegiance to the state in which he resides. He has full share of civil and political privileges and makes an intelligent contribution to the flow of social richness.

You should remember here that citizenship not only bestows status and grants recognition, but also demands participation in the state affairs. It is very important to mention here that we find citizens only in a democracy. There are no citizens in a monarchy.

4.7 Historical Development of the Concept of Citizenship

From the above discussion you must have gathered some idea about the concept of citizenship. Now let us discuss the growth and development of the concept of citizenship through the ages. The history of citizenship can

be divided into two periods- (a)pre-French Revolution period and (b) post-French Revolution period. In the pre- French Revolution period one is called a citizen if he participates in the affairs of the state. This is a Greek legacy. The second era i.e. the the post- French Revolution period is marked by the absence of civic virtue in a citizen. Now let us discuss the various stages of the development of the concept of citizenship in this section.

Citizenship in Ancient Times :

It is pertinent to mention here that in the ancient Greek society, citizenship as a concept could not develop much due to the anti- democratic stance of the society. Unlike the modern democratic states where all the members of the community are regarded as citizens, in the Greek society very few inhabitants were considered as citizens. You must remember here that the citizens were the freemen which constituted approximately 10% of the total population of the Greek society. No discrimination was made on the basis of property among the freemen and the rest of the population in the community comprised of slaves, women and aliens, were given no right of citizenship. During that time, the citizens were expected to perform certain duties so that they could secure a good life for themselves as well as for the non- citizens.

The two prominent Greek political thinkers Plato and Aristotle also dealt with the concept of citizenship. Plato in his *Republic* divides the people of Athens into three classes viz. men of reason, men of spirit and the men of appetite. According to him, all the three classes are citizens with their respective rights and obligations. He regards the first two classes as active citizens whereas the third is the class of passive citizens. Again in his *Laws* he mentions that one's lack of education and not race is the greatest obstacle to become a citizen of Magnesia i.e. his law state. But the slaves are denied the rights and privileges of a citizen in Plato's theory.

Aristotle, the greatest disciple of Plato, has dealt with the negative aspect of citizenship. He does not insist on the residential qualification or the legal rights. According to him, aliens and slaves also have the residential qualification. But they are not the citizens. Again, the legal rights may be possessed even by the aliens. He also excludes the children from his scheme of citizenship. Aristotle thinks that though the children are citizen in a sense

still they are not citizen in an absolute sense. Moreover, he also believes that those people born of citizen father and not of citizen mother or vice versa cannot be considered as citizens.

You should remember here that according to Aristotle, a citizen is one who has a share in the administration of justice and enjoys the right to hold office for any period. But the question arises whether those people who acquire the right to hold office as a result of revolution should be considered as citizens or not. Aristotle's answer is affirmative. Next comes the question what are the virtues of citizens? He considers the protection of the community and the capability to rule and be ruled the two most important virtues of a citizen.

Stop To Consider

Characteristics of Citizenship

Citizenship is not only an arrangement of rights but also a system of duties. It has certain characteristic features which are as follows-

- Membership of a political community and legally recognized.
- A status which is the exclusive property of the citizen.
- Participation in the affairs of the state.
- Provision and exercise of political rights to ensure participation; and
- Performance of duties as members of the state.

Like the Greeks, the Romans also did not give much importance to the concept of citizenship. In ancient Rome the idea of citizenship could not develop to its fullest extent as slavery was an inevitable part of Roman society. In the institution of slavery, the people are engaged in unskilled labour and regarded as inferior. Consequently, they were denied civil and political rights. Citizenship, then, was restricted to cities and citizens were only city-dwellers. It needs mention here that though initially citizenship is confined only to the power holders but later on it has been extended to the ordinary people and those defeated in war. During the Roman Empire, diverse groups of people came under the domain of citizenship except the women and the people of the lowest rank.

Check Your Progress:

1. Fill in the blanks-

(a) Citizenship implies a membership of the ____.

(b) The English word Citizenship is derived from the----- word-----.

(c) Aristotle deals with the ____ aspect of citizenship.

2. Define citizenship.

3. Trace the development of the concept of citizenship in the ancient period.

4. Discuss the relationship between democracy and citizenship.

Citizenship in Medieval Period:

The medieval period comes after the ancient period. During the medieval period the political authority is overshadowed by the ecclesiastical authority and citizenship as a concept has lost its importance. Contradiction in matters relating to society is one of the major characteristics of the medieval society. On the religious planes all are considered equal because all are being the son of God. But on the social and political planes, there is hardly any equality, universal brotherhood and democratic value. People believe that kingship is divinely ordained and they do not challenge the king's right to rule. Individuals play no role in politics. As politics is an activity of the few, democracy hardly exists there and therefore any citizenship. But during the 15th and the 16th centuries in the Renaissance period, the idea of citizenship becomes central in Italy, especially with the writings of Nicollo Machiavelli. In the 17th century, James Harrington and John Milton also redefine this idea.

Citizenship in Modern Age:

You should remember here that the civil war between the king and feudal lords on the one hand and the merchant and manufacturing classes on the other is a glaring feature of the whole of the Stuart period i.e. from 1603-1688. The Glorious Revolution of 1688 is the victory of the capitalists but it cannot be seen as the beginning of the democracy as it popularizes the

liberalism popularly known as classical liberalism. The course of history in France, Germany, Italy and other European countries is more or less the repetition of the English events. Macpherson has rightly pointed out that the English system has been liberal first and democratic later. With the introduction of the different aspects of democracy, various forms of citizenship have been introduced in the West. The French 'Liberty, Equality and Fraternity' and American declaration of 'Rights of Man' have made the beginning of the concept of citizenship. With the French Revolution and the consequent declaration of rights of man and citizen, a new era in the history of citizenship begun.

It needs mention here that the noted philosopher Jeremy Bentham is not enthusiastic about laying down the principles of representative governments though during his time the attention is paid on structuring and restructuring of the democratic institutions. He is in favour of giving limited power to the state. Between the period 1791 and 1802, Bentham is in favour of limited franchise. It is limited to those paying direct taxes on property. By 1817, he is talking about universal franchise excluding the under age, illiterate as well as women. Again by 1820, he is for manhood franchise. So we have seen that Bentham has accorded less importance to citizens and citizenship. His concept of citizenship keeps on changing from time to time.

Unlike Bentham, John Stuart Mill (1806- 1873) is too eager to grant citizenship to everyone including women. In fact he is in favour of giving more than one vote to some people. According to him, the greatest task of citizenship is to participate in the affairs of the state. He is in favour of giving plural voting to some people and on the other hand excludes the poor from his citizenship.

In the 19th century, the growth of market liberalism contributes to add a new meaning to the notion of citizenship. The natural rights i.e. the right to life, liberty and property became the basis for citizenship in this century.

It is pertinent to mention here that the concept of citizenship has changed from an idea to a movement in the later part of the 19th century and first quarter of the 20th century. This movement has begun everywhere in the West from England to the United States. universal adult suffrage replaces the earlier suffrage based on the qualification of property, education, residence, sex etc.

By the middle of the 20th century, the concept of citizenship has been accepted by most of the liberal world. For the Marxists, citizenship is a class concept which is found in class societies as they are in favour of a classless society where human beings can meet only as free human beings.

With the advancing years, citizenship emerges as an immensely important idea. The neo- liberals like Nozick and Hayek gave no importance to the idea of citizenship. On the other hand, the communitarians give utmost importance to the idea of citizenship. Feminists on the other hand, wish to grant citizenship to women. The subaltern advocates the equal citizenship for the weakest and the most backward in the society.

Check Your Progress:

1. Discuss the views of Bentham and Mill on citizenship.
2. Why do the neo- liberals give no importance to the concept of citizenship?

4.8 Global Citizenship

The field of cross cultural communication has been largely overlooked by social theorists engaged in the development of the field of multiculturalism and global studies. The concept and the skills of such cross cultural communication represents a missing link in our evolution towards the emergence of a set of citizenship known as Global Citizenship which is necessary for life in the 21st century. In its general meaning global citizenship implies world peace and applies the concept of citizenship to a global level. It is strongly connected to the concepts of globalization and cosmopolitanism. Since the beginning of 20th century the notion becomes an integral part of Political Science.

The term Global citizenship is popularized by the US President Barak Obama in 2008 in a speech in Berlin. He uses this term in terms of a moral and ethical disposition to guide the understanding of individuals or groups of local and global contexts, and remind them of their relative responsibilities within various communities. In the traditional sense we know that citizenship

refers to a person of a particular state who enjoys the privileges. In this sense citizenship is motivated by local interests (love of family, communal fairness, self-interest). But in the context of Global citizenship it is motivated by global interest and a sense of universal equality. Global citizenship includes respect for any and all fellow global citizens, regardless of race, religion or creed and gives rise to a universal sympathy beyond the barriers of nationality.

In its broader sense, global citizenship implies a responsibility to reduce international inequality in social and economic spheres to refrain from action which compromises an individuals' well-being, and avoids contributing to environmental degradation. In terms of International Politics, it refers to those responsibilities which can bring the awareness of global unity by considering and with fulfilling its obligations towards the entire globe and introducing some global rights. For example, states may choose the right to freedom of movement. Global citizenship is related to the International Relations Theory of Idealism which holds that states should include a level of moral goodwill in their foreign policy decisions.

However, global citizenship is different from the national variety, where rights and obligations come at the behest and generosity of the state. With global citizenship, individuals exercise organizational tools like the internet to make themselves global citizens. No government sanctioned this development. Habermas tends to place global citizenship in a larger, social context, arguing that nations can be central engines of citizenship but culture can also be powerful. He regards the formation of the "European citizen" as a kind of natural epiphany of governmental conglomeration within the forces of globalization, only remotely alluding to the corporate conglomeration that has been both the recipient and cause of worldwide economic expansion.

The concept of global citizenship is impractical. All the interpretations of global citizenship are not positive. Parekh advocates "If global citizenship means being a citizen of the world, it is neither practicable nor desirable". He argues that global citizenship, defined as an actual membership of a type of worldwide government system is impractical and dislocated from one's immediate community. He also notes that such a world state would inevitably be "remote, bureaucratic, oppressive, and culturally bland."

SAQ:

Do you think that the idea of global citizenship is applicable in contemporary context? Give arguments in favour of your answer. (60 words).

.....
.....
.....
.....

4.9 Summing Up

After reading this unit you have learnt the concept of state. State is a given territory in which human beings come together for achieving some common goals and it has four essential elements viz. population, territory, government and sovereignty. This unit has also helped you understand the various theories of origin of state like the social contract theory, the divine origin theory as well as the evolutionary theory. As envisaged in the social contract theory, state is the result of a deliberate and voluntary agreement among primitive men in a pre-social and pre-political age. The divine theory emphasizes that the state is established by God and the evolutionary theory considers state as the result of a long process of evolution. The modern concept of state begins with the Westphalia treaty in 1648. Moreover, this unit also discusses at length the challenges to the sovereignty of state like social inequality, communalism, global terrorism, globalization, increase in communal activity, explosive growth of influential non- state actors. . In this context, you have also learnt that a citizen is one who lives in a city and citizenship is the status of the citizen. A citizen owes allegiance to the state in which he/she resides. You have also learnt that in ancient Greek society citizenship was the privilege of the selected few and the slaves, women and the aliens were excluded from the scheme of citizenship. In ancient Rome, the idea of citizenship could not develop much due to the existence of slavery. As a whole, the idea of citizenship was not popular until the Renaissance period. As stated, the French 'liberty, equality and fraternity' and American declaration of 'rights of man' marked the beginning of the concept of citizenship. This unit also helps you to understand the concept of global citizenship. Global citizenship implies a responsibility to reduce international inequality.

4.10 References and Suggested Readings

Gokhale, B.K, *Political Science*, (Theory and Governmental Mechanism), Himalya Publication, Mumbai, 2001

Krasner, D, *Sovereignty: Organized Hypocrisy*, Princeton University Press, Princeton 1999

Salamon, L, "*Nonstate Actors on the Global Scene: The Case of Civil Society Organizations*," paper prepared for the National Intelligence Council Project, April 18, 2000

Shelley, L "*Identifying, Counting and Categorizing Transnational Criminal Organizations*," paper prepared for the National Intelligence Council Project, April 18, 2000

Bertram, Christopher, *Rousseau and The Social Contract*. Routledge, London 2003

Hobbes, Thomas. *Leviathan*. C.B Macpherson (Editor). London: Penguin Books (1985)

Kavka, Gregory S. *Hobbesian Moral and Political Theory*. Princeton: Princeton University Press. 1986.

Locke, John. *Two Treatises of Government and A Letter Concerning Toleration*, Yale University Press , 2003

Macpherson, C.B. *Democratic Theory: Essays in Retrieval*, Oxford, Clarendon Press, 1973.

A History of Political Theories: V Venkata Rao, S. Chand and Company Ltd. New Delhi, 1980, 2000(reprint)

Political Theory: N.D. Arora and S.S. Awasthy, Har- Anand Publications Pvt Ltd, New Delhi, 1996, 2004(reprint)

An Introduction to Political Theory: O. P. Gauba, Macmilan India Ltd., Delhi, 2003

Political Theory: V.D. Mahajan, S. Chand and Company Ltd. New Delhi, 1988, reprint 2000.

* * *

**Institute of Distance and Open Learning
Gauhati University**

**MA in Political Science
(2nd Semester)**

**Paper V
Political Theory II**

**Block 2
Classical Ideologies**



Contents:

Block Introduction–

Unit 1 : Liberalism

Unit 2 : Socialism

Unit 3 : Nationalism

Contributors:

Jonaki Dutta
(Units 1, 2 & 3) Guest Lecturer in Political Science
IDOL, GU

Course Co-ordination

Dr. Kandarpa Das : Director
IDOL, GU

Barnalee Choudhury : Lecturer in Political Science
IDOL, GU

Editorial Team

Content Editing : Dr. Jayanta Krishna Sarma
Reader, Dept. of Political Science
Gauhati University

Format Editing : Dipankar Saikia
Guest Lecturer in Political Science
IDOL, GU

Language Editing : Shanghamitra De
Guest Lecturer in English
IDOL, GU

Cover Page Designing:

Kaushik Sarma : Graphic Designer
CET, IITG

February, 2011

© Institute of Distance and Open Learning, Gauhati University. All rights reserved. No part of this work may be reproduced in any form, by mimeograph or any other means, without permission in writing from the Institute of Distance and Open Learning, Gauhati University. Further information about the Institute of Distance and Open Learning, Gauhati University courses may be obtained from the University's office at IDOL Building, Gauhati University, Guwahati-14. Published on behalf of the Institute of Distance and Open Learning, Gauhati University by Dr. Kandarpa Das, Director and printed at Maliyata Offset Press, Mirza. Copies printed 1000.

Acknowledgement

The Institute of Distance and Open Learning, Gauhati University duly acknowledges the financial assistance from the Distance Education Council, IGNOU, New Delhi for preparation of this material.

Block Introduction:

Ideology in general sense refers to the set of ideas. In political theory the concept of ideology has two implications. Firstly, ideology is applied as a set of ideas and secondly, it refers to the science of ideas. In the first sense, ideology means a set of those ideas which are accepted to be true by a particular group without further examination. In the second sense, ideology seeks to determine how ideas are formed, distorted and how true ideas could be segregated from false ideas. In this block we are going to discuss three major ideologies viz. liberalism, socialism and nationalism. Liberalism as an ideology developed in the later part of the 19th century and reflected the aspirations of a rising middle class. Socialism as an ideology promotes social welfare as it aims at the welfare of all and not of few. Socialism is a theory according to which the means of production, distribution and exchange should be owned and controlled by the people. Another important ideology which has been discussed in this block is nationalism. Nationalism is a concept which originates in the people having the same race, language, tradition, culture etc. inhabiting a territory of a geographic unity.

In the first unit of this block we are going to discuss the ideology of liberalism. Liberalism as an ideology emphasizes the establishment of an industrialized and market economic order free from government interference. The ideology of liberalism has gone through some changes from classical to contemporary period. It is evident from the fact that whereas the early liberals do not favour state interference, the contemporary liberals want the state to play an important role in the welfare activities like health, housing, education etc.

The second unit deals with the ideology of socialism. The main objective of this ideology is the elimination of capitalism. Socialism stands for equality. It condemns the existing inequality created by the capitalist system. The advocates of socialism hold the view that capitalism often leads to the unequal distribution of wealth among the different classes. Hence, socialism stands for the abolition of capitalism.

The third unit of this block emphasizes on the concept of nationalism. Nationalism is the most significant force in modern times. Nationalism inspires to fight for liberation and development. Nationalism arose in the countries like Britain, France and United States where the principles like liberty and

equality flourishes. Various factors like common race, common territory, common historical background also help in the development and growth of the concept of nationalism.

The block consists of the following three units

Unit 1: Liberalism

Unit 2: Socialism

Unit 3: Nationalism

Unit I

Liberalism

Contents:

- 1.1 Introduction**
- 1.2 Objectives**
- 1.3 Meaning of Liberalism**
- 1.4 A Brief History of Liberalism**
- 1.5 Classical Liberalism**
- 1.6 Contemporary Liberalism**
- 1.7 Summing Up**
- 1.8 References and Suggested Readings**

1.1 Introduction

In the field of political science, different political philosophies and ideologies exist to influence the nature as well as the sphere of state. These political philosophies have a deep imprint on the economic, political and social life of the individual and the society. These political ideas are part of the political environment. A study of these political values within the framework of a 'science of ideas' or ideology has a significance of its own in the field of Political Science. The important ideologies like Liberalism, Fascism, Gandhism etc. have their role in determining the objectives of the state, and the relationship between the individual and the state. Liberalism is an outstanding ideology of modern world. Under liberalism, the individual is the end, not the means. Liberalism as a principle insists on 'liberty' of individual as the first and foremost goal of public policy. The political aspect of liberalism promotes democracy and the economic aspect promotes capitalism. As a combination of the ideas of democracy and individualism, liberalism does not tolerate authoritarianism where individual personality is sacrificed in the name of 'social welfare'. Liberalism respects democratic ideals and seeks to give full scope to the individual for his fullest development.

In this unit we will discuss various aspects of the concept of liberalism, its meaning, history, drawbacks etc. We shall also discuss the two traditions of

thought within liberalism viz. the classical liberalism and contemporary liberalism.

1.2 Objectives

This unit is meant to introduce you to the concept of liberalism. Liberalism promotes civil liberties of the individual, including freedom of thought and expression, freedom of association and movement etc. After reading the unit you will be able to

- *define* liberalism
- *trace* the difference between classical and contemporary liberalism.
- *comprehend* the various implications of the concept of liberalism.
- *examine* the historical background of liberalism.
- *discuss* the deficiencies as well as advantages of liberalism.

1.3 Meaning of Liberalism

Before discussing the concept of liberalism, it is pertinent to mention here that the word 'liberalism' is derived from the Latin word 'liberalis'. Its literal meaning is 'free man'. According to Laski, " liberalism is no doubt related to freedom." This implies the establishment of a political, social and economic order in which the individual is free and secure. Liberalism has been designated as a doctrine, a principle, a philosophy, a school, a movement, an idea, an attitude, an ideology. The essential reason for this can be described by taking into consideration the 'essence of man' in relation to his social and political life. Liberalism, whether a philosophy or an ideology, may be precisely defined as "an idea committed to freedom as a method and policy in government, as an organizing principle in society, and a way of life for the individual and community." J.S.Mill, T.H.Green, Laski etc. were the main supporters of liberalism. As generally understood, liberalism stands against coercive interference of any kind in any walk of life whether moral or religious, social or political, and the like. Socrates, the Stoics, the fathers of Christianity, Milton, Descartes, Spinoza, Voltaire, Locke, Goethe, Jefferson, Rousseau, Kant, Hume, Diderot, Montesquieu, Lessing, Adam Smith, Vico, Condorcet, Benjamin Franklin, T.H. Green, Cole, Laski, Barker and a host of other eminent social theorists, philosophers and statesmen can be

regarded as the leading theorists who have defended the cause of liberalism in varying degrees and diverse ways.

While keeping the dynamic implications of liberalism in view, we can define liberalism as "the belief that society can safely be founded on this self-directing power of personality, that it is only on this foundation that a true community can be built, and that so established its foundations are so deep and so wide that there is no limit that we can place to the extent of the building. Liberty thus becomes not so much a right of the individual as a necessity of society. It rests not on the claim of A to be let alone by B, but on the duty of B to treat A as a rational being. It is not right to let crime alone or to let terror alone, but it is imperative to treat the criminal or the mistaken or the ignorant as being capable of right and truth, and to lead them on instead of merely beating them down. The rule of liberty is just the application of rational method. It is the opening of the door to the appeal of imagination, of social feeling; and except through the response to the appeal there is no assured progress of society."

According to Mc. Govern, - "liberalism as political concept is a compound of two separate elements. One of these is democracy, the other is individualism." In short, liberals put great stress on individual goodness and nationality and advocate freedom in all spheres in the society.

Thus, from the above discussion, it is clear to you that liberalism replacing religion as the controlling factor in shaping the thoughts of men is a philosophy of the modern age. It is liberalism in which the notion of social initiative and control is surrendered to the idea of individual initiative and control. In other words, liberalism is the voice of a free life- a life in which freedom is maximized. The principle of liberty is central to the whole idea of liberalism. The worth and dignity of an individual can be secured only when he is free from coercion and oppression of any kind. He has the right to live according to his choice so that he may seek the best possible development of his personality.

Thus, opposed to the ideology of totalitarianism, is the ideology or philosophy of liberalism that stands for the values of freedom, democracy and humanism. The assumptions of liberalism may be said to reside in the paraphernalia of a democratic order having representative government, responsible executive, socio-economic and political checks and balances, independence of judiciary

and rule of law. It has three fundamental assumptions- limited government, pluralistic society and unlimited scope for human choices.

Liberalism is closely associated with individualism. As Sabine says, it is very difficult to distinguish individualism from liberalism. Liberalism rejects the negative aspect of the state. But liberalism accepts the role of the state for economic and social development of life. Thus, it is clear that liberalism should not be associated with individualism.

Liberalism can be understood as (1) a political tradition, (2) a political philosophy and (3) a general philosophical theory, encompassing a theory of value, a conception of the person and a moral theory as well as a political philosophy. It must be noted here that, as a political tradition, liberalism has different connotations in different countries. In England, in many ways the birthplace of liberalism, it means different things like government by consent, personal and especially economic freedom. In France, liberalism has been more closely associated with secularism and democracy. In the United States, liberals often combine a devotion to personal liberty with an antipathy to capitalism, while the liberalism of Australia tends to be much more sympathetic to capitalism but often less enthusiastic about civil liberties.

Maurice Cranston rightly pointed out that by definition, a liberal is a man who believes in liberty. Liberals always accord liberty primacy as a political value.

The fundamental liberal principle holds that restrictions on liberty must be justified. Paradigmatic liberals such as Locke not only advocate the fundamental liberal principle, but also maintain that justified limitations on liberty are fairly modest. The basic task of government is to protect the equal liberty of citizens. John Rawls's first principle of justice : 'each person is to have an equal right to the most extensive total system of equal basic liberties compatible with a similar system for all' is a testimony to this fact.

1.3.1 Implication of Liberalism

The implications of liberalism may be seen in three important directions - social, economic and political:-

- (1) In the social sphere, liberalism stands for secularism, i.e., man's freedom from the shackles of religious orthodoxy. It enjoins that man should

have a scientific temper and a critical disposition. He should change his habits, customs and institutions which have outlived their usefulness, or which act like a chain on his real freedom. The social aspect of liberalism has its particular concern with man's freedom in relation to religion and morality.

- (2) In the economic sphere, liberalism means man's freedom to produce, exchange and distribute goods, carry on any trade or profession, keep or dispose off his property. Here a line of distinction should be drawn between negative and positive liberalism. While the former desires least possible state interference in the economic sphere, the latter desires more and more reasonable restrictions on man's economic freedom in social interest. For this reason positive liberalism shares similar ties with the democratic socialism.
- (3) Finally, in the political sphere, it desires a democratic system with separation of powers, checks and balances, free and fair periodic elections, accountability of the rulers to the people, universal adult franchise, freedom of the press and judiciary, protection of the rights of the minorities, freedom of thought and expression and the like.

So, from the above discussion, you are able to understand what actually the ideology of individualism means. Here we will deal with some of the definitions on this topic for conceptual clarity.

In Encyclopaedia Britannica, it has been defined as an idea committed to freedom as a method and policy in government, as an organizing principle in society, and a way of life for the individual and the community.

G. Sartori says - "liberalism is the theory and practice of individual liberty, juridical defence, and the constitutional state."

According to Edward Smith, - "liberalism stands midway between conservatism and radicalism."

According to Davis and Good, " liberalism, in the broadest sense, is synonymous with democracy."

After going through the above definitions, it is clear to you that in liberalism, more importance and emphasis has been given to freedom. Liberalism is the embodiment of the demand for freedom in every sphere of life, i.e., intellectual, social, religious, political and economic.

1.3.2 Characteristics of Liberalism

In order to understand the meaning of 'liberalism', let us have a look into some of the basic principles or characteristic features of liberalism :-

- Liberalism has full faith in human rationality and dignity. It places complete faith in man as a rational human being with the capability and potentiality to develop himself to the best.
- It supports democracy. Democratic institutions which promote the freedom of the individual have been supported by the liberals. Liberalists firmly believe in the concepts of - adult franchise, responsible government, fair and free elections, independent judiciary etc. They want constitutionalism, decentralization of powers and emphasise on popular sovereignty.
- Liberalism has been the supporter of human freedom. It may be defined as an idea committed to freedom as a method and policy in government, as an organizing principle in society, and a way of life for the individual and the community.
- Liberalism is opposed to conservatism and blind faith. Liberalism is a revolt against this tendency. It always stresses on logical and rational ideas and attaches importance to human rights.
- Liberalism believes in the concept of natural rights. It believes that state is formed for protecting these rights as these rights are essential for the development of the personality of man.
- Liberalism has full faith in limited and constitutional government.
- Internationalism is advocated by the liberals. They believe in 'live and let live' principle, peaceful co-existence, peaceful settlement of disputes etc.
- Liberal philosophers are of the view that the state exists only with a view to the multi-sided development of men. According to them, man is the end and state is only a means to the end.

Stop To Consider

Prof. Schleicher on Liberalism:

Prof. Schleicher has highlighted the following salient characteristics of liberalism:-

- (1) It is conducive to the practices which promote the welfare of men regardless of their social, economic, racial or national status.
- (2) It seeks to promote individual dignity not only of its own nationals but of all people in general.
- (3) It does not permit sovereignty to stand in the way of protection and promotion of human rights and other democratic values.
- (4) It favours international institutions where men shall have right to take part in important decisions affecting them and find peaceful solutions.
- (5) It favours pacific settlement of disputes and peaceful changes in accordance with the will of the majority.

Thus, liberalism is known as the ideology of freedom and world peace. It regarded the individual as supreme and laid emphasis on the development of his talents and capacities to the maximum.

In international sphere, this ideology emphasizes the principles of peace, friendship, freedom, co-operation, justices etc. it is opposed to intervention in the domestic affairs of other states and holds faith in peaceful co-existence of all states irrespective of their position or status.

At the core of this mode of political thought was a fundamental postulate about the nature of value, viz., that value inheres ultimately in the satisfactions and the realizations of human personality. It was this postulate which Kant had expressed in his famous dictum that morality consists in treating persons as ends and not as means, and which Jefferson had affirmed when he said that governments exist to protect and realize the inalienable rights of men.

'Liberal Democracy', the institutionalized form of liberalism, is the form of government many of the World's states profess to adhere to, including some of the most powerful, populous and prosperous. Examining Kantian liberalism, it is seen as a direct product of the Enlightenment, the 18th century intellectual revolution.

Thus, from the above discussion of meaning of liberalism at length, you are able to understand the basic idea of liberalism that liberalism denotes an attitude which seeks to ensure those social conditions in which the individuality

of all men may be best realized. In short, liberalism treats market society as the model of social organization where role of the state should be confined to the protection of individuals' life and property, enforcement of contracts, and maintenance of minimum common services which would not be undertaken by private entrepreneurs. In liberal view, the state is a necessary evil. Liberalism treats the state as the means and individual as the end. It rules out the absolute authority of the state.

SAQ:

Do you think the concept of liberalism has relevance in the Indian context? Justify your answer. (60 words).

.....
.....
.....
.....
.....

1.4 A Brief History of Liberalism

In order to conceptualize liberalism, we need to discuss the history of the concept of liberalism. It was opined by Gilbert Murray that the theory of liberalism was first developed by the ancient Greek philosophers for they laid more emphasis on the rights of freedom of expression and political liberty. However, in Roman period and in the Middle Ages, men did not have an independent status. But as Maxey says, during the 17th and 18th centuries, the demand for rights and political freedom got an impetus.

The doctrine of liberalism was modified in the later half of the 19th century. Political liberalism as a whole was a massive movement that made itself felt in all the countries of Western Europe and in America, but its most characteristic development took place in England. As an effective political movement, liberalism in England was composed of many elements which learned to co-operate for specific purposes without insisting upon ideological agreement.

The Liberal philosophy of law was almost wholly inspired by Bentham. Its economic theory - the so-called Classical Economics or the theory of Laissez Faire - formed another strand of the liberal thought, which owed little to Bentham, but was similar in purpose and point of view. Like Bentham's own views on economic subjects, it was derived from Adam Smith's Wealth of Nations.

James Mill's ideas of government and reform differed in no important respect from those of Bentham, but his 'Essay on Government' exposed somewhat more clearly the philosophical basis of those ideas. In particular, it showed that the political thought of the Benthamite liberals depended more on Hobbes than on Hume. Like Hobbes, Mill believed that all men are driven by a restless desire for power which institutional limitations cannot check. Thinkers like J.S. Mill and T.H. Green believed that the interests of the individuals were tied to social interests. They linked up the idea of the individual good to the common good. State was required to ensure conditions in which there were changes of equal development of all.

Early liberal theory developed in two main directions -

(a) Individualism which focused on individual as a rational creature. John Locke and Adam Smith are the early exponents of individualism. This concept lays stress on the fact that every individual should be allowed freedom so that he can develop himself in his own way, without any mutual interference.

(b) Utilitarianism which stands for the greatest happiness of the greatest number. Jeremy Bentham is the founder of this school of thought who has observed that nature has placed mankind under two sovereign masters : pleasure and pain. Human behaviour is guided by an urge to obtain pleasure and avoid pain.

Actually, from the mid-nineteenth century onwards, liberals witnessed various changes. An ambivalence attitude to the new industrial age runs right through the writings of J.S. Mill. For example, his essay 'On Liberty' (1859) has achieved the status of one of the classic statements of Liberalism.

One of the major exponents of contemporary social democratic liberalism is John Rawls, whose A Theory of Justice (1972) is an important document. Rawls has recently reworked his theory in Political Liberalism (1993) to meet some of the objections raised against his previous work.

Lastly, we will have to note that the American Declaration of Independence and the French and American Bill of Rights also clamoured for liberal principles.

Thus, from the above discussion, it is clear to you that 'liberalism' is actually an old idea. The name of Socrates comes first here as he died for the cause of freedom of thought and expression. Lincoln and Gandhi were also great liberals who paid with their life for the cause of human freedom. Among the great liberal thinkers of the 18th century, the names are - Locke, Rousseau, Voltaire, Burke etc.

The names of Bentham, Mill and Green have the equal place in the 19th century. Among the great liberal thinkers of the present century, we may refer to some of the important names like - Laski, Cole, Barker, Russell, Keynes, Friedman, Macpherson etc.

Early exponents of liberalism include John Locke (1632-1704), Adam Smith (1723-90) and Jeremy Bentham (1748-1832). All of them were English philosophers. Locke is known as the father of liberalism. Smith is known as the father of economics, Bentham the founder of utilitarianism. All of them defended the principle of laissez-faire which implies least interference of the state in the economic activities of individuals. Hence, they are called the founders of 'classical liberalism' which is called negative liberalism because it contemplates negative role of the state in the sphere of mutual interaction of individuals. In the 20th century, Herbert Spencer (1820-1903), an English philosopher, sought to reaffirm negative liberalism through the application of the principles of natural science to social organization.

John Stuart Mill (1806-73), an English philosopher, sought to modify utilitarianism and the principle of laissez-faire on philosophical grounds which paved the way for the theory of welfare state. Then T.H.Green (1836-82), another English philosopher, sought to add a moral dimension to liberalism and thus advanced a full-fledged theory of welfare state. This tradition was further developed by L.T.Hobhouse (1864-1929), Harold J. Laski (1893-1950) and R.H.Tawney (1880-1962). Thus the theory and practice of welfare state flourished in the first half of the 20th century in England. This theory contemplates a positive role of the state in securing a dignified life for the individuals. It is therefore called positive liberalism.

Prominent liberals have recently shied away from the conception of liberalism as a comprehensive philosophy and have sought to return to its roots as a purely political doctrine. John Rawls is one of the proponents of this view.

Actually, some events gave impetus to the concept of liberalism. Some of these events which played important role in ushering the concept of liberalism, are -

- The enlightenment which led to the intellectual awakening. At that time, more emphasis was laid on the individual and his welfare.
- The Reformation which led to the freedom of the people in religious matters.
- The Industrial Revolution witnessed new inventions and gave encouragement to the demand for liberty in the economic field.
- The Glorious Revolution in England which gave the idea that divine right of any kind of rule cannot be justified.
- The French Revolution, with its famous slogan of 'liberty, equality and fraternity', was very important in ushering the concept of individual liberty.

So, we have discussed above the various parameters of the historical background of the concept of liberalism and from the above discussion, it is clear to you that the ideology of liberalism developed through the above discussed phases.

Stop To Consider

Distinction between Traditional and Modern Liberalism :

- (1) Traditional liberalism gives importance to the individual and considers man as the basis, whereas modern liberalism gives more importance to the pluralistic aspect of society.
- (2) Traditional liberalists have put more emphasis on the natural rights of men, whereas modern liberalism attaches importance to society and considers that men's rights can be best achieved under society.
- (3) Traditional liberalism emphasizes the negative aspect of liberty, but modern liberalism has given utmost importance to the positive aspect of liberty.
- (4) Traditional liberalism has limited the sphere of the activities of the state, whereas modern liberalism regards the state as a positive institution and thus supports the increasing activities of the state.
- (5) Traditional liberalism regards the state as a necessary evil, whereas, modern liberalists regards the state as a welfare unit.

- (6) Traditional liberalism has been the supporter of open, free and competitive economy, but, modern liberalism advocates that the state should regulate the economic sphere. It thus supports state control over big industries.
- (7) Traditional liberalism was reformative, whereas, modern liberalism is more realistic.

Check Your Progress

1. Discuss the differences between Traditional and Modern Liberalism.
2. Critically discuss J.S.Mill's views on Liberalism.

1.5 Classical Liberalism

The concept of the liberalism developed in the 18th and 19th centuries is called Traditional Liberalism, whereas Modern Liberalism is a feature of the 20th century. The view of the classical liberals was to treat liberty of the individual and authority of the state as antithetical, and thus, to identify liberty of the individual with minimum possible restraints.

The assumptions of Classical Liberalism can be summed up as follows:

- The absolute value of human personality and the spiritual equality of all individuals.
- The autonomy of the will of the individual.
- The essential rationality and goodness of man,
- The existence of certain inalienable rights like those relating to life, liberty and material possessions,
- The creation of state of mutual consent for the sole purpose of preserving and protecting the natural rights of the individuals.
- The limit and negative functions of government which is the best if it governs the least.
- The affirmation that the individual is, and should be, free in all spheres of life, such as - political, economic, social, intellectual, religious, and,
- The existence of a supreme truth based on reason which can be achieved by individual thought and conscience that plays an important role in man's choice between order and anarchy.

Thus, it is clear to you from the above discussion that the basis of 'classical liberalism' is the principle of 'laissez faire' or 'leave man alone'. It implies that the interference of state should be as little as possible so that man may enjoy as much liberty as possible.

SAQ:

Do you think Classical Liberalism has given too much emphasis on the principle of 'laissez faire'? Explain. (60 words)

.....
.....
.....
.....
.....
.....
.....

1.6 Contemporary Liberalism

However, a marked change took place after 1860 when Mill revised his views in a way that became the basis of the philosophy of modern or contemporary liberalism. A new awareness developed that desired more and more state interference in the liberty of the individual in the name of public interest. Thus, Mill supported state regulation of private property and went to the length of sanctioning public ownership and control of natural resources of the country, T.H.Green desired positive action of the state in the eradication of three gigantic social evils - ignorance, intemperance and pauperism.

This trend became more manifest in the present century when Laski in England and MacIver in the United States desired positive role of the state in rendering socially useful services. Similarly, Hobhouse, Barker and Keynes preferred more and more regulations by the state action so as to remove social ills.

The Beveridge Report of 1943 strongly recommended state action in eradicating great evils like those of unemployment, disease, starvation, ignorance and squalor.

Thus, from the above discussion of contemporary liberalism, we can now sum up the main features of positive or modern liberalism :-

- (1) The individual must be able to exercise effective political influence through properly constituted constitutional machinery.
- (2) Modernisation of the machinery of government by bringing new life to the neglected sections and dispelling present political apathy.
- (3) There should be constitutional reforms involving devolution of power to give effective power to regional councils.
- (4) In the international field, state sovereignty should be restricted to strengthening supra-national bodies like the United Nations.

Thus, from the above discussion of the salient features of Modern Liberalism, it is clear to us that positive liberalism has a socialistic content.

Isaiah Berlin has advocated a negative conception of liberty. For Berlin and those who follow him, the heart of liberty is the absence of coercion by others. However, despite the powerful case for negative liberty, many liberals have been attracted to more 'positive' conceptions of liberty. Although Rousseau seemed to advocate a positive conception of liberty, according to which one was free when one acted according to one's true will (the general will), the positive conception was best developed by the British neo-Hegelians of the late 19th and early 20th centuries, such as Thomas Green and Bernard Bosanquet (1923).

Today, the concept of liberalism is writ large in the works of S.I.Benn (1988), Gerald Dworkin (1988), and Joseph Raz (1986).

However, a continuing problem for liberal theory is whether these two conceptions of freedom can somehow co-exist or whether they are fundamentally at odds. The worry about positive freedom is that it seems to lay the basis for justifying paternalistic interferences on the grounds that they are freedom-enhancing. A paternalist imposes on a person for his own good, and typically this imposition would appear to limit that person's freedom.

1.7 Neo-Liberalism

Neo-Liberalism stands for contemporary version of classical liberalism which seeks to restore laissez faire individualism. It denounces the concept of welfare state, opposes state intervention and control of economic activities. Champions of neo-liberalism stand for 'rolling back' the state which has immensely expanded its sphere of activities. The chief exponents of neo-liberalism include F.A.Hayek (1899-1992), an Austrian thinker, Milton Friedman, an American economist, and Robert Nozick, an American philosopher. In the second half of the 20th century, these thinkers realized the fact that too much importance on the theory of welfare state is trying to curtail individual liberty. Thus, in order to restore individual liberty, they sought to revive the principle of laissez-faire not only in economic sphere, but also in social and political sphere. Thus, in a nutshell, neo-liberalism upholds full autonomy and freedom of the individual. This concept treats man as the maker of his destiny, where he will not face any restriction from any institution. It is, therefore, hostile to all social and legal restrictions on individual's freedom of action. In the political sphere, neo-liberalism particularly insists that man's economic activity must be actively liberated from all restrictions to enable him to achieve true progress and prosperity. According to the neo-liberalists, if the government tries to regulate all the human activities, it would amount to curtailing their freedom without fulfilling their genuine needs. Thus, from the above discussion of the concept of neo-liberalism, it is clear to you all that it simply advocates the freedom of men in all the spheres so that they can develop their personality and inner faculties to the fullest extent.

1.8 Justification of Liberalism

The positive points in favour of the ideology of liberalism are :-

- (1) It supports the doctrine of natural rights. According to John Locke, one of the exponents of liberalism, nature has given us the right to life, liberty, and property and the state has no right to do away with these rights.
- (2) According to some philosophers like Kant, J.S.Mill, T.H.Green, Hume etc., liberalism is supported on ethical grounds, because the interference of the state in the lives of the individual is morally unjustified.

(3) On the basis of the study of science, Botany and Zoology, Herbert Spencer opines that everyone has the right to make himself fit for survival in an increasingly competitive world. Thus, he supports the theory of liberalism.

1.9 Criticisms of liberalism

The following are the arguments against liberalism

- (1) According to critics, men do not always know their own good. At times, they are unable to make correct decisions. So, this ideology is impractical.
- (2) Liberalism, as criticized by the thinkers, has totally neglected the welfare nature of the state.
- (3) According to critics, the concept of liberalism is quite vague and uncertain.
- (4) Also, the critics try to point out the disastrous consequences of free competition.

Thus, liberalism is a dynamic political philosophy which always tries to respond to the changing needs of the time. But, the glaring defect of liberalism lies in its failure to redeem mankind from its predicament. Liberalism is criticized because it has always clung to capitalism so firmly that all its new ventures appear to be new devices for sustaining the capitalist system or justifying the existence of the system. That is why, the ideology of liberalism is criticized on the above grounds.

1.10 Summing Up

After reading this unit, it is now clear to you that there are different parameters of the concept of liberalism. Liberalism may be regarded as an idea, an attitude, a philosophy, a disposition, even an ideology the heart of which is contained in recognizing the liberty, the worth and the dignity of the individual. You have learnt the historical background of the concept of liberalism as well as the concepts like classical and contemporary liberalism. The classical liberalism developed during the transition from feudalism to capitalism. This unit has also helped you to understand the concept of contemporary liberalism developed in the 20th century. A reading of this unit will contribute to your conceptual clarity and understand the ideology of socialism in the next unit.

1.11 References and Suggested Readings

A History of Political Theory. (4th edition). George H. Sabine. Thomas L. Thorson. Oxford and IBI + Publishing co. pvt. Ltd., New Delhi. (Indian edition, 1973).

Liberalism - an essential reading. Edited by - R.G.Gettel and W.A.Dunning. Cosmo Publications, New Delhi. (2004).

An Introduction to Political Theory (4th edition). O.P.Gauba. Macmillan India Ltd. (2004) 1st edition 1981.

Contemporary Political Ideologies (2nd edition). Edited by - Roger Eatwell and Anthony Wright. Printer, London and New York. (1999).

The Liberal Virus - Permanent War and the Americanization of the World. By - Samir Amin. Aakar Books, delhi (2005).

* * *

Unit- 2

Socialism

Contents:

- 2.1 Introduction**
- 2.2 Objectives**
- 2.3 Meaning of Socialism**
 - 2.3.1. Definition of socialism**
 - 2.3.2. Features of socialism**
- 2.4 Responses to Inequality**
- 2.5 Critique of Capitalism**
- 2.6 Different types of Socialism**
- 2.7 Summing up**
- 2.8 References and Suggested Readings**

2.1 Introduction

The present age is known as the age of 'democracy' and 'socialism'. There is no doubt that socialism has been one of the most important philosophies as well as political movements of the modern era. But the concept of 'socialism' is difficult to enumerate. According to Ramsay Muir,- "it is a chameleon-like creed, it changes its colour according to its environment." In a similar vein, C.E.M. Joad, has also observed that "socialism is like a hat that has lost its shape because everybody wears it." Thus, descriptions of socialism, will vary considerably according to the angle of approach. Each method of treatment will emphasise different aspects of socialism and result in the presentation of a different picture. Socialism proves to be a different creed at the hands of each exponent. In this unit, our attempt is to deal with the concept of 'socialism' in its entirety, covering its meaning, various manifestations of the concept in actual practice etc.

2.2 Objectives

This unit is meant to introduce you to the concept of socialism. After reading the unit you will be able to:

- *define* socialism.
- *analyse* the emergence of socialism as a response to inequality.
- *assess* socialism as a critique of Capitalism.
- *discuss* the different types of socialism.

2.3 Meaning of Socialism

We have already learnt that it is very difficult to define Socialism because its supporters have expressed different views about it at different times. In simple words, we can say that socialism considers that the sphere of state activity should be extended to the maximum. Now let us discuss some of the definitions of socialism.

2.3.1 Definition of Socialism

The supporters of socialism want the abolition of the private means of production and distribution. Everything should be owned and controlled by the state. The system of socialism aim to abolish the evils of exploitation and poverty. As a result, everybody in the society will be able to get his own share. Thus, Garner says-

"Directly opposed to the laissez faire theory of state functions is the socialistic theory, which contends for a maximum, rather than a minimum of government. The supporters of this theory, instead of distrusting the state and looking upon it as an evil whose functions should be restricted to the narrowest possible limits, regard it as a supreme and positive good; and hence its mission should include the promotion of the common economic, moral and intellectual interests of the people."

According to Joad, socialism has three implications. Firstly, Socialism signifies both a body of doctrine and a political movement going on all over the world i.e., it has its theoretical as well as practical aspects. Secondly, socialism has two more aspects- political and economic i.e. it not only desires to speak about state's power, but also seeks to give a new shape to the system of national economy. Lastly, it has its advocates all over the world

armed with their own expositions and interpretations, with the result that there are astonishing varieties of socialism so much so that it is hard to say what exactly socialism means.

Mr. Humphery defines socialism as a system of society in which means of life belong to the community as a whole and are developed and operated by the community with the aims of promoting the general well-being."

In order to understand the meaning of socialism, let us discuss some of the leading definitions on this topic. As already stated, socialism has been defined variously by various writers. Encyclopaedia Britannica defines socialism as "the policy or theory which aims at securing by the action of the central democratic authority better distribution and, in due subordination thereto, a better production of wealth than now prevails." According to Sellars, "socialism is a democratic movement whose purpose is the securing of an economic organization of society which will give the maximum possible, at any time of, justice and liberty." Robert Bland defines socialism as the "common holding of means of production and exchange and the holding of them for the equal benefit of all." For Ramsay Macdonald, "no better definition of Socialism can be given in general terms than that it aims at the organization of the material, economic forces of society and their control by the human forces." According to Hughan "socialism is the political movement of working class which aims to abolish exploitation by means of the collective ownership and democratic management of the basic instruments of production and distribution." As defined by J.H. Hallowell "socialism aims at nothing less than the re-creation of a new social life through the collective reason of the community and the public ownership and administration of property." According to Bertrand Russell the essence of Socialism is the community ownership of land and property. For G.D.H.Cole, "socialism means four closely connected things - a human fellowship, which denies and expels distinctions of class, a social system in which no one is so much richer or poorer than his neighbours as to be unable to mix with them on equal terms, the common ownership and use of all vital instruments of production, and an obligation upon all citizens to serve one another according to their capacities." Joseph Schumpeter offers the definition of socialist society. According to him, "by socialist society we shall designate an institutional pattern in which the control over the means of production itself is vested with a central authority or, as we may say, in which as a matter of principle,

the economic affairs of society belong to the public and not to the private sphere. According to C.E.M.Joad, socialism, in fact, seeks to free the individual from the pressure of material cares, in order that he may live his life in his own way and freely develop his personality. But because the Socialist holds an organic view of the state as an entity composed of mutually dependent units, he believes that such freedom can only be achieved as the result of elaborate social organization. As enumerated by R.G. Gettel, "opposed to the theory of individualism stands a group of doctrines that favour collective control and a wide extension of public activities. While believing in individual freedom, the supporters of these theories hold that it can be better secured under social regulations than by unrestricted individual competition. They believe that the instruments of production should be owned and operated and their products distributed by the organized community."

SAQ:

Do you think it is possible to offer a definition of socialism? Justify your answer by discussing the various definitions of socialism. (60+50 words).

.....
.....
.....
.....
.....
.....
.....
.....

From the discussion of the above definitions, we come to know that the scholars are not unanimous about the concept of socialism. Some of them term it as a 'political movement', while others opine that it is the economic system. Yet the fact is that all the socialists desire the end of capitalism as the system of production and the establishment of a non-exploitative, equalitarian society in which mankind will be free from want and hunger, and all the individuals will be provided equal opportunities of development without discrimination.

Thus, the subscribers of socialism take the state as an instrument of positive good and lay all stress on narrowing the gulf between the rich and poor as much as possible. To achieve this end, they advocate the case of public ownership over the means of production, exchange and distribution of goods, elimination of competition, social justice and the like. In the words of Kirkup " A socialist society is one based on the system of public or collective ownership of the material instruments of production, democratic administration of the industries, and cooperative labour."

Stop To Consider

The 6 E's Programme of Prof; F.J.C. Hearnshaw :

The 6E's fulfills all the requirements of the socialists. Summary of their arguments are as follows

- (1) exaltation of community above the individual,
- (2) equalization of human conditions,
- (3) elimination of capitalism,
- (4) expropriation of landlordism,
- (5) extinction of private capital, and,
- (6) eradication of competition.

In short, Socialism is that policy or theory which aims to secure a better distribution by the action of the central democratic authority and in due subordination thereto, a better production of wealth than the prevailing system.

After studying the above given definitions of socialism, you can understand that socialism aims at the welfare of all the citizens of a state. Individualism is based on liberty, socialism is based on equality. Socialism wants nationalization of the means of production and the end of social inequality.

2.3.2 Features of Socialism

Already you have learnt that socialism aims to secure a better distribution policy by the action of the central democratic authority. Socialism also aims at establishing equality among the people in terms of distribution of the means of production. Here in this section we are going to discuss some basic characteristics of socialism which are as follows.

- Socialism gives more importance to the society than to the individual. This means that the individual is an organ of the society - an organic whole. All the individuals would be happy only if the society is prosperous.
- Socialism is based on co-operation. It seeks to end competition.
- Socialism believes in economic equality.
- Socialists favor public control over the means of production and distribution.
- Socialism has faith in democratic form of government. It is opposed to private property. It demands the abolition of private ownership of wealth, and requires that the wealth should in some way be vested in, and operated by the community as a whole.
- Socialism is ordinarily regarded as opposed to individualism.

SAQ:

Do you think that 'socialism' as a concept has its impact on India.
Discuss. (60 words)

.....

2.4 Responses to inequality

Socialism always opposes inequality. In simple words, we can say that socialism considers that the sphere of state activity should be extended to the maximum, so that inequality of any kind is removed. Socialism is a concept which opposes capitalism, as capitalism leads to inequality in the society. The supporters of socialism wants the abolition of the private means of production and distribution. According to them, everything should be owned and controlled by the state. The system of socialism aim to abolish the evils of exploitation and poverty. As a result, everybody in the society will be able to get his own share of equality. Thus, one of the main features

of socialism is the aim to establish an egalitarian society where everybody will be able to enjoy equal treatment.

Socialists insist on what G.D.H. Cole called human fellowship. It aims to guarantee reasonable equality in the society so that all are able to face each other on equal terms. It holds that there can be no genuine liberty without equality as freedom cannot survive without security.

Thus, from the above discussion, it is clear to you that the concept of socialism values liberty and equality as both liberty and equality are essential for a perfect life. But they must serve the common good. Therefore, in the interest of the society, state can impose reasonable restrictions. Equality does not mean absolute uniformity. It simply means provision of equal opportunity and absence of exploitation in society.

Apart from political equality socialism gives importance to economic and social equality also. Socialists believe that without economic inequality political equality becomes a myth. Without the basic necessity of food, the poor or the have-nots cannot be expected to exercise their voting rights properly. Hence stressing on economic equality, socialism aims to guarantee a true democracy.

SAQ:

Do you think socialism aims at egalitarian society?

.....

.....

.....

Check Your Progress

1. Discuss the meaning of Socialism.
2. Discuss the main characteristics of Socialism.

2.5 Critique of Capitalism

From the discussion of the salient features or characteristics of the concept of 'socialism', we have already come to understand that socialism is opposed to capitalism. Socialism actually emerged as a reaction against the rise and

development of capitalism. Due to exploitation of the workers by the capitalists, the labour class became conscious of its interest. Consequently, the concept of collective ownership of the means of production came into forefront thereby leading to the emergence of the concept of socialism.

The basis of capitalism was competition which led to the wide gulf between the rich and the poor. The rich exploited the poor ruthlessly with the help of the state. The socialists wanted to put an end to this unfettered, cut-throat competition amongst industries and thus ensure co-operation, in place of competition. Under capitalism, the capitalists used to own the means of production and distribution. This ownership help them to earn the highest amount of profit and thus exploit the labourers. But, socialism advocates the control of the state over the means of production and distribution, and tries to put an end to the capitalist system of production and exploitation.

In fact, the concept of socialism emerged and came into the limelight due to the weakness of capitalist system. Socialism emerged as a reaction against capitalism as capitalism led to the misery of the world. Creation of monopolies due to free competition characterized capitalism and social welfare was sacrificed at the alter of maximum profit. There was unplanned production and unequal distribution of wealth leading to wide gulf and distrust between the haves and have-nots. Socialism emerged as the anti-thesis of capitalism. It believes that capitalism is negation of egalitarianism. It is inefficient and disregards justice and happiness of all. Capitalism leads to wasteful competition, callous exploitation, unequal distribution of wealth and lack of social purpose. Thus, socialism arose as a reaction to the rise and development of capitalism.

The socialists are against open competition because the capitalists take undue advantage of their positions to exploit the poor. They make the poor work more and pay them less, thereby leading to the wide gap between rich and poor. Socialists always want an egalitarian society, with the aim to reduce the gap between the rich and the poor and also emphasizes equality without which freedom cannot survive.

Thus, from the above discussion, it is already clear to you that socialism is totally opposed to capitalism. So, socialism is said to be a critique of capitalism. The characteristic features of socialism and capitalism are just the opposite. Critics also conceptualize socialism as the means the

organization of workers for the conquest of political power for the purpose of transforming capitalist property into socialist property.

William Clarke, in his paper on the 'industrial basis' of socialism, makes a careful survey of the effects of industrial revolution on the working class and the absolute need of factory legislation to save the workers from utter demoralization under the capitalist system. According to him, unrestrained capitalism tends as surely to cruelty and oppression as did feudalism or chattel slavery. Thus the remedy has been, as a matter of fact, of a socialistic character, involving collective checking of individual greed and the parting of slices of the profits of capital in the interest of the working community.

Even Marx is deeply touched by the evils of capitalism. Influenced by the contemporary socialistic ideology and Hegel's Dialectic. Marx tries to find out the actual development of the capitalist society through the materialistic interpretation of history. On the basis of the change in the relations of production, Marx has divided the human history in six parts - (1) age of primitive communism, (2) age of slavery, (3) age of feudalism, (4) age of capitalist society, (5) dictatorship of the Proletariat class, (6) communist age.

According to Marx, in the capitalist order of the society, the labourers struggle because the capitalists are the exploiters and the labourers are the exploited. The interests of both these classes clash with one another. Therefore, this struggle can stop only if capitalism is abolished. Marx firmly believes that the germs to destroy capitalism are already present within it as the capitalism with its inherent evils creates a situation for self-destruction. Due to capitalism, the wealth of the country gets concentrated in the hands of a few. With the increase of capitalism, the condition of the workers gets worsened which results in real chaotic situation. Therefore, the labourers raise the banner of revolution and ultimately the workers come out victorious in this struggle. Marx says that in the long run a stateless and classless society shall be established. In this society, the principle of distribution shall be from each according to one's ability and to each according to one's needs. G. Bernard Shaw, in his paper on the 'economic basis' of socialism, maintains that the private appropriation of land is the source of the unjust privileges against which socialism is aimed. Sidney Olivier in his paper on the 'moral basis' of Socialism defends the case from an ethical angle of

vision. He says that the present state of private ownership is immoral. A typical capitalist or owner of property earns without any contribution of his activity. In his paper on 'forecasts of a Socialist Society', Graham Wallas desires social control over the principal means of production and distribution. Thus, from the above discussion, we can understand that socialism emerges basically as a critique of capitalism.

SAQ:

Do you think that, capitalism loss its importance in the contemporary socialist countries especially in India? Give arguments in favour of your answer. (100 words)

.....
.....
.....
.....

2.6 Types of Socialism

Now let us discuss here the various types or brands of 'socialism', which will help us understand the concept more clearly -

(1) Utopian Socialism

Socialistic ideas are old and we may find their traces in religious scriptures where ideas of social justice have been laid down. We can cite here the example of Plato's *Republic*, where he has laid down the basis of utopian socialism. However, in 18th century France, a good number of socialist writings appeared, and since they dwelt on the rosy picture of a future society guaranteeing equality and social justice for all, it came to be nicknamed as 'utopian socialism'. Advocates of this type are - Cabet, St. Simon, Fourier, Blenc, Robert Owen etc.

The main features of Utopian Socialism are—

- (a) In utopian literature, it is assumed that men are intended to live in a state of equality and mutual love, and that exploitation, oppression and conflicts are contrary to nature's ordinance.

- (b) Utopian socialists try to visualize an industrial society characterized by equality of economic opportunity where no man is able to live on the labour of his fellows.
- (c) They regard poverty as the principal source of the ills of society and private property as the chief cause of poverty. They believe that the changes they desire can be achieved through appeals to the reason and sense of justice of influential members of the community.
- (d) The utopian socialists take recourse neither to the revolutionary action and revolutionary reconstruction of society, nor primarily to political action for bringing about the changes. Rather they seek to set up select communities in which principles of justice, benevolence and intelligence will rule and the society will be gradually converted to their ideas exemplified by the example.
- (e) They hope for the eventual society of socialism in the world.

The ideas of these socialists are dubbed as 'utopian' as they take matters to the world of unreality. Now we will examine the ideas of leading utopian socialists. The most important utopian socialist is St. Simon, who argues that the new industrial state must take the place of the church as the supreme authority among men to bring harmony into their lives. Society must be recognized into a 'productive association' with an economic rather than a political form of government. Representation in the government should be in terms of economic interests and occupation and the supreme task of government should be the development of nation's economic resources. However, St. Simon does not advocate the abolition of private property system. He does not favour any drastic reform of land ownership.

Again, the socialism of Charles Fourier is saturated with the doses of over-optimism. He looks at the fact of social inequality and injustice with great concern and discovers its solution in the life of mutual attraction available in a phalanx. According to him, at least seven persons or more bound together by similar tastes and desiring to be united in the pursuit of some common art, science, or industry should form a 'group' and a series of such groups should form a bigger gathering called 'phalanx'. It may, however, be pointed out that Fourier does not propose abolition of private property since each phalanx is to be organized like a joint stock corporation.

In England, Robert Owen comes forward with his own design of a future society based on the principles of complete equality and justice. From the above discussion, it is evident that like Fourier, Owen also discovers the alternative to the evils of a capitalist society in the establishment of co-operative village societies.

Check Your Progress

1. Critically examine the features of Utopian socialism.
2. Examine the contribution of Robert Owen towards the development of Utopian socialism.
3. Fill in the blanks
 - a. Utopian socialists try to visualize an industrial society characterized by equality of -----.
 - b. Robert Owens's future society is based on the principles of -----
-----.

(2) Revisionism or Evolutionary Socialism

A new kind of socialism known as 'scientific socialism' of Marx and Engels appears in the later part of the 19th century. The simultaneous acceptance and rejection of this version of socialism paves the way for a new variety of socialism called 'revisionism'. The most important exponent of revisionism is Edward Bernstein of Germany and his book *Evolutionary Socialism* attributes it that name also.

The main points of Bernstein's 'revisionism' are :

- It is a mistake to believe that the collapse of capitalism is imminent.
- The concentration of industries is not occurring at the rate at which Marx predicted it would, nor is it occurring uniformly.
- A great security for lasting success lies in steady advance rather than in the possibilities offered by a catastrophic crash etc.

Thus, from the above discussion it is clear that Bernstein is more a mutilator, rather than a modifier of Marxism. It is because he rejects Marxism at so many places and accepts it at only a few points, and even there he makes

some qualifying interpretations. The fault of the revisionists may be traced in their wavering between the two poles of pro- and anti-marxism.

As a matter of fact, Lassalle should be regarded as the pioneer of German Revisionism. He accepted the Marxian interpretation of history, but he differed from Marx on some other point. German and French Revisionists repudiated the anti-nationalist doctrine of the Communist Manifesto. Bernstein argued that the working class endowed with political privileges has a legitimate concern in the defense of national interests.

However, Karl Kautsky who shows himself as a defender of Marx but a critic of Lenin offers a different perspective. Since he undertook to defend the basic tenets of Marxism after the death of Engels in 1895, he did not appreciate the line of Bernstein. So, he sought to correct the revisionism of Bernstein in the fashion of an orthodox Marxist. That is why, the socialism of Kautsky is both pro- and anti-Bernstein. It is a revisionism of its own kind in which the basic tenets of Marxism are critically accepted, but the tenets of Leninism are frankly rejected. The core of Kautsky's thought may be seen in his frank denunciation of the system of dictatorship of the Proletariat as established by Lenin and other Bolsheviks in Russia after the Great Revolution of 1917.

(3) Fabianism

Fabian socialists believe in establishing an equalitarian non-exploitative society through democratic and peaceful means. The Fabian society was an organization of the leading English intellectuals of that time who drew inspiration from the social and economic theories of Henry George, David Ricardo and John Stuart Mill. In short, the Fabians offer a kind of socialism that is anti-Marxist, anti-utopian as well as anti-revisionist. It is anti-Marxist because the Fabians reject all the tenets of Marxism; it is anti-utopian, because they do not believe in the world of dreams; they see the things from the practical perspectives. Lastly, they are anti-revisionists in the sense that the revisionist tendency and the consequent acceptance and rejection of Marxism paves the way for newer versions of Marxism. Its main proponents were G.B.Shaw, Graham Wallace, H.G.Wales, G.D.H.Cole etc.

In 1888, the leaders of the Fabian society delivered a series of public lectures that were edited by G.B.Shaw and that appeared in the form of a book Fabian Essays in the following year.

The salient features of Fabian socialism are :-

- (a) Faith in democracy.
- (b) Ownership of society over land and industrial capital.
- (c) Abolition of ownership of capitalists.
- (d) Improvement in the conditions of the workers.

The Fabian Socialism was criticized by the Marxian Socialists as well as the Individualists. But, at the same time, it must be admitted that the Fabians were practical reformers. What they said and did was taken over by the leaders of the labour movement and that ultimately went into the philosophy of the labour party.

Stop To Consider

Syndicalism and Anarchism:-

- Syndicalism is another variety of socialism that looks like a hybrid of the socialism of Marx and the anarchism of Proudhon. Here, the main reliance is on the role of the syndicates or unions of the workers which will stage a successful revolution and create a new social order in which all power will be vested in these organizations. The syndicalists say that since the workers are the real producers of value, they should be the masters of entire production. They contend that in the future society, all power should be given to the syndicates. It is a special and sinister variety of socialism due to the advocacy of revolutionary means. The syndicalists reject all peaceful and constitutional methods and instead advocate the use of very revolutionary means, like general strike, sabotage, boycott, etc. Like the anarchists, the syndicalists uphold their version of the future society in which power will be vested in the trade unions.
- Anarchism is another variety of socialism. The word 'anarchism' originates from a Greek word 'anarchia' meaning 'non-rule'. It is obvious that the anarchists want no authority of any kind, so as to ensure complete liberty of man. Anarchism should be regarded as an extension of the theory of socialism in a particular direction. Anarchism is an anti-state theory. It regards state as an unnecessary evil. The earliest reflections of anarchism as a social and political theory are traced in William Godwin's An Enquiry concerning Political Justice published in 1791.

(4) Guild Socialism

It is another variety of socialism that may be taken as a curious mixture of French syndicalism and English fabianism. It aims at ending the capitalist system of society in which the workers do not get their due share. G.D.H.Cole is one of the most prominent political philosophers who has made most important contribution to Guild Socialism. His book *Self-government in Industries* was published in 1917 and the other books *Guild Socialism Restated* and *Social Theory* were published in 1920. The chief supporters of Guild Socialism were A.J.Penty (1875-1935), A.R.Orange (1873-1934), S.G.Hobson (1894-1940), G.D.H.Cole (1880-1959), Bertrand Russell and R.H.Tawney.

The main characteristics of guild socialism are:-

- Public ownership of means of production.
- Self-government in industry.
- Abolition of wage system.
- Organization of society on the basis of functional representation.

Thus, like Syndicalists, the Guild Socialists take into consideration the welfare of the workers. The story of Guild Socialism starts from 1906 when A.J.Penty brought out his book titled *The Restoration of the Guild System*. The Guild Socialists condemn the surplus value and the institution of private property. They also condemn the system of machines which has destroyed the freedom of the workers and undervalued their skill. Therefore, the Guild Socialists have criticized the wage system and strongly supported the self-government in the industries. To achieve this aim, they want to abolish the capitalist system and vest the control and management of the factories in the hands of the Guilds. Thus, Guild Socialists want to give the workers their due honourable position in the society.

(5) Democratic Socialism

Democratic socialism aims to establish liberty, equality and fraternity and achieve economic, social and political justice. Proponents of democratic socialism are R.H.Tawney, Laski, Robert Owen, Sydney Webb etc.

The salient features of democratic socialism are :-

- It is a synthesis of democracy and socialism.
- It aims to suppress anti-social activities.
- Democratic socialism emphasizes economic planning.
- Democratic socialism believes in widening the base of democracy.
- Democratic socialism upholds respect for civil liberties.

(6) Marxism or Scientific Socialism or Communism

Socialism propounded by Marx is also known as Marxism or Scientific Socialism or Communism. In his *Communist Manifesto* Marx says, Communism in this sense of word is essentially a theory of method, it seeks to lay down the principles upon which the transition from capitalism to socialism is to be accomplished and its two essential doctrines are the class war and revolution that is the forcible transfer of power to the proletariat.

Stop To Consider

Garner on the Principles of Socialism :-

(1) The theory of socialism is founded on the principles of justice and right or liberty. The land and the mineral wealth contained therein should belong equally to all, not to few.

(2) Competition under the present system not only leads to injustice and the crushing out of small competitor, but also involves enormous economic waste and extravagance in the duplication of services. The system of unrestricted competition leads to lower wages, over-production, cheap goods, and unemployed workers.

(3) The state has already abolished competition in certain fields and introduced the co-operative principle in its place and has demonstrated its success as an industrial manager to the entire satisfaction of all candid and thoughtful men.

Check Your Progress

1. What are the different kinds or brands of Socialism. Explain in brief.
2. What is meant by 'democratic socialism'?

2.7 Arguments in favour of Socialism

Due to the failure of capitalist system in terms of distribution of the means of production socialism got its importance in the contemporary world. Socialism basically helps the proletariat class to get their much needed right in the productive sector. For the common people socialism brings an opportunity to participate in the decision making process of the governmental procedures. On the basis of these the following arguments can be offered in favour of socialism:

- (a) Socialism is against capitalism which is based on exploitation as the capitalists exploit the poor and lead an idle and luxurious life on the profits earned by the poor thereby leading to economic inequality which hinders social progress. Thus, socialism wants to put an end to this exploitation and establish social equality.
- (b) In a capitalist system, there is open economic competition in which much money is spent on propaganda, advertisement. This situation creates trouble for the society. Socialism tries to remove this evil of capitalism and lays more emphasis on co-operation instead of an open competition.
- (c) Socialism is based on the concept of justice. Capitalism concentrates the capital of the society in the hands of a few which is based on injustice. Socialism wants social control over factories, ships, and railways. Thus, socialism is based on the concept of justice.
- (d) Socialism is much more democratic than capitalistic system. In a capitalist order of society, there remains economic inequality which stands as an obstacle in the path of democracy. Thus, in order to make democracy successful, it is essential to establish socialism.
- (e) Socialism is much more scientific than capitalism because capitalism safeguards the interests of a few while socialism protects the interests of the society at large.

2.8 Criticism of Socialism

The ideology of Socialism has also been criticized. The points of criticism are laid down below:

- (a) Socialism is sometimes criticized for killing individual initiative. It is a known fact that each individual works more and more for private property. Therefore, individual initiative to produce more will be killed under social control.
- (b) According to the critics, under socialism the functions of the state is so enlarged that it will not be possible for it to discharge these multifarious functions efficiently.
- (c) Critics are of the view that socialism will fail in practice because it wants to establish peace and economic prosperity and to remove economic disparity and social ills. But in practice, this is very difficult to accomplish.
- (d) Socialism gives many powers to the state which interfere in every sphere of the individual activity. This hampers individual freedom.

2.9 Summing Up

In this unit we have discussed the various parameters of the concept of socialism. We have discussed its meaning with special reference to the definitions of leading thinkers on this topic. After reading this unit you have learnt that socialism as an ideology actually wants to abolish all forms of inequality in the society. Socialism opposes the doctrine of capitalism as it introduces inequality in the society. We have also discussed the various types of socialism in this unit. Though these types of socialism differ yet abolition of capitalism and widening the base of democracy in the society remains the common fact.

2.10 References and Suggested Readings

Socialism for a Sceptical Age by - Ralph Miliband. First published in 1994 by Polity Press in association with Blackwell Publishers.

Socialism by- Bernard Crick. World View Publications, Delhi. First Indian reprint, 1998.

Political Theory (principles of Political Science) by- R.C.Agarwal (2005) S.Chand and Company Ltd., New Delhi.

* * *

Unit 3

Nationalism

Contents:

- 3.1 Introduction**
- 3.2 Objectives**
- 3.3 Meaning of Nationalism**
- 3.4 Historical Background**
- 3.5 Non- European Nationalism**
- 3.6 Critical Appraisal**
- 3.7 The future of Nationalism**
- 3.8 Summing Up**
- 3.9 Reference and Suggested Readings**

3.1 Introduction

The concepts like Nationalism, internationalism, imperialism are inter related concepts as the rise of nationalism in Europe led to the rise of imperialism of the West over the poor and backward countries of the East. But it must be remembered here that whereas western nationalism led to the rise of imperialism, imperialism in its own turn, led to the rise of nationalism in the East. Thus, these three concepts are closely connected. At the same time it must be born in mind that the concepts of nation, nationality and nationalism are closely related.

The concept of "Nationalism" is very important now-a-days, as nation-state has become the basic pattern throughout the modern world. In this unit, we will make an attempt to study the various aspects of the concept of nationalism. Our aim is to explore the meaning, historical background, and future of nationalism.

3.2 Objectives

Nationalism is one of the important concepts of Political Science which recognizes the principle of self-determination, or the right of every nationality to govern itself.

After reading this unit, you will be able to:

- *understand* the meaning of nationalism.
- *trace* the historical background of the concept of nationalism.
- *analyse* the merits and demerits of the concept.
- *explain* the future of the concept of nationalism.

3.3 Meaning of Nationalism

We have already learnt that the concepts of nation, nationalism and nationality are interrelated. In order to understand the meaning of 'Nationalism', we will have to understand the meanings of the concepts of 'Nation' and 'Nationality', as sometimes these interrelated terms are used interchangeably.

The word 'nation' is derived from a Latin word 'natio' which denotes the idea of common birth or descent. The term 'nation' signifies the existence of a common political consciousness of a nationality that, according to A. Zimmern, is a form of corporate sentiment of peculiar intensity, intimacy and dignity related to a definite home country. Thus, 'nationality' is a sentiment of 'oneness' that unites the people of a particular kind and thus differentiates them from others who do not share the common feelings. As a result, the individual becomes loyal to his nation-state. 'Nationalism' in short, becomes the 'state of mind'. It is actually a psychological feeling of belongingness to a particular nation-state. Hans Kohn defines nationalism as -a state of mind permeating the large majority of the people and claiming to permeate all its members; it recognizes the nation-state as the ideal form of political organization and the nationality as the source of all creative cultural energy and economic well-being. The supreme loyalty of man is therefore due to his nationality, as his own life is supposedly rooted in and made possible by its welfare.

Hence, it can be said that nationalism has become a dogma and dominated the human mind over a large part of the globe. It is worth mentioning here that the concept of nationalism was unthinkable before the emergence of the modern nation-state system, in the period from the 16th to the 18th century. Asirvatham rightly says- "nationalism stands for the historical process by which nationalities are transferred into political units and for the legitimate right of a people who form a distinct and vigorous nation or nationality to a

place in the sun." To put it straight, when a national group either aspires to become self-governing or when having achieved self-government, this fact becomes part of the complex of national sentiment, we speak of nationalism.

Ernest Gullner speaks about 'nationalism' in the following manner-

"Nationalism tends to treat itself as a manifest and self-evident principle, accessible as such to all men and violated only through some perverse blindness, when in fact it owes its plausibility and compelling nature only to a very special set of circumstances, which do indeed obtain now, but which were alien to most of humanity and history.

Nationalism is an ideology whose affective driving force is the sense of belonging to and serving a perceived national community. Nationalism, as the story is generally told, begins as Sleeping Beauty and ends as Frankenstein's Monster."

Thus, from the above discussion, it is clear to you that the concept combines love for country along with suspiciousness of foreigners. Love for country comes from shared values, and suspiciousness of foreigners comes from the belief that foreigners do not share such values in the same strength. Actually, the difficulty with offering a standard definition of the term 'nationalism' lies in the fact that this term is used interchangeably with the terms-'nation' and 'nationality'. But, the factor of a common political consciousness appears important in all these concepts. In most of the situations, 'Nationalism' has been identified with love for the motherland or patriotism. The multitude of people bound by such a strong bond of unity and oneness may be either sovereign or fighting for the cause of emancipation from alien yoke. Due to this reason the struggle of a subject people for overthrowing foreign rule becomes the history of their national movement. Thus, 'nationalism' implies a common political sentiment. Nationalism is, therefore, a state or a condition of mind characteristic of certain people with a homogenous culture living together in close association in a given territory and sharing a belief in a distinctive existence and a common destiny.

Again, you should remember here that the people of same race, language, religion, history, literature, economic interests and political aspirations share the feelings of nationalism. Nationalism teaches us to love our motherland. It is evident from the above discussion that the nationalists love their motherland, rivers, mountains, flowers, animals and birds and consider their

motherland better than paradise. Hans Kohn says that - nationalism is an idea, an idea, force which fills man's brain and heart with new thoughts and sentiments and drives him to translate his consciousness into deeds of organized action.

Stop To Consider

Concepts of 'Nation', 'Nationalism' and 'Nationality'

Nationalism - Many wrongly use the term 'nationalism' as a synonym for 'nation'. Nationalism refers to a set of beliefs about the nation. Distinctive of nationalism is the belief that the nation is the only goal worthy of pursuit - an assertion that often leads to the belief that the nation demands unquestioned and uncompromising loyalty. However, when such a belief about the nation becomes predominant, it can threaten the individual liberty. Thus, Nationalism in short means love for motherland.

Nation - In contrast to nationalism, the nation is a particular kind of society. The nation is a territorial community of nativity. Nations emerge over time as a result of numerous historical processes. Actually, we know that all nations have some historical antecedents, whether tribe, city-state, or kingdom. These historically earlier societies are important components in the formation of nations. For example, the English nation emerges out of the historically earlier societies of the Saxons, Angles, and Normans. There would have been no nation of England had there not been memories about the Saxon king Alfred (849-899 CE) and the 'good old law' - likewise, memories about the Piasts (10th-12th centuries CE) and their kingdom were components in the emergence of Poland as a nation. Thus, the Nation is a social relation of collective self-consciousness. The nation is a territorial relation of collective self-consciousness of actual and imagined duration.

Nationality - Many political thinkers have defined 'nationality' in their own way. Richard W.F. Flournoy has very aptly remarked that while nationality is sometimes used broadly with reference to blood relationship in the strict legal sense, there is no necessary connection between them. The legal definition of nationality is that nationality is the status of a person who is attached to a state by a tie of allegiance. Thus, nationality is actually a spiritual sentiment of a number of people who belong to the same race, and same country, with same history and literature.

SAQ

Nationality is a sentiment of "oneness". Relate the concept of nationality with that of 'nation' and 'nationalism'. (20+30 words)

.....
.....
.....
.....

3.4 Historical Background

You have already learnt that nationalism emerges in the West as a result of the decline of the Papacy and the rise of sovereign secular states in the early modern period. Machiavelli strongly supports the case of unification of the Roman people. However, the concept receives great impetus after the French Revolution of 1789. Thus, G.P.Gooch can well take nationalism as a child of the French Revolution. The French Revolution is primarily responsible for revival of national sentiment. Cohesion in the society is sought on the basis of kinship and sentiment of oneness aided by the natural boundaries the formation and strengthening of such feelings.

Enthused with this new spirit and attitude of mind and a pattern of attention and desires, poets, historians, journalists and politicians roused the sentiments of nationalism in central Europe and in the Balkans. Elsewhere in the near East and far away in India, China and Japan, it began to cast a spell by promising relief from actual or threatened domination. Meanwhile, the Industrial Revolution was made a means to promote the national purposes and interests rather than to gain benefits for all communities and states. The Revolution had a national content and national purpose as its home was a nation- state and it spread chiefly to national states imbued with the traditions of mercantilism.

It needs mention here that since the late 18th century, a number of important political theorists have contributed to the theoretical elaboration of the concept of 'nationalism'. Some of the well known Jean Jacques Rousseau (1712- 78), Immanuel Kant (1724- 1804), Jeremy Bentham (1748- 1832), Richard Cobden (1804- 65), John Bright (1811- 89) and Francisque Bouret (1799- 1871).

Again, nationalism emerged in a new form in the early 19th century. Since then it has gradually spread throughout the world. It even changed the course of the movement in the Eastern nations. It ignited powerful desire for self-government in the majority of the colonial areas of the world. Once these colonies attained independence, it was attuned to the extreme type of nationalism in order to retain their newly won independence, placed as they were in the midst of power-hungry nations, and, at the same time, to accelerate the pace of economic growth to usher an era of just and happy life for the people hitherto trodden under the heels of the alien rulers.

It was J. S. Mill(1806-73) who has given the most lucid exposition of the liberal thinking on nationalism. He saw nationality as the- 'essential condition of stability in political society' when it consists of the feeling of common interest among those who live under the same government, and are contained within the same national and historical boundaries. Mill again return to the topic of nationalism in a chapter of his seminal work of liberal theory, 'Considerations on Constitutional Government' (1861), entitled 'Of Nationality, as Connected with Representative Government', which contains one of the classic formulations of a people's right to self determination. It is pertinent to mention here that a contemporary statesman who will endorse most of Mill's reflections on nationalism, is Vaclav Havel, former President of Czechoslovakia.

In the context of 20th century political theory, the hallmark of a truly liberal nationalism is that the nation- state is considered to be a political unit indispensable to the modern age. One of the leading nationalist theorists was Giuseppe Mazzini (1805-72), who inspired nationalist liberation or unification movements in various parts of 19th century Europe. Anthony Smith has also dedicated mere his intellectual energy to unraveling the mysteries of nationalism. The mythic dimension of nationalism has also been highlighted by Benedict Anderson who has studied the complex process by which the modern nation comes into being.

You should learn here that three manifestations of the vitality of the populist nationalism at the end of the 20th century are particularly disturbing—

- The first is the continuing vigour of movements struggling for greater political autonomy, which continues to enlist support for devolutionists, secessionists or irredentist causes in both the North and the South,

some using liberal tactics, others having recourse to naked acts of terrorism, and some maintaining an uneasy mixture of both.

- The second is the growing power of religious fundamentalism.
- The third manifestation of the unabated force of contemporary populist nationalism is that all over the world, in both the North and the South, minorities are asserting their ethnicity.

Thus, from the above discussion of the historical background of 'Nationalism', it is clear that the essence of nationalism lies in a separate state and each state should comprise a single nation. President Woodrow Wilson's right of self-determination of nations and nationalities, enunciated by him in January 1918 and embodied in his famous '14 points' well highlights this fact. President Franklin Roosevelt and Prime Minister Winston Churchill in a meeting on August 14, 1941 somewhere on the Atlantic, issued an eight point Joint Declaration (popularly known the Atlantic Charter) embodying the objectives for which the Allies were fighting against Germany and explained the principles that would serve as the basis of the future peace of the world.

It needs special mention here that the doctrine of national self-rule was accepted and incorporated in the charter of the UNO. Chapter XI of the charter on the non-self-governing territories fixed the principle of international accountability as the administering powers of these territories would be the progressive development of institutions of self-government. The principle of self-determination had earlier been advocated by some eminent thinkers and statesmen like J.S Mill, James Bryce, MacIver etc. MacIver held that the right of self-determination "has prepared the way for our modern democracies since the demand for self-government expands into the demand that the nation really governs itself." The right of self-determination and to decide about one's own political future has a democratic basis, international recognition, and collective commitment of nations. It ignites the national-consciousness of the peoples yoked to the shackles of the foreign rulers. From the time of the declaration of Woodrow Wilson's 14 points, there had been an upsurge first in Europe and then in Asia, Africa and Latin America, resulting into the ultimate liquidation of the colonial empires. The events in Africa proved the last phase in the history of the colonial empires. Thus, from the above discussion, it is already evident that the emergence of the concept of Nationalism helped the colonies all over the world to attain an independent status and became sovereign nation-states.

In this context we can cite here the example of Switzerland and agree with Hans Kohn that Switzerland has developed a democratic nationalism, similar to the one known in England and the United States, a nationalism made secure and strong by its insistence on individual liberty and respect for diversity.

But, the harsh fact which has to be admitted is that the presence of too many nation-states add to international complications and help to mount mutual rivalries and conflicts, resulting ultimately into a conflagration involving in it even the major states. Addressing a 53 nation commission on Human Rights in Geneva in Feb 1993, Morris Abraham, the United States Ambassador, explained that self-determination should not be confused with ethnic isolationism. But ironically in today's world "self-determination has become the world cry of groups which for ethnic or religious reasons, are bent on dividing nations.

Factors Responsible for the Growth of Nationalism:

Already, you have learnt that nationalism in its broader sense refers to the feeling of oneness. The feelings of nationalism or nationality are subjective and no measurable factor universal in application can be traced. It is actually a sentiment of unity, a common mass consciousness that may be the result of many factors, like common race and language, common history of victories in war and sufferings endured, common traditions, and customs giving birth to a common culture and common political aspirations. The presence of these factors help in the growth of the sentiments of unity and oneness. Let us discuss the following in brief—

- **Community of Race-** Racial unity is one of the stronger bonds of cohesion. Writers like Zimmern put emphasis on racial purity and consider it as a vital factor helping in the formation of nation and strengthening the idea of nationality. Whenever a body of people believe that they belong to one race, they become a group of common consciousness and interests. This feeling of belonging to one group is a propelling force for the development of nationalism.
- **Common Religion and Common Language -** Community of religion and language has also played a vital role in binding the people in oneness of purpose as it is great cementing force.

- **Geographical Contiguity** - Geographical unity is another important factor that fosters sentiments of unity. It is desirable that people constituting a nationality should occupy a fixed territory, the parts of which are contiguous, proudly represent their home country. A fixed and contiguous territory produces community of interest and feelings of co-operation and sympathy. But geographic unity is not an indispensable factor. There are many examples of nationalities spread over different lands. Jews are the most notable examples.
- **Common History and Culture** - Common historical traditions are regarded by Ramsay Muir as an 'indispensable factor' in cementing the bonds of nationality. John Stuart Mill has given them the first place of precedence. A common psychological make-up is also effected by the fact of people living together, thinking together, suffering together, working together, feeling joy and sorrow together. The people take pride in memorializing the deeds of their great heroes, they celebrate festivals and function to perpetuate the traditions of their history and culture. For example, the Scots cherish the memories of Bannockburn, the Swiss take the pleasure in recalling the achievements of William Tell, the Jews invoke the tenets of Zionism etc.
- **Common Government** - Common government is also another cementing factor. Irrespective of different outlook and sentiments national feelings of oneness if they live for a long time under the same government.
- **Common Interests** - Common interests like economic, political, social etc. act as a unifying factors in strengthening the ties of common aspirations.
- **Common Political Aspirations** - The people of a nationality desire to be independent of any kind of alien control or domination. That is, the members of a nationality desire to live under a state of their own and they resist all alien attempts to keep them under their domination. The fact is that, actually the growth of democratic ideas give an impetus to the ideal of nationality by transferring allegiance from the king to the nation.

Thus, from the above discussion, it is clear to you that 'nationalism' is the ideology that stands for attainment of political unification. Actually, different factors play their own part in the making of a nationality. Thus, Garner has rightly remarked - the truth is, this thing which we call nationality, and which is so difficult to define, is in essence, largely a matter of sentiment. If the people have acquired the character of a nationality, it is because they believe

that they possess a consciousness of being bound together by strong ties and affinities which distinguish them from their neighbours. They have a feeling of common interests and ideals, their moral ideas are fundamentally the same, they have a common heritage of tradition and of memories of common sacrifice and suffering, or of achievement and glory, and they share a common pride in great personalities and heroes.

Check Your Progress

1. Discuss the meaning of the concept of Nationalism.
2. Discuss the different factors which helped in the growth of the sentiment of nationalism.

3.5 Non-European Nationalism

From the earlier discussion of the evolution of the concept of nationalism, it is almost clear to you that the rise of nationalism in the West, also known as European Nationalism led to the rise of nation-state system, and the advent of imperialism. In a way, it became the precursor of imperialism. It assumed the form of a desire, an appetite, even an obsession to exalt the name of the state in the world by establishing colonial possessions. It encouraged the western nations to carry their flag, their culture, their language, and their political and economic institutions to the poor and backward regions of the world and thereby convert these vast countries into their dependencies, market, colonies and the like.

Thus, as a result of imperialism of the West, a counter-agitation emerged from the side of the weak and exploited people creating a new kind of nationalism that may be christened as 'Nationalism of the East'. In this way, nationalism strives to unite the members of one nation, politically and territorially in a state organization. When that is accomplished, the struggle for the possession of the earth proceeds further and Imperialism inflames the nationalism of the oppressed people or fractions.

Though it is not possible to generalize and enumerate all the factors promoting this type of nationalism in East, also known as Non-European Nationalism, and giving rise to popular movements for independence in the countries of Asia and Africa, the circumstances in each case being different; nevertheless,

there are certain factors, some of which, or all of them, may be said to be responsible for the rise of freedom movement in countries living under the subjection of the colonial powers of the world. These factors leading to the rise of Non-European Nationalism may be summarized below

- economic exploitation of the natural resources and man-power resulting in the enrichment of the masters and the pauperization of the slaves,
- unifying influence produced by the introduction of western language, growing awareness of the cultural heritage causing resentment against invasion of alien religious and social values,
- resentment against the policies of economic discontent and racial bitterness shown to dependent peoples,
- denial of adequate opportunities to the native people in higher public services, suppression of national resurgence and expression of popular grievances by brutal methods,
- implementation of the policy of divide and rule and of conciliation and counter-poise of the natives against the natives.

Thus, non-European nationalism signifies a common political consciousness or patriotism which the people of colonies under imperial rule share among themselves for the purpose of winning "swaraj" or self rule. It implies nationalism in the countries of Asia, Africa and Latin America which were under foreign subjection and dread for self rule. It also desires an independent integrated political system on the country wide basis.

Stop To Consider

Concept of National Self-Determination :

In order to understand properly what the concept of nationalism actually means, we will have to understand the concept of National Self-determination. Here we will discuss the concept of national self-determination in brief :

One of the great exponents of this principle is J.S.Mill. After the battle of Waterloo, the congress of Vienna (1815), gave recognition to this principle. Since then, the principle of 'one nation, one state' dominated the scene. After that, president Wilson of U.S.A stressed it in his 14 points (1917), and thereafter it became the accepted norm.

This principle implies that every nation should be organized as an independent political entity. The motivating idea behind the affirmation of this principle is

that the attempt to group together people of different nationalities into a single state will lead to a lack of patriotic feelings and internal dissensions. It is further contended that a nationality spread over several states can never be happy, contended and stable like a dismembered social organism. So, the concept believes that political boundary lines should be drawn where national lines exist. This principle treats it as natural right of the people of a particular nationality to determine their political destiny. It implies that states having different nationalities are like unnatural unions and the people of different nationalities have the option to leave the state and have their own state. So, President Wilson often stresses the point during the First World War that self-determination is not a mere phrase, it is an imperative principle of action which statesmen will henceforth ignore at their peril.

But, this principle is open to serious objections. It is stated by the critics that if the people of a particular nationality and given a natural right to demand self-determination, there will be chaos in many states of the world. It is owing to the rise of such sentiments that many states want disintegration. So, John Dalberg Acton (Lord Acton) rightly opines that this principle of national self-determination is a 'retrograde step in human history'. So, every state must be a composite of many nationalities.

But, at the end, it must be admitted that whatever be the extent and substance in the criticism of the right of self-determination, it had been and is still the ideal of nationalities who aspire for nationhood and statehood. It is a device to unify nationalities into a cohesive society and simultaneously provides them an opportunity to preserve their separate individuality through the process of adequate and abiding constitutional safeguards.

Coming to the context of India, we can say that after the 'Sepoy Mutiny' nationalism in India began to grow very rapidly. The struggle for Independence was inspired by this nationalism at an advanced stage of our society. The sense of nationalism guided Indians to fight for an integrated political system covering the whole country. Dr. Raghuvanshi makes a correct observation about the rise and growth of Indian Nationalism:- India acquired this consciousness with the unity of her political and economic life achieved as an indirect consequence of the foreign rule in the 19th century. Resentment against the colonial rule sharpened this consciousness and gave birth to nationalist agitation.

The causes for the rise of nationalism in India are-

- Effect of the first war of Independence i.e. Sepoy Mutiny- It was the Sepoy Mutiny of 1857, which for the first time sowed the seeds of nationalism in India.
- Social and religious movements- Various social and religious movements during that time also accelerated the pace of Indian Nationalism.
- Western education - The spread of western education also helped in stimulating the sentiment of nationalism amongst Indians.
- Universal poverty in India - Due to economic exploitation of the Indian masses, there was universal poverty amongst Indians but British did not take any step to relieve the misery of the Indians. This further infuriated the masses.
- Role of the press - Press played a vital role at that time and different social changes led to the emergence of this sentiment.
- Repressive measures of Lord Lytton -The repressive measures of Lord Lytton, created discontentment amongst Indian masses.
- Lastly, racial discrimination, and other Foreign events, severe famines and the oppressive agrarian system etc. also added fuel to the fire, thereby leading to the emergence of the concept of Indian Nationalism.

Thus from the above discussion, it is clear to you that the Indian nationalism is a by-product of British imperialism. In a sense, British imperialism in India sowed the seeds of Indian nationalism which bore fruit in 1947. Rajani Palme Dutt rightly remarked-Indian nationalism arose from social conditions, from the conditions of imperialism and its economic forces generated within Indian society under the condition of that explanation.

3.6 Critical Appraisal

The concept of nationalism is said to have its strong and weak elements. In defense of nationalism the following points can be offered

1. The concept of nationalism has played a constructive role in unifying the people of a particular stock. It has led to the rise of powerful nation states and made the people free from undesirable alien subjection.

2. Nationalism and liberalism became identifiable movements and brought with it the system of democracy.
3. The triumph of nationalism has signified astonishing progress of the people of different nationalities. After the existence in the form of separate political entities, the people could make astonishing progress in various directions, particularly in social and economic fronts.
4. In the countries of the Third World, nationalism has emerged as a blessing in creating powerful political consciousness as a result of which the ruled could overthrow the imperialistic hold of the advanced nation of the West. The emancipation of the people of the countries of Africa and Asia from centuries of political subjection and economic exploitation occurred only with the rise of nationalism in the East.
5. Finally, nationalism has been and also a strong force all over the world. It can neither be ignored nor abolished as the concept is consonant with fundamental human nature.
6. Nationalism infuses the spirit of patriotism in the minds of the people. Through nationalism, the feelings of the high and low and casteism are banished from the minds of the people. The nationalist leaders make the people understand that our nation can progress and gain a prestigious place in the world only when all disparities are removed.
7. Nationalism creates the feeling of heroism and self-sacrifice. Every nation has to make several sacrifices for the attainment and protection of its freedom.
8. Nationalism helps in curbing mutual conflicts and quarrels and the attention of the people is drawn towards important problems.
9. The individual gives up his selfish interests and works for national interests.
10. True nationalism is an important link between different countries of the world. Mahatma Gandhi, Shri Jawaharlal Nehru and Mrs. Indira Gandhi being true nationalists, are internationalists also. It is under the inspiration of Jawaharlal Nehru, the U.N declared the year 1965 as international co-operation year.

Thus, from the above discussion, it is clear to us that if nationalism is liberal, it is not harmful. Liberal nationalists in fact want world peace. However, at times it becomes aggressive nationalism creating problems.

However, the concept of nationalism also has its weak points. Let us discuss these points

- Nationalism has a separating and insulting tendency that creates barrier among the people of the world. In the words of Tagore, it raises narrow domestic walls to fragment the people of the universe. Such nationalism is the enemy of universalism.
- Nationalism justifies the case of people as a whole in the form of a collective ego and scarifies liberty of the individual at the altar. Man is commanded to sacrifice his personal interest at the altar of this collective good.
- It creates the feelings of fundamentalism that prevents a nation from treating the men of other nationalities with a sense of equality and respect.
- The worst and most serious aspect of nationalism can be seen in its aggressive and militant forms. The way Mussolini and Hitler explain national sentiments and push the world towards the Second World War provided much stuff for the critics to treat nationalism as a great cause, or as the biggest stumbling block in the way of internationalism.

Also, at times, Nationalism often asserts that other nations are implacable enemies to one's own nation. It also injects hatred of what is perceived to be foreign, whether another nation, an immigrant, or a person who may practise another religion or speak a different language. Of course, one need not view one's own nation and its relation to other nations in such a manner. These are the problems associated with extreme nationalism.

3.7 The Future of Nationalism

Regarding the future of nationalism we can say that although nationalism has its sinister dimensions, it cannot be rooted out. What is required is that the different aspects of nationalism like---chauvinism, dogmatism, fundamentalism, aggressive militarism etc. should be removed out. Thus nationalism must be immunized from its evil effects. In other words, nationalism should be universalized so as to constitute real internationalism. Let all the nations of the world exist and enjoy good relations.

Nationalism will provide rests for internationalism if it is taken in its positive and constructive dimensions. Thus, in conclusion, we can say that the future of nationalism is good only if it is immunized from its evil effect.

But, today, we are living in an era of LPG, i.e., Liberalisation, Privatisation and Globalisation. In this era of Globalisation, the whole world has actually been converted into a global village. In this global village, every nation is inter-dependent in all aspects - political, social, cultural etc. and also the concept of global citizenship emerged as a result of globalization. Global citizenship implies the entire world to bring world peace and applies the concept of citizenship to a global level. Also, there are a large scale exchange of views amongst different countries of the World. Thus, in this era of globalization, though the concept of Nationalism got a blow, yet, it must be taken in its positive sense because, it posed as an obstacle in the path of extreme sense of nationalism, which is detrimental to world peace. The combined effect of nationalism and globalization result in the emergence of sovereign nation-state as well as respect for international norms.

Check Your Progress

- 1) What do you mean by non-European nationalism? Trace the factors leading to the emergence of such nationalism.
- 2) Point out the advantages as well as drawbacks of the concept of nationalism.
- 3) Mention the factors leading to the rise and growth of Indian Nationalism.

3.8 Summing Up

From the above discussion it is clear to you all that Nationalism is a unifying force, which brings together the people. It is evident to you all that a cluster of different factors are actually responsible for the emergence of the concept of Nationalism. Also, you all have studied the difference between European and non-european nationalism and the different factors responsible for the emergence of Indian Nationalism.

3.9 References and Suggested Readings

Principles of Modern Political Science. by - J.C. Johari. Sterling Publication. (2009).

Principles of Political Science. By- A.C.Kapur. S.Chand and Comp. ltd. New Delhi. (2009).

Contemporary Political Ideologies (2nd edition) edited by - Roger Eatwell and, Anthony Wright. Printer, London and new york. (1999).

Political Theory (Principles of Political Science). By - R.C.Agarwal. (S.Chand and Company Ltd.), New Delhi. (2005)

Nationalism and Colonialism in Modern India. By - Bipan Chandra. Orient Longman. (2000).

Nationalism, Democracy and Development. (State and Politics in India) Edited by - Sugata Bose and Ayesha Jalal. (1999).

Political Theory (principles of political science). By - R.C. Agarwal. S.Chand and Company Ltd. New Delhi (2005).

* * *

**Institute of Distance and Open Learning
Gauhati University**

**MA in Political Science
(2nd Semester)**

**Paper V
Political Theory II**

**Block 3
Contemporary Ideologies**



Contents:

Block Introduction–

Unit 1 : Feminism

Unit 2 : Multiculturalism

Contributors:

Sabeena Yasmin Saikia : Asst. Director, Administrative Staff College
(Unit 1) Gauhati University
Rumi Roy : Research Scholar
(Unit 2) JNU, New Delhi

Course Co-ordination

Dr. Kandarpa Das : Director
IDOL, GU
Barnalee Choudhury : Lecturer in Political Science
IDOL, GU

Editorial Team

Content Editing : Barnalee Choudhury
Lecturer in Political Science
IDOL, GU
Format Editing : Dipankar Saikia
Guest Lecturer in Political Science
IDOL, GU
Language Editing : Shanghamitra De
Lecturer in English
IDOL, GU

Cover Page Designing:

Kaushik Sarma : Graphic Designer
CET, IITG

March, 2011

© Institute of Distance and Open Learning, Gauhati University. All rights reserved. No part of this work may be reproduced in any form, by mimeograph or any other means, without permission in writing from the Institute of Distance and Open Learning, Gauhati University. Further information about the Institute of Distance and Open Learning, Gauhati University courses may be obtained from the University's office at IDOL Building, Gauhati University, Guwahati-14. Published on behalf of the Institute of Distance and Open Learning, Gauhati University by Dr. Kandarpa Das, Director and printed at Maliyata Offset Press, Mirza. Copies printed 1000.

Acknowledgement

The Institute of Distance and Open Learning, Gauhati University duly acknowledges the financial assistance from the Distance Education Council, IGNOU, New Delhi for preparation of this material.

Block Introduction:

In the previous two blocks of this paper we have discussed the classical ideas like liberty, equality, justice, democracy, state and citizenship as well as classical ideologies like liberalism, socialism and nationalism. In this block we are going to discuss the contemporary ideologies viz. feminism and multiculturalism. Feminism as a movement opposes the discrimination between man and woman. It emphasises the equal opportunities for men and women in social, economic and political fields. The feminists also advocate for various rights for women including the right to property, right to vote, right to bodily integrity, right to autonomy, reproductive right etc. Hence, our attempt also is to discuss the ideology of multiculturalism. Multiculturalism in its general sense denotes the peaceful co-existence of different culture in a society. In a multicultural society diversity of culture is always respected. The term 'multiculturalism' is basically used to describe the demographic make- up of a country's population, as well as the expressions of an ideal of cross- cultural inter- ethnic and inter- community harmony. Moreover, it also describes the public policy initiatives to promote such an ideals.

In the first unit of this block we are going to discuss the ideology of feminism. Feminism is an ideology which basically seeks equality between men and women. As an ideology it becomes popular in the 19th century. The feminist opposes the marginalisation of women. Feminism as an ideology was developed in the 1960s. It has drawn the attention of the society to the sexual divisions in the society. Feminists hold the belief that sexual inequality or oppression can and should be abolished. In this unit we will discuss the meaning of feminism as well as different feminist perspectives on state, power, justice and gender discrimination.

The second unit of this block is an attempt to understand the ideology of multiculturalism. Multiculturalism believes in showing respect to all the existing cultures in the society. Multiculturalism promotes ethnic diversity in the society. It was first introduced by the Swiss in 1957 and was further developed in the 1960s. In a multicultural society people maintain their own culture but a diversity of cultures is also respected. The unit on multiculturalism discusses the meaning and evolution of the concept. It also helps you in understanding multiculturalism from the perspective of Taylor, Bhikhu Parekh

and Kymlicka. Moreover, the unit tries to draw the linkage between multiculturalism and nationalism on the one hand and multiculturalism and globalization on the other.

This block consists of two units:

Unit 1: Feminism

Unit 2: Multiculturalism

Unit 1

Feminism

Contents:

- 1.1 Introduction
- 1.2 Objectives
- 1.3 Meaning of Feminism
- 1.4 Feminism on State
- 1.5 Feminists Perspective on Power
 - 1.5.1 Power as Resource
 - 1.5.2. Power as Domination
 - 1.5.3. Power as Empowerment
- 1.6 Feminism on Justice
- 1.7 Feminists Perspective on Gender Discrimination
- 1.8 Summing Up
- 1.9 References and Suggested Readings

1.1 INTRODUCTION

The term ‘feminism’ has been receiving a lot of attention in the previous and the present centuries. It is often being used and abused in the academic-intellectual circle, media, corporate sector and in various other engagements of social life. Such an engagement and non-engagement, both by the state and civil society, public and private spheres, at various levels, has generated intense debate as well as widespread sensitivity on the issue of gender. In the process, it has intensified rigor in the concerns over gender, especially of women and girls, their rights and constraints and has led to the emergence of a rich body of feminist work, both theoretical-ideological and activity oriented which seeks to eliminate gender injustice.

The concepts of justice, right, oppression, equality, power, and agency are some of the vital areas on which feminism argues. These debates have enriched the general body of intellectual and philosophical work. This unit on feminism attempts to explore and introduce the learners to the concept and implications of feminism, its understanding of debates on state as a

potent agency, on power and justice, and in this process open up the wide arena of ideas and stimulate critical appreciation of crucial themes.

1.2 Objectives

Feminism highlights the relationship between the sexes especially the supremacy of men and subjection of women in most of the societies. After reading this unit you will be able to:

- *explain* the meaning and characteristics of feminism
- *trace* the historical development of the ideas and activities under the feminist framework
- *discuss* the feminist perspective on state, power, justice and gender distinctions

1.3 Meaning of Feminism

Feminism is a social movement and an ideology which seeks to achieve justice and equal rights for women. It aspires to achieve non-discrimination between men and women on the grounds that they belong to different sexes. It argues that women should share equally the scarce resources and society's opportunities such that they can equally participate in the society. Feminist theory which forms a part of the feminist ideology constitutes several perspectives and each perspective or theory attempts to describe women's oppression, explain its causes and consequences and prescribe strategies for women's liberation.

Certain social reforms introduced by the different regimes of power in different parts of the world at different points of history gave better rights to women than before and certain religious and political thought and ideology did confer women with more rights than others did. However, the ideology of women as a distinct category having equal rights with men had hardly gained any ground. Accordingly, the social, political and economic structures reflected the absence of that ideology. The democratic revolutions of the 17th and the 18th century in Europe and America, and the emerging changes in ideology and social arrangements consequent to these and the visibility of women in the public sphere as a result of the Industrial Revolution, posited several questions about the rights of women. The last decade of the 17th

century has come to be referred to as ‘Battle of Sexes’ with the educated women’s struggle for more women’s rights becomes vocal and urgent. Among the several noteworthy contributions of this period mention may be made of Mary Wollstonecraft’s *A Vindication of the Rights of Women* (1792).

Furthermore, the status of women in the developing countries driven by tradition and imperialism gradually received attention. This witnessed the struggle for women’s rights and gender equality and the mission to end the gender based discriminatory practices against women became a global struggle.

The struggle for women’s rights in the ensuing centuries gained momentum and the 19th century Charles Fourier used the term ‘Feminism’ to refer to the question of equal rights of women. Hence, Fourier is credited to have first used that term with which this struggle for women’s rights came to be defined.

Feminism grew in three distinct waves- the first, second and third. These are-

1. The first wave corresponding to the 19th and the early 20th century saw the struggle for rights of women emerging as an organized movement and dealt mainly with suffrage, working conditions and education right for women and girls. It was more oriented to the upper and middle class white women.

Writers such as Virginia Woolf are associated with the ideas of the first wave of feminism. In her book *A Room of One’s Own* Woolf “describes how men socially and psychically dominate women”. She recognizes the social constructs that restrict women in society and uses literature to contextualize it for other women.

2. The second wave occurred in the late 1960’s across North America and Europe in the wake of the civil rights, students, and anti-imperialist movements and continued to the 1980’s. It was concerned with gender inequality in laws and culture. The feminist engages in exploring the varied forms and sites of female subordination and male power, from reproductive technologies and socialization practices to laws and cultural representations and the institutions that confine women to the private sphere. Simone de Beauvoir’s *Second Sex* became the foundational text with crucial influence on contemporary feminist thought. The distinction between gender and sex

was underlined. The cultural and social specificity of gender issues and its linkage with class and race gained perspective during the second wave.

3. The third wave feminism begins in the 1990s centering upon the post-structuralist interpretation of gender and sexuality with focus on micropolitics. It witnesses considerable theoretical attention being devoted to the formation of gendered subjectivity, male and female, informed by the recent developments in psychoanalytic thinking. The sex/gender dichotomy is being challenged, arguing that sex is also a social construct.

It needs mention here that the third-wave feminism is a reaction to and continuation of the second wave. It confronts the essentialist definitions of femininity, which assume a universal female identity. It takes a post-structuralist analysis of femininity to argue that there is in fact no all-encompassing single feminist idea. It seeks to accommodate diversity and change and understand women in their different socio-cultural contexts thereby accommodating the voices of non-heterosexual women.

Thus, the concerns of feminism have evolved over time, differences among women rather than between men and women become the central focus and the theoretical challenge has been to conceptualise the intersection of multiple cross-cutting social divisions.

Feminism, therefore, can be summarized as having the following characteristics:

- It is concerned with issues of justice, equality, rights, oppression, disadvantage, etc. in reference to gender differences.
- It generally holds that people are broadly divided into categories based on sex, i.e. male and female in reference to biological differences, and social differences are built up on this notion.
- It argues that gender differences lead to gender disparity where women are at a disadvantage vis-à-vis their male counterparts.
- It explores and questions the power structures and hierarchical differences between men and women and the marginalization of women and girls.
- It argues that such discriminatory gender treatments and corresponding institutional arrangements are socio-cultural and hence possible to change.

- It seeks to assert the rights of women and the elimination of discrimination of women on grounds of gender.
- It has an ideological basis and is also a social movement.
- It takes note of the cultural uniqueness and differences and seeks to understand the position of women from this perspective and address women rights issues.
- The various perspectives of feminism are fraught with ideas which not only centers round but also differs on the issues of identifying justice, equality and discrimination. It generates debates on whether the goal should be equal treatment or equal respect in different roles, identifying of which of women’s experiences to be taken as normative, questions whether inequality is significantly different in different groups or should the focus be on the common experiences of women or otherwise, etc.

SAQ

Do you think that the various waves of feminism helped in the establishment of gender equality in the society? (40 words)

.....

.....

.....

.....

.....

1.4 Feminism on State

You have already learnt that feminism stresses on gender equality. Though state plays an important role in structuring gender relationship, theorizing about the state does not occupy a central role in feminists’ jurisprudence. Most political treatments of the state have had little to say about gender just as most feminist theory about gender has been uninterested in conceptual approaches to the state. In her work *Towards a Feminist Theory of State*, (1989) Catharine MacKinnon has observed, “Feminism has no theory of state”. Nor do feminists agree about whether that constitutes a problem. For some theorists, as Judith Allen writes in *Does Feminist Need a ‘Theory of State’?* (1990) “abstraction like the state is too unitary and too unspecific

to be of much use in addressing The diverse and specific.... That must be of the most pressing concern to feminists”. By contrast, other feminists emphasized the centrality of government structures in women’s lives and the need for theoretically richer accounts of that role in mediating gender relation.

You should remember here that the early feminists drew the state into gender studies through analyses of the state’s role in reproducing patriarchal social relations; they examined how women, as a homogenous group, were oppressed by a centralized state.

Stop to Consider

Patriarchy

Patriarchy, in simple terms explains how our society functions and how it controls women. In a patriarchal system, the male members in the family hold authority over women, children and property. Gerda Lerner, an American historian defines patriarchy as “the manifestation and institutionalization of male dominance over women and children in the family and the extension of male dominance over women in society in general. Kate Millet, a feminist writer known for her work *Sexual Politics* identified two areas by which men exercise their domination: social authority and economic forces. Such domination is not an individual phenomenon but a structural and encompassing social phenomenon.

In recent times, feminists have turned their back on such conspiratorial notions of state patriarchy. Rather they have taken up the task of illuminating the ways through which states shape, and are shaped by, gender relations. Through studies of state spheres—including welfare provisions, legal codes, and penal policies—feminist theorists uncovered how states are differentiated entities, composed of multiple gender arrangements. The result has been the proliferation and diversification of feminist analyses of the state.

It needs mention here that during the 1970s, the feminist social movements identified the state as having the power to change policies which affect women and to give women certain rights. Demands for equal pay and equal opportunities for child care provisions, reproductive rights and sexual self determination and the demand to end male violence were directed at the

state with the belief that it could implement the desired changes. At the same time the state was identified as supporting social relations oppressive to women. Thus, women demonstrating in defence of abortion rights chanted “not the church and not the state, women will decide their fate”. This suggests that the state is central to feminist policies. But, it also reveals ambivalence towards the state which characterized the second wave feminism. However, the state came to assume a place of centrality in feminist discourses and activities and this has shaped the tactics adopted by feminist special movements in their engagement with the state.

It is pertinent to mention here that since the mid-1980s, there has been a reevaluation of the central role of the state in the structuration and institutionalization of relations between men and women, and in establishing and policing the frontiers between public and private spheres. It is somewhat paradoxical that, at a time when the importance of the state itself is being eroded by supranational processes, the state has been brought back into feminist theory. However, feminist perspective diverges not only in their views on the theorisation of gender inequality but also on the nature and role of the state institutions.

Liberal feminists hold the view that the state is a monolithic, all-seeing, all-knowing body which acts in the most advantageous way possible for existing power relations (Susan Halford 1992). For them, gender inequality is the result of individual cases of discrimination combined sometimes with the existence of sex-role stereotyping in education and the labour market within the state. (Pringle & Watson, 1998). They visualize that access to education and legal reform could enhance women’s professional and occupational stature thereby enabling women to compete equally with men. In this context, the state is regarded as a neutral arbiter in equalizing gender relations by removing discriminatory laws and policies. Many feminists, thus, view that introduction of women’s initiatives and representatives into local government, then, could be a prime strategy to achieve gender equality within the political arena of a state. Liberal feminists rely mainly on legal remedies. They believe in the institutionalization of women’s needs in the state institutions by focusing heavily on the assumption of monolithic state.

STOP TO CONSIDER:

EQUITY FEMINISM

Equity feminism is a form of classical liberal or libertarian feminism. In terms of gender difference, the equity feminists believe that the differences in outcomes between women and men can be explained, not by violence against women and sex discrimination, but by differences in the preferences of women and men (Epstein 2002,; Stolba and Furchtgott-Roth, 1999). “In many cases where women remain behind men, personal choices explain outcomes more readily than does overt discrimination”. (Stolba and Furchtgott-Roth 1999). Similarly, the differences between the sexes largely explain the sex segregation in the workplace and in family roles still common in various countries like the United States (Epstein 2002; Lehrman 1997).

According to Young (2004), not all the equity feminists agree to the fact that biological sex differences alone can explain this differences in outcome. In many cases, socialization process or incentives influence the women’s preferences. For instance, women may be socialized to opt for stereotypical roles. Again, the women may be motivated to take up the stereotypical roles for the rewards associated with such roles. In this context, the equity feminists hold the view that the state remedies are inappropriate as the women are not legally bound and traditionally coerced to accept these roles. The equity feminists believes that a law may be termed as coercive if it prohibits women to take up the job of a surgeon or otherwise as it constitutes a threat in terms of loss of liberty or property.

Equity feminism holds that feminism’s political role simply is to ensure that everyone’s, including women’s, right against coercive interference is respected. According to them, feminism’s political role is not only to bring an end to laws that limit women’s liberty in particular, but also to laws that grant special privileges to women. The conservative wing among these group stresses on the traditional values which according to them will function as bulwarks against state power and produce independent and self-restraining citizens.

The liberal feminists hold that freedom is a fundamental value and the state institution ensures freedom for citizens. However, there are diverse feminist views about what actually freedom means. These views are categorized under two heads namely classical liberal or libertarian feminism and egalitarian liberal feminism.

Classical liberal or libertarian feminists were of the view that both men and women hold the same political interests. McElory (2002) states that this

interest shall be treated as self owners. Classical liberalists opine that as self- owners they are capable of acquiring property rights over things. As such, they are equally entitled to the right to freedom from coercive interference with their person and property. The right to freedom should at least be rights to freedom of conscience and expression, freedom to control what happens to one's body, freedom of association, freedom to acquire, control and transfer property, freedom of contract, as well as the right to compensation when rights are violated. According to them, the state's role is, exclusively, to protect citizens from coercive interference by protecting their rights.

Classical liberal or libertarian feminism envisages freedom as freedom from coercive interference. It holds the view that as self- owners both men and women have a right to such freedom. It further believes that coercive state power is justified only to the extent necessary to protect the right to freedom from coercive interference.

On the other hand, the second view i.e. the egalitarian feminist view analyses the concept of freedom from two perspectives- personal and political autonomy. Personal autonomy freedom implies living a life of one's own choice while freedom from the perspective of political autonomy refers to being a co- author of the conditions under which one lives. According to the egalitarian feminists, the exercise of personal autonomy depends on certain enabling conditions and unfortunately, these conditions are not sufficiently present in women's lives. Moreover, the social arrangements often fail to respect women's personal autonomy. They believe that the basic conditions of a society do not sufficiently reflect the needs and interests of women.

As opposed to the liberal feminists view, the Marxist feminists look upon the state institution as an instrument of exploiting women. For them, although the state sustains women's oppression and subordination within capitalism, it only indirectly oppresses women because it is capitalist rather than patriarchal (Pringle & Watson 1998). Thus, the Marxist feminists focus on the oppressive aspects of the state. According to Vietz, (1998), although not directly, the state participates in oppressing women by protecting capitalism and racism (Vietz 1998). In order to end this oppression, they showed the path of bringing more and more women into the economic

spheres. They do not believe in participating in politics within the state describing the institutions as ‘hallowed institutional halls of men’s political machinery’ (Staudt 1998). In this strategy, the separation between women and men is urgent (Sapiro 1998) and on this ground they argue for keeping distance from state.

Through its political critique of capitalism, a Marxist feminist perspective contributes in challenging the liberal assumption that representative government is the sole sanctuary for politics and the legitimate arbiter of social change (Vietz 1998). Yet, by over-emphasising the effectiveness with which the welfare state reproduces the capitalist mode of production through women’s dependence upon men within the family, it fails in explaining convincingly just why the state should need to reinforce masculine dominance and privilege (Pringle & Watson 1998). In the same tune, the radical feminists also argue that male dominated patriarchal states.

Check Your Progress:

1. Discuss the meaning and characteristics of feminism.
2. Trace the development of feminist movement during the third wave.
3. Point out three basic areas of perspective of contemporary feminism on State.

SAQ:

Do you agree with the Marxist feminist that state is an instrument of exploiting women? Give arguments in favour of your answer. (20+30 words)

.....

.....

.....

.....

.....

.....

.....

.....

.....

.....

1.5 Feminist Perspective on Power

In the previous section of this unit, you have learnt about different feminist perspectives on state. The concept of power can also be called as a hidden theme of the feminists. In none of their works it is explicitly discussed and therefore, it has been a challenge to reconstruct the feminists' views on power from various sources. Irrespective of the ways in which we define power, the feminist idea of power can be identified in the following manner:-

- power as a resource to be redistributed ,
- power as domination
- power as empowerment.

Before analysing the feminist perspective on power, let us have a brief discussion on the nature of power. In simple terminology, power means getting someone else to do what one wants them to do. It is also defined as an ability or a capacity to act (power to) . Max Weber defines power as “the probability that one actor within a social relationship will be in a position to carry out his own will despite resistance...” (1978). Hobbes' definition of power as a person's “present means...to obtain some future apparent Good” {Hobbes 1985 (1641)} is a classic example of this understanding of power. Hanna Pitkin notes that power is related etymologically to the French word ‘pouvoir’ and the Latin ‘potere’, both of which mean to be able. “That suggests, in turn, that power is a something — anything — which makes or renders somebody able to do, capable of doing something. Power is a capacity, potential, ability, or wherewithal” (Pitkin 1972).

Hence, from the above discussion, we can say that conceptualising power actually depends on the angle from which it is examined. While a political scientist looks upon it from the political angle, a sociologist will take interest in studying the power configuration of various social institutions. Feminist history provides materials to conclude that feminists who are interested in power are interested in understanding and critiquing social relations of domination and subordination and thinking about how such relations can be transformed through individual and collective resistance. This means that, for the most part, feminist discussions of power focus on social rather than political power understood in terms of the power of the state.

SAQ:

Do you think the feminist conceptualisation of power focus more on political power? Give reasons in support of your argument. (40+50 words)

.....
.....
.....
.....
.....

1.5.1 Power as Resource: Liberal Feminist Approaches

Liberal feminists view power as a positive social good and according to them in the society it is not equally distributed between women and men. Their objective, therefore, was how to redistribute the resources so as to achieve equality between men and women. While talking about power as good, liberal feminists in certain cases include the benefits and burdens of familial life which are unevenly distributed between men and women in the family. In this context Okin’s conclusion is comprehensive, “when we look seriously at the distribution between husbands and wives of such critical social goods as work (paid and unpaid), power, prestige, self-esteem, opportunities for self-development, and both physical and economic security, we find socially constructed inequalities between them, right down the list” (Okin, 1989,). Young, another liberal feminist calls this a distributive model of power. She criticises this and opines that power is not a thing to possess this way. According to her, power exists only in action and thus must be understood dynamically as existing in ongoing process or interactions. She comments that injustice in power distribution can be observed in the traditional societies where social relations are tightly defined by domination and oppression.

1.5.2 Power as domination:

Power as domination refers to such unjust or oppressive power over whom it is exercised. Feminist’s perspective of power can be discussed under various heads such as, radical feminism, socialist feminism, and post-structuralism.

Among the feminist scholars who use phenomenological methods are Bartkey (1990), Nissim Sabat, Smith (1997), Stanley and Wise (1983), Young (1980). The works of Judith Butler, Jenney Nelson and Marian Paget are notable. They concentrated on the communication and performance in their efforts to be true to the phenomenon i.e the phenomenon of women's lived experience.

STOP TO CONSIDER:

Simon de Beauvoir and Feminism

Simon de Beauvoir's *The Second Sex* is considered as an authentic document of the feminists where situation of women is portrayed analytically under the backdrop of social, cultural, historical and economic conditions that define their existence. Beauvoir argues that whereas men have assumed the status of the transcendent subject, women have been relegated to the status of the immanent Other. In her words "She is defined and differentiated with reference to man and not he with reference to her; she is the incidental, the inessential as opposed to the essential. He is the Subject, he is the Absolute — she is the Other." This distinction — between man as Subject and woman as other — is key to Beauvoir's understanding of domination or oppression.

In Beauvoir's explanation women are oppressed because they are compelled to submit to the status of the Other. They are doomed to immanence for which they themselves are partly responsible. From this it follows that women's situation is marked by a basic tension between transcendence and immanence. As self-conscious human beings, they are capable of transcendence, but they are compelled into immanence by cultural and social conditions that deny them that transcendence.

Another feminist phenomenologist in this line is Iris Young. She offered critical analysis of Beauvoir's book. Young discusses women's bodily structure and how it has a bearing in women's oppression. According to her, women very often fail to use fully the spatial potential of their bodies. They try not to take up too much space, and they tend to approach physical activity tentatively and uncertainly. Their bodily compartment, movement and spatial orientation are expressive of the fact that there are tension equally between transcendence and immanence. She made it explicitly clear that in patriarchal

society women is considered only as a body and that is the main source of dominance. She writes, “Woman lives her body as object as well as subject. The source of this is that patriarchal society defines woman as object, as a mere body, and that in sexist society women are in fact frequently regarded by others as objects and mere bodies”

Many other feminists have engaged in similar phenomenological analyses of the tension between transcendence and immanence (inherent) that is, on this view, characteristic of women’s subordination.

• **Radical Feminist Approaches**

Radical feminist like Catherine Mac Kinnon believes that dominance is closely associated with the gender difference. According to her, “difference is the velvet glove on the iron fist of domination. The problem is not that differences are not valued; the problem is that they are defined by power”. If gender difference is a function of domination then it follows that men are powerful and women are powerless in the society. In her paper “Feminism, Marxism, Methods and the State”, she propounded a theory of state in opposition to Marxist theory. Here, she put forward her analogy, “sexuality is to feminism, what work is to Marxism”. Her theory revolves around the sexual subordination of women and how this subordination is embedded in the state apparatus, procedures and structures. In her theory, men and women appear as dominant and subordinate. Sexuality offers women no possible heaven from oppression, for them to choose sexuality over freedom would be like slaves choosing forced labour over emancipation. Women and sexuality are antagonistic and she rejects any extra social sexual domain that could provide liberating erotic enjoyment.

On another occasion MacKinnon writes, “the social relation between the sexes is organized so that men may dominate and women must submit and this relation is sexual — in fact, is sex” (MacKinnon 1987, 3). In her concept of domination, individual women are subject to the will of individual men. If male domination is pervasive and women are powerless by definition, then it follows that female power is “a contradiction in terms, socially speaking”. At this point she invites criticisms from many fellow feminists saying that she disregards women’s agency and presents them as helpless victim.

Catherine MacKinnon in her book *Feminism Unmodified* put forward her conception of feminism. She also presents some examples of practices which hinder our society from becoming more feminist; that is, women living not only equally as entitled as men, but on their own terms. The main practices and phenomena outlined by her include sexual harassment, pornography and how each perpetuates the power play of domination and subordination within society.

Similar concept of male domination can be found in the writings of Carole Pateman. In her *The Sexual Contract* (1988) she claims that gender difference is constituted by domination. Attacking the theory of social contract she opines that the contemporary theory which she describes as “tales” says only about half of the contract. They do not tell anything about the sexual contract. According to her, the original contract was the sexual contract – sexual social pact. The story of social contract is also about the genesis of political rights and explains why exercise of the right is legitimate. But what we commonly hear is the patriarchal right or sex right- the power that men exercise over women. Social contract is a story of freedom while sexual contract is a story of subjection. The original contract constitutes both freedom and domination. Men’s freedom and women’s subjection are created through the original contract which is both sexual and social contract. It is sexual in the sense of patriarchal domination i.e. the contract establishes men’s political rights over women and also sexual in the sense of establishing orderly access by men to women’s bodies. It is through this contract that modern patriarchy was established.

Nancy Fraser is a sympathetic critique of Pateman’s arguments. She notes that it is marriage not prostitution that establishes a long term hierarchical status relation whose terms are predetermined and unalterable and whose roles are assigned according to sex. She opines that a notion of male sex right may well underlie the patriarchal meaning of sexual difference defining femininity as subjection, the commodified version of that relationship through prostitution may offer a challenge to notions of boundless male dominance. It is because of this Fraser suggests that it is misleading to assimilate “commodification to command” because even as the wage contract establishes worker as subjects to the bosses’ command in the employment sphere, it simultaneously constitutes that sphere as a limited sphere.

- **Socialist Feminist Approaches**

The social feminists consider Marx's theory of Power as deficient as it ignores the ways in which class exploitation and gender subordination are interwind. Marx solely offers explanation about economic production and overlooks women's reproductive labour at home and the exploitation of this labour in a capitalist mode of production. That is why socialist feminist considers Marx as gender blind and feels it necessary to supplement his theory of class domination with a radical feminist critique of patriarchy in order to yield a satisfactory account of women's oppression; the resulting theory is referred to as dual system theory.

The dual system theory argues that two distinct and relatively autonomous systems viz, the system of male domination and the system of the mode of production and class relations help in oppression of women. The first system which is most often called the patriarchy, produces specific gender oppression of women while the second system produces class oppression and work alienation of most women. This theory is criticized by Iris Young, a socialist feminist as inadequate. Young opines that socialist feminists supports the claim of the radical feminists that the Marxist theory has failed to explain the origins and structure of sex oppression though this kind of oppression is one of the fundamental elements of most societies.

But social feminists did not entirely reject the Marxist theory of history or critique of capitalism. Young was of the view that the labour of women occupies a central place in any system of government, gender division is a basic axis of social structuration in all hitherto existing social formations, and the gender hierarchy serves as a pivotal element in most systems of domination. According to her, if traditional Marxism does not cover all these hypotheses, then it is not an adequate theory of women oppression as well as of social relations, relations of production, and domination. What we need is not merely a synthesis of feminism with traditional Marxism, but a thoroughly feminist historical materialism which regards the social relations of a particular historical formation as one system in which gender differentiation is a core attribute.

She concludes, saying that "a feminist historical materialism must explore the hypothesis that class domination arises from and/or is intimately tied to

patriarchal domination. We cannot simply assume that sex domination causes class society, as most radical feminists have done. But we must take seriously the question of whether there is a causal relation here, to what extent there is, and precisely how the causal relations operate if and when they exist.”

- **Post-structuralist Feminist Approaches**

Post- structuralist approach is dominated by the ideas of Michel Foucault on power. Foucault ‘s proposition that power is not simply concentrated in the hands of sovereign but flows through the capillaries of the social body became very popular by that time. For Foucault , although power sometimes functions as repressive, it is primarily productive; as he puts it, “power produces; it produces reality; it produces domains of objects and rituals of truth”.

Post- structuralist feminists criticise Foucault’s principle of power which analyses how the disciplinary practices in various institutions such as prisons, schools, and factories in the 18th century insisted on minute regulations of bodily movements, obsessively detailed time schedules, and surveillance techniques and how these practices shaped the bodies of prisoners, students and workers into docile bodies. Sandra Bartky criticises Foucault for not observing these practices as gendered discipline. Due to the gendered discipline, women’s bodies are more docile than that of man. According to Bartky disciplinary practices such as dieting practices, limitations on gestures and mobility and bodily ornamentation, keeping one’s body properly hairless, attired, ornamented and made up implies their obedience to patriarchy. In her own words “it is women themselves who practice this discipline on and against their own bodies....The woman who checks her make-up half a dozen times a day to see if her foundation has caked or her mascara run, who worries that the wind or rain may spoil her hairdo, who looks frequently to see if her stockings have bagged at the ankle, or who, feeling fat, monitors everything she eats, has become, just as surely as the inmate in the Panopticon, a self-policing subject, a self committed to relentless self-surveillance. This self-surveillance is a form of obedience to patriarchy”.

Check Your Progress:

1. How is the concept of power approached by the various feminists in their understanding of gender?
2. Highlight the fundamental differences in the idea of power as subordination and power as empowerment in context of gender.

1.5.3 Power as Empowerment

So far we have analysed the feminists who consider power as domination. There is yet another aspect of power as analysed by some feminists. This group of feminists stress on the reconceptualisation of power as a capacity or ability, specifically, the capacity to empower or transform oneself and others. In their understanding, power is conceived as power to and not as power over.

Jean Baker Miller one of the prominent feminists of this group opines that this “new concept of power can bring new understanding to the whole concept of power” She looks upon power not as domination; instead, the capacity to produce a change — that is, “to move anything from point A or state A to point B or state B”. According to her, power understood as domination is particularly masculine. From women’s perspective, power is understood differently: “there is enormous validity in women’s not wanting to use power as it is presently conceived and used. Rather, women may want to be powerful in ways that simultaneously enhance, rather than diminish, the power of others”.

Virginia Held adds to it in a slightly different aspect saying that women’s unique experience as mother and care givers operates as the basis for new insights into power. Mother’s power to give birth to a child and her role as caregiver, to nurture and empower could be the basis for new and more humanly promising conception of power than the existing ones. According to Held, “the power of a mothering person to empower others, to foster transformative growth, is a different sort of power from that of a stronger sword or a dominant will”. On Held’s view, a feminist analysis of society and politics leads to an understanding of power as the capacity to transform and empower one and others.

SAQ

Do you agree with the view that benefits and burdens of familial life is unevenly distributed between men and women? Give reasons. (30+30 words)

.....
.....
.....
.....
.....
.....

1.6 Feminism on Justice

Feminists’ concept of justice is a broad issue which covers both gender justice and distributive justice. Traditional theories of justice which mainly focus on the rights and obligations have been challenged by the feminists on the ground that these have not incorporated gender differences into their assumptions. They highlighted the necessity to recognize principles of responsibility and care in addition to rights and obligations. According to them, the separation of social life into public and private or domestic spheres is a construct that has enabled philosophers to limit their theories to the former and virtually to ignore the latter. Justice, rights, and the rule of law are meant to govern the public sphere, while love, altruism, and privacy are thought to govern the domestic sphere.

It is because of these reasons that the feminists have critiqued the separate spheres model. For them, the idea of a private domestic sphere allows injustice to flourish within the family in the form of family violence and the unequal and gendered distribution of power, labour, and income. Moreover, the gendered inequality of the domestic sphere necessarily spills over into the public sphere where women’s disproportionate domestic responsibilities prevent them from competing fairly and on equal terms with men for jobs, income, political power, and other forms of influence, and often relegates women to provide most of society’s low-*paid* care as well.

But the third reason is the crucial one which shows that women are primarily responsible for care work in the domestic sphere while the social institutions fail to recognize the enormous amount of work that goes on in the domestic sphere to make the public sphere possible, and ignores the constraints

confronted by those who are primarily responsible for unpaid care when they enter the public sphere and are unable to leave the domestic sphere fully behind. This enormous amount of unpaid work transforms dependent infants into “independent” adults. Furthermore, the “independence” of these now-adults is only maintained to the extent that chance—or more likely, gender—preserves them from being providers of unpaid care. In addition, some number of adults will never achieve independence or will lose it for a time because of handicap or age-related disability. In the light of these widespread and quite natural limitations on competence and independence, the presumption of a competent, independent adult subject strongly limits the legitimacy of traditional theories of justice.

The feminists need not have to necessarily reject the idea of two spheres but their rigid separation and the implicit or explicit relegation of men to one sphere and women to the other sphere. Gender equality depends on the recognition of their interdependence and the restructuring of social institutions to allow fluidity between both spheres for both men and women.

A Feminist Theory of Justice :

Almaz Zelleke in her essay “A Feminist Critique of Reciprocity and Conditionality” offered a proposal containing the principles of a feminist theory of justice. These principles are more like traditional theories of justice. They are: equality, autonomy, reciprocity, and pluralism. But when viewed through a feminist perspective and through the lens of the domestic sphere in particular, they take on different meanings than they do in traditional theories of justice

While considering the Equality aspect, Zelleke writes when the realities of interdependence and responsibility for caregiving are given priority over the ideal of independence, it is clear that women’s equality cannot mean only the absence of overt discrimination. Equality of respect means the exploitation of the unpaid and low-paid caregivers by those who are shielded from the responsibilities of care must end. This requires increasing the compensation of low-paid caregivers, and devising a way to compensate unpaid caregivers.

Equality and Autonomy:

Equality of respect as well as the principle of autonomy demands that the burdens and rewards of caregiving and the burdens and rewards of other occupations shall be proportionately distributed by genders. A just society ensures some opportunity to its people to step away from these responsibilities and choose their own end.

The society should make the caregiving responsibilities easier and more attractive for men and women.

SAQ

Do you think that the social justice system of India provides greater opportunities to the women? Elaborate in the context of recent constitutional provisions to safeguard the rights of women. (30+50 words)

.....
.....
.....
.....
.....

Reciprocity:

The care which the infants receive is out of love. It does not involve any distributional principle as it is a gift of life. Though it is not possible for anyone to reciprocate to this unconditional care directly, yet it can be reciprocated socially by giving love and care to our children as well as the others in need. This principle of reciprocity does not favour a selective duty to the poor to work for his survival. It stresses that we should reciprocate unconditionally for the care we receive. It will help in covering the basic needs like food and shelter as well as a minimum of health care and education.

Pluralism:

Again the feminist perspective makes sure that all individuals have a voice in the development of social norms. Also they have the ability to challenge those norms. Any norm that is considered to be normal shall not be a result

of domination of one group over another as is currently the case with our prevailing male-centric norm of what it means to be a contributing member of society. A just society guarantees an effective voice of its members in the allocation of social resources to different ends as well as in the valuation of different ways of life. For this purpose individuals should have the opportunity and means to make different choices in life.

Check Your Progress:

1. Discuss the four areas on which the feminists have based their arguments of gender justice.
2. Discuss the critiquing of the public-private sphere dichotomy in the analysis of gender justice.

1.7 Feminists Perspective on Gender Discrimination

Feminists distinguish between sex and gender. Sex which is natural and unalterable refers to biological difference between males and females. On the other hand, gender is a cultural term which refers to the different roles that society ascribes to men and women. Gender differences are imposed through contrasting stereotypes of ‘masculinity’ and ‘femininity’. Simone de Beauvoir summarised this with the line “women are made, not born”. This belief has had many implications for feminist theory. Prior to 1970s, the prevailing concept was that one’s biological sex determine ones gender.

Since 70s, an attempt is made to differentiate between sex and gender. The biological factors help in theorising this distinctions and sexuality as integrated with sex and gender.

Gayle Rubin published her landmark essay “The Traffic in Women” in the year 1975. In it, Rubin identifies a universal “sex/gender system” by first pointing out the shortcomings of using Marxist theory to explain women’s oppression. Rubin argues that in every society, a system is in place, a specific mechanism that converts sex in to gender. She does not intend for the sex/gender system to be understood as a synonym for patriarchy; rather, she argues that it is “a neutral term which refers to the domain and indicates that oppression is not inevitable in that domain, but is the product of the specific social relations which organize it”. Sexuality, in the sex/gender system, is a by-product of system-produced gender.

Rubin aptly points out that if heterosexuality was so “natural,” there would be no need for a cultural imperative to be heterosexual. She says that “gender is not only an identification with one sex; it also entails that sexual desire be directed toward the other sex” (p. 546). Rubin qualifies the statement by saying that the sex/gender system does not merely produce heterosexuality, but in many cases, specific forms of heterosexuality. Her theory provides a considerable windfall for feminist theory.

In her subsequent publication “Thinking Sex,” in which Rubin distances herself from her prior position in “The Traffic in Women.” In *this publication* Rubin argues for a separate theory of sexuality as a stand-alone system that cannot be reduced to biological sex and/or gender roles. She does this by using Foucault’s *History of Sexuality*, in which he claims that a sexual system has emerged out of kinship systems and that desires, and new forms of sexuality, “are constituted in the course of historically specific social practices”. According to her, Sexual oppression cuts across other kinds of oppression and privilege. In “Thinking Sex,” Rubin says that in “The Traffic in Women,” she assumed that “gender and desire [sexuality] were systematically intertwined” and did not take into consideration a distinction between “lust” and gender. She reviewed her earlier stand keeping intact the biological sex/gender distinction and declared that sexuality is not always a by-product of system-produced gender: “ although sexuality and gender are related, they are not the same thing, and they form two distinct areas of social practice”. Sexuality is not “derived from gender,” as many feminist theorists have thought, Rubin says.

Judith Butler another feminists in her essay “Against Proper Objects” points out that the problems associated with the sex/gender distinction are part of a larger problem in feminist theory. She cautioned that biological sex, or sexual difference, gender, and sexuality should not be distinguished too much from each other, especially not to the point that each is turned into a “proper object” of a particular discipline of study, e.g. biological sex and gender are the proper objects of feminist theory, and sexual practices and sexuality are the proper objects of lesbian and gay studies. They should be distinguishable, but studied in conjunction.

Check Your Progress:

1. What is dual system theory?
1. Define gender.
2. Discuss the differences between gender and sex.

1.8 Summing Up

After reading this unit, you are now able to understand feminism. Feminism is a movement which seeks to eliminate the discrimination between men and women. The feminists are of the view that women should be emancipated from the undue dominance of men. You are also in a position to analyse the feminist perspective on state, power, justice and gender discrimination. While the early feminists believe that state oppresses women, the modern feminists opine that both state and gender are interrelated issues and affected by each other. In this unit, you have also learnt various feminist perspectives on state like liberal feminists, equity feminist, classical liberal feminist, Marxist feminists etc.. After going through this unit you have come to know that the feminists view power from three different angles viz. power as a resource to be distributed, power as domination and power as empowerment. This unit has also helped you in understanding the feminist perspective on justice which includes principles like equality, autonomy, reciprocity and pluralism as well as distinction between sex and gender in feminism.

1.9 References and Suggested Readings

Rosemarie Tong (1990) *Feminist Thought: A Comprehensive Introduction*, Routledge, London

Margaret Walters (2005) *Feminism, Very Short Introduction*, Oxford University Press, India

V Geetha (2002) *Gender (Theorizing Feminism)*, 1st edition, Bhatkal & Sen, Kolkata

Amy Allen (2000) *The Power Of Feminist Theory: Domination, Resistance, Solidarity*, Westview Press, Colorado

Susan Miller Okin(1989) *Justice, Gender, and the Family*, Basic Books, New York

* * *

Unit II

Multiculturalism

Contents:

- 2.1 Introduction**
- 2.2 Objectives**
- 2.3 Meaning and Evolution of the Concept of Multiculturalism**
- 2.4 Understanding Multiculturalism**
 - 2.4.1 Views of Charles Taylor**
 - 2.4.2 Views of Bhikhu Parekh**
 - 2.4.3 Views of Will Kymlicka**
- 2.5 Multiculturalism and Nationalism**
- 2.6 Multiculturalism and Globalization**
- 2.7 Crisis of Multiculturalism**
- 2.8 Summing Up**
- 2.9 References and Suggested Readings**

2.1 Introduction

In its general sense, the term culture includes all the walks of one's life in terms of modes of behaviour, philosophies and ethics, morals and manners, customs and traditions, religious, political, economic and other types of activities. Culture is about shared beliefs, ways of life, ways of thinking and understanding the world around us in which we situate others and ourselves on different grounds. Culture is one of the unique characters of human society. Only man is born and brought up in a cultural environment. Every man can be regarded as a representative of his culture. Culture develops through social interaction. It is a product of the society and every society has a culture of its own. The culture of every society is unique to itself. Sometimes a society consists of people belonging to different cultures. The existence of different cultures in a society has led to the rise of the concept of multiculturalism. Multiculturalism in the most literal sense means "a multiplicity of cultures". On a basic level, multiculturalism is a recognition and affirmation of the diversity of our society. Multiculturalism denotes that several different cultures can coexist peacefully and equitably in a single country. In simple

terms multiculturalism is a system which rests on respect for and promotion of ethnic diversity in a society. Hence, it can be said that multiculturalism is not about endorsing cultural differences per se but about giving equal respects and worth to diverse values and beliefs that give meaning to life. The term ‘multiculturalism’ is basically used to describe the demographic make-up of a country’s population, as well as the expressions of an ideal of cross-cultural inter- ethnic and inter- community harmony. Moreover, it also describes the public policy initiatives to promote such an ideals.

In this unit an attempt has been made to deal with the concept of multiculturalism as well as its growth. Multiculturalism is about giving equal value and worth to all cultures that shape human lives. As a concept, multiculturalism first emerged in the late 1960s and 1970s during the Civil Rights Movements in the multi- ethnic societies such as the US, Canada and Sweden. This unit also provides an operational definition of multiculturalism with emphasis on the ways theorists have dealt with the understanding of the concept. In this context, the views of Charles Taylor, Bhikhu Parekh and Will Kymlicka have also been discussed. The unit also explores the ways of moving through the debate on globalisation and multiculturalism debate.

2.2 Objectives

Multiculturalism aims at recognising, celebrating and maintaining different cultures or cultural identities within the society to promote social solidarity. A multicultural society grants equitable status to distinct cultural and religious groups. After going through this unit, you will be able to

- *understand* the meaning of multiculturalism
- *trace* the growth of the concept of multiculturalism
- *analyse* multiculturalism from different perspectives given by different scholars
- *discuss* the relationship between multiculturalism and globalisation

2.3 Meaning and Evolution of the Concept of Multiculturalism

The term multiculturalism is used to denote different things in different countries. For eg. In Canada and Australia, multiculturalism is used in the context the

immigrant groups and not the indigenous groups while in Latin America, it has been used to refer almost exclusively to the indigeonous groups and not to the immigrant groups. Again, in some other countries, multiculturalism is used as an umbrella term to cover all forms of ethno- cultural diversity.

In general, multiculturalism can be defined as a system of beliefs and behaviours that recognizes and respects the presence of all diverse groups in an organization or society, acknowledges and values their socio-cultural differences, and encourages and enables their continued contribution within an inclusive cultural context which empowers all within the organization or society.

The term multiculturalism has been first used by the Swiss in 1957. They have introduced the term to identify their country with four spoken languages and different religions. The idea of multiculturalism was further developed during 1960s in New York when it was observed that many immigrant ethnic and racial groups have not really ‘melted’ in the American ‘pot.’ Diverse ethnic and racial groups of white European stock had maintained their distinctive ethnic characteristics. Moreover, as the number of non-white immigrant groups from Asia and Latin America had begun to increase, they found ‘assimilation’ difficult. It is worth mentioning here that assimilation in general sense denotes a process where the members of the ethno- cultural groups are absorbed into a larger established community. In this process of absorption the absorbed group losses many of its characteristics. Assimilation is visible where everyone joins the same culture. In short, there were several limitations to the policies of ‘assimilation’ as well as resistance on the part of many groups to assimilate fully in the host society.

<p>SAQ</p> <p>Is multiculturalism instrumental in securing the rights of the minority community only? (40 words)</p> <p>.....</p> <p>.....</p> <p>.....</p> <p>.....</p> <p>.....</p> <p>.....</p>

In this context, the ideas and policies of multiculturalism emerged. Unlike assimilation, multiculturalism refers to the situation where people keep their own cultures but a diversity of cultures is respected. In the 1970s, Canada and Australia officially declared themselves as multicultural nations whose diverse ethnic groups were encouraged to maintain their heritage. By the end of the 1980s, multiculturalism had reached Western Europe where societies were undergoing cultural and demographic changes on account of immigration, mainly from Africa and Asia. Multicultural policies were pioneered in Canada at both provincial and national level in the early 1970s. The concept of multiculturalism got its first legal implementation through the 1988 Multiculturalism Act in Canada.

STOP TO CONSIDER

THE CANADIAN MULTICULTURALISM ACT OF 1988

During the 1970s, the immigrants from Eastern Europe, Africa, Central and South America, and Asia have changed the demographic profile of Canada. In order to accommodate the cultural diversity, the concept of multiculturalism has been introduced in Canada. The Canadian Multiculturalism Act of 1988 firmly guarantees the cultural diversity in Canada. The Act recognizes the rights of the ethnic groups in Canada. Moreover, this Act also emphasises preserving and sharing the unique cultural heritage of the ethnic groups as well as guarantees equal opportunity to the Canadians irrespective of their origin. The chief objectives of this act are-

- To make people understand that multiculturalism reflects the cultural and social diversity of Canadian society as well as acknowledge the freedom of Canadian society to preserve, enhance and share their cultural heritage
- To recognize the existence of communities whose members share a common origin and their historic contribution to Canadian society, and enhance their development
- To ensure that all individuals receive equal treatment and equal protection under the law, while respecting and valuing their diversity;
- To encourage and assist the social, cultural, economic and political institutions of Canada to be respectful and inclusive of Canada's multicultural character
- To promote the understanding and creativity that arise from the interaction between individuals and communities of different origins
- To foster the recognition and appreciation of the diverse cultures of Canadian society and promote the reflection and the evolving expressions of those cultures

- To preserve and enhance the use of languages other than English and French, while strengthening the status and use of the official languages of Canada

To advance multiculturalism throughout Canada in harmony with the national commitment to the official languages of Canada.

You should remember here that factors like colonisation, migration and globalisation have helped in the rise of the concept of multiculturalism. The Western countries specially Portugal and France have established its colonies in Africa and Latin America. Through the establishment of the colonies, people became aware of the existence of different cultures in the world. Again migration also causes multiculturalism as through migration people of different cultures move and live together. Migration gives birth to new ethnic groups in the country and it leads to the problem of accommodating these new cultural differences in the local structure. Also, the process of globalisation has introduced mainly the western cultures in the society. As a result, the ethnic groups have tried to preserve their separate identity leading to multiculturalism.

SAQ

Do you think multiculturalism is a better social model than assimilation?
Explain. (50 words)

.....
.....
.....
.....
.....

2.4 Understanding Multiculturalism

You have already learnt that in recent years ‘multiculturalism’ has emerged as a distinct and yet varied political theory. It is often confused with the term cosmopolitanism. But there are some differences between these two terms. Multiculturalism intends to preserve the culture of the community. On the other hand, cosmopolitanism believes that everyone is free to choose his/

her own culture. Multiculturalism tries to preserve the inherent differences in the society and cosmopolitanism believes in bridging these differences. Cosmopolitanism is characterised by tolerance while multiculturalism allows division and distinction. Many modern democratic societies are multicultural and they can also be termed as multinational or polytechnic. Multinational societies are states that have incorporated previously self-governing cultures such as aboriginal peoples whilst polyethnic societies are states where cultural diversity arises from immigration. Let us now try to understand the concept from the analysis of Taylor, Parekh and Kymlicka.

2.4.1 Views of Charles Taylor

While dealing with the concept of multiculturalism, Taylor put forward two concepts- politics of equal dignity and politics of difference. Politics of equal dignity implies that all human beings are equally deserving of respect and equal rights. The politics of difference refers to the need for recognition of unique identity of individuals and groups. Politics of equal dignity requires treating people in an equal manner while the politics of difference demands differential treatment. Taylor is of the view that both are built on the notion of equal respect. Human identity is partly shaped by recognition. Therefore, the withholding of recognition or misrecognition can be damaging to a person's dignity. According to Taylor, the cultural communities in which we are nurtured provide us identity and therefore it should be protected. Hence, Taylor argues for political recognition of all communities.

So, it can be said that Taylor considers multiculturalism as an instrument of preserving one's unique identity. He also mentions that in the process of recognition, power plays an important role. However, it will be wrong to merge multiculturalism with that of power politics because it basically deals with one's attitudes, beliefs which consist the culture of a nation.

STOP TO CONSIDER

ETHNICITY, RACE AND MULTICULTURALISM

Racial or ethnic group refers to the human divisions made on the basis of the physical characteristics or cultural traits. While race refers to those people who share similar physical characteristics, ethnic groups are those who share similar

cultural traits. The term ethnic group or ethnicity signifies cultural features which may include language, religion, national origin, dietary practices, a sense of common historical heritage or other distinctive cultural traits. Ethnic groups maintain their own communities and subcultures even while some of their members are assimilated into the larger society and it gave support to the concept of multiculturalism. A multicultural society is one in which different ethnic and racial groups are able to maintain their own cultures and life styles even as they gain equality in the institution of the larger society. Hence, it may encourage cultural variation within the broader confines of national unity. Eg. Switzerland is the most outstanding example of multiculturalism. In Switzerland four ethnic groups speaking German, French Italian and Romanche retain a sense of group identity while living together amicably in the society as a whole. In Tanzania also Africans, Europeans and Middle Eastern people participate with relative equality in the public life of their society while retaining distinctive languages and customs. No group dominates the others.

2.4.2 Views of Bhikhu Parekh

The concept of Taylor has been criticised by Parekh on the ground that multiculturalism does not necessarily imply the recognising process of one's unique identity. He argues that multiculturalism is one kind of motivating factor which brings an attitude of collective living.

According to Parekh, there are three central insights of the concept of multiculturalism. Firstly, human beings are culturally rooted as they grow up in a culturally structured world. They even organize their lives and social relations in terms of a culturally derived system of meaning and significance. Human beings are shaped by the culture and they can hardly overcome all of its influences. They view the world from the perspective of being within a culture be it the one they have inherited and uncritically accepted or accepted with some modifications and revisions.

Secondly, different cultures represent different systems of meaning and vision of good life. One culture cannot cover the whole range of human capacities. Therefore, for the fullest development of the human capacities access to different cultures is needed. Though one can live a good life within one's culture, one's way of life is likely to be richer if he/she has access to other cultures. Moreover, a culturally self-contained life is almost impossible in the modern, mobile and interdependent world. Although all the cultures are equally rich, yet no culture is wholly worthless.

Thirdly, every culture is internally plural and reflects a continuing conversation between its different traditions and strands of thought. Until and unless one culture cannot respect the differences within itself, it cannot respect the differences outside. Multiculturalism, according to Parekh is nothing but a creative interplay of these three insights namely, the cultural embeddedness of human beings, the inescapability and desirability of cultural plurality, and the plural and multicultural constitution of each culture.

The members of a multicultural society should develop a feeling of belongingness and commonness towards a common political community. Consequently, though they may be different in some respects, for example, lifestyles, views and values, yet their mutual commitment and concern as members of a shared community remain unaffected. The commitment to the political community involves commitment to its continuing existence and well-being, and implies that one cares enough for it not to harm its interests and undermine its integrity. A citizen cannot be committed to the political community unless it is also committed to his/her, and he/she cannot belong to it unless it accepts him/her as one of it.

Again, it needs mention here that, in a multicultural society, different communities have different needs, and some might be structurally disadvantaged or lack the skill and the confidence to participate in the mainstream society and avail of its opportunities. Consequently, both justice and the need to foster a common sense of belonging require such measures as group-differentiated rights, culturally differentiated applications of laws and policies, state support for minority institutions, and a judicious programme of affirmative action.

Parekh argues that recognition of cultural differences requires that society sometimes permit members of certain groups to do things that others are prohibited from doing. For example, we can cite the case of granting turban-wearing Sikhs exemptions from the legal requirement that drivers and passengers on motorcycles should wear a helmet. These exemptions do not mean that people have unequal rights; rather, such measures show respect for the importance religious practices have for the cultural groups involved.

Parekh's main interest is in rethinking the theory of the state so that it makes space for multiculturalism. The author does not address the question how

the state can accommodate diversity. Rather, he emphasises the philosophical, and thus cultural, context of the contemporary state. Parekh concludes with a statement that no cultural recognition will be successful without a 'just share of economic and political power'.

In conclusion, we can say that Parekh claims that an individual has the right to criticize its culture in order to remove its blemishes; that different cultures correct and complement each other so cultural diversity can be seen as a way to recognize the variety of possibilities to lead a good life; and, finally, that the mechanisms used for evaluating and respecting a culture are enhanced by the confrontation with another culture.

STOP TO CONSIDER

MULTICULTURAL DEMOCRACY

The concept of multicultural democracy has emerged in North America and Europe. This concept has mainly been introduced to understand as well as explain the inferior status of certain ethnic groups and their demand for cultural retention, representation and autonomy. Multicultural democracy incorporates socio-economic, cultural and political diversity. The membership of state in a multicultural democracy is based on legal citizenship and not on any ethnic descent. New Zealand can be cited as an example of multicultural democracy. It has recognised the indigenous Maori as a national minority to grant them a full statutory, non-territorial autonomy.

Multicultural democracy holds the idea that democracy is a path, rather than a destination. Multicultural democracy also recognises the importance of large and small publics. Large public refers to the state while the small public refers to the voluntary and involuntary associations based on religion, sexual orientation, language, ethnicity, race etc. It considers diversity as essential due to two main reasons-

- Diversity protects and enables liberty by preventing the tyranny of the majority.
- Diversity challenges the status quo.

Factors like globalisation, expanding unification of Europe, legacy of decolonisation and galloping international tourism etc. are turning the western democracies into multicultural democracy.

2.4.3 Views of Will Kymlicka

After discussing multiculturalism from two different perspectives now we are going to analyse the term on the basis of Will Kymlicka's opinion. You have already learnt that multiculturalism as a concept denotes various meanings. Where Taylor considers it as the power mechanism to preserve one's unique identity, Parekh believes it as a motivating factor to bring a common consciousness among the people. It is worth mentioning here that Will Kymlicka combines both the views and favours a new one.

In his theory of multiculturalism, Will Kymlicka focuses on defending self-government rights of indigenous groups and minority nations, such as Quebec. He also defends special accommodations for immigrants, i.e. "polyethnic rights." Kymlicka, in his interesting and tightly argued book *Liberalism, Community and Culture*, tries to argue for a kind of politics of difference, notably in relation to aboriginal rights in Canada. He wants to argue on the basis of certain cultural needs—minimally, the need for an integral and undamaged cultural language with which one can define and pursue his or her own conception of good life. He argues that multiculturalism theory holds the view that cultural identity or membership in a particular community does not signify that individuals are freedom bound with the group. Minority groups often face cultural discrimination from the majority group.

Hence it is clear to you that the concept of Will Kymlicka is the combination of both Taylor and Parekh's views. In other words, we can say that he relates power and common consciousness to bring unity in the society. Specially, he mentions preserving the right of minority groups and their natural rights which according to him is a sign of multiculturalism.

The most distinctive feature of contemporary multiculturalism as it has been theorized in the West is that it locates the issue of cultural discrimination in the context of the nation-state. More recent contributions to the multiculturalism debate also draw on cases involving religion, language, ethnicity, nationality, and race – including female circumcision, polygamy, cultural defences in criminal law, public funding for religious schools, religion-based family law, aboriginal membership rules, and affirmative action programs – without much explicit attention to the relationship between culture and these other categories of difference.

2.5 Multiculturalism and Nationalism

You have already learnt that multiculturalism refers to the existence of people belonging to different groups in a society. In this context, we can cite the example of Netherlands where multiculturalism is generally used in opposition to equality. The multicultural society of Netherlands maintains a distinction between the African immigrants and the Dutch people. The African immigrants in Netherlands clean toilets whereas the upper-middle-class ethnic Dutch are engaged in other professions as lawyers, pilots, surgeons, bankers etc.

Nationalism is an ideology based on the sense of belonging to a national community. Both the ideologies of nationalism and multiculturalism refer to a strong sense of cultural belonging. Both emphasise the preservation of different cultures in the society and the multiculturalists and nationalists campaign for special rights for national minorities. However, both the terms differ in some respects. Whereas nationalism encourages people to stick to the national identity, multiculturalism promotes the rights of the minorities which sometimes can be dangerous to the national unity.

You should remember here that multiculturalism recognizes the cultural diversity of a society. At the extreme level, it can take the form of differentiated rights like linguistic, special representation or self-government. On the other hand, nationalism believes in the sharing of common culture i.e. the national culture. In other words, whereas, multiculturalism stands for segregation, nationalism stands for unity. The practice of multiculturalism in its extreme form may lead to the disintegration of the feeling of nationalism.

Belgium can be cited as an example in this context. In Belgium there are two main districts: 'Wallonië' and 'Vlaanderen'. These two districts have different languages- French and Dutch. The politics is also different in the two districts, especially in the context of economic policy. The people who live in Belgium have a regional consciousness. When one asks them where they live, they do not answer with the name of their country, but with that of their district. Thus, multiculturalism within a nation/ country may create divisions among groups leading to narrow nationalism.

SAQ:

Do you think multiculturalism is a threat to national unity? Give reasons in favour of your answer. (20+30 words)

.....
.....
.....
.....
.....

2.6 Multiculturalism and Globalization

You have already learnt that multiculturalism has a close relation with globalisation. In recent years, the words “multiculturalism” and “globalization” have captured the imagination of scholars and the public alike. The last few decades have been a time of rapid social and cultural changes for the Western world in general and Europe in particular. Diversity has become a dominating feature of modern life. Many people are suspicious of this new world order, fearing that it is being built on the triumphs of one or another people or culture or class. Certainly the process of globalization disrupts the fragile societies and traditional identities. On the other hand, globalization does not necessarily mean homogeneity. Indeed, in some respects globalization fosters and allows for differences. Spurred by modernization, global politics is being reconfigured along cultural lines.

At the most generic level, globalization is simply defined by the shrinking of geographic space and the porousness of politically defined borders that accelerates flows of money, goods, people and culture around the world. Contemporary literatures describe globalization as sets of interweaving and interchanges, which change ever faster as people come to live in worlds where taken for granted assumptions about locality, nationality, ways of thinking and doing, are up for grabs and need to be re-imagined. As goods, people, knowledge and images flow across territorial boundaries in complex connectivities, the nexus between imagination and geographic space becomes increasingly stretched; deterritoralised. Multicultural policies are set out to deal with diversity. In the context of globalization, times the concept of multiculturalism becomes more complex. The nexus between geographic space and representations of the identities within it become deterritoralised

as it becomes increasingly clear that cultures are neither coherent, bounded, contagious nor naturally localised and locality bound.

From the above discussion we can say that globalization is the togetherness of international cultures, societies and economies. In this new world of globalization, however, cultural identity is the central factor shaping a country's association and antagonism. In a very fluid world, people are seeking identity security and are looking for roots and connections to defend themselves against the unknown. During this era, countries throughout the world began developing new affiliations. They have been looking for groupings with countries with similar culture and the same civilization. Culture as the whole way of life of people - from birth to the grave, from morning to night, and even during sleep, - has today become inevitable. Judging from the way the texture of cultural diversity is recognized and especially the way globalization influences culture, we can say without doubt that culture is and will always be different but equal. Every culture is valuable and worthy of non-interference.

In today's world, improvements in transportation and communication have produced more frequent, more intense, more symmetrical, and more inclusive interaction among people of different civilizations. As a result, their civilizational identity has become increasingly salient. All things considered, globalization has not ended conflicts but has rather given rise to new identities rooted in culture. From this perspective, it can be said that globalisation has contributed towards the growth of multiculturalism.

STOP TO CONSIDER:

MULTICULTURALISM IN INDIA

Cultural diversity is a distinctive feature of India both socially and economically. Indian culture is the conglomeration of diverse sub- cultures. Multiculturalism in India persuades the Indian citizens to take active part in the affairs of the country. The Constitution of India is a multicultural document. It is the basis of various state policies aiming at the recognition and accommodation of the diversity of the country. The development of a common sense of belonging is a pre requisite for the stability of a multicultural society. The practice of multiculturalism in India allows the citizens to keep their own identity and this gives them a sense of belonging. This acceptance also makes the Indian citizens feel secured and self confident. Consequently, they become more open to the

diverse cultures. The presence of Italian cuisine or Chinese dishes in the menu of an Indian restaurant can be cited as an example of multiculturalism. Again, we can cite the example of hockey from Canada, soccer from Europe, and golf from Scotland to highlight the multicultural bent in Indian culture.

Multiculturalism believes in the equality of citizens. The Indian citizens take active part in the affairs of the state on equal basis. None can be discriminated on the basis of language, colour, education, culture etc.

The concept of multiculturalism can best be understood as a way of viewing human life. In India there are three aspects related to it.

Firstly, human beings are culturally embedded in the sense that they grow up and live within a culturally structured world and organize their lives and social relations.

Secondly, different cultures represent different systems of meaning and visions of the good life. Since each realises a limited range of human capacities and emotions and grasps only a part of the totality of human existence, it needs other cultures to help it understand itself better, expand its intellectual and moral horizon, stretch its imagination, and so on.

Thirdly, every culture is internally plural and reflects a continuing conversation between its different traditions and strands of thought. This does not mean that it is devoid of coherence and identity, but that its identity is plural, fluid and open.

In recent times the advanced industrial liberal democratic nations of the world have become increasingly enmeshed in the information age that is helping to reconfigure an increasingly global network society. The economies of these nations have been transformed by expansion of transnational capitalism and the emergence and increasing significance of regional and international economic entities designed to regulate capitalist development. The political systems, too, have been transformed by globalization, in part calling into question the future functions of the nation-state vis-a-vis transnational political organizations. Within this framework, it is clear that the ethnic factor will play a crucially important role in shaping the social life of these nation-states in future.

Contemporary social relations are no longer necessarily linked to particular places in the globalised era. Instead, we have entered a world in which social relations are less tied to “local contexts of interaction”, and we are witnessing their “restructuring across infinite spans of time-space.” The salience of ethnicity as a result of globalization in recent decades has

manifested itself in two main ways: by the migration of newcomers into various nations throughout the world, and as a result of the resurgence of nationalism among long-established minority groups within existing states which has given birth to politics over the issue of migration. South Asia bears a testimony to this. There has been a resurgence of new politics over the issue of migration.

Check Your Progress:

1. Define multiculturalism.
2. What do you understand by globalisation?
3. Mention the ways globalization and multiculturalism transformed meanings and human interactions.
4. Explain in your own words the impact of globalisation on your society.

2.7 Crisis of Multiculturalism

In the previous sections of the unit you have learnt that the extreme form of multiculturalism threatens the unity of the nation. Again you have also learnt that globalisation is helping in exporting the western way of life to the rest of the world. It is considered something opposed to multiculturalism. With the beginning of the first decade of the twenty-first century, the very idea and the policies of multiculturalism are under attack. It is being said that multiculturalism was a 'fad' of the 1980s and 1990s; and that it has no place in the world of the twenty-first century. The concept of multiculturalism is facing a set back in the post- 9/11 era. It has further been stimulated by the Madrid bombings in 2004, the London bombings in the summer of 2005, and in Canada by the alleged terrorist plot in 2006. hence it can be said that over- emphasis on one's own identity leads to extremists activities.

One could cite several reasons for the crisis of multiculturalism. The following four are the often mentioned:

- (i) It is argued that the process of cultural globalisation, aided by technological revolution, is making the dominant majorities in Western societies look at multiculturalism negatively. They look at immigrants, who are now mostly from the developing world as threatening the Western culture of their societies.

- (ii) Popular reaction against ethnic, especially religious minorities importantly Muslims, has become very negative following the terrorist attack on World Trade Centre on 9 September 2001. Governments are 'securitising' immigration and looking at ethnic minorities with suspicion as if they are the potential security threat. In the many ethnic wars since the 1990s diasporas have become a source of funding and political support for separatists and militant movements.
- (iii) No less a factor in arousing suspicion in the Western societies about the politics of recognising diversity is the work of Samuel Huntington who has analysed the world as comprising of cultural blocks and predicted clash of cultures.
- (iv) Scholars have also associated the growing criticism against multiculturalism to the long-term trends of rising poverty and unemployment in Western societies. Those who have been adversely affected by economic restructuring blame the immigrants for poverty, income inequalities and rising urban crimes and violence.

But it is pertinent to mention here that none of the reasons cited above stand academic and scientific scrutiny. It is disingenuous on the part of some religious fanatics to blame multiculturalism for causing terrorist acts. Historically speaking, no civilisation has lived and can be understood as living in water-tight compartments. Similarly, immigrants were until recently believed to bring in new skills, generate wealth and were considered as indispensable for economic expansion in 'ageing' societies. Hence, they could not, overnight, be considered as economic burden. Hence the criticism labelled against multiculturalism needs to be rethought. The discourses on anti- multiculturalism led to the emergence of the concept 'post-multiculturalism'. The term 'post- multiculturalism has been popularised by Vertovec in Europe. This term mainly insists on finding an alternative to multiculturalism. It also emphasises the search for a new model fostering on social unity and promoting assimilation and a common identity. The post-multiculturalism believes that multiculturalism is not working and it segregates the ethnic and religious groups which lead to the fragmentation of the society.

STOP TO CONSIDER:**ADVANTAGES AND DISADVANTAGES OF MULTICULTURALISM**

Multiculturalism in its varied and wide form has been discussed and introduced in the West. There are both advantages as well as disadvantages of this concept.

ADVANTAGES

Advantages of multiculturalism are that it enriches one's culture by bringing new traditions and ideas. It helps people to acquire a sense of tolerance and peace towards other cultures. We become worldly, and learn about other places and people. It also helps us to connect with other people and learn how to cooperate. Multiculturalism teaches the citizens to value diversity and differences and bridges the chasm of ignorance and arrogance.

DISADVANTAGES

Multiculturalism diminishes the position of country as its culture is diluted. Believing in certain values and traditions when you are in a country which practices the opposite ideals, can sometimes cause conflict. To elaborate, we can cite the example of the case when a group of people immigrated to a country and decided that the elders of the group should decide punishments for crimes done by people in the group and did not allow the police to get involved.

You have already learnt that multiculturalism puts a premium on recognition of differences; therefore, it may, and sometimes does, clash with the basic organising values of society. Different groups may believe and practise values that contradict these basic values. Thus, in certain situations, upholding the diversity may mean undermining the common values of equality, rights and democracy. Scholars find merit in the above argument. They therefore argue that multicultural policies and programmes need to be tampered with values of individual equality and freedom, and liberal democratic processes.

The criticism that multicultural policies and programmes have produced divided societies, caused urban tensions and violence, and encouraged anti-freedom and anti-democracy practices among ethnic groups lead scholars like Bhiku Parekh opines that truth of the matter is that Western liberal democracies have not embraced multiculturalism seriously enough. Merely celebrating different cultures and tolerating differences at a symbolic level is just not enough. Different cultures should be accommodated equally.

The manner in which Western democracies have practised multiculturalism in the past three decades has created a social hierarchy based on the primary or core values of the majority. As a result, the ethnic and cultural minorities find themselves as less than equal members of the society.

SAQ:

Do you think multiculturalism is contributing towards the development of a nation? Give arguments in support of your answer. (20+30words)

.....
.....
.....
.....
.....

What is required is that multicultural policies and programmes need to actually accommodate diversities so that different cultural groups are able to socially integrate through participation and partnership with the institutions of their new society. Multiculturalism should go beyond symbolic recognition of diversities. In short, what is required is not abandonment or dilution of multiculturalism but, what Will Kymlicka has called, 'liberal multiculturalism'. Multiculturalism needs to be combined with the broader policies for promoting citizenship and a multicultural national identity. What is needed for the state is to convince its citizens of the benefits of multiculturalism; and, at the same time, demonstrate its capacity to manage in a constitutional democratic manner the tensions that are generated by multiculturalism. The politics of recognition needs to be counter-balanced by fostering a shared public culture and civic identities that fully embrace cultural differences.

While looking into the crisis on multiculturalism, we see that there is no escape from the conclusion that the problems multiculturalism responds to are real; and that there are no satisfactory alternatives to multiculturalism.

Check Your Progress:

1. How can a liberal society develop according to Charles Taylor?
2. Why is multiculturalism criticised in the twenty first century?
3. Fill in the blanks (Read each sub section carefully and try to answer
 - a. The most important attribute of our country is _____.
 - b. In the West multiculturalism locates the issue of cultural discrimination in the _____

2.8 Summing Up

After going through the unit, now you are in a position to understand the concept and growth of multiculturalism. Multiculturalism is a process of change by which we learn to recognize, understand and appreciate our own cultural identities as well as the similarities and differences of people from other cultural groups. The idea of multiculturalism was born in 1960s in New York. You are also in a position to analyse the concept of multiculturalism from the viewpoint of different scholars specially Charles Taylor, Bhikhu Parekh and Will Kymlicka. Taylor believes that everybody should be recognised for his or her unique identity. Bhikhu Parekh is of the view that multiculturalism is about cultural diversity. Will Kymlicka opines that multiculturalism tries to preserve the self- government rights of the indigenous people. You have also gained insight into the cultural aspect of globalisation. Globalisation processes such as immigration and internationalisation lead to contact situations in which different people with their distinct languages and cultures meet.

2.9 References and Suggested Readings

Gallanter, Marc (1989): *Law and Society in India*, Oxford University Press, New Delhi.

Kymlicka, Will. (1995). *Multicultural citizenship: A liberal theory of minority rights*. Clarendon Press, Oxford, NY.

and Citizenship, Oxford University Press, New York.

Modood, Tariq, (2007). *Multicultural Citizenship*. Polity Press, Cambridge.

Parekh, Bhikhu (2002) *Rethinking Multiculturalism: Cultural Diversity and Political Theory*, Harvard University Press, Harvard.

Phillips, A. (2007) *Multiculturalism without Culture*. Princeton University Press, Princeton.

Willet, C. (1998). *Theorizing Multiculturalism, A Guide to the Current Debate*, Blackwell Publishers, Oxford.

Finlayson, A, (ed. 1989), *Contemporary Political Thought: A Reader and Guide*; Edinburgh university press, Edinburgh, 2003

* * *