PREFACE

With its grounding in the "guiding pillars of Access, Equity, Equality, Affordability and Accountability," the New Education Policy (NEP 2020) envisions flexible curricular structures and creative combinations for studies across disciplines. Accordingly, the UGC has revised the CBCS with a new Curriculum and Credit Framework for Undergraduate Programmes (CCFUP) to further empower the flexible choice based credit system with a multidisciplinary approach and multiple/ lateral entry-exit options. It is held that this entire exercise shall leverage the potential of higher education in three-fold ways – learner's personal enlightenment; her/his constructive public engagement; productive social contribution. Cumulatively therefore, all academic endeavours taken up under the NEP 2020 framework are aimed at synergising individual attainments towards the enhancement of our national goals.

In this epochal moment of a paradigmatic transformation in the higher education scenario, the role of an Open University is crucial, not just in terms of improving the Gross Enrolment Ratio (GER) but also in upholding the qualitative parameters. It is time to acknowledge that the implementation of the National Higher Education Qualifications Framework (NHEQF) and its syncing with the National Skills Qualification Framework (NSQF) are best optimised in the arena of Open and Distance Learning that is truly seamless in its horizons. As one of the largest Open Universities in Eastern India that has been accredited with 'A' grade by NAAC in 2021, has ranked second among Open Universities in the NIRF in 2024, and attained the much required UGC 12B status, Netaji Subhas Open University is committed to both quantity and quality in its mission to spread higher education. It was therefore imperative upon us to embrace NEP 2020, bring in dynamic revisions to our Undergraduate syllabi, and formulate these Self Learning Materials anew. Our new offering is synchronised with the CCFUP in integrating domain specific knowledge with multidisciplinary fields, honing of skills that are relevant to each domain, enhancement of abilities, and of course deep-diving into Indian Knowledge Systems.

Self Learning Materials (SLM's) are the mainstay of Student Support Services (SSS) of an Open University. It is with a futuristic thought that we now offer our learners the choice of print or e-slm's. From our mandate of offering quality higher education in the mother tongue, and from the logistic viewpoint of balancing scholastic needs, we strive to bring out learning materials in Bengali and English. All our faculty members are constantly engaged in this academic exercise that combines subject specific academic research with educational pedagogy.We are privileged in that the expertise of academics across institutions on a national level also comes together to augment our own faculty strength in developing these learning materials. We look forward to proactive feedback from all stakeholders whose participatory zeal in the teaching-learning process based on these study materials will enable us to only get better. On the whole it has been a very challenging task, and I congratulate everyone in the preparation of these SLM's.

I wish the venture all success.

Professor Indrajit Lahiri
Vice Chancellor

NETAJI SUBHAS OPEN UNIVERSITY

Four Year Undergraduate Degree Programme
Under National Higher Education Qualifications Framework (NHEQF) &
Curriculum and Credit Framework for Undergraduate Programmes
Bachelor of Arts (Honours) in Political Science

Programme Code : NPS

Course Type: Discipline Specific Core (DSC)

Course Title: Introducing Political Theory

Course Code: **5CC-PS-01**

NETAJI SUBHAS OPEN UNIVERSITY
Four Year Undergraduate Degree Programme
Under National Higher Education Qualifications Framework (NHEQF) &
Curriculum and Credit Framework for Undergraduate Programmes
Bachelor of Arts (Honours) in Political Science
Programme Code : NPS
Course Type: Discipline Specific Core (DSC)
Course Title: Introducing Political Theory
Course Code: **5CC-PS-01**

: Board of Studies:
Members

Course Writer :

Module-1
Prof. Sital Prasad Nag
Associate Professor
School of Social Sciences,
Netaji Subhas Open University

Module-2
Prof. Alok Kumar Das
Associate Professor (WBSE)
Department of Political Science
Moulana Azad College

Course Writer :

Module-3
Prof. Prolaydeb Mukhopadhyay
Retd. Associate Professor
Department of Political Science
Narasimha Dutta College

: Course Editor:
Professor Sobhanlal Dattagupta
Retd. S. N. Banerjee Chair Professor
University of Calcutta

: Editorial Assistance, Formatting, Language Editing & Coordination:
Dr. Manoj Kumar Haldar
Associate Professor
Department of Political Science
Netaji Subhas Open University

Notification

Netaji Subhas Open University

UG : Political Science
(HPS)

Course Title: Introducing Political Theory
Course Code: 5CC-PS-01

Module-1

Module-2

Module-3

MODULE-1

Unit-1 □ What is Politics: Theorising the Political

1.0 Objective

The main objectives of this unit are to understand the meaning of politics andpolitical theory. After studying this unit learners will be familiar with

- Defining features of politics as an activity.
- How politics has been understood by different thinkers and traditions.
- Meaning and feaures of political theory
- Importance and functions of Political theory.

1.1 Introduction

The concept of politics originates with the classical Greek Philosophers such as Plato and Aristotle for whom politics is concerned with the general issues affecting the whole community.

Politics in the Greek world enveloped the whole life of the individual. Politics is a social activity through which human beings attempt to create a well organised and peaceful society. It exists due to the broad spectrum of ideas. and opinions

within any society. It is always a dialogue. Theory is a tool for analysing politics. It is ananalytical device that helps to advance our understanding of the political world. It simultaneously performs both explanatory and normative functions.

1.2 Nature and definition of politics

In everyday language politics is a loaded concept. Negative images have always been associated with it. In popular parlance politics is closely associated with the behaviour and activities of the politicians who are generally considered as selfish power seekers who hide their narrow self interests behind the veil of public interests and ideological convictions. Media exposure of the corrupt activities and practices of the politicians gives credence to the public perception. This has resulted in growing disillusionment with formal and established political processes. This phenomenon is known us anti-politics, which is rooted in a view of politics as a self-serving unprincipled activity. In this view politics is a dirty word, associated with trouble, disruption, violence, deceit, manipulation and lies. Such negative images need to be dispelled to establish that politics is a valuable activity.

Another major difficulty in arriving at a definition of politics is that in the academic study of the subject political scientists have defined the concept in different ways. The concept has been defined as the exercise of power, the excercise of authority, making of collective decisions, authoritative allocation of values, as the art of government, the practice of deception and manipulation and so on. Thus, in the academic world it is an essentially a contested concept. There exists deep intellectual and ideological disagreements among political scientists. Andrew Heywood has identified four different views of politics in the academic study of the subject.

First view defines politcs as an art of managing government and administration. This is the traditional view of politics which originated from the meaning of the term in ancient Greece. The word politics has been derived from the Greek word 'Polis', meaning the state or community as a whole. In this light, politics refers to the affairs of the state. The traditional view of politics is reflected in the tendency for academic study with its focus on the machinery of government and administration. American Political Scientist David Easton however, defines politics as the authoritative allocation of values. In his view, politics refers to the whole processes through which government responds to the societal demands by allocating values authoritatively.

This is a restrictive view of politics. From this prespective politics takes placein cabinet forum, legislative chamber, government agencies, administrative

organisations and the like and only a limited number of people engage themselves in politics. Thus most people, institutions and their activities remain outside the domain of politics. Different associations connected with trade and business, sports, education and other areas of social life are, in this sense, non political. In a more restricted view, politics is equivalent of party politics. Needless to say that the negative image of politics largely originates from this attempt to link politics exclusively to the affairs of the state.

The second view associates politics with public affairs. This view is based on the division between public and private sphere, which largely conforms to the distinction between state and society. State institutions which include government apparatus, court, army, police and so on belong to the public sphere because they are responsible for organization and management of social life. Civil society institutions like family, church, business organizations trade unions, clubs etc. are private in the sense that they are established by the individuals to satisfy their own specific interests. Accordingly, politics is restricted to the activities in the public sphere. The areas of life which individuals can manage for themselves are defined as non-political.

Over a period of time particularly with the advent of modernity a subtle distinction is made between personal and the political. In this view personal affairs must be kept separate from politics. Feminist thinkers argue that this is simply an attempt to deny that politics does occur in family life and personal relationships. They insist that politics is an activity that takes place within all social groups and is not confined to the public sphere.

Politics, in the third view, is the process of resolving conflict through compromise, conciliation and negotiation. Politics is the art of the possible. This view is well reflected in the description of problems like ethinc conflict as political, which requires political solution. Bernerd Crick, one of the leading modern exponents of this view, defines politics as the activity through which diverse interests within a given community are reconciled. In this view politics exists due to the broad spectrum of ideas and opinions within any society. To resolve conflicting views and interests, all affected parties must arrive at a consensus through debate and discussion. Accordingly politics is the process of civilizing the barbarous conflict situation arising out of diverse views and interests.

The fourth view relates politics to power structured relationships which operate at every level of human existence. From this perspective politics is universal,

occuring in every social groups, institutions and societies, large or small. It is argued that politics is at the heart of all collective social activity.

The ubiquity of politics is explained by the inevitable presence of conflict in society. Scarcity of resources and diversity of views and interests make conflict an ever present reality. Thus, politics is, in essence, power, the ability to achieve desired values even at the cost of others. In Harold Lasswell's view, the essence of politics is: Who gets What, When and How?

Feminists and Marxists look at conflict differently. Feminists argue that traditional view of politics is exclusionary in nature keeping women outside the public domain.Women are traditionally confined to family. Radical feminists vehemently oppose the idea that politics stops at the front door, emphasizing rather that 'Personal is thePolitical'. Politics of everyday life is a major concern of the radical feminists.

For the Marxists, the heart of politics is conflict. They argue that the roots of social structure lie in the social relations emanating from the system of production. This is called class relations and the conflict inherent in class relations is called class conflict. Politics is the expression of this conflict in different forms and ways.

Both feminists and Marxists share the view that politics is all about domination and subjection. Feminists draw attention to the totality of oppression and subjection to which women are subject. Marxists argue that in a class divided society politics is characterised by the domination of the ruling class and the struggle of the subject classes to overthrow that domination. Both Marxists and feminists view politics as a means to challenge domination and subjection.

It is now abundantly clear from the above discussion that politics is not all about violence, distruption deceit and lie. The negative image of politics is largely a result of the behaviour and activities of the power hungry politicians. Politics, in effect, is a valuable activity and a civilizing force.

Politics begins with human purpose. Men form groups to realize their purposes. Politics occurs in and among human groups organized for action. Solitary individuals cannot engage in politics. In any human group members agree on some issues but disagree on others. Perfect unity and harmony in any group is rare. Politics, according to Aristotle, is a master science. For him, politics is an activity through which humanbeings attempt to realize their potential and create an ideal society.

Conflict lies at the heart of politics. It may be argued that politics is at once the condition, the process and the result of the resolution of conflict. Diversity of views and interests and scarcity of resources make conflict inevitable. Political world is predicated upon the inescapable presence of conflict in society. Politics, at the sametime, is also the process through which allocation of limited resources is attempted and adjustments of diverse needs and interests temporarily achieved. Without this process society would be reduced to a permanent state of anarchy. It must be emphasized, however, that politics cannot eliminate conflict. It is only the process through which resolution of conflict is attempted. Finally, politics is also the result of the resolution of conflict. This is because desired values are always scarce and resolution of conflict in such conditions means at best only temporary adjustment. As a result resolution of conflict at one point in time creates the conditions for conflict at another point in time. It is for this reason that politics is often described as a process of conflict management. Thus, we may define politics as a social process characterised by activities involving competition and cooperation in the exercise of power, resulting in the making of decisions for a group.

1.3 Political Theory: Definition and Features

Attempts to construct political theory can be traced back to ancient Greece. Plato and Aristotle, in the context of the crisis of the Greek city state, sought to identify the reasons behind the crisis and prescribe ways for constructing an ideal state. In Greek thought, theory was associated with observation. Theory was the intermediary between the event and the observer. For Aristotle, theory denoted intellectual observation and contemplation in accordance with wisdom.

Theory is expression of systematic reflection and explanation of a chosen phenomena. Political theory attempts to arrive at generalizations and draws conclusions from the data relating to political phenomena. The term political theory has been defined in both a broad and a narrow sense. According to G. H. Sabine, political theory, in a broad sense, is anything about politics or relevant to politics. In its narrow sense, Sabine defines political theory "as the disciplined investigation of political problems".

David Held defines political theory as a network of concepts and generalizations about political life involving ideas, assumptions and statements about the nature, purpose and key features of government, state and society and about political capabilities of human beings. Political theory is not only concerned with the empirical study of the political phenomena but also prescribing the goals which

states, governments, societies and citizens ought to pursue. Thus, political theory is neither pure thought nor philosophy, nor science. While it draws heavily from all of them, yet it is distinct from them.

Rajeev Bhargava identifies six distinctive features of political theory. First feature is its concern with internal structure of concepts and their interrelations. In order to make sense of the political world, we impose meaning upon it and this we do through construction of concepts.

Second, a theory has a rational structure. There is a chain of reasons which is implicit in a theoretical work.

Third, theory is commited to find out truth objectively. However, the truth that theories search for are limited to specific time and place.

Fourth, theory seeks to identify the underlying assumptions of our specific beliefs, actions and practices.

Fifth feature of a theory is some degree of generality. It seeks to cover a variety of related but disparate phenomena.

Sixth, theory must not be purely speculative. A theory must be rooted in the lived experience of the people and transcend it.

1.4   Decline of Political Theory

In the 1950s many political scientists claimed that political theory was on the decline. David Easton in his essay "The decline of Modern Political Theory" raised this issue. According to him, it is primarily because of the attitude of the contemporary political scientists, who are satisfied with century old ideas and has failed to develop new political synthesis. He observed that modern political scientists have been guided by historical approach ignoring contemporary social problems and made no attempt to find their solution. According to him hyperfactualism has been dominating political science for a long time. New techniques of data collection have been adopted without any theoretical orientation. Comprehensive view of politics is conspicuous by its absence.

Echoing Easton's view Alfred Cobban observed that there was something definitely wrong with present day thinking about politics. Contemporary political

writings are characterised by lack of purpose. He attributed this to the influence of historical approach and scientific attitude of the modern political scientists.

During the 1950s many political scientists shared the view that political theory has lost its importance. They blamed historicism and increasing influence of logical positivism for the decline of political theory. Peter Laslett, in 1956, observed that the tradition of political theory is almost extinct and political philosophy is now dead.

The above view associated with posivitism, is now widely believed to be mistaken. Behavioural political scientists sought to strengthen scientific basis of the study of politics by delinking it from normative issues. However, from the 1960s onwards it becomes increasingly clear that political theory cannot grow along with positivism which abstains from a critical examination of any social situation. Political theory addresses question relating to the structure and functioning of the society in which we live. Our knowledge of the political world is built up through developing and refining concepts that help us make sense of the human world. Most of these concepts carry a normative import. Thus, every aspect of the human world is subject to normative assessment.

1.5   Need for Political Theory

We need political theory to make political life intelligible. Theories do not originate in a vacuum. It originates from practice, reflects on the political realm and prescribe ways to transcend the current situation. According Rajeev Bhargava, we need political theory because it performs certain key functions.

First is the interpretative and explanatory function. The human world does not exist independently of the concept we have constructed. To understand and explain the human world we must have clear grasp of the complicated structure of the concepts that partly constitute it. It is theory which helps us in this respect.

Second is the contemplative role of political theory. Large social formations, historical changes, nature of modernity and problems associated with it cannot be fully understood by empirical enquiry. Some degree of speculation is needed. Political theory fulfills this purpose.

Third is the evaluative role. All human actions are subject to evaluation in the light of ethical considerations. Political theory brings out normative import of concepts embedded in political practices and subject them to critical reasoning.

Fourth, politial theory is a form of thought. It is a systematic enquiry into the self. It provides answers to the questions regarding our identity and corresponding role.

David held in his book Political Theory Today writes that political theory has three distinct tasks:

(i) **Philosophical:** It is concerned with the conceptual and normative world. It involves an account of how things should be with some kind of acknowledgement that this is not how things are.

(ii) **Empirical-analytical tasks:** Theory is concerned with the problem of understanding and explanation of the political world.

(iii) **Strategic:** Theory gives an account of the feasibility of moving from where we are to where we might like to be.

All these functions of the political theory are crucial in the contemporary world.In the present circumstances with its multitude of problems and uncertainties we need sound political theory to give us a sense of direction and a feeling of purpose.

1.6 Conclusion

Politics is invariably associated with the phenomena of conflict and cooperation in social life. It is a process in which the most-fundamental decisions are made concerning the kind of life that people will lead. It is not all about violence, deceit and lie. It is a civilising force. Political theory makes politics intelligible. It is rooted in the experience of the people and transcend it. It helps us make sense of the human world. In the present day world with its various problems and uncentainties we need sound political theory to give us a sense of direction.

1.7 Summing Up

- Politics is the sum total of all those activities and processes through which a society makes its own history and faces the historical challenges. It is a process of conflict and cooperation among individuals and groups whose purpose is to secure values like liberty, equality, property etc. It is linked to the diversity and conflict.

- Thinkers belonging to different political traditions have understood politics differently. Politics has been defined as the art of government and administration, as management of public affars, as resolution of conflict or conflic management.

- Traditional view restricts politics to personnel and machinery of government. However, when politics is defined as power, it is present in all social activities and in every corner of human existence.

- Theory is a tool of political analysis. Political theory sceks to understand, explain and analyse the political pohenomena and prescribe ways and means to rectify the shortcomings. Since the ancient Greece political theory is a form of thought with a direct practical orientation. It is concerned with logical coherence, rigour in argument, empirical accuracy, moral seriousness and practical efficacy. All these attributes are crucial in modern complex societies.

1.8 Pobable Questions

Essay Type Questions:
1. Explain how politics has been understood by different thinkers belonging to different political traditions.
2. Examine the basic features of political theory.
3. Do you think that political theory is on the decline? Argue your case.

Short Questions:
1. In what sense politics is a loaded as well as a contested concept.
2. Why is conflict regarded as the heart of politics?
3. Discuss the nature and meaning of politics.
4. Define political theory.
5. Examine the need and importance of political theory.

Objective Questions:
1. What is meant by anti-politics?
2. What, according to the Marxists, is the heart of politics?
3. What, according to David Held, is the strategic task of the political theory?

1.9   Further Reading

1. Ball, A and B. Guy Peters *Modern Politics and Government Basingstoke:* (Palgrave and New York: Chatham House Publishers Inc., 2000)

2. Crick, B. *In defence of Politics* (rev.ed.) (Harmonds worth and New York: Penguin. 2000)

3. Heywood, Andrew. *Politics* (Basingstoke: Palgrave 2002)

4. Held, David *Political Theory Today*, (Oxford: Blackwell, 1991)

5. Vincent, Andrew (ed) *Political Theory: Tradition and diversity:* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1997)

6. Bhargava, Rajeev and Acharya Ashok, (ed) Political *Theory, An Introduction,* (Delhi: Pearson, 2019)

7. Sabine, George H., *A History of Politcal Theory.* (Oxford and IBH., 1973,Third Indian Reprint)

Unit-2 □ Traditions of Political Theory: Liberal Theory

Structure

2.0   Objective

The unit deals with the Liberal Tradition. After going through this unit learners will

- Know the meaning of liberalism and its defining features.
- Be able to identify different versions of the liberal tradition.
- Be able to identify the impact of liberal tradition on political theory and practice

2.1   Introduction

All theories contain implicit assumptions. They bear the imprint of values and normative beliefs. The major theories of politics address the issues of power and the role of the state. At a deeper level they reflect the assumptions and beliefs of one

19

or other major ideological traditions. Political and social enquiry is a battleground of competing traditions: Liberalism, Marxism, Conservatism, Anarchism and so on. Each presents its own account of social existence and a particular view of the world.

As a theoretical tradition liberalism emerged in the 17th century. Renaissance, Enlightenment together with Reformation created the environment for the growth of liberal ideas. Liberalism developed initially as a protest against feudal authority and privileges and absolute monarchy, claimed to be based on the doctrine of the divine right of kings. As a theory of modernity, it was an expression of the economic, social and political aspirations of the rising middle classes. Liberal protest centered around the demand for liberty of the individual in every sphere of life. Liberalism at this stage was revolutionary, fighting against irrationalism, superstition, intolerance and arbitrariness.

The distinctive features which marked the liberal tradition at its inception were altered and reshaped by the historical developments since the 19th century. Liberalism which was radical at its inception became increasingly conservative in the face of challenges of other political traditions and movements such as Socialism, Marxism and Fascism. It absorbed democracy and socialism to a great extent in the form of the welfare state. With the fall of Soviet Union and disintegration of the socialist block liberalism has become dominant political tradition of the contemporary world. However, various political developments since the last decade of the 20th century, notably growing moral and cultural diversity in the Western countries and North America, rise of varieties of fundamentalisms, rise of identity politics have led many liberals to cast doubt about the applicability of liberal principles to all people and all societies.

2.2   Origin

Liberalism as a theoretical tradition established itself in the 19th century. But its origin as a way of thinking about man and society may be traced back to diverse sources and social experience that gradually merged to form a strong political current. Ancient Greek tradition of freedom of enquiry and comparative religious toleration, sophists and sceptical thinkers' assertion of the universal equality of men and the doctrine of political equality, individualistic legal tradition of Rome, and the Universalist and individualistic outlook of the christianity–all these significantly contributed to the formation of the liberal tradition.

In political theory the rise of liberalism is identified with the development of individualism. Seventeenth century natural rights theories emphasized voluntarism

and inviolability of individual rights. The idea of social contract expressed an individualist philosophy that allowed free choice and personal expression. In the American War of Independence and the French Revolution liberalism was clearly accompanied by a commitment to social equality, indicating that all individuals are equal in relation to one another and deserve no special privilege because of their class or heritage. Liberalism thus, became a theory with a focus on the emancipation of the individual. In theory it subordinated the state and political institutions to individual will, by identifying the former as human creation.

2.3   Definition

Liberalism is a dynamic and flexible concept. It has shown tremendous capacity of survival and adaptability. However, it is difficult to provide a precise and uncontroversial definition of liberalism. It has undergone many changes in the course of its evolution and it necessitates a historical rather than static type of analysis.

Liberalism refers to a cluster of social, political and economic doctrines which have changed overtime, For Laski, liberalism implies a passion for liberty. It was an attempt to give back to man his individuality. It was this postulate that was expressed in Kant's statement that morality consists in treating persons as ends and not as means. As an attitude, liberalism lays stress on man's goodness and rationality and seeks reforms in every sphere of life for a better future.

Liberalism has a rich historical story with contrasting formations. It has accquired different forms in different national cultures. John Gray in his persuasive analysis argues that liberalism has no single static essence. But it has a set of distinctive conception of man and society which differentiates it from other political traditions.This has undergone alteration and modification in the process of evolution of liberalism. But the core elements of the liberal concept of man and society did not change. These elements are:

Liberalism is individualist in asserting the moral primacy of individual against the claims of any social group. It is egalitarian in acknowledging same moral status of all individuals. It is universalist in claiming the moral unity of the human species. It is meliorist in asserting that all social and political institutions and arrangements are improvable. John Gray claims that in spite of all the rich historical diversity, liberalism is a single phenomenon by virtue of the four elements that constitute

the liberal conception of man and society. Despite all controversies and contrasting formations liberalism remains an integral outlook whose core elements are not hard to specify.

2.4   Different Strands of Liberalism: Classical

Several crises of modernity and emergence of rival theoretical traditions made reinterpretation of liberal principles inevitable. This led to the rise of several versions of the liberal tradition: Classical, Modern, Neo-liberal and Egalitarian liberalism.

Classical Liberalism

Classical lineralism emerged in an atmosphere characterized by changes in all areas of social life. Renaissanee, reformation and enlightenment created an atmosphere favouring autonomy of the individual, his liberty and rationality. Industrial revolution and consequent emergence of a new social class, which was later called bourgeoisie, emergence of the nation state, growing influence of secular ideas led to the rise of classical liberalism. This new philosophy found expression in the writings of Thomas Hobbes, John Locke, Adam Smith, Malthus, Ricardo, James Mill, Bentham, John Stuart Mill among others.

Classical liberalism emerged as a protest against the arbitrary power of the kings and privileges of the nobility based on birth. Opposing the tradition of man's fixed station in life it supported an open society where every individual could attain respectability and sucess based on his merit. It believed in a competitive society and free market economy. It supported free thinking and rationalism. The idea of change, growth, dynamism, competition and mobility occupied central place in classical liberal theory.

The distinctive feature of classical liberalism is its commitment to an extreme form of individualism. Human beings are described as selfish and egoistical but at the same time rational. In C.B. Macpherson's analysis this form of individualism is identified as possessive individualism, where individuals are owner of their own persons and capacities, owing nothing to society or to one another. Society is composed of atom like autonomous individual.

Individual liberty constitute the core of classical liberalism. Classical liberals believed in negative liberty, meaning non interference or absence of restraints upon individual. It is liberty both from the state and society. The individual is free in so far as he or she is not interfered with or coerced by others.

Classical liberals saw the state in purely negative terms. State is not a natural institution, but an artifical institution created by man. The state originates by mutual consent for the sole purpose of preserving and protecting rights of the individual. The relationship between the state and the individual is contractual. Individuals have every right to revolt and establish a new government in the event of violation of the terms of the contract. The state is viewed as a necessary evil. It is necessary in the sense that it establishes order and security. At the same time it is an evil in the sense that it imposes a collective will upon society and thereby limiting the freedom of the individual. Classical liberals supported the establishment of a minimal or night watchman state. In classical liberal theory rights are prior to the state. Locke advocated a theory of natural rights of life, liberty and property for the protection of which state was constituted.

In the economic sphere clasical liberals had deep faith in the mechanism of the free market. They believed that economy works best when left alone by government. Laissez faire capitalism would gurantee prosperity and uphold individual liberty. The market is a self-regulating mechanism. It is managed by what Adam Smith referred to as an invisible hand.

One salient feature of classical liberalism is its explanation of poverty and social inequality in terms of human talents and their hard work. Men with competence and willingness to work will prosper and the incompetent or the lazy will perish. Herbert Spencer expressed these ideas boldly in his book The Man versus the State. Spencer developed a strong defence of the doctrine of laissez-faire drawing upon Charles Darwin's theory of 'natural selection'. According to him, a process of natural selection operates within human society, which is characterized by the principle of the survival of the fittest. Ineqalities of wealth, position and power are natural and government should not interfere with them. Thus individual liberty, limited state, free contract, competition, free market economy were the hall marks of classical liberal theory.

2.5 Modern Liberalism

The sucess of capitalism in the 19th century witnessed rapid concentration of wealth in a few hands which created many social, economic and political contradictions.The free market economy created massive inequalities among people and subjected the vulnerable sections of the society to greater exploitation and oppression. With the enormous growth of the labour force in the industrial cities,

freedom of contract virtually meant freedom of the factory owner to hire and fire workers to maximise their profit. Free market economy virtually resulted in inhuman conditions for the workers, child labour and slum dwellers. When free market was interpreted as total absence of government regulation, it brought disastrous consequences for the bulk of the society instead of greatest happiness of the greatest number held so dearly by the utilitarians. In England, the Royal Commission, appointed to investigate the coal mining industry, in its report brought to light the brutality that existed in the mines, employment of women and children, long hours of barbarous work, absence of safety devices. Classical liberalism came in for sharp criticism from different quarters. The humanists criticized it for its practical outcome such as poverty, unemployment, ignorance and disease. The socialists were pressing for urgent solution of problems affecting the working class. The liberals were forced to realize that liberal principles need to be revised in the changed social and historical context.

In the changed social and historical contest old notions such as self-interest, pleasure and utility proved unconvincing. The situation called for re-examination of the nature and function of liberty, the relationship between liberty and authority and the relationship between individual and society. The revision was carried out by J.S. Mill, T.H. Green, Hobhouse, G.D.H. Cole, Barker, Laski among others.

Modern liberals were profoundly influenced by German idealism, particularly by the ideas of Emmanuel Kant and Hegel. This was evident in the shift away from individualism toward exploring some kind of collectivist concept. Modern liberals acknowledged the institutional nature of society and historical evolution of institutions.

Liberty occupies a prime position in modern liberalism. John Stuart Mill in his book "On Liberty" presented solid argnments in favour of individual liberty. According to him, individual is sovereign over his body and mind. Liberty is explained as the absence of restrictions upon individual's selfregarding actions. This is essentially negative concept of freedom. At the same time Mill saw liberty as a positive and constructive force. The value of liberty, for Mill, is that it enables individuals to develop, to acquire talents, skills and knowledge and to refine their sensibilities.

Central to John Stuart Mill's exploration of liberty was the move from individualism to individuality. Mill focussed on human growth and on exercising mental and moral faculties of the individual. According to him, the value of personality can be realized in the actual conditions of a free society. Liberty is a good in itself. To live one's own life, developing one's own talents and capacities, is not only a means to happiness, but a substantive part of happiness itself. For

him liberty is not only an individual but also a social good. In a free society the function of a liberal state is to act as a means of creating, increasing and equalising opportunity.

T. H. Green sought to place liberalism on broad foundations. He argued that at the centre of liberal philosophy was the idea of general good, to be shared by everyone and which provided a standard for legislation. In his interpretation, choice means opportunity and opportunity means a society that is not coercive beyond need in its legal, political, economic and social structure.

Liberty, for Green, is really a social as much as it is an individual conception. It refers to a quality of society and also quality of the persons who compose it. A government cannot remain liberal by standing aside and refraining from legislation. A liberal government must support the existence of a free society and remove obstacles in the way of moral development of the individual.

Although this undoubtedly modified classical liberal theory, it did not amount to the rejection of core liberal ideas. Modern liberalism while appropriating some of the socialist principles did not place society before the individual. It developed a positive view of freedom. Freedom implies the ability of the individual to gain fulfilment and achieve self-realization. The night watchman state of classical liberal theory was quite incapable of creating condition for the development of individuality. L. T. Hobhouse and J. A. Hobson developed a redical organic view of society in which the health of the whole was dependent on the health of each and every part.

These ideas provided the basis for the emergence of the welfare state in the 20th century. Influenced by the German philosopher Hegel who described the state as an ethical institution, modern liberals put emphasis on social responsibility of the state. State, for them, is the guarantor of liberty. Social welfare activities of the state will create eauality of opportunity. State has responsibility to protect the disadvantaged section of society and by doing so it broadens individual rights. Modern liberals believed that coordinated governmental activities could atleast significantly ameliorate evils of industrial capitalism. The principle of laissez-faire was abandoned because of its failure to bring about general prosperity. The insightful argument of J. M. Keynes that growth and prosperity could be maintained only through a system of regulated capitalism became theoretical basis of interventionist state. Keynes argued that problems of unemployment and poverty cannot be solved by the invisible hand of the market. The primary goal of the modern liberals was to develop individual capabilities so that they can take responsibility for their own situation and make their own moral choices.

2.6   Neo-Liberalism

In the 1970s the sharp deterioration in the performance of the western economy, the collapse of the Bretton Woods agreements for managing currencies, recession, the oil price shocks, the rise in working class militancy and growing inflation led to widespread questioning of Keynesian economic management. The crisis created the context for renewed interest in the theories of classical political economy. The shifta way from Keynesian priorities and revival of free market doctrines went under the name neoliberalism. It reflected a reaction to the general trend towards an expanding state in the economy and society. However, it is not a unified and coherent theory. It includes diverse set of ideas and policies having many internal tensions. It has included many kinds of liberals and conservatives. Friedrich Von Hayek, Milton Friedman, James Buchanan, Robert Nozick, Ayn Rand and Murray Rothbard are chief propenents of neoliberal ideas.

Neo-liberals balieve that freedom is the fundamental value that must underlie all social relations. Personal liberty is the supreme moral good. Individual should be free from the interference of others. One's liberty can be restricted only if he consents to restriction. Liberty is not just another good like car. It is a necessary condition of action.

Opposition to the big government constitutes one fundamental element of neoliberalism. It is deeply suspicious of the state. The state is viewed in negative terms, as a source of restriction on individual freedom. To the neoliberals economic freedom is the most fundamental. Hayek argued that control over economic sphere ultimately leads to control over every sphere. According to Hayek, the adoption of welfare policies would bring totalitarian government in the long run. The tendency of the state to encroach on individual liberty has to be resisted continually. Rothbard argued that only safe course to protect liberty is to abolish the state altogether and rely on voluntary and private agreements.

However, all neoliberals do not subscribe to the view that there is no role for the state. Majority of them endorse a role for the state, but there is considerable disagreement over what functions the state should perform. Those who favour right based arguments tend to advocate a minimal state, whose functions are restricted to internal security, external defence, the rule of law, protection of property and enforcement of contract. Robert Nozick has provided a strong defence of the minimal state in these terms. According to him, the state will arise from anarchy. Individuals in the state of nature would find it in their interset to allow dominant protective agency to emerge. The function of the state should be limited to the

narrow functions of protection against force, theft, fraud, enforcement of contract and so on. Justifying the minimal state he categorically asserts that liberty must get absolute precedence over equality. He opposes policies of progressive taxation and any redistribution of property by the state because it may violate the liberty of those who have property.

Neoliberals claim that only economic order that respects individual freedom is free market. Free market, to them is an example of freedom in action. The market is superior to other economic system, since it handles human ignorance by passing information in coded form through the price mechanism which indicates where profits could be made and resources efficiently used. Market delivers fairness and economic justice. It gives all people the opportunity to rise and fall on the basis of talent and hard work. Free market is the economic system of free individual and it is necessary to create wealth. Market process being non-coercive is more efficient than planning in producing harmony among men's economic activities. It is in this sense market may be considered as the basis of a spontaneous social order.

Neo-liberals support democracy, but consider it exclusively as means of choosing representatives and governments under condition of reasonable transparency and competition. At the same time they have certain reservations about democracy and want to restrict its scope as much as possible. They argue that democracy generates ideas and expectations which if acted upon can undermine the principles of a market order. Democratic concepts such as popular sovereignty and mandate indicate that will of the people should get priority over everything. But for neoliberals reality of the market is much more important than the will of the people. Politicians have a tendency to raise expectation during election, then lower them afterwards. This inturn leads to widespread disillusion and cynicism about politics. Hayek and other neoliberals propose reduction of scope of democracy as much as possible. Hayek advocates the idea of creating an institutional structure for democracy which limits the power of the mob and entrusts power to the informed and the judicious.

2.7 Egalitarian Liberalism

Over the course of the last four decades there has emerged a distinctive brand of liberal political theory called egalitarian liberalism. It is primarily concerned with the issue of distributive justice, that is how the benefits and burdens of social cooperation are to be distributed. Egalitarian liberals believe that liberty and equality

are compatible political values and that the demands of these two values should be taken seriously when considering what the just division of burdens and benefits are.

John Rawls in his major works, *A Theory of Justice*, and Political Liberalism has contributed to the elaboration of this perspective. His theory of justice may be explained as an attempt to combine liberal democracy, the market economy and the distributive welfare state. He is critical of utilitarianism which employs net aggregate satisfactions to assess the fairness of public policy and institutions drawing upon the moral theory of institutions Drawing upon the moral theory of Immanuel Kant, Rawls argues that a just order should be based on the principle of the priority of right over the good.

This version of liberalism is generally conceived as a particular form of ethical theory. It seeks to give priority to the interests of individuals as autonomous, rational and purposive agents. The egalitarian liberalism of John Rawls appears to be a device to create universal ground rules for society that permit a fair and equal opportunity for all in the context of a political order based on impartiality, relative inclusiveness and distribution of goods and services that works for the benefit of all and especially the least well off.

For Rawls, a fundamental fact of our world is a pluralism of conceptions of the good. Many conflicting doctrines cannot all be true, but all may be reasonable, According to Rawls, liberalism is a reasonable response to the reasonable plurality of beliefs. This is political liberalism. It can operate as an 'over lapping consensus', shared by men loyal to comprehesive philosophies otherwise conflicting.

2.8   Critique of Liberalism

Like any other theoretical tradition liberalism has had its critics. It has been denounced, rejected, revised and defended by leading writers. Thus, Laski while criticising liberalism for upholding the values of the bourgeoisie, laid emphasis on the liberal virtues of freedom and tolerance.

Conservatives rejected liberalism's initial emphasis on liberation. They argued that liberalism's emphasis on the individual and his or her creative talents unsettled established order. Liberal theory is criticised for being blind to sources of power other than those found in the state. In the postwar period it is denounced for being too close to neo-colonialism.

Marxists lay emphasis on the hidden dangers of liberalism. For them, liberalism delivers the exact opposite of what it claims to seek. Liberalism presents itself as a theory of freedom but is infact one of coercion and exploitation. It pretends to be theory of inclusion when it infact excludes. It is claimed to be a theory of equality, when infact it justifies established patterns of ineqality. Marxists condemn liberalism for working as an ideological justification for a competitive, property owning, free market capitalism and ignoring the interests of those incapable of surviving in such an environment.

Critics argue that liberal ideas have been widely used for distinctly non liberal purposes in the actual history of developed democracies. Liberal languages have been employed intentionally to justify campaign for disenfranchisement, inequality in public service provision and racial segregation.

Communitarians criticize liberalism for propagating false conception of the self. Liberals suggest that self is 'unencumbered, detached and separate form social ends'. Liberalism, therefore, threatens to degenerate into unrestrained egoism and is incapable of promoting cooperation.

Feminists attack liberalism for its failure to recognise the significance of gender differences and propagating a conception of personhood that is dominated by maletraits and characteristics.

Despite these criticisms it is difficult to underestimate the historical importance and contribution of liberalism. During the last four centuries it has given many humanistic and democratic ideas. Almost all the issues of modern western philosophy have been connected with liberalism. It has provided inspiration to a multitude of political programmes and movements. It has influenced the discourses of a large range of political traditions in smaller or longer degree, It has propagated a secular vision built around some of the most persistent challenges of social and political life.

In the twenty-first century liberalism is confronted with challenges from various sources. Growing ideological diversity, various forms of fundamentalism, resurgent nationalism based on ethnic purity, growing importance of multiple cultural identities have created a situation in which liberal tradition is suffering from a crisis of confidence. This is evident in the growing reluctance of liberals to present their ideas as universal. John Gray argues that in the post modern situation liberalism will have to renounce any claim to universal authority and learn to live peacefully with rivalcul tures and world views.

2.9   Conclusion

Liberalism evolved out of prolonged struggle against Feudal authority and privileges and absolute monarchy. As a theory of modernity, it was an expression of the economic, social and political aspirations of the rising middle class. It has undergone significant transformations in the course of its evolution. Liberalism which was revolutionary fighting against intolerance and arbitrariness, was reshaped by the historical developments since the 19th century. In the twenty-first century it is confronted with challenges from various sources. This has led many liberals to raise doubt about its universalist claim.

2.10   Summing Up

- Liberalism was the product of the breakdown of feudalism and the growth of a market society in its place. Right from its inception, it has been continuously changing, adding something and discarding others. It began as a protest movement against the hierarchical and privileged authority and absolute monarchy. The main slogan of the protest was liberty in every sphere of life.

- There are several strands of the liberal tradition: Classical, Modern, Neoliberal and Egalitarian.

- Classical liberalism believed in the antonomy of the individual will and the rationality and goodness of the individual. Classical liberals defined freedom as absence of restraints. They believed in the inalienable right of the individual. In classical liberal view, state is an artificial institution based upon social contract. It is a necessary evil. Its role is to maintain law and order, and leave the individual free.

- The development of industrial capitalism necessitated a thorough going revision of liberal theory. The revision was carried out by J. S. Mill, T. H. Green, L. T. Hobhouse, Hobson, Harold Laski, Barker among others. Modern liberals attempted to reconcile the interest of the individual with that of society so that the essentials of the capitalist system could be preserved while removing its ill effects. For the modern liberals state is an instrument of development of human personality through social reform and welfare measures. This involved abandoning the policy of laissez-faire and adopting the principle of the welfare state.

- In the last three decades of the 20th century there has been a sustained attempt to limit the role of the state in the ecomomy and society and glorify the role of the market. It has brought into existence a new version of liberalism, called neoliberalism. It asserts the primacy of liberty. For the neoliberals market is the embodiment of freedom. They attempt to set up an unbreakable bond between freedom, the market and efficient pursuit of policies and programmer.

- Egalitarian liberalism associated with John Rawls is based on the belief that social inequality can be justified only if it is of benefit to the least advantaged. It is primarily concerned with the issue of distributive justice.

2.11 Pobable Questions

Essay Type Questions:

1. Discuss, the origin and development of liberalism as a distinct theoretical tradition.
2. Examine the distinctive features of classical liberalism.
3. Discuss the neoliberal theory of the nature and function of the state.

Short Questions:

1. Trace the evolution of modern liberalism.
2. Examine the liberal approach to individual liberty.
3. Make a critical assessment of liberalism as a political tradition.
4. How would you define liberalism?
5. How is liberalism linked to capitalism?
6. Write a short note on egalitarian liberalism.

Objective Questions:

1. Why do the classical liberals view the state as an evil?
2. What do the modern liberals mean by positive freedom?
3. What, according to the neo-liberals, is the basis of the spontaneous social order?

2.12 Further Reading

1. Gray, John. *Liberalism*, 2nd edn. (Milton Keynes: Open University, Press, 2000)

2. Heywood, Andrew, *Political Ideologies*. (Palgrave, Macmillan, 2003)

3. Freeden. M. Sargent, L. T. and Marestears. (ed) *The Oxford Handbook of Politica Idologics*. (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2013)

4. Bhargava, Rajeev and Acharya, Ashok, *Political Theory. An Introduction*. (Delh: Pearson, 2019)

5. Freeden, M. *Idologics and Political Theory*. (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1996)

Unit-3 □ Marxist Theory

Structure

3.0 Objective

In this unit learners will read theory of Marxism, propounded by Karl Marx andothers. The basic principles of Marxism and different strands of Marxism arediscussed at length. After reading this unit learners will be famillar with:

- Sources of Marxism
- Basic Postulates of Marxism
- Different versions of the Marxist tradition
- Limitations and contemporary relevance of Marxism

3.1 Introduction

Marxism constitutes one of the most lively and influential currents of modern thought. It has constituted the principal alternative to the liberal tradition. It is not a closed and completed system. It is an evolving tradition and has assumed a great variety of forms. It has developed by responding to intellectual challenges from critics as well as sympathisers and attempting to explain and understand changes in the social world.

3.2 What is Marxism?

There is no simple answer to the question: What is Marxism? It has been defined differently; as a comprehensive world view, as a philosophical outlook, as an ideology of the proletariat, as a social movement, as a science of society and social change. Russian Marxist Plekhanov defined Marxism as a total world view. For him Marxism is an explanation of the world from the materialist prespective. According to Emile Burns, Marxism is a general theory of the world and of human society. For him, Marxism refers to the ideas which Marx together with Friedrich Engels developed during the middle and latter part of the 19th century.

However, Marxism is not simply an ideology or a philosophical world view. It is an aggregate of some definite theories which explain human society, its development and transformation. Lenin defined Marxism as the system of views and teaching of Marx.

Recent Marxist scholars like Althusser view Marxism as a science which seeks to uncover the truth lying behind the visible social world. It seeks to explain social life of man and its transformation scientifically.

However, Marxism does not mean exclusively the ideas of Marx. It includes ideas of Marx, Engels and their followers who call themselves Marxists. Marxism is constantly being developed keeping in view the changes occuring in the real world.

3.3 Sources of Marxism

Marxism emerged as a distinct theoretical tradition in the mid 19th century. It is combination of all those best created by men in the world of science, knowledge

and philosophy. According to Lenin, it is the lawful successor to the best that has been created by humanity in the 19th century– German Philosophy, English Political Economy and Utopian Socialism.

Late 18th and early 19th century was the golden age of philosophical thinking in Germany. During this period Kant and Hegel gave idealist philosophy an absolute form. Ancient philosophers considered truth as absolute. For them truth is one and the same in all ages. Rejecting this view Hegel argued that truth can never be absolute. Nothing is eternal and everything is in a state of flux. The driving force of change is the dialectic, a process of interaction between competing forces. Infact progress is the consequence of internal conflict. In Hegel's formulation this explains the movement of the world spirit towards self realization through conflict between a thesis, and its opposing force, an anti-thesis producing a synthesis, which in turn constitutes a new thesis. This process keeps on repeating itself and historical changes occur through this process.

In this dialectical movement of human history ideas are conceived to be principal causes of historical changes. Marx, according to Engels, turned Hegel on his head by investing Hegelian dialectic with a materialist interpretation. Dialectical changes are not due to ideas but material conditions. Ideas are the product of material conditions of society. Marx got this insight from Feuerbach's writings. Feuerbach was a staunch critic of Hegel's idealism. According to him nature exists independently of human consiousness. Man is a creation of nature. Nothing is real outside nature and religion also is not real. It is a creation of man's imagination. Alienated from himself man creates religion which ultimately controls his life.

In Feuerbach's materialism there was no role for consciousness in the process of man's interaction with the material world. His materialism was mechanical. Marx modified Feuerbach's formulation and made it the basis of his philosophical theory. Marx's materialism aimed to do more than interpret the world. It aimed to be intellectually adequate to the practical task of changing the world.

English political economy constitutes the second intellectual source of Marxism. Labour theory of value has been derived from the British Political conomists of the18th and 19th centuries. According to this theory the value of every commodity is determind by the quantity of socially recessary labour spent in its production. According to Marx, British political economists had analysed relations between different commodities and for them value of a commodity simply expresses this relation. But in reality value of a commodity expreses relations between different

men. Exchange means exchange of labour and labour, under capitalist system is a commodity. Marx made a threadbare analysis of economic ideas of British Political economists and constructed his theory of surplus value on that basis.

French socialism constitutes the third intellectual source of Marxism. Socialist ideas emerged in France during French Revolution and immediately after it. Babeuf and his associates propagated theory of communist society. They wanted to establish revolutionary dictatorship of the working class. Saint Simon and his followers felt the need for tackling the problem of inequality in industrial capitalism. French socialists had fair understanding of the competitive character of capitalism. They raised the question of social transformation and suggested reorganization of society according to rational principles of production and distribution.

However, they could not indicate a real way out. They failed to explain the essence of wage slavery and discover the laws of social development. They could not identify the social force capable of becoming the creator of a new society.

However, Marx became familiar with socialist ideas in embryonic form from their writings. Saint simon's concept of stateless society free from exploitation influenced him. Similarly, Fourier's analysis of division of labour in bourgeois society and Proudhon's economic analysis of private property earned his respect.

3.4 Basic Principles of Marxism

The basic principles of Marxism are: dialectical materialism, historical materialism, class strnggle, theory of surplus value, revolution, dictatorship of the proletariat and Communism.

3.4.1 Dialectical Materialism

Dialectical materialism is the scientific methodology developed by Marx and Engels for the interprectation of human history. The word dialectic was used by the Greek philosophers to denote a method of discovering truth. German philosopher Hegel made scientific use of the term dialectic. For him, dialectic is the method by which human history is unfolded. Historical changes take place in a dialectical process. He developed the triology of thesis, anti-thesis and synthesis. Every stage of growth is characterized by contradictions. These contradictions induce further change, progress and development. Thesis is challenged by its anti-thesis. Both contain elements of truth and falsehood. The false elements constitute contradictions. The true elements of both the thesis and anti-thesis are fused together in a synthesis. The evolved synthesis in course of time becomes a thesis and it is again challenged

by its opposite, antithesis, which again results in a new synthesis. This process continues until the stage of perfection is reached.

According to Hegel, in this dialectical movement of human history ideas are conceived to be principal cause of historical process. Dialectical change in history takes place under the impact of ideas. In Marx's view, Hegel's dialectic was standing on its head and he put it on its feet. For Hegel, ultimately it is the idea which matters and other things are its refletion. Marx replaced idea with matter. According to him material forces constitute the base and idea is a part of the superstructure. The material forces determine the idea and not vice-versa. The fundamental laws of dialectical materialism are: (a) the law of the transformation of quantity into quality, according to which gradual quantative changes; give rise to revolutionary qualitative changes. (b) the law of the unity of opposites, which holds that the unity of concerete reality is a unity of opposites or contradictions; and (c) the law of negation of the negation, which claims that in the clash of opposites one opposite negates another and is in turn negated by a higher level of historical development that preserves something of both negated terms.

3.4.2 Historical Materialism

Historical materialism is the application of the principles of dialectical materialism to the study of human society. It constitutes the social scientific core of Marxist theory. Historical materialism starts from the view that in order to survive human beings collectively work on nature to produce the means to live. There is a division of labour in which people not only do different jobs, but some people live from the work of others by owning the means of production. Marx gave pride of place to the production of material life in the investigation of social structure and historical development. In his preface to a Contribution to the Critique of Political Economy Marx argues that economic structure of society, constituted by its relations of production, is the real foundation of society. It is the basis on which rises a legal and political superstructure and to which correspond definite forms of social consciousness. The economic structure of society contains social relations of production as well as forces of production. A mode of production is a relationship between forces of production and relations of production.

As the society's productive forces develop, they clash with existing relations of production. Capacity to produce expands but ownership of the means of production contracts, The result is maladjustment which is built in. Then begins an epoch of social revolution. The conflict is resolved in favour of the productive forces and

new relations of production emerge whose material precondition have matured in the womb of the old society.

Thus, different socio-economic organizations of production which have characterized human history arise or fall as they enable or hinder the expansion of society's productive capacity. It is to be noted that this is not technological determinism. Technology functions within a social context. Its ultimate source is human labour and inventiveness and what makes it important is the character of the production process.

For Marx the super structure is derived from the base. But in each social formation more specific laws govern the precise nature of the general derivation. Marx's theory does not view the super structure as an epi-phenomenon of the economic base. It is because a super structure is needed to organize and stabilize society that the economic base brings about those institutions that are best suited to it. In fact, one of the fundamental tenets of historical materialism is that super structure affects or reacts back on the base.

Marx designates the Asiatic, ancient, feudal and modern bourgeois modes of production as the major epochs in humanity's advance. However, these mark the general stages of socio-economic evolution-as a whole. These are not the steps which history obliges every nation without exception to climb. Marx did not attempt to indicate a series of successive stages through which all societies without exception must pass in sequence. He denied propounding any historico-philosophical theory of social development imposed by fate upon every people.

3.4.3 Class Struggle

The theory of class struggle is a corollary of historical materialism. While historical materialism contains the theory of social change, theory of class struggle describes its mechanism. According to Marx, the history of all hitherto existing society has been history of class struggle. He wanted to prove that class struggle has been the permanent feature of human history. Except the primitive communist stage, all historical ages have been characterized by the antagonism between the dominant and dependent classes. It is the result of exploitation by the property owning class of the property-less class. The interests of the contending clases are irreconcilable. It is resolved through a social revolution. The inherent contradictions of contending classes of every epoch can be resolved only through the abolition of the exploiting classes.

3.4.4 Theory of Surplus Value

Marx developed the theory of surplus value to explain the whole phenomenon of exploitation in the capitalist society. In simple term surplus value is what is normally called profit. The theory of surplus value is rooted in the labour theory of value. Value of a commodity is nothing but erystallized labour. Surplus value arises because some part of the worker's labour is not paid to him. The major share of profit is appropriated by the capitalists. Surplus value is the difference between market value of commodity and the wage paid to a labourer for creating this value. According to Marx, capital is the vampire that sucks the blood of the worker. With the growth of capitalism and the rise in competition, the wages of the workers continue to fall. Cutthroat competition leads to deterioration of the lot of the proletariat. This intensifies class struggle and eventually leads to revolution.

3.4.5 Revolution

According to Marx, social revolution takes place when the existing relations of production begin to act as a fetter on the further development of the forces of production. For him, the major political developments of the modern age are to be explained as the result of the long term social and economic developments in which new forms of economic exploitation and property ownership steadily develop. In the capitalist society quest for more profit intensifies exploitation of workers. This creates conditions for the organization of the workers and awakening of class consciousness in the ranks of the proletariat. Revolution occurs to resolve contradictions between the forces of production and the relations of production.

3.4.6 Dictatorship of the Proletariat

The proletarian revolution will lead to the establisment of the dictatorship of the proletariat. This is a necessary prelude to communism. The transient dictatorship is necessary for finishing the tasks of revolution. It is a quasi-state which will function as the representative of the revolutionary working class. It will expropriate the bourgeoisie, centralize all means of production and increase total production as rapidly as possible. In short, the proletarian state will follow revolutionary measures leading to the complete destruction of capitalism. The bourgeoisie will try to stage a counter revolution to restore the old system and so the coercive institutions of the state are needed to restrain the bourgeoisie.

3.4.7 Communism

Communism is the central political idea of Marx's theory. It is a social conception with a philosophical and historical meaning. For Marx, communism

is the positive abolition of private property, of human self-alienation and thus the real appropriation of human nature through and for man. It means that communism abolishes private property in such a way as to move humanity to a more advanced stage of historical development. It will return to men and women something from which they were previously estranged. Marx claimed that communism will resolve the conflict between man and nature. This is an extraordinarily utopian speculative claim. It means that communism will not be a stage of social development, since no further development will come after it. It will inagurate a new era of human freedom.

Communism will be a system of common ownership of the means of production. But it would not regress behind enormous historical advance for the human species represented by capitalism. It is this historical dimension that distinguishes Marx's conception of communism from previous one which were utopain. The historical possibility of communism is based on the revolutionary role that capitalism plays in developing the forces of production.

3.5   Different strands of Marxism

Changing class relations, tremendous survival capacity of capitalism and application of Marxism in distinct and undeveloped societies have led to the rise of different strands Marxism. The following forms of the Marxist tradition are note worthy.

3.5.1 Orthodox Marxism

Orthodox Marxism is closely linked to the experience of soviet communism and to the contribution of V. I. Lenin and Joseph Stalin. It was concerned with the issues of leadership, political organization and economic management. In fact 20th century is best understood as orthodox Marxism modified by a set of Leninist theories and doctrines. Lenin's central contribution to Marxism was his theory of the Vanguard Party. He argued that the workers under the influence of bourgeouis ideas and values would not realize its revolutionary potential. By itself the proletariat could not go beyond trade union consciousness. Hence, a revolutionary party duly armed with a revolutionary theory was needed to serve as a vanguard of the working class. This would be tightly knit party of professional and dedicated revolutonaries capable of exercising ideological leadership. The party was to be based on the principle of democratic centralism, a belief in freedom of debate coupled with unity of action.

In Imperialism: The Highest Stage of Capitalism, Lenin analysed colonialism as an economic phenomenon and highlighted the possibility of turning world war into class war. According to him, a new and final epoch of capitalism had emerged in which competition is replaced by monopoly and the concentration of capital and class antagonism had reached their extremes. Whole world had been subjected to the parasitic exploitation of the most powerful capitalist states. Capitalism, in the imperialist stage had become parasitic, oppressive and decadent. It had simplified the task of bringing the whole economy under society's control and created a complete material basis for socialism.

Stalinism

Stalin made Marxism more dogmatic. He was no great theoretician. Stalinism refers to a distinctive politico economic system. His most important ideological shift was to propound the doctrine of 'Socialism in one country'.

He proclaimed that Soviet Union could succeed in building socialism without the need for international revolution. This clearly distinguished his position from that of Marx and Lenin who had deep commitment to internationalism. This doctrine dictated the drive for industrialization, and collectivization, justified by the need to resist capitalist encirclement and to eliminate kulak as a class.

Maoism

Maoism is usually understood as an anti-bureaucratic form of Marxism that places its faith in the revolutionary zeal of the masses. As a political theorist Mao Ze Dong accepted Marxism-Laninism to the needs of a predominantly agricultural and traditional society. Mao's concept of the mass line introduced an element of democratic participation from below under party guidance, which was wholly absent in the soviet tradition.

His ideas regarding the participation of the bourgeoisie in the revolution before and after 1949 integrated non-proletarian elements into the revolutionary process in China to a degree which was carried a step further by synthesis between national and social revolution in Asia. He launched a great war on bureaucracy and thus, placed the agenda for the future. He tried to combine the principle of working class ledership over the peasants with the conviction that the centre of gravity of chinese society was to be found in the country side and the peasantry must play an active part in building a new socialist China.

3.5.2 Western Marxism

Western Marxism is a term used to describe a wide variety of Marxist theoreticians based in western and central Europe. It arises from the uniform defeat

of the working class movements and emergence of fascist forces in western Europe in the inter-War period. It challenged Soviet Marxism and shifted the emphasis from politicale conomy and state to culture, Philosophy and art. Some of the important spokes persons of this tradition are Rosa Luxemburg, George Lukacs, Karl Korsch, Antonio Gramsci, Theodor Adorno, Herbert Marcuse, Walter Benjamin, Louis Althusser and Jurgen Habermas. It has led to the emergence of a number of distinct schools of thought such as Austro-Marxism, the Frankfurt School, Structural Marxism, Analytical Marxism and Post-Marxism.

The philosophical orientation of western Marxists implied principles which conflicted with Leninism. They relied more on councils and other forms of self management rather than the Vanguard Party.

Western Marxists identified alienation, fetishism and ideology as important issues before the working class movement. Basic texts of the second international and Soviet Marxism, treated Marxism as a universal science of history and nature. Western Marxists opposed this trend arguing that such positivist approach undermined the critical categories of subjectivity and class consciousness. Marxism according to them, was not a general science but a theory of society. Opposing positivism and crude materialism inherent in Soviet Marxism, Western Marxists aragued that Marxism was primarily a critique of Political economy. Lukacs viewed Marxism as committed to the emancipation of the working class from the rule of capital.

Western Marxism has tried to face the predicament of the revolutionary socialist movements in the west by advancing alternative explanations. The works of Antonio Gramsci has been pioneering in this regard. He drew attention to the degree to which the class system is upheld not simply by unequal economic and political power, but also by bourgeois hegemony. This consists of the spiritual and cultural supremacy of the ruling class brought about through the spread of bourgeois values and beliefs via civil society. Gramsci's analysis has drawn attention to the interaction of socialists in the sphere of civil society, ideology and popular cultures much more differently than earlier versions of Marxism suggested.

Frankfrurt school, whose leading members Theodor Adorno, Max Horkheimer, Herbert Marcuse and Habermas, attempted to recast the classical ideas of Marx while remaining faithful to certain Marxist principles. The ideas of the Frankfurt school are generally referred to as critical theory, a blend of Marxist political economy, Hegelion philosophy and Freudian psychology. They sought to reinvigorate and develop Marxism by highlighting the expansion of the state into more and more areas, growing interlocking of base and superstructure, the spread of ''culture industry'' and the development of authoritarianism. Their primary purpose was

to expose the particular social basis of apparently anonymous domination and identify the forces responsible for preventing people from attaining consciousness of themselves as subjects capable of positive action.

French Marxist Louis Althusser developed a form of structural Marxisms. According to him Marxist theory is concerned essentially with the structural analysis of social totality. The object of such analysis is to disclose the deep structure which underline and produces the visible phenomena of social life.

Analytical Marxism associated with John Elster and John Roemer, has attempted to fuse Marxism with methodological individualism. They do not believe that history is shaped by collective entities like class. They attempt to explain collective action in terms of rational calculation of individual self-interests.

3.5.3 Post-Marxism

Post-Marxism may be seen as a progressive movement away from economism and objectivism towards a greater emphasis on context, politics and hegemony. It is an attempt to salvage certain key Marxist insights by attempting to reconcile Marxism with aspects of post-modernism and post-structuralism. Ernesto Laclau and Chantal Mouffe contended that the priority traditionally accorded to social class and the central position of the working class in bringing about social change is no longer sustainable. The advent of new social movements is seen as evidence of the fact that power in contemporary societies is increasingly dispersed and fragmented. The new social movements offer new and rival centres of power. The class based politics has been replaced by a new politics based on democratic pluralism.

3.6   Critique of Marxism

Marxism has changed out of all recognition in the last few decades. Marxism has been questioned not only by critics but also by Marxists.

Critics argue that it has simplified the class division of society into two classes- owning class and the workers. This is far from the reality. Society is very complex and is divided into numerous groups. There is no clear cut division of classes as envisaged by classical Marxism. Marx's prediction that with the development of capitalism middle class would disappear and merge with the proletariat did not

come true. In reality middle class has been strengthened both in size and position. The condition of the working class has not deteriorated as predicted by Marx.

Marx predicted that the inherent contradictions of capitalism would ultimately lead to its destruction. This again has not been corroborated by facts. Indeed capitalism has shown tremendous capacity for adaptation.

Similarly Marx's argument that proletarian revolution would occur only in advanced capitalist societies has been proved false. In fact, revolution did take place in undeveloped societies of Russia and China.

One of the major reason for the theoretical critique of Marxism is that economism, determinism and structuralism did not offer a convincing explanation of economic. Social and political developments in contemporary societies. Economism emphasizes that economic relations determine social and political relations and thus, focuses on structural explanation, allowing very little space for agency. Empirical analysis indicated that economic relations of production did not determine culture and ideology or the form of the state. Developed capitalist countries at similar stage of economic development have different more or less democratic or authoritarian from of state. Examination of the politics of capitalist states showed that policy decisions did not always advance the interests of the owner of capital. States clearly have autonomy. Marxists have aimed to theorise that autonomy by developing the concept of relative autonomy of the state and by dropping determinacy altogether.

Some claim that Marxism is dead. The collapse of communism, the triumph of capitalism. New Right ideology and post-modernism have all been credited for the death of Marxism. There is no doubt that Marxism is in crisis. At the some time it is a living theoretical tradition. One cannot find all truth in the works of Karl Marx writing some hundred fifty years ago. It is a rich tradition and has undergone substantial change as it has struggled to reject economism, determinism and structuralism. It focuses upon the problems of capitalism and upon structured inequality which is the key feature of modern society at both the national and international level. It has great utility as a critical analytical framework and the collapse of communism and the changes that have occurred in capitalist society have revitalized rather than diminished its role.

3.7   Conclusion

Marxism is a living theoretical tradition one can not find all truth in Marx's writings, but Marxism is a rich tradition which has undergone substantial change as it has struggled to reject economism detorminism and structuralism. At the

some time Marxism is a broad tradition. In face, we no longer have Marxism but Marxisms. Different authors acknowledge their debt to the Marxist tradities, and use that tradition in significantly different ways.

3.8   Summing Up

● Karl Marx laid the theoretical foundations of scientific socialism. Lenin and Mao modelled their respective societies by adapting the principles of Marxist theory to the conditions prevailing in their countries. In the process of doing so, they have enriched the Marxist theory and practice by adding new dimension and by offering diverse interpretations to the original Marxian formulations.

● Western Marxist, while differing with each other in matters of detail, share some common elements in their formulations. They underplay the Marxian doctrine of historical materialism, where the ecomomic base deternines the super structure. In stead, they emphasize the role of human consciousness, will and culture. For them mere existence of the proletariat is not enough for a revolution to occur. They must develop the necessary revolutionary consciousness. They maintain that ruling classes are able to secure their Hegemony by imposing cultural norms and values on the masses.

● Ultimately it is Marx's writing and the extraordinary richness of his conceptions of social and economic change which has provided inspiration for generations of Marxist intellectuals. Few would claim that Marxism has all the answers to the problems confronting contemporary societies. In many areas it has been found inadequate. But there is a legacy of critical social theory and analysis which remains a key resource for contemporary social scientists.

3.9   Pobable Questions

Essay Type Questions:

1. What is Marxism? Discuss its various sources.
2. What is Western Marxism? Examine its contribution to the Marxist theory.
3. Evaluate Marxism and examine its contemporary relevance.

Short Questions:

1. Explain the meaning of dialectical materialism.
2. Critically examine Marx's theory of historical materialism.
3. Discuss Mao's contribution to the development of Marxism.
4. What is surplus value?
5. Explain the concept of class struggle.
6. Write a short note on communism.

Objective Questions:

1. What is surplus value?
2. What is meant by mode of production?
3. What is the central contribution of Lenin to Marxism?

3.10 Further Reading

1. Avineri S. *The social and political thought of K. Marx.* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1968)
2. Kolakowski, Leszek, *Main Currents of Marxism*, 3 Vols. (Oxford: OxfordUniversity Press. 1978)
3. Mclellan, David. *Marxism After Marx.* (London: Maclillan. 1974)
4. Bottomore, Tom et al (eds) A Dictionary of Marxist Thought. (Oxford: Basil Blackwell 1987)

Unit-4 □ Anarchist Theory

Structure

4.0 Objective

This unit introduces learners to the anarchist tradition. After going through this unit they will be able to understand and explain the following:

- Nature of anarchist theory;
- Origin and development of anarchism;
- Core elements of anarchism;
- Different strands of anarchist tradition; and
- Anarchist macthods.

4.1 Introduction

It is difficult to explain anarchism precisely. Some scholars have raised doubt about the possibility of providing a satisfactory definition of anarchism. This is because of the impossibility of identifying common features from among the different versions of anarchism. Even though some relatively stable principles

may be identified from different accounts of anarchism, commentators differ in their opinion as to which are the core ones. Besides, the term anarchism has often been used in a nagative sense. It was initially used to imply breakdown of civilized order. In popular preception it is equated with chaos and disorder. Sometimes its opponents deliberately associate it with any number of social ills to discredit it.

Anarchists, however, vehemently contest such associations. It was after the publication of Pierre Joseph Proudhon's book What is Property? that the word anarchism came to be associated with a positive set of political ideas. Anarchists propagate the idea of abolition of government and law in the belief that a more natural and spontaneous social order will emerge. Similarly the attempt to link anarchism with violence is simply misrepresentation of the ideology. Most anarchists believe that violence is counter productive and unacceptable.

4.2 Origin and Development

Although anarchist pronciples were first systematically stated in the late eighteenth century in William Godwin's book Enquiry Concerning Political Justice, the roots of anarchist ideas had their roots in the distant past. The stoic philosophers of ancient Greece expressed doubts about the efficacy of political institutions and favoured creation of a social condition in which men will act freely in response to the natural instinct of sociability and justice. In the medieval age some religious sects advocated that professing and practicing christian ideas and values were adequate to the task of maintaining a free and fair civil life. In the 16th and 17th century anti-monarchists propagated the idea of free individual. In 18th century England the Levellers and Diggers interpreted the law of nature as endowing human individuals with innate and inalienable rights which legal and political institutions protect. In France the physiocrats belived in a natural order of society. Economic individualism reflected in the works of Adam Smith and socialist theory regarding exploitation of the workers in modern society significantly influenced anarchist thinking about man and society.

The word anarchism came into vogue during the French Revolution when there was practically no authority to enforce rules and regulations and the people had no faith in the existing legal system. The term anarchism was used to explain this situation.

Willam Godwin in his Enquiry Concerning Political Justice gave classic statement of anarchist principles. He opposed both political authority and the institution of private property. He argued that state power corrupts and misleads people. Pierre Joseph Proudhon described property as theft and maintained that state

originated from the need to protect private property. According to him, political authority is an enemy of justice and reason.

Russian anarchists Michael Bakunin and Peter Kropotkin contributed significantly to the development of anarchist theory. Bakunin's anarchism was based on a belief in human sociability, which is expressed in the desire for freedom within a community of equals. He propounded a view of free individuals which put him at odds with Karl Marx and his followers.

Kropotkin's anarchism was based upon a theory of evolution. Mutual aid, he argued, is the principal means of human development and this constitutes the empirical basis for both anarchism and communism. State for him, is a coercive institution and need to be replaced by a web of freely functioning groups.

Russian novelist Tolstoy gave a new dimension to anarchist thinking by emphasizing the principles of non-violence and pacifism. In his writings he developed the image of a corrupt and false modern civilization. He believed that salvation could be attained by living according to religious principles and returning to a simple rural life.

In the early 20th century anarchism became a genuine mass movement in Europe and Latin America. However, the growth of authoritarianism and political repression associated with it gradually undermined anarchism in both the continent. The influence of anarchism also subsided with success of Bolshevik revolution in Russia and the growing prestige of communism within the revolutionary movements.

4.3   Core elements of Anarchism

Anarchist thinkers have stated the theory in their own way which have created a lot of confusion. Its supporters have drawn upon elements from different political traditions. It has been regarded as a conjoining of liberal individualism with socialist egalitarianism. There are a number of different formations of anarchism and commentators argue that there are no common features ascribed to anarchism. However, anarchist thinkers share certain broad pronciples which constitute the core elements of the theory. Andrew Heywood identifies four core elements of anarchism. These are: anti-statism, natural order anti-clericalism and economic freedom.

Anti-Statism

Anarchism regards the state as undesirable, unnecessary and harmful. Hostility to the state is shared by all anarchist thinkers. The state is without any natural

or historical justification and it is opposed to man's natural cooperative instinct. They argue that state authority is based upon political inequality and it enslaves, oppresses and limits human life. It is based upon compulsion, fear, egoism and exclusion.

Anarchists argue that government and law represent negative and destructive forces. Law can control every sphere of individual life and thereby prevent the development of individuality. According to US anarchist Emma Goldman government is symbolized by the gun, the handcuff or the prison. For the anarchists, state is in effect a concentrated form of evil.

Natural Order

Anarchists in general support the view that human beings are essentially rational. They believe that people are naturally inclined to organize their lives in a peaceful and harmonious fashion. Anarchists of all shades believe in the natural goodness of the mankind. They maintain that social order arises naturally and spontaneously and this makes machinery of law and order unnecessary.

However, anarchist thinkers acknowledge that human beings could be selfish and competitive as well as sociable and cooperative depending on the social, political and economic circumstances within which they live.

Anti-Clericalism

Hostility to the organised religion constitues third core element of anarchism. The Church obliges poor persons to reconcile their lot with a system which brings them sorrow and degradation. Anarchists argue that emancipation of the human being demands rejection of christianity. Religion and political authority often work in unision. Religion, they maintain, is one of the pillars of the state. Moreover, religion seeks to establish a code of acceptable behaviour and in the process destroys moral autonomy of the individual and their capacity to make independent judgement.

Despite their hostile attitude to the organised religion anarchists profess a positive view of the religious impulse. They have utopian faith in the unlimited possibility of development of the human self and in the unity of all living things.

Economic Freedom

Anarchists are united in their disapproval of the prevailing capitalist system. They are highly critical of managed capitalism of the post war era. State intervantion in the name of giving capitalism a human face, actually strengthens the system of class exploitation. They vehemently oppose Soviet style state socialism and planned

economy. Individualist anarchists argue that planned economy violates property rights and individual freedom. For the collectivist anarchists state socialism is self contradictory in the sense that state itself becomes the source of exploitation replacing the capitalist class. Anarchists prefer an economy in which individuals freely manage their own affairs without state regulation.

4.4 Different versions of Anarchism

There are a number of different versions of anarchism. The most important of these are individualist anarchism and collectivist anarchism.

4.4.1 Individualist Anarchism

There are many different types of individualist anarchism. Philosophical anarchism of Willian Godwin captures many of the core features of classical liberalism. It prefers absolute prohibition of coercion in order to protect the negative rights of the individual, Consensual agreements among individuals is the only legitimate basis of human interaction. Willam Godwin developed an extreme form of liberal rationalism. According to him, human beings are essentially rational creatures. Education and enligntened judgement propel them to live in accordance with truth and universal moral law. Unlike liberals, individualist anarchists regard constitutionalism and democracy as simply facade to hide political oppression.

Max Stirner developed an extreme form of individualist anarchism on the basis of his idea of sovereign individual. The individual should act as he or she chooses ignoring law, conventions, religious or moral principles.

Liberatarians like David Thoreau, Benjamin Tucker and Joseph Warren took individualist argument to a new height. Thoreau argued that government is an impediment to establish spiritual truth and self-reliance. According to him, individual should follow only the dictates of his/her conscience. For him demands of political obligation is secondary to the dictates of individual conscience.

Benjamin Tucker believed that autonomous individuals could live and work together in peace through a system of market exchange. Warren claimed that individual right to property is supreme. However, they are forced to work with others to take advantage of division of labour. He believed that this could be achieved by developing a system of labour for labour exchange. Tucker claimed that genuine anarchism is consistant with free market, free trade principles. Free working of the market forces will make government and law unnecessary.

Another variant of individualist anarchism is anarcho capitalism. Its proponents vehemently oppose state intervention in the economy. Robert Nozick, a right wing libertarian, argued for a minimal state, whose principal function is to protect individual rights. Ayn Rand, Murray Rothbard and David Friedman pushed further free market ideas. They argued that market can replace government and satisfy all human needs. The main target of anarcho, capitalist attack is state legislation that restricts self-ownership such as imposition of minimum health and safety regulations, paternalistic prohibition of drug, alcohol and tobacco, compulsory wearing of seatbelts or violating property rights by destructive welfare policies.

4.4.2 Collectivist Anarchism

Collectivist anarchism, some times called social anarchism, is identified by its emphasis on human capacity to work together for common good. Because of their social and cooperative character natural and proper relationship among human beings is one of sympathy, affection and harmony. This makes government regulation unnecessary. Thus, collectivist anarchists reject state and state like bodies. For them state is a political form of hierachical institution which makes social solidarity impossible. State primarily functions to support property relations that support economic inequality maintained by a coercive apparatus.

The main form of social anarchism are anarchist communism and anarcho syndicalism. Anarchist communism is historically associated with Errico Malatesta and Kropotkin. It is based on the optimistic belief about the human capacity for cooperation. Anarcho communists argue that social wealth created through human cooperation should be owned in common by the community rather than by any single individual. Private property is, in effect, the exploitation of workers by employers who merely own it. Kropotkin sought to provide a scientific basis for social solidarity by re-examining Darwin's theory of evolution. He had a strong belief in the importance of the cooperative and altruistic features of human personality. He argued in his book Mutual Aid that cooperation is a vital force inhuman evolution which turns not upon competition and survival of the fittest.

Anarcho communists believed that true communism demands abolition of the state. Kropotkin argued in terms of the abolition of the state and its replacement by a decentralized network of small self-sufficient communities based upon voluntary agreements.

Anarcho syndicalism is most often associated with Emile Pouget, Rocker and Lucy Parsons. In the recent era Noam Chomsky is perhaps the most famous

advocate of anarcho syndicalism. Syndicalist ideas are an attempt to revise Marxism in the light of new experience gained from growing labour movement in Europe in late 19th and early 20th century. Anarcho Syndicalists developed the vision of stateless and classless society with the trade union as its base. They saw trade union or the syndicate as the foundation for a decentralized non-hierarchical society of the future. For them fierce class struggle is the technique of social change. General strike, sabotage and other kinds of direct action are the revolutionary instruments to exert working class power.

The application of anarchist principles to the different contexts of oppression produces distinct forms of anarchism such as anarcho faminism, black anarchism and environmental anarchism. Anarcho-feminists seek new ways to identify, examine and confront male domination. Black anarchists seek structures that allow them to develop their own froms where they can share their experiences and meet as people from oppressed backgrounds. Such anarchist groups give priority to agents based on ethnicity rather than class. Environmental anarchists recognise the artificiality of the border of nation states and identify human subject as a part of, rather than separate from, the biosphere. They regard environmental problem as a product of oppressive human interaction.

4.5   Assessment

Critics argue that anarchist ideas are mostly unrealistic. Anarchists put emphasis on the natural inclination of individuals for cooperation and harmony completely ignoring their self seeking and competitive impulses. They display immense faith in innate human rationality. But psychological research suggests that irrational forces are important determinants of human behaviour.

Second, anarchist description of the state as a coercive institution is grossly exaggerated. It completely ignores the role of the state as the engine of development and provider of important welfare services.

Third, anarchist idea of future stateless society with peace, harmony and unbounded individual freedom is a distant dream. It is viewed as the weakest aspect of anarchist theory. Liberty by its nature is limited. There must be restrictions on the liberty of each to ensure liberty for all.

Fourth, critics argue that there is some truth in anarchist criticism of the present state of affairs in which there is misery, suffering and unemployment, but they advocate methods which are destructive. In this they suggest a remedy worse than the disease.

However, anarchist theory has certain positive aspects as well. Amarchist thinkers have drawn attention to the dangers of growing power of the state. They have shown how modern state controls every aspect of individual life in the guise of democracy. They have rightly underscore the need for decentralization to check overgrowth of state power. Infact, in the contemporary increasingly complex and fragmented world anarchism with its emphasis on equality, participation and decentralization may be better equipped to respond to the challenges facing humanity.

4.6   Summing Up

Anarchism challenges the conventional belief that law, government and the state are either useful or indispensable. The central idea underlying anarchism is the belief that political authority in all its forms is both evil and unnecessary. Anarchists ideal for a stateless society in which free individuals manage their own affairs through, voluntary cooperation has been developed on the basis of two rival traditions: liberalism and socialism while an archist idal has been criticised for being unrealistic, it has certain positive aspects as well. Anarchist thinkers have drawn attention to the growing power of the state and emphasived the need for decentralization to check growing state power.

4.7   Summing Up

- Anarchist ideal has been developed on the basis of two rival traditions: liberalism and socialism. Thus anarchism can be thought of as a point of intersection between liberalism and socialism.

- Anarchists are uncompromising in rejecting all institutions of political control. Like the communists the anarchists are vehement critics of the institution of private property. They hold that private property by its very nature is an offence against justice. They are bitter critics of religion. Religion, they claim, supports servitude and inequality.

- The anarchists believe that the law of organic evolution is primarily a law of natural aid, not of conflict. Their ideal is a free society from which the coercive elements will disappear. The anarchist society will be based on purely voluntary cooperation.

- Two major anarchist tradition may be identified; one of which is individualist and the other is collectivist. Individual anarchists support

the market and private property, while collectivist anarchists advocate an economy based upon cooperation and collective ownership.

4.8 Pobable Questions

Essay Type Questions:
1. Discuss the core elements of anarchist theory.
2. Discuss the basic arguments of the individualist anarchists.
3. Evaluate anarchism as a distinct theoretical tradition.

Short Questions:
1. Explain the anarchist attitude to the state.
2. Examine the anarchist concept of natural order.
3. Write a short note on anarchist view of individual liberty.
4. Write an essay on collectivist anarchism.

Objective Questions:
1. Why do the anarchists oppose private property?
2. How do the anarchists view religion?
3. What do you consititute the key element of anarchism?

4.9 Further Reading

1. Heywood Andrew, *Political Ideologies, An Introduction*. (Palgrave, Macmillan, Basingstoke, 3rd ed. 2003)
2. Franks, Benjamin. "Anarchists" in Michael Freeden et al (eds) *The Oxford Handbook of Political Ideologies*. (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2013)
3. Marshall, P., *Demanding the Impossible: A History of Anarchism*. (London: Fontana, 1993)

Unit-5 □ Conservative TheoryStructure

Structure

5.0   Objective

After reading this unit learners will be able to understand.

- Multiple use of the term conservatism
- Meaning of conservatism
- Some general features of conservatism
- Different versions of conservatism

5.1   Introduction

Conservative ideas emerged in response to the rapid pace of social, political and economic change ushered in by the French Revolution. It is generally viewed

as an ideology of status quo and an attempt to prevent change. However, theorizing about conservative ideology is no easy task. This is because it has assumed different meaning in different historical contexts. Thus, in the 19th century conservatives entertained a hierarchical and inegalitarian social structure, before the first world war some of them defended the older liberal tradition of atomistic individualism and a free market, and in the 1950s conservatives appeared reconciled to the redistributive welfare state.

Conservative thought has varied considerably as it has adapted itself to the existing traditions and national cultures. In spite of all historical variations it is possible to identify the basic principles on which conservatism is based. According to Clinton Rossiter, these principles are: (i) The existence of a universal moral order sanctioned and supported by organised religion. (ii) belief in the imperfect nature of men and their selfishnes and greed for power; (iii) the natural inequality of men; (iv) the necessity of gradations of social status and position; (v) the primary role of private property in ensuring security and liberty of the individual; (vi) the uncertainty of progress; (vii) the need for a ruling and serving bureaucracy; (viii) respect for tradition, established customs and institutions; (ix) possibility of tyranny of the majority and the consequent need for diffusing, limiting and balancing political power.

5.2 Meaning of Conservatism

The term conservatism convey different meanings. It may refer to a person with a moderate and cautious behaviour, or a lifestyle that is conventional, even conformist, or fear of change. It is sometimes dismissed as an anti-ideology inspired by self-interest and fear of change with no coherent alternative of its won to offer. In this sense conservatism is a negative philosophy which preaches resistance to change. Itis thus a political attitude rather than an ideology.

For Samuel Huntington, conservatism is a positional ideology, lacking both an intellectual tradition and substanive ideals. In Michael Oakeshott's formulation, conservatism prefers familiar to the unknown, tried to the untried, fact to the mystery, the actual to the possible, the limited to the unbounds, the near to the distant, the sufficient to the super abundant and the convenient to the perfect. In this sense conservatism is a psychological mood.

Infact, conservatism is more than an attitude of mind, or an approach to life or a natural disposition of human mind. According to Andrew Heyhood, conservatism is neither simple pragmatism nor mere opportunism. It is based upon a particular setof political beliefs about man and the society in which they live in and the importance of a specific set of political values. Hence, like liberalism and socialism,it should rightfully be described as an ideology.

5.3 Features of Conservatism

The desire to conserve is the underlying theme of conservative ideology though it is not the sole objective which conservatives of all shades entertain. The characteristic features of conservatism as evolved over time can be identified in a following manner.

First, conservatism is not an ideology of the status auo. It is not merely an attenpt to prevent change and to arrest historical process. On the contrary. It is an ideology fundamentally concerned with the problem of change. It does not seek to eliminate change, but to make it safe. Conservatives identify desirable change as growth and 'natural'. They advocate only that change which is respective of the past and safe. History as organic growth makes change acceptable because its pace does not exceed the ability of people to adjust to it and it does not appear to be instituted by human planning. In fact, conservatives try to set limits to the scope of political action. They advocate limited politics against a belief in the desirability of radical political and social change.

Second, conservatives believe in the extra-human origin of the social order. It is independednt of the human will. The search for harmony, equilibrium and order has adopted many forms-God, history, biology and science have served as extra-human factor of the social order. In the 19th century. Conservatives saw stability as a function of natural order, or hierarchy. In the early part of the 20th century their main concern was to identify immutable psychological principles of human nature which justifies property ownership as expressions of human worth. In the era of welfare statism and thereafter the appeal has been to scientific economic laws endowed with universal validity.

The belief in the extra human origin of society has prompted conservatives to reject the concept of individual with free will and purpose. Conservatives question

the rationality of artificial human design and planning. This amounts to marginalize the role of politics understood as a deliberate and purposive human activity. Roger Scruton has interpreted this marginalization of politics as "Political Scepticism".

Third, conservatism is an ideology that attains self awareness when exposed by its ideological opponents. It reacts to them in looking glass manner. Karl Mannheim regarded conservatism as a counter movement and this fact makes it reflective.

Much conservative theorising has developed in response to the spread of core liberal concepts of rationality, individuality, liberty and responsible power. Conservatives reject liberal concept of rationality because of its overcritical attitude. Rationality asserts the sovereignty of the individual. In the name of abstract logic it challenges existing authority. It holds out the hope that human will can refashion history in whatever ways human ideals may require. All these run counter to the conservative belief. They marginalize the liberal concept of rationality and individuality in the name of order, stability and continuity.

Likewise they dismiss the idea of human perfectibility. They base their theories on the belief that human beings are both imperfect and unperfectible. Citing French and Russian Revolution they argued against any attempt to reorganize society. History provides no clue to the future. History is not patterned. It is not a repository of grand law of motion. Rather, it is a repository of sensible rules of practice.

All these conservative beliefs and values have been fashioned out of reactions to progressive ideological concepts.

Fourth, the intellectual development of conservatism lies in the fact that the most recent antagonist dictates the form and tempo of its response. Its perceived enemies change contingently over time. Classical liberals, welfare liberals, socialists, fascists, communists whenever any ideological configuration is viewed as the most menacing source of externally induced change, conservatives came up with response which they believed to be most effective conceptual strategy. Thus, in the face of liberal appeal to individual rights and egalitarianism conservatives insisted on the virtues of paternalism and responsibility. Towards the end of the 19th century conservatives attacked liberal and socialist welfare policies by highlighting the importance of private property rights as anchor of the social order and reaffirmed the importance of traditional institutions as protectors of the nation against unprecedented social upheaval.

5.4   Different versions of Conservatism

The unifying theme of all shades of conservatives is to set limits to the scope of political action by identifying the ineradicable sources of tension at the heart of the human situation. However, diffent conservative thinkers have theorised the ideas of limit and tension in so different ways that they have given rise to incompatible version of conservative ideology Noel o'sullivan has divided them into four schools: the reactionary, the radical, the moderate and new right schools.

5.4.1. The Reactionary School

The reactionary school is known for its outright rejection of modern radical and progressive thought. It is nostalgic about a pre-revolutionary golden age. Reactionary conservatives contended that no society can survive unless its political institutions are based on unified religious and moral values. Modern secular democracy inevitably destroy spiritual control by encouraging diversity of self-expression. This undoubtedly makes way for the emergence of some collosal tyrant. This possibility cannot be averted by the liberal tactics of granting more liberty, rights and new constitution Religious reaction is the only hope in this situation. Radical argument that man can abandon religion and pursue happiness through creative activities, has created a spiritual void in modern democracies.

Extending the critique of modern democracy reactionary conservative thinkers argue that linking modern democracy with capitalism legitimates a ruthles ethic of self seeking and thereby makes it difficult to achieve a consensus on fundamental values. It is argued that self-seeking ethic has replaced the old form of oppression by an aristocracy with oppression by a new business plutocracy. Egalitarian ideal of modern democracy has made it impossible to transmit a common cultural heritage to each new generation, which in turn has created spiritual rootlessness. T.S. Eliot described modern mass democracy as a 'waste land'.

The reactionary critique of modern democracy is inspired by an essentially utopian vision of a perfectly harmonious hierarchical society. When this vision proves to be unattainable, their immediate response is to attribute its failure to conspirators, to demonise some groups or other.

The condemnation of democratic modernity has led to their marginalisation in politics. They have responded to this situation either by advocating extra constitutional

methods for overthrowing established order or by joining a revolutionary political party better placed to overthrow established order or by compromising with modern democracy by adopting a charismatic concept of leadership, capable of uniting the people in the face of divisive impact of representative institutions, or by abandoning politics altogether and confining them to purely private activities.

5.4.2 Radical Conservatism

Radical conservatives profess completely different view of democratic modernity. Its members insist that to remain relevant conservatism must embrace democratic modernity positively. This can most successfully be done by mobilising the masses in suport of a leader who rejects both liberal and socialist strategy in favour of an idelogy which combines nationalism with socialism in a synthesis intended to integrate the whole population.

Radical conservative thinkers were associated with Nazism in the inter war period. In the post war era they tried to make conservative school more respectable by adopting three intellectual strategies. First was the rejection of the leader principle in its individualised form. The second was rejection of nationalist doctrine in favour of a supranational idea of European unity. Third strategy was rejection of extra constitutional political methods in favour of the gradualist programme of mass political education.

5.4.3 Moderate Conservatism

Moderate conservatism is characterised by support for a liberal idea of a limited state ruled by law, with representative institutions and constitutional checks on executive power. However, they reject abstract rationalist concepts used by liberals. The, moderate conservatives interpret their concept of limit in different ways.

For Edmund Burke, the source of moderation is divinely ordained structure of the universe. He belived that society was shaped by natural law and this was reflected in the balanced constitution of Britain. The reason for British sucess is that British people have rejected abstract political ideal in favour of a constitutional polity working after the pattern of nature. If the human beings tamper with natural law, they are challenging the will of god and as a result they are likely to make human affairs worse rather than better. Burke did not advocate blind resistance to change, but rather a prudent willingness to change in order to conserve. He opposed any attempt to recast politics in accordance with abstract principles such as liberty,

equality and fraternity. According to him, wisdom resides largely in experience, tradition and history. Burkean conservatism is characterised by caution, moderation and pragmatism.

The commitment of the moderate conservatives to the ideal of the limited state has proved difficult to defend because of its link to an organic vision of society. Conservatives have traditionally thought of society as an organism. An organic society is fashioned by natural necessity. Society has a natural tendency towards harmony provided it remains under the guidance of what Burke called 'natural aristocracy'.

Coleridge, however, has shown greater realism by insisting that organic view of society would only be plausible if it takes account of the demand for political reform arising from the spread of the democratic sentiment and disruptive effects of the industrial revolution on social orders. He maintained that in the changed situation organic social order could only be achieved if the state adopted a far more interventionist role than Burke had envisaged. He also emphasized the need for restructuring the state in a way that allowed a shift of political power away from the aristocratic leadership towards the newly influential middle class. Similar sentiment was expressed in Carlyle's proposal for abolishing parliamentary government and promoting instead charismatic style of leadership to bridge the gap between the nation's institutions and its spiritual values. This could be done by articulating the unstated demands of the people.

Disraeli advocated moderate revision of the organic view of society and it proved much more influential. Like Burke, he believed that no society is safe unless there is a public recognition of the providential government of the world. He expressed the fear that growing industrialisation and economic inequality would divide Britain into two nations: the rich and the poor. This could only be averted by reducing hours of labour and humanising the working conditions of the labour. He supported the need for a more interventionist state and extending the suffrage beyond the middle class.

Disraeli emphasised the organic conservative belief that society is held together by an acceptance of duty and obligations. The rich must bear the burden of social responsibility. They have a responsibility for the poor. Similarly the ruler has a parental responsibility for the nation. Disraeli's ideas had considerable impact upon conservatism and in England these ideas provided the basis of what is called one nation conservatism.

In the 1960s in UK conservatives put emphasis on the need for a 'middle way' between the extremes of laissez-faire liberalism and socialism. This idea was most clearly expressed in Harold Macmillan's book 'The Middle Way'. Macmillan advocated planned capitalism which combines state ownership or regulation of certain aspects of the ecomomy with the drive and initiative of private enterprise. The purpose of paternalistic conservatism is to consolidate hierarchy rather than to remove it.

In Continental Europe the so called middle way took the form of a social market economy. This is best expressed in the christian democratic ideal which combines socialist sympathies with a rejection of secular human culture and a conservative stress on authority and traditional institutions like the family and the church.

5.4.4 New Right Conservatism

During the 1970s growing state power, rising inflation, increasing welfare dependency, family breakdown led to the development of a set of more radical ideas within conservatism, known as new right conservatism. This is not an intellectually homogeneous movement. O'sullivan identifies three conflicting responses to the breakdown of the social democratic consensus.

The first response consists in the reformulation of the organic position. This is known as neo-conservatism. The principal concerns of the neo-conservatives are law and order, public morality and national identity. Roger Scruton, Irving Kristol, Russel Kirk are the leading theorists of this kind. They believe that decline of authority has led to rising crime, delinquence and anti-social behaviour in the western societies. The situation can only be dealt with by strengthening authority relationships in the family, school and larger society. They expressed concern over the fall of moral and social standard that was underminig cohesion of society.

Neo Conservatives want to strengthen national identity in the face of threats from within and without. They want to restore national sentiment which is weakened by the growth of multi culturalism and cultural diversity. For Roger Scruton a shared sense of national identity is the only possible bond for modern European states, all of which are societies of strangers. According to him, restoring national loyalty will unite religion and culture in a way that will give concrete loyalty to the Burkean contract between the living, the dead, and the unborn.

The second response of new right conservatism was based on defending the free market. F. A. Hayek was the most influential advocate of this version. He argued that there can be no middle way conpromise between outright collectivism and the free market. He pointed to the inefficency of a centrally planned ecomomy. It is not possible to collect knowledge of the entire economic resources. In reality practical knowledge is necessarily dispersed throughout society and can only be coordinated by the market. Hayek put emphasis on custom and tradition, rather than planning as the principal force integrating the social order.

The third response is the attempt to deal with the breakdown of the social democratic consensus by reviving the ideal of civil association. The essence of this ideal is to construct a form of political solidarity that depends only on the mutual recognition of civilized men and women. In a state of this kind different religious and cultural groups are at liberty to profess and practice their values without disturbing common peace. The government is only concerned with the limited task of securing peace to create the possibility of a civilisation. Michael Oakeshott is its most impressive philosophical proponent.

5.5 Evaluation

Conservatism is too broad and has become too vague an ideology. Reactionary conservatives desires to pull the clock back is that it pursues a romantic vision of a social order that prevents any compromise with the realities of social order.

Radical conservative's faith in a politically unaccountable national leader makes it unpopular in societies which have a strong democratic culture. Although radical conservatism claims to be a movement of national unification, in practice it offers no protection against a slide into totalitarian dictatorship.

Similarly Burke's ambitions attempt to provide a theological ground for moderate conservatism entails a dogmatic claim to knowledge about God's plan for mankind. It also makes dogmatic claim that social and political hierarchy is divinely ordained.

Critics argue that theoretical foundations of conservatism is not convincing. The very concept of sacred body of customs and traditions is historically unfounded. The use of organic metaphor for understanding society denies creative role of the individual in relation to his circumstances.

5.6   Conclusion

Conservatism is an ideology of conservation. It developed as a reaction against the growing pace of social, political and economic changes ashered in by the French Revolution. It is fundamentally concerned with change, conservatism, like liberalism and socialism has different versions, partly because conservatives often disagree with each other about the particular arrangements that ought to be conserved. Conservatism is characterised by support for tradition, order, duty, authority, persimism about human perfectibility and the eradication of evil.

5.7   Summing Up

- Conservatism is an ideology of conservation. It developed essentially as a reaction against the growing pace of political and economic changes in the west. It is fundamentally concerned with the problem of change. As a philosophy it defends the values of tradition, hierarchy and order. Conservatism is characterized by support for tradition, order, duty, authority and property. Conservatives have traditionally put emphasis on the limitations of human rationality. Rejecting abstract principles they highlight the importance of experience, history and pragmatism.

- Conservatives do not have optimistic belief in the ability of political action to transform society into a rationally grounded order. However, they have theorised the ideas of limits of political action in different ways giving riseto different versions of conservative ideology: reactionary, the radical, moderate and the new right schools.

- Reactionary coservatives reject any idea of reform. They contend that no society can survive unless its political institutions are based on consensus on fundamental religious and moral values. Radical conservatives reject both liberal commitment to parliamentary institution and socialist emphasis on class conflict. They favour an ideology which would integrate the whole population. Moderate conservatism is more cautious and more flexible. It is characterised by the belief in 'change in order to conserve'. New Right comservatism is radically anti statist and anti paternalist drawing heavily from classical liberal themes and values.

5.8 Pobable Questions

Essay Type Questions:

1. What is new right conservatism? Explain its nature and characteristics.
2. Discuss the nature and characteristics of moderate conservatism.
3. Evaluate conservatism as a distinct theoretical tradition.

Short Questions:

1. Discuss the characteristics of conservatism.
2. Examine the basic arguments of the reactionary conservatives.
3. Examine the core elements of conservatism.
4. Explain the meaning of conservatism.
5. What are the basic principles of conservatisms.
6. Write a short note on neoconservatism.

Objective Questions:

1. What is the underlying these of the conservative ideology?
2. Why do you conservatives reject liberal concept of rationality?
3. What are the principal concerns of the neo-conservaties?

5.9 Further Reading

1. Scruton, *R., The meaning of conservatism*. (Basingstoke: Macmillan, 2001)

2. O' Sullivan, Conservatism, in Michael Freeden et al (eds), *The Oxford Handbook of Political Ideologies*. (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2013)

3. Freeden Michael, *Idcologies and Political Theory; A conceptual Approach Oxford:* Oxford University Press, 1996)

4. Heywood, Andrew, *Political Ideologies, An introduction*. (Palgrave, Macmillan, Basingstoke, 3rd ed. 2003)

MODULE-2

Unit-6 □ Approaches to Political Theory: Normative Approach and Historical Approach

Structure

6.0 Objective

After studying the materials of this unit the learners will understand

- the difference between approach and method,
- the characteristics and limitations of normative approach,
- the characteristics and limitations of historical approach.

6.1 Introduction

Political Science deals with an infinite number of political phenomena. These phenomena appear to have varied meanings, dimensions and implications. Persons with different persuations and perspectives look at them differently, think of them differently, understand them differently and explain or analyse them differently and

hardly there lies any substantial unity of outlook while taking those phenomena for understanding, explanation and analysis. What it indicates indeed is that there areseveral attitudes and approaches to understand and explain political phenomena and on the basis of inner trends and characteristics of each of these attitudes and approaches political narratives and counter-narratives have primarily grown. When the primary political narratives and counter-narratives get logically ordered and systematized, they give birth to political theories.

This foregoing introduction leads us to state that there are various approaches in the domain of political science. By approach in particular, we mean, in the words of Vernon van Dyke, the criteria to employ in selecting the questions to ask and the data to consider relevant in political enquiry. Approach, in fact, denotes the scientific way of studying a subject. The term 'approach' contains a wider implication than 'method' does. In his Political Ideas and Ideologies, O. P. Gauba writes that method may be defined as a systematic study of the procedure of inquiry by which reliable knowledge could be obtained and reliable conclusions could be drawn. On the other hand, approach is a wider term which comprehends not only method, but also the focus of our study in order to understand the given phenomenon.

In political science, the political analysts use to accept and follow a criterion or a set of criteria for the purpose of understanding and explanation of political questions or political issues. In this sphere of politics and political science, the same issues or the same political questions are differently viewed and differently explained as different viewers or scholars have their own perspectives or standpoints and particular focus of attention from which they approach to do so. So there arises a variety of approaches to the study of political phemomena as there remains a variety of standards governing the inclusion and exclusion of questions and data in political inquiry. Standard of values or inclinations to values are inherent in each of the variedapproaches rife in the domain of political science. Contending standard of values or value preferences of the viewers and scholars lead to the birth of contending appoaches which are found to be employed in understanding and analysing same political events and issues simulteneously. Again, it is important to note that an approach developed and grown in a particular period of time may incorporate many new aspects and dimensions. For example, both the liberal and Marxist approaches to the study of the subject-matter of politics and political science have thus developed much over the times by means of incorporating various new concepts and thoughts grown within their respective body of knowledge.

In this unit we would discuss normative and historical approaches, which

are thought to be the components of what is called the traditional approach to the study of political science.

6.2   Normative Approach

As indicated earlier, the traditional study of politics as grown from the days of Plato is largely guided by normative approach. It is thus an old approach, but its trends are found in the political expositions of thinkers and theorists who belong even to the recent generation.

The English term 'normative' is emanated from the Latin term 'norma' which etemologically means 'principle' or standard that is preferred. From this point of view, normative approach mainly lays emphasis on principles, ideals and values. Itaims at, as Vernon van Dyke states, making a normative statement that is predominantly concerned with what 'ought to be' or 'should be'. In political inquiry, normative approach appears to avoid the questions that relate to 'what is'. Thinkers and theorists in political science are traditionally found engaged to prescribe the good and the desirable state of affaiirs in their attempt to describe and analyse the state, politics and political organizations. They are, in this realm of normative study, very much conscious in their scholarly devotion to establish norm and value in the place of norm and value they consider counter-intuitive and harmful.

In Political Science: A Philosophical Analysis, Vernon van Dyke contends that normative statements always tend to express what is considered the most preferred and desirable. They are concerned not with the practical reality but the intrinsic value aspects reflecting the ends and the purposes. The exponents belonging to this trend are more concerned with evelution of the issues, things and events that are political and try to find out the value and the moral content of the questions under their explanation and inquiry. They seek to make normative statements which express preference for building a particular order which is intended to become good, moral and ideal for the people. So the basic thinking of normative approach becomes the basis of moral priorities and it prefers good to bad. It discusses thus priorities in values.

It is important to note that the great political philosopher and political theorists from Plato, Aristotle, Thomas Acquinus, Bodin, Locke, Rousseau, Machiaveli down to Green, Mill, Hobhouse, Marx and the many of the recent times such as John Rawls, Leo starauss, Hannah Arendt, Isaiah Berlin, Michael Oakeshott, Dante Germino, John Plamenatz, Robert Nozick etc. belong to this intellectual milieu, and they all have attempted to criticize and repudiate some existing value

as enshrined in some political thought or theory and favour and establish some particular value or set of values they think beneficial for the community from their own standpoint.These great thinkers and theorists raise a few general questions in the course of their political inquiry and on the basis of their personal opinion grown out of their intuition, past experience, general doubt and scepticism, and after logically describing and analysing each of the questions, they come to moral conclusion. The political philosophers and theorists emphasizing norm and values in their respective enterprise have tried to solve the big moral problems concerning the rights and freedom of the individuals, power and legitimacy of the state, consent and obligation towards the authority, relevance and usefulness of revolution and change and etc. The answers and the solutions as advanced by or derived from these philosophers and theorists have their significant cumulative impacts as they have been the sources of enormous political literatures and discourses grown in the later days.

Normative political science contends that it is not essentially bereft of any practical dimension or practical sense. In politics, norm and values are organically present in all issues and events in reality. All political activities found either in parliament or in public protests in the streets and grounds, or in the sphere of policy formulation and policy implimentation are dictated or guided by some values to be established or reestablished. The judges in the judiciary work either to establish the constitutional values or to make new moral judgement which, in most cases, gets incorporated into the body of law. Again, in the sphere of undertaking any new research work or project in any field of knowledge, commitment to some value or purpose becomes evident, and it guides the scholar in all phases of his or her research, and the truth to which he or she reaches at the end entails some purpose for the society and the community. So politics can not avoid the relevance of values, on the contrary, it is a value or a set of values that constitutes the content and the realm of politics. It is politics that guides us to find out and accept the right and shun the wrongs. Values are part and parcel of a 'political man'. A man is 'political' because he does have values, and, on the basis of values he acquires the power and ability to differenciate good from the evil.

So it is evident from the foregoing discussion that political inquiry and political analysis of political society, processes and institutions are not possible without their respective value relevance because politics essentially embodies an ethical and conscious purpose. Plato pleads for ideal state, Mill for individual freedom, Marx for classless communist society, Gandhi for Ram Rajya and the feminists of these days for gender equality. Ethical considerations and higher social and philosophical ideals and values have been the motive force for these thinkers,

theorists and the philosophers to dip into their respective inquiry and investigation for the discovery of truth they consider true. The men in state power cannot deny the relevance of the ideals and values pronounced and emphasized by the thinkers and theorists, and they more often than not recuperate their authority from serious crisis with recourse to alternative set of values and principles different from theirs and thus sustain their existence. Sovalues and norms do not altogether reside in the realm of ideas or philosophizing of ideas. Values do have practical value.

6.2.1 Characteristics of Normative Approach

1. Normative political theory or analysis considers and justifies the political questions in the light of definite purpose, pre-determined ideal and cherised principle. It lays emphasis on good rather than evil purpose, 'ought' rather than 'ought not' question, desirable rather than undesirable state of affair, and thus considers the utility and validity of state, politics and political organizations. The purpose of normative political analysis is concerned with the normative ordering or reordering of political society and its institutions and processes so as to ensure people's prosperity both material and moral.

2. Normative political science is mainly committed to deep intellectual discussion, philosophical analysis and moral description of the great issues of politics like basis of state, equality and freedom of the individuals, political obligation, rights of the citizens, law and justice, quality of governance, etc. It is less inclined to deal with description of the factual reality of politics.

3. Normative political science is subjective by nature and for this matter, as many argue, it is more akin and related to philosophy than science. The thinkers and theorists belonging to this normative trend depend on their intuition and sequential logic and counter-logic and reach broad statement relating to any particular course of action rationally considered suitable to any particular time, space and circumstances.

4. Normative analysis of politics lays emphasis on deductive method while describing state, politics and political life of man. Deductive method is philosophical, speculative and a priori. It is, however, argued that thoughts and theorizations as come out of application of this method in political inquiry and investigation at times amount to abstraction and give vent to utopia. But what is relevant here to note that new ideas in all ages appearedas utopia. When these ideas revolutionize the world either at the macro orat the local level, utopia turns into a reality.

5. The statement established in normative political inquiry is mainly prescriptive. A normative statement is inclined to express preference for a particular type of order or a particular course of action which is considered right, moral or ethical repudiating the wrong, immoral or unethical. In the context of moral values and ideals, normative analysis sedulously searches out the best form of political institution and political system and expresses its assertion regarding how best the political life of man can be ensured.

6. Normative political analysis is very much connected with history. Historical explanation and deseription of past facts and past events have historically contributed to the growth and development of normative analysis of politics. Normative thoughts gathered momentum in the context of historical changes of political situations. Different and diverse contexts of history have given birth to new values, ideals and ideas which in turn again have changed thereality through ages. Construction and replacement of values, and philosophical ideas are very much interconnected with the construction and replacement of the phases of human history. From very ancient time down to our own, political philosophers and political theorists have derived historical knowledge and experience from history and thus have enriched their respective political literatures imbued with high philosophical values and vision. Marx spent a big part of his study-life to know and understand the French revolution of the eighteenth century and it led him to theorize on the rise and fall of capitalism and building of the material preconditions for the growth of classless communist society.

7. Normative political analysis also entails an inclination to legal-institutional study. More often than not it starts with state and governmental systems that work under law and constitution. The trend and tradition of juridical and institutional study grow from the days of Pericles and Aristotle. Aristotle had experience of 168 city states, which led him to formulate the scheme of classification of governments and other ideas of high political values and significance.

It is relevant to note that the values, ideas and ideals that the normative political analysts and theoreticians have built from time to time are not fixed and static. Different political analyses and expositions have created new values or new set of values replacing those created earlier. Values may again grow out of reform and refinement of old or prevailing values. New value may also result from value-conflict set in motion in any particular time of turmoil and turbulence.

Again, within the same category of values, additional values involving new content and dimension may be incorporated. Liberal political values, for example, grown since the days of Locke, Mill, Bosanquet and Hobhouse, reflect itself as a broad spectrum of political values involving the recent contribution of liberal thinkers like Hannah Arendt, Isiah Berlin and John Rawls. Normative political analysis that emphasizes values, precepts and principles does not either belong to so-called crass traditionalism, nor it is anachronistic.

6.2.2 Limitations of Normative Approach

Normative political science aims at political analysis and explanation of political phenomena from moral, ethical and prescriptive standpoint. The very nature of this sort of analysis and explanation is subjectively speculative and value oriented. Normative concern and philosophical overtone has guided the political narratives of centuries since the days of Plato and Aristotle. But this long established tradition of political science met a formidable challenge posed by a group of the pragmatists came in the begining of the twentieth century. Social scientists having more or less rigorous multi-disciplinary orientation and learning towards scienticism like Graham Wallace, Aurther Bentley, Charles Merriam, Harold Laswell, V. O. Key, Jeorge Catlin, Robert Michels, Gaetano Mosca, Karl Popper, all products of the trend of positivism, logical positivism and linguistic philosophy, raised their voice against the relevance, validity and even the dominance of normative political science. They raised against the basic postulates and chief concerns of political theories and analyses based on subjective imagination as opposed to objective verification. They came forward to prefer the 'is' questions in politics and repudiate and nullify the exercise in the realm of what may happen or what ought to do in solving both epistemological and virtual problems in politics.

Secondly, the critics of normative political science are of opinion that normative theories and political analyses are not based on facts. Those have denied the factual reality of politics and thus have given room to allegedly becoming either dogma or utopia. The knowledge as developed from the deep cultivation in the sphere of speculation is far from having any practical utility. The theorists and the political philosophers so far have developed knowledge for knowledge sake. The truth they claim to have established through the process of seqential logic and individual intuition is apparent and hypothetical and not subject to rigorous verification.

Thirdly, Roy C. Macrid is contends that normative political analysis is too concerned with the production of ideology and counter-ideology and hence narrow and uni-linear, conservative and repitive and predominantly monographic. Its orientation is less comparative and hence arid and detached.

Fourthly, the main focus of normative discussion and analysis is heavily limited to legal and institutional aspects of politics. Legal and institutional politics places law and institution at the centre of attention. But politics is essentially a human activity and political life of man consisting of diverse pulls and pressures constitutes the very core of it. The political phenomena, thus the critics opine, do have a wider critical context and a broad relevant convas involing various disciplinary dimensions and implications. Their proper understanding and a multi-disciplinary frame of reference alongwith a conscious excercise into it are, therefore, imperative to proper contextualization and satisfying presentation of political phenomena. Normative analysis thus does not bring before us the total meaning imanent in political problems and issues.

Fifthly, critics trained in empirical methodological dispensation have alleged that normative political analysts persistently have tended to make either political history, or metaphysics, pure literature or social philosophy or jurisprudence instead of having a concern for building a science of politics. Knowledge as produced though deductive reasoning in normative analysis is far from being reliable, objective and scientific because observation and experiment, collection of data and application of statistical method, and inter-disciplinary perspective of the political issues or events are given no attention in normative political analysis. Normative approach does have no scientifically valid or reliable method of determining the validity of the moral propositions made regarding politics. Normative political science can best be regarded as a meta-science of ideas and values and prejudice and predilections of those detached from objective reality.

Sixthly, Karl Popper discovers a distinct trend of epistemological domination in the tradition of political thought based on some pre-conceived ideas, axioms and individual values, that have grown since Plato and Aristotle. The notion and image of the 'philosopher king' as made by Plato is totalitarian, according to Popper, as this 'philosopher king' exists beyond the scope of 'falsification'. Hegel's idea of absolutist sovereign state and Marx's idea of class war for social change appeared mythical dictates for Popper as these supress critical deliberation needed for ascertaining their validity.

Lastly, the focus of normative political tradition dominating political thinking for centuries has been confined only to western political context. All the aspects and dimentions of normative politics namely, history, philosophy, law and institution do not belong to the states of the eastern part of the world, nor the socio-political, economic and cultural scenerio and perspective of the non-western under developed

states are taken into account by the great political thinkers done so much without transcending the limit to conservatism and ethno-centrism.

6.2.3 Relevance of Normative Approach to Political Science

It is the empericists grew since the first decade of the twentieth century who have posed formidable challenge against normative tradition of political science. But the importance of normative approach to political science is over-riding becomes denial of this approach is tentamount to the very denial of the study of politics. None can oppose the fact that we study politics to gather knowledge and this knowledge is used for ushering a good life for all of us. Normative political science knowledge does possess an action orientation. Value-based politics has contributed much to constitute the assertive political attitude of man though ages, taught us to become aware of the pitfals and drawbacks of different political processes, political systems and political ideologies. Enormous literature given by the normative political thinkers and theorists constitute the foundation of modern civilization, modern way of life and also they have been the sources of ideas and knowledge with which men have changed political reality whenever they felt needed or have maintained social and political equlibrium. Traditional political thought drawn along norms and values carries significant bearing upon solving the crisis of modern states and political life of the nations. It also acts as a key to understand where the problem lies and how it can be solved. Harold Lasswell, despite his strong advocacy for be behavioural science of politics, sought to direct efforts for providing the knowledge relevant to improve the practice of democracy. The empiricists' persistent urge for and dogged devotion to scienticism received a serious blow when a series of new political developments or crises like urban riot, civil rights movement, environmental polllution and serial assasination of some world leaders had violently shaken the floor of western politicsin the later half of the twentienth century. In this backdrop, David Easton came forward to speak for the 'Credo of Relevance' as the basic principle of 'post-behavioural revolution' in political science, asking both the scholars and the commoners to devote themselves to generate knowledge relevant to solving the actual problem of both micro and macro political life in the second edition of his 'Political System'.

It is now to conclude aptly noting that no discussion, explanation, analysis in and scholarly investigation into philosophy and science is inseparable from purpose and, for this reason, value-neutral. What we call objective reality is essentially but the objectified frame of value. Even a bubble in the realm of seciety and politics

does have its significant social and political import which requires cultivation and application of sensible, critical and creative mind to understand and interpret, rather than bare techniques of objective research as exalted by the early positivists.

6.3   Historical Approach

Historical approach is one of the important components of traditional approach to the study of political science. Political science deals with various subjects like state, law, institutions, ideologies, governmental systems which have their roots in history. History is the store-house of facts and events which are relevant to understand how did state come into existence, how various states were governed in various parts of the world, how the present content and nature of law, both civil and criminal, were built, how democeracy did function in the Greek city states and how modern democracy came out of the monarchical regime in Europe, how did the states and their interets interact to grow inter-state confederation and international body, how did capitalis mover-power feudalism and revolutionize production and then capture power to dominate market, both local and global, and also how and under what social, economic and political condition poeple did rise to overthrow exploitative regime and expand freedom for mankind. Political science has to depend upon history for getting information on any of the above subjects requiring serious analysis, explanation and illumination. And this particular requirement or set of requirments reasonably lead us to become less obsesssive to recognize the relative truth implicit in Seeley when he says that political science without history has no root.

G. H. Sabine is of opnion that basic theories in political science can not be discussed without reference to history. He strongly contends that if political theory has a universal and respectable character, its reason should be traced in the affirmation that it is rooted in historial traditions. Almost in the same direction, Michael Oakshott observes that what we want to inquire into politics is the huge oscillation and elasticity in the growth of political tradition that relates to the systems of human behaviour andhuman actions which are varied and dynamic indeed.

History is the record of the past events. It carries various accounts of how a biological person is transformed into a socio-political being imbued with culture and ability to distinguish between good and evil. The evolutionary roots of human socio-political identity and of human socio-political system are embedded in history. Development of ideas and change in them are also there in interpretations, comments

and explanations made by the historians. The imformation implicit in biographies, autobiographies, travelogues, memoirs, commentaries and letters of the historians and historical fugures act as the important primary source for the scholars in political science, who are working on themes even of significant present-day implications. Political thinkers and theorists like Plato, Hobbes, Hegel, Montesquieu, Seeley, Henry Maine, Freeman, Laski, MacIver heavily depended on history while propounding their ideas on various aspects of politics. Sir Ivor Jennings, Robert Mackenzi, G. B. Mackintosh, Samuel Bear and many other theorists and commentators had produced significant works in the domain of political science deriving several information from the documents of history. For this reason, W.A. Dunning rightly observes that political theory is a historical record of the conditions and effects of political ideas.

History is not only important for classical political theory, it substantially constitutes the base of fundamental research in politics. Even for both qualitative and quantitative research fashionable and common in the present day, scholars have to enter into history for relevant facts and information. Zimmern is of opinion that it is contact with the past that equips men and community for the tasks of the present, and the more be wildering the present, the greater the accumulation of material goods and material cares, the greater the need for inspiration and refreshment from the past. History does share its information with the scholars in political science, it orients them to find out the cause-effect relationships among various variables. It embodies laws of historical development and these laws are largely helptul to direct there searchers particularly in political science to formulate their respective research design and draw research deductions.

One of the most important characteristic features of historical approach is that it lays emphasis on inductive methodology. An inductive method establishes general truth by observation, experiment or reasoning from particular examples. History is essentially based on facts. The historical approach is regarded as a form of the experimental approach. In a systematic manner it gathers knowledge or builds historical laws on the basis of facts. Historical knowledge and historical laws are helpful for understanding the current pattern of functioning of various state and non-state institutions and organizations, their very nature, and also the future growth and development of institutions and organizations which are right now be set with burgeoning problems coming from social economic, political, cultural and environmental fronts. R.N. Gilchrist points out that history not only explains political institutions, but it helps us to make deductions for furture guidance.

So history provides a value framework also for men in political science. The study of history admonishes a ruler against committing wrong in public interest.

This study again, substantially directs the scholar in political science what to select as are search topic for fulfilling the social purpose of research. We must have to admit that the historians have made history of political life of man. They have made available the valuable resources of society, polity and culture for the entire human race. We know from history about what had been our past, how we have arrived at present and what future is staying for us. It is history which brings the three together, throws light on them and speaks for and against them and whatever it speaks expands the map of human knowledge and cognition which are the key to enhance freedom and to place the human community in a higher state of development.

6.4　Criticism of Historical Approach

Although history carries tremendous significance for political theory and political science, it has been subjected to several points of criticism advanced by scholars like Sidgwick, James Bryce, Ernest Barker and David Easton.

The critics are of opinion that historical approach is descriptive and not it is analytical. The historians tend to describe past events without going into the inner content of them with an annalytical bent of mind; and, as a result of it, the interplay of forces behind the historical events are left mysterious having no first hand significant meaning for an intelligent mind.

Secondly, historical approach is limited and narrow in both scope and outlook. In most cases, political history is confined to the discussion of important past events, royal dynasties and renowned personalities. History seldom carries the stories of the common people, the struggles and revolts of the subalterns who really constitute history. Allan R. Ball opines that many a description of the older days are often partial or far from being complete and they do not provide full picture of the nature and characteristics of the time, place and circumstances relevant to the students of political science. So comprehensive and total analysis of political phenomena upon which researchers of political science work is not possible with the help of historical approach.

Thirdly, there is no denying the fact that all historical accounts are reliable and true to facts. Many a time adequate care and caution are not consciously taken on the part of some historians while evaluating evidence and facts. They may be influenced by fabricated data and manufactured information. Historical accounts thus grown are misleading and dangerous particularly for young scholars who are

yet to gather prudence and erudition. James Bryce observes that historical parallels may sometimes be illuminating, but they are also misleading in most of the cases if historians happen to be less careful and cautious while gathering facts and presenting historical narratives based on them.

Fourthly, historial approach is not always able to provide universal explanation of events took place in history because of the fact that the presenters of history may hold mutually different outlook made up of mutually different value system and attitude to understanding things arround them. As the historians explain and interpret history from their own individual standpoint, there remains a variety of history on the same event. Marx viewed the 1857 happening in the history of India as the first war of Indian independence while it appeared before the colomial historians as a big rebellion perpetrated against the civilizing force then at work in India under British rule.

Fifthly, individual bias of the historians for certain fixed notions, intersts, ideas and ideologies retards the progress of scientific temper and creates hegemonic atmosphere where men can not think and act freely to evolve and strengthen a democratic social order based on justice, equality and freedom. It is a very big problem of historical approach. As David Easton contends that historical ideas are parasitic and may cast a veil of control upon empirical research. Only a few historians are found sincere in collecting data and impartial in interpreting them. Sir Ivor Jenning is known for his broadness of outlook and impartiality of treatment. His authority on British constitution and varions aspects of British Government is widely recognized and regarded as authentic. Similarly, the study of the party system by Robert Mackenzie and that of the cabinet system of England by J. B. Mackintosh are taken with high academic esteem as their works reflect a liberal and impartial excercise in their respective research and investigation. In this context, however, it is important to note that in respect of composing institutional history bias-neutrality on the part of the historians is rather possible and easy to mantain, but it is too difficult to do so in the sphere where the law of socio-political change and development or how history of human kind does advance require interpretation from the historians. So the question and doubt concerning the bias of the historians persists and it adversely matters in respect of evolving an impartial and objective history.

Karl Popper has described historical approach as 'historicism'. Historicism at present involves several schools each of which involves different outlook and different sets of characteristics and parameters on the basis of which historical events are explained, interpreted and judged. Popper is of opinion that historicism leads

to a sort of historical determinism which does entail the traits of totalitarianism. Historical determinism involving totalitarian character if gets room in explanation and interpretation of facts and events of the past truth as inherent in historical facts and events gets away or is thrown into prison.

Despite all these scathing criticisms against historical approach to the study of political phenomena, we can not however deny the significance of it as a good number of representative political theorists had received inspiration from history while theorizing on key issues of political science.

Although the students and scholars of each discipline today are aware of the autonomous identity of their respective discipline they tend to study their respective phenomena from the perspective of multi-disciplinary frame of reference for the purpose of having holistic interpretation of things under study. From this point of view, history substantially helps the scholars of political science to make a broad canvas where they draw the picture of their subject-matter broadly and elaborate ideas. But what is imperative upon them is that they have to become cautious about the personal bias and evil purpose of some of the historians. They have to avoid oversimplification inherent in the statement of Edward Augustus Freeman who observes that history is past politics, politics is present history. They are also to remember that apart from history political science has many a root and that political science has many a thing giving birth to new generation of historians who have rewritten history and discovered new historical laws and new historical truth. It is true that narratives in political science have acquired the status of theory many a time after having been substantiated and verified by historical data. But it is also a fact that many historical accounts have been reconstructed to bring out the significance of various events in the light of political theory. Academic inter-dependence and reciprocity between history and political science is on rising today and it results in recent proliferation of new and new quality researches in both fields of study.

6.5   Conclusion

Normative approach is concerned with the ethical and value aspect of the political issues. It is subjective by nature and lays emphasis on deductive method. It is mainly preseriptive. This makes it highly specutative and unscientific. However normative study can not be discarded as useless. Every political act implies some underlying political value. Historical approach seeks an explanation of what institutions are and how they came to be what they are. It gives us an idea of what

is possible in a given situation. It teaches us not to run after the impossible and unrealizable ideals. Critic argue that hsitorical approach fosters social and political conservatism. It promotes a determinist attitude towards social change.

6.6   Summing Up

- Normative approach to political science is concerned with the ethical and value aspect of the questions and issues under political study. It is prescriptive in nature and based on deductive reasoning. Philosophical, institutional and legal studies of political phenomena are closely associated with normative approach.

- Political thinkers and theorists from the days of Plato and Aristotle have made a long tradition of normative political science which has faced a challenge as empirical approach to political science grew under pressure of the positivist wave in social science in the late nineteenth and early part of the twentieth century.

- Despite several criticisms against normative approach to political theory and political science, the fundamental emphasis upon the fundamental objective and purpose of theorizing on the various issues of politics as stressed by this approach can not be denied. Many contemporary political theorists like Leo Struss, Isaiah Berlin, Hannah Arendt, Michael Oakeshott, John Rawls, etc., have all reestablished the importance of moral, ethical and purposive dimension of political study.

- Historical approach belongs to the traditional approach to political theory. Historical approach is followed by a good number of political theorists who have tried to discover laws and rules of social and political development of human civilization.

- As History is based on facts, historical approach emphasizes inductive generalization. On the basis of factual generalization of historical events, political thorists build theories for the present and make prediction for the future on the basis of experience and evidence derived from history.

- Historical approach does have some serious limitations. Historical approach is descriptive and it is not analytical. Apart from it, the bias and prejudice of some historians may be fatal for those who are not suffciently cautions while using the resource of history.

6.7   Pobable Questions

Essay Type Questions:

1. What are the features of normative approach to political theory?

2. Make a critical analysis of the normative approach to political theory?

3. What are the characteristics of the historical approach to political science?

4. Make a critical estimate of the historical approach to political science.

Short Questions:

1. Point out the limitations of normative approach of political science?

2. Attempt an overview of the historical approach to political science?

3. Do you find any relevance of normative approach in political theory? Argue your case.

4. What, according to you, are the limitations of historical approach to political science?

Objective Questions:

1. What is the main focus of normative analysis?

2. What, according to David Easton, is the basic principle of the post-behavioural revolution in Political Science?

3. What is meant by historicism?

6.8   Further Reading

1. Reading1.Dyke, Vernon van, Political Science: *A Philosophical Analysis, California*: Standford University Press, 1960.

2. Ball, Alan R, *Modern Politics and Government*, London, Macmillan, 1988.

3. Dahl, Robert A, *Modern Political Analysi*s, New Jersey, Prentice Hall Inc., 1976.

4. Easton, David, *The Political System: An Enquiry into the state of Political Science*, New York, Alfred A. Knopf, 1971.

5. Gauba, O. P., *An Introduction to Political Theory*, Delhi, Macmillan, 2012. (5th Edition)

6. Gauba, O.P, *Political Ideas and Ideology*, Delhi, Macmillan, 2010.

7. Heywood, Andrew, *Politics*, New York, Palgrave, 2007.

8. Sabine, G.H., *A History of Political Theory*, Delhi, Oxford, 1973.

9. Gandhi, Madan G., *Modern Political Theory*, Delhi, Oxford and IBH, 1981.

10. Gandhi, Madan. *G., Modern Political Analysis*, Delhi, Oxford and IBH,1981. (Second Edition)

11. Verma, S.P., *Modern Political Theor*y, New Delhi: Vikash Publishing House, 1986.

12. Bhargava, Rajeev, *What is Political Theory and Why do we Need It?* Delhi, Oxford, 2012. (Indian Paper Back)

Unit-7 □ Empirical Approach to Politcal Theory

Structure

7.0   Objective

After studying the materials of this unit the learners will understand

- what empirical approach means

- the characteristics of empirical approach

- the limitations and shortcoming of empirical approach

7.1   Introduction

Empirical approach to political analysis claims to become characterized by anattempt to offer a dispassionate and impartial account of political reality. The empiricists seek to proceed with the assumption that experience gathered through human sense organs is the basis of knowledge. Experience is an attempt and a conscisus process of thinking about real problems of political life of individuals and their political society exists at both micro and macro levels. On the basis of experience and thinking of real life situations of the political role-players and of the functioning of their organizations and institutions the empiricists claim that they gather objective and reliable political science knowledge.

Vernon van Dyke is of opinion that empiricism does not study organistions, institutions, laws, political processes, political activities and other issues of politics as they 'ought to be', on the contrary, it focuses on these aspects and issues of politics as they actually are. According to Robert Dahl, political scientist following empirical approach is concerned with 'what is' rather than with 'what ought to be'. So empirical approach is not concerned with the moral and ethical dimension of things political. It is rather concerned with building of value-free scientific political theories through inductive method that emphasizes observation and experiment of facts. For the purpose of making political theories objective and scientific, empirical approach asks the researchers to give up values and preconceived ideas and prejudices and devote them to collection of facts through sample survey, analysis of facts through statistical method and formulation of general statement after validating hypothesis. This general statement is scientific statement which is verifiable. The empiricist contends that verifiable scientific knowledge based on the analysis of facts is the real pragmatic knowledge. This knowledge is used to make decision and formulate policies of organization to run effectively and efficiently, and it guides behaviour and activities of the people in real political life situation.

It is not right to state that traditional political theory is not altogether devoid of the marks of empiricism. The political thoughts of Aristotle, Hobbes, Mechiavelli and Montesquieu in particular, were to a significant extent, based on the practical experience gathered from the the then political situation as prevailed at home or in their neighbouring countries. Aristotle's scheme of classification of government, Hobbesian view of human nature, Machivelli's doctrine of statecraft and sociological interpretation of goverment and law of Montesquieu are all based on facts and experience gathered from the prevalent political situation and political crises be setting the states and political life of people of their time. So traditional political science as a whole was not completely indifferent to the practical aspects of politics. But a common belief goes in that traditional thinking was predominantly devoted to philosophical inquiry and presentation of the value-loaded views and understanding of the theorists belonging to traditional political theory and traditional political science.

7.2 Evolution and Development of Empiricism

Empiricism, as such, as a stream of thinking evolved with John Locke and David Hume in the seventeenth and eighteenth century. The underlying idea of empiricism is that the basis of scientific knowledge is observation through sense–experience. The empirical statement is concerned with the knowledge of a fact and

a fact is concerned with 'is' and not with 'ought to be' questions. The ought-to-be-questions are concerned with values, ideals and morals which are not factual and verifiable. Empiricirm lays emphasis on the value-neutral, impartial and unprejudiced description of objective reality. This description is logical, pragmatic and scientific the validity of which can be verified and restablished whenever and whenever it is required.

It is positivism of Auguste Comte, a French sociologist who subsumed all the trends of empiricism into its fold in the nineteenth century. Comte asked the social science theorist to follow strictly the methods of the natural science in order to build true knowledge. He sought to create social physics instead of social and political thinking to base on speculative metaphysics which, according to him, is but pre-scientific forms of thought. He holds that empirical knowledge acquired through rigorous observation and experiment is the key to the genuine inquiry in the field of social sciences.

The impact of positivism in social science loomed large since the very begining of the twentieth century. Max Weber, however, qualified Comte's positivism and promoted 'neo-positivism' which is akin to 'logical positivism'. Weber did extol science but not at the cost of ethics and morality. He held the view that scientific method is the only key to obtain the knowledge of facts. It is empirical analysis which can uncover truth and discover knowledge implicit in issues, events and problems in social sciences, and this truth and knowledge is scientific as they are verifiable. Scientific method, however, can not be applied, as the logical positivists point out, to the analysis and understanding of values and to test their validity. Logical positivists are of opinion that factual and objective knowledge gathered through sense-experience constitutes the core of science which together cause to make logic that builds empirical theory.

In lieu of institutional, legal and moral tradition of political theory and political analysis, two books viz. Human Nature in Politics by Graham Wallas of England and The Process of Government by Arther Bentley of the United States of America, both published in 1908, had set a new tradition in the sphere of thinking and analysing of political phenomena. Wallas laid emphasis on human nature and behaviour of human beings while Arther Bentley had his focus on the governmental process as influenced by inter-group-relations and activities of several groups. In their discussion the informal aspects of politics, so far neglected, took precedence over formal aspects like law, constitution, institution and organization. Wallase brought before us the inter-play in operation between human nature and shaping of politics not always concerned with formal politics as such. The chemistry between man's nature and politics and the vice versa are very important to understand and Wallase

had done it and gave it to ourselves so as to consider politics no longer a dull study of state and constitution. Wallase is of opinion that politics is a rational and logical activity upon which the influence and impact of human feeling, habit, intention and orientation are as impartant as politics is on making the new components of and changing the content of human nature.

Arthur Bentley, in his work, holds the view that the inputs and impacts of politics are lied in human activities that are reflected in the processes of government. According to him, human activities can be understood and explained by theory and facts and these facts can be measured and quantified. As he contends, human political activities denotes the activities of varions groups working on the basis of competing interests they have towards others. Group activities reflect the behaviour of the group members who are guided by their own will and intention be they negative or positive and short-term or far-reaching. In this way, both Graham Wallase and Arthur Bentley had laid the foundation of empiricism quiet formidably in political science in the year 1908.

The empirical political analysis as initiated most prominently by Graham Wallace and Arthur Bentley gained momentum in the effort of a group of American research scholars who had worked under the most effective leadership of Charles K. Merriam who was the founder of Chicago School. Alongwith his associates and deciples, Merriam built a new model of political science which was resulted from the conscions application of the methods of science. Merriam in his 'New Aspects in Politics', laid emphasis on the systematic use of statistical method to measure and quantify the psychological components involved into the behaviours and action of the persons who perform political role or roles in actual reality.

According to Merriam, politics is action-oriented and it reflects the behaviour of man which can be described systematically and hence scientifically with the help of the application of scientific methods. In the growth of empiricism in politics, Charles Merriam was an important personality because he felt it imperative to make a strong link between political science and empirical research and he brought into the domain of research in political science the ideas and items which were so far regarded as unnecessary and irrelevant. Merriam strongly believed that political scientists imbued with empirical orientation must focus on the mental and the psychological trends and components that govern and are become evident in the behaviour of the political role-players. These, according to him, constitute also the political personality of the individuals who actually run the political organizations and act in those organization to serve purpose they hold.

In the twenties of the twentieth century George G. E.G. Catlin, Frank Kent and Stuart A. Rice had made tremendous effort to advance the need for orienting political analysis and research along empricial dispensation. In his 'The Science and

Methods in Politics', G.E.G. Catlin highlighted on the path of development of the science of politics and purposeful research. Stuart Rice in his Quantitative Methods in Political Science had indentified the distinction between science and philosophy. He expressed his indignation for the social science theorists who attempted to conceptualize and establish a science of moral purpose which is not at all the subject to scientific study and investigation. Both Pareto and Mosca who had their continental European influence upon American empiricists strongly advocated the cause of objective research in social science through their analysis of the elite and of the processes of consensus and dissent.

In the development of "qualitative empiricism" in political science Harold D. Lasswell is a very big name and, according to Heinz Eulau, his influence was pervasive as he introduced new behavioural trend not in the light of crude empiricismas derived from Comte's positivism. In his "Politics: Who Gets What, When and How" he insisted on the indispensibility of scientific methodology but he refused the insistence of value-neutrality. He is of opinion that science can not judge the validity of values but it can judge the impacts of values on social and political activities. As Harold Laswell was a policy scientist for a democratic society his empiricism andscheme of scientific inquiry did not negate the relevance of purpose of the scientist had in his mind before his effort was to start. He contends that scientific description is necessary because the analysis of value can not always provide a satisfactory and reliable answer to who gets what when and how.

In the fifties and sixties of the twentieth century, the establishment and consolidation of behavioural revolution in the United States in particular, strengthened the empirical tradition of political analysis and research. The empirical political theorists of Chicago, Michigan, Princeton and Stanford Universities had been adominant force in the domain of political science research under the pressure of the influence of behaviouralism.

7.3   Basic Postulates of Empirical Approach

Empirical approach to the study and research of the subject-matter of political science indicates the following basic postulates.

(a)   Greater emphasis on factual background of the subjects under study and research rather than on focussing only on structure, institution and ideology.

(b)   Discussion and explanation of political phenomena in the multi-disciplinary context composed of sociology, psychology, economics and other related disciplines.

(c) Verification and validation of the basic idea and induction that guide political analysis and discussion.

(d) Reciprocal relationship and inter-dependence between theory and research.

(e) Value-neutral commitment to the study and discussion of political phenomena.

(f) Reliance on scientific method in the generation of reliable, objective and scientific knowledge required as an input for governing institutions and organizing political activities.

7.4 Characteristics of Empirical Approach

On the basis of the foregoing discussion we can sort out the basic characteristics of empirical approach to political study in the following way.

First of all, empirical approach focuses on actual facts. Empirical politital sirentists search out facts relevant to the respective political issues and events under study and discussion. Facts are the basic input to building of theory which is the decisive objective of empirical project of the political scientists. The researchers take conscious and continuous effort in collection of facts and fact-analysis and for this purpose they rely on and apply the statistical methods.

Secondly, the empirical political theorists insistently try to find out causal relationship in the process of analysis of relevant facts and on its basis they build causal theory. This causal theory indicates general laws and rules relating to the problems or issues upon which discussion or research is held. David Easton holds the view that causal theory is a device for improving the dependability of our knowledge.

Thirdly, for systematic, objective and scientific theory building empirical political analysis stresses on inductive method. Political scientists are very much cautious conscious in the collection of relevant data and they analyse each of those minutely to find out its value and relevance in view of the basic proposition and intent of there search project. As inductive method is opposed to deductive reasoning, there is no scope of speculation and abstruction in the sphere of empirical discussion and investigation. Reason in empirical analysis is grown out of real life situation and hence, it does not require deep imagination and abstract thinking.

Fourthly, empirical approach lays significant emphasis on building of empirical political theory on the basis of empirical research. Empirical research is carried through scientific methodology emphasizing observation and experiment. Empirical

political theory that relies on observation and experiment is descriptive. It describesin clear terms the facts that are observed and give rise to theory.

Fifthly, the main focus of empirical approach is not the law or constitution, institution or organization, nor the ideology and big philosophical issues concerning state and man's political destiny. Rather, the observable behaviour of political actor or group of actors and his/its political activities are the main points of inquiry for the empirical analyst. Empirical political theory is the result of description and scientific analysis of individual and/or group behaviour and individual and/or group activities held in the real world of politics.

Sixthly, empirical political theory is objective and focuses on the observable behaviour and activities of individual and group as the main objects of attention. For this reason in particular, values and moral or ethical consideration have no scope to penetrate into the sphere of empirical discussion and inquiry. The champions of empiricism guided particularly by positivism ask the researchers to banish values in order to get their study objective and true to the spirit of scienticism. Value-neutrality and refusal of moral and ethical standard from the domain of discussion and research on politics are regarded as a very important attribute of empirical approach.

Seventhly, empirical approach requires and guides the political analysts to become oriented to multi-disciplinary study of political phenemena. Graham Wallase had long laid emphasis on the psychological dimension of politics. In his 'New Apsects of Politics', Charles Merriam advised the students of politics to make full use of the recent advances in social sciences particularly in psychology, sociology and economics for the purpose of developing inter-disciplinary and scientific rigour of political science. Inter-disciplinary orientation helps the political reserchers get abroad spectrum of his subject-matter and on consideration of varions aspects and dimension he could build statement of holistic importance, which is more acceptable and useful as it is more purposive.

Eightly, the objective of empirical approach is to develop scientific discussion and research on human behaviours and human activities relying on scientific methods of observation and experiment. Man, instead of institution, law or constitution, is placed at the centre of attention on the basis of rigorous scientific inquiry and investigation empirical political science seeks to develop a stock of political science knowledge which may come to improve the condition of actual political life of human being.

Empirical approach to political study and research has created tremendous academic sensation among the students and scholars of political science. No doubt it has led to the proliferation of various angles for analysis of various and growing

aspects of politics both domestic and international, and, as a result of it, many theories and approaches like behaviouralism, system theory, communication theory, structural-functional theory, game theoriy, etc. have evolved to make political science a more vibrant, dynamic and a very relevant and useful problem-solving discipline in the present time.

7.5 Limitations and Shortcoming of Empirical Approach

Tremendous impact and contribution notwithstanding, the empirical approach involves some serious problems and shortcoming about which we have to become alert and conscious while using or applying this approach to understand and explainor analyse politics. Critics like Leo Strauss, Leslie Lipson, Gunnar Myrdal, Alfred Cobban, Karl Manheim and many others have raised the following objections against empirical approach to the study of politics.

First of all, methodology of natural science and/or the techniques of statistics cannot always be applied to the study of human behaviour and nature of man. Human behaviour and human nature consist of many and diverse socio-psychological components and pulls and pressure which are not always direct and discernible and, hence, they are not subject to rigorous quantification and measurement. Unpredictable behaviour and changing and highly erratic nature of man cause to happen political events which are often regarded unprecedented and altogether novel in character. Application of so-called scientific methods is possible in a rather stable situation which hardly exists in politics that is always in a state of flux. The research finding held on French revolution of 1789 is not verifiable as we can engineer another French revolution neither in France nor elsewhere in the world.

The critics are of opinion that fission and fusion lie in the content of political event which result from the will and intention and from behaviour of individual and group of individuals. So it would be an act of folly if we assume or try to discover homogeneity in the pattern of human behaviour and, for that matter, in the happening of political events or within the political issues be setting political life of individual or of group or of nation. From this point of view, empirical approach gives indulgence to conservatism and favours status quo. It defies and denies the ever-changing nature of human nature, human behaviour and that of politics as such. The highly publicised commitment if empirical approach to hyper-science has under estimated the great contribution of the great political philosophers and political scientists who enriched this discipline so long since Plato and Aristotle.

The critics also accuse that the empiricists guided by Comte intend to build pseudo social science as distinct from social science concerning human being having emotion and instinct, aspiration and intention and natural ability to think and power to judge. The demand for scienticism as asserted by the empiricists is but a matter of pretention, they are theorists created out of a revelling positivist passion. They are mere model builders and in a clan of pseudo-scientists propagating neo-scholasticism and jargon. They have confined political science to number and to monotonous ritual grappled with methodological war-strategy-and-tactics. In this empirical regime this discipline becomes narrow, parochial and obsessed with craze of irrelevant scienticism.

The critics again attack the value-neutral commitment of empirical study of political phenomena that relate to human activities and human behaviour. They contend that value-free social science is a fundamental fallacy. Man is a politicalanimal is a saying of Aristotle. It implies that man is a social creature having reasoning faculty. He has the power of judgement on the basis of which he can differentiate good from evil. He possesses the potential to alter or change his living conditions for a qualitatively better and just life full of virtue. Throughout ages manis on searching knowledge that could act as a key to material and moral improvement of human life. These propositions, however, are largely meaningless and irrelevant for empirical approach which advocates objective and scientific study of political life bereft of purpose and reference to more freedom, more equality, more rights and more justice for the people. Empiricism denies the fact that knowledge has a liberating role to play in human society. Man hankers after knowledge and truth for they liberate man from huger, illiteracy, disease, unemployment and exploitation of man by man on the one hand, and obscurantism, bigotry, intolerance and fundamentalism on the other. Value-free discussion as emphasized by empiricism does not address these issues of human existence and human condition and thus it becomes parasitic. It retards imagination and creativity which the students need to have for using politics as an instrument of change. Empiricism does oppose change and believe in the reason of conservation and this reason, in fact, constitutes the hidden agenda and the ideology of empiriciom.

The critics also expressed the view that persistent demand for inter-disciplinary focus as required by the empiricists, has been injurious to autonomous disciplinary identity of political science. The different disciplinary perspectives and concepts, ideas, models, information and facts derived from disciplines such as economics, sociology, psychology etc., have unnecssarily made political science encumbered, got its discussion irrelevant and wearisome. The critics point out that over-dependence upon other disciplines has circumscribed the autonomy of political science and got it down from the status of 'master science' that Aristotle, the father of political science, had ascribed to.

Some critics have again argued that empiricism stands for value-relativism, hyperfactualism, non-ideological reductionism and positivization of social sciences inclusive of political science. All these attributes of empiricism led political theory to its natural decline in the late fifties and sixties of the twentieth century. It was only a small but epistemoloically rich group consisting of thinkers and theorists like Michael Oakeshott, Hannah Arendt, Bextrand de Jouvenal, Leo Strauss, Eric Voegelin and a few other had reestablished the link betwen philosophy and science, rejeted the totalitarian notion of dead uniformity and homogeneity in respect of human behaviour, restored the potentiality of politics as a creative activity that change human candition and human existence for the better. The reinstatement in values, reciprocity between philosophizing faculty and scientific methodology, role of politics in society and culture change as emphasized by these theorists had caused to revival of political theory in the later days.

7.6   Conclusion

Empirical approach is concerned with building of value-free scientific theory through inductive method emphasizing observation. It is not concerned with the ethical dimention of things political. The empiricist argues that verifiable scientific knowledge based on the analysis of facts is the real knowledge. However, the pure science approach of the empiricists is absent. The theory has no value unless it can be applied to the political problems of society and helps in finding out solujtions to them.

7.7   Summing Up

- In this unit empirical approach to the study of political science is discussed and explained. Empirical approach is opposed to normative approach. It lays emphasis on factual knowledge based on sense-experience. Observation and experiment and application of statistical methods along positivist social science dispensation are stressed for the study of human behaviour and human activities which are considered as the central focus of attention in the place of institution and constitution. Empirical political approach is primarily oriented to build objective and scientific theory on the basis of objective and scientific research and, hence, it asks the researchers to shun values and to acquire a value-neutral attitude in the whole process of doing research and building

value-free objective political theory. Empirical approach also endorses inter-disciplinary perspective of political discussion and explanation.

● Empirical approach, although useful in research and study of some areas of politics, has been criticized severely by some critics for its excessive crazefor scienticism and banishment of values from the field of research and study of human behaviour and human action in particular.

7.8   Pobable Questions

Essay Type Questions:

1. Discuss the characteristics of empirical approach to the study of political science.
2. What are the limitations of empirical approach to the study of politicalscience.
3. Critically discuss the empirical approach to the study of political science.
4. Trace the evolution and development of empiricism.
5. Discuss the background and features, of the empirical approach to politcal sciences.

Short Questions:

1. What do you mean by empirical approach to political science?
2. Mention the basic postulates of empirical approach.

Objective Questions:

1. What is the underlying idea of empiricism?
2. What is the central tenet of logical positivism?
3. What is the primary limitation of the empirical approach to the study of political science?

7.9   Further Reading

1. Dyke, Vernon Van, *Political Science: A Philosophical Analysis*, California: Standford University Press, 1960.
2. Ball, Alan R, *Modern Politics and Government*, London, Macmillan, 1988.
3. Dahl, Robert A, *Modern Political Analysis*, Prentice, New Jersey, Hall Inc.,1976.

4. Easton, David, *The Political System: An Enquiry into the state of Political Science*, New York, Alfred A. Knopf, 1971.

5. Gauba, O. P., *An Introduction to Political Theory*, Delhi, Macmillan, 2012.(5th Edition)

6. Gauba, O. P., *Political Ideas and Ideology*, Delhi, Macmillan, 2010.

7. Heyood, Andrew, *Politics*, New York, Palgrave, 2007.

8. Sabine, G.H., *A History of Political Theory*, Delhi, Oxford, 1973.

9. Gandhi, Madan G., *Modern Political Theory*, Delhi, Oxford and IBH, 1981.

10. Gandhi, Madan. G., *Modern Political Analysi*s, Delhi, Oxford and IBH,1981. (Second Edition)

11. Verma, S.P., *Modern Political Theory*, New Delhi, Vikash Publishing House, 1986.

12. Bhargava Rajeev, *What is Political Theory and Why do we Need It*? Oxford: Delhi, 2012. (Indian Paper Back)

Unit-8 □ Feminist Perspective in Political Theory Structure

Structure

8.0 Objective

After studying the materials of this unit the learners will understand

- Meaning of Feminism,
- Development of the Feminist approach,
- Various concepts associated with Feminism,
- Types of Feminism

8.1 Introduction

Faminism is a recent critical perspective in political theory. Feminism is, in fact a praxis combining both a theory built for the purpose of attaining equal rights for the women on the one hand and practice as exemplified in the movements of the feminists all over the world, that represent diverse experiences and peculiar context. Feminism is intrinsically associated with feminist movements and feminist movements are the result of the growth of feminism. Right consciousness or identity consciusness of the women is apparently prior to women's movement, but this

consciousness is a necessary outcome of the subjugated and suppressed socio-political condition thewomen were used to experience in course of their living.

The objective of feminism is to build a society free from gender discrimination. The excercise into feminist epistemology and feminist movements as such are basically oriented to assert and extablish the personal identity of women. Feminism is no theory bereft of practical implications. It activates the consciousness of the women about their subordinate position and makes them aware of the fact that they are deprieved of equality of opportunity in society because of their being women. The feminists champion the cause of change of patriachal values and condition pertaining to society, ecomomy, politics and culture that promote gender discrimination and sexual exploitation.

8.2   Growth of Feminism

Feminism as a specific socio-political body of knoledge grew since the sixties of the twentieth century in Europe and in the United States of America. But as early as in 1700, Mary Astell wrote "Some Reflection upon Marriage". Astell, the first British feminist, was of opinion that women are no inferior to men and they have as much reason and rationality as men have. As both men and women are human being, both they are rational. Because of particular and peculiar upbringing, socialisation and training and also of customs and social practices as rife in male-dominated society, women are given a subservient or subordinate position and they are subjugated. She raised a very legitimate and pertinent question for the whole human race that if all men are born free, why women are born slave! Astell asked for right kind of upbringing, training and education for women so as to get them free and self-dependent.

Before the publication of 'A Vindication of the Rights of Women,' in 1792, the major work of Mary Wollstonecraft, Abigail Adams wrote in March, 1776 a historic letter to her husband John Adams who became the US President in 1797. Abigail in her letter strongly demanded education and property rights for the women. She mentioned in her letter that if the women are not paid particular care and attention, if they are not considered as the co-partner in the making of decision and if their voice and representation are denied in marking laws, they will rise in rebellion. Abigail was averse to putting unlimited power in the hands of the husbands.

Wollstonecraft, in her work, raised first the main concerns of feminist critique against 'malestream' political theory. In opposition to the discriminatory projection on education advanced by Rousseau, she established the social role, rationality and claim for equal rights of the women. Wollstonecraft was the liberal feminist

who stressed the right to education, right to property and the right to participate in the process of politics. Some fifty years before the emergence of the female suffrage movement in Britain and in the United States of America, Wollstonecraft strongly advocated for the right to vote without which, she asserts, democracy remain incomplete. She criticizes the confinement of the women to the 'private sphere' and thus asked them to have connection with the 'public sphere'. She is of opinion that when a woman goes beyond the private sphere and participates in the activities in the public sphere and receives education she is placed in the status due to her as a person.

John Stuart Mill advocated the cause of the women's rights, and accordingly he is considered as one the champions of liberal feminism. He in his 'The Subjection of Women' (1869), considered lack of education, legal disparity, and political oppression as being the main causes for the slavery of the women in society. In this direction of socio-political thinking on the condition of women, Frances Wright, Sarah Grimke, Elizabethe Cady Staston, etc., expressed the view that in the interest of establishing women's freedom, of increasing their intellectual skill and of gaining equal rights for them, a significant social change is an imperative, which could ensure educational, property and voting rights for the women against the domination by religious and social customs, institutions and tradition of the male-dominated society. Liberal feminism, however, can not pose a formidable challenge against the ever-more formidable patriarchy or the patriarchal institutions. Without going beyond the limit of existing society and politics the liberal feminists did not demanded the equal rights for the women. But the strong beliefs for the women's rights, the classical feminists raised had their deep impacts upon the later feminists such as Betty Friedan, Radcliffe Richards, Susan Moller Okin who opined for building a state of affair under the active role and supervision of the state. This new condition, as these thinkers contend, will ensure well-being of the women by means of eradicating gender disparity of myriad forms.

8.3 Key Concepts in Feminism

It is now important to discuss some general but significant concepts associated with all shades of feminism before we deal with other schools or forms of feminism. One such general concept is the concept of public-private divide. There is a common belief prevalent long in society is that men function in the public sphere while the general works and activities of the women happen in private sphere that is within the confine of their respective family. To go beyond the private sphere and work with others in the public sphere on the part of the women is a social and cultural

taboo upon them and even punishable in some places and within some communities. It implies that in the realm of politics and administration that lies in the public sphere, women are prohibited. They are permitted to work for her husband and off springs and others in the family and to perform domestic duties within the private sphere. Private sphere is devoid of effective power with which the women have or should have no connection because any such connection is injurions to their being women and this particular beingness of the women is created by nature which has settled the public sphere only for the men.

Feminism does oppouse these ideas and notions which are thought to be arbitrary, irrational and dangerous. The feminists argue that as marriage requires registration, birth control and entitlement of heirship are all determined by public policy and governmental laws and rules, the so called private sphere is not left out of control of the public sphere. So the practice of public-private divide has no rational basis and it is but an ill-conceived intrigue of the male designed to dominate over the women, resist them against their desire to get education, to have share of political power and become free from domestic violence and household druggery. The feminists strongly hold the view that power and authority are very much basic to politics and for this reason, the so-called most personal sphere of the women is basically political where women are subservient to the male who exerts varied power over the women and seeks to acquire their unquestioned allegiance. Kate Millelt, known as a radical feminist, observes in this respect that politics is obviously there where power-relation does exist. So 'personal is political'. Politics exists in the personal sphere where on the basis of power and authority the male rules the women for denying everything that necessitates the share of power and doing everying to the satisfaction of the male. It is important to note here that 'Personal is Political' was the trenchant slogan of the feminist movement in the sixties and seventies of the twentieth century. Public private divide is, indeed, a social and cultural construct and it is devoid of any rational basis.

Patriarchy is another important concept against which the feminists are very critical. Patriarchy literally means 'rule by the father'. In feminist analysis, it directly denotes the combination of power, authority and the absolute domination or hegemony of the male head of the household. Obtaining its legitimacy from the long-drawn customs and practices having its deep roots into the mind and body of man and society the husband-father subordinate his wife and children within the family. In society the male members receive and acquire the patriarchal mindset and power operting within the families, and, on the basis of it, they assume the hegemonic authority for total oppression and exploitation to which women are subjected. In patriarchal socio-political regime, women are subordinate and subservient to the

male both within and outside the family in the spheres of politics, ecomomy and culture. Patriarchy is thus the key cause of female domination and exploitation. The female uses to experience every now and then the diverse implications of patriarchy both within family and in society. Patriarchy turns into an all-pervasive culture into which the female members of society in particular are inducted. The tentacles of patriarchy have a huge spread in educational institutions, religious organizations, sport bodies and elsewhere. They permeate bureaucracy, police, military, judiciary all belonging to state system.

As Sylvia Walby in her 'Theorizing Patriarchy' (1990) observes, patriarchy is a system of socio-political structures, socio-political values and socio-political practices, and in this system the male controls, oppresses and exploits the female. It is again an ideology which expresses the view that men are more powerful, productive and skilled than the women. It considers the latter as the property possessed by the former, and it rationalizes the predominating superiority of men over women. Because of the superior status of men as determined by patriarchy the premiere posts in politics and administration are concentrated in the hands of the men. It is again due to all existent and all-pervading patriarchy that the male child is discriminated against female child, female foetus is killed and legislation for reservation of seats in the deliberative body at the upper level fails recurringly to become a fact of political life. As Walby contends, forms of partiarchy are varied and their manifestations are different, deep and pervasive. It frightens the female both at home and in the sphere where they get education, work for livelihood, exhibit their talent, skill and ability as singer, dancer, writer or poet, or perform political role.

Sex and gender distinction is again another concept associated with feminist theorization. Patriarchy views that the role of the women in society is biologically determined. Biologically male and female are different from their very birth and hence their respective social roles are not similar but different. Patriarchy considers the females not as powerful physically as males are. Since this difference is unchanging, the females are confined to the structure of family which is their personal sphere where they fulfill the goal of perfect life performing domestic duties, bearing children and rearing them. The feminists attack this biological determinism as the most important source of male domination in society. Biological determinism creates an egoistic personality and an expression of masculine tyranny for the male with which they determine the do's and don'ts for the female. Simone de Beauvoirholds the view that one is not born but rather becomes a woman. A society ruled by patriarchy, artificially constructs the ideas, conditions, mores and customs relating to masculinity and faminity and these taken together give birth to gender

ideology. This gender ideology bnilds the socio-political image and identity specific to men and women and decides their respective space and respective roles. At the time when one is born, one is recognised simply as a baby, but it is society and the system based on patriarchy, the notion and characteristic or attribute of masculinity or feminity is imposed upon the baby. In the course of upbringing and living in society the baby becomes male having masculine gender or famale having feminine gender. So gender is a social construct. It indicates whether one will rule and suppress or will be ruled and suppressed.

The concept of sexuality is also associated with the faminist critique. According to Sylvia Walby, sexual domination over the women in patriarchal society is definitely a sort of oppression. In this society, the male establishes their hegmony over the female through sexuality which also works as a semi-institution having its social recognition behind it. In several phases of feminist movement the notion of sexuality is differently defined and viewed. In the sixties of the twentieth century, sexuality was considered both as a source of pleasure reasonable and legitimate, and again as a danger against which awarness campaign was thought to be organized. In the seventies a group of feminists endorsed and ratified homosexuality or lesbianismin order to deliberately ignore the sex of the male because, as they hold, it dominates, suppresses and exploits the women. Homosexuality is not simply a means of sexual pleasure and gratification, according to this group of feminists; on the contrary, it is a protest against the men's effort to establish sexual supremacy upon the female. Porno movie or porno advertisement having exposure of female body is no nuisance, rather it signifies the assertion of women's freedom and women's rights, Wendy McElroy implies in her various works.

The idea of equality and difference is also a constitutive of the feminist perspective. Particularly the liberal feminists have required equality for the women to be established in society. In favour of women they demanded the absence of discrimination in the field of education, political representation, employment in public sphere, payment of wage, owning and inheritance of property and dispensation of legal justice. Equal rights for the women are essential for getting a woman a 'person'.

But a group of a feminist in the mid seventies of the twentieth century has given stress on difference insted of equality for the women. They contend that the women possess distinctive virtue because it is they who menstruate, bear and rear children, perform domestic works and serve the elders in their respective families. This virtue helps the women to have a distinct identity and a distinct space in society. These feminists are also of opinion that the women are not only a community distinct from the community of men, because of class and ethnic

distinctiveness, all the members belonging to women community as such are not equal. The feminist movements of the seventies of the previous century have raised with greater importance the individual characteristics and the separate and distincte identity specific to the women. This assertion of self-identity of the women posed a formidable challenge against male domination and it helped form association of the women themselves for holding debate and discussion on women's issues.

8.4 Waves of Feminism

In all societies, East and West, the women are prey to dual domination. One is established by the prevailing society, culture, economy and politics and the other by the male members of the family and society. This dual domination is the source of the subservient position, the condition of being slave and loss of identity as a person the women suffer. In the last hundred and fifty years or more, many a feminist movement have been erupted in various parts of the world. In recorded history, the first feminist movement received its inspiration from Seneca Falls Convention held in july, 1848, which asserted that all men and women are created equal. The movement was essentially a suffrage movement which also covered the issues like social and institutional barriers that limited women's rights, a lack of educational and economic opportunities and absense of a voice in political debates. All these issues were discussed and debated in the Seneca Falls Convention. In this historical phase the women's citizenship issue was raised and in this particular phase, National Women Suffrage Association, Society for Promoting the Employment of Women came at the fore. This equal rights feminism of the forties and fifties and the initial assertions and attributes of early feminism belong to what is called the 'first wave feminism', which had been successful to move the people towards more radical and sometimes revolutionary expressions of feminism and feminist movement that constitute the broader context of the 'second wave feminism' started since sixties of the preceding century.

The second phase feminism or what is called the 'second-wave feminism' is distinct from the first phase or first wave faminism and is much more powerful than it. In fact, the contemporary students' movement, civil rights movement and national liberation movement held in several parts of the world were the main inspiration of the more articulate feminist movements took place in this phase. The feminist theorists and activists held patriarchy directly responsible for discrimination against and disregard of women. Some feminist activists point to sexual exploitation and sexual oppression as existent even in heterosexuality and, thus, they mark the men as natural enemy to women and support homosexuality as a protest against

patriarchy. In this phase it gets clear that through various institutions and social practices as prevalent in seciety such as marriage, sexual habit, domestic mores and customs, the male establishes their dominance over the female. In this context, the feminists felt it an imperative to build organizations for themselves to challenge this dominance on the one hand, and to grow awareness among the women in particular, about emancipation and freedom of the women on the other. In this phase, a few women's organizations were grown in the United States. Betty Friedan built National Organization of Women in this phase. In 1970, Carol Hanisch wrote a book under the title ''The Personal is Political'' and this title became the political argument and a rallying slogan of second-wave feminism.

The third phase feminism known also as the third-wave faminism was developed in the nineties of the twentieth century. It represents a combination of many and diverse theoretical trends derived from psychoanalysis, post-structuralism, post-modernism and postcolonialism. Hence third-wave feminism turns from the theoretical conceptualization powered by practical experiences into a developing discourse consisting of basic content of the problem alongwith its varied ramifications. Third-wave feminism is thus broadly regarded as Post-feminism developed by Camille Paglia, Patrick Califia, Natasha Walter, etc. Post-feminism is global in its nature and outlook; and it is not confined to white-centric and middle-class-centric feminism only. Post-feminism rejects 'victim feminism' and glorifies 'power feminism'. It boldly approves sexual exposure of the young lady for the purpose of using it as a weapon to fight against domination of the male over the female. The feminists of this phase find no vice in the fashion-show or beauti-contest programmes of the women, rather they are in favour of promotion of all these events and programmes because, as they think, these programmes signify freedom of women and an alternative construction against the construction that induces the male to suppress and exploit the female.

Feminists like Germaine Greer of Australia and Susan Faludi of the United States are, however, critical on some points of post-feminist arguments. Greer disapproves the celebration of women's sex in print and electronic media as it makes, she observes, the women into an exchangeable commodity in the market.

But the importance of post-feminist projection is not denied. Because it is widely considered as a continuation of the feminist thoughts and movements of the preceding days. Post-feminism is multi-dimensional and it addresses the feminist issues of the Afro-Asian and Latin American women who live under much more difficult condition and suffer multiple subjugation and exploitation because of backwardness engulfing their state, society, politics and culture.

8.5 Typology of Feminism

In the earlier part of this discussion we have dealt with liberal view of feminism. Avoiding repititive discussion on liberal faminism we now concentrate on Marxist and socialist types of feminism for discussion and exploration. What is noteworthy in this context, however is that although both Marxist and socialist feminisms are taken interchangeably and although both these two variants receive their inspiration from the Marxist philosophy, both are not similar.

"The Origin of the Family, Private Property and State" written by Fredrich Engels is the main source of Marxist feminism. According to Engels, the subordinate position of the women is not natural, but it grew in a particular stage of development of production system. As Engels observes, the dominance and authority of the male is developed to ensure the inheritance of private ownership of the means of production which was developed in the process of production at a particular stage. The women are placed within the confine of respective family where they perform domestic functions and bear and rear children. Introducing mongamy for them, control is imposed upon their sexuality and thus they come under the tutelege of patriarchy. The women engaged in domestic labour are estranged from the process of social production as they have no direct contribution to it and, thus, they become completely dependent upon the male members of their families. Engels is of opinion that the women, under capitalism, are the regular provider of healthy and sound male labourers that are required by the owners of the capitalist production units to produce goods and services. In case of emergency appeared in production system, the women's labour power is used at a very low wage-rate.

So, the Marxists are of opinion that the institution of private property is responsible for the inferior and subjugated position of the women in society. The discriminatory relation between the male and female is one of the many expressions of class relation as exists in a society based on private ownership of the means of production. The Marxists strongly believe that with the abolition of the institution of private property, the women will be emancipated and become free. So freedom of the women is contingent upon abolition of capitalism and building of socialism.

Socialist feminism like Marxist feminism is based on the Marxist theory. But it throws light on the subjects Marxist feminism does not incorporate. Socialist feminism lays stress on gender discrimination while class discrimination received greater attention by the Marxist feminists. The socialist feminists opine that patriarchy is much more deep and penetrative than an exploitative social system.

Patriarchy is not necessarily connected with the institution of private property and, hence, abolition of private property does not put an end to patriarchy. The Marxist feminists do not pay much attention to family, domestic labour and to matter like reproduction, which are important concepts in feminist analysis.

Socialist feminist Zillah Eisenstein observes that male domination and capitalism are the two central constituents of exploitation of the women. According to Eisenstein, sexism and gendered division of labour is determined by the prevailing exploitative economic system. So the liberation of women depends upon (a) the simultaneous abolition of both the ecomomic and 'cultural' sources of women's oppression, and (b) building of a society that ensures social, economic and political justice. Juliet Michell is of the view that the location of the women in society is determined by production, reproduction, socialization and sexuality. So women's liberation does not depend solely on dismantling of capitalism, rather it requires the abolition of all the determinants that get women subjugated and subjected.

Radical feminism, however, is evolved to challege all the variants of feminism. Unlike liberal feminists, radical feminists do not consider patriarchy as being anatural institution. In contravention of the argument of the Marxist feminists, the radical feminists contend that gender-conflict is the main and the predominant conflict in society and biological and psychological difference or distinction is the source of the discrimination between the male and the female. Patriarchy is built upon gender-division which is responsible for the bondage of the women, and this gender-division empowers and invigourates patriarchy. The dominating biological structure of the male that terrifies and control the women, is derived from patriarchy. Patriachy, according to the radical feminists, is thus both an institution and anideology. It gets the women as the subjects ruled by the male.

"The Second Sex" of Simone de Beauvoir is the main source and inspiration of radial feminism. Simone holds that the on-going general processes of society have held the women as an "other" group. Because of physical form, reproduction and childrearing the female is 'other' in the eyes of society, they play in 'other' role in society. This 'otherness' restricts the freedom of the women and as a result of it, they cannot express and expose power they have in them. Simone urges the abolition of the processes, norms, mores and values that compel the women to become the 'other' orto become the 'second sex'. Boldly she asserts, 'one is not born but becomes a woman'.

According to Shulamith Firestone, another radical feminist, human reproductive biology is responsible for considering women the weaker sex. The prevailing norms and social values work behind the reproductive biology compel the lactating mother

to feed the dependent babies and in turn the mother becomes dependent on her husband. So liberation of women requires a holistic effort which involves both objective and subjective dimensions.

Kate Millet, a very articulate and powerful radical feminist, observes in her 'Sexual Politics' that power exists in relation between man and woman and because of it the relation is political. A male person derives power from the institution of patriarchy and on the basis of it he subordinates women in family and in society. So both the spheres, private and public, are political. Because of politics the women are kept confined to their respective family and they are denied access to public sphere so as to deprive them of any share of political power. And again, it is because of politics that men are allowed to public space to appropriate power existent there. Millet is of opinion that state normally can not resist this politics as determind by patriarchy which dominates women at home and in society and state because it is ubiquitous. The radical feminists, the non-believers in reform, thus call for world wide female solidarity and sisterhood in order to build organized resistance against this all-pervading patriarchy.

Rather a more recent theme, called postmodern feminism is developed by Judith Butler, Elizabeth Spelman, Julia Kristeva and others. Postmodern feminism is grown out of a combined theoretical forces of structuralism, postmodernism and French feminism. The post-modern feminists are of opinion that the women have many identities other than gender. The conditions and problems of them are not similar irrespective of caste, class, colour, religion and region. All Asian women, all black women, all Hindu or all Muslim women of India are different and they experience things differently. Post-modern feminists, therefore, reject the broad-narrative or the meta-narrative of feminism and draw our attention to the difference within as exists in the central core of the problem and also to the many, diverse, fragmented and micro expressions and experiences of the women who belong to no singular class, caste, colour, religion, region and culture. According to post modern feminists, women or gender is a multi-dimentional term, it signifies a varied implications, multiple realities and a lot of life-experiences. Hence, it is imperative, they hold, to have a different explanation and analysis of deconstructed and fragmented identity of the women.

Critics of postmodern feminism, however, observe that post-modern feminism has attempted to deconstruct the identity of women which has resulted in weakening the central solidarity and the feminist sisterhood, the feminists of several variants have tried to build up through ages.

8.6   Conclusion

Feminist perspective has exposed the fals universalism of much of contemporary political theiry. In doing so they have operated a theoretical shift from an initial emphasis on politics of identity towards the affirmation of a politics of differences Ferninist theory is not limited to providing tools for rethinking Women's issues. More fundamentally, ferminist political theory transforms the ways in which we think about central issues within political theory, the relations between public and privatespheres, citizenship and other core aspects of democratic theory.

8.7   Summing Up

- Feminism as an approach to the study of political science is different from other approaches. The feminists are of opinion that the domain of political theory like that of mythology, literature and culture is male-centric. Main-stream politics, they strongly observe, is but male stream politics. The women who constitute even more than the lion's share of the total resources of the world and receive less than one precent of it, are subject to domination, exploitation and violence. Both the institution of patriarchy and multi-dimensional vulnerability of the women are ubiquitous and restlessly terrifying. Feminism signifies the protest against the male-dominated theory, ideolgy, socio-political practices, and culture which deny freedom, equality, power and rights of the women and have suppressed and subjugated them over centuries.

- The critical perspective of feminism is an important key to understand politics which does have multiple meanings and diverse manifestations. The theme or perspective of feminism has now led to proliferation of research not only in the field of political science but in other disciplines dealing with human relationships irrespective of their focus specificity.

8.8   Pobable Questions

Essay Type Questions:

1. What are various concepts associated with feminism. Explain those concepts.
2. What are the main propositions of liberal feminism? How do the radical feminists criticise liberal feminism?

3. What are the basic contentions of Marxist and Socialist feminisms. Is there any difference of emphasis between the two?

4. Point out the main content of postmodern feminism. What are its limitations?

5. Make, a critical estimate of feminism as a necessary perspective of politicaltheory.

Short Questions:

1. Examine the typologies of feminism.

2. Define gender. How do you differentiate gender from sex?

3. Examine how the feminists view patriarchy.

4. What are the basic arguments of radical feminism? Ellucidate.

Objective Questions:

1. What does the expression 'personal is political' imply?

2. What do the Ferninists mean by patriarchy?

3. What, according to the radical Ferminists, is the main conflict in society?

8.9 Further Reading

1. Gauba O.P., *Political Ideas and Ideologies*, New Delhi, Macmillan, 2010.

2. Basu, Rajeshree and Chakraborty, Basabi (ed), *Prasanga Manabividya*, Kolkata, Urbi Prakashan, 2008. (in Bangali)

3. Walby, Sylvia, *Theorizing Patriarchy*, Basil Blackwell Inc.,Cambridge, GreatBritain, 1990.

4. Beauvoir, Simone de, *The Second Sex*, London, Vintage Publishing, 2010.

5. Heywood, Andrew, *Politics*, New York, Palgrave, 2007.

Unit-9 □ Postmodern Perspective in Political Theory

Structure

9.0 Objective

After studying the materials of this unit, the learners will understand

- Meaning of postmodernism

- Background of the growth of postmodernism

- Features of postmodernism

- Content of the debate between Marxism and Postmodernism

9.1 Introduction

Postmodernism is a sharp intellectual movement against modernity. It presents a pungent criticism of painting, art, architecture, literature, movie, music, history, theory and doctrine, etc., emanated out or drawn in the spirit of modernity. Although the notion of postmodernism dates back to 1870 when John Watkins Chapman, an English painter used the term postmodern while reviewing the impressionist art of the French, in the field of social science as such, postmodernism, as a critical

perspective, is a development of the seventies and eighties of the twentieth century. Jean Francois Lyotard, Michel Foucault, Jacques Derrida, Roland Barthes, Jean Baudrillard are the main expoenents of postmodernism.

9.2   Meaning of Postmodernism

Postmodernism, in fact, is a radical discursive position which involves enormous ambiguity and controversy and, for this reason, it is convenient for us to state with what we mean by modernity by postmodernism developed by the above-said postmodern thinkers.

Modernity is rooted in the Englishtement and anchored in rationalism. Enligntment denotes an intellectnal movement took place in the sphere of ideas and thinking in Europe in the middle of the eighteenth century. It led to free social and political life from orthodoxy and obscurity and inspired growth of new attitude and outlook basing on reason. This reason-based attitude and outlook favoured by Voltaire, Locke, Descartes, Didero etc. gave birth to a regime of knowledge which is all-engulfing and beyond which nothing exists. This attitudinal and philosophical framework is called rationalism which provides the reason and authoritative authenticity of all explanations of various phenomena of the universe.

Modernity implies truth, beauty and all that standards exist as objective realities that can be discovered, known and understood through rational and scientific means. In this sense, modernity is closely associated with positivism which affirms the view that relies on scientific method as the only source of true knowledge. Modernity, like positivism, rejects tradition and metaphysics as pre-scientific firms of thought.

Modernity ushered in an age of reason. In this age man became aware of his own potentiality and was able to replace God from the centre of thought and action. This age espoused and affirmed the rational, natural or earthly, secular, human-centric thought-process. Francis Bacon strongly favoured scientific and technological advancement for the fulfillment of human needs. Mastery of man over nature was thought to be the mian function of scientific knowledge. Scientific truth established through rigorous analysis of empirical data and information is infallible, absolute and universal.

Modern age was as an age of progress too. On the basis of unprecedented development of science and technology, transport and communication industrial production and trade and business get a tremendous fillip which helped to boost market worldwide. This age put an end to feudalism and gave birth to a new

civilization based on new mode of production. This new civilization asserted the supremacy of reason which made man his own master. In this respect, modernity is an offshot of Enlightenment which according to Kant stands for man's emergence from his self-incurred immaturity which hinders man's own understanding of his immense power inherent in him.

Enlightenment entails an engulfing force of reason, rationality and scientific temper and it criticizes all that which appears as unscientific and irrational. According to the spirit of Enlightenment, all human actions and all explanations of things come under the strict rule and scrutiny of reason; and it is reason which searches out and establishes decisive, total and unchanging or constant truth. This truth is, in nature, essential and foundational and denies relativism in respect of reaching alternative truth. Establishment of this truth is the motto of science which is used to create the wealth or to increase the productivity of material production. Huge material production requires the development of technology along with science and this science and technology combined together forges a powerful 'cultural regime' which determines not only human actions but unwaveringly belives in the notion that it is able to expose and explain the rules and laws of development of history and society. Modernity as sponsored by Enlightenment thus believes in historicism; and it asserts that the development of history is unilinear and always it advances towards progress. Being inspired by the all-engulfing culture of reason, science and technology as activated by the motivation to prodnce more, the concept of creation and strengthening of nation-states looms large and those are established on the basis of homogeneous notion cutting accross all cultural diversities and societal differences and heterogencitie sand micro identities existent in societies. Overriding and denial of all these cultural diversities and societal fragments require power of dominance and aggresive assertions which sought to be legitimized by the doctrine of the power-thinker like Machavelli, a strong representative of this age of Enlightenment.

The inter-relation between Enlightenment and modernity is very close or, to say, organic. The inherent attributes of modernity are claimed to be the attributes of humanism. Enlightenment and, for that matter, modernity were responsible for American War of Independence in 1776, French revolution of 1789 and rapid industrialization of 1780s and thereafter, which led to the birth of capitalism drawn on the philosophical system of individualism and on general progress of mankind.

But postmodernism has no unified, essential and foundational defination, nor it represents a so-called coherent theoretical scheme with formidable doctrinaire position usually preferred by a typical scholar in social science or by socio-political activist working on any uni-dimensional issue. The central theme of postmodernism

as developed by the thinkers is oriented to criticize the notions and the social and political messages of modernity and to point out the limitations of it as a praxis. These limitations were exposed in the course of its operation both at the level of theory and practice to which all dominant social and political theories and their practical manifestations including Marxism have been subjected to. Instead of essentialism, foundationalism, totality, universalism, determinism and homogeneity inherent in modernity, postmodernism relies on relativism, piuralism, detotalization, localism, disclosure and fragmentation, deconstruction and heterogeneity.

9.3   Origin of Postmodernism

In social science and in the realm of social and political practice, postmodernism emerged in the background which is composed by the students' uprising and protest movements in Europe and in the United States in the middle of the twentieth century. The postmodernists are of opinion that the entire first half of the twentieth century is riddled with conflicts, chaos and contradictions and all these are grown out of obsessive attitude to hyper-scientific and rational epistemology and overlordship of scientific and technological revolution (STR) purshed and spearheaded by the nations who later turned into powerful imperialist powers in an age of flourishing industrialism. The twentieth century, for important reasons, is eventful. It witnessed the First World War, the emergence of socialist state in Russia rise of fascism and nazism respectively in Italy and Germany, heinous genocide, outbreak of the Second World War, heart-breaking Hirosima and Nagasaki, crushing of nationalist and democratic aspirations of the people of Asia, Africa and Latin America by the colonial and imperialist powers, birth of cold war between the USA and the erstwhile USSR, politics of possession over world economic, social and political resources by both the capitalist and the socialist blocs, rampant exploitation and mass killing in Vietnam-Laos and Kampuchia, cross border terrorism, fall of Berlin Wall, repeated gulf wars, dissolution of the USSR, burgeoning recession in capitalism etc. on the one hand and on the other, liberation and emergence of many new nations, birth of an wide array of new social movements in various parts of the world like feminist movements, environmental movements, human rights movements of varried forms, urge for sustainable development and so on and so forth through the length of this century. Questions were raised contesting the claims of modernity to (a) emancipate man from unreasonable exploitation and oppression of myriad forms and degrees, (b) ensure progress, and (c) make new history of mankind free from unreason and untruth.

9.3.1 Philosophical Sources

Jean Jacques Rousseau, influenced by romantism, had first raised question against the validity of reason and rationality and of the notion of progress and universalism as emphatically stressed by European modernity and the 17th century Enlightenment. Rousseau was not in a position to approve the confinement of man and his free consciousness to so-called hyper-scientific laws and rules as urged by the positivists. Kant also had expressed his categorial doubt against it. Professor Sobhanlal Datta Gupta contends that Kant's bifurcation of the world of noumenon and the world of phenomenon, his dictinction between the beautiful and the sublime, were powerful philosophical pointers in this direction. Professor Datta Gupta is also of opinion that it is this notion of critique of reason which later flowed into the ideas of Frankfurt School and exposed the vandalizing power of instrumental reason. Itrevealed, most flagrantly, the content of unreason resident in reason as valorized by European modernity.

Postmodern socio-political perspective, it is commonly taken, has received adirect impetus from Nietzsche and Heidegger. Nietzsche is the champion of perspectivism. He is of opinion that interpretations and conceptions of truth depend on perspective. There is nothing saying of absolute truth. Truth varies because of perspective of persons who seek to understand and realize truth varies. According to him, a particular language is not always adequate experession of all realities. Concepts, he holds, may have a long history and in the course of history those concepts are variously defined and understood by people who are in different and heterogeneous positions and with different and heterogeneous prespectives. His Genealogy of Morals approves no objective point upon which anything particular and systematic can be built.

Martin Heidegger is very much averse to positivism of modernity and to modern technology which, according to him, lead to homelessness. Modern technology, he contends, is dangerous because it is the ultimate distance from the philosophical study of the nature of being, becoming, existence or reality. Heidegger seeks to restore a home for man in an awareness of Being. In the Letter of Humanism of 1947 he says that homelessness consists in the abondonment of Being by beings and because of it the truth of being remains unthought. Heidegger is in favour of liberation of language from grammer which asks everyone and everything to strictly conform to rules. He opines that thinking begins only when we have come to know that reason glorified for centuries, is the most stiff-naked adversary of thought. Instead of modern utilitarian, technological and, for that matter meaningless

and empty world Heideggar aims at returning to a supersensuous world where Being would present itself in its plentitude. His philosophical attitude to modern technology leads him to oppose both the capitalist and socialist industrialism.

9.4   kPostmodernist Thinkers

1. Lyotard

Armed with the attitude and interpretation of many thinkers and philosophers against modernity and Enlightenment Jean Francois Lyotard in his The Postmodern Condition–A Report on Knowledge (1979) represents the central core of postmodern thinking. Lyotard does not believe in the great plans that shape the world. He explicitlyrejects tolalizing perspectives on history and society. These totalizing perspectives are, according to him, the grand narratives or the meta-narratives. In credulity towards meta-narratives is his strong philosophical position with which he questions the previleged position of scientific rationalism as a dominant form of knowledge. Lyotard contends that postmodern knowledge is not simply a tool of authorities; it refines our sensitivity to differences and reinforces our ability to telerate the incommensurable. He discovers intolerence and varying degree of dictate behind the modernist design of so-called universalism, essentialism and totality the modernists have implanted into their science, history, language and narratives. Modernist notions of emancipation, freedom and progress are not, according to Lyotard, very reliable and, hence, are doubtful, and, for this reason, he prefers smallish, localized narratives to meta-narratives or the grand narratives, of modernity. Localized narratives or micro narratives, as Lyotard implies, rescues what is displaced in the high flow of modernism, confines none and nothing to cultural stereotypes and recognizes boundless diversity, differences and million motives and arpirations of man.

2. Foucault

Michel Foucault is a very strong postmodernist thinker. He contends that there is nothing saying of absolute truth. Truth is recognized by society and as social reality is always in a state of flux truth, he says, varies. According to him, men in society exchange their ideas and information through signs, symbols, pictures, languages and discourses which reflect power dirtributed among the members of society.

Foucault believes that knowledge is not immune from the workings of power. Power, as he says, has the character of a network which has a wide reach in society.

In his opinion, schools, hospitals, workshops, barracks of modern society are all, in fact the epitome of power where men in there are to become socialized and to work under strict surveilance of the person who can use language, sign, symbol and discource with greater dominance. Foucault opines that there are varions forms of human rationality, diverse and heterogenous traditions of reason in the histories of human societies, different modes of logical consistency and argumentations which together contradict the monist privilege of essential reason. The reason of Enlightenment is thus represssive to all other forms of reason; it marginalizes all other reasons and excludes them as unreason, thereby builds an imperialist regime ofa despotic reason which forcefully declares itself as the supreme and sovereign and trivialize others as being inadequte, fragmentary and subordinate. So according to Foucault, post-Enlightenment reason is a discourse of power which standardizes, homogenizes and determines what is rational and what is irrational.

Foucault holds that power is an integral component in the production of knowledge, reason and truth and all these are not outside power and are lacking inpower, rather they manifest the workings and plays of power. His particular position to power-knowledge or power-truth relationship implies that he seeks to take and support a relativist position. He attacks on the tyranny of the great systems, grand theories and vital truths. His aim is to give free play to difference, to local and contextual knowledge, to fragmented and subjugated peripheral knowledge, to marginalized wisdoms, and to rupture, contingency and discontinuity.

Michel Foucault, once himself a Marxist and member of French Communist, Party, raises serious question against Marxism which, according to him, is emanated from the so-called European modernity as it could not alienate itself from the root of western knowledge. As he contends Marxism is a structure of orthodoxy and it has failed to slove the problem relating to gender, environment, minority community and crime. Dialectical materialism and class struggle are but grand narratives which expand the net of power-knowledge relationships and create a new equation that instead of hastening the freedom of the masses helps in unfolding a new social and political tyranny. He denounces the role and the belief system of the Communist Party of France as determined by the then Soviet Union and unequivocally supported the East European communist dissenters. Madness and Civilization (1961), The Archaeology of Knowledge (1969), History of Sexuality (Vols I-III, 1976-1987-1990) and Discipline and Punish (1977) are the major works of Michel Foucault where he has presented his critique of modernism and his own post-structuralist and postmodernist position.

3. Derrida

Jacques Derrida, starts his philosophical journey with severe attack on structuralism and also with strong belief that an word, or a poetry or a language express and reveal multiple meanings and implications. In his Writing and Difference (1978); Of Gramatology (1967), Margin of Philosophy (1981) and Voice and Phenomenon (1967), in particular, he establishes his stand for postmodernism. Derrida repudiates Logocentrism which approves the notion that truth is the fundamental, fullest and central thing that expresses the cause or the meaning of origin. Logocentism, according to him, phallocratic, patriarchal and masculine because it rejects others contradicting the central truth. He is, however, agreed to recognize the multiple meanings of any text. As periphery resides within centre, he opines, text involves several dimensions and implications which are denied by the orthodox western scholars. The footnotes and the notes in the margin of a text are important for the text to reveal irself. Derrida here prescribes the need for deconstruction of all constructed texts to reveal what they seek to express and thus they become new construction. Deconstruction, as he thinks, helps to liberate text and truth drawn on uni-linear fashion and thus to continue the search of new and new text and truth which themselves are subject to further analysis and inquiry. Truth, thus, according to Dersida, is not permanant, nor it is universal; but it is contextual as its validity is judged by the context which is but changing.

Jacques Derrida's postmodernist ideas do have important impact upon the feminist, lesbian, minority and other identity groups who challenge the centralized socio-cultural values of socially and politically anthoritarian regime. Darrida opposes any scheme or project forged by any political orthodoxy, and for this reason, he rejects authoritarian inheritance of Marxism. He prefers discursive Marxism to 'scientific' Marxism.

4. Baudrillard

Jean Baudrillard is an ardent postmodermist who later views postmodernity as completely a new phenomenon totally dissociated from modernity. Baudrillard starts his postmodernist philophical journey with his opposition to Marxism. He has introduced the idea of symbolic exchange as against economic exchange. He is of opinion that in postmodern society a cycle of giving and receiving, taking and returning is in constant operation. Contemporary society is not controlled and determined by production, rather it is controlled and dominated by media, cybernetic

models and steering systems, computers, information processing, entertainment and knowledge industries. All these models, systems and devices produce or create signs through which coding and decoding of everything are done. These signs and their producers or creators, in fact, control the society. In this society, profit, explotation or mode of production are irrelevant, and the signs are predominant and these signs are themselves self-referential. In this society, there remains no distinction between signs and the social reality and just for this reason, it is very difficult to determine what does reality mean in definite terms. Baudrillard observes that productive system, commodity and techonology as such do not imply the characteristics of the present society. This society instead is characterized by implosion of the distinction between signs and reality. Baudrillard contends that post modern society can be seen as undergoing the process of dedifferentiation while modern world underwent a process of differentiation.

Baudrillard describes this world as hyperreality. He opines that the media pervades or engulf all the aspects and spheres of life. In so doing it becomes even more real than life is in reality. Whatever the media presents are indiscriminately followed by people who accept their presentations as more than real without judging their validity. In this process, Baudrillard observes, the real takes on the character of hyperreal which, in the end, replaces the real and establishes itself as real in collective mind and perception. This perception makes the masses increasingly passive, indifferent and apathetic and creates a culture of death.

The Mirror of Production (1975), Simulacres et Simulation (1981), The Gulf War did not take place (1995) are Baudrillard's main works.

It is relavant to mention here that none of the postmodernist interpretations as advanced by lyotard, Foucault, Derrida and Baudrillard is above and beyond criticism. Charles Taylor, Noam Chomsky, Camil Paglia, Jurgen Habermas among others have raised serions allegation against postmodermism for its conceptenal inconsistency as evident in understanding and presentation of the overal trends of the world we are living in. The language, the postmodernist thinkers have used is exorbitantly complex and full of jargons thereby making their statements unusaually critical. Various critics are of opinion that, postmodernism is highly diverse intellectual activity as a result of which it can not provide any distinct idea about what postmodernism does mean in particular. It lacks coherence and promotes resistance to reliable knowledge and relativism in culture and morality.

9.5   Features of Postmodern Perspective

Dispite intricacy immanent in concepts and presentation of original postmodern socio-political literatures we can sort out some features of postmodern perspective in the following way.

1. In the sphere of knowledge, no inference is final, conclusive and dicisive, nor it can be scientific and be categorized as unchanging truth. Knowledge called scientific or theories pronounced as grand and systematic are established by dominant power existent in society. Knowledge, according to postmodernist perspective, is contextual and culture-specific and truths are many and they appear differently to different people at different places and circumstances. Pure reason and infallible knowledge are myth, according to postmodernist interpretation.

2. The notion of power is no uni-dimensional and it is not always necessarily state-centric. Power is ubiquitous in society. Postmodern politics is suspicious of the nation-state system and considers it as a political construction. As against Hegel it denies the emergence and existence of state as aninstrument of change of human history and ensuring progress. State power extolls itself and besieges micro, marginal, local and fragmented entities thatpossess significant resources in making numerous narratives.

3. Postmodern perspectives is opposed to historicism. The postmodernists assert that there is no overall pattern in history, nor history is progressive and is progressing towards any perfection enhancing the freedom of man. History is directionless. History, knowledge and human subject are fundamentally rooted in contingency, discontinuity and iniquitous origins. Postmodern thinkers believe in the irreducible contingency and indeterminancy.

4. Postmordern pesepctive opposes Marxian explanation of state mechinary. The postmodernists are of opinion that power is not only concentrated in the mechinery of state. Power has the character of a network which has a wide reach in society. Within society, power is variegated and found everywhere and, hence it is difficult to step outside the net of power. The concept of power, according to postmodernist perspective is multi-dimensional as it operates in much more subtle and small level of regular human activity.

5. The state in postmodern discourse does have no class character because of the fact that society and state do have multiple discourses of multiple groups and entities basing on gender, class and ethnicity. Class-centric politics, according to the postmodernist interpretation, is too limited and does not represent the diverse narratives and interactions taking place in the realm of society and state.

6. Postmodernism defies universal reason and the prospect of rational thinkingas emphasized by modernism. For this matter, it goes against its project of humanism and the assurance of independence, freedom, democracy and so-called scientific advancement of human civilization as pronomced by modernity which has extolled its pure reason and science wining over spiritual forces. The postmodernists are of opinion that western ideologies based on the spirit of European Enlightement, instead of expanding independence in thinking and belief in progress of human race, have allowed the politics of power and are used to colonize foreign cultures and subjugate the minorities and the underprivileged.

7. Postmodernists contend that politics is all-pervading and it is the fundamantal basis of our life, of our thinking and activity. All aspects of our life and activity, our existence and feeling, thinking and consciousness, our realization of nature and of needs of others are derivatives of politics which againis shaped by them. Politics is thus an inportant component of human life and the core of politics is composed of whatever happens in the realm of thinking and activity of human being.

8. Postmodernism tends to reject broad narratives which are taken as authoritative and conceal diverse narratives in the name of absolute and essential reason and science by means of homogenization of all plural and heterogeneous forces existing in state and society. Jacque Derrida, hence, has urged the need for deconstruction of the modernist construction and the modernist text or discourse which do not represent the concrete reality or truth. The purpose of deconstruction is to discover the opposite discourse of the prevalent language and text which rationalize metaphysics as science and domination as natural rule.

9. Postmodern condition of the present world is characterized, as Baudrillard observes, by symbolic exchange simulation, hyperreality and seduction. The media and the electronic devices have changed the social, economic, political and cultural processes as introduced by modernism and have taken away distinction between signs and reality. The media today is

no longer the mirror of reality, but it becomes even more real than reality. This hyperreality have created a catastrophic culture absorbing the masses who later forget everything meaningful and who lose the revolutionary hope as Marx urged or the need for reform as Durkheim hoped.

10. Postmoderm perspective is appeared as distinct and exceptional. When all other theories tend to prescribe any particular state of affair as being good and ideal and guide people to follow and execute it to benefit them, postmodernism does not search for any master discourse. On the contrary, it encourages relativism and scepticism towards and also sabotage agaist dominant theory, dominant ideology, dominant epistemology and dominant socio-political and cultural force.

Postmodernism is explained as being self-refuting and anarchical as it does not even allow itself any pause in decentering the centre, debasing the based, indeterminating the determinate, deunifying the unified and demystifying the mistified.

9.6   Debate between Marxism and Postmodern perspective

The debate between Marxism and postmodernism is very interesting as it possesses a deep theoritical as well as practical value. Scholars like Alex Callinicos, E.M. Wood and Terry Eagleton have taken a very sharp critical position against postmodernism. They consider the postmodernist position vis-a-vis Marxism is baffling, dangerous and reactionary. They are of opinion that Marxism project is an alternative to capitalism that is meant for an explanation of oppression, domination and exploitation of man by man. Although Marxism is an outcome of European modernism based on reason and rationality, it negates and is critical towards bourgeois modernism that enslaves man by controlling the reason of capital. Postmodernism tends to attack the Marxist project to create a society free from class domination and class exploitation. A society based on the Marxist principles is society that ensures freedom and equality not for any particular class but for the entire citizenry. Postmodernism, these scholars argue, defeats this grand project of emancipation of man.

Marxist scholar Aijaz Ahmad in his book 'In Theory: Classes, Nations, Literature', contends that postmodernism is an intellectual weapon of imperialism. It decisively seeks to uproot socialism and weaken class struggle. It rationalises the capitalist order and misguides the international communist movement for establishing socialism on the demolition of imperialism and colonialism.

A few other Marxist ideologues have denounced postmodernism using several virulent comments like (a) it is disguised enemy of Marxism, (b) it is intellectually marked nihilism, and (c) it is a bourgeois ideology in its finest sophistication, etc.

Some other Marxist critics are of opinion that in an age of total confusion resultantly grown out of the fall of Berlin Wall, breakdown of socialist regimes in East European countries, end of Maoist period in China and finally collapse of the Soviet Union in Russia, postmodernism seeks to roll back the wheel of civilization. The secritics contend that the seventeenth century renaissance-reformation and Englightement had brought reason and rationalism in Europe. Refusing any particular scheme of social development, postmodernism seeks to refute and attack rationalism. Essentially the philosophy postmodernism espouses is but the fatalism of the middle ages.

Marxism is born in the process of modernity. The foundation of Marxism is materialistic philisophy based on rationalism. By its rejection of grand narrative, postmodernism defends the narrative of disorder and anarchy. Marxist critics of postmodernism observe that European Enlightenment does have tremendous intellectual contribution to the advancement of human history and human civilization. The theorists and philosophers of Enlightenment like Locke, Kant, Hume, Descartes, Bacon have constructed the theory of progress and advancement by means of illuminating the inner relationship between science and advancement. The postmodernists have opposed Enlightenment and modernism but they could not preseribe any alternative philosophy and theory of human progress and advancement. From this point of view, postmodernism is pointless. It is but an word game. It is itself the dead end of philosophy and of political theory.

Fredric Jameson has criticized postmodernism from a rather moderate Marxist standpoint. According to him, postmodernism is the cultural logic of late capitalism. He opines that modernity is the relevant culture of market capitalism while globalized capitalism has created postmodernism as its relevant culture. He has opposed Lyotard when he advocates incredulity to meta-narrative, and observes that the relevance of meta-narrative is still valid. He strongly holds the view that history could not be reduced to only text and narrative, and history, according to him, is the narrative of class struggle. In the sphere of politics, he believes firmly, the notion of totality cannot be avoided. Jameson is of the view that postmodernism refuses to critically engage itself with the meta-narrative of capitalization and globalization. This refusal makes it consistent with prevailing relations of domination and expliotation.

Perry Anderson has identifyed a new kind of capitalism which rose in the very later part of the twentieth century. It has led, as he observes, to the birth of postmodernism. Uncertain, restless and speculative stock market condition determining the worldwide flow of capital is the characteristic of this new capitalism.

This time is a time of boom of information technology which transforms the real man into a digitized image altogether averse and unable to reverse the consistent trend of frustration, cynicism and negation spread in all spheres of life. Features and trends of this age are, Anderson contends, features and trends of postmodernism.

As the various Marxist scholars and ideologues criticize postmodernism, the postmodermists are also critical against Marxism and the Marxists. Prof. Sobhanlal Datta Gupta has excellently put together the points of criticism the postmodernists have raised against Marxism. We now mention below the postmodernist arguments against Marxism.

First of all, Marxism is an offshoot of modernity. It is a branch and a component of it. It is a metanarrative and a grand utopia against the bourgeois vision of modernity. Marxism is grounded in the notion of reason as emphasized by the Europian Enlightenment. In Marxism the reason and rationality of capital is replaced by the reason and rationality of class struggle is the only difference between bourgeois vision of modernity and Marxist vision of modernity.

Secondly, as postmodernism opposes teleological history and as history is fluid and indeterminate and endowed with a plurality of meanings, according to the postmodern understanding of history, it contests Marxism as it considers the history of all hitherto existing society is the history of class struggle and the future development of history will culminate, as Marxism contends, in the attainment of communism via socialism. Postmodernism does not belive in such unileaner progress of history.

Thirdly, in the postmodernist power-knowledge frame of reference, the vision of socialism is outmoded and not tenable because it is essentially a universalist and totalizing frame basically grounded in reason. The Marxian project of socialism and communism represents the notion of power and domination and reflects a persistent trend of totalitarianism.

Fourthly, Marxist narrative of class struggle is highly sceptical as history of manis not a result of class struggle, nor it is at its command and will follow its unilateral directives to evolve in the days ahead. The postmodernists contend that history is replete with million struggles waged by various groups at different local and micro levels.

Fifthly, Marxism defies the multidimensional existence of gender, tribe, caste and clan and it has given total emphasis on class in its meta-narrative of universal history. It thus gets history in closure.

Sixthly, Marxism beleives in uniformity so far as the composition and development of history are concerned. It negates difference. According to the

Marxists, class is the chief component of society and history and they develop according to the universal logic of class struggle. But, on the contrary, the postmodern view of history has its emphasis on difference, fragments and deconstruction.

Seventhly, Marxism relies on revolution and revolutionary parties as relevant to social and political transformation and change. So the macro ideas relating to society and politics are central concern upon Marxism lays central emphasis, while decentering the centre or the central is strongly espoused by postmodernism.

Eighthly, as Marxism disapproves plurality, multi-dimensionality, heterogeneity, and contextual specificity in respect of social composition and/or human action, itdenies the concept of freedom and democracy.

Two important notes in the concluding part of the debate between Marxism and postmodernism are thought to be worth mentioning.

Note 1. It is not Marx but Marxism of some Marxist ideologues, scholars and practitioners that has been the prime target of postmodernist criticism. And

Note 2. It is Marx and his Marxism that have led the mainstream postmodernists to reinstate the creative principles of emancipatory Marxism.

The original Marx and his own Marxism is not unilinear, opposed to multi-dimensionality and historical and contextual specificity and confined to fixity or closure. The Class Struggle in France, The Eighteenth Brumaire of Louis Bonaparte, The Civil War in France composed by Marx and The Peasant War in Germany composed by Marx and his associate, Fredrich Engels, have reflected in clear terms historical specificity and multi-dimensionality of struggle as against universality and unilinearity of history. Even the writings like The Development of Capitalism in Russia by Lenin, The Analysis of Classes in Chinese Society by Mao Zedong and Prison Notebook by Antonio Gramsci were the exercises into understanding the particular situations of revolutionary processes against contemporary feudalism, capitalism and fascism.

Marxism is basically a subjective instrument to change the objective reality of class exploitation and class domination. But literatures like Bukharin's theory of Historical Materialism: a Manual of Popular Sociology, Stalin's Foundation of Leninism and A Short History of the CPSU (Bolshevik) etc., have transformed Marxism into science and into manualized doctrine. The turning of Marxism into a Bolshevik phenomenon, its growing Stalinization, the outright negation and forceful repression of the 'other' or the 'different' as represented by Trotsky or Rosa Luxemburg, growth of absolute centrality and bureaucratization in the structure and functioning of the communist party particularly in Soviet Union, etc., had reduced creative Marxism into mechanical, hyperrational and regressive Marxism

which reflects essentialism, absence of difference and otherness and negation of democracy and tolerence. The Soviet communist experiment with the East Eurpean nations like Poland, Hungery and Czechoslovakia narrates the meta-narrative of control, surveilance and domination upon which the 'Soviet Marxism' excessively relied. This storyline of the 'Soviet Marxism' got it in permanent closure towards the close of the twentieth century.

Twenty first century may be a time-period of dialogue between Marxism and postmodernism. Michel Foucault and Jacque Derrida had expressed their unwavering faith in Marxism as revealed in their several conversations. Coming out of scholars, intellectuals and practitioners who have intense reading of original Marxism and of the nature and movement of international capitalism is the need of the hour, for initiating the dialogue between Marxism and postmodernism in the interest of removing the poverty, both physical and philosophical.

9.7   Conclusion

Postmodernism may be explained as a set of philosophical critians of teleological and rationalist conceptions of natures, history, power, freedom and subjectivity. Postmodernism in political theory emerged in close ralation to other approaches including ferminism, liberalism, psychoanatytic theory and critical theory. It makes the most sense when understood in dialogue with these perspectives, as part of a broader dicussion about the nature of reality, the degree to which it is knowable and the possibilities for its improvement in terms of justice. Freedom or hermaneness. However, critics from both the right and the left have tended to see postmodernism as a rejection of the quest for an objective truth behind subjective experiences. Postmodern political theory is charged with being anti-political and unable to take an ethnical stand except that of resistance, disobedience or refusal.

9.8   Summing Up

- Postmodernism is the crtique of the basic ideas and assumptions of modernism and thier impacts on art, literature and theories and discourses of state, society, politics and culture.
- Modernity is a necessary product of European Enlightenment that emphasized the totalizing and essentializing notions like rationalism, scienticism, humanism, integration and general progress. But the objectives social and political reality as grown even in enlightend Europe and America in the face of diverse socio-political chaos and contradiction

has challenged the basic assumptions of modernity and bring out the hollowed content of grand theories and meta narratives built upon those ideas and assumptions modernity incorporates and espouses.

- As aganist modernist discourse, Lyotard, Foucault, Derrida and Baudrillard and many others drawing impetus from Nietzsche and Heidegger have emphasized the existence of multiple meaning of truth and they have questioned the validity of settled assumptions of knowledge relating to society, culture and civilization.

9.9   Pobable Questions

Essay Type Questions:

1. Discuss the background of the emergence of postmodernism.
2. How do the Marxists criticize postmodernism?
3. Give an account of the postmodernist critique of Marxism.

Short Questions:

1. In what sense can postmodernism be considered as a critique of modernity?
2. What do you mean by postmodernism?
3. Discuss, in brief, the characteristics of postmodernism.

Objectives Questions:

1. What is the intellectual source of postmodernism?
2. What does Derrida mean by deconstruition?
3. What is the most-fundamental aspect of Foucault's concept of power?

9.9   Further Reading

1. Ritzer, George, *Modern Sociological Theory*, New York, McGRAW HillInternational Editions, 1996.
2. Datta Gupta, Sobhanlal, *Marxism in Dark Times*, London, Anthem Press, 2013.
3. Datta Gupta, Sobhanlal, *Samaj, Marxtattwa O Samakal*, Kolkata, Seriban,2019. (in Bengali)
4. Basu, Pradip, *Postmodernism, Marxism, Postcolonialism*, Kolkata, AvenelPress, 2010. (in Bengali)

5. Basu, Pradip, *Uttaradhunik Rajniti O Marxbad*, Kolkata, Pustok Biponi,2005. (in Bengali)

6. Sen, Sujit (ed), *Uttaradhunikatabad Prasanger Nanadi*k, Kolkata, LakiPublishers, 2018. (in Bengali)

7. Khasnobis, Ratan, *Marxbad O Uttaradhunikata*, Kolkata, Rupali, 2012. (inBengali)

8. Doshi, S.L., Modernity, *Postmodernity and Neo-Sociological Theories*, NewDelhi, Rawat Publications, 2006.

9. Hutcheon, Linda, *The Politics of Postmodernism*, London, Routeledge, 2003.

Unit-10 □ Postcolonial Perspective in Political Theory

Structure

10.0 Objective

After studying the materials of this unit the learners will understand
- Meaning of Postcolonialism
- Growth and development of the perspective of postcolonialism
- Different ideas of different scholars on postcolonialism
- Features of postcolonial perspectives
- Limitations of the perspective of postcolonialism

10.1 Introduction

Postcolonialism is a recent discursive perspective in political and social theory. In the fields of literature, film, music and art, postcolonicalism is a topic of enduring critical discussion. It is a subject, basically inter-disciplinary in nature

and has become substantially complex but multi-dimensional attractive subject as it involves several questions of intellectual debates relating to epistemological and philosophical throught-processes. Postcolonialism to be precise, is the cultural critique of western colonialism, most formally has evolved in 1970s and '80s. But the root of its evolution dates back to much earlier and the inspiration of this critique or theoretical prespective still permeates a good number of contemporary works of cultural, artistic, literary and educational significance.

We all know that colonialism is the name of transformed imperialism. The objective of colonialism is not just to occupy colony through military aggression butto ensure and perpetuate economic exploitation and political control by means of extending the net of power and domination over the realm of psyche and culture of the colonized. The colonical rulers and their intellectual associates legitimizing the colonial rules designate the West as responsible for bringing the colonized of Asia, Africa and Latin America in the light of 'modern' civilization. Rudyard Kipling and many other had much earlier stated the burden of the colonized and their ignorance, poverty and destitude as being the responsibility of the White to address.

Postcolonialism signifies the project of extension of civilization by the White rulers and their following and associating social theorists and literary community. Ideologically postcolonialism and postcolonial writings highlight on the forceful cultural and racial domination and supremacy of the West over the non-western world and people thereof. Joseph Arnest Renan, a French racialist orientalist had made rude and offensive remarks towards the non-White people of non-western nations in his various works in the second part of the nineteenth century. These people having old and obsolete ideas and orientations had, as Renan observed, nosense of world civilization of modern times. In all respects, they, according to him, were backward and stupid. Thomas Babington Macaulay in his infamous educational Minute of 1835 despised the tradition of education and learning in Sanskrit language as prevalent in the early part of British India and strongly exalted the superiority of western literature and system of knowledge. In his Minute Macaulay remarked that the education and learning pattern of the native was much inferior to education and learning as rife in the lower primary schools in England.

Almost similar narrative regarding Indian education and culture and of civilization Reverend J. Tucker had presented. In his opinion, Indian civilization is inferior becouse Indian mind is deficient in power and the world of understanding

of the Indian people is void. Indian people, as Tucker contended, are not those people who are entitled to have importance in the light of Enlightenment humanism as they lack superior knowledge and education or the will to have such knowledge and education. The colonial rulers and their associates are, in fact, so racist as they strongly believethat East in East and West is West and never the twine shall meet as the knowledge and education and culture and civilization of the West reside in a place far beyond the reach of those of the East. There is no denying the fact that the real intention and scheme of these remarks and observations were designed to demolish the cultural and moral backbone of the colonized of the orient and exploitation and looting of economic resources of these countries on long-term basis. As we know, every nation possesses broady two kinds of basic resources: (a) psychological and cultural resources involvingthe power of mind, consciousness and thought-process and (b) economic resources embeded in water, forests, mines, agriculture and industry. The strongly coarse expression of arrogant egoism of the ethno-centric and racist rulers and their hired administrators and intellectuals was but to consolidate colonial control and domination over these two kinds of resources of the colonized nations. And it indicates that the cultural and psychological supremacy and racial egoism of the West definitely and desperately shows the existence of power-relations between the colonizer and the colonized. Postcolonialism and postcolonial writings have stood against the colonial ethics and ideology and oppose their pervading impact that dampens the spirit and energy of resurgence and regeneration of people once colonized.

Postcolonialism is indeed a study of the cultural conflicts and confrontations and their several ramifications which are very complex as they appear often mutually contending. These cultural conflicts and confrontations befall between the dominantracist colonizers of Europe and the colonized of Asia and Africa. Postcolonialism is not culturally or theoritically someting that has evolved in the period when and where colonialism had ended. The mainstream theorists of postcolonialism have enphaiszed the notion of postcolonial condition or the condition of postcoloniality as an important theme inherent in postcolonialism and most of them, thus, justify not to append hyphen between post and colonialism. These theorists are of opinion that the colonizers use to have intention to establish perpetual cultural hegemony upon the colonized nations. They firmly require to destroy not only their respective economy but to crush their language, education, culture and general understanding of moral principles. Desperately they use to

follow very deliberate and subtle plan to implement so as to get the general desire, taste and common ideas and prejudices of the people of the colonies consistent with and suitable to the colonial interest of the West. Perpetual subservience and subordination of the colonized to the supremacy and hegemonic hold of the colonizer refers to the condition of postcoloniality or postcolonial condition. This condition exists during the course of colonization and does not cease to exist when colonization comes to an end and the colonized acquires political statehood. Because of colonial hangover widely pervading the ideas and institutions, values and cultures of the peoples once colonized the prescription of the theorists and writers for withdrawing the hyphen between post and colonialism appears justified and consistent.

10.2 Evolution and Development of the Theory: The Perspective of Frantz Fanon

Although writings on postcolonialism began to flourish since 1970s, Frantz Fanon, an working psychiatrist at a French hospital in Algeria, had, in the begining of 1950s penned on the psycological subordination and erosion of cultural consciousness of the colonized people all over world. The immediate perspective of Fanon's work, Black Skin White Masks published in 1952, was the condition of the Algerian people under French colonial rule. Here Fanon elaborated on how the colonized people destroy their own indigenous cultural resources and identities undergoing the process of imitating or going after the ideas and practices of the colonizers. His another important work, Wretched of the Earth was published posthumously in 1961. In this later work, Fanon observed that at the global level, power is discriminately distributed. In this book, he discussed, in strong languages, the nature of inequality of power and couflict between the colonized nations of Afro-Asia and the colonizers of Europe. Domination of colonial discourses, stupid internalization of these discourses by the colonized and its resultant all-round obedience and subordination of the indigenous black and the brown to the White, etc. have been vividly described in Fanon's writings.

Fanon is very much critical against the pervasive psychological and political aggression of the colonial rulers of Europe. He strongly rejected the egoistic demand of the White for civilizing the subjugated indigenous people under colonialism. He gave the clarion call for the people to wage psychological resistance against the colonial rulers. He was confident in that the people in the colonies are capable to

rise against cultural aggression of the colonial rulers and their associates. Rightly he understood that colonial education and culture and the very attitudes to colonial civilization were the instruments of European hegemony and all these instruments were powered by the ideas of so-called Enlightenment, rationalism, humanism, progress and modernity. But these ideas as Fanon intends to express, do not relate to the condition of the powerless colonized, rather they endanger them and marginalize them. He observes that these instruments are instruments of hegemonic colonization, and, for eradication of the racist cultural and psychological decolonization Fanon adheres to the theory of collective violence and theoretically explains the redemptive value of collective action relevant to his project of decolonization. Jean Paul Sartre who consistently believed in revolutionary existential humanism upheld earnestly Fonon's call for forceful extraction of hegemonic European culture from Africa and Asia in his introduction to The Wretched of the Earth. Fanon's idea and exposition of revolutionary cultural and political decolonization is reflected favourably in the works of Simone de Beauvoir and Albert Camns. As we know Simone de Beaurvoir is a strong feminist theoretician of France and Albert Camus was the French leftist litterateur and philosophical thinker who won Nobel Prize in 1957 for literature at the age of only 44.

Both Fanon and Sartre were close to each other on the question of human freedom and social and moral responsibility of the individual. The philosophy of Sartre emphasized the importance of human dignity and social accountability of man. According to Sartre, freedom and social accountability are the tool of human struggle. To fight against oppression and injustice is the moral responsibility of an individual. If this individual does not take part in this struggle, he or she gets estranged from freedom and humanism and becomes himself or herself an oppressor. Fanon too considered development of new avenue for development of humanism as the moral responsibility of man. He regarded the stupid imitation of the European culture and way of life as contrary to reconstruction of human relationships and he observed that this imitation produces nothing but obscene caricatiure which adversely results in the way of making new history of the third world nations even after acquiring statehood after a long and protracted struggle against imperialism and colonialism.

Fanon strongly required to create creative cultural and psychological autonomy and self-identity of the colonized free from European subjugation and domination. He, however, observed that this new creative cultural autonomy and self-identity of

the colonized do not conform to the simple and uncontentious cultural values and actual practices of the people in the pre-colonial period. Fanon did not advocate to bring back the old days when our old ancestors lived in peace and tranquility. Rather he advised his fellowmen to overcome coloniality completely. In the post-colonial period, he opined, the attempt to establish creative community life of the once colonized will be failed if we fail to overcome the notions, signs, symbols or marks of coloniality. Fanon asked to evolve unceasing creative innovations by the free community for itself. He strongly believed that Europe can not make those individuals with all-round perfection. European culture and civilization does not involve any iota of humanity or humanism, on the contrary, it involves seccessive negations of it and it involves series of incidents of murder and killing of persons of various parts of the world. In fact, Fanon had upon him the deep impact of political thinking of his preceptor, Aime Cesaire. Cesaire once expressed his view that colonization led the colonial rulers and their associating poet, literateur and political thinkers to become wild and savage. This process of colonization turned these people into cruel and in human, and it sowed in them the poisonous seeds of greed and violence and racist discrimination and hatred. Almost fully convinced by the observations of his preceptor Fanon contended that the more the Europeans feel them endowed with the ideas of rationality, progress and humanism and all other gifts of European Enlightenment, the more they express their real identity as completely subdued by the pathological ideas of exploitation, racial discrimination, persecution and violence.

Fanon is a political theorist of decolonization. He strongly denounced the modernist exposition in regard to the ideas of progress and humanism of Europe and advised to shun this exposition in his attempt to repudiate coloniality of the colonized and make a creative future for them. For acquiring and ensuring freedom from the colonial rule based on violence, exploitation and racial discrimination Fanon gave the call for united revolutionary effort of the indigenous peasants, labourers, feudal masters, capitalists and the bourgeois elite for organization of national liberation struggle. He did not consider post-colonial nation-state as the only legitimate goal of this struggle; but anti-colonial nationalism and post-colonial nation-state, he observed, can require the colonized to evolve the possible condition helping them to remove mental and psychological degradition, dejection and pervasive marginalization. Fanon is of opinion that colonial world is bifurcated, and it is bifurcated between the ruler and the ruled, colonizer and the colonized, western and non-western, White and non-White. This bifurcation predominates the ideas and activities of the two contending groups or the parties of the colonial world.

Anti-colonial national liberation struggle,as he held, posed the challenge against domination and racial supremacy of the colonial rulers and their associates on the one hand, and on the other, it grew courage in the minds of the dejected colonized to raise human demands for freedom and equality. What is worth mentioning here is that Mahatma Gandhi in India and Ngugi, Cabral and Mboya in Africa had expressed their views favouring the varying influences of anti-colonial nationalism.

10.2.1 Contribution of Edward W. Said

Edward W. Said has elaborated the principal features of the intellectual inheritance of postcolonialism. He published his Orientalism in 1978 and this work is considered as the postcolonial classic and the most pertinent referring pointer for postcolonialism. He also wrote Culture and Imperialism published in 1993, The Question of Palestine, published in 1979, Power, Politics and Culture published in 2001, The Politics of Dispossession, published in 1994 and a few other to express his views on cultural studies more concerned to point the connection between imperialism and culture.

Said had on him the profound influences of post-structuralist and anti-humanist understanding of the contiguity between colonial power and western knowledge. His Orientalism entails attention to the discursive production of colonial meaning and also to the consolidation of colonial hegemony. In his Orientalism Said emphasized the theme that has enabled marginality and the matter of colony and empire to acquire the status of a discipline or a big area of study and research in Anglo-American academy. In fact, Orientalism does have extending impact on intellectual formations, structures and lives both in the West and in the postcolonninal non-West.

In Orientalism, Said has elaborated, indeed, a unique understanding of imperialism and colonialism as the epistemological and cultural attitude which accompanies the obvious habit of dominating and ruling distant territories. In his Culture and Imperialism, Said, again, has elaborated this idea. Here he writes that imperialism and colonialism do not indicate a simple act of accumulation and acquisition. He opines there that both imperialism and colonialism are supported and perhaps even impelled by impressive ideological formations and these ideological formations are based on the relationship between power and knowlege. This relationship is the source of hegemony that is imposed by the imperial and colonial rulers upon the people of the colonies. Power and domination backed by knowledge is turned into legitimate authority which is hegemonic in nature and which is not normally defied by the people.

While unmasking the ideological disguises of imperialism, Said, in his Orientalism, tries to expose the reciprocal relationship between colonial power and colonial knowledge. Said is of opinion that the way the westerners exihibit, judge, observe and assess obviously express definite insolence and boastful threat of power and domination. Western knowledge has its organic link with the rule, power and authority the colonialists build in their colonies. The East is won in the way East is known. In Orientalism, we find that Said is heavily influenced by Michel Foucault. Here he has extended his (Foucault's) paradigmatic accounts of the organic alliance between power and knowledge to colonial conditions. While explaining the contiguity between power and knowledge, Foucault observes that knowlege transforms power, changes it from a monolithic apparatus accumulated within the state into a web-like force which is confirmed and articulated through the everyday exchanges of knowledge or information which animate social life. Accordingly, power is reproduced indiscursive networks at every point where someone who knows is instructing someone who does not know.

Said is of opinion that the mastery and supremacy of power over knowledge is fatal and injurious. As he says, no self-respecting scholar or writer can get himself dissociated from the concerned social and political condition or reality and hence their work/s relates/relate to the time, place and circumstances. In socio-political system, Said argues, power is not evenly distributed and this results in multiple problems in society and polity. A responsible scholar or writer in his work tries to address these problems and it is his or her moral commitment. But in organized political society the dominant ruling class tends to institutionalize knowledge and use the institutionalized knowledge as an instrument to serve its own class interest. As a result of it, knowledge gets degraded and deviated from its orginal grandeur and dignity. Against this institutionalized degraded knowledge, Said seeks to to go for oppositional counter-knowledge.

Primarily Said welcomes orientalism of the western scholars. But a clear and deliberate effort to belittle and humiliate the East is definitely found implicit in the mainstream western orientalism for long. From their own standpoint and orientation, the western orientalist scholars have made explanation and description of history and culture, ideas and institutions and of social, political and religious

life of the East. These descriptions and explanations are the products of divisive mindset, full of hostility and 'us-them' discrimination. Orientalism of the occidental scholars represents superior-inferior relationship, it is inseminated by racial hatred and expresses overt and covert violence. The western orientalists have used this orientation and mindset in knowing, understanding and theorizing on the mind, nature, characteristics, socio-political and cultural behaviours and practices and general life-patterns of the easterner other who are considered distinct from the westerner selves from cultural and civilizational standpoint. Said firmly believes that the knowledge inspires this essentialization of the 'other' or, to say, this 'othering' is coercive and this coercive knowledge leads to grow discourses. Faithfully following the formulation of Foucault, Said observes that in every society discourses are produced, organized, selected and redistributed to crush or to manage popular resistance against the reigning regime and its authority. These discourses are produced, organized and redistributed under severesurveillance of the state so as to enable them to gain success in controlling the means and forms of representation in the society concerned. Said is of opinion that colonial discourses or orientalist discourses do conform to Foucault's idea of discourse and these colonial or orientalist discourses essentialize, particularize and symbolize the East as ignorant, speechless, sullen, indignant, half-devil, half-child, mystical and impoverished 'other'. Said opines that western discourses relating to the East are originally oriented to control and dominate the East; and, following Lacan's idea, he observes that the western culture with its fundamental orientation towards control and domination constructs its own self identity through 'othering'.

In his Orientatism, Said holds the view that by means of constructing the above-said stereotypes the western orientalists despise and neglect everything eastern and establish their own supremacy. Along this line of activity colonies are built, the indigenous education, culture, knowledge and the free spaces of common life of the people of the colonies are occupied and exploitation and presecution are kept in motion. Orientalism of the West is thus violent in nature and it is this discourse, Said observes, that offers representational violence. As he says, orientalist stereotypes invariably presupposes and confirms a totalizing and unified imperialist discourse.The arrogant and violent knowledge implicit in western orientalism, Said argues, led the imperialist and the colonial rulers and their associates to glorify and valorize their 'self' and disdain and humiliate 'other'. The power and authority the imperialist and the colonialist rulers thus assume is not only cultural and psychological, but it is also political and economic and then it is military.

Western orientalism constructs the identity of conqueror colonizer and superior for Europe and for the non-Europeans it constructs the identity of the conquered, colonized and inferior. So, as Said opines firmly, orientalism and knowledge about the orient of the occident scholars indicates a distinct scheme of relationship of power between the colonizers and the colonized, between the West and the East and between Europe and non-Europe.

The people under long-standing cultural, psychological, political, economic and military rule of the colonizers had followed, imitated and been influenced by the western education and culture, language and forms of apparent bahaviour. Various attempts of the colonizers like introduction of English department in Indian universities, valorization of english literature with its own perceived beauty, truth and morality and practising Euro-centric values in public and private life had two-fold objectives. These attempts were undertaken with an intention to enforce marginality and inferiority of the colonized culture and of the indigenous knowledge and sense of morality on the one hand and to manufacture consent towards the imperial and colonial rule by mans of creating in them a favourable belief-system conducive to rule the colonies on the other. Ngugi wa Thiong'O, the renowned Kenyan writer and academic and Mahatma Gandhi have given a solemn declaration of opinion against European aggression of education and culture and knowledge and wisdom of the non-European races.

Ngugi has considered the colonial language and culture as the fatal and terrifying sphere of colonial discourse. In his Decolonizing Mind, published in 1986, Ngugi observes that language asserts self-identity. Hence, he emphasizes on building and strengthening cultural foundation of identity of the colonized and calls for abrogation of the language and culture of the colonizers. As he opines, this act of abrogation of the alien language and culture and of building of the strong basis of own culture and language of the people in the colonies are of utmost importance. He has noticed that the language and culture of the indigenous people of Africa and Latin America are about to become extinct in the face of cocrcion and high handedness of the colonial language and culture and French or Spanish or English has been predominant there. This is why. Ngugi has sought to abrogate colonial language or languages and to reread and rewrite the colonial writings. This rereading and rewriting express his attitude to protest and dissent against colonialist aggression of indigenous cultural wealth of the colonies. His River Between (1965) is an express product of this protest attitude Ngugi had long cherished before his publication of Decolonizing Mind.

Edward Said has endorsed Ngugi's intention and attempt to build anti-colonial cultural resistance. But he rejects abrogation of the colonial language and culture and has recommended to alter and make them consistent to social and cultural contexts of the locality and then to make the counter-culture against colonial culture. He thinks that Salman Rushdie is successful in performing this work in his Midnight's Children. Said contends that Rushdie has compelled the West to recognize the East. In the hands of Rushdie this East in restructured and it is restructured by the discourses of the West. So, instead of obrogation of colonial culture and languges Said intends to build counter-culture or culture of resistance which repudiates orthodox nativism and extremist nationalism hindering the process of decolonization. Said is of opinion that it is an imperative to rediscover the nature of imperialist domination and repression, deformation and defamation of the history and culture of the indigenous nations and then to build a solid foundation of decolonization. For this purpose he asserts, we should have to work with tradition, language, history and literature of different nations and again, customs and conventions, rituals and social pratices as prevalent in various societies and in various parts of them are required to be involved to this attempt. In his Culture and Imperialism published in 1993, Said lays emphasis on the deep inquiry into the different roots of South Asian culture and literature which entail multi-cultural dimension, and in this attempt he himself comes closer to sub-altern study group.

10.2.2 Homi K. Bhaba and Theory of Postcolonialism

Homi K. Bhaba is an important thinker of postcolonialism. Bhaba is influenced by the ideas, observations and conceptual innovations advanced by Jack Lacan, Jacque Derrida and Michel Foucault. Bhada has introduced the concepts and ideas like hybridity, displacement, ambivalence, unhomely etc. in the realm of the theoryof postcolonialism and these ideas and concepts have led the theory to gain more richness and intricacy as well.

What Bhaba has told in his Location of Culture (1994) and Of Mimicry and Man (1984) and elsewhere is that the imperialist powers have brought various changes in the realm of language, education, culture and life-processes of the people in the colonies. The primary objectives of this change-effort were to establish colonies and to consolidate their all-round hold upon there. Introduction of western education and system of knowledge by the colonizers has produced a peculiar oscillation and ambivalence in society, which is an outcome, as Bhaba argues, of

hybridization. Introduction of western culture in non-western colonies gives birth to a peculiar amalgam of cultures and identities. The age-old social customs and conventions, habits and symbols prevalent in indigenous societies are moved by new ideas and they take a mixed form. The oscillating and ambivalent colonized people who were influenced by mixed cultural ideas and practices embrace the critical existence that is resulted from the mutual cultural contagion. Bhaba is of opinion that the colonizers are not immune from hybridization or from the effects of it. But the ambivalence resulted from this hybridization creates much more problem for the anti-colonial movement as it creates deep doubt as to which direction it will be organized and guided. But, as Bhaba contends, despite this problem and dispite strong surveillance of the colonial rulers, the local people have tried to speak out following their own direction and intent. The colonizers have become not always successful to bring power or the discourses of power under their absolute control and, for this reason, as Bhaba observes, the hybrid identity built through the mutual interaction and subtle intimacy between the two cultures has challenged the cultural supremacy of the colonizers. The purpose and desire guiding the colonizers to construct the 'other' against the 'self' have not been completely successful. The so called subjects of the colonies have become vocal and active and ignored the vigilant and all-pervading watch of the colonizers. Bhaba opines that when the hybridized colonized existing in the realm of ambivalence rewrite the colonial narrative, that rewriting does not necessarily become an irrelevant and pointless duplicate. This rewriting definitely carries the inkling of the change of time and change of the fate of those who are called the subjects. This rewriting obviously hastens the process of decolonization.

According to Bhaba, hybridity or hybridization is no any negative fact or a negative force. Rather it identifies the presence or representation particularly of the people of the colonies through their interaction with the aliens. Hybridization does not mean the decay and devastation of the old forms of cultural ideas and practices. In several parts of several colonies deep inquiry into and exercises in age-old community life, community literatures and different community cultural forms were found pervasively and this tradition has been formidable there in the post-colonial period. The enormous diversity as represented by those age-old cultural forms seems to constitute a treasure of gems and diamonds which are now used to make new narratives of mass interest. Hybridization has, in fact, given birth to a certain kind of double consciousness. This double consciousness does not exist only among the colonized in the periphery, it exists even in ideas and activites of

the colonizers of the centre, and as a result of it, the colonial identity, the colonial administration and the colonial edifice have been nativized and rift and tension are produced within the structure of power. So hybridization, as Bhaba argues, can be said to be responsible for the mutual transculturation of the colonizer and the colonized. It leaves neither the colonized nor the colonizers to remain in pure, rather it forges inter-civilizational contiguity between masters and the so-called slaves in the colonial non-west.

In postcolonial discussion, imitation or mimicry is an important concept. Frantz Fanon in his Black Skin, White Masks, mentioned that at the time of carnival held in the Carribean region, the black slaves were given the permission to use white masks. The blacks used to exihibit carricatures using the white masks. Fanon tells that fairly a good number of Carribean blacks had used this practice and wanted to become similar to the white. The colonial power used to induce the local blacks to imitate the language, culture, habits and practices of the colonizers for the actual purpose of downgrading the local people and for estranging them from their own culture and own identity. The condition, the colonialists wanted to create by this effort, is the condition of coloniality which was required to expedite the cultural and psychological fall of the colonized leading them to welcome and enfold the culture of the alien.

Homi Bhaba in his of Mimicry and Man has elaborated the idea of Fanon. We know that Michel Foucault in his Discipline and Punish has observed that the ruling class seeks elsewhere to expand the net of surveillance in order to consolidate and deepen its absolute power elsewhere in society. To get all ideas and activities under the umbrella of its power and authority and also to crush the anti-gevernment protest movements or even such voices, the ruling power strengthens the net of watch and vigilance upon the people. Bhaba, who is heavily influenced by this Foucauldian idea of power-consolidation of the ruler, observes that the colonial rulers seek to make new habits, taste and all other socio-cultural practices of the colonized on the model and pattern of the colonizers through their act of surrveillance and constant vigilance. The wertern rulers want the colonized to become alienated from their age-old habits and belief-system, social norms and values and practices, and they (the colonized) would become the followers of the westerners through imitation or mimicry. For the purpose of expanding and strengthening imperialism in the vast length and breadth of British India, Macauley in his Minute on Indian education (1835) sought to grow a class of persons Indian in blood and colour, but English in taste, in opinion, in morals and in intellect. But in Location of power, Bhaba

argues that the colonial rulers intended to make the colonial subjects into reformed and recognizable mass through mimicry or mimicking the westerners and they even used to accept and regard them as 'almost the same, but not quite'. Bhaba strongly opines in this context that this attitude of the colonizers is fundamentally humiliating and this colonial attitude proves post-Enlightment civility as being devoid of its essence, honesty, humanity and universality. But mimicry itself, as Bhaba emphasizes, is not altogether devoid of political meaning. The parts of ideas and experiences gathered in the process of mimicry promote and enrich the anti-colonial texts and it results in the expansion of the scope of or the space for anti-colonialism and decolonization.

10.2.3 Gayatri Chakraborty Spivak and the Theory of Postcolonialism

Gayatri Chakraborty Spivak is one of the resourceful thinkers in the continuing discussion and debate on postcolonialism. Spivak is equally influenced by Marxism and deconstruction discourse of Jacque Derrida. Again she has deep exercise into and curions academic pulling for sub-altern history.

In her A Critique of Post-Colonial Reason, published in 1999, Spivak has mentioned that the non-westerners have been described as the uncivilized and barbaric in most of the metaphysical writings of the West. Spivak has given particular emphasis on 'difference', a subject she thinks very important in postcolonial discussion. She admits the relevance of Said's Orientalism and considers it as the 'source-book' of postcolonial study. She observes that Said is correct when he opines that the western orientalists had described the non-western world as ignorant, primitive and backward from a totalizing point of view. But the idea and concept of the East Said has built against the western construction of it have been done from similar totalizing stand-point and it does not go beyond the bound of grand narrative neglecting difference, heterogeneity and plurality with which a society, be it westernor eastern, modern or backward, is grown and exists. Perhaps for translating 'Of Grammatology' of Derrida into English Sprivak is found very consistent and categorical in asserting the view that all discursive endeavours necessarily involve multiple coflicts and contradiction, multiple dimensions and multiple meanings. As she argues, the East involves, reflects and represents enormous differences; life and living here go along several directions and towards several goals. And, hence, she contends that the experience of colonial domination over and exploitation of various resources is not homogeneous and the orientation of the attempt of discussion, analysis of and theorization on this colonial domination and exploitation can not be unilinear and totalizing but multi-dimensional and pluralistic in nature.

Spivak also throws light on the relationship between postcolonialism and feminism. In postcolonial study it is thought that the women are oppressed by and under the domination of the men. Spivak thinks it appropriate or correct, but in addition to it what she wants to say is that the women in colony are doubly subjugated ans doubly dominated and herein lies the difference between the European women and women in the colonies. European women are subjugated and dominated only by the patriarchy of the home country, but the women in the colonies are subjugated and dominated by the two fold patriarchy-one of the home country and the other of the imperial or colonial country. For this reason particularly, the European women and the European feminists cannot represent the women of the third world which was once colonized. The European women and the European feminists are immune from the experience of coloniality or colonial exploitation, domination and persecution. So the European feminist discourse, Spivak strongly observes, is not adequate, complete and universally acceptable, and, for this reason, she, in her paper entitled French Feminism in an International Frame, (1987), strongly criticizes 'About Chinese Women', an work by Julia Kristeva on the plight of the Chinese women. Identifying the marks of coloniality existent in Kristeva, Spivak argues that she has penned on the Chinese women without having an adequete understanding of their real plight or its history.

Gayatri Chakraborty Spivak has highlighted on the problems of representation by the sub-altern. She, in her essay entitled Can the sub-altern Speak? (1988), has raised the eqestion about whether the sub-altern can exihibit their vocal existence or can raise their voice signifying their existance or not. Spivak observes that the postcolonial theorists undergoing schooling in and orientation to western mode and system of so-called modern education and learning have come forward to raise the narrative of grief and suffering and also displeasure and agitation of the sub-altern women and they want, thus, to represent them. But she finds no fundamental sympathy and sensitivity immanent in western knowledge, culture and epistemology by virtue of which any scholar oriented to that knowledge and culture can reach the sub-altern become one of them and understand their voice. Rather Spivak finds insurmoutable and huge gap between listening to and voicing of the sub-altern, because the curious scholar wishing to understand the sub-altern and to represent them and the sub-altern themselves are mutually 'other' to each other; and since they do not belong to the same knowing race and community, the people belonging to the sub-altern category or class are, as they appear, speechless

and unrepresented. In this analysis, Spivak also expresses her strong belief and opinion that the women within this sub-altern class or social category are more sub-altern than the normal sub-altern for the reason that the place where they live or exist in sub-altern society is shadelessly dark, a place absolutely unreachable for a narrator wishing to make enlightened, rational, human, modern and universal narrative.

10.3 Features of the Theory of Postcolonialism

Postcolonialism is a multi-demensional and inter-disciplinany approach to the study of socio-economic, cultural and political phenomena. It consists of various thoughts and ideological waves like Marxism, postmodernism and post-structuralism. It is found that Marx, Gramsci, Lyotard, Foucault, Derrida and also the scholars of the sub-altern school have their varying direct and indirect impacts upon the writers developing postcolonial discursive theory or literary works along postcolonial orientation. So from varying and sometimes muturally unstructured and contending standipoint the postcolonial thinkers have discused the psychology, values, thoughtful thinking reflected in education and learning, art and literature, habits and persuations and effort of institution-building and political governance of the people and nations once colonized, and they put forward an unstructured theory we call postcolonialism.

Secondly, postcolonialism broadly tends to reject modernist meta-narrative or grand narrative. According to the opinion of the postcolonial thinkers meta-narratives or grand narratives are prone to become fundamentalist, totalizing and hence seeks dominance over all kinds of socio-political, cultural and epistemological diversity and plurality. Most of the grand narratives in the sphere of education, culture and social and political thinking, the postcolonialist thinkers observe, are grown centering on the post-Enlightenment Europe, and, for this reason, postcolonialism is basically a critique of Eurocentrism which depicts Europe as matured, civilized, developed and progressive and denounces the non-western people and their society and civilization as immatured, barbaric, primitive and backward.

Thirdly, postcolonialism and post-colonial literatures and other socio-political writings and analyses are directly and indirectly associated with anti-colonial protest and movement for decolonization. Frantz Fanon was the first powerfull thinker who

most formidably described how the western colonizers used to destroy education, knowledge, culture and civilization of the colonial subjects; and they valorized their own education and culture to legitimize and institutionalize imperial and colonial rule. Black Skin White Masks and The Wretched of the Earth, two important works of Fanon had tremendous impacts on the subsequent proliferation of postcolonial writings of the latter days.

Edward W. Said in his Orientalism and Culture and Imperialism in particular observes that European orientalism and European knowledge have humilitated and degraded deliberately the East. European knowledge and culture is inseminated by racialism and it expresses egoistic power to occupy the mental, psychological and cultural resources of people of the colonies. Western orientalism, Said opines, is thesubtle design for establisling domination over society, polity, economy and mind of the East. It depicts the East as idle, idiotic, idyllic, impoverished and inferrior while the West, is rational, progressive, humane and superior. In western orientalism, the West is the 'self' while the East is 'other'. The othering sterotypes tend to recognize and cornsider the East as similar and homogeneous. Said has criticized this totalizing European narrative on the society, culture and politics of the orient.

Fourthly, it is reflected in the postcolonial writings that western 'othering' has failed to take into consideration the enormous heterogeneity and plurality as prevalent and implicit in 'other'. The scheme of western otherings unilaterally assumes that the West is ordered, rational, masculine and good and consistent while the East or the non-West is chaotic, irrational, faminine and bad and inconsistent. This grand narrative of cultural colonialism is an expedient means of colonization and institutionalization of colonization.

Fifthly, the binary concept of centre and periphery has acquired importance in postcolonial thinking. In colonial education, culture and epistemology, Britain and France in particular, constitute the 'centre' and the whole of non-West, is known as the 'periphery'. Although the concept relating to centre-periphery division was grown with the colonization project of Britain in the sevententh century, it becomes fashionable, powerful and far more relevant when English language and literature were introduced for 'civilizing' the natives in the nineteenth century for colonial reason. Colonial narratives presumably project the people in the centre as the natural occupant of political, economic, cultural and psychological resources of

the people in the periphery by virture of their racial and cultural superiority. And because of harsh and pervasive domination and hegemonic surveillance imposed upon people in the periphery their free voice is hardly heard and they get speechless. In her postcolonial writing Gayatri Chakraborty Spivak has offered a very intersting discussion about how the sub-altern loses their ability to speak about themselves in a socio-cultural and political regime which is not their own but owned by the elite in the centre.

Sixthly, the postcolonial socio-political and literary writings have sought to express and analyse the nature of western domination over non-western people of the colonies. Fanon, Said and Homi K. Bhaba extensively write on how the people of the colonies have accepted, rejected and resisted the cultural supremacy of the colonial powers. In their writings how the cultures of both the colonizers and the colonized came to each other and got mixed and hybridized in the process of acceptance, rejection and resistance are shown. The indigenous culture as transformed through mimiking the language, symbols, values and social practices of the westerners and also through the process of hybridization, is not, in the opinion of some of the thinkers of postcolonialism, altogether a signifier of the cultural void of the colonized. On the contrary, as Said has observed and Salman Rushdie has shown in his Midnight's Children, it has been and can be the signifier of challenge and protest on the part of the people of the colonies against the racist European colonial hegemons who use to brag to the non-westerners about the hollowed national fall-outs of European Enlightenment like rationality, modernity and sense of progress and humanity. Homi K. Bhaba in his Location of Culture observes that the process of hybridization and mimicry does not annihilate the culture of the indigenous people, rather it leads to identify and assert the presence of the colonized, and it restores the cultural forms and ideas which are lost or deformed during the period of long colonial domination. Unlike Ngugi wa Thiong'O who has gone for complete abrogation of alien languages and advised his Kenyan people to cultivate literature in local Kikuyu language, the writers like Rushdie are in favour of brightening the indigenous and pre-colonial cultural elements in the context of hybridized and mixed culture.The process of hybridization and mimicry leads to grow and is capable to grow such works that reconstruct the western discourse and compel the West to recognize this new construction of the East. It is, as these writers view, an important and effective means for cultural decolonization. Said and Homi Bhaba strongly think that the indigenous people or those who seek to represent

these people have language and culture the indigenous people have adopted and used should have to be changed and reconstructed in view of local socio-political and cultural context and circumstances. This effort or the outcome of this effort will facilitate the intervention of the East in the domain of the dominant discourse of the West and thus the prospect of redevelopement of the history and content of the non-western traditions will be brightened in this process. This attempt taken or to be taken by the perceptible actors in the field history, literature, politics, art and culture is definitely an attempt of protest and resistance against cultural supremacy of the colonizers. This attempt decentres the centre and asserts the identity of the periphery.

Seventhly, in postcolonial writings we are offered various binary ideas regarding the colonizers and the colonized. These novel ideas indicate the mutually oppositional relationship between these two socio-political and cultural categories and reflect their relative status, identity and position as determined by the notion of colonialism and its culture. In the field of colonialism and colonial ideas the colonizer West and/or the westerners are depicted as the 'self', civilized, matured, progressive, rational and superior while the colonized East and/or the non-westerners as immatured, barbaric, primitive, backward, aberrant and inferior. These binaries express the antagonistic relationships particularly the colonizers built or constructed to convey their habitual hatred towards and dominance over the colonized.

Eighthly, rewriting and reconstruction of history, litarary works and discourses is an important feature of postcolonialism. The River Between (1965) of Ngugi is there construction of Heart of Darkness by Joseph Conrad (1899). In India, Partha Chatterjee, Amitava Ghosh and many other scholars-writers have made such attempt which is considered as a significant means for cultural decolonization. Following this trend of postcolonial rewriting of classical narratives, Pompero and Calibon of Tempest by William Shakespeare have been transformed in the context of decolonization process in Africa and Carribean region during 1960s and 70s into representative of alien rule and indigenous inhabitant from their respective original identity as depicted in original text.

Ninethly, postcolonial explanation have their continuing impact upon explaining and analysing the nature and characteristics of various socio-economic and political conflicts and contradictions exist at different levels particularly of the societies belonging to the third world nation-states. Postcolonial prespective is also

relevant in explaining the nature and dynamics of political relations among rich and the poor states.

Finally, postcolonial thought has been an obvious powerful inspiration for anti-colonial nationalism and anti colonial movement of the countries once colonized and now belonging to the third world. The multi-cultural and pluralist counsciousness as implicit in postcolonial thinking contains the power to guide the states now independent to fight against unequal distribution of global power and totalizing agenda of economic globalization sponsored by the big capitalist states seeking to destroy the autonomous identity and existential plurality upon which human civilization is based.

10.4 Limitations of Postcolonial Perspective

Postcolonialism or postcolonial perspective has been criticized by some scholars like Robert Young, Aijaz Ahmed and a few others. The main allegations against postcolonialism we will now discuss.

First of all, this theoretical perspective have tried to put emphasis on the political and cultural relationship between the European colonizer nations and the non-European countries once colonized on the basis of two important notions of dominance and subordination. But this theory is consistently indifferent to give emphasis on the commitment of the subjugated and unfree nations and on their stiff and difficult struggle for national liberation and for extablishing 'swaraj' for them. Postcolonialism lacks in representing the narrative of multi-dimensional exploitation, pain and suffering out of oppression and persecution of the nations under the pressure of colonialism and neo-colonialism. This prespective does have no inspiration for thebasic change of the socio-economic and political conditon of poor people in the poornations in particular. This theory has failed to become a material force as it fails to grip the masses.

Secondly, the critics are of opinion that the western colonial powers did not always regard the non-western people as culturally 'other'; rather they regard them as stiff political opponents as and when they had faced their countervailing attack for autonomy and independence. Postcolonialism is not thus serious about incorporating the revolutionary intent, strong determination and resistance of the colonized 'subjects' against the colonial 'masters'.

Thirdly, the postcolonial theory is no any well-knit, structured and systematic perspective with definite message either. The protagonists and proponents of this theory are influenced by several ideological systems sometimes contending one another. Apart from it, several diversified concepts and experiences grown from the several contexts of colonization and decolonialization, the proponents have used to explain their specific position in regard to the content of this theory. It results in making this theory a bit complex for students of social and political theory.

Fourthly, postcolonial theory contains an explanation of the relationship of conflict and contradiction exist between capitalist and the former colonial powers on the one hand and the countries belonging to the third world on the other. But this explanation, as some of the critics observe, carries no any new idea; rather it may be regarded as an extension of the old Marxist theory of the relations of states found in international politics.

Fifthly, the postcolonial writings or particularly the broad pattern of their presentation are western in nature. Mostly the higher education centres in the West are their epicentre and proponents, of course barring a few, some critics argue, have introduced and supported the as similative ideas like hybridity, mimicry, in-betweeness etc, in this theory and in the agenda of decolonization for the purpose of getting them included into or connected with the western academia. So, on the question of extinction of imperialism and colonialism and of retrieval and reestablishment of the glorious history, tradition, culture and civilization of the indigenous people this theory is not active; nor this theory talks about the needs of the people of the non-West to develop competitive attitude, skill and productivity for the purpose of their empowerment and progress.

Despite the above criticism against the postcolonial theory, we cannot altogether deny its importance. The effort it has taken to unearth and explicate the nature of cultural domination of colonialism and continuing colonialism is really significant. Distinctly this theory has shown that the occupation of mind and culture of people could weaken them and this act gets them subservient to and fervent follower of the ruler. In fact, despite various epistemological opinions and debates on the relationship between consciousness and social existence of man we find to exist in the field of social philosophy, some effective synergy between the two requires of recognition. In the context of both colonization and decolonization, several thinkers and writers of postcolonialism have discussed this subject extensively.

10.5 Conclusion

Post-colonialism assentially focuses on the persistence of colonial forms of power especially how the social construction of racial, gendered and class differences uphold relations of power and suborlination. Most post-colonial writers rejects positivism given its claims to produce knowledge devoid of race, gender and class power hierarchies, post-colonial. They reject the assumptions of the explanatory and foundational theories because they obscure how identities are not fixed and essential but are produced through social processes and practices.

10.6 Summing Up

- Postcolonialism is a recent critical perspective in the study of political theory. Several thinkers and writers of postcolonialism like Frantz Fanon, Edward W. Said, Homi K. Bhaba, Gayatri Chakraborty Spivak and many others, despite diverse orientations among them, have tried to describe their broad argument within the framework of post colonialism.

- Imitations of the in that the West, and the experience of the colonial period, had tried to control and occupy the realm of mind, psychology, language and culture of the colonized for the purpose of institutionalizing the colonial rule and domination. This rule and domination have their continuing impact upon the people of the former colonies which now acquired statehood.

- Unearthing the ideological disguishes behind colonization and relative significance of the process like hybridization and mimicry having their direct and indirect impact on decolonization are discussed extensively in this theory from various epistemological standpoints.

- However, some critics have identified certain limitations and this theory has rediscovers the fact that those who rule construct ideologies or discourses manufacturing consent in favour of the rulers.

10.7 Pobable Questions

Essay Type Questions:

1. How did the West expand psychological and cultural domination over the East? Answer the question from the postcolonial perspective of politicaltheory.

2. Make an estimate of the contribution of Edward Said to the development of postcolonial perspective.

3. Make an assesment of the postcolonial ideas of Homi K. Bhaba.

4. Discuss the general characteristics of postcolonial theory.

5. Discuss the contributions of Fanan and Eduard said to the development ofpost colonial theroy.

Short Questions:

1. Point out the limitations of the postcolonial perspective.

2. What the central theme of postcolonialism?

3. How did Frantz Fanon develop the theory of postcolonialism?

4. What are the main points of discussion as advanced by Gayatri Chakraborty Spivak on the theme of postcolonialism?

5. What are main points of argument the critics have raised against postcolonial theory?

Objective Questions:

1. Why does post-colonial theory reject grand narrative?

2. What does Horni K. Bhaba mean by 'hybridity'?

3. Who is the author of the book 'Orientalism'?

10.8 Further Reading

1. Gandhi Leela, *Postcolonial Theory: A Critical Introduction*, Oxford, NewYork: Columbia University Press, 1998.

2. Basu, Pradip, *Postmodermism, Marxism, Postcolonialism*, Kolkata, Avenel Press, 2010.

3. Mongia, Padmini, (ed), *Contemporary Postcolomial Theory*, Oxford: Ox-ford University, Press, 2000.

4. Said, Edward, *Orientalism*, New York, Vintage, 1979.

5. Guha, Ranajit and Spivak, Gayatri Chakraborty (eds), *Selected Subaltern Studies*, New Delhi, Oxford, 1988.

6. Ashcroft, Bill et al, *The Empire Writes Back: Theory and Practice inPostcolonial Literatures*, London and New York, Routeledge, 1989.

7. Ahmad, Aijaz, *'The Politics of Literary Postcoloniality'*, Race and Class 36.3(1995): 1-20.

8. Young, Robert, *White Mythologies: Writing History and the West*, London: Routeledge, London, 1990.

MODULE-3

Unit-11 □ Political Obligation and its Limits

Structure

11.1 Objective

After studying this unit, learners will be able to:

- Understand the meaning and significance of political obligation.
- Analyze various theories of political obligation.
- Explain the nature and principles underlying political obligation.11.2 Introduction

11.2 Introduction

The very first question facing a student of politics can be the ground for justifying the state. In other words, why should we obey the state and how can we justify its existence in our lives. A simple answer could be, following J. S. Mill. that life without restraint on behaviour of others would be of little or no worth and that 'enforcement of restraint 'without the state is mere wishful thinking. Judged in such terms, any further argument about its justification may seem idle. But theargument that we have no alternative to the state acts as a negative justification, we can't

think of anything better. The defenders of the state should have some more positive argument to offer, in order to show how the state can be justified in terms of some universally acknowledged moral reasoning. That is, we need an argument to show that we have a moral duty to obey the state. Such arguments would also help us to understand when a particular state might lose its legitimacy as it happened in the past in the case of so many states and still happening in today's world. In the same way one can say, following Max Weber, that the state possesses a monopoly of legitimate violence. The state accepts the responsibility of protecting everyone who resides within its border from illegitimate violence. Surely this is the only ground for which we grant the state the monopoly of legitimate violence and its existence in our lives can also be justified on the same ground. This argument is quite akin to that of Charles Tilly who said that every State functions by the logic of a crime syndicate. We give them tax as protection money on the condition that it would not attack us and protect us from external attack.. But the task of justifying the state is often said to be the task of showing that there are some universal political obligations. Universal obligation, in this sense, does not mean the duty to obey all the laws of the state at all times. Only a certain rather unpleasant kind of fanatic could believe that we are always morally obliged to do whatever is commanded by the laws of the state. The goal of justifying the state, the meaning of universal political obligations, in this case, is to show that, in principle, everyone within the territory of a state is morally bound to follow its laws and ethics. This justification is offered by different theories of political obligations.

11.3 Divine Right Theory of Political Obligation

Divine Right Theory tried to justify absolute monarchy in Europe. It can be considered as the oldest theory of political obligation. It stems from a specific metaphysical framework in which a monarch is pre-ordained to inherit the crown before his birth. The divine right is considered a key element for legitimising many absolute monarchies in Europe. According to this theory a monarch is not accountable to any earthly authority. Thus, the ground of political obligation in this theory is based on the idea that the subjects while obeying the orders of the king are actuallyobeying the command of God who gives the king the authority to rule. As the right to rule is derived from divine authority, the monarch is not subject to the will of the people, the aristocracy or of any other estate of the realm. Outside

Christianity also kings were often seen as either ruling with the backing of heavenly powers or perhaps even being divine beings themselves. Christian notion of divine right can be traced back in Bible. St. Paul, following St. Peter was of the view that subjects should be obedient to the powers that be as they are appointed by God. In the English-speaking world, the theory of divine right is largely associated with the early Stuart reigns in Britain and the theology of clergy who held their tenure at the pleasure of James 1, Charles 1 and Charles II. One of the first English texts supporting divine right of kings was written in 1597-98 by James 1 himself before his accession to the English throne. The overriding metaphor of James' book was that of a father's relation with his children: "Just as no misconduct on the part of a father can free his children from obedience to the parents, so no misgovernment on the part of a king can release his subjects from their allegiance. "

In the mid seventeenth century, Sir Robert Filmer, a royalist, developed the idea of the right of the king on similar lines. According to Filmer the king is the head of the state in the same sense the father is the head of the family. In his theory Adam was the first king and Charles I stood in the position of Adam in England, with absolute authority to rule. Later John Locke effectively refuted Filmer's argument in his First Treatise.

In France, the chief theorist of divine right was Jacques-Benigne Bossuet, the bishop and court preacher to Louis XIV. Like Filmer, Boussuet also argued that the kings received their authority directly from God. Just as a father's authority is absolute in a family, so is the king's in a state. Louis XIV agreed to these aspects of Boussuet's view and claimed himself to be an absolute ruler, the so called Sun King. The Glorious Revolution of 1688 in England, the French Revolution and the American Revolution made this theory of Divine Right of the king insignificant in western political thought as an explanation of the basis of political obligation.

11.4 Consent as the basis of Political Obligation

Individuals consent to the state lies behind the idea of the social contract theories propounded by Hobbes, Locke and Rousseau. If, somehow or other it can be shownthat every individual has consented to the state, formed a contract with the state, or made a contract with each other to create the state, then the problem of finding the ground of political obligation appears to be solved. We would have shown how the state comes to have universal authority over each of us by showing

that everyone has consented to that authority. Social contract theory then is an obvious and elegant solution to the problem of political obligation. It satisfies the twin demands of universalism- every person must be obligated and voluntarism- political obligation can only come through consent.

The idea of consent as the basis of political obligation was propounded strongly by John Locke who was refuting the argument of Sir. Robert Filmer who justified the absolute power of the contemporary kings as paternal inheritance from Adam, the father of mankind. Locke begins his argument by stating that that paternal authority should not be equated with political authority. A father's right over to command over his children is based on the supposed immaturity of the children, on their inability to decide as to what is best in their own interest This supposed immaturity allows a father's command to ignore the issues of the children's consent. But for Locke since, unlike paternal authority, political authority is exercised over equals, over rational, mature individuals, it has to be based on consent. People's consent is then the basis of political power which Locke defines at the end of the first chapter of the Second Treatise. So, for Locke political power is a natural property of the individuals who are capable of exercising it and who, in fact, has a duty and right to exercise it. Tully calls this Lockean claim one of the major conceptual innovations in early modern European political thought. So rational, free individuals consent to transfer the political power to the governmental institutions making it government of the demos, by the demos. Thus 'consent of the adult citizens becomes the basis of 'universal political obligation'.

The idea of tacit consent is also related with political obligation. There are critics who raise doubt about the validity of the idea of contract as the ground for political obligation. First, where can we look for a social contract? There is no evidence whatsoever of the historical validity of such contract. Second, even if we accept that there was such a contract in the past, it can hardly explain the politicalobligation of the existing citizens. After all, no reasonable legal system allows one generation to make a contract which binds the succeeding generations. Here it might be replied that consent is given in a less obvious or explicit way. Consent, argues some critics, may be communicated via the ballot-box. In voting for the government, we give it our consent. It is not wholly implausible that even those who vote against the government nevertheless indicate their consent to the system as a whole through voting. So voting is a way of tacit consenting. But perhaps the idea of tacit consent can be developed in more clear terms. In fact, all the major

contract theorists Hobbes, Locke and Rousseau rely in different ways on arguments based on tacit consent. Here the central argument is that by quietly enjoying the protection of the state one is giving it one's tacit consent. And this is enough to bind an individual to the state. Thus, even Locke who believed in express consent, famously argued:" Every man that hath any Possession, or Enjoyment, of any part of the Dominions of any Government, doth thereby give his tacit consent, and is as far forth obliged to obedience to the laws of that Government...".

11.5 Utilitarian Theory of Political Obligation

The fundamental Idea of utilitarianism is that the morally correct act in any situation is that which brings about the highest possible total sum of utility. Utility is variously understood as happiness, pleasure, or the satisfaction of desires or preferences. For the purposes of this discussion, it doesn't matter which of these options we choose, so let us speak of maximization of happiness, for convenience. Put crudely, utilitarianism requires one to perform the action that will create more happiness, (less unhappiness) in the world than any other action available at the time.

Consequently, the utilitarian can argue that we need a body of laws which will lead to an increase in happiness. This can be called indirect utilitarianism. The idea is that if we all reason directly in utilitarian terms things will go very badly. Hence, we need to follow non-utilitarian reasoning obey the laws- maximize happiness. So, it is claimed that direct search for happiness both individually and socially, can be self-defeating. The best we can do is to set for ourselves other goals, or followother rules, in the hope or expectation that happiness will follow as a consequence. This is probably Bentham's own real view: 'taking the whole body (of people) together, it is their duty to obey only when it is in their interests (Fragments on Government, 56). An extension of this passage provides several ideas:

1. Laws should be passed if, and only if, they contribute more to human happiness than any competing law (or absence of law) would do.

2. Laws should be obeyed because they are laws (and will be obeyed because disobedience means punishment), and should only be disobeyed to avoid disaster.

3. Laws should be repealed and replaced if they fail to serve the proper utilitarian function.

Utilitarian message of political obligation now seems clear enough. The state as the provider and enforcer of a body of law, is justified if and only if it contributes to human happiness than any feasible competing arrangement. If we think in terms of a basic contrast between the state and the state of nature and we accept the arguments of the contract theorists- particularly those of Hobbes the utilitarian argument seems convincing. In terms of contributing to general happiness, the state seems far more preferable to the state of nature. Judged in this sense the utilitarian justification of the state and political obligation seems to be complete. The argument itself is very simple. In essence it means:

1. The best society is one in which happiness is maximised.

2. The state promotes happiness better than the state of nature.

3. We have a moral duty to obey the state and its laws if it contributes to general happiness.

11.6 Idealist interpretation of Political Obligation

Idealist theory of the State and the basis of obligation to it can be traced back to Greek philosophy, especially in the thought of Plato and Aristotle. In modern times idealist theory of political obligation was propounded mainly by German philosopher Hegel and English philosophers like T.H. Green and Bosanquet. Aristotlesaid that the state was a self-sufficing institution and that the state comes into existence, originating in the bare needs of life and continuing its existence for the sake of a good life." He considered the state as the highest community embracing all the other within it. The state, in his opinion, is aimed at the highest good". Plato also held a view almost on similar lines. The citizens, according to the Greek thinkers, could not think of a life outside, against or going against the state. As Aristotle famously said, man is by nature a political animal'. The state is natural. In other words, it is inherent in man's nature. Aristotle believed that through the state and the laws man attains his highest 'virtue' and perfection and becomes a citizen, capable of sharing in public activity and performing public duties. Thus, political obligation to the state, in Geek thought, is based on the fact that man's emancipation lies in the polis, the city state.

In modern times German philosopher Hegel can be considered one of the main proponents of idealist thought. Central to the Hegelian idea of the state is the Hegelian dictum that history is the progressive realisation of the idea of freedom. Hegel believed that individual freedom is embodied in the modern institutions of family, civil society and the state, since it is belonging to these institutions that makes up a person's life in modern society. For Hegel modern family is based on consent, whether the marriage comes through arrangements between the partners parents or whether it takes place because two individuals fall in love with each other, Hegel claimed that the subjective will of the two partners must be satisfied. In that sense modern family expresses the idea of individual freedom. If family is the first unit of social organisation, civil society comes next. It is the arena of social and economic interaction of individuals belonging to different families. Civil society was much wider than economy for Hegel. It is made up of at least four different systems or institutions: the system of needs, the administration of justice, the police and corporation. But Hegel was driven by the idea that civil society, in spite of being wider arena of human interaction, is also a sphere of conflict of particular interests of individuals. He even pointed to the possibility of an emergence of poverty and corruption as a consequence of the emergence of civil society. According to Neera Chandak, Hegel believed that the state with its bureaucracy can resolve these conflicts. Hegel called the bureaucracy the universal class because he believed that they could serve the common interests of the community. Thus, in spite of the positiverole of family and civil society for the fulfilment of individual freedom, 'concrete freedom can only be realised through the state. The state as a political community is, in that sense, prior to other communities like family and civil society. Given that modern family and civil society are embodiments of freedom, the modern state, as their precondition, thus becomes the realisation of human freedom in the ultimate sense of the term. So political obligation to the state is based on the obvious fact that it is the realisation of freedom. Hegel glorified the role of the state to the extent that many critics find in his thought clear leanings to an absolute power, especially in such statements like: 'The state is March of God on earth'.

English philosopher T.H. Green offered new moral justification of obligation to state authority in his Idealist philosophy. Green famously said that 'citizenship only makes the moral man'. Green naturally led to the conclusion that for the fulfilment of man's moral possibilities the entire social environment comprising

various institutions including political institutions are important. Although man's moral development is very much dependent on his personal efforts it is, indeed, facilitated by a set of external conditions regulated under the overriding goal of 'common good'. The state, according to Green, provides these external conditions. Actually, man's rights are important external conditions for the development of his moral power and the state secures such conditions by guaranteeing these rights. The state is not the creator of these rights, for the source of these rights is the moral nature of man. Thus, the state preserves the conditions for the sustenance of the freedom of the individual; it is essentially a moral freedom, that is not a freedom to pursue one's animal desires. It is what a moral being would like to be assured of for pursuing a moral goal. But a moral goal in essence is common good. Thus, if an individual deviates from the path of common good, the state is justified in controlling his deviant behaviour and making necessary interventions. Freedom thus becomes positive freedom, not a negative one in the sense of 'absence of restraint' only. The state actions are thus meant to remove obstacles to the development of the individual, 'hindering hindrances'. Green in this way in his Idealist philosophy offered a new moral justification of obligation to the authority. There is a moral ground for obligation. The individual's duty to obey the state, is, in essence, a duty to the cause of his own moral development.

11.7 Principle of Fairness as the basis of Political Obligation

Whether or not individuals consent to the state, it can seem unfair of them to enjoy its benefits without also accepting the necessary burdens that help to produce those benefits in a joint enterprise'. So, it has been argued, anyone who gains an advantage from the state has a duty, following fairness, to obey its laws, to contribute taxes and so on. The principle underlying this view was explicitly formulated by the legal theorist and philosopher H.L. Hart. Hart's view is that this principle is, as it were, the 'rational core' of the doctrine of tacit consent.. Receiving benefits does indeed binds one to the state, but not because it is a way of tacitly consenting. Rather, the force of the argument is that it is unfair to reap the benefits of the state, unless one is prepared to shoulder one's share of burdens too. The benefits, of course, are security, and stability of living in a society which operates a system of enforced laws. The corresponding burdens are political obligations. John Rawls subsequently adopted this principle in an influential essay of his own,

referring to the duty derived from the principle as the 'duty of fair play' (1964). What the' principle of fair play holds, then, is that everyone who participates in a reasonably just, mutually beneficial cooperative practice- Hart's 'joint enterprise' has an obligation to bear a fair share of burdens of the practice. This obligation is owed to the others who cooperate in the enterprise, for cooperation is what makes it possible for any Individual to enjoy the benefits of the practice Anyone who acts a free rider is acting wrongly, even if his or her shirking doesn't directly threaten the existence of the enterprise. Contemporary philosopher Robert Nozick in his famous work, 'Anarchy, State, and Utopia' refutes this argument of 'fair play' and claims that unsolicited benefits create no obligations to reciprocate. He presents an example in which the other members of the neighbarhood have discovered a public address system, and decide to institute a scheme for public entertainment. Each person is assigned a day on which to broadcast play records, tell jokes,sing, and so on-for the benefits of all. I have enjoyed 137 days of entertainment from others. On day 138 when my turn comes, do I have a duty to give up my day to entertain the rest. Nozick thinks that obviously I don't have any moral duty or obligation to do it, because I have not asked for it and may not enjoy all the programmes too.

11.8 Conclusion

While the different theories of political obligation may offer different interpretations of the ground for political obligation, only a blind, rigid supporter of state power would argue that there is no limit to political obligation whatsoever or that we are obliged to unconditionally obey any command of the state authority and its laws however oppressive they may seem. Thus, there are possibilities of resistance to state power even in the divine right theory. If the kings had the divine right to rule, then the royal power must protect the interests of the subjects to get divine approval.If he goes against the divine will the subjects have the divine right to resist. I modern theory of political obligation, the right to resist perhaps is expressed in clear and strongest terms in John Locke's liberal philosophy. In the last two chapters of Second Treatise, titled Tyranny' and Of the Dissolution of Government', Locke argues repeatedly for the right of the people to rebel against a government which fails in preserving their life, liberty and possession. Apprehending that his argument giving so much importance to the right to resist may seem like a law-breaker's charter, giving birth to anarchy, Locke put the responsibility on the

ruler. He says in categorical terms that a government or a prince, acting against the interests of the people puts' himself into a state of war with his people' and so the government or the prince is responsible for the disorder, not the resisting people. The roots of resistance is there even in the Utilitarian theory, even though Bentham referred to it with great caution: "It is then, we may say, and not till then, allowable to, if not incumbent on, every man, as well on the score of duty as of interest, to enter into measures of resistance; when, according to the best calculation he is able to make, the probable mischiefs of resistance (speaking with respect to the community in general) appear less to him than the probable mischiefs of submission. This, then, is to him, that is, to each man in particular, the juncture of resistance." Bentham perhaps tried to base the right to resist on a utilitarian basis, instead of one based on contract, but with the highest degree of caution. In contemporary philosophy one of the most influential thinkers, John Rawls also in his 'A Theory of Justice' discussed the possibility of non-violent, civil disobedience against the government under a 'nearly just society.

11.9 Summing Up

- The concept of political obligation is related with the laws of the state. Citizens obey the laws of the state because as J S.Millarguedthat some short of restraint on the behaviour of others is necessary.

- It is only thestate which may resort to enforcement of restraint. The state accepts the responsibility of protecting everyone who resides within its territory. This is the reason for which we grant the state the monopoly of legitimate violence.

- Justification of the actions of the state thus leads to universal political obligations.

- The oldest theory of political obligation is the divine right theory. According to this theory King directly represents God.Political obligation is thus based on the idea that the subjects while obeying the order of the king are obeying the order of the God. Monarch is not accountable to the people because his right to rule is derived from divine authority.

- The idea of consent as the basis of political obligation found its valid ground in the social contract theories propounded by Hobbes, Locke and

Rousseau. The state appears to have universal authority which emerges from the consent of the every individual.

● Further political obligation is also related with the idea of tacit consent. It is argued that consent may be given in a less obvious or explicit way. Voting is a way of tacit consent.

● Political obligation can also be explained through the concept of utilitarianism.

● We have a moral duty to obey the state and its laws if it contributes to general happiness.

● Concept of political obligation may be also explained from the viewpoint of idealist theory. In the modern era, idealist theory of political obligation was propounded by the German philosopher Hegel and English philosophers like T.H.Green and Bosanquet. According to Aristotle the state is aimed at the highest good. Aristotle argued that through the state and the laws man attains his highestvirtue and perfection. In Greek thought political obligation is based on the fact that man's emancipation is only possible in the city state. Hegel is considered as the main exponent of idealist thought. Hegel was of the opinion that individual freedom is embodied in the modern institutions of family, civil society and the state. But instead of family and civil society, it is the state where concrete freedom can be realised.

● T.H. Green offered new moral justification of obligation to state authority in his Idealist philosophy. Man's moral development is very much dependent on his personal efforts which are facilitated by a set of external conditions. The state, according to Green, provides these external conditions.

● Political obligation may be also explained on the basis of the principle of 'fair play. This principle was explicitly formulated by philosopher H.L. Hart. According to Hart receiving benefits binds one to the state. It is unfair for an individual to enjoy benefits from the state without accepting the necessary burdens that helps to produce these benefits. John Rawls explained this principle referring to the duty derived from the principle as the duty of fair play.

- However, exponents of fair play have faced serious criticisms Robert Nozick objects that the principle of fair play would allow others to place us under an obligation to them simply by conferring benefits on us. Further, fair play considerations apply only to co-operative schemes that produce benefits one may refuse.

11.10 Probable Questions

Essay Type Questions:

1. Discuss the consent-based theory of political obligation.
2. Analyse utilitarian theory of political obligation.
3. Explain idealist interpretation of political obligation.
4. Explain the importance and meaning of political obligation.
5. Discuss divine theory of political obligation.
6. Analyse the principle of 'fairness' in explaining political obligation

Short Questions:

1. Write a short note on the Divine Right theory of political obligation.
2. Write a note on T. H. Green's arguments for political obligation
3. Briefly discuss relevance of social contract theory to political obligation.

Objective Questions :

1. Who argued that the state possesses a monopoly on legitimate violence?
2. Which philosopher suggested that life without restraint would be of little worth?
3. Who authored one of the first English texts supporting the divine right of kings?
4. Which theory attempted to justify absolute monarchy in Europe?

11.11 Further Reading

1. John Horton, Political Obligation, Macmillan, London, 1992.
2. Sabine George, History of Political Theory, Oxford IBH Publishers, New Delhi, 2005.

3. Ernest Barker, Principles of Social and Political Theory, Surjit Publications, New Delhi, 2005.

4. R.E. Goodwin (Editor), The Oxford Handbook of Political Thought, Oxford University Press, London, 2008.

5. ShefaliJha, Western Political Thought, Pearson Education India, 2009.

6. Jonathan Wolff, An Introduction to Political Philosophy', Oxford University Press, London, 2015.

7. J.S.Mcllelland, A History of Western Political Thought, London and New York, 2005.

Unit-12 □ Civil Disobedience

Structure

12.1 Objective

After studying this unit, learners will be able to:

● Understand the concept of Civil Disobedience.

● Explore the origin and evolution of the idea of Civil Disobedience.

● Examine Civil Disobedience as a form of non-violent Satyagraha.

● Analyse Mahatma Gandhi's perspective on Civil Disobedience.

● Identify the key features of Civil Disobedience.

● Assess the contemporary relevance of Civil Disobedience in social and political movements.

12.2 Introduction

Any discussion about the history of twentieth century and even that of the first two decades of the present century without exploring the impact of the civil disobedience movements amounts to devaluing the role of social movements of the masses in differentparts of the world. While the movements of Gandhi and Martin Luther King Jr are often represented as the success of civil disobedience movement,

it is equally important to refer to the non-violent movement against apartheid led by Nelson Mandela, the long movement against military rule in Myanmar led by Aung San Suu Kyi, the Solidarity movement in Poland led by Lech Walesa, the environmental movements emerging in India and different parts of the world as important chapters in this success story. It is pertinent, perhaps, to mention here how the teenage girl climate activist, Geta Thunberg, the new icon of the global fight against climate change, is described by some sections of the western media as 'Little Gandhi'.

12.3 The Idea of Civil Disobedience

The idea of civil disobedience was introduced in modern Western political thought by Henry David Thoreau 150 years ago. Since that time civil disobedience has often been regarded as a mechanism of working democracy, one of the accepted ways of expressing citizens' disagreement with authorities and a minorities' disagreement with the majority. In his famous essay' Civil Disobedience' published in 1849 Thoreau emphasized the fact that an individual has to be faithful to his or her conscience and do only what coachbelieve to be right regardless of the demands of society or the laws made by the state. Thoreau, driven by his anarchist position, placed individual conscience above the political obligation to the state. Guided by this spirit Thoreau disobeyed the US government for acting immorally in upholding slavery and waging war against Mexico. Thoreau publicly condemned those acts and refused to pay taxes in protest. In July 1846 he was arrested. Thoreau's minor act of defiance led him to the conclusion that it was not enough to be against the unjust act of the government. A person of conscience had to act. Civil Disobedience' was, in fact, an activist manifesto. Thoreau argued that a government must end an unjust act to earn the moral right to collect taxes from the citizens. He declared in no certain terms that if the government of the day forced the citizens to participate in injustice by obeying unjust laws, then people should break the laws' even if they ended up in prison. "Under a government which imprisons anyone unjustly", he said, " the true place for a just man is also a prison." It is difficult to define 'Civil Disobedience'. In our time John Rawls in his path breaking book A Theory of Justice defines civil disobedience as "a public, nonviolent, conscientious yet political actcontrary to law usually done with the aim of bringing about a change in the law or policies of the government."

12.4 Origin of the concept

Some commentators trace the origin of civil disobedience in the long and varied history of western thought. Thus, one can find a faint expression of this idea in the Antigone theme in Greek dramas. In fact, the long history of western civilization has always been a conflict between individual freedom and the political authority of the state which finds reflection in the idea of civil disobedience. Thus, Socrates considered search for truth as the fundamental aim of human life. He believed that human life could flourish only within a society and it was the duty of the individual to obey the state. But under no circumstances he was ready to sacrifice his inner truth, his conscience at the altar of the state. He strongly believed that the state had no right to force the individual to act unjustly. The core idea involved here inspired the notion of civil disobedience. Some critics also trace the idea of civil disobedience in the liberal tradition of Europe especially in the political thought of thinkers like John Locke, Jeremy Bentham, and John Stuart Mill. Locke advocated the concept of the right to resistance -"people have a right to resume their original liberty and to establish a new government." He was convinced that people had the right to resist, the right to have civil disobedience to restore their rights to life, liberty and property, the three rights being included within the 'right to property'. Bentham also advocated that conscientious citizens have to 'enter into measures of resistance as a matter of duty as well as interest.'. But nowhere can one find the idea of civil disobedience in more clear terms as in the thought of Henry David Thoreau for whom civil laws that come into conflict with moral laws have no moral right to exist.

12.5 Gandhi and Civil Disobedience

Gandhi didn't read Thoreau's', Civil Disobedience' when he first started the civil disobedience or Satyagraha when Transvaal passed a law in 1907 requiring the registration and fingerprinting of all Indians, giving the police the power to enter their houses to ensure registration of all the Indians. It was during his prison term that he came to know and read Thoreau's 'Civil Disobedience' Like Thoreau Gandhi believed that an individualis a moral agent taking a moral position on the question of obeying a state's law or an order. As moral beings, citizens had

a duty to decide to whom they should give their loyalty and support and under what conditions. Their loyalty should not be taken for granted. When a law is just, they had a' sacred duty' to give it their 'willing and spontaneous obedience. But when it is unjust and morally unacceptable, they had the opposite duty to disobey it. They can't be forced to participate in the state's act of injustice and incur the moral responsibility for its consequences.

Gandhi described civil disobedience as the doctrine of', Satyagraha', or 'Truth Force'. For him the word 'civil' expresses the peaceful, courteous and 'civilized' nature of the resistance. Initially, Gandhi accepted the expression 'passive resistance to refer to civil disobedience. But to him it was not enough to resist injustice perpetrated by a state, but it is equally important to do it without any feeling of animosity. Gandhi's aim was to win over the enemy by what he called 'surgery of the soul'. Thus, subsequently Gandhi discarded the term 'passive resistance and decided to use the term 'satyagraha' which was, to him, devoid of any animosity, hatred and violent means. It is based on spiritual purity. Like Tolstoy Gandhi was opposed to all forms of violence in political actions. For him nonviolence (Ahimsa) and truth are inseparable. As Gandhisaid: "Satyagraha largely appears to the public as Civil Disobedience or Civil Resistance. It is civil in the sense that it is not criminal. The lawbreaker...... openly and civil breaks (unjust laws) and quietly suffers the penalty for their breach. And in order to register his protest against the actions of the lawgivers, it is open to him to withdraw his cooperation from the state by disobeying such other laws whose breach does not constitute moral turpitude. In my opinion the beauty and efficacy of Satyagraha are so great that it can be preached even to children." Gandhi strongly believed that, faced with injustice of the state, every individual has a birth right to start civil disobedience. He wrote in 1920.: "I wish I could persuade everybody that civil disobedience is the inherent right of a citizen. He does not give it up without ceasing to be a man. Civil disobedience, therefore, becomes a sacred duty, when the state has become lawless, or which is the same thing, corrupt. And a citizen that barters with such a state, shares in corruption or lawlessness." In 1918, Gandhi used the civil disobedience movement in India during his campaign for the textile workers of Ahmedabad. The Salt Satyagraha of 1930, the civil disobedience movement for independence in 1930 and his fast unto death for the development of social conditions of the untouchables in 1939 are some of examples of civil disobedience led by Gandhi inIndia. Some of the other important civil disobedience movements

of the last century are the movement against apartheid policies of South African Government in 1952, the American civil rights movement led by Matin Luther King Jr. from 1955 till his assassination in 1968, to mention a few.

12.6 Features of the Civil Disobedience Movement

It is not difficult to identify the features of civil disobedience after analysing Gandhi's views on the same. But most of the commentators refer to some features of civil disobedience which are as follows:

(a) Conscientiousness: The first feature of civil disobedience is that it must be committed consciously, intentionally, with the civil disobedient breaching the law with seriousness, sincerity, and moral conviction. Through their disobedience, the civil disobedient try to draw attention to laws and policies that they believe require reassessment or rejection. Here it is important to mention that this civil disobedience can be both direct or indirect. Direct civil disobedience requires action carried out directly to violate a law which is challenged. But in the case of indirect civil disobedience the norm or law violated is not the one being challenged as in the case of sit-ins in public places when the traffic regulations are not the ones being challenged. In Rawls's view, in a nearly just society civil disobedient try to appeal to the majority to show that, in their considerate opinion, the principle of justice governing liberty and equality has not been respected by the policy makers. However, critics point out inherent flaws in Rawls's arguments. Thus, a whole range of legitimate values not reducible to justice or liberty and equality like transparency, stability, privacy integrity may motivate people to participate in civil disobedience. Moreover, climate activists today in different parts of the world take resort to civil disobedience not for liberty, equality and justice referred to by Rawls. They also fight for a kind of justice, often described as climate justice, which is understood in a sense quite different from that of Rawls.

(b) Publicity: Civil disobedience must be a public act. Performing a public act gives it a symbolic value and allows reaching widespread intended to raise public awareness of the case. This element of civil disobedience is highly endorsed by Rawls who argues that disobedience should never

be covert and secretive, as this would defeat the very purposeof civil disobedience which is intended to communicate with the people and seek their moral support against an unjust act of the state. As Hugo A. Bedau says that it is essential to the dissenters purpose that both the government and public should know what she intends to do. But publicity sometimes undermines the attempt to communicate through civil disobedience. If a person gives prior publicity to her intention to breach a law she gives both her opponents and the law enforcing agencies the opportunity to abort her effort to communicate. For this reason, unnoticed or covert disobedience is sometimes more effective than civil disobedience organized with prior notice or publicity. There are many examples like the animal rights activists releasing animals from research laboratories, peace movement activists reaching a Nuclear research site, environmental activists attacking a thermal Power plant or nuclear power plants in Europe. Such acts of civil disobedience, however, is followed by an open acknowledgement of the act and the reasons for doing it. Subsequent openness and publicity gives the action a moral legitimacy in the people's eyes,makes the much needed communication possible and offers the activists the opportunity to show their willingness to deal fairly with state authorities.

(c) Nonviolence: For Gandhi civil disobedience by definition should be civil; that is it should be public and non-violent. The civil disobedient who, according to Gandhi, is a satyagrahi must convince the opponent the intensity of the satyagrahi's feeling and give him the last chance of negotiation. He championed the effectiveness of satyagraha in terms of the spiritual impact of suffering love. The satyagrahi's love for his opponent and moral nobility disarmed the latter, defused his feeling of anger and hatred and sends an appeal to his higher nature. A satyagrahi's uncomplaining suffering denied the opponent a sense of victory, mobilized the neutral public opinion creating the space for introspection and negotiation.

Some theorists like John Rawls argue that civil disobedience by definition is non-violent. According to Rawls violent acts likely to injure are incompatible with civil disobedience as a mode of address. That is why, according to Raws, Gandhi and Martin Luther King Jr

represent, classic examples of non-violent direct action. However, there are disputes regarding the centrality of non-violence to the concept of civil disobedience.

First, there is the challenge of defining the appropriate notion of non-violence—whether acts that cause minor injuries should also be considered forms of violence.

Second, some non-violent and legally permissible actions can, at times, cause greater harm to others than certain acts of violence.A legal, peaceful strike by ambulance workers may cause more harm to the society than what can be done by some minor acts vandalism.

Third, sometimes limited violence may heighten the communicative quality of civil disobedience by drawing attention to the dissenter's cause by emphasising her seriousness and frustration. Notwithstanding such criticisms, generally non-violence is preferable to violence in any act of civil disobedience. As a matter of prudence too, non-violence has less possibilities of antagonising potential allies and or confirming the antipathy of the opponent. Besides, non-violence does not distract the attention of the public, and denies authorities an excuse of resorting to violence against civil disobedient. That is why perhaps, the state authorities sometimes, by some acts of subversion, try to push the non-violent activists to the path of violence to get an excuse to make violent counter offensive.

Another feature of civil disobedience, mentioned by some commentators, is that civil disobedience should be a collective action, not individual action. The movement must be carried out collectively to achieve success. However, there are serious disputes regarding this feature of civil disobedience. It is not clear why an individual act of civil disobedience should not be brought under the rubric of Civil Disobedience.

An important feature of civil disobedience is that the civil disobedient should take resort to an act of civil disobedience accepting the eventualities of a sanction. A fundamental difference between civil disobedience and ordinary crimes is the willingness of the offender to accept legal consequences. The willingness of the civil disobedient to accept punishment is taken not only as a mark of general fidelity to

the law, but also a statement that they differ from ordinary offenders who, usually, does not want to make it known that she has violated the law and does not want to suffer from her unlawful action. Accepting punishment can have great strategic value as Martin Luther King Jr observed, If you confront a man who has been cruelly misusing you, and say " punish me, if you will; I do not deserve it, but I will accept it, so that the world will know that 1 am right and you are wrong", then you wield a powerful and just weapon.'

Judging by these criteria of civil disobedience, it is difficult to describe even David Thoreau as a civil disobedient, for neither did he give publicity to his act of disobedience of not paying taxes as mark of protest against the state nor was his act was a collective one. In our time when teenage climate activist Geta Thunberg started her act of civildisobedience by her sit-ins with a placard in her hands, she was a lonely climate crusader going almost unnoticed initially.

Another problem of civil disobedience is its efficacy under a cruelly authoritarian regime. Rawls also says that this instrument of struggle can get success in a nearly 'just society'. Perhaps the people of Myanmar trying to fight the authoritarian military regime in their country recently has learnt this bitter truth.

12.7 Conclusion

In today's world, the environmental and climate activists are exploring in their innovative ways the wide significance of civil disobedience, focused as they are on the most pressing problem of the present world- sustainability due to climate change.

Greenpeace movement, the movements of 'Extinction Rebellion', or Fridays for Future (the school strike for climate under the inspiration of Geta Thunberg) are some of the leading movements of our time as more people participate in their civil disobedience actions to save our mother planet.

Unlike all the previous Civil disobedience movements, these are innovative in the sense that these activists have helped to reach an international consensus (their cause being backed by science) and they make use of new propaganda techniques by wide use of internet and social networking sites. Here lies the relevance of the

Civil Disobedience movement in the 21" century as a tool of protest when the mankind are confronting massive injustice.

12.8 Summing Up

- The idea of civil disobedience was introduced in modern western political theory 150 years age.

- It has often been regarded as a mechanism of working democracy and one of the accepted ways of expressing citizens discontent to the authorities.

- Gandhi described civil disobedience as the doctrine of satyagraha or Truth Force. He was opposed to all forms of violence. For him truth and nonviolence are insepa-rable.

- The defining features of civil disobedience are conscientiousness publicity and non-violence.

- For John Rawls, civil disobedience is a public, nonviolent, conscientious yet political act done with the aim of bringing about change in the law or policies of the govern-ment.

12.9 Probable Questions

Essay Type Questions:

1. Discuss Gandhi's views on Civil Disobedience.

2. Analyse the features of Civil Disobedience

3. Trace the origin of the concept of Civil Disobedience.

4. Write on Henry David Thoreau's idea of Civil Disobedience

Short Questions:

1. Write a short note on a contemporary civil disobedience movement.

2. What is the meaning of Satyagraha?

3. Make a brief overview of the relevance of the Civil Disobedience as a tool of protest in the present world.

Objective Question:

1. Who introduced the idea of civil disobedience in modern Western political thought?

2. What, according to Gandhi, is the philosophical basis of Satyagraha?

3. What is meant by indirect civil disobedience?

12.10 Further Reading

1. Bhikhu Parekh, Gandhi, New york, Sterling Publishing House, 1997.

2. John Rawls, A Theory of Justice, London, Oxford University Press, 1972.

3. Civil Disobedience (Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy),

   https://Plato.stanford.edu>entries>civil disobedience

Unit-13 □ Cultural Relativism

Structure

13.1 Objective

After studying this unit, the learner will be able to:

- Explain the concept of cultural relativism and its significance in understanding diverse cultural perspectives.

- Identify the key principles of cultural relativism as articulated by Franz Boas and his followers.

- Analyse the historical context and evolution of cultural relativism, including its role in countering ethnocentrism.

- Evaluate the critiques of cultural relativism, including its limitations and contradictions.

- Differentiate between cultural relativism and ethical relativism and understand their implications in cross-cultural studies.

- Examine the relationship between cultural relativism and multiculturalism, particularly in the context of minority rights and cultural diversity.

- Assess the contributions of scholars such as Herskovits, W. Kymlicka, Charles Taylor, Bhikhu Parekh, and Margaret Moore in the debate on cultural relativism.

● Develop a critical perspective on the application of cultural relativism in contemporary social and political discourse.

13.2 Introduction

We live in a fast-changing world society. People belonging to various cultures are increasingly coming into contact with each other. In today's world cultural differences are more prevalent than cultural Universals. In this context the interaction among people with distinct culture can be positive or negative depending on the degree of sensitivity and respect people have for other cultural groups. These two types of responses are related to the two important concepts- ethnocentrism and cultural relativism. Negative responses towards others cultural groups arise out of ethnocentrism, while positive responses are the results of a culturally relativist approach. Cultures often vary greatly in their ethical concepts of right and wrong. Cultural relativism, the theory that what is morally right and wrong depends only on one's culture, attempts to address the difference in ethical standards across cultures. It is a heuristic device of fundamental importance because it calls attention to the importance of all possible variant forms and conditions. However, the principle of cultural relativism is not without its flaws.

13.3 Cultural Relativism: Meaning and basic principles

In anthropology, cultural relativism is traditionally traced back to American anthropologist Franz Boas. Boas articulated the idea that civilization is relative and the meaning of particular ideas and conception should be understood in the local context. The idea was later developed by his students.

Cultural relativism is the idea that each culture is to be evaluated on the basis of its own values and norms of behavior and not on the basis of those of another culture. According to Melville Herskovits, Boas's student, the basic principle out of which cultural relativism emerged is ""judgments are based on experience and experience is interpreted by each individual in terms of his or her own enculturation"

Cultural relativism was in part a response to western ethnocentrism. Social and cultural anthropology reacted against this by committing itself to salvage distinct forms of life from a process of global westernization. Cultural relativism

was initially elaborated as a methodological concept. In his work, Boas used the concept of culture against the racist views of 19th century scholars and their evolutionary representation of primitive peoples. He rejected the idea of ranking primitive peoples anthropocentrically in relation to modern societies. He envisaged culture as a totality. In this view culture is a Universe, a vast field in which we and our civilization occupy only one place of many. This was a departure from ethnocentricity toward relativity. Boas rejected the idea of the universal standards of comparison promoted by the theory of evolution and in the process paved the way for the eventual emergence of cultural relativism.

This theoretical and methodological approach inspired by German philosopher Herder allowed Boas to highlight the specificity, diversity and incommensurability of cultural systems. The popularization of cultural relativism after World War II was a reaction to such historical events as Nazism, colonialism, ethnocentrism and racism.

In his book, Man and his works, Herskovits gave a concise statement of cultural relativism. For him every society has code of conduct, an ethical system a moral code, which the individual members hardly question. In philosophical terms, cultural relativism is a perspective which in recognizing the values set up by every society to guide its own life, puts emphasis on the dignity of social custom and on the need for tolerance of conventions even though they may differ from one's own. The philosophical perspective of cultural relativism enabled scholars to recognize the validity of every set of norms for the people whose lives are guided by them. For Herskovits, the epistemological function of anthropological research is to observe describe and analyze systems of valueand acknowledge the validity of specificities of distinctive moral regime even if these moral regimes are maintained to justify existing social inequalities. The poliucal function of anthropological research is to reject ethnocentric accounts of the social world and to promote a tolerant attitude.

13.4 Critique of Cultural Relativism

Classical cultural relativism has been debated by scholars for more than a half century. Today's consensus is that, classical cultural relativism has significant flaws. It tends to exaggerate the internal coherence of individual cultures. It overstates differences between societies and underplays the possibility of transcending these differences. It invites moral relativism and fosters hostility to comparative analysis.

Critics have noted that proponents of classical cultural relativism are inclined to contradict their own core principle by criticizing the social institutions and practices of western societies when assessing nonwestern societies. They have a tendency to serve as critic at home and conformist elsewhere.

A major complaint against cultural relativism is that by explaining human thought and behavior exclusively with reference to particular cultures, it has marginalized the study of human nature in the broadest sense.

The problem is that culture relativism is primarily directed to difference and hence it tends to underestimate the universals. These universals are treated as constants and therefore of limited utility in the interpretation of behavior in specific settings.

Cultural relativism tends to view reality exclusively from its own narrow perspective. The basic premise of anthropology is that all experience is culturally mediated. All known reality is culturally determined. Once this basic assumption is granted then it follows that all modes of perception and all value judgment are also culturally determined. In this view culture constitutes a closed system and culture alone is autonomous and independent. All other modes of human experience and thought are dependent on culture for their own form and content. However, it is important to realize that culture is but one of the conditions of human experience.

According to W. Kymlicka, cultural relativism violates one of our deepest shared understandings. For the cultural relativists, slavery is wrong if our society disapproves it. But this is not how most people understand slavery. People disapprove slavery because it is wrong. Further, it is difficult to identify shared understandings about different issues if only the voices of the vocal and powerful are taken into account and ignore the weak and the marginalized people.

Despite its flaws cultural relativism is a set of ideas useful as an intellectual tool. The limits of its usefulness are determined by the problems at hand and the skill of the person who wields it. Cultural relativism's historical role in encouraging cross-cultural understanding cannot be ignored. This is what Herskovits and other Boasians intended when they articulated it. The simplicity of cultural relativism's basic principles acts as a useful brake on analytical complacency. Alasdair Macintyre acknowledges relativism's role as a check on conclusions that otherwise seem self-evident. In fact, cultural relativism disciplines the imagination and prompts us to observe carefully while avoiding the temptation to take much for granted.

Cultural relativism is not the same as ethical relativism. Cultural relativism has an exclusive cross-cultural reference. Cultural relativism, according to Herskovits, suggests that every society has its own moral code to guide members of that society. But these values are of worth to those who live by them; though they may differ from our own. Thus, it raises the question of the validity of applying the criteria that guide the thinking of the people of one society to the standards of another. Ethical relativism raises the question of whether any standards can be drawn to direct individual conduct within any one society. Cultural relativism does not advocate ethical relativism.

13.5 Cultural Relativism and Multiculturalism

Many critics of multiculturalism take for granted the assumption that ethical or cultural relativism is a constitutive element of the theory of multiculturalism. The question of ethical relativism arises most sharply in connection with the problem of the oppression of minorities within minorities. Many liberal and feminist critics raised the objection that the majority of a given cultural minority is able to abuse its collective rights in order to oppress the vulnerable members of that minority.

Critics argue that the multicultural recognition of diversity appears to bring about an unavoidable dilemma between individual and collective rights. In emphasizing group rights multiculturalism presents itself as a form of cultural determinism that restricts individual's freedom of choice. Thus, multiculturalism indirectly limits the freedom of minority members. This becomes particularly evident when some cultural groups see individual freedom as a threat to their cultural identity and to the boundaries, they have set up to protect it. By supporting cultural diversity multiculturalism does not break down cultural barriers. It reinforces those barriers and creates suspicion and hostility between minority groups and between them and members of the majority.

Critics assert that multicultural recognition is inherently limited in two interrelated ways. First, it aims to protect diversity irrespective of cultural practices. The anthropological debate on culture suggests that instead of focusing on culture as an abstract set of values we should focus on cultural practices. From this perspective emphasis should be put on practices which create conditions within which diverse ways of living can peacefully coexist. Second, multiculturalism wants to protect

minority cultures as if they were immutable, while at the same time demands dramatic changes in the majority culture. Multicultural policies aim at promoting a democratic pluralist integration not on the basis of reciprocal respect but on the basis of toleration. Historically this kind of reciprocity has made possible the co-existence of different cultures in many countries.

Relativist view that cultures and values are incommensurable does not provide the best foundation for the acknowledgement of cultural rights. For the view of incommensurability of cultural values can be abused to defend practices that marginalize, degrade or harm people. If cultures are incommensurable, then no neutral standards are available by which different cultural claims can be assessed and measured. Multiculturalists employ three distinct strategies to meet this objection.

According to Charles Taylor, the hypothesis that the various ways of being human are ultimately incommensurable is possible, but it is doubtful. He draws attention to the risk of relativism and warns that cultural openness while necessary for understanding other cultures and tradition, should not lead to the questioning of the very idea of truth in human affairs. For him it is wrong to belief that accepting cultural differences necessitates abandoning allegiance to truth.

Bhikhu Parekh contests moral relativism on the ground of "minimum universalism" or "pluralist universalism", conceived as a middle ground between relativism on the one hand and moral monism on the other. According to him, relativism mistakenly ignores cross culturally shared human properties which give rise to some basic norms of human well-being common and valid to all societies. He argues that culture do not exist in a vacuum. They are embedded in and limited by the universally shared features of human existence. He contends that cultural relativists mistakenly believe that a culture is a tightly integrated and self-contained whole and determines its members.

In the similar vein, Margaret Moore observes that radical cultural and moral relativism does not necessarily follow from the recognition of multiple cultural values. She argues that it might not be possible to produce a full-scale ranking of diverse human values, but it might be possible to identify what is morally evil. It is possible to acknowledge that there are certain evils like cruelty, human suffering-that any moral system should recognize and prohibit.

13.6 Conclusion

Foregoing analysis suggests that the thesis of incommensurability of cultures and values which usually underlines the position of cultural relativism is debatable. This in turn appears to support the view that it is possible to identify certain cultures as more valuable than others and to discredit moral relativism as an inappropriate foundation of multiculturalism. The reason for this is that it can tolerate some cultural practices that are unacceptable in terms of basic minimum human functioning.

13.7 Summing Up

- In the early 20th century American anthropologist Franz Boas used the concept of culture against the racist views of 19th century scholars.

- Cultural relativism was in part a response to western ethnocentrism.

- It is based on the idea that a person's beliefs, values and practices should be explained based on person's own culture.

- Critics argue that cultural relativism overstate differences between societies and under plays universals.

- For some critics multicalturalism in emphasizing group rights presents itself as a form of cultural determinism.

- However multi-cultural theorist, such as, Charles Tayor, Bhikhu Parekh and Margaret Moore argue that relativism ignores cross cultural shared human properties.

13.8 Probable Questions

Essay Type Questions:

1. Write a critical note on cultural relativism

2. Do you think that cultural relativism is a constituent element of multiculturalism? Give reasons for your answer.

Short Questions:

1. What's cultural relativism? Examine its implications.

2. What are the major complaints against culture relativism?

3. What are the core principles of cultural relativism?

4. Write a short note on the utility of cultural relativism as a methodological tool.

Objective questions

1. What is the meaning of ethnocentrism?

2. What is the fundamental idea behind the concept of cultural relativism?

3. How does Bhikhu Parekh define pluralist universalism?

13.9 Further Reading

1. Rachels, james, the challenge of Cultural Relativism, in Exploring Ethics, Ed, steven Kahn, OUP.2014

2. Rosado Caleb; understanding Cultural Relativism in a Multicultural World, written in 1990: Accessed from Academia, 19th October, 2021

3. Prato Giuliana B. Beyond Multiculturalism: Anthropology at the Intersections between the Local, the National and the Global, Paper presented at the xv International Congress of the International Union of Anthropology and Ethnological Sciences, 2003: Accessed from Academia, 19th October, 2021

4. Taylor, Charles, 2002. The Other and ourselves: Is Multiculturalism inherently relativist? Http://w.w.w.Project syndicate.org/commentary

5. Parekh Bhikhu 2000, Rethinking Multiculturalism: Cultural Diversity and Political Theory. Basingstoke, Macmillan

Unit-14 □ Plural Society and Multiculturalism

Structure

14.1 Objective

After reading this unit the learners will be able to

- Discuss the conceptof plural society and multiculturalism.
- Understand the challenges facing multiculturalism in liberal democracy.
- Explain the different types of multiculturalism.
- Explain the different kinds of cultural diversity in a multicultural state.

14.2 Introduction

Individual liberty was deeply cherished by the advocates of liberal democracy since the beginning of its journey in Europe. Locke put liberty at the centre of European politics - the rights to life, liberty and property being the three inalienable,

186

natural rights. Rousseau considered freedom an essential attribute of being human. Liberty of thought, expression and action was central to Mill's idea of democracy. From the seventeenth century the concept of equality along with liberty was placed at the core of democratic theory.

Once civil and political liberties were granted to persons of all classes, colour and gender were no longer the basis of excluding people from the political sphere, thinking about differences took a new turn undergoing changes that brought new challenges to liberal democratic theory and practice. Social differences began to reassert themselves without accompanying fear of legitimising discrimination. In the changed scenario the focus was shifted to cultural differences. Liberal democracies had to negotiate these new claims of cultural differences. Previously race, religion, and gender were based for unequal treatment to be meted out to different people. Now, cultural differences between communities, with their distinctive ways of life, values, norms, dress codes were viewed positively. Instead of indicators of stratification, they became so many markers of identity, self-respect, self- esteem demanding recognition from the society and the state.

The celebration of cultural differences seemed to fit into the concept of liberty, not so was, perhaps, the case with the idea of equality. Both liberty and the idea of cultural differences fostered the idea of diversity. By contrast, the idea of cultural differences comes into conflict with the idea of equality as understood previously in democratic theory. In fact, the proponents of multiculturalism were critical of the principle of formal equality on the ground that it leads to the erasure of all cultural differences treating and categorizing every member of the nation state as citizen only, camouflaging the homogenising cultural bias of the nation state.

Multiculturalism can be described as the central feature of the world we live in now. Whether we accept or reject the fact of cultural differences in the modern state, we simply can't wish away the reality of multiculturalism. Strangely, however, for a long time it was ignored in the western world despite decades of struggle by black Americans for full political inclusion, the confederacies adopted by several European states to accommodate linguistic and religious diversity and the multicultural policies pursued by Australia and Canada in the 1970s, to mention a few. While in the 1980s the communitarian writers championed the culture-friendly virtues of solidarity, togetherness and belonging, it was never spelt out which communities-cultural or otherwise-was being referred to. It was only the

context of the liberal -communitarian debate in the 1990s that communitarianism transformed itself to a broader debate about how to accommodate cultural and ethnic claims within the framework of liberal democracy. In this context Will Kymlicka's Liberalism, Community and Culture broke new ground Theories of democracy, justice, freedom, equality are abstract theories which often do not help us to address the issues of the right to have a particular dress code of persons belonging to a particular community, hate speech against a particular community, the cultural rights of the immigrants. These are all concrete questions, culture-specific questions. It is not that we can accommodate the multicultural reality in the existing theories of democracy, justice, freedom and equality, because often these theories are formulated in a culture-blind way. So the challenge of multiculturalism demands a reformulation and redefinition of these theories.

14.3 Bhiku Parekh's analysis of the forms of cultural diversity and multicultural rights

Bhiku Parekh analyses four major forms of cultural diversity and consequent forms of multicultural rights. First, the indigenous peoples, such as the Amerindians, the Maoris, the Australian aborigines, the Inuits and others like them, want to preserve their distinct and largely pre modern ways of life. Although they once enjoyed independence which they lost to the white colonizers, they do not generally want to form themselves into independent states. Their claim is generally restricted to the demand to retain their land, cultures and traditional ways of life within the framework of the existing states. Sometimes they demand the right to have special representation in the legislatures.

Secondly, there are territorially concentrated and politically self-conscious communities that want to preserve their distinct languages and cultures, if possible within the existing states, if not by achieving independence from the existing states. The French speaking people in Quebec, the Basques, the Catalonians in Spain, the Tamils in Sri Lanka, the Muslims in Kashmir fall within this category. Unlike the first group they are not opposed to wider society's modern ways of life and socio-economic, political aspirations. But they have a distinct linguistic and cultural identity which, they think, they can't preserve within the framework of the traditional federal state granting them administrative autonomy.

Thirdly, there are immigrants, ethnic minorities and religious communities who, unlike the first two groups, neither demand to be left alone nor seek political autonomy. They, generally, seek the cultural space to retain and transmit their ways of life.

Finally, the demand for recognition and cultural diversity may also come from groups of men and women sharing in common a self-chosen life-style likethe gays, lesbians and other groups of people opting for unconventional ways of living. Such groups demand not only toleration, but respect for what they consider their unconventional practices. They are not distinct enthnicgroups, their ways of life are not radically different from the mainstream of society. But have developed a kind of subculture with their unconventional life practices within the shared framework of common culture.

14.4 Core themes of multiculturalism

Four themes are identified by Andrew Heywood as the core themes of multiculturalism Post-colonialism, Identity and Culture, Minority Rights, Diversity.

Postcolonialism: Postcolonialism gave a fillip to multiculturalism by challengingthe cultural hegemony of the west and legitimising nonwestern cultural practices, traditions and political ideas. Edward Said's path-breaking work 'Orientalism' is often considered the most influential text of postcolonialism. Frantz Fanon's theory of imperialism analysed the psychological dimension of colonial subjugation. To Edward Said Orientalism is a sign of Europe-Atlantic power over the Orient which produces a body of knowledge creating a stereotype of the 'Orient'. In his words Orientalism is system of knowledge about the Orient, an accepted grid for filtering through the Orient into Western consciousness.' Taking the cue from Gramsci's idea of hegemony, Edward Said considers Orientalism 'the hegemony of European ideas about the Orient, themselves reiterating the European superiority over Oriental backwardness', usually overriding the possibility of an independent, authentic voice on this matter. Postcolonialism made some important contributions to the movement of multiculturalism. Firstly, by challenging the Eurocentric worldviews it gave a distinctive space to non-western cultures, ideas, religions and philosophies and encouraged their broader reassessment. Secondly, it brought to the fore the political importance of different varying cultures getting free from the bias of Eurocentrism and colonial legacy.

14.5 Identity and Culture

Needless to say, that multiculturalism is a kind of identity politics in the face of the challenges coming from the homogenising culture of the modern nation state or the dominant culture of the majority community. So it is the result of a sense of perceived injustice and driven by that perception it tries to strengthen the sense of collective identity of the members and the commonality of their shared life experiences. Identity in this sense connects the personal to the social and considers the individual embedded in a cultural, social, institutional or ideological context. Multiculturalism, in other words is rooted in communitarian view of human nature, as against the liberal idea of disengaged', 'unencumbered self. Communitarian theorists like Alistair MacIntyre and Michael Sandel point out the rootless atomism of liberal individualism. Canadian philosopher, Charles Taylor developed the idea of 'politics of recognition' explicitly built on the communitarian view of personal identity. Arguing for a model of liberal society that can include important collective goals, Taylor distinguishes between the crucial liberties central to any liberal society and the less critical rights and opportunities that may be overridden. The pro-French policies of Quebec are such a collective goal. The goal here is not just to sustain, but actively create a community of French speakers into the indefinite future. Taylor argues that individuals require, not just respect, but recognition, they need to be objects of others' positive attitudes. Taylor distinguishes between two modes of being in late modernity- autonomy and authenticity. While autonomy is the seedbed in which the modern rational disengaged self has grown, authenticity invokes an alternative Romantic tradition of spontaneity, uniqueness, and difference. There is a certain way of life that is my way. These two traditions are not opposite, but divergent. Taylor, however interprets authenticity not just in an individual sense, but also in a collective sense: cultures too have their own authentic essences which need recognition.

Minority rights and Will Kymlicka:Kymlicka's Multicultural Citizenship wants to defend cultural protection along liberal lines. He distinguishes between cultural contexts, as media that provide meaning,orientation, identity, belonging and cultural options within that context. With that distinction Kymlicka tries to advance two divergent arguments. Cultures are a necessary frame of human action; hence there is a loss if one's cultural context begins to erode. This is justice argument, and it says

that each person has the right to a secure cultural context, not just any context, but his/her own. The freedom argument says that people are free autonomous choosers, and what they choose between are different cultural options. Unitary optionless contexts, like seamless webs of shared values, would leave cultural members without liberal choices. Both these arguments ultimately lead to multiculturalism.

Kymlicka distinguishes between national minorities and ethnic groups to advance different kinds of cultural rights. The national minorities are incipient nations who themselves incorporated into a larger multinational state. Examples include the aboriginal peoples in Canada and Australia, Maori in New Zealand and the various multinational groups that comprise multinational states like Switzerland and Belgium. Ethnic groups on the other hand, are formed largely as a result of immigration.

This category includes the diverse groups of migrants found in the USA, Canada and Australia, countries with highest rates of immigration, as well as the Turks in Germany, the immigrants from the Commonwealth countries in the UK, for example. The point of such distinction is to refer to the hierarchy of cultural rights required for different cultural minorities. The national minorities require the rights to special representation and devolved self- government, although in some cases it may extend to the right to secession and, therefore, to sovereign independence. The ethnic groups, formed mainly by the immigrants, on the other hand require rights to express their cultural distinctiveness through certain exemptions and privileges. This may include, for instance, legal exemptions of Jews and Muslims from animal slaughtering, the exemptions of Muslim girls from school dress codes. Kymlicka also emphasizes the need for special representation of minorities and disadvantaged groups in education and in senior positions in political and public life. Kymlicka supported 'reverse or positive discrimination as the only way of ensuring full and equal participation of minorities, which consequently guarantees public policies reflecting the interests of all groups and people, not merely those of the dominant groups. Judged from this perspective, multiculturalism goes against the principle of formal equality by granting preferential rights and privileges to certain groups to compensate for past injustice or present disadvantages, and thus associated with the principle of so-called, 'affirmative action', followed in many democracies.

14.6 Diversity

Diversity lies at the core of multiculturalism. It is, however, different from conflict or lack of cohesion as feared by the nationalists. On the contrary multiculturalism is driven by the assumption that diversity and unity can coexist and the two should be combined to build multicultural citizenship and political cohesion. Diversity and respect for diversity can, in fact, act as an antidote to polarization in society. Multiculturalists believe that diversity is not only desirable, but should be celebrated. Diversity builds a vibrant society in which a variety of life-styles, culturalpractices, traditions and beliefs enriches the overall health of the society. Multiculturalism, in this sense, is akin to ecologism, in drawing links between diversity and systemic health. Cultural diversity benefits the society in the same way that biodiversity benefits an ecosystem. Besides, respect for diversity promotes cross-cultural exchanges and fosters cross-cultural tolerance required for a healthy democracy.

While all forms of multiculturalism propose a political vision which claims to reconcile diversity with civic cohesion, there is no unanimity about the nature of society and polity they want to build up based on these core multicultural values. In other words, there is no agreement amongst the multiculturalists about how the liberal state should respond to their demands how they should go in positively endorsing cultural diversity in state policies. Andrew Heywood classifies three shades of multiculturalist answers or three models of multiculturalism: Liberal Multiculturalism, Cosmopolitan Multiculturalism, Pluralist Multiculturalism.

14.7 Liberal Multiculturalism

Multiculturalism is often considered a threat to liberal values. But since the 1970s liberal thinkers have tried to address this issue of cultural diversity and developed a form of liberal multiculturalism. Central to this liberal multiculturalism is the idea of toleration and a desire to uphold the freedom of choice in moral sphere especially in matters relating to specific cultural and religious traditions. The cornerstone of this kind of liberal multiculturalism is the central importance of individual autonomy in cultural and religious sphere, the liberal state being considered 'neutral' to moral, cultural, religious choice of the citizens. However,

'liberal toleration', is not morally neutral where a question of individual freedom and autonomy is involved. Liberal multiculturalism, thus, can't accommodate 'deep diversity' and often is not willing to accept cultural practices like arranged marriages and female dress codes as markers of a community's cultural identity. To the liberal multiculturalists an individual's freedom of choice gets precedence over the cultural rights of a community. They would, rather, like to confine the community's cultural rights to the private sphere, while the public sphere is to remain an arena of shared civic allegiances. They would propose a kind of citizenship devoid of any cultural identity leading to a kind of civic nationalism which is compatible with multiculturalism. According to Heywood hyphenated expression like 'African-Americans, 'Polish-Americans', 'German-Americans' prevalent in the USA reflects this approach which emphasizes inclusion, rather than diversity, in the public sphere.

In other words, liberal multiculturalism regards liberal 'democracy' as a preeminent value to be protected at any cost. Bhikhu Parekh calls it Assimilationist Liberalism which argues that the liberal state is a custodian of a way of life centered on the values of autonomy, freedom of choice and independent thought. Minority ways of life, based on different set of values deny their members this freedom of choice threatening the integrity of liberal way of life. Assimilationist liberalism, in other words, insists on the importance of common citizenship, social cohesion and a shared system of meaning, the limit to a society's ability to tolerate cultural diversity. But Bhikhu Parekh points out flaws in such line of argument. The liberalism, Parekh argues, values cultural diversity and pluralism on moral and epistemological grounds. As a liberal one would accept the fact that cultural diversity increases the range of available options. Expands one's imagination and enriches life. Since this is so, a liberal can't privilege the liberal way of life, conduct an assimilationist campaign against all opposing values, projecting liberal way of life as the last word of human wisdom.

14.8 Cosmopolitan Multiculturalism

Theorists like Jeremy Waldron equates multiculturalism with cosmopolitanism which enables an individual to accept and learn from multicultural values and ideas, not confined to any national borders. In other words, cosmopolitan multiculturalism celebrates diversity on the ground that each culture can learn from other cultures and it widens the possibility of individual self-development and enrichment in

a world of wider cultural opportunities and options. It can lead to even cultural hybridization and result in a pick-and-mix multiculturalism in which people may eat Italian food, practice Yoga, enjoy African songs, all at the same time. Culture, in this perspective, is fluid and changing perhaps like changing consumer choices. A multicultural society thus becomes a melting pot of different ideas, values and traditions. Bhikhu Parekh calls it cultural laissez-faire'. John Gray is one of the leading proponents of this approach. Extending the liberal principles of choice and competition to the realm of culture, proponents of this approach insist that every individual should be free to choose his or her way of life in a fair competition between several of them. Like the proponents of laissez-faire economy, Gray wants the state to eschew all the social, cultural or economic goals and confine itself to creating conducive conditions for individual choice. As Bhikhu Parekh beautifully observes, such a line of argument proposes that culturally unattached individuals should be given the right to freely choose their ways of life in a kind of cultural supermarket. Such a view, as Parekh says, misunderstands both the individual, who is by nature, a cultural being, and culture which cannot be chosen in the manner of material goods.

14.9 Pluralist Multiculturalism

Pluralism accommodates 'deep diversity', thereby placing diversity on a firmer basis than does liberalism. Isaiah Berlin, going beyond the liberal idea of toleration, proposes the idea of 'value pluralism' which allows space for disagreement over the ultimate ends of life, as it is not possible to establish the superiority of one value system over another. However, Berlin's adherence to the core idea of liberalism is indicated by his belief that only a society that respects individual liberty can accommodate value pluralism.

One of the leading proponents of an alternative basis for pluralism is Bhikhu Parekh. Parekh argues that human beings are cultural beings. As self-reflective beings they develop distinct cultures in the context of their natural and social experiences. Although all human beings share some common attributes which are species-driven, they are also structured and constituted and developed differently in different cultural settings. In this sense all human beings are culturally embedded. As cultures are human creations, respect for human beings demands respect for their cultures too. Cultural diversity is valuable not because it expands our choices of the ways of life in a 'cultural supermarket', but because it deepens our self-knowledge

and helps us to borrow whatever is attractive in other cultures, integrating them into our own. Cultural diversity, then, is, to borrow an expression from Taylor, a collective good. It both gives the individual a sense of identity and rootedness while at the same time creating possibilities for enriching dialogues between different cultures. Such diversity, however, can't be protected and safeguarded by a policy of cultural laissez-faire. Since it is a 'collective 'or 'public good', it cannot be left to the vagaries of the market. On the contrary, it needs the state's active role for its promotion and protection. The state can promote and sustain cultural diversity in different ways like providing public funds for teaching of minority languages, cultures, religions and so on. It can pursue group-, related welfare policies, it can patronize minority religious and cultural functions, can even encourage self-governance for some minority communities.

14.10 Conclusion

Multiculturalism has been criticised from different standpoints. Making a fierce attack on the liberal state's policies of positive discrimination John Gray has observed that by a dialectic twist of its own inner logic the response of dominant liberalism to the threat of cultural homogeneity has given birth to a new form of cultural imperialism, in which the remnants of overwhelmed traditions are preserved as spectacles for public consumption and subsidized ghettoes. There are liberals who argue that the so-called fundamental or core values of their society are not negotiable. Thus customs and practices incompatible with these core values may rightly be banned. Bhikhu Parekh would argue that the idea of fundamental or core values is itself problematic and too elusive to be of much use. To talk of some core values is to reify those values and that can lead to another kind of cultural homogeneity.

Despite all the criticisms, it can be said that multiculturalism, to varying degrees, has been accepted in principle and state policies by almost all major democracies worldwide. This, perhaps, underscores its significance..

14.11 Summing Up

- Multiculturalism is a central feature of the present-day world. Its proponents argue that the principle of formal equality reflects the homogenizing cultural bias of the nation state.

- Core themes of multiculturalism include identity and culture, minority rights, diversity and post colonialism.

- Liberal multiculturalism emphasizes individual autonomy in cultural and religious sphere.

- Cosmopolitan multiculturalismcelebrates cultural diversity as it widens the possibility of individual self-development.

- Pluralist multiculturalism lays emphasis on deep diversity. Berlin proposes the idea of value pluralism. Bhiku Parekh justifies cultural diversity because it deepens our self-knowledge and helps us to borrow whatever is attractive in other cultures.

14.12 Probable Questions

Essay Type Questions:

1. Do you think that multiculturalism is a kind of identity politics? Explain your view.
2. What are the challenges facing multiculturalism in liberal democracy
3. Explain the different types of multiculturalism.

Short Questions:

1. Discuss, following Bhiku Parekh the different kinds of cultural diversity in a multicultural state.
2. What are the core themes of multiculturalism?
3. Discuss Will Kymlicka's view on minority rights.

Short Question:

1. Write a short note on cosmopolitan multiculturalism.
2. What according to Kymlicka are the different forms of cultural rights?
3. Write a short note on 'liberal multiculturalism.

Objective Questions:

1. What is the central element of J. S. Mill's concept of democracy?
2. What does Charles Taylor mean by 'authenticity'?
3. How does Bhikhu Parekh define 'cultural laissez-faire'?

14.13 Further Reading

1. Bhiku Parekh, Rethinking Multiculturalism: Cultural Diversityand political Theory, Harvard University Press, 2002.

2. Anne Philips, Multiculturalism: Cultural Diversity, Princeton University Press, Princeton, 2007.

3. Tariq Modood, Multi culturalpolitics: Racism, Ethnicity and Muslims in Britain, Edinburgh University Press, Edinburgh, 2005.

4. Will Kymlicka, Multicultural Citizenship, Oxford Scholarship online, 1996.

5. Gurpreet Mahajan,' Religions, Democracy and Governance: Spaces for the Mmarginalised in Contemporary India' in Economic and Political Weekly, Vol.47. No.1 (Januarty7, 2012).

6. Gurpreet Mahajan, Democracy, Difference and Social Justice, Oxford University Press, New York and Delhi, 1998.

Unit-15 □ Issues of Toleration

Structure

15.1 Objective

After going through these unit students will be familiar with

- The meaning of toleration
- Relations between liberalism and toleration Limits of toleration
- Relation between toleration and neutrality

15.2 Introduction

The fact of diversity is evident everywhere in our social world. Individuals express different preferences and judgments on the question of ways of organizing their personal and collective lives. Since the 1960s attitudes to personal morality have undergone profound changes. In the contemporary world the advent of multiculturalism has seen widespread moral religious and ethnic diversity. This has made toleration a pressing issue both socially and globally. The idea that nations are based on a single culture is untenable now. Increasing diversity in the social world has provoked ideological debate between the liberals and the conservatives. While liberals are seen as supporter of toleration and diversity, conservatives are portrayed as defenders of authoritative values and a common culture.

15.3 Meaning of Toleration

Toleration is a much-misunderstood concept. In everyday language it is often taken to mean a willingness to leave alone, with little under understanding of the motives that lie behind such an attitude. In this sense, toleration implies inaction, a refusal to interfere or willingness to bear with something. Toleration as a political value, however, refers to a specific form of inaction based on moral reasoning and a particular set of circumstances. Toleration does not mean permissiveness, blind indifference or willing indulgence.

According to Andrew Heywood, toleration means forbearance, a willingness to accept form of behavior or beliefs of which one disapproves or simply dislike. Toleration in other words, is not morally neutral; it only applies to circumstances where there is disagreement with the views or action of others, combined with a deliberate refusal to act to prevent them. In this interpretation toleration is a principled unwillingness to impose one's views upon others, even when there is a clear capacity to do so.

Toleration may be negative or positive. For the individual, the capacity to choose one's own moral beliefs, cultural practices and way of life, notwithstanding the disapproval of these by others, is an essential condition of freedom and self-development. This can be seen as negative toleration which justifies at least a live and let-live multiculturalism. On the other hand toleration, in its positive sense, by promoting diversity, contributes to the vigour and health of society and ensures progress by stimulating debate, argument and discussion. Thus toleration is both an ethical ideal and a social principle. On the one hand It represents the goal of individual autonomy, on the other hand, it establishes a set of rules concerning interpersonal behavior.

15.4 Liberalism and Toleration

Liberals envisage a tolerant inclusive society populated by people adhering to a variety of belief systems. The distinguishing characteristics of liberal social ethic is willingness to accept moral, cultural and political diversity. In fact, diversity can be said to be rooted in the principle of liberalism and the assumption that human beings are separate and distinct creatures. To be precise, liberal support for diversity has more commonly been associated with toleration.

Liberals justify toleration in at least three different ways:Liberal support for toleration first emerged in the 17th century in the writings of John Milton and John Locke to justify religious freedom. In a Letter concerning Toleration Locke asserted that the primary task of the government is to protect life, liberty and property and it has no right to interfere in matters related to individual conscience. He defended toleration on rational grounds. He believed that truth will come out of free competition among ideas and beliefs and therefore must be left to individual self. Religious truth cannot be taught and it should not be imposed by government. Individual, being rational, should be left to decide their own actions. Liberal argument is based on the assumption that most forms of intolerance originate from ignorance and prejudice and hence will crumble in the face of rational analysis.

The second ground for justifying toleration is individual autonomy. Individuals are held to be independent and self-determining creatures John Stuart Mill expressed this view in his book On Liberty. For Mill autonomy is an essential condition for any form of personal development. Intolerance and the consequent restriction of the range of individual choice leads to the sacrifice of the entire moral courage of the human mind. Mill developed his famous "harm principle", the belief that individual freedom can be rightfully constrained only in order to prevent harm to others. Mill was particularly fearful of the threat to autonomy posed by the spread of democracy and by the consequent tyranny of the majority. In his judgment the power of majority would promote dull conformity and encourage individuals to submit their rational faculties to the popular prejudice of the day.

The third justification for toleration is that it is good for the society as well as the individual. Mill argued that political, cultural and moral diversity will ensure free competition among rival ideas and doctrines and in the process good ideas will displace the bad one and truth will conquer falsehood. However, Mill admitted that debate, discussion and argument will be continuous because no absolute truth can ever be established. Hence social progress demands the scrupulous maintenance of toleration to ensure free market of ideas.

15.5 Limits of Toleration

In a pluralist society different faiths and culture co-exist and there is likely to be friction and offence. One group's festivities might seem like an attack on another group. As values and philosophies compete in the marketplace of ideas,

the competition will often seem disrespectful as each group tries to discredit its opponents. It is not easy to define the duty of mutual toleration under these circumstances or to sustain the distinction between harm and offence that a pluralist society requires. However, the line between public and private on the one hand and individual ethics and cultural observance on the other is always going to be an issue. In a pluralist society a religion may have its own values with a distinctive bearing on the problems of social life. It may impose particular obligation on its members which may or may not be compatible with the society's broader social arrangements.

According to Andrew Heywood liberal toleration extends only to views values and practice that are themselves tolerant. It tolerates ideas and actions that are compatible with individual freedom and autonomy. Liberals cannot accommodate "deep diversity" advocated by some multiculturalists. Emphasis on autonomy means that liberals usually place individual rights above the rights of cultural, religious or ethnic groups. Liberals have been critical of the indoctrination of children and restriction on members access to rival views and alternative lifestyle.

Liberals do not assume that societies are stable if they are based on shared values and common culture. They often insist that moral and cultural diversity should be confined to private life and should not be allowed to intrude into the public sphere. Liberals usually support moral and cultural diversity operating within the context of a shared citizenship. According to Heywood liberal democracy is taken to be the sole legitimate political system. Because it ensures that government is based on the consent of the people and it provides guarantees for individual freedom and toleration. Liberals may therefore be willing to ban fascist or militant fundamentalist groups that try to overthrow liberal democracy.

15.6 Toleration and Neutrality

Disapproval is essential to the idea of toleration. Absence of disapproval might suggest political neutrality. However liberal democracy with which toleration is associated does not presuppose a neutral state. Neutrality is thought to be incompatible with toleration for the simple reason that in so far as a state or government or body of citizens remains neutral, it refrains from taking either an approving or disapproving stance on the matter at hand. In so far as it refrains from disapproval it cannot engage in toleration. Thus, neutrality precludes toleration. It

is not neutrality that gives birth to toleration on the contrary it is a particular sort of commitment to toleration that creates a case for neutrality John Rawls's political liberalism makes it abundantly clear.

Rawls's political liberalism is designed for a society whose members adhere to diverse and conflicting comprehensive doctrines and to different and conflicting conceptions of the good rooted in those doctrines. In so far as people recognizethe "burdens of judgment" they will recognize that at least some of the doctrines of others are reasonable even though they believe them to be mistaken. Rawls's aim is to find a just way of providing for that reasonable pluralism. He aims to discover political arrangements that would regulate fairly lives of people who profess different and conflicting conceptions of the good. He does so by drawing upon certain ideas that he takes to be fundamental to the public culture of a democratic society. It is a society of a fair scheme of cooperation and of persons as free and equal. These ideas he takes to be independent of any particular conceptions of the good, so that he is not drawing on any particular conception of the good in deriving principles and institutions that will regulate the lives of people who possess different conception of the good.

Through reasoning he arrives at his celebrated two principle of justice. More generally he arrives at an order of things in which citizens may not use political power either to advance their own conception of the good or to discriminate against the rival conception of others. Rawlsian citizen will not draw upon particular conception of the good and will remain politically neutral. They are not only citizens but also full-fledged persons possessing different and conflicting comprehensive doctrines. In the absence of Rawls's political conception of justice, they would have ample reason to impose their conceptions of the good upon one another. The institutional constraints that Rawlsian individuals have to observe as political actors are grounded in the principle that it is unjust for citizens to use political power to impose their rival conceptions upon one another. Rawlsian citizens manifest their commitment to toleration through their commitment to political arrangement that are designed neither to favour their own conception of the good nor to disadvantage the rival conception of other's. For Rawls liberalism seeks to establish the conditions in which people in groups can pursue the good life as each defines it, but it does not prescribe or try to promote any particular values. This enables liberalism to coexist with a wide variety of political, moral and cultural beliefs.

Liberalism stands for openness and self-determination. It is also characterized by a powerful moral thrust. Recognizing this Rawls argues that differences within society have to take place within an "over-lapping" consensus or what citizens

could agree on despite the other matters that divide them. At the heart of this consensus are the values of autonomy, freedom and equality. Rawls believes that it is unreasonable to challenge or reject these values.

15.7 Conclusion

Modern societies are increasingly becoming diverse and this diversity is affecting matters of personal morality as well as religious principles and cultural practices. This trend is associated with the advance of liberalism and the spread of toleration. However liberal support for toleration is not absolute. While supporting the virtues of toleration liberalism also emphasizes its limits.

Since the late 20th century, many liberals have gone beyond toleration and support the idea of moral neutrality. This reflects a shift from universalism to pluralism within liberalism. Liberals have often abandoned the search for a set of fundamental value in favour of the desire to create condition in which people adhering and practicing different moral values can live together.

15.8 Summing Up

- Widespread moral, religious and ethnic diversity has made toleration a pressing issue in the contemporary world.
- Toleration does not mean permissiveness, blind indifferences or willing indulgence. It is a principled unwillingness to impose ones views upon others, even when there is a -clear capacity to do so.
- Liberal support for diversity has commonly been associated with toleration. How-ever, liberal toleration extends only to views, values and practices that are them-selves tolerant.
- Neutrality precludes toleration. It is not neutrality that gives birth to toleration, on the contrary, it is a particular sort of commitment to toleration that creates a case for neutrality.

15.9 Probable Questions

Essay Type Questions:
1. Why do liberals support toleration and diversity?
2. Explain the relationship between toleration and neutrality

Short Questions:

1. What are the limits of toleration?
2. Write a note on the relations between liberalism and toleration.
3. Define toleration
4. Bring out the main features of Rawl's political liberalism.

Objective Questions:

1. What is meant by negative toleration?
2. What is the most essential element of toleration?
3. What does John Rawls mean by 'overlapping consensus'?

15.10 Further Reading

1. Heywood, Andrew Political Theory; Palgrave Macmillan, 2004.
2. Gaus, GF and Kukathas Chandran; Handbook of Political Theory, Sage, 2004.
3. Kymlicka Will Contemporary Political Philosophy: Oxford University Press, 2002.