

## POLITICAL SCIENCE

### PRELIMS

#### SECTION - A

1. **POLITICAL SCIENCE:** Nature and scope of the discipline, relationship with allied disciplines like history, economics, philosophy, sociology, and psychology.
2. **MEANING OF POLITICS:** Approaches to study of politics.
3. **KEY CONCEPTS:** State, society, sovereignty, power, citizenship, nation, global order and imperialism.

## chapter 1 political theory: nature and significance

Systematic reflection on politics, the nature and purpose of government and political institutions, involving both to understand them and if necessary, how to change them, is quite old. Political activity is an activity concerned with the management of man's collective life through the state. From classical period onwards, political speculation has been about: how fundamental political activity is; how it provides the groundwork for human civilization which distinguishes man from all other living creatures; and to inquire into the basic problem of 'how to live together' in a community because living together is necessitated by human nature and forms the core of individual life.

Political theory seeks to understand, explain and analyse the political phenomena and prescribe ways and means to rectify the shortcomings. Political theory is a complex subject. This is because in the Western tradition, it is at least 2300 years old and has been attended to by philosophers, theologians, kings, economists, sociologists, popes and others. The number of political theorists is very large, and the interests and commitments of those engaged in this field have been so different that we are faced with the difficult task of answering a simple question: What is political theory? Moreover, because of the diversity and changes in the socio-economic circumstances, there have been substantial changes both in the subject matter of political theory and the methods of studying it.

2

For the purpose of study, political theory is divided into distinct streams such as classical, modern, empirical etc. While the classical political theory was dominated by philosophy and

dealt with the description, explanation, prescription and evaluation of the political phenomena; empirical political theory claimed to be a science and has been primarily concerned with the description and explanation of the political reality. Of late, contemporary political theory has tried to blend the theoretical and practical aspects. We shall talk in detail on this subject in the course of this chapter.

## WHAT IS POLITICAL THEORY?

At the most general level, political theory is ‘a body of knowledge related to the phenomenon of the state’. While ‘theory’ refers to ‘a systematic knowledge’, ‘political’ refers to ‘matters of public concern’. According to David Held, political theory is 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 the political capabilities of human beings’<sup>1</sup>. Andrew Hacker defines it as ‘a combination of a disinterested search for the principles of good state and good society on the one hand, and a disinterested search for knowledge of political and social reality on the other’.<sup>2</sup> Another writer, George Catlin expresses almost the same views. He says, ‘political theory includes political science and political philosophy. While science refers to the phenomena of control in many forms over all the process of whole social field... It is concerned with means; political philosophy is concerned with the end or final value, when man asks ‘what is the national good’ or ‘what is good society’.<sup>3</sup> Again, according to W.C. Coker, ‘When political government and its forms and activities are studied not simply as facts to be described and compared or judged in reference to their immediate and temporary effects, but as facts to be understood and appraised in relation to the constants needs, desires and opinions of men, then we have political theory’.<sup>4</sup> We can sum up the meaning of political theory by referring to the comprehensive definition given by Gould and Kolb who say that it is ‘a sub-field of political science which includes: i) political philosophy—a moral theory of politics and a historical study of political ideas, ii) a scientific criterion, iii) a linguistic analysis of political ideas, iv) the discovery and systematic development of generalizations about political

3

behaviour’.<sup>5</sup>

On the basis of the above definitions, we can conclude that political theory is concerned with the study of the phenomena of the state both in philosophical as well as empirical terms. It not only involves explanation, description and prescription regarding the state and political institutions but also evaluation of their moral philosophical purpose. It is not only concerned with what the state is but also what it ought to be. According to Weinstein, political theory can be viewed as an activity which involves posing questions, developing responses to those questions and creating imaginative perspectives on the public life of human beings.<sup>6</sup> It has been probing into questions like: nature and purpose of the state; why one should prefer a kind of state than the other; what the political organization aims at; by what criteria its ends, its methods and its achievements should be judged; what is the relation between state and the individual. Political theory has been engaged in these age old questions from Plato onwards because it is concerned with the fate of man which depends upon his ability to create a kind of political community in which rulers and

ruled are united in the pursuit of common good. It is not necessary that political theory can provide answers to all questions but it can at least tell us how one should go about the solution.

## NATURE AND SIGNIFICANCE

### **distinction between political theory and political thought, political philosophy and political science.**

As stated above, political theory is the study of the phenomena of the state both from philosophical as well as empirical points of view. In this context, certain similar terms are also used such as political thought, political philosophy, political science. Although all of them are concerned with explaining the political phenomena, yet political theory is distinct from them. The distinction of political theory from other terms is as follows.

#### **political theory and political thought**

It is generally believed that political thought is the general thought comprising of theories and values of all those persons or a section of the community who think and write on the day-do-day activities, policies and decisions of the state, and which has a

4

bearing on our present living. These persons can be philosophers, writers, journalists, poets, political commentators etc. Political thought has no 'fixed' form and can be in the form of treatise, speeches, political commentaries etc. What is important about political thought is that it is 'time bound' since the policies and programmes of the governments change from time to time. Thus we have Greek thought or Roman thought of ancient period or the political thought of the medieval ages.<sup>7</sup> Political theory, on the other hand, is the systematic speculation of a particular writer who talks specifically about the phenomena of the state. This speculation is based on certain hypothesis which may or may not be valid and may be open to criticism. Theory provides a model of explanation of political reality as is understood by the writer. As such there can be different political theories of the same period. Also, political theory is based on certain discipline-be it philosophy, history, economics or sociology. And lastly, since the task of theory is not only to explain the political reality but also to change it (or to resist change), political theory can be conservative, critical or revolutionary. According to Barker, while political thought is the immanent philosophy of a whole age, political theory is the speculation of a particular thinker. While political thought is implicit and immersed in the stream of vital action, political theory is explicit and may be detached from the political reality of a particular period.<sup>8</sup>

#### **Political theory and political philosophy**

Philosophy is called 'science of wisdom'—wisdom about this world, man or God. This wisdom is all-inclusive and tries to explain everything. When this wisdom is applied to the study of political phenomena or the state, it is called political philosophy. Political philosophy belongs to the category of normative political theory. It is concerned with not only explaining what 'is' but also what 'ought' to be. Political philosophy is not concerned with contemporary issues but with

certain universal issues in the political life of man such as nature and purpose of the political organisation, basis of political authority, nature of rights, liberty, equality, justice etc. The distinction between political philosophy and political theory is explained by the fact that whereas a political philosopher is a political theorist, but a political theorist may not necessarily be a political philosopher.<sup>9</sup> For example, David Easton is an eminent

5

political theorist but is not considered a political philosopher. Though theory deals with the same issues as political philosophy, it can explain them both from philosophical as well as empirical points of view. In other words, while political philosophy is abstract or speculative, political theory can be both normative and empirical. A political theorist is as much interested in explaining the nature and purpose of the state as in describing the realities of political behaviour, the actual relations between state and citizens, and the role of power in the society. As has been pointed out by Arnold Brecht, philosophical explanations are theories too, but they are non-scientific.<sup>10</sup> Political theory is concerned both with political institutions and the ideas and aspirations that form the basis of those institutions. However, we must not forget that though we can analytically distinguish between philosophy and theory, yet if political theory is separated from political philosophy, its meaning will appear distorted and it will prove barren and irrelevant. Theory must be supplemented by philosophy.

### **political theory and political science**

As a discipline, political science is much more comprehensive and includes different forms of speculation in politics such as political thought, political theory, political philosophy, political ideology, institutional or structural framework, comparative politics, public administration, international law and organizations etc. With the rise of political science as a separate discipline, political theory was made one of its subfields. However, when used specifically with emphasis on 'science' as distinct from 'theory', political science refers to the study of politics by the use of scientific methods in contrast to political philosophy which is free to follow intuition. 'Political theory when opposed to political philosophy is political science'. Political science is concerned with describing and explaining the realities of political behaviour, generalizations about man and political institutions on empirical evidence, and the role of power in the society. Political theory, on the other hand, is not only concerned about the behavioural study of the political phenomena from empirical point of view but also prescribing the goals which states, governments, societies and citizens ought to pursue. Political theory also aims to generalize about the right conduct in the political life and about the legitimate use of power.<sup>11</sup>

Thus political theory is neither pure thought, nor philosophy,

6

nor science. While it draws heavily from all of them, yet it is distinct from them. Contemporary political theory is trying to attempt a synthesis between political philosophy and political science.

### **characteristics of political theory**

Political theory is an intellectual and moral creation of man. Generally it is the speculation of a single individual who is attempting to offer us a theoretical explanation of the political reality i.e. the phenomena of the state. Every theory by its very nature is an explanation, built upon certain hypothesis which may be valid (or not) and which are always open to criticism. So what we find in political theory is a number of attempts made by thinkers from Plato onwards to unravel the mysteries of man's political life. They have given so many modes of explanations which may or may not convince us but to which we cannot pass any final judgement. Political theory is largely an attempt to seek the truth as the thinker sees it and it is usually expressed through a treatise such as Plato's Republic, Aristotle's Politics, Hobb'es' Leviathan, or Rawls' A Theory of Justice.

Secondly, political theory contains an explanation of man, society and history. It probes the nature of man and society: how a society is made up and how it works; what are the important elements; what are the sources of conflict in the society and how they can be resolved.

Thirdly, political theory is discipline based. It means that though the phenomena which the theorist seeks to explain remains the same i.e. the state, the writer may be a philosopher, historian, economist, theologian or a sociologist. Thus we are confronted by a variety of political theories, each distinguished by a discipline on which it is based.

Fourthly, political theory not only comprehends and explains the social and political reality but is also actively engaged in hastening the process of history. The task of political theory is not only to understand and explain but also to device ways and means to change the society. As Laski put it, the task is not merely one of description of what it is but also a prescription of what ought to be.<sup>12</sup> Thus political theory recommends agencies of action as well as means of reform, revolution or conservation. It contains programmes that embody both ends and means. Political

7

theory plays a double role: to understand society and to suggest how to remove the imperfections.

And lastly, political theory also includes political ideology. Ideology in simple language means 'a system of beliefs, values and ideals by which people allow themselves to be governed'. We find a number of ideologies in the modern world such as liberalism, Marxism, socialism etc. All political theories from Plato to date reflect a distinct ideology of the writer. Political theory in the form of political ideology includes a system of political values, institutions and practices which a society has adopted as its ideal. For example, all political theories adopted by Western Europe and America have been dominated by liberalism and the theories accepted by China and erstwhile USSR were influenced by a particular brand of Marxism. Each brand of theory or ideology in this sense claims for itself the attributes of universality and compels others to accept it, leading to what is generally known as 'ideological conflicts'.

In short, political theory is associated with the explanation and evaluation of the political phenomena and this phenomena can be examined as a statement of ideas and ideals, as an agent of socio-economic change, and as an ideology.

## issues in political theory

The nature of political theory can also be understood from the kind of issues it has been grappling with during the long span of more than 2300 years. Different political issues have been dominant in different epochs. Classical political theory was primarily concerned with the search for a perfect political order. As such it analysed the basic issues of political theory such as the nature and purpose of the state, basis of political authority, the problem of political obligation and political disobedience. It was more concerned with what the state ought to be i.e. the ideal state. The rise of modern nation-state and the industrial revolution gave birth to a new kind of society, economy and polity. Modern political theory starts from individualism and made liberty of the individual as the basic issue. Hence it was concerned with issues like rights, liberty, equality, property and justice for the individual, how to create a state based upon individual consent, and a right to change the government. At one time, it also became important to explain the

8

interrelation between one concept and the other such as liberty and equality, justice and liberty, equality and property. The empirical political theory, particularly after the second world war, shifted the emphasis from concepts to the political behaviour of man. It invented a number new issues largely borrowed from other social sciences. Some of the important issue of empirical political theory were authority, legitimacy, elite, party, group, political system, political culture etc.

During the last twenty years, quite a number of different issues have come to dominate the scene of political theory. With the resurgence of value-based political theory, there is once again an emphasis on the issues of freedom, equality and justice. Apart from them, some new issues have come to dominate the scene such as feminism, environmentalism, ecology, community, issue concerning development, subalternism etc. These are the issues which have been engaging the attention of political theorists today. We shall touch upon these issues in the relevant chapters in this book. Moreover traditional picture of studying the issues from a single perspective i.e. either from liberal or Marxist point of view, is also changing. Though the method was not wrong but today it is found inadequate. To give an example, both liberalism and Marxism have viewed justice or freedom in the male dominated sphere of government and economy and ignored the freedom of the traditional female spheres of home and family. An adequate theory of sexual equality will involve considerations that simply are not addressed in the traditional right or left debates. Similarly, communitarians have also exposed the weakness of single perspective approach. Recent political theory is trying to redefine the issues of liberty, equality and justice in the context of ultimate values of common good.<sup>15</sup>

## significance

The significance of political theory can be derived from the purpose it serves or supposed to serve and the task performed by it. Political theory is a form of all embracing system of values which a society adopts as its ideal with a view to understand the political reality and, if necessary, to change it. It involves speculation at higher level about the nature of good life, the



political institutions appropriate for its realization, to what end the state is directed and how it should be constituted to achieve those ends. The

9

significance of political theory lies in providing the moral criteria that ought to be used to judge the ethical worth of a political state and to propose alternative political arrangements and practices likely to meet the moral standards. The importance of political theory lies in providing i) a description of the political phenomena, ii) a non-scientific (based upon philosophy or religion) or a scientific (based upon empirical studies) explanation, iii) proposals for the selection of political goals and political action, and iv) moral judgement. Examples of such a political theory can be found in Plato's Republic, or Rawls' A Theory of Justice or Nozic's Anarchy, State and Utopia.

As mentioned earlier, the fundamental question facing human beings has been 'how to live together'. Politics is an activity engaged with the management of the collective affairs of society. The significance of theory lies in evolving various doctrines and approaches regarding the nature and purpose of the state, the bases of political authority, vision of an ideal state, best form of government, relations between the state and the individual and basic issues such as rights, liberty, equality, property, justice etc. Again what has become important in our times is to explain the inter-relation between one concept and another such as the relationship between liberty and equality, equality and property, justice and property. This is as important as peace, order, harmony-stability and unity in the society. In fact peace and harmony in the society very much depends upon how we interpret and implement the values of liberty, equality and justice etc.

Contemporary states face a number of problems such as poverty, over-population, corruption, racial and ethnic tensions, environment pollution etc., conflicts among individuals, groups as well as nations. The task of political theory is to study and analyse more profoundly than others, the immediate and potential problems of political life of the society and to supply the practical politician with an alternative course of action, the consequences of which have been fully thought of. According to David Held, the task of political theorist is really demanding because in the absence of systematic study, there is a danger that politics will be left to the ignorant and self-seeking people who only want to pursue it as 'power'.<sup>13</sup>

In short, the significance of political theory lies in the fact that it provides systematic thinking about the nature and purpose of

10

state and government. It helps us to establish a correlation between ideals and the socio-political phenomena. It makes the individual aware of his rights and duties in the society. It helps us to understand the nature of the socio-economic system and its problems like poverty, violence, corruption, ethnicity etc. Since the task of political theory is not only to understand and explain the social reality but also to change it, political theory helps us to evolve ways and means to change society either through reform or revolution. When political theory performs its function

well, it is one of the most important weapons of struggle for the advancement of humanity. To imbue people with correct theories may make them choose their goals and means correctly so as to avoid the roads that end in disappointment.<sup>14</sup>

## MAJOR SCHOOLS OF POLITICAL THEORY

As mentioned above, there is considerable diversity in political theory. Political theory in the western world is a continuous dialogue extended over time. Broadly speaking, although there is more or less a continuity regarding the subject matter of political theory, yet the approaches to its study have been changing during the past 2000 years. We shall now consider some major schools which have helped in the development of certain key concepts of political theory. These are:

- i. Classical Political Theory
- ii. Liberal Political Theory
- iii. Marxist Political Theory
- iv. Empirical-Scientific Political Theory
- v. Contemporary Political Theory

### classical political theory

Classical political theory starts from 6th century B.C. and covers the political ideas of a large number of Greek, Roman and Christian thinkers and philosophers. Plato and Aristotle are the two great giants of the classical period who had enormous influence in their own times and on later thinking. Classical political theory included i) politics, ii) the idea of theory, and iii) the practice of philosophy. Politics referred to participation in the public affairs, theory referred to the systematic knowledge gained through observation, and philosophy referred to the quest for reliable knowledge - knowledge which would enable men to become wiser in the conduct of collective

11

life. Thus political theory was a 'systematic inquiry to acquire reliable knowledge about matters concerning public affairs'

Classical political theory has certain specific characteristics. Firstly, it was dominated by philosophy. The great philosophers such as Plato, Aristotle were great because of the comprehensiveness and scope of their thought. They were more than political thinkers. The dimensions of political theory included description, explanation, prescription and evaluation. Secondly, there was no clear distinction between philosophical, theological and political issues. Political theory was not an autonomous subject as it is today. Thirdly, political theory was concerned with probing into issues, asking important questions and serving as a sort of conscience keeper of politics. Fourthly, classical tradition believed that political theory dealt with the political whole - the theory must be all-comprehensive and all-inclusive. It included ruling, warfare, religious practices, economic problems or relations between the classes and also beliefs such as God, justice, equality etc. The quest for an absolutely best form of government was also an important preoccupation of classical political theory. Fifthly, since classical tradition believed



in the ultimate good, political good was a part of it. State was a part of the moral framework of man's earthly living. State was considered as a natural institution and prior to the individual because 'the individual when isolated is not self-sufficing and therefore he is like a part in relation to the whole'. State was also an educational institution which made man a good citizen, sensitive to the recognition of law and virtue of civic obedience. The end of the state was the promotion of good life. Though there has been a debate about which comes first - the common good or the individual good, but the classical tradition believed that the common good was the good of the individuals as part and member of the society and sought by them precisely as members of society. The common good was more complete than the private good of the individual and it was this completeness 'which determined the greater excellence of the common good'. And lastly, an important theme of classical political tradition was the search for an ideal state and the most stable system of government. Classical theorists repeatedly asked questions like: Who should rule and why; what is the best form of government? Theory was preoccupied with analysing the sources of conflict and to enunciate the principles of justice which might guide the political organization in discharging its distributive

12

functions of assigning material and non-material goods. The search for an ideal state provided an invaluable means of practicing theory and of acquiring experience in its handling. The trend of an idealist state as set by classical political theory had clear reflection on later political thinking.

The classical political tradition - a tradition usually considered to include eighteen or so centuries sandwiched between Plato and Machiavelli was considerably richer and more varied. But even more important differences and variations were yet to come. With Renaissance, Reformation and industrial revolution, new ideas and events shook the foundation of Western world. During this period a new school of political theory was born, which was later known as liberalism.

### **liberal political theory**

The long spell of Plato, Aristotle, S. Augustine, Cicero and other thinkers of classical age was broken in a variety of ways after the twin revolutions of Renaissance and Reformation in Europe from 15th century onwards, coupled with the industrial revolution later on. Renaissance produced a new intellectual climate which gave birth to modern science and modern philosophy and a new political theory known as liberalism. This new political theory found classical expression in the writings of Grotius, Hobbes, Locke, Thomas Jefferson, Thomas Paine, Jeremy Bentham, J.S. Mill, Herbert Spencer and a host of other writers. Whereas classical political theory considered the moral development of individual and the evolution of the community as co-terminus, the liberal political theory developed the concept of sovereign individual. The central theme of this political theory was Individualism. It started with the belief in the absolute value of human personality and spiritual equality of all individuals and in the autonomy of individual will. Secondly, it believed in individual freedom in all spheres of life - political, economic, social, intellectual, religious etc. Freedom meant as freedom from all authority that is capable of acting arbitrarily and freedom to act in accordance with the dictates of 'right reason'. Thirdly, it brought in the concept of individual rights - that man is 'endowed by his creator with certain inalienable rights' commonly known as the natural rights of 'life, liberty and property'.

Since man and his rights exist prior to the establishment of state, these cannot be bargained away when the

13

state is established.

Fourthly, the new theory declared that state is not a natural institution but comes into existence by mutual consent for the sole purpose of preserving and protecting the individual rights. The relation between state and the individual is contractual and when the terms of the contract are violated, individuals not only the right but the responsibility to revolt and establish a new government. The state was not a natural institution as claimed by classical political theory but a machine devised by men for certain specific purposes such as law, order, protection, justice, and preservation of individual rights. The state is useful to man but he is the master. Social control is best secured by law rather than by command - the law which was conceived as being the product of individual will and the embodiment of reason.

Fifthly, the new political theory dismissed the idea of common good and an organic community. Instead it gave the idea that 'government that governs' the least is the best' and the only genuine entity is the Individual. Political theory during this period was not searching for an Ideal State or a Utopia but was preoccupied with freeing the individual from the social and economic restraints and from the tyrannical and non-representative governments. In this context, it redefined the concept of state, relations between the individual and the state, and developed the concepts of rights liberty, equality, property, justice and democracy for the individual'

### **marxist political theory**

Liberal-individualistic political theory was challenged by Marx, Engles and their subsequent followers in the later half nineteenth century by their 'scientific socialism'. While socialism extends back far beyond Marx's time, it was he who brought together many ideas about the ills of society and gave them a great sense of urgency and relevancy. No political theory can ignore the study of Marxist history, politics, society and economics. The knowledge of Marxism has put us in a better position to analyse the socio, economic developments. Marxism introduced a new concept of philosophy conceived as a way to the liberation of mankind. The task of knowledge, according to Marx, is not only to understand the world but also to change the material conditions of human life. He insisted that the salvation is to be found by man in this

14

world itself and it laid in the revolutionary reconstitution of the present society and the establishment of a socialist society. His complaint against liberal capitalism was that it was a civilization of property, inequality and family fortune for a few and most degrading conditions for the vast number of people. Socialism was an attempt to secure the necessary, if not sufficient, conditions for the realization of emancipation of mankind. It is the establishment of a society on rational basis—a society in which 'man shall not be exploited by man', a society in which men will have the full opportunity to develop their potentialities and personality, a classless and

stateless society in which 'the free development of each shall be the condition for the free development of all'.

Marxist political theory is a theory of social change and revolutionary reconstitution of society. In this context, Marxism consists of three inter-related elements: i) An examination and critique of the present and past societies. This is known as Dialectical materialism and historical materialism; ii) the notion of an alternative model against a society based upon exploitation and divided among classes. The new society is based on the common ownership of the means of production in which human potential will be allowed to freely develop its manifold facets. Such a society will be classless and stateless; iii) how to bring about such a society'.<sup>16</sup> Though there was a general agreement that capitalist system was unstable and crisis-ridden but the advent of socialism required a revolutionary action by the proletariat, whose growing impoverishment will lead to revolution, and establishment of a socialist state and society.

The central themes of Marxist political theory are mode of production, class division, class struggle, property relations, revolution and state as an instrument of class domination. Marxism also examined the nature of rights, liberty, equality, justice and democracy but came to the conclusion that in a class divided society, they are the prerogatives of the propertied class. Real liberty and equality can be achieved only in a classless and stateless society. Thus whereas liberal political theory was associated with the establishment of modern liberal capitalist democratic state, Marxist political theory preoccupied itself with the establishment of a socialist state through revolutionary action.

Marxism as the economic, social and political theory and practice originating in the works of Marx and Engels, has been enriched

15

by a number of revolutionaries, philosophers, academicians and politicians. It has also been subject to a variety of interpretations. In the twentieth century, the prominent contributors to the Marxist thought have been Lenin, Bukharin, Stalin, Rose Luxemburg, Gramsci, Lukacs, Austro-Marxists, the Frankfurt school, Herbert Marcuse, the New Left theorists, Euro-communists, Mao Tse Tung and host of others. Up to the first world war, Marxism was highly deterministic and represented a philosophy of socio-political changes which culminated in the Russian revolution. However, during the inter-war period and the post-second world war, Marxism developed more as a critique of present socio-economic and cultural conditions than a philosophy of revolutionary action. Known as contemporary Marxism, it has been more concerned with the problems of superstructure, culture, art, aesthetics, ideology, alienation etc.

### **empirical-scientific political theory**

There is another kind of political theory developed in America popularly known as the Empirical-Scientific political theory. The study of political theory through scientific method (instead of philosophical) and based upon facts (rather than on values) has long history but the credit for making significant developments in this connection goes to the American social scientists. In the early twentieth century, Max Weber, Graham Wallas and Bentley gave an

empirical dimension to the study of political theory and advocated that its study should be based upon 'facts' only. Another writer George Catlin emphasized that the study of political theory should be integrated with other social sciences such as sociology, psychology, anthropology etc. However, it was during the inter-war period and after the second world war that a new theory was developed by the political scientists of Chicago University (known as the Chicago School) such as Charles Merriam, Harold Lasswell, Gosnell, and others like David Easton, Stuart Rice, V.O. Key and David Apter. The new political theory shifted emphasis from the study of political ideals, values and institutions to the examination of politics in the context of individual and group behaviour. The new approach advocated that the method of studying should be through the behaviour of human beings as members of political community. The task of political theory is to formulate and systemtize the concept of science of political behaviour in which emphasis is placed on empirical research than on political philosophy. A political

16

theorist should clarify and criticize systems of concepts which have empirical relevance to political behaviour. According to Easton, 'systematic theory corresponds at the level of thought to the concrete empirical political systems of daily life'.<sup>17</sup>

Empirical-Scientific theory is different from the classical tradition in many respects. Firstly, the scientific theory believes that the political theory is to order, explain and predict the phenomena and not to evaluate it. Nor is it concerned with the creation of grand political Utopias. What is worth noting is that the relation with philosophy is completely severed. Political theory is meaningful to the point or degree it is verifiable. Secondly, the study of political theory should be value free; it should concern itself with 'facts' only. The task of theory is to analyse the present political phenomena and not with the evaluation of what is happening and what should happen. The concern of political theory should not be with 'who rules, should rule or why?' but with only 'who does rule and how'. It should focus attention on the study of political behaviour of man, group and institutions irrespective of their good or bad character. Thirdly, practical theory is not only concerned with the study of the state but also with the political process. Fourthly, scientific theory does not believe in critical function, that is, it should not question the basis of the state but should be concerned with maintaining the status quo, stability, equilibrium and harmony in the society. Fifthly, it developed many new concepts borrowed from other social sciences such as power, elite, decision-making, policy-making, functioning of structures, political system, political culture etc.

Because of too much stress on science, value-free politics, methods and its failure to study the pressing social and political issues, empirical political theory began to attract criticism after 1960s. The 'Behavioural Revolution' announced by David Easton laid less emphasis on scientific method and technique and showed greater concern for the public responsibilities of political theory. The debates in 1970s resulted in the frank admission that there are segments of human life relating to values or purposes embodied in any political structure that were either ignored or overlooked by the behavioural studies. The core issues of political theory such as liberty, equality, justice were taken up once again by John Rawls, Robert Nozic, Habermas and others which signalled once

17

again the revival of normative political theory. This new revival is termed as contemporary political theory.

### **contemporary political theory**

Since 1970s, there has been a revival of interest in political theory in USA, Europe and other parts of the world. At the heart of this renaissance has been the emerging clash of values on the one hand and the changes in the humanities and social sciences, on the other. Moreover, the passing away of the shadows of second world war, reemergence of Europe, and crisis in the ideologies of socialism and Marxism brought about a new fluidity in political ideologies. Whether it is Marxism or socialism, liberalism or democracy - all stand challenged and new powerful social movements are seeking to redraw the issues in political theory.

During the era of domination of behaviouralism, political theory was overpowered by political science. Theory was denied the status of a legitimate form of knowledge and inquiry. Though the hold of empiricism did not last long, yet it left an enduring legacy in the development of political and social sciences particularly in North America in the form of 'scientificism'.

The encouragement for the regeneration of political theory came from many sources. While a number of thinkers (such as Thomas Kuhn) challenged the whole model of what is science, there were others who felt that there are distinctive problems of understanding the social sciences and social issues which could not be grasped by the model of a unified science. This is because of two factors: Firstly, the object of social sciences is the self-interpreting social being and different thinkers interpret the social issues differently. Secondly, political theory cannot be limited to a systematic account of politics; it must also perform its critical role, i.e., its capacity to offer an account of politics which transcends those of lay men. As a result of the great debates, a number of important innovations in the study of political theory followed. Though it is not possible to give a detailed account of these developments, a few distinctive features of the contemporary political theory can be summerized as follows:18

1. An important feature of empirical theory was its break with history. Contemporary political theorists believe that political theory must not be disassociated from history. Political theory has once

18

again been renewed as history of political thought.

2. All knowledge about human activities involves interpretation and the interpretation can lead to different conclusions. Hence the idea of political theory being neutral and value-free is wrong.

3. Political understanding cannot escape the history of tradition. Knowledge is a part of the tradition and the process of understanding aspects of the world contributes to our self-understanding. However, the process of self-understanding is never complete. 'History does not

belong to us but we belong to History'. There is no final truth. As such there can be no such thing as 'the only correct or the final' understanding of the political phenomena. The meaning of a text on political theory is always open to further interrelations from new perspectives.

4. Political theory is concerned with conceptual analysis. This involves seeing political theory as a systematic reflection upon the meaning of the key terms and concepts like sovereignty, democracy, right, liberty, justice etc.

5. There is a revival of normative element. Contemporary political theory is concerned with the systematic elaboration of the underlying structure of our moral and political activities, as well as examination and reconstruction of the principal political values such as justice, liberty, common good, community living etc.

6. Theory is concerned with both abstract theoretical questions and particular political issues. This is due to the belief that consideration of political concepts without detailed examination of the condition of their realization may not be able to bring out the actual meaning of the concept. Political theory should be problem-oriented and should probe issues like democracy, market, equal opportunities in such contexts. Political theory is a theoretical aspect of political science, trying to construct a theory on the basis of observation.

In short, according to David Held, contemporary political theory involves four distinct tasks: Firstly, it is philosophical, i.e. it is concerned with the normative and conceptual framework; secondly, it is empirical, i.e., it is concerned with the problem of understanding and explanation of the concepts; thirdly, it is historical, i.e., it is concerned with the examination of the key concepts of political

19

theory in historical context; and finally, it is strategic, i.e. it is concerned with an assessment of the feasibility of moving from where we are to where we might likely to be. It is only through the combination of these elements that the central problems of political theory can be solved.

## CONCLUSION

Political theory is a never ending dialogue. Speculation on politics will continue because it relates to the life and values by which men live and die. The goal of theory is to enhance our understanding of the social reality and create conditions for good life. In this context, both classical and empirical theories need to be synthesized. Political theory cannot be based purely either on philosophy or science. All issues raised by philosophy must be examined within modes of inquiry at empirical level. Conversely, the normative issues raised by political science cannot be evaded. For example, the meaning of justice, equality or freedom cannot be explained by science. Similarly, the problems of our times - whether they are racial and ethnic tensions and bigotry, overpopulation, unemployment, decaying cities, corruption, conflicts between the nations - are such that we need every available brain to work for their solution. While the political scientists produce more comprehensive explanation of how and why things happen in the world of politics, the task of political philosopher is to relate this knowledge with the big



problems of mankind and to inquire into how these can help in enhancing liberty, equality, justice and fraternity in the society and among the peoples so as to create conditions for good life.

## 2 What is Politics?

What is Politics? It is very difficult to answer this question because it is the most controversial topic of social life. Civilized man has always been searching for answer to this question. Everybody, from the common man to the political philosophers, has been interpreting it in his own way, but no satisfactory solution has been found so far.

These days everybody acknowledges this fact that politics is influencing every aspect of human life. Whatever the type of administration, political activities seem to be going on around us. We may, or may not participate in political activities, we can't get rid of politics. People are considered to be the rulers in democratic countries and they are given the right to choose their representatives to rule over them. Therefore, the citizens of such countries are more vigilant about politics. They, not only choose their representatives after every five years, but, go on evaluating the work of their rulers daily. Thus, all citizens take active part in politics in a democracy.

In modern time, state is considered a social welfare institution. Therefore, it is always busy in making the daily life of the citizens happy and, consequently, it fulfils every type of their need. This work is done by those persons who are elected rulers by the public. They run the administration according to the will of their voters. Thus, there is close relationship between the rulers (elected representatives) and the ruled (voters). Rulers, for remaining in their position, always try to secure the support of their voters through various means and on the other hand, the voters, with the help of their limited wisdom, try to hand over the reins of administration in the hands of those who work for public interest. Election of the rulers by the voters and the effort to solve the problems of the citizens by the rulers is the most significant problem of the modern times. The solution of this problem gives birth to politics.

It is because of this relationship of politics with common man's life that Aristotle has called man, a political being. Politics is involved in the mutual relations of men, in the relations of citizens and rulers and in the efforts of satisfying the unlimited needs of man with limited means. When Aristotle calls politics, the Master Science, he tries to prove that the knowledge of politics is extremely essential to understand the environment around the

13

man. In the views of Aristotle, political aspect of man's existence is the most important aspect and this aspect determines the other aspects of human life. He has said that legally politics tells us as to what we should do and what not.

The relationship between politics and individual life being so important, it is extremely essential to study it systematically.

## Controversy Regarding Nomenclature

Before starting the study of politics, it is essential to understand that, normally, the meaning of politics, political science and political philosophy is the same because the main part of the subject matter of them all is the same. In spite of all this similarity, there is a lot of difference among the three. The fact is that the Greek philosophers called the study of this branch of human knowledge 'polities', though, at that time, its meaning was limited. But, when the small Greek city-states started changing into the present nation-states, politics began to be studied as political science and the nation-state became its subject matter. And, when the philosophical aspect of the state was studied, it was called political philosophy. These days, it is again being studied as politics because it is now admitted that the subject matter of politics is very broad-based, and the subject matters of political science and political philosophy are included in it. The differences of all the three are given below:

1. Study of State and Government in Political Science. The study of politics as political science started after the rise of nation-states. With the change in the development and nature of the state the political thinkers thought it more proper to use the word political science, in place of politics, for the study of origin, development and aims of the state. Henceforth political science got a broader base instead of the idea of limited study of the city-state designed by the Greek philosophers. Gettell connected the study of past, present and future of the state with political science. According to Demock political science is concerned with state and its instrument—government. Paul Janet says that political science deals with "foundations of the state and the principles of government."

2. Political Philosophy, mainly theoretical and philosophical. Many writers use the name Political Philosophy instead of Political Science or Politics because they lay more emphasis on the philosophical aspect in its study. Ideal is their aim. Their subject matter is the origin of state, the position of man before the state came into being and the aims of the state etc. In it, there is neither any place for scientific experiments nor is the behaviour of the individual studied. In spite of it, one shall have to admit that without theory or philosophy, the study of behaviour will be partial and incomplete. Therefore, the study of political philosophy is inevitable for a student of politics.

3. The scope of politics, very broad-based. Politics does not only include

14

state or government, which is the subject matter of political science nor theory or philosophy of state or government which is the subject matter of political philosophy, but it also includes subject matter beyond state which is studied in it. We know that there are various topics which are out of the scope of political science which have, thus far, been neglected. Today, it is felt that the study of the topics, which are concerned with politics directly, is essential, e.g. direct or indirect influences behind the decision-making, the behaviour of leaders, administrators and the citizens etc. on different occasions and the procedure of decision-making controlling of their effects etc.

Thus, philosophical aspect of the political philosophy also is a subject matter of politics. Though political philosophy came into being before politics, yet it is mainly philosophical, not pragmatic. Political philosophy does not explain the working of the state, but presents only a philosophical explanation of the origin of the state, its nature, duties etc. Therefore, political philosophy becomes a part of political science. Thus, the scope of politics, which we study today, is very broad-based and the scopes of both—political science and political philosophy—are included in it. That is why, the political writers lay emphasis on the study of the totality of political problems to find out the solution of all social, economic and political problems of man.

## Definition of Politics

Distorted form of Politics. When we try to understand the word 'politics' as common men, it appears before us in the form of practical politics or the art of administration. Its philosophical aspect disappears. Working of political parties, use of fair or foul means in elections, use of bureaucracy for selfish ends through corrupt means etc., are included in politics. Not only this, now-a-days, there is more distorted form of politics which comes before us, we daily hear about politics of the family, politics of the mohalla, politics of the college, politics of the village etc. All this implies that to achieve our aims by telling lies, by cheating and by dishonesty, is called politics. Conferences, processions, slogans, strikes and riots, are being accepted as parts of politics. In fact, it is the distorted form of politics.

The Real Nature of Politics. Politics, as a study, is a very broad discipline. It is called a broad physical activity. In his book, 'An Introduction to Politics', Soltau says, "Politics is the concern of everybody with any sense of responsibility," because it is concerned with everybody. So, nobody can avoid it in spite of the fact whether he has any interest in it or not. When some individuals search for the solution of a problem and take the help of mutual co-operation and struggle, politics comes into being. Because of this very reason, politics exists in every association, organisation-national and international. According to Herbert J. Spiro, Politics is the process by which communities of human beings deal with their problems. Thus, we see that many human problems are being solved out of the state and the associations concerned there with, political parties, pressure groups and elections etc., are

15

such fields, the study of which is an important part of politics. By Politics, L. Lipson means "a process of active controversy." By it he means that, in every society there are limited means for the fulfilment of the various necessities and every individual, group or organisation tries to achieve its aims by utilising these limited means. Therefore, because of the limitation of the means, struggle is inevitable. According to Lipson, this process of struggle goes on constantly. In politics, we study the process of solving problem is a constant struggle. In this connection, rise of struggle or clash is not enough. Politics comes into being when man becomes active in solving his problem, participation in politics, criticism of government. Discussion and getting the policy of the government amended through agitation as peasants, labourers and businessmen are the subject matter of politics.

On the basis of the above given analysis it can be said that politics is a fundamental political activity with the help of which man solves his problems by using limited means.

## **DIFFERENT VIEWS ABOUT THE NATURE OF POLITICS**

Though efforts have been made to give the definition of Politics above, yet it will be difficult to understand the real meaning of Politics until we understand various points of view regarding the nature of politics. All the points of view from the ancient Greek to the present day philosophers have been given below:

1. Ancient Greek view.
2. Traditional view.
3. Modern view.
4. Behavioral view.

### **1. Ancient Greek view**

Systematic study of Politics started with the Greek philosophers. Plato and Aristotle provided it with a definite basis. Aristotle named his book itself as Politics. It is a derivative of a Greek word 'Polis' which means a city-state, which is called states now-a-days. We may compare the Greek city-states with the big villages of India because no city state had a population of more than a few thousand citizens. Not only this, many persons in those city-states did not have the rights of citizenship because, according to their rules and traditions, the slaves, foreigners and women did not have the rights of citizenship. The remaining ten to fifteen per cent persons had the rights of citizenship and these citizens ran the administration of their city-state. In such conditions, the Greek philosophers put forth their ideas of politics which are being discussed, in brief, below.

1. Greek philosophers did not make any distinction between state and society. Greek city-states can be very well compared with the Indian villages. There seemed to be no difference in the social, political, ethical and individual

16

life. Because of it, the Greek philosophers did not differentiate between the state and society and both of them were conveniently used for each other. Aristotle said that 'Man is a social animal' and because of his nature and necessities man lives in such a state which is an association of villages that has an ideal and self-sufficient life. According to his point of view, the state has an independent identity and that is natural and has not been created by man.

2. State is moral organisation and individual can realise the ideal of moral life in the state, maintained the Greek philosophers. The aim of the state is to develop moral qualities in citizens and to do their welfare.

3. Greek philosophers wanted an ideal state. Greek philosophers were idealistic and they produced an idea of the establishment of an ideal state. They not only discussed the nature of an ideal state but also produced a complete plan for its establishment. They did not explain the nature of state and society, but discussed as to what the state should be, they were busy in factually establishing an ideal state.

17

According to Plato, the actual state did not allow the individual to become fully moral. Therefore, it is only in an ideal state that the individual can live a moral life.

4. Aristotle adopted scientific method. He gave scientific basis to politics and named it the Master Science. His idea was to understand the environment around us and to solve the problems, it is essential to study politics scientifically. He drew very significant conclusions by comparing his contemporary constitutions.

## 2. Traditional view

Traditional View of politics means that view which the political thinkers adopted upto the decades in the beginning of the 20th century. During this long period, efforts have been made to define Politics with reference to the various institutions of political life. That is why, the thinkers of this period— Plato, Hobbes, Rousseau etc.—kept their study limited to the state, the government and the political institutions concerned with them. Therefore, their view became narrow, formal and institutional. This very view is called the Traditional View. From this point of view, political thinkers kept their study limited to the following three institutional bases and named politics as Political Science:

(a) Relation of political science with state.

(b) Relation of political science with the government.

(c) Political science as a study of institutions concerned with state with government.

(a) Political Science is concerned with the state. With the rise of nation-states, the writers of Politics started studying various aspects of these states under the name of Political Science.

According to Bluntschli and Garner the pivotal point in political science is the state. According to Bluntschli, Political Science is the science which is concerned with the state in its fundamental conditions, in its essential nature, in its various forms of manifestation, its development. Similarly, Garner says that Political Science begins and ends with the state. According to Garies, Political Science considers the state as an instrument of power, in the totality of its relations, its

origin, its setting (land and people), its object, its ethical significance, its economic problems, its life conditions, its financial side, its end etc.

(b) Political Science deals with Government. The tradition of keeping the scope of political science limited to the study of government and various institutions related with it, is very popular. Even now-a-days, the traditional writers of many countries support this point of view. Seeley and Leacock have mainly supported this point of view. According to the English writer, John Seeley, Political Science investigates the phenomena of government as Political Economy deals with wealth, Biology with life, Algebra with numbers and Geometry with space and magnitude. Further, Leacock upholds that "Political Science deals with government."

(c) Political Science deals with general problems of state and government. Considering the above given two points of view as partial and narrow, some traditional writers have maintained that Political Science studies both—state and government. In fact, when we study state, government is automatically studied because government is not only a main part of state, but we come to know form of state through government. Without the study of government, the study of state is meaningless. Similarly, government is studied as an agent of the state. According to the French writer Paul Janet, Political Science is that part of social science which treats of foundations of the state and the principles of government. Gettell says that "It (Political Science) is thus a study of the state in the past, present and future of political organisation and political functions of political institutions and political theories. According to Gilchrist, Political Science deals with the general problems of state and government. Demock says that Political Science is concerned with state and its instrumentality—Government.

Characteristics of the Traditional View. After discussing the above given ideas regarding the traditional view, we may now discuss its characteristic features.

1. It studies the state and the associations concerned with it in institutional form. Therefore, the subject matter of its study includes state, government, political institutions etc.
2. Most of the writers of this view were influenced by ethics and philosophy. Therefore, they tried to fix the aims of the individual and the society. For example, the Greek thinkers put forth the aim of achievement of ethical life;

18

the Medieval Christian thinkers imagined the establishment of a theological state, the Idealists put forward the ideal of realisation of the reason.

3. The traditional thinkers neglected the scientific method normally. Their approach is subjective and they adopted the deductive method.
4. A characteristic of the traditional ideas was that they were not only concerned with politics but with many social sciences. That is why, Plato, Aristotle, Rousseau a Marx etc. are concerned with other social sciences also.



5. Traditional thinkers used mainly historical and descriptive methods.
6. Traditional thinkers did not try to intermingle political science with other social sciences and, consequently, their study could not become interdisciplinary.

### 3. Modern View

The liberals limited the study of politics to state, law and the topics concerned therewith because of which this study remained partial and limited. In the 20th century, emphasis was laid on the modern point of view of politics and it was set free. Therefore, many basic activities, which were beyond the scope of state, began to be studied in politics which, thus far, were not its subject matter. The Modern View of Politics may be discussed, in brief, as under.

(1) Allocation of scarce resources is politics. Resources here do not mean only material resources, but human and spiritual resources are also included in them. According to David Easton, Politics is the process by which scarce resources (human, material and spiritual) are allocated within a social unit for the purpose of providing for human needs and desires.

In fact, the individual makes hectic efforts to get the material and non-material resources which include the political position and offices of profit. Those resources are limited and are not easily available. Therefore, there is competition to achieve them. Struggle is unavoidable for achieving these scarce and priceless resources. Various types of efforts are made by individuals and their groups to achieve them. As a result of these efforts, the process of allocation of these resources is called Politics. Discussing this fact about resources, H.D. Lasswell, using some different words, says "Who gets what, when and how?"

(2) The study of Politics is wider than the study of State and Government. The traditionalists had limited Politics to the study of various institutions concerning State and Government but the proponents of the Modern View say that Politics is concerned with everything which is related with political life of the individual, and, which may not be directly related with state or government. Therefore, associations, society, labour organisations, political parties, pressure and interest groups are also included in the subject matter of politics. According to Lipson, like other human associations, state also is born in the society and is a part of it. State is that association through which

19

the process of politics is organised and set in order. According to Lipson the idea of state is much more limited than politics. He, further, says that wherever state exists, there is also politics. But the converse is not true—that wherever politics exists so does state. We can rightly speak of international politics but we know that there is not yet a supernational state. We can talk of politics within churches or corporations or trade unions, although, none of these is a state.

(3) Politics is the art and practice of Government of human societies. The conclusions can be drawn from this definition of Politics given by Robert. Firstly, Politics is an art and the behaviour of the individual is studied in it, i.e. the study of political activities of man is Politics. Secondly,

here government means the organised power, i.e., where the activities concerning issuing of orders and establishing of control take place. Thirdly, Politics is concerned with the whole human society and not with a limited association like state. Thus, Politics is concerned with those activities of human society also which are not related with the state.

(4) Politics is the study of power. Now-a-days, there is an agreement about the study of state as power. According to Lasswell, Politics is the study of the influence. He further says that Politics is the "study of shaping and sharing of political power". Defining power, Wiseman has said that it is the "ability to get one's wishes carried out despite opposition." Thus, in view of such writers power is Politics. They study the questions like as to what is Power in politics, how is it achieved, how is it maintained, what are its aim, its ideals, its scope and bases and how is it lost? This point of view has been studied in this chapter elsewhere.

(5) Politics is an effort to bring about the rule of order and justice. Politics is normally viewed as a conflict and struggle and it is said that Politics is that struggle in which those who have power try to maintain it and make use of it and those who are out of power try to get it by controlling the government. But it is only one aspect of power. The other aspect is that Politics is an effort to establish law and order and justice in the society where balance is maintained in the interests of the society and the individual and the common interest is secured. Thus, there are two aspects of Politics. First, Politics protects the privileges of minority and, secondly, Politics teaches about the organised unity of individuals as society. In fact, politics is concerned with both the aspects discussed above. However arbitrary a ruler may be, he has to work for common interest also and law and order has to be established in society. Thus, Politics is also an effort for the establishment of law and order and justice in the society.

#### **4. Behavioral View**

In Politics, Behavioralism started in the 20th century. Its roots can be seen in the ideas of Graham Wallas etc., before the First World War, and, it was

20

developed by the American writers after the Second World War. The pivotal point of behavioralism is the political behaviour. These thinkers study the attitudes, motivations and perceptions of man through political behaviour with the help of which political processes etc. may be studied in a scientific way. For this they adopt new scientific methods and techniques which have been borrowed from other social and physical sciences.

The birth of behavioralism is based on the dissatisfaction with the achievements of traditional political science. They felt that the methods— historical, philosophical analytical etc.—used in the traditional analysis were not adequate. So, they tried to search the new scientific methods.

Krikpatrick mentions the following four characteristics of behavioralism:

(i) It is a study of the individual behaviour. In behavioralism, the behaviour of the individual, instead of the political institutions, is analysed. This is its main characteristic.

(ii) It is inter-disciplinary. Behavioralism can be studied only in relation with other disciplines. In the absence of the knowledge of other social sciences, Politics can not be studied. Therefore, they lay emphasis on interdisciplinary method.

(iii) For analysis, it lays emphasis on the scientific method. Behavioralism emphasises the collection of statistics, instead of facts, and their evaluation with scientific methods.

(iv) The behavioralists want to establish systematised pragmatic theory.

Major Tenets of Behavioral View. In the recent past, many Western writers—David B. Truman, Robert A. Dahl, David Easton, Heisz Eulau, Krikpatrick, Malford Q. Sibley etc.—have thoughtfully analysed this movement. There are many writers of behavioralism and all of them are not unanimous on every point but on the point of behaviour almost all of them agree. Sonit and Tenenhans have explained the following main bases of bahavioralism in their essay named "The Behavioral Traditional Debate in Political Science".

(i) It is capable of predicting. Behavioralists agree that if a student of politics adopts strictly analytical method for organised development of political knowledge instead of wholly explanatory method, politics can be made capable of making predictions.

(ii) Politics should concern itself primarily with observable behaviour. The main topic of the study of politics should be that behaviour of the individual or the group which can be observed, only that should be studied which is said or done by individual or a group.

(iii) Data should be quantified. Every behaviour should be collected in such statistics which can be measured and their conclusion may be drawn from various sides. To base one's conclusions of study of such statistics is correct.

(iv) Its values are beyond the scope of measurement. The topics of political

21

science, which are related with values, e.g. democracy, liberty, equality and justice, are beyond the limit of legitimate enquiry because such values can not be established as true or false on the basis of science.

(v) Political Science should be more inter disciplinary. Study of politics is not possible in a limited field. The study of the political activities of the individual is possible only in the social atmosphere. Therefore, it is essential for a political scientist to achieve the knowledge of the other social sciences. Moreover, he is dependent on other sciences for scientific technique of enquiry. Therefore, the behaviouralists lay emphasis on inter-disciplinary study.

## **POLITICS AS THE CONCILIATION OF INTERESTS**

Politics has been termed as the means of establishing conciliation and coordination among different interests. We know that people living in the society have different desires and

aspirations. In order to fulfil them numerous organisations, communities and institutions are formed. We see countless such institutions in economic, social, religions and cultural spheres. State is also a political institution/organisation but due to its prime importance it is the most powerful one among all the institutions. Man goes on trying always to fulfil his desires, aspirations and wants. In the course of fulfilling them it is natural to face opposition, confrontation and struggle. Thus there remains a continuous situation of struggle and confrontation between man and various institutions formed by him. Politics is the means of establishing rapport, coordination and conciliation among different interests created among individuals, communities and groups (classes). As politics establishes conciliation after removing various confrontations and struggles, where there is politics there would be problems, confrontations, oppositions and struggles. In this way every walk of life is confronted with politics. Stephan L. Wasby has rightly said that it is generally said that politics will exist where there is a dispute. Where there is problems there is politics. Where there is no dispute, there is no situation of debate on problems and there is no question of the existence of politics. (Political Science—The Discipline and its Dimensions). Politics is such a process of removing confrontation and solving disputes and problems that goes on in every field of society without break.

1. Controversy should be within State limits. Disputes may be of two types—one of individual or private disputes and the other of state limits. Individual disputes between husband and wife may be on what is to be prepared in the meals and to which park we have to go on strolling in the evening, what should be the cost of cloths to be purchased from the market? And in which institution/school children should be admitted. Such disputes do not come in the scope of state limits, hence they are out of our study. The other group of disputes are those disputes which come under the scope of state limits. If there is a dispute or controversy between husband and wife

22

over the division of a property, its solution is possible only through politics or in other words through state. The subject matter of studies is the solution of such disputes and controversies which come under the scope of state.

2. Existence of Established Laws about Controversy. It is also necessary to have established laws to settle these disputes or controversies. Such established laws are accepted by one and all. Both the parties should also be made confident that through laws framed by state we are capable of settling disputes and controversies.

3. The state and politics will bring about unity and agreement in the society full of conflicts and disagreements. Man is a rational animal, he bases his behaviour on criteria of good and bad or useful and useless. He is vigilant about his interests, and he is busy in the fulfilment of his various types of interests. In the society, there is clash of interests of the individuals. And, because of it, the conflicts and struggles among them are natural. Where, in a society there is disorder and lack of peace because of the conflict of interests, development is restricted and the individual interests also are not satisfied. The liberals hold that, in the society full of conflicts and differences, state and politics try to establish unity and agreement. They say that state is an

instrument for establishing unity and agreement in the human society. Politics is the process through which unity and agreement are born. J.B. Miller has said that "The origin of politics lies in social diversity." By saying this, he meant that politics comes into being for removing the conflicts, differences and disagreements present in the society. The process in the instrument, i.e. the state lessens the gulf between these interests. Thus, the liberals consider the state and politics as the means for developing a peaceful society minus conflicts.

In this context, according to Maurice Duverger, two self-contradictory points of view come to the fore, regarding the aims of politics. The first point of view is that of the Communists. They say that the powerful men, who are in authority, to maintain their hold in the society and to achieve their interest, make use of politics. In their eyes, there is no good aim of politics. It is an instrument of the strong to maintain their domination over the weak. According to the other view, politics is an effort to bring about the rule of order and justice in which power guarantees the general interest and the common good against the pressures of private interest. The fact is, that in every society, the above given both the forms of politics, are active. On the one hand, the ruling class tries to use politics for the fulfilment of its interests and for making its authority permanent to dominate others, and, on the other hand, politics works as such an instrument with the help of which a definite social order is established and in which, the efforts are made to limit the individual interest for the satisfaction of the general interest. The liberals support the second aspect of politics.

(4) Politics is the process through which peaceful social change is possible. By studying the history of the political ideologies, it becomes clear

23

that liberalism was a revolt against blind faith, traditionalism, conservatism and religious fundamentalism. It always supported the wise and reasonable ideas because liberalism has faith in the rationality of man. Therefore, it supported all those ideas and faiths, which may protect the interests of the rational man, and opposed those ideas which bind the man like animals to restrain them and because of which there may be no development of the human mind and intellect. Though there were revolutions in the U.S.A., U.K. and France against traditionalism and conservatism, yet, in the modern times liberalism favours peaceful means of change against the violent revolutions. A violent revolution paves the way for another and it spoils the reasonableness of man and creates lack of peace. Therefore, it is an admitted fact in liberalism that social reforms should be introduced slowly. The mind of man should be prepared for it first. As soon as this consciousness develops, he will accept the social reforms and necessary changes. The communist thinkers allege that liberalism is in favour of status quo and say that they are traditionalist and liberal, and they are against progress, but we have seen that many capitalist countries and many developing countries are making progress in every sphere through the same process with the help of which social change can be brought by peaceful means. Being in accordance with human nature, the individuals accept them because the people are encouraged to accept them. Violence, domination and pressure are not used for spread of education, for the betterment of health, for scientific research, and for the removal of conservatism and had customs, but the concerned classes are educated for this purpose.

Though liberalism is in favour of bringing changes peacefully, but it also supports the use force when the need arises. Army, police and judiciary are the symbols of its brute force, the use of which is allowed in special circumstances. The aim of the use of this force is to reform the criminal and to bring change in his life instead of punishing him. Therefore, army, police, judiciary and jails in the states are considered reformatory institutions and not those with the aim of punishing them. In addition to it, in liberalism, the state is encouraged to play a positive role, i.e., it is expected of state that it will create such circumstances in which, on the one hand, man's basic necessities may be easily fulfilled and, on the other, his talent may be developed.

(5) Politics is the means to govern Democracies. Democracy is such an administration in which there is very much scope of settling disputes and struggles. These situations are:

(a) There is freedom of speech in the Democracy. Through this man is able to express his point of view fearlessly and without any hurdle. Due to freedom of speech ways and means can be found for the settlement or solution of various disputes.

(b) Freedom to form Political Parties. Due to this freedom various political parties are formed. These political parties provide opportunities to the common people to express their view point on the basis of open competition.

24

(c) Law formation by the Executive of the Country. In democracy the people's representatives make laws and the executive through these laws settle the disputes and struggles. If the executive works arbitrarily, the judiciary comes in between and settles the disputes between the people and the government, and protects the interests of the people. In this politics works for removing disputes and establishing conciliation in such countries which have democratic set-ups.

(d) Debate in Parliament. The democratic government's main characteristic feature is that the people's representatives find solutions to different problems through debate. Different parties express their views on every issue whether it is of minor value or the prime value. Through discussion there is every possibility to find solution to these problems, which is acceptable to one and all. There is a check on the power of the government and the common good comes to the fore.

(e) Important Role of pressure and Interest Groups. Every problem or dispute or controversy has several aspects. Different interest groups on the basis of interest work in the form of pressure-groups to further their interests. These interest groups by using different ways they try to make administrative decisions in their favour. There pressure groups in democracy help in decision-making and also help in finding the middle way through mutual discussions in place of disputes or confrontation. Many times when there is a situation of dispute or confrontation, even then these groups prove helpful in finding a peaceful way in place of dispute and confrontation.

There exist circumstances to solve problems through peaceful means in democracy. Sir Bernard Crick has said that in democratic society government/ administration is run through politics.



## POLITICS AS A CLASS STRUGGLE

Karl Marx the propounder of Marxism "was a revolutionary thinker. He tried to bring a revolution in the world. Like other writers, he did not merely explain the circumstances of his time, but put forth a plan to change them. He said that the other "Philosophers have sought to interpret the world: what matters however is to change it." Marx was in favour of raising a new society on debris of the old one. In his opinion, the state is an oppressive organisation which protects property and which, with the help of power, protects the interests of the capitalists. He criticised the various aspects of liberalism very vehemently and he proved this idea of liberalism wrong that, with the help of state and politics, peace, order and justice will be established in the world and plans of public welfare will be made successful. He maintained that state and politics were the means to make the rule of the rich stable. Harmony and cooperation were not possible with the help of state. It only creates conflict. Interpreting the point of view of Marx, M. Duverger says, "Politics is conflict, a struggle in which power allows those who possess it to ensure their hold on society and profit by it."

25

Marx had seen politics in the form of class struggle. A detailed discussion of Marxism regarding politics is extremely essential because, in the modern times without understanding Marxist view, knowledge of the subject will remain one-sided and incomplete.

1. Material conditions are the basis of Politics. According to Marx the basis of politics are material conditions. Material conditions here mean the modes of production. He has clarified that there was no state or politics in primitive age of communism, because modes of production were very simple at that time and there was no conflict. But when there was a change in the material conditions i. e., modes of production and class conflict started politics came into being. Marx says that material conditions settle the form of politics. Change in mode of production changes form of politics also. Thus, material conditions are the basis of politics which give directions to human behaviour. A Hacker says, "If the study of politics is to be scientific, Marx and Engels wrote, both social and political institutions must be regarded as outgrowths of material conditions which direct major paths of human behaviour."

2. Politics is the study of class-struggle. According to Marx, politics comes into being, when there are two opposite classes in the society because conflict between these two opposite classes is inevitable. Thus, this constantly going on conflict is studied as politics. He says that in the primitive society, because of absence of these opposite classes, there was no politics. After the primitive society till today, the conflict between the two classes has been going on constantly and it will go on, according to Marx, till the final stage of this conflict, i.e., the establishment of a classless society. Thus, we call the study of conflict, of these two mutually opposing classes produced by material conditions, as politics.

Clarifying his above given point of view, Karl Marx says that, after leaving the Primitive Communism which owns means of production, has taken power of ruling also in its hands and it exploits the remaining society. Thus, till today, in every period, special class has been exploiting others. Marx says that it has not happened suddenly, but it happens because of this principle of

history that the class, which owns means of production, dominates the whole society. For example, when the main source of production was agriculture, the peasant-class became the ruler and it exploited the working class. In fact, the ruling class to keep itself in power for ever creates and executes which is called state. This state protects interests of the ruling class. Marx takes the analogy further and says that as soon as condition of production change, state prevailing at that time becomes unfit for fulfilling the needs of new exploiting class. Therefore, the new ruling class does not accept the old set up of state. It can be said that a feudal state is unfit for protecting the capitalist class. For it a capitalist state is needed. Thus, the form of government changes with the change in the exploiting class, so that it may fulfil needs of the exploiting class, of that period. Marx says that the

26

interests of the exploiting and the exploited classes have always been conflicting. On one hand, the exploited class has been in conflict with the exploiting class, on the other hand, the exploiting class exploits the exploited class more, and more. According to Marx state is that when there was change in economic setup of the society. In the ancient times, society was divided into slaves and slave owners. The state came into being to protect the interests of the slave owners, and, Politics was made a medium of it. During the capitalist era, there was conflict between labourers and capitalists and the aim of state and politics was to protect the interests of the capitalists and to exploit the labourers. According to Marx, with the rise of state, society was divided, economically, into two opposite classes, between which there has always been a conflict; which is present even today. Politics discloses this very conflict and it (politics) will remain in existence till classless society is not established. Marx believes that ultimate victory lies with labourers, who will destroy capitalism totally and, then, a classless society will be established. In this changed form of society, there will be neither state nor politics

According to Marxists state and politics depend on social conditions of man and with the change in social conditions, the forms of state and politics also will change. Thus, Marx also admits that politics is an aspect of social process. To understand this point of view in details, it is very essential to understand the following points.

1. To Marx, the subject is always a social man. While studying the liberal view of politics, we saw that they recognise separate authorities of the individual and society and they say that society should be used for the development of the individual. That is why, stronger liberals felt that the authority of state makes the individual more and more slavish. They advocated a limited sphere for the state by calling it a necessary evil. But the later liberals, when they wanted the welfare of the individual through state, wanted to give the function of public welfare to state. Thus, according to the liberals, the relation of the individuals with state is only to that extent to which it fulfils interests of the individual.

Marx followed the ideas of Aristotle and Hegel in relation to individual. He said that individual can be considered only as a social being. The individual and society are neither separate nor their interests separate. Discussing this point of view of Marx, Lefebvre says in his "The sociology of Marx", "To Marx subject is always a social man, the individual viewed in his actual relationship with groups, classes, society as a whole". Marx considered individual as a part of society to

cover the gulf between the individual and the society in a capitalist set up and for full development of the individual. In the capitalist set up, man is a propertied man and in it there is exploitation of man by man. Marx tried to build society. Marx wanted to demolish the wall of property between the individual and the society. It will make the establishment of society, based on equality, possible. Thus, in the views of Marx, all-round development of the individual is possible only as a social man. He can not

27

develop away from the society. The capitalist society separates the individual from the society. Discussing this point of view of Marx, S. Avineri has said in very beautiful words, "Man, according to Marx, is the totality of his social organisation which in the existing class-struggle of a society, protects the interests of the exploiting class which is in authority and politics is that process with the help of which class relations and the class struggle can be studied. B. Fyodorov, in his book "Theory of politics and Lenin's legacy" says, "with the aid of politics classes that hold power strive to influence nature of the economy, the forms and scale of distribution of material wealth, ideology, culture, morality, family and daily life." He further says that "State and politics are final analysis, and the expression of the economic requirements of the society and its social groups."

3. All political conflicts are class conflicts. By giving materialistic interpretation of history, Marx tried to prove that, after the primitive stage, there have been two mutually opposing classes on the basis of material conditions of the society. The form of these classes is determined by modes of production of the time. He says that material conditions are basis of all social relations. Thus, the activities of man which we call political activities are, basically, economic activities, and all the political struggles going on in the society are the struggles between the two mutually opposing classes based on economic interests.

Marx disagrees with the traditional interpretation of politics in which politics is related to the political and ethical questions. He said that the forms of all types of political struggles are indirectly class-struggles which can be seen in the capitalist countries. Though the struggle, going on between the rulers and the ruled, seems to be political struggle, yet, indirectly, it is the class struggle, as the study of history indicates. Thus, all the struggles going on in the state, whether these are struggles in democracy, aristocracy or monarchy or may be struggle for franchise, are seemingly political struggles, yet, in the eyes of Marx, these are the struggles between the opposing classes for achieving their material interests.

4. Politics in the capitalist society is the means of economic exploitation. After the primitive stage, Marx has divided society into two mutually opposing economic classes at every stage of the society. One of them is the exploiting class and the other is the exploited class. Marx says that, in every era, the exploiting class establishes its domination over the exploited class through politics and, then, fully exploits them.

This is the condition of the present capitalist society. The capitalist class, is the class in authority the interests of which are protected by state. Means of production are owned by it. It exploits the proletariat class and uses all material resources for the satisfaction of its interests. Politics is their

means with the help of which they exploit the working class. Marx calls it 'Anti-Politics' and 'False Politics'.

28

5. Politics creates consciousness in the proletariat. According to Marx main function of Politics is to create consciousness in the individual which helps in bringing change in the society. He says that, by reading history, it becomes clear that society is dynamic, but this change is brought through conflict which takes place between the opposing economic interests. Marx says that, before the revolution which establishes dictatorship of the proletariat, the main junction of politics is to bring such consciousness among workers which may encourage them to struggle with the capitalists. Lenin has said that the working class takes part in politics to bring change in society. The more, he is active in politics, the more conscious he becomes about class conflict. This process will give labourers to establish their dictatorship through revolution. Thus according to the communist ideology, before the revolution, politics performs function of creating consciousness for revolution.

6. Politics will stamp out the last remnants of capitalism and will be used as a means for the establishment, of a new society. According to Marx, after the revolution brought by the working class, capitalist set-up will be destroyed and dictatorship of the proletariat will be established. Because politics is a process which brings change, therefore, after the revolution, during dictatorship of the proletariat, politics will play an important role. Unlike the capitalist set-up, politics is no longer a means of exploiting the labourers, but it works for making dictatorship of the proletariat stronger. At this stage, politics, on one hand, destroys the remnants of capitalism and on the other it is used for protecting interests of the labourers. The defenders of capitalism will be done away with, the anti-revolutionaries will be suppressed. Trotsky is right when he says that the enemy (the remnants of capitalism) should be made until for doing any harm and they should be ultimately eliminated.

In the transitional stage, politics is not used in the form of play of authority because its class character starts eroding. Henceforth, the relation of state authority is established with economic relations instead of politics. It cooperates in the establishment of a classless society, after destroying the remnants of capitalism. During this period, main function of the state is boosting of the social status of the labourers. For this purpose, all economic relations are socialised. Politics now becomes a means for social change. In the eyes of Marx, when politics becomes an instrument of social reconstruction after making roots of the revolution of the labourers, its form is real politics. Thus, such a change is slowly brought in social life and a new society is established.

7. Politics and Classless Society. After the Labour Revolution, when with the end of the remnants of capitalism, its values also will end and a classless society will be established where there will be neither any class nor state, Marx and Engels are silent about form of politics. Both of them present a vague picture regarding it and say that there will neither be any groups of exploiters nor the exploited class, after the establishment of a classless society. The

29

whole of society will become one class, the interests of which will be the same. Then no state will be needed because every body is performing his duty, and there is no need of oppression or pressure for it. The whole of the society will be united by the moral principles and social bonds. Thus, the need of the state will end and it will wither away. According to the Marxists, it will be the golden period.

Marx and Engels have not written much about this stage. Perhaps, they were not quite clear about it. They had envisaged a society which would be classless and which would have neither any state nor politics, but, according to the later writers like Stalin and Mao Tse Tung, after the establishment of classless society also, politics will not disappear because directions of change and development will not halt. Development in a classless society will be peaceful in the absence of the class conflict, but, there may be contradictions in society at this stage also which may not result in enmity. Function of politics will be to find the solution of these contradictions. Politics will create political consciousness in the individual and rational knowledge will grow. Thus, in a classless society, politics works in such a way that it generates and develops rational knowledge.

## **Criticism of the Marxist View of Politics**

Though, because of spread of communism, there is no dearth of writers who support Marxist view of politics, yet because of the defects in the Marxist ideology, there seem to be certain defects in the Marxist View of Politics. That is why, Marxist View has been critically discussed below.

1. The individual-self is merged in the social-self. Idea of Marx about the individual has actually merged the individual-self with the social-self. The fact is that, in liberalism, society was so much neglected for the individual that some powerful persons of the society fully exploited others, but, on the other hand, because of discussion of the all-round development of the individual as a part of society in communism, free personality of the individual was lost. Perhaps, unknowingly, Marx like Hegel merged the self of the individual in the social self. Thus, it may be liberalism or communism, the class, owing the material resources and political power, uses the common man of the society as a means of the fulfilment of its interest. Marxists claim that politics is an instrument of development of the individual, but, practically, they use him for exploitation. This fact becomes clear by studying social set-up of those countries where dictatorship of the proletariat has been established.

2. Material conditions are not the only basis of politics. Marx recognises man only in his economic capacity, and he thinks that the other aspects of his life depend only on material conditions. Religious, cultural, moral and other sentimental aspects of individual are influenced by his economic life and direction is provided by it. That is why, Marx has come to the conclusion that material conditions of man are the basis of politics.

30

This point of view of Marx can not be accepted. It is a fact that material conditions influence politics, but these are not the sole basis. In addition to cultural, religious, spiritual and moral values, traditions and customs of a country also influence its political process. Marx admitted

this fact in his later writings and admitted that only economic conditions are not believed to be the whole process of political development. Clarifying this fact, Fyodorov says, "Marxism-Leninism, however, does not consider that whole process of political development is only directly and indirectly dependent on production." Avineri also says that Marx, in his later writings, did not consider politics only as a reflection of the economic conditions. Thus, political process, as explained by Marx, seems to be defective in itself.

3. Politics is not merely the study of class-struggle. Marx has divided the society into two mutually opposing classes, whose interests are always opposed to each other and they constantly go on struggling. In the present era, it can not be accepted that whole society is divided into two mutually opposite classes (capitalists and labourers). The fact is that every society is divided into various classes and those classes are not necessarily organised on economic basis. Some of these classes may be such that they have no economic basis and there is no condition of their being in struggle. Even between the capitalists and the labourers, as explained by Marx, these days, there is cooperation and not struggle because, needs of the labourers having been fulfilled and the functions concerning their welfare having been performed, the difference between the labourers and capitalists, as discussed by Marx, do not seem to be working now. So, saying that politics is merely a study of class-struggle is not logical because that form of class-struggle does not seem to be working in the society.

4. All political conflicts are not class-struggle. It is wrong to accept all political struggles as class conflicts. It may be possible, that there is a very important economic reason behind every political question, but it will not be reasonable to call them class-struggle. For example, in India, it is being demanded that right to vote should be given at 18. But the arguments, being advanced for this demand, are more political and social than economic. If a young man of 18 can become an able, efficient and reliable soldier who shoulders the responsibility of defence of the country, why should he not be allowed to take part in the politics of the country? Similarly, a young man of 18 is considered fit for handling the property as an adult person, how has he become unable to participate in the administration of the country? We do not see that between 18 years and 21 years' age, there is an economic class of the young men and they have a struggle with the ruling class. Now the youth aged 18 is permitted to cast votes or in other words he has been given adult franchise. The public of a country wants to establish democracy in place of monarchy or wants to establish presidential form of government in place of parliamentary government, the form of this struggle is political or social and

31

not economic. Therefore, it is correct to say that every political struggle is not class-struggle.

Economic conditions of the proletariat have improved in the capitalist society, Marx had said that, in a capitalist society, politics is an instrument for exploiting the labourers, and consequently, economic condition of the labourers will worsen but the study of social organisations of capitalist countries indicate that there capitalist class has made many changes and arrangements have been made for ameliorating economic and social conditions of the labourers and for the security of their lives, their health and education. Because of these arrangements, on the one hand, there is amelioration in the economic conditions of the labourers



and, on the other hand, their professional efficiency has increased. It does not prove assertion of Karl Marx that politics will become the basis of economic exploitation in the capitalist countries.

6. Politics also did not create consciousness for revolution. The countries, where communist revolutions have occurred, were not industrially advanced, as Marx had claimed. And, in modern times, no revolution has been brought by the labourers in the industrialised countries. The fact is that because of fulfilment of economic, social and cultural demands and because of betterment in their condition, consciousness of class struggle did not develop in the labourers in capitalist countries. If any consciousness had developed it was for co-operation with the capitalists. It is correct that, sometimes, the labour class becomes ready for struggle with the capitalists, but it is not for establishing dictatorship of the proletariat, but for betterment of their economic conditions. So, it is clear that in the capitalist society, politics does not prepare ground for class struggle.

7. The politics could not become a means to establish a new society. According to Marx, after the revolution, Politics will be utilised for destroying remnants of capitalism and to eradicate the traditions and moral values of capitalism and, out of it, such a society will be established, in which there is no place for class struggle. The whole of society will become one class in which there is no antagonism of economic classes.

When we study those countries of the world, where dictatorship of the proletariat was established, according to the Marxists, e.g., Russia and China. The conditions of dictatorship of the proletariat are still prevailing there. And there is no possibility in the near future, for the establishment of classless society there, which was the dream of a stateless society of Marx. By this, it can be concluded that with the help of politics, a classless society could not be established. In the countries like Russia and China, politics, even today is a means for the ruling class for getting hold of authority, and their society is still divided into two classes, i.e., the rulers and the ruled.

A. The point of view of the Liberals, on the questions given above, is discussed below:

(1) Various types of conflicts in society are problems of society. The

32

causes of these problems are on the surface and general. These can be solved with the help of wisdom and reason in a friendly atmosphere and in the atmosphere of mutual agreement with peaceful means. Thus, liberal point of view is based on wisdom, reason and justice.

(2) Conflict plays an active role in the development of society and these are basic points in the growth of civilization. To make society progressive they create new ideas and create the atmosphere of goodwill and co-operation in the society, ultimately.

B. The following are the ideas of the Marxists regarding questions concerning conflicts present in the society.

(1) Cause of the conflicts is the result of clash of interests between the two opposing classes. Conflict is not only a problem which can be solved. It is proof of the presence of the two opposite classes—exploiters and the exploited—in the society. This conflict of the two opposite classes cannot be solved peacefully. For this purpose, those circumstances shall have to be changed which create two opposite classes. According to the Marxists, "The said circumstances present in the society will keep the exploitation alive till Socialists change the whole social set-up through a violent' revolution". According to them, the idea of co-operation of the two classes is useless.

(2) According to the Marxists, until class structure of society is destroyed, social co-operation cannot be established by ending the conflict. Only classless society can be a society minus conflict.

## **POLITICS AS THE PURSUIT OF COMMON GOOD**

### **What is Meant by Common Good?**

Marxists think that the ruling class always cares for their own interests. They can not care for common good at all. According to Marxists a small group or capitalistic group controls the government and uses the government as a weapon to fulfil the interests of capitalistic group. They not only neglect the common interests of the poor but also exploit them in order to fulfil the interests of the capitalists. They say that there is a continuous struggle between these two groups—the poor and the capitalists. This struggle would come to an end after a bloody revolution and dictatorship of the poor would be established. Thus the poor with the help of administration would finish the capitalist group very soon and a classless and stateless society would be established.

The above thinking is discarded by the Liberalists. According to them the problems and disputes are possible to be solved with peaceful means through political process. Despite confrontation between different interests prevalent in every sphere of society there are seeds of co-ordination and conciliation. Democratic systems given impetus to achieve the common good. Liberalists have confidence that rationality of man wins over the struggle prevalent in the society and establishes the common good.

33

Common good or general good discussed by several philosophers is based on their original thinking. The Indian thinking aims at HINDHI WORDS (Common good). Common good has been dealt with several times under modern thinking. Individualists favour foundless competition for man. Individual will pave the way of development and welfare of the society and man. This viewpoint of individualists divided the society into two groups or classes. The development of the weak and the poor stopped. Thus to the individualists in the name of common good authorised the capitalists to exploit the rest of the society.

Marxists, the opponents of capitalists announced the good of the poor class as the common good. As a result in the name of dictatorship of the poor people they established dictatorship by giving the reigns of government in the hands of a few.

The third group of thinkers is of utilitarians who announced that the main aim of the state should be good of the majority. Helvetius has said that we shall the act a good act in which there is maximum good of the maximum people, and the act which is opposed to this is bad act.

The welfaristic nature of state, in present times, is near to the India's old thinking in which welfare of all has been provided, because it is expected of a welfare state that it would care for the minimum provisions to the weak, the poor and the backward, and would try to bring them to the level of the remaining classes of the society. In order to give practical shape to the concept and assumption of the welfare state of the liberalists, various ways and means are to be thought of.

## Means to Establish Common Good

Liberalists have a long chain of their own, who have strengthened the way of establishing common good. The view points of these thinkers have been described have under:

1. Individual is the focal point. Though the ideas of the liberals have been changing about the limits of individual liberty, yet the focal point of their philosophy has been individual. Whenever there was any trouble about the liberty of the individual the liberals wrote for the protection of that liberty. On one hand, during the Renaissance, liberty of the individual and his regard for his individuality were emphasised and, on the other hand, during the Reformation, right to freedom of religion was protected.

Some liberals have studied individual separately from the society to prove his end and to protect his arbitrary behaviour. Hobbes and Locke have declared the individual unsocial and have considered his nature away from the society. So, when they, thus, considered the individual and the society separately their interests also were separated. Locke and Spencer advocated the idea of limiting the authority of the society. In the present era, the idea of Aristotle that "Man is a social animal" has been fully accepted by the liberals

34

and this is well-established idea that the all-round development of man is possible only in the society. Society is the highest need of man's life. Man is a rational animal and he should be given full opportunities of work according to this rationality. Society produces such circumstances in which the mind of the individual develops but Green, Laski and MacIver etc. have advocated the interests of the individual in the social context and they consider state as a mean for fulfilment of the interests of the individual. That way, today also, all the liberals are busy in creating the social conditions for the all-round development of the individual after making him the focal point.

2. Competition in society is necessary for the common good. According to the liberals, all-round development of the individual is possible only in the society. His development, out of the

society, can not be thought of. In fact, society implies such conditions in which the individual, in company with others, tries to protect his interests because all men are inspired by this very aim. Therefore, they manipulate with each other, they enter into contracts and they develop themselves fully by fulfilling their needs. The liberals hold that this very competition is the basis of society. They feel that the people develop themselves through this competition and the welfare of the common man also is possible because of this competition because it is in a free society, based on competition, that the individual can have the opportunities to develop his talent. The competition in a free society, which is mentioned by the liberal writers, is visible in the economic, political and ideological fields. It is discussed, in brief, below:

(a) Competition in economic sphere is necessary for maximum production. The liberals have been in favour of free competition in the economic field from the very beginning. Their argument is that, in the economic sphere, the individual makes efforts to earn the maximum money through competition. The urge for private property inspires him to produce the maximum with the help of his full talent. The more the production, the more prosperous will there be the society.

Stronger liberals have advocated the cause of free competition or Laissez Faire in the economic sphere. They opposed the interference of the state in the economic affairs of the individual. The opinion of the liberal economists, like Adam Smith and Ricardo is that if the state will control the means of production, the urge of the individual to earn money decreases and there is set-back to production. Therefore, the state should not interfere in their economic sphere. Not only this, these economists have not entrusted the state with the work of the welfare of the poor. They do not want the state to protect the economic interests of the poor.

There was a change in the point of view of the liberals in the 19th and the 20th centuries. The writers like Bentham, Mill and Green accepted the positive aspect of state and allowed it a limited right of interference in the economic sphere. They admit that the state can protect the economic interests of the weaker sections of the society—labourers, women and children.

35

In the 20th century, liberalism has accepted the new form of the state. Now-a-days, the liberal idea of the welfare state is universally accepted. It may perform the functions with public welfare. It may control the economic activities of the individual for public welfare. That is why, in the modern world, the economic sphere of the state is increasing in the liberal states. It does economic planning, makes provision for education and public health and also makes provision of equal distribution of national wealth. Not only this, even in the capitalist countries like the U.S.A., U.K. and Canada, the economic sphere of the state has become so wide that the state had started industries in the public sector and in the private sector, it is controlling the industries by law. Thus, free competition advocated by the strong liberals seems to prevail nowhere. In the modern liberal countries, controlled and regulated competition is going on, because of which the defects of free competition have been removed.

(b) Political competition is necessary for the best form of government. Liberals, normally, believe that only in those countries the best form of government can be established, where there

is opportunity of political competition for getting the right of governing. Political competition is possible only in a democratic government. Therefore, the liberals support the democratic government. In this system, the common man can take part in the competition for authority. He elects his rulers for a fixed period, if the rulers elected by him do not work for the interests of the people, he may hand over the reigns of government to some other hands. In democratic countries, the political parties, in organised form, try to get hold of the authority to rule. In this competition for power, by various parties, there is more possibility of the welfare of the people. In this political competition, the Pressure or Interest Groups take part indirectly and influence the decisions of the political parties in this competition for power.

The political competition goes on even after the elections. In the legislatures, the political leaders co-operate in taking right decisions after discussing the various topics. The problems are discussed from various points of view in the newspapers. In the public meetings, the opposition exposes the weaknesses of the government. Thus, the decisions taken by the ruling party are better and more balanced because of the political competition going on in the society. Discussing this political competition Maurice Duverger has said, "Outside the elections, political conflict in democracy retains the same order and character. In parliamentary debates, in press policies, in meeting and discussions at the meetings of the parties, unions and various organisations it takes place for all to see."

To allow the political conflict going on, the liberals emphasis the maintenance of certain conditions in society without which political conflict becomes limited and one sided. The conditions, which have been emphasised upon by the liberals are as follows:

36

(i) There should be full liberty of organising political parties and these parties should be given the option to use the constitutional means to achieve the right of authority.

(ii) The citizens should be given the fundamental rights which should include the right to vote for electing their representatives and to fight election.

(iii) There should be independent judiciary as a guarantee for the protection of the rights of the citizens,

(iv) All the citizens, in the country should have the right to franchise without any discrimination which may help in making that political competition broad-based,

(v) Within the constitutional limits, all the citizens should be given the right to freedom of speech and expression which may make the spread and propaganda of the various ideologies possible. (vi) All should be equal before law and protection of law should be equally provided to all.

(c) Free Ideological Competition shall pave the way for the individual and social development. Liberals are in favour of free competition in the intellectual sphere also. They feel that, for individual and social development, freedom of thought is essential. Change can not be brought in

the society through power and authority. Explaining the ideas of J.S. Mill, C.L. Wayper says that believing that it is man's mind that changes society and that only free discussion can nourish fruitful ideas, he (J.S. Mill) says that all mankind minus one man may have an idea but they have no right to coerce that single dissent. For if it suppresses his opinion it injures the human race. That is why, Mill considers individual liberty the most important. He maintains that "over himself, over his own body and mind the individual is sovereign". Only the individual as sovereign over his body, mind and intellect can express his ideas freely. But Mill favours restrictions over the individual liberty for the common good. He further says that the only principle for which power can be rightfully exercised over any member of civilised community against his will is to prevent harm to others. Clearing his point of view, Mill has said that it is possible that the idea of one man, against that of the whole world, may be correct. If his idea is correct its suppression will do harm to the whole society. His idea is that it is possible that the idea of that one man is wrong. In such circumstances, through discussion, they can arrive at the right idea.

Today we see, that in the liberal states, maximum importance is attached to the free expression of the individual's ideas. Constitutional guarantee is given to the fundamental rights and liberties. The mass media—Press, radio and T.V. etc. are being made more and more free so that these may be utilised for propagating the various ideas opposed to each other. Truth comes out of this ideological churning.

37

3. There is harmony between individual and society. Stronger liberals recognised the negative aspect of liberty. Therefore, they saw contradiction between the interests of the individual and the society. Because they considered the fulfilment of the interests of the individual as their aim, therefore, they opposed every idea which was against the interests of the individual. This was the reason that they talked about limiting the jurisdiction of the state. In their eyes, increasing of the jurisdiction of the state will limit. The present free competition in the society and the individual interests will be dominated by the social interests. This form of liberalism was, more or less, accepted upto the 19th century.

In the last decades of the 19th century, because of industrialisation, the working class began to rise in organised form and the conflict of the capitalists and the labourers began to increase. Because of the exploitation of the labourers by the capitalists, the idea, of opposing the capitalists by the labourers in organised form, began to develop among the labourers. New liberal writers were born because of the propaganda and development of socialist ideology. These new liberals saw the interests of the individual and the society and found harmony between the two. They opined on the one hand, that the use of co-operation should be developed among the individuals and, on the other hand, they said that there was no contradiction in the interests of the individual and the society. In fact, they supplement each other. Society is as important for the individual as vice-versa. Because of this reason, they opposed the free competition in the society. In the open competition, harmony between the opposing classes was not possible, because some of them will, consequently, become property holders and the others will become propertyless. Because of it the individual interest will have the upper hand and the interests of others will suffer. Discussing the relations of the individual and the society, MacIver, in his 'Modern state'



says that "The relationship between the individual and the society is not one-sided, both are essential for the comprehension of either." According to August Comte the society is an organised whole in which all classes work for the common good. The other liberal sociologists like Pareto, Siurmel, Mosca, Sombart and Max Weber etc. developed the idea of Comte and emphasised the ideas of social unity, social order and common interest etc. After rejecting the ideas of free competition (liberals) and class struggle (Marx), they attached importance to the social cooperation, goodwill and harmony of interests.

4. Welfare state is possible. The liberals in the beginning opposed increasing state jurisdiction. They had no faith in state. They felt that the more the jurisdiction of the state, the more the individual liberty will be restricted because they attached more importance to liberty of the individual. Therefore, they advanced the view that less number of functions should be entrusted to the state. According to them, the state was a necessary evil i.e., the existence of the state can not be denied but it should exist the least because it is an evil.

38

Therefore, its jurisdiction should be decreased as much as possible. Thus, state will do the minimum harm to the society. Locke and Herbert Spencer advocated the allotment of the minimum functions to the state. They allotted only four functions to the state: (i) Establishment of the law and order in state—for this purpose, the state will have police which establishes law and order in the state with the use of limited force, (ii) Defence of the country from foreign aggression, for this purpose, state will organise armed forces, (iii) Settlement of disputes among the citizens—for this purpose the state organises courts, (iv) Establishment of foreign relations—The state performs this function with the help of foreign services and the organisations concerned therewith. Thus, stronger liberals have laid emphasis on the negative side of the state. But these weaknesses of the liberals, regarding the state, soon came to the surface. Because of the increasing complications of the society, liberals were forced to think that an institution like the state should be used for solving the social complications and performing the functions for the public interest. Development of industrialisation and the problems created by capitalism and the spread of communism forced the liberals to understand the importance of positive functions of the state. Thus, liberals, for establishing the reasonable mutual relations of the individual and the society, allowed interference by the state in the social, economic, religious and other aspects of individual life. In the conditions of the 20th century, the point of view of liberals was made more liberal and now they consider the state as a mean of social welfare. Thus, the liberalism of the 20th century is much different from the previous liberalism. In it, sanction has been accorded for giving more rights to the state in the economic sphere because of which it may do economic welfare of the common man and may perform the functions concerning social reform. Consequently, the scope of the state has become broad-based in the capitalist states like U.S.A., U.K. and Canada and in the private sector, many restrictions have been put, keeping public welfare in view. Today, in all the states of world—developed and developing the states fulfil every need, social, economic etc., of the individual. We see in daily life, that in addition to the economy of the country, state controls every side—public health, art, science, education, culture etc. Explaining this point of view in simple words, Hobbes has said that "The state has assumed the duties of a doctor, nurse, a school master, trader and manufacturer, insurance agent, house builder, town planner, railway controller and a hundred other functions."

## Criticism of the Liberal View

The above given views of the liberals may be criticised as under.

1. Liberals have viewed individual and society differently. Though the focal point of liberalism is the individual, yet it is criticised on this point that they have discussed the individual separately from society. Thus, the individual and the society become opponents of each other. That is why, the liberals advocate the uncontrolled rights to protect the interests of the individual.

39

And, because of this, they consider the state as a "necessary evil." In fact, liberals have discussed the interests of the individual and the society separately as opposing each other. For protecting the interests of the individual, liberals have neglected the society. In the modern era, this problem is before even those liberals who are in favour of welfare state. In reality, they face difficulty in discussing the relation of the individual and the society. The fact is that man is a social animal. It is unreasonable to discuss him as separate from the society because the interests of the individual and the society are interdependent. S. Avinan, in his "Social and Political Thought of Karl Marx" says "The individual can not be conceptually isolated from his social context: by definition any meaningful sentence about individual must simultaneously refer to his environment, and anatomistic model of an individual is philosophically unsound."

2. Open Competition safeguards the interests of the people having power. The liberals' assumption that it is necessary to have open competition in society for the development and the common good, has been severely criticised by the communists. They have said that few powerful people succeed in a competition whether it is open or closed, and the weaker section of the society becomes more backward. Communists say that the plan of competition has been presented by the catalysts for the exploitation of the weak. Following this plan the weak go on becoming weaker and the rich go on becoming richer. Open competition is not only seen in economic fields but also in political as well as thinking fields. Through political competition the rich keep. Their strong hold over the government and the administration because he has the strength to buy the poor in the elections. In the field of thought, through various means they propagate the theories of the liberals in order to protect their interests. Thus liberalistic, in order to fulfil the common good (interests) and develop the society, advocated such an open competition which has ultimately fulfilled the interests of the capitalists and exploited the toiling millions.

3. The harmony of interest is not possible because the society and the individual are viewed differently. As already discussed, liberalism has considered the individual and the society separately, and, for them, the individual is the end and the state is a means. The aim of liberalism is the protection of the rights of the individuals. On this basis, it is very difficult to create harmony because society has been considered against the interests of the individual. That is why, the more the liberals try to create harmony between the individual and the society, the more conflicting it becomes.

4. The welfare of the weaker sections is not possible. The liberals of the present century consider state as a Welfare state. They feel that the state is in a position to fulfil the needs of the common man. It should perform functions concerning the interest of the public so that there may be welfare of the weaker sections. That is why in the liberal states, the jurisdiction of the state includes education, health and social security etc. But the Communist say that

40

the basic aim of the liberal states is to protect the interests of the capitalists. The state leaves the weaker section for exploration by the capitalists in the name of welfare functions and creates the idea of status quo in the weaker sections. But welfare of the whole society will not be possible until plans are implemented by keeping the whole society, including the above given two opposite classes, in view.

5. Liberal democracy safeguards the interests of the capitalists. In the liberal states, where democracy is appreciated so much, the reality is that it has been organised in such a way that it takes the permission of the poor and the weaker sections for capitalists to rule over them. In no liberal state, the rule of the poor and the weaker sections has been established. The rich, by spending lot of money, buy the votes of the poor and, by thus controlling the government, they frame laws in their favour. Thus, a liberal democracy always protects the rights of the rich.

6. Politics will not establish the rule of order and justice but will ensure the hold of the rulers on society. Liberals feel that politics will establish law and order by ending the present conflict in the society and by doing the welfare functions; it will try to achieve common good. The Communists have vehemently opposed this idea of the liberals. They say that politics is that process which creates conflicts and disagreements. This is an institution for continuing hold of the men in authority over society. In this condition, the powerful men satisfy their interests. Thus, the idea of the liberals, that law and order can be established in the society with the help of Politics, is wrong. The other way, there is more exploitation of the ruled in the liberal states.

7. Peaceful social change is merely a fraud. The Communists also criticise this point of the liberals that, in the liberal states, the possibilities of peaceful change are always present. According to the Communists in liberal states, there is always one sided competition. The ruling class, with the help of its unlimited resources, rules over the ruled in such a way that the ruled feel that they are being governed by the rulers, according to their (those of the ruled) will. In fact, capitalists, with the help of their unlimited resources, rule over them with the help of their votes.

## IMPORTANT QUESTIONS

1. What do you mean by Politics? Give its definition.
2. Distinguish between Traditional view and the Modern view of Politics.
3. What do you understand by the Ancient Greek view of Politics?
4. What is meant by Behavioral view of Politics?

5. "Politics is the means of reconciling various interests." Explain.
6. "Politics is the result of class struggle." Discuss.
7. Discuss the Marxist view of Politics.
8. 'politics is the pursuit of common good.' Discuss.

### 3 The Concept of Modern Nation-State

What is Nation-state? Before discussing the origin and development of the modern nation-state, it is necessary to know as to what it means by it. Nation-state is made of two words—nation and state, which means by it. inhabited, normally, by the people of one nationality. In fact, nation state has a detailed and wide meaning. When a definite race has been living for a very long time, on a fixed territory, and has made its own history, develops common traditions, has common religious ideas, develops its own language, who have common interests and common friend—foes and whose ancestors are the same, such a race with one culture and civilization, develops a sentiment of nationality and, in that territory, it is known as a nation. On the other hand, a state is a legal entity. According to it, when a human race, resides in a fixed territory, is organised politically and is habituated to obey the orders of the sovereign (who is their own part), it is called a state\*. For a state, it is not essential that the race, living in that fixed territory, should have achieved a specific standard of culture and civilisation. In fact, the races with various cultures and civilizations have been organised in one state, e.g., in Europe, in states like Switzerland, Bulgaria and Yugoslavia, the people of various nationalities are living. On the other hand there are people of one nationality who are living in several states, e.g., Poles are living in several states, similarly, Muslims are living in various states of the whole of Asia. Nation-states, normally means a state where the people of one nationality are living. One features of a nation-state is that there should be one such race in a state which is in majority and that state is influenced by its cultural ideas. The residents of that state, in spite of their separate cultural identities, develop their common national ideas. Though in the former U.S.S.R., China, India, England and the U.S.A. the people of various religions and culture are living, yet, in every one of them, a majority race is living, the cultural life of which has made it a separate nation from others.

#### Various Stages of the development of nation-state

The modern nation-states have not been existing for ever. In ancient and medieval times, in all the regions of the world, no nation-state had developed.

68

The formation of the nation-states is a modern development, which is a result of constant development. According to Burgess, "State is a continuous development of human society out of a glory of imperfect beginning through crude but improving forms of manifestation towards a perfect universal organisation of mankind." Meaning thereby, that the state, in the beginning was

incomplete, disordered and imperfect. With the development of culture, it also went on developing, and, after slowly developing, now it is at the stage of nation-state. For understanding the modern nation-states, it is necessary to study the various steps of development of the state through which it has come to the modern pattern. For studying it conveniently, this long period of the development of the state has been divided into three parts:

1. Ancient States.
2. Medieval Feudal States.
3. Modern Nation-States.

## **ANCIENT STATES**

The history of ancient states is very long and the states also, during this long period, have developed in various forms. In fact, it was during this period that the organised form of state came into being. This period can be studied under the following headings:

- (a) Earliest States.
- (b) River Valley States.
- (c) Greek City-States.
- (d) Indian Republics of Vedic Age.
- (e) Roman and Magadhan Empires.

(a) Earliest States. Though the unanimity about the form of the earliest states is lacking, yet, it is, normally, accepted that the most ancient social organisation of man is family. An organised form of the family was tribe. Possibly, the most ancient political organisation of man is tribe. The cause of accepting the tribe as the original form of state is that the most important manifestation of the state—obedience of the orders of the supreme authority— was found in it. The order of the head of the tribe was supreme, and, everyone had to obey it. If any member of the tribe disobeyed him, he could be sentenced to death even, though, there was absence of definite and fully defined rules, yet the laws based on customs were fully obeyed. When a strong head of a tribe defeated the head of the same type of tribe, he would dominate that tribe also and would rule over it. This was the primitive form of the state.

(b) River Valley States. The tribal states are not included in the category of modern states, because the tribes were not inhabited on a fixed territory. These tribes roamed from one place to another in search of fertile land and grazing grounds for their animals. Wherever they got enough facilities for

better living, they, slowly, started to settle at fixed places. In various regions of the world, the remnants, found in the excavations by the archeologists, prove that these tribes made the valleys of the big rivers their abode of living because they received the facilities of life there to the maximum. We come to know from history that the big empires of the ancient times were established in the regions of the river valleys. For example, in India, the main empires were established in the valleys of the big rivers Sindh and Ganges. Similarly, empires were established on the banks of the big rivers in the other countries also. The most ancient civilisations of the world developed on the banks of Hwangho and Yangtsiang rivers in China, Ephratas and Tigris rivers of Iraq and Syria and Nile river of Egypt.

The states, which were established in the river valleys, are very important in the history of political thought, because various types of states developed there. And the Thinkers, discussing the relations of the state and the individual, established various types of ideas. The following were the main characteristics of those states.

(i) Big Empires. The empires, established in river valley, were spread over a large territory and were very strong because of peace and happiness, a lot of knowledge, science and art developed there.

(ii) Monarchical System was established. There was, normally monarchy in those empires. The king had the highest authority. He ran the administration with the help of landlords, officers, and servants of kingdom, who were loyal to him. He normally used arbitrary powers. He enjoyed unlimited powers. At some places, he was considered the representative of God also. Therefore, obedience of his orders was the duty of the people. They had no right against the King. But, at some places, the democratic institutions also had developed. In India, constitutional monarchy had developed. There were many limitations of the king. He used to consider himself as the servant of the masses. He used to run the administration according to the well established rules. He used to seek opinion of the learned Councils for solving the various problems of the state.

(iii) The State was influenced by religion. There was enough of influence of the religion on state. The people were habituated to obey the king on religions grounds. The religion laid limits on the kings also. Religious customs, religious rituals and defence of religion provided limitations of religion.

(iv) Military Administration. The king ran the administration with the help of his personality and the armed force. The other Lords, Governors and other officers obeyed him because of this military power. Whenever the king became weak, the provincial rulers would challenge his authority, and would struggle among themselves for power. One who defeated others with his military force, he would become the emperor. The empires of Assyria, India, Egypt and China and Sumerian Empire were the important examples of River Valley Civilizations. Most of them were neither well organised nor military,

70

that is why, the struggle for superiority always went on. Possibly because of this reason, some western writers criticised them as incomplete from political point of view. Saltu came to this



extent that "From the point of view of the student of politics, those empires offer, however, little interest. Few of them evolved any significant institutions that would repay study and they were all characterised by an internal inertia amounting to something like paralysis." There is some truth in Saltau's criticism, when we compare them with the modern states, but, if we study them in context with the ancient times, their importance can not be overlooked. These states gave birth to many political ideas and political institutions, which have special importance for the modern states. According to Gettell, "These great empires performed valuable service in establishing the beginnings of culture, in breaking down the local basis of tribal organisation in familiarising mankind with widespread authority."

(c) Greek City-States. In the 4th and 5th centuries before Christ, there were small city-states in Greece. Greece is divided into many valleys and islands. So, it was natural that small city-states developed in those valleys and islands because those places were far away from each other. Those city-states are considered significant even today from an administrative point of view. Two city-states Athens and Sparta—were more famous and significant than the others. There were different types of administrative systems in Greek city-states. All the forms of government, Democracy, Aristocracy and monarchy—were tested there. Because of the various types of experiments the philosophers of that time got enough opportunities for political thinkings.

These city-states were like the modern cities. The population of these city-states was forty thousand, on the average, though the population of Athens was two and a half lakhs. The city-states included the city as well as the states. The administration was also of different types, e.g. monarchy, aristocracy and democracy. The form of government went on changing in most of the states. From monarchy to aristocracy from aristocracy to oligarchy, from oligarchy to monarchy was the normal process of change. In spite of it, there was direct democracy in most of the states. But there used to be a large number of slaves. Every city-state had its own god, whom they worshipped.

(1) Self-sufficient social life. The life of the Greeks was self-sufficient, they had inhabited villages at the feet of the mountains. Therefore, the life in these villages was separate from and independent of each other. They loved their land very much. The Greeks considered the state as a moral organisation. Because it fulfilled every necessity of life. The city-state worked, simultaneously, as a state, church and the university. Therefore, the state had the organisation of the full development of the individual. The Greeks considered the city life extremely important because they could not think of any development of the individual out of the state. Thus, the city-states led sufficient and autonomous social life.

(2) Establishment of direct democracy. Though there were monarchical,

71

aristocratic, oligarchical and democratic governments in the Greek city-states, yet they were very well known for direct democracy. The main cause of it was that their population was small and those, who had the right of citizenship, were much less in number. Slaves, women, foreigners and children, had no right of citizenship. There were only few persons who had these rights. They would gather at one place to solve the problems of the state. Being of the same race and

knowing each other very well, these citizens were capable of gathering at one place and solving the problems of the state. It was the duty of the citizens to take part in the activities of the city-state. They performed this duty very well. Pericles had rightly said that those citizens, who did not participate in state affairs, may not be harmful, but, were surely useless. This was one of the main features of the city-state; whatever the form of government, the final authority was in the hands of the people and used it efficiently.

(3) Integration of religion and Politics. There was no dividing line between the religion and politics. Every city-state had its own god, who was publicly worshipped. There was only one god of the citizens and the city-states. The citizens worshipped their god in public festivals.

(4) An important place to the System of Slavery. A very glaring weakness of the Greek society was that a big portion of it was known as slaves, who had no rights of citizenship. In the Greek city-states, the rights of citizenship were limited to a few well-to-do persons.

Because of mutual straggle, the power of the city-states weakened, and they became a part of the Mecedonian Republic first and that of Roman Empire later.

(d) Indian Republics of Vedic Age. In the line of the development of the ancient states, the Republics of Vedic India occupied an important place. These states were contemporary of the Greek city-states, but the details of the Indian Republics are available also before and after the Greek city-states. Though detailed account about these states, unlike the Greek city-state, is not available, yet, on the basis of the various researches, a lot of information, about them, is now available. These republics have been discussed in the Mahabhartta and the Buddhist literature. During the beginning of the Maurya period, these republics existed.

The administrative system of these republics was almost the same. Normally, there were two types of Republics. In the first type of republics, the head of the state was elected by the public, and they took part in the activities of the state. In the other type of republics, the heads of the villages and the prominent families took part in the work of the states.

The republics, which are discussed in the Vedas, had an organised administration which was similar to the modern republics. There were three parts of the administration of the state—(1) Council, (2) Committee and (3) The head. The Council had only learned persons as its members, who were elected by the people, and this august assembly had the function of

72

justice. The members of it advised the head in running the administration. The Committee was the second institution which was bigger than the Council, as far as the number of members is concerned, the whole public was represented in it. In fact, it was like the National Assembly. It was called for specific purposes. Declaration of war, maintenance of peace, election of the king or the head were its main functions. The head of the state was called Raja or Ganapati, who was elected, but, later on, this institution became hereditary. The king could not become arbitrary because he was under the control of the council and the Committee. He considered himself as a servant of the people. While elected as Ganapati, he took an oath of service of the people. The

proud, arbitrary and unable kings were dismissed by the people and the new ones were elected in their places.

These republics struggled against each other. Stronger kings established Empires by winning the territories of the weaker ones. The big empire at Patliputra won them once and established a bigger empire acceding and annexing them. Thus, like the Greek city-states, these republics'also became a subject-matter of history.

### **(e) Roman and Magadhan Empires**

(1) Roman Empire. Like the city-states of Greece, there were city-states in Italy also. Rome also was a city-state like them. Its importance was more because of its navigability. The resident tribes of the city-states of Rome had similar religious ideas. Therefore, they had a stronger sense of unity. The Romans, first, made their city-state very strong, and, then, they started to make it an empire. The city states of Italy, at that time, became a part of it. Thus, after organising strongly in Italy, Romans won the various other countries of Europe. Romans won, not only the nearer countries like France, Spain, England and Germany only, but, also which were far off. i.e., Greece, Asia Minor and Egypt etc. and, thus, established a big empire. The long history of Roman Empire can be divided at three places. In fact, Rome came into existence as a city-state with monarchy, but, it came to be famous as a republic, and, during her downfall period, she was a dictatorial empire. The three periods have been briefly discussed below:

(i) The period of city-state. In the beginning, the Roman Empire started as a city-state. It was the period before 510 B.C. During this period, there used to be hereditary kings. In addition to his kingship, he was a judge as well as the defender of the faith. In administration, the aristocrats also participated with the king. The government consisted of the King, the Senate and the Comitia Curiata. Though, in the beginning the aristocratic class i.e., Patricians, had the authority in their hands, yet, in the later days, it was transferred to the common men.

(ii) The Time of Republic. The removing of the weaknesses of the Monarchy and for ending the arbitrariness of the kings, The Romans, in 510 B.C., ended

73

Monarchy and established a republic. During the Republican days, the administration of Rome was run by two Consuls; one of them used to be a military officer and the other used to be a civil officer. They were elected annually. In the beginning, only the aristocrats participated in the elections, but, after a struggle of two centuries, the common men were also given a share in these elections. Thus, the administration of the Republic was run by the consuls, aristocrats and the Tribune, a representative body of the commoners

The characteristics of the Roman Empire were—division of authority among various organisations and officers, definite tenure of the officers of the state, limited military powers with the Consuls, discussion of important problems by the people.

(iii) Rise of dictatorial rule in The Rome Empire. As the Roman empire spread, the imperial trends went on increasing and dictatorial administration was ultimately established. Before the first century B.C., The Roman empire had spread to its fullest extreme, and in addition to Italy, France, Spain, England, Germany, Greece, Austria, Asia Minor, the beach of the mediterranean Sea etc. were included in it. Now, the need of the central government was felt. Therefore, the efforts were made to maintain this big empire with the help of an arbitrary monarchy

Now, the emperor had the chance to behave arbitrarily. His orders became laws. He was considered as the representative of God, and obedience of his orders became a duty of the people. The liberty of the Republican days, democracy and local autonomy were done away with. The king enjoyed very much of powers. He finished the bodies representing the people. In their place, strength and sovereignty etc. were emphasised.

The Roman Empire gave a lot to Politics; its international law, colonial rule, civil law etc. are very important even today.

(2) Magadhan Empire. Like the Roman Empire, the empire of Magadha in India is very important for the students of Politics. Its process of development also is the same. The republic of Magadh became a big republic first, and, later on, after defeating the other republics, it became a very big Magadhan Empire. A big part of South India was also a part of Magadh Empire. Chandragupta Maurya and Ashoka the Great made its image better.

The foreign historians have very much appreciated the Magadhan Empire. The Emperor was the focal point of the central rule, and he led the army himself. In fact, the emperor depended on the advice of his ministers. The basis of whose appointment was purely merit. The Council of Ministers took majority decisions which were, normally, accepted by the emperor. Though the emperor was the Chief Justice also, yet the cases were actually decided by the judges. The main function of the emperor was the welfare of the people. The empire was divided into provinces and their heads were appointed by the emperor. The local people were also given the local authority by accepting the principle of decentralisation.

74

## **2. MEDIEVAL FEUDAL STATES**

After the downfall of the Roman Empire, the smaller chiefs established their small independent states on its debris. In fact, many defects had developed in the Roman Empire and it had reached the brick of disaster. When the barbaric Teuton race of Germany invaded the Roman empire, it fizzled out. Not only this, even the chiefs of those places, were Teuton invasion had not taken place, established independent small states. Even small landlords who were a bit powerful, declared themselves sovereign kings. Thus, during the 5th century A.D., feudal states were established on the debris of the Roman Empire. These Feudal states continued upto 15th century.

The administration of a feudal state used to be pyramidal. The king used to be at the head of it and the tenants were at the lowest ladder. When an able man used to declare himself king after winning the territory nearby, he would divide the territory won by him, among his lords who had

co-operated with him in this victory, who used to be the feudal lords of those territories. But they were under the control of the king. They would give the king financial and military help. Feudal lords were made on hereditary basis. Big lords used to behave like kings. They used to divide their land to the sub-lords. Thus, under every lord and sub-lord there used to be many Sardars who were responsible forwards their lords. The Sardars, in their own gave their land to the tenants and received taxes from them according to their will.

The rise of medieval feudal state was due to the mutual contact of Roman and Teuton institutions, and, consequently it was influenced by the qualities of both these systems. Teutons were not familiar with established institutions. They attached very much of importance to the individual liberty and local autonomy. On the other hand, the basis of the Roman institutions was—unity, organisation, centralisation. It is not appropriate to judge the feudal institutions from political point of view. According to Saltau, instead of political and economic organisations, these were merely a form of culture and society.

Characteristics of the Feudal States. The characteristic features of the Feudal States were as given below:

(1) The states were pyramidically organised. The feudal states can be compared with pyramids, the head of which was the king and the tenants were at the lowest level. In between the two, there were various types of landlords. These landlords were fully responsible for the administration of their land, and, from time to time, they gave financial and military help to the king or the other landlords who were at a higher level.

(2) The condition of the slaves was very poor. The condition, of the agricultural slaves, who were at the lowest ladder of the pyramid, was extremely bad, causing concern. They were the slaves of their lords, and it was their duty to obey the orders of their masters. They also worked as soldiers, and they had to pay the tax imposed by the lord. Most of the part of their production used to go to the lords.

75

(3) The basis of the state was personal loyalty and local autonomy. The main basis of the feudal states was personal loyalty. The king used to give land to his close confidants. These feudal lords were the basis of the king's power. The king used to get the financial help from these very lords. For military power also the king depended on these very lords. For this all, the landlords were given local autonomy. They were the full lords of their land. They used to keep full control on their subordinate lords. Thus, the local lords had the power to solve the local problems.

(4) Powerless Centre. The king ran the administration with the help of the landlords. Those lords were under the king in name. The centre was powerless. There was no special control of the king over the landlords. They showed, their loyalty towards the king, from time to time, by giving gifts, financial and military help. Whenever, a landlord became powerful, he would declare himself independent, by challenging the authority of the king.

(5) Establishment of religious unity. No doubt, in political field, there was anarchy and lack of organisation, yet because of the spread and propaganda of Christianity, religious unity had been established in the whole of the region. Till now, the kings, lords and commoners, all had accepted Christianity the Pope of Rome was given special importance. He was the head of the Bishops of the other states. That is why, he was called the Pope.

(6) Struggle between the authorities of the church and the state. After the establishment of the authority of the Pope in the religious sphere, a struggle for authority started between the church and the state. According to the order of Lord Christ that in worldly affairs, the king should be obeyed and, in spiritual affairs, the Pope should be supreme, Pope was not ready to accept the authority of the state in religious and moral affairs. Most of the Bishops would not consider themselves under their kings. They had no right to punish a bishop. Besides, on the territory of the church, the orders of the bishops were obeyed, not of the kings, but the kings were not ready to accept this position. And, thus, a struggle started between the church and the state. In the politics of medieval times, on the one hand, the struggle was going on between the kings and landlords and, on the other hand, the struggle was going on between the church and the state. The result of this struggle was that the modern are started in which now political order and organisation developed.

### **3. MODERN NATION-STATES**

At the end of the medieval era, the power of the state weakened, and the Christian Church rose as a new power. In the beginning of the 14th century, the Pope started to use uncontrolled authority which was challenged by the kings and struggle, between the two, started. On the other hand, in the industrial sector because of the development of the means of production a new class of traders came into existence, which, on the one hand, needed a large number of labourers and. on the other hand, they needed big markets for selling the finished goods. Thus, the feudal states were not strong enough to

76

face the authority of Pope and for the fulfilment of the needs of the industrial products. They began to disintegrate and a new political system started, which is before us, in the form of Nation-states.

In the beginning of this chapter, a detailed interpretation of the nation-state was given. In the formation of the nation-states, on the debris of the feudal states, the sentiment of nationality had a special importance. Though the nation-states developed mainly in the 18th and 19th centuries, yet the circumstances for their formation had started from the 15th century. In the 16th century, in Italy, the great thinker, Machiavelli made efforts to arouse the sentiment of nationality in his fellow countrymen. The sentiment of nationality came into existence, first, in England and when England tried to dominate France, the sentiment of nationality arose in France also. Thus, in many European countries—Portugal, Spain, Sweden and Denmark etc. the sentiment of nationality developed there. This sentiment helped the formation of nation-state.



In the 18th century, Poland was divided, but the people remained conscious about their nationality and they started thinking of establishing Poland as a nation-state. After sometime, after the division of Poland, a revolution took place in France. When Napoleon defeated most of Europe, the speed of consciousness of nationality in the other European countries increased. After the defeat of Napoleon, when the map of Europe was redrawn, the sentiment of nationality was ignored. This incident also fanned the fire of nationality in the minds of the people of the various countries. The people of Italy, Germany and Belgium, being filled with the sentiment of nationality started efforts for the national unity. The Belgium people, in the beginning of 19th century started a struggle against the higher authorities and got rid of them.

Upto the beginning of the First World War, the feeling of nationality had spread throughout Europe. After the war, at the time of Warsaw Treaty, the theory of nationality was accepted for the reorganisation of Europe politically. Thus, many national states—Poland, Lithuania, Latvia, Czechoslovakia etc.— came into existence on the map of Europe. The nation-states have spread throughout the world, these days. These states lay emphasis on the racial unity and geographical contiguity. In Africa and Asia, in many countries, because of national movements, a feeling of nationality developed in the people for the formation of nation-states, as a result of which, they started struggles for their freedom from foreign powers. Ultimately, the states, based on the sentiment of nationality, were formed.

Characteristics of Nation-States. The characteristics of the modern nation-states are discussed below:

(1) In the beginning, the form of nation-states was arbitrary kingship. The nation-states, which were organised on the remnants of feudal states, had monarchical form of government. The kingdom had all the powers and enjoyed arbitrary authority. The kings fully trampled the powers of the feudal lords so that they may be none to challenge their authority. The people gave

77

them lot of money. So, kings paid attention towards agriculture and industry. The Tudor kings of England, the Louis of France and the Charles of Spain were arbitrary kings. The theory of the philosophy of Machiavelli supported the arbitrary authority of the kings. Bodin, proving the kings above law, said that the laws, framed by the king were above all the citizens and associations, but, the ruler himself is above those laws. Later on, the kings got the final authority in religious affairs also. Richard Hooker, in his book, advocated the cause of the kings over the religious authority. In the 17th and 18th centuries, the Divine Origin of king's rights was established. Thus, the rulers of nation-states in the beginning, became uncontrolled and arbitrary.

(2) Establishment of Constitutional Monarchy and Democracy out of the Arbitrary kingship. The arbitrary government could not run for a long time. Slowly, in almost every country, the arbitrary authority of the king was challenged by the people. In Europe, England is such country, where, the struggle between the people and the king started first. In this struggle, the people were successful in limiting the powers of the king. The Bloodless Revolution of 1688, which took place in England, is very important for the student of political thought. During this period, in England and the U.S.A., there were many such philosophers who established the ideas regarding

the individual liberty. Montesquieu, Voltaire and Bentham etc. showed the way for the establishment of democratic government. In the 18th century, for the establishment of democracy, the American Declaration of Independence, 1776 and the French Revolution of 1789 are specially important. By accepting both of these incidents as bases, efforts went on, in Europe, for the establishment of democratic governments, with the spread of democracy emphasis was laid on liberty, equality, fraternity, popular sovereignty, and the theory of rule of law and these ideas became the bases of democratic government in future.

(3) Efforts for establishing Colonialism and Imperialism. With the rise of arbitrary kingship, in Europe, Industrial Revolution took place and, the whole of Europe, with the help of the big machines prepared by scientific inventors, started production on large scale. The industrialisation gave birth to a new industrialist class, which, on one hand, gave material prosperity to their nations and on the other hand, started search for markets for their goods and for less costly labour and the market for buying the raw material. The industrialists received full co-operation from their rulers. For the fulfilment of these necessities, new regions were searched, and the European countries made efforts to establish their empires there. The countries of Asia, Africa and Latin America were the main targets. The European countries, like England, France, Portugal, Holland and Spain etc., established their empires in those countries, and looted the property of the people of these countries, by exploiting them. Thus, the condition of the European countries in the 19th century was of special type. In those European nation-states, for their citizens, there were liberty, equality and rule of law etc., but the colonial people were fully exploited.

78

(4) Rise of the spirit of nationalism in the colonial people. If the 19th century was the period of the exploitation of the colonial people, the 20th century was the period of the rise of the spirit of nationalism in the colonial people. From the beginning of the 20th century, especially after the First World War, the movements full of the spirit of nationality based on political consciousness started in the countries of Asia, Africa and Latin America. On the one hand, because of the influence of the Marxist theory, communist revolutions took place in the U.S.S.R. and China and, on the other hand, the colonial countries of Asia and Africa, tried to start movements for freedom from the imperial powers. The period after the Second World War can be called the period of the establishment of free nation-states in the colonial countries. Establishment of free nation-states, in countries-like India, Pakistan, Burma, Egypt, Algeria, Ghana, Nigeria, Vietnam, Indonesia, Fiji, Libya, Zimbabwe and Syria etc. was an important incident of history. The newly formed nation-states of Asia, Africa and Latin America, are called the Third World. The problems of these countries are almost the same because the imperialist powers exploited them so much that their socio-politico-economic life was full of difficulties and problems. Before these countries there are problems like development, food, poverty, social deterioration and political instability because of the conspiracies of the foreign powers. That is why, these developing countries are trying to solve their problems by mutual cooperation.

(5) Nation-states in the Communist World. The communism discussed by Karl Marx, does not accept the barriers of nationalism; that is why, he gave a call "Labourers of the world, unite". In the modern era, where the communist governments have been established, they, in principle,

declare that they are making an effort to organise the labourers as a world organisation, but, actually, no communist-country has been able to neglect their national interests for internationalism. Not only they have their national interest before themselves, but, they even exploit the fellow communist countries for their own interests. Russia and China are its main examples. There are communist governments in both the countries, but, because of a clash of their national interests, the idea of world society has remained only a plan on paper. Thus, with these two communist giants, the behaviour of the East European communist states is on national pattern, who are always busy in fulfilling their national interests even on the international plan. Not only this, the communist countries exploit the newly free countries for their own national interest, in the name of communism. This imperialist policy of theirs is a symbol of their limited nationalism.

(6) Development of Internationalism. Though nation-state is considered the last link in the development of the state, but, in the present century, the idea of internationalism and world-brotherhood, has crossed the limits of nationalism and has accepted the idea of human welfare everywhere. It may not be said, that, in the near future, idea of world government will be realised, yet, it is essential that, in the modern era of internationalism various states

79

gather at a platform to solve their national and international problems. Not only this, the nations with unequal interests also gather to discuss their mutual problems and to increase mutual goodwill. The Summit Meeting of Cancun of Mexico in Oct., 1981, is an example of it. The heads of 22 developed and developing nations of North and South attended this Summit, and, by mutual co-operation tried to solve their mutual problems.

In fact, because of the development of the national states, the idea of internationalism has grown to control their mutual behaviour. The various states have recognised the equally applicable international laws in the international sphere. From this point of view, the work of U.N.O. and its allied agencies is appreciable. These nations solve each other's problems by mutual cooperation. These nation try to enhance the speed of their development by helping each other in the fields of science, technology, education, health, art and culture etc.

Besides, the developed countries, which include both the capitalist and communist countries, try their level best to exploit the newly freed nations by making use of their problems in various ways. This is neo-colonialism, which is an open effort of limiting their sovereignty and to exploit them with the excuse of helping them financially. This side of the problem can not be solved, till the developed countries give up their idea of exploiting them and the economic condition of the developing countries ameliorates so much that they need not see towards the developed countries for financial help.

## IMPORTANT QUESTIONS

1. What is meant by Nation-State?
2. What was the system of states during the following periods:

- (1) Ancient States.
  - (2) River Valley States.
  - (3) Greek-city states.
  - (4) Vedic Indian Republics.
  - (5) Roman and Magadhan Empires.
3. What do you know about Medieval Feudal States? Give their characteristics.
  4. Discuss Modern Nation-state. What are their characteristics?
  5. Give a detailed account of the rise and development of Modern Nation States.

What is the meaning of Nation-State?

## Chapter 4 State: Origins and Development

The origin and the development of the state have attracted a great deal of attention of practically all the important political thinkers. Like the other concepts in political theory, important changes are reflected in the understanding of the nature of the state with the changes in political order and the advancement in other areas of human knowledge. The social contract theory in the seventeenth century introduced a radical departure in analyzing the relationship between the ruler and the ruled challenging the traditional divine right theory, by arguing that the ruler and ruled are two parties of the agreement and as such essentially equal. The evolutionary theory provided a more plausible account of the gradual consolidation of the state in its present form.

### SOCIAL CONTRACT THEORY

The distinction that the Greeks made between nature and convention was considered by many as the source of the social contract theory. One can find in the writings of the Sophists Antiphon, Hippias, Thrasymachus and Glaucon, the idea of an agreement as the beginning of the origin and organization of political society. Socrates (469-399 BC) in the Crito, illustrated the idea that implied contract and its concomitant obligations between the citizen and the state. Having remained and enjoyed the benefits of Athens as an adult he had thereby implicitly entered into an agreement with the state to abide by with its laws and thereby accept its authority over him in exchange for those benefits. The ancient Chinese did not look upon political authority as supernatural and the Emperor as divine. They justified and defended revolution. Government for Confucius (K'sung Fu Tzu, 551-479 BC) was not a divine institution but a product of human reason and sound virtue. Mencius (Meng Tzu, 372-289 BC) even declared that a ruler who departed from reason and virtue could be executed. A ruler was responsible for the quality of governance and was accountable to his subordinates. Throughout Chinese thought runs an ideal of a ruler who has to ensure the safety and the prosperity of his people. For the Hebrews, the

monarch was both an agent of God and a symbol of the people, implying that besides divine sanction the monarch needed the support of his people. Hebrew thinkers repudiated the idea that the same person exercised both priestly and kingly functions. They advocated separation, so that the priest checked and criticized the king, if and whenever necessary.

134

The idea of voluntarism, a crucial idea in the social contract tradition comes to western social thought with Augustine who borrows Cicero and Seneca, L. Annaeus'(c. 4 BC-65 AD) *bona voluntas* and broadens it into a pivotal moral concept. Though not a voluntarist or a contractarian, Augustine stresses on a strong nexus between consent and will, thus paving the way for the social contract theory. An Alsatian Monk, Manegold of Lautenbach, wrote in 1080 that 'if in any way the king transgresses the contract by virtue of which he is chosen, he absolves the people from the obligation of submission'. For Manegold, political authority exists for meeting certain needs of the people. Aquinas in whose writings the 'theory of Contract is finally hatched' (Barker 1960: viii) also speaks of artificial relationships, such as agreements among a group of individuals to certain legal, economic and political standards. He explains the origin of the state as being a 'kind of pact between king and people'. Marsilius argues that people constitute the only legitimate source of all political authority and make laws either by themselves or through elected representatives, and it is the people who elect, correct and, if necessary, depose the government, an idea that Locke subsequently develops elegantly and cogently. Engelbert of Volersdorf (1250-1311) was the first to state the idea of what came to be referred to as an original contract or *pactum subiectionis*, that implies the existence of a pre-political phase in human history. William of Ockham (1280/5-1349) and Nicholas of Cusa (1401-64) explicitly highlight the fact that a legitimate political authority depends on the free consent of subjects. Later writers refer to this as the state of nature. Salamonio in *De Principatu* (1511-13) like Manegold uses contractarian arguments to place limits on the power of princes. He claims that God and nature create all individuals as equals and the latter finds it necessary to establish kingdoms by an agreement between persons. Salamonio's importance lay in his conception of the political community or state (*civitas*) in Roman law which he terms as a *civilis societas* to mean a partnership made by free contract among individuals. The civil society is a partnership among individual citizens made possible by a contract between them. He considers political society and its laws prior to the creation of the prince. The original contract is between the individual citizens and not between the ruler and people. George Buchanan (1506-82), during the Reformation, endorses the idea of the contract. Francisco Suarez (1548-1617) argues that free will and consent are the cause of the state; that people will form one political body only on common consent that is voluntary. Richard Hooker (1554-1600) argues that the monarchs and bishops derive their authority from the consent of the community rather than from the divine right. Junius Brutus', (a pseudonymous French Huguenot) *Vindiciae Contra Tyrannos*, written in 1570s, reiterates the existence in all domains of a mutually obligatory contract between the king and his subjects that requires the people to obey faithfully and the king to govern lawfully. A transgression of faith by the prince frees people from their obligation of obedience. Prior to this is also another contract(s) that focusses on the role of the individuals and government

135

in the divine plan of the universe, as visualized by the Calvinists. This is covenant between God and the ruler and the people in, which the people undertake to honour and serve God, according to His will revealed in His word. A ruler who destroys true religion shall be resisted for the breach of the fundamental authorizing covenant. Johannes Althusius (1557-1638) establishes the authority of all princes and kings on an original contract between each people and its first ruler with a prior contract, the covenant of God that obliges the ruler to establish true religion and the people to resist him, if he does not do so. This is also preceded by a contract by which the political community itself—the people, commonwealth or realm— is first established. Like Salamonio, Althusius argues that these laws bound the ruler, being a part of the original contract between ruler and people. For Althusius, the parties to the commonwealth-forming contract are not individuals but provinces and cities, lesser political units with their government and laws. These were formed prior to the commonwealth by private associations and eventually contracting individuals. Through this hierarchy of contracts Althusius makes the authority of the commonwealth and in particular its ruler, the supreme magistrate a conditional delegation from its component units and their representatives. This leads to the derivation of the Calvinist doctrine that the lesser magistrates have a duty to resist a tyrannical and ungodly king. Till the time of Althusius the 'contract theory in politics was mainly invoked in order to justify resistance to rulers' (Lessnoff 1990: 10). The exception to this is Hobbes.

### **Contract Doctrine in Modern Times**

Hugo Grotius (1583-1654), Hobbes, Samuel Pufendorf (1632-94), Locke, Rousseau and Immanuel Kant (1724-1804) in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries, used the idea of the social contract to explain the origins and nature of the state and search for philosophical basis to moral and political obligation. Some like Kant<sup>1</sup> used the idea of contract to characterize a form of political association and regard it as a rational criterion of the just polity. The crux of the social contract theory is the idea that legitimate government is artificially and voluntarily agreed upon by free moral agents and it rejects the argument that there is something like natural political

<sup>1</sup> The noteworthy features of Kant's theory of the social contract are: first, he does not accept the supposition that the citizens of a particular state have actually concluded a social contract; it is an idea that should influence a person's motives and intentions in acting rather than one which arises in observing the world. Second, it is connected with a programme of political reform that the ruler and ruled of a state try to implement. Third, he tries to work out the idea at an international level, the relations among states as well as relations among individuals. Fourth, the notion of a social contract is in moral terms constructive of civil society because a civil society comes into being for Kant only in so far as we act as moral (or rational) agents (Williams 1994: 132-46).

136

authority. Wayper calls it the 'Will and the Artifice Tradition'. Hobbes, Locke and Rousseau, the classical exponents of the doctrine of the social contract produce political prescriptions that are profoundly at variance with one another. Hobbes places premium on order and through the contract justifies an all-powerful absolute state. Locke considers consent as the basis of a legitimate political authority and defends a minimal constitutional state. Rousseau regards freedom as supreme, which is possible in community based on common interest and, thus he



advances the notion of a moral state. However, common to their perceptions is the idea that an agreement made by all individuals who compose a state is the true foundation of the body politic. It is not a pact between ruled and rulers but one that establishes rule explained with reference to a transition from the state of nature to a civil state.

The idea of the social contract advances the notion of human equality as a result of the Protestant Reformation,<sup>2</sup> the civil wars that raged in Europe between 1560 and 1660 and the rapid expansion of the commercial economy and market relations. This idea of equality implies that all rule—just and legitimate—are constituted by the ruled who are free and equal thereby rejecting the notion of rule by right of birth, by divine right, by charisma, and by physical force. Most importantly it rejects the contention, which can be traced back to Plato, that only certain people are qualified to rule over the rest because they have an access to 'truth' whether religious revelation or scientific truth of ideology. Through an agreement between or by a multitude of individuals embedded in the notion of the social contract, isolated individuals voluntarily incorporate themselves into an acting unity, by creating a permanent union between the present contractors and with the successors of the original contractors (Forsyth 1994: 37-39). The classic contractualists also contrast the pre-political—the state of nature—from the political order, to explain the rationale for political society.

The contract theory in the seventeenth century criticized and provided a democratic alternative challenging absolutism and traditional dictatorship, part of the then dominant theory—Divine Right of Kings. This theory accepted the proposition that the sovereign rules by divine ordinance or that he was divinity himself. Augustus consciously promoted the idea to the government of Rome to legitimize his newfound absolutism. In 1610 in a speech that James I the British monarch, delivered, he argued that 'Kings are not only God's lieutenants upon earth and sit upon God's throne, but even by God himself they are called gods' adding that kings, 'exercise a manner or resemblance of divine power on earth'. Since the authority of the monarchs had been ordained by God himself for the benefit of humankind, the ruler had unlimited and indivisible sovereignty, though they were morally

2 The freedom to comply voluntarily has been the part of the Christian doctrine but the Reformation reinforced the idea of individual choice and responsibility. This perception naturally came into politics and became the intellectual basis for the social contract theory. All the classic social contract exponents were Protestants.

137

bound to follow the divine law. The theory became popular during the English Civil War. Filmer defended and modified its arguments.

Grotius stresses that the contract that establishes civil society constitutes a legal community compatible with individual's natural sociability and conformed to mutual recognition and protection of his moral rights. He believes that the contract actually takes place prior to the state in every community governed by law. Like Grotius, Hobbes considers self-preservation as a basic right. Through the state of nature, he portrays the dismal human existence since it prohibits the possibilities of commodious living that makes life meaningful and worthwhile. In the absence

of a common power to keep individuals in awe there are no legal or moral rules, no notions of right and wrong, justice and injustice. There is no property and each can take whatever he can get and so long as he can keep it. This state of nature is a state of war, 'a war of every man against every man'. Natural freedom and natural equality of individuals in the state of nature are the reasons for this intolerable and insecure life.

It such condition there is no place for Industry,... no Culture of the Earth; no Navigation, nor use of the commodities that may be imported by Sea; no commodious Building; no Instruments of moving such things as require much force, no knowledge of the face of the earth; no account of Time, no Arts; no Letters, no Society; and which is worst of all, continuall feare, and danger of violent death; And the life of man, solitary, poor, nasty, brutish and short (Hobbes 1991: 89).

The contract between one individual and the others enables them to come out of the state of nature, which is made possible due to the presence of natural laws. These natural laws are nineteen in all. Of these nineteen three are most important. These are (a) seek peace and follow it, (b) abandon the natural right to things and (c) that individuals must honour contracts. There is just one contract that creates both the civil society and an absolute political authority. The sovereign power, the third party is a consequence and not a party to the contract. The contract was perpetual and irrevocable. There is no question of individuals first contracting amongst themselves and then with the ruler thereby circumscribing his powers. Hobbes considers it the power of the sovereign to enforce contracts and make them binding.

Pufendorf criticizes Hobbes and goes back to the older notions of 'two contracts' for he argues that individuals established a sovereign without obtaining in return a promise of protection. Therefore, there must first be a contract to establish a political community, followed by a second one, between the community and its ruler. Interestingly, he does not concede the right of resistance, sharing Hobbes' perception that the pre-political state of nature is intolerable and the supreme political authority is by definition not accountable to or punishable by any person. The social contract creates the 'person of the state', demanding almost complete obedience. The state

138

has a personality that is distinct from the people who institute it. The state is a moral person with a will and capacity to bear rights and duties that none of the individual comprising it could claim in their own right. The aim of the state was to ensure the security of its citizens.

Locke developed Pufendorf's arguments convincingly. He restored the traditional role of the contract theory as a justification of resistance to government. However, he did not follow Pufendorf's multiple contracts and his tasks were twofold: first, to refute Filmer's criticisms of contractualism and second, to explain the origins of legitimate political authority. The First Treatise rejected the central arguments of Filmer,<sup>3</sup> which were reiterated in the Second Treatise and these are broadly four:

1. God does not give the relevant power to Adam.

2. Assuming Adam had been granted this power does not mean that his heirs would also have a right to it.
3. Even if Adam's heirs do have such a right, there are no clear rules of succession according to which the rightful heirs could be named.
4. Even if there were such rules, it would be impossible to identify Adam's actual heirs, considering the time span since God's original grant of power to him (Locke 1960: 307).

Through the technique of the social contract, Locke explains that consent is the basis of a legitimate political authority. Like Hobbes, he too begins with the idea of the state of nature. He rejects Filmer's biblical account of the origins of political power, without abandoning its religious foundations and acknowledges an explicit moral relationship between an individual and God. To preserve oneself and the well-being of others is a duty that an individual owed to God as part of God's creation as the basic moral law of nature, that existed in the pre-political state of nature. Like Grotius and Pufendorf, Locke viewed the state of nature as a social condition regulated by God's moral law. Political authority, like all moral claims for Locke was ultimately based on religious obligations, the source of all morality. He used the contract as a means to create a body politic but concurrently as a device, to subordinate the body politic to the 'Kingdom of God'. This is in sharp contrast to the rigid secularism of Hobbes who refused to begin from absolute moral presumptions, seeing the social contract as creating a temporal political power for fulfilling external peace, security and earthly felicity (Forsyth 1994: 39-40). The distinctiveness of Locke's argument was the two-staged contract as exemplified by two types of consent. The first contract created the civil society from the state of nature, to which the individual contractees directly consented and agreed to submit to the majority rule principle as the basis of decision-making. Unlike Hobbes, who considered

3 Filmer and not Hobbes was Locke's main antagonist. Locke as Strauss (1952: 226-30) contended was not presenting a disguised and moderate version of Hobbes (Laslett 1960: 60).

139

civil society as uniting otherwise morally unrelated individuals, Grotius, Pufendorf, Locke and Emmerich de Vattel (1714-67) regarded the civil society with its ensuing obligations as superimposed upon a universal moral community, thus, resulting in potential conflicts between one's duties as a citizen and a human being. While for Grotius the universal moral community of humankind is declared as a real constraint upon the activities of the state, Locke, Pufendorf and Vattel gradually place the state at the centre of international relations. They endorse a process that attains formal recognition and was greatly made easy by the Peace of Westphalia of 1648. The state becomes the principal moral entity through which the interests of individuals are expressed in the international society of states.

The provision for an explicit consent as declaration of one's allegiance at becoming an adult exists in the constitution of Carolina in the United States, that Locke helped to draft. The second contract creates political authority with all its institutions—legislature, courts and socially authorized property arrangements—in the nature of a 'fiduciary' power, a trust. Tacit consent

enables successor generations to consent to the arrangement upheld by the original contractors, thus, circumventing Filmer's criticism. Three indicators demonstrate tacit consent: the first is when a person possesses and enjoys property and transmits it to his heirs, which means he is obliged to the laws of that government. The second, when a person lodges for a week and third, when he is travelling freely on the highway. Thus, unlike Hobbes who in spite of providing a contractual and consensual basis to his sovereign power accepts not only political absolutism but also the fact that this absolute sovereign is self-perpetuating, Locke is a thoroughgoing contractualist. Hobbes rejects the premise but not the conclusion of the divine rights theory thus being midway precariously perched between a tradition that he does not thoroughly reject and the new, which he does not completely embrace. Locke, on the other hand rejects political absolutism, divine right theory and patriarchalism. He provides for a two-staged process to create government with two types of consent, to counter Filmer's defense of the divine basis of royal absolutism.

Rousseau uses the contract as a hypothesis to throw light on the human condition. He praises and dismisses the idea of social contract simultaneously. He criticizes Grotius, Hobbes, Locke and Pufendorf for reading back into the natural condition attributes and desires peculiar to civil society. Having identified inequality as the malaise of modern society he uses the contract in the *Social Contract* (1762) to design the right society to transform it into a just body politic from the one that is corrupted by self-interest. He tries to instill a strong sense of the community that ancient Sparta exhibited by diluting individualism. He retains the voluntarist theory of political obligation to legitimize sovereign authority by basing it on consent. Individuals would have both liberty and law if they are able to construct a society where they rule themselves through a contract of association that is not a pact of submission. Through the contract the individual expresses his reciprocal commitment to his fellow contractors and also as a member

140

of the state in relation to the sovereign that is deemed to possess a moral personality. The contract is between a collectivity that is a single moral person and each of its members taken individually. This collectivity is always right and always tends to the public good. Rousseau, like Hobbes, maintains that the individuals of the two contracting parties are responsible for upholding the terms of the contract, thus, arriving at the same conclusion as Hobbes but through a different route. Unlike Locke, for Rousseau the foundational contract as a mechanism of regulating the required balance between rights bearing individuals and government, or of obtaining the liberal functioning of institutions. For Rousseau, just like Hobbes the contract was constitutive of society itself, with a difference in the ends that they envisaged. For Hobbes, the ends were civil peace and commodious living, while for Rousseau it was to ensure that individuals unite without renouncing their liberty and the moral advancement of the components of civil society. The individual lost, through the social contract, his 'natural liberty and the absolute right to anything that tempts him and that he can take: what he gains by the social contract is civil liberty and the legal right of property in what he possess' (Rousseau 1958: 42). The contract replaces arbitrary relation that exists between persons with obedience of the citizen to the law and for this purpose, atomistic individuals with different wills transform themselves into a community with a common will or interest. For Rousseau, consent is the basis of society but emphasizes the importance of the community along with the need to protect individual

freedom. He attempts to reconcile the claims of the individual with that of the community through the notion of the General Will that emerges in an assembly of equal lawmakers. He categorically asserts that each person is free only if he obeys his own will that finds expression in the laws of the state of which he is the lawmaker. He visualizes a free state as a consensual and also the existence of participatory democracy. Rousseau is a critic of 'the fraudulent liberal social contract' (Pateman 1985:142-62). The liberal contract, argued Carole Pateman (1940-), served to justify social relationships and political institutions that already existed, while Rousseau's contract provides 'an actual foundation for a participatory political order of the future'. It is one of association based on self-assumed obligation and of substantive equality between 'active citizens who are political decision-makers'.

## CRITICS OF THE CONTRACT DOCTRINE

The use of the contract along with its attendant idea of consent has its criticisms and limits. Many critics found its language inappropriate because it suggests that the obligation to obey authority, and even its very legitimacy, depends upon an original agreement by which succeeding generations are bound or a continuously renewed agreement that can be revoked if its conditions are not met. The contract doctrine has been criticized for its historical ambiguity, unfeasibility and defective logic.

141

Filmer's long forgotten Patriarcha or the Natural Power of the King written between 1653-54 but published in 1680 is important, for it formed part of the context in which the social contract doctrine emerged in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries. It was the target of Locke and his fellow revolutionaries Tyrrell and Sidney. Furthermore, for present times many of Filmer's arguments resonate in the contemporary feminist critiques of contractarianism, and that of Pateman. Modern contractarians like Rawls, attempt to resurrect Kant while simultaneously responding to Hegel's criticisms of Kant. Most of the recent liberal/communitarian debate has labouriously tried to stress how neo-Kantianism can avoid the Hegelian inspired communitarian debate. Filmer contends that patriarchal authority is absolute and analogous to political authority. Having created Adam, God gave him authority over his family, the earth and its product. Adam was the first king and the present kings derive their rightful authority from this grant. Adam was thus the first king and the first father and the subsequent generations of men are not born free, but subjects to Adam and his successors with the powers of the father derived from God. Fathers, or patriarchs and their successors, exercise a natural authority that is inherent in the family, and command a natural obligation, that of children to their father. Fatherly authority for Filmer is both real and abstract. It inheres in natural fathers but it is not necessarily congenital: it is the authority that is natural, not the line of its decent. Filmer argues that kings are not now as they once were, the natural fathers of the families over which they rule, but 'they all either are, or are reputed to be, the next heirs to the first progenitors' (1991:10). Sons who are not themselves fathers, but who became heads of households or states, exercise the authority attached to the office. Hence queens, in the absence of kings, exercise paternal rather than maternal authority. Since God's original grant to Adam is unconditional, monarchial rule is also unlimited. Any attempt to restrain absolutism results in a limited or mixed monarchy. Divided sovereignty

weakens authority. Filmer does not support the idea of divided sovereignty though he makes the monarch obey God's laws.

Filmer criticizes contractualism, contending that if contractual arguments are true, then it results in two unacceptable consequences, which its advocates find hard to explain. First, it is not possible to provide for a continuing valid political authority. If all authority is vested on consent, then an individual who has not consented is not bound by the laws, implying that minorities, dissenters, non-voters (women and children) need not obey the law and the new ruler, since one has not consented to them. If the original contractors who establish society are free, then each generation (unless it consents) is not bound to obey the laws. This makes society unstable. If, on the contrary, one contends that succeeding generations have to obey because their father and forefathers had expressed their consent, then such argument is no different from the one championed by the patriarchists. Filmer argues, contrary to the contractualists, that men are not born free but into families, and hence subject to the authority of their fathers. There is nothing like

142

natural liberty and equality. Individuals confer their authority upon a ruler, because they have none. Natural rights exist but they are not universal for 'there is, and always shall be continued to the end of the world, natural right of a supreme father over every multitude' (Filmer 1991: 11). Fathers have natural rights and the power to consent to the transfer of their authority to another party. Such transfers are however unconditional because the power exercised is not derived from consenting heads of families, but is merely substituted by God and acknowledged by them. Moreover, relationships of subordination are natural and that individuals are not equal for a son is subject to the authority of his father. The second argument related to property rights. Filmer thinks that those who explain the origin of government with reference to consent of free individuals find it difficult to establish either feasible or morally acceptable political authority or rightful private possession of goods. Filmer like many of his contemporaries adheres to the view that each individual is God's property and does not have a right to take his own life. It is therefore absurd to harbour the idea that consenting individuals confer a power that they do not themselves have, namely that of life and death, upon a sovereign. Only God has this power and it is He who confers it upon kings. Locke not merely refutes Filmer's patriarchal theory but also rejects his critique of contractualism as absurd by providing an explanation about the origins of political power and private property.

In the eighteenth century, there were efforts to explore 'the true foundation of. society' without using the social contract theory and its attendant idea that society was a mere collection of individuals whose psychological ends conclude in social institutions. One such effort was by Montesquieu. He insists that human beings need to be reminded that they live in society and are 'governed by many factors: climate, religion, law, the precepts of government, the examples of the past, customs, manners; and from the combination of such influences there arises a general spirit'. The individual will be shaped by the particular social associations in which he lives. Political and moral systems are to be judged in terms of the social context in which they exist.



Maistre provides a more extreme defense for natural authority by rejecting the contractarian conception of the individual as a free and equal subject. He directs his arguments against European Enlightenment and French Revolutionaries in general, and against Rousseau's conception of natural equality and popular sovereignty, in particular. Like Filmer, he regards human being's natural condition as social. Unlike the former's subtle charges against the contract doctrine, Maistre's arguments are a more virulent attack on the presumption of human beings to challenge a Divine injunction and God's authoritative will. The contract theory's attempt to justify political authority and political obligation are seen as examples of human beings' sinful pride. It is precisely because of this that there is a need for unquestionable political authority in the person of the monarch. Any attempts to establish equal civil or political authority only results in barbarism and

143

chaos. Maistre perceives human nature and human condition to be similar to that of Hobbes but does not consider it necessary to derive political authority from contractarian arguments. Instead it is the Divinely instituted and authoritative will of God. He does not merely reject contractarianism but any effort to question, legitimize or circumscribe political authority, thus, forming an important source for extreme anti-rationalist conservatism. Lamennais too rejects Rousseau's contract theory, dismissing it as absurd for no society visualized as a random collection of individuals coming together by chance has ever originated in this manner. Furthermore, any pact has sanctions to ensure its implementation but Rousseau's has none that will stop the people from reclaiming their sovereignty. The social contract according to Lamennais reduces society into one vast realm where private interests dominate, for governments act purely for self-preservation and aggrandizement. Having dethroned God and kings, it has also dethrones human beings, reducing them to animals with consequences like turmoil and revolution. For Constant, the fact that Rousseau does not acknowledge any limits is the most serious threat to liberty. Proudhon perceives Rousseau's contract to be one of hatred, 'an offensive and defensive alliance of those who possess against those who do not possess'. Proudhon proposes a 'free contract' that leads to the dissolution and eventual disappearance of the state, which he thinks is possible if one moves away from politics to economics. A proper contract is not between the ruled and ruler, as Rousseau contends, but between individuals as individuals for equal exchange of goods and services of equal value. Beyond this each of the contractees is perfectly independent. This is possible when there is perfect equilibrium. Reacting to the excesses of the French Revolution and fearing its adverse effects on England, Burke points out that the overall structure of society cannot be reduced to a mere contract between two or more parties similar to a trade agreement, that is more transient and which can be dissolved by the parties involved. Society, in his memorable words,

is a partnership in all science, a partnership in all art, a partnership in every virtue and in all perfection. As the ends of such a partnership cannot be obtained in many generations, it becomes a partnership not only between those who are living, but between those who are living, those who are dead and those who are to be born. Each contract of a particular state is but a clause in the great primeval contract of eternal natures, connecting the visible and invisible world, according to a fixed compact sanctioned by the inviolable oath which holds all physical and all moral natures, each in their appointed place (Burke cited in Curtis 1961b: 59).

Thomas Paine (1737-1809) criticizes Burke by reiterating Locke, that government is an outcome of a social contract between the people themselves. He criticizes the British constitution for being unwritten and hence unhelpful as a reference point. Its precedents are all arbitrary, contrary to reason and

144

common sense. Hume was the most virulent critic of contractarism without propping the theories of Divine Right and patriarchy. In *A Treatise of Human Nature* (1739-40), he submits that societies are prior to governments and the most likely reason why governments come into existence is not because of disagreement between members of the same society but external threats and conflicts. The sudden dangers to which societies are vulnerable necessitates retaliatory and immediate authoritative responses and a single individual assumes charge. Hume argues that this natural origin of monarchy is perhaps more convincing than the argument that it is derived from the natural right of patriarchy. He points out that most of the present governments, except for some stray cases, are not established through consent or contract, so there is no universal acceptance of the theory, a point that influences Bentham. Even if it is assumed that some kind of contact has taken place at an earlier time, the old contract cannot bind future generations. Authority in the long run is based on necessities of circumstances and not on consent. Not only in Persia and China but even in Holland and England, where consent was proclaimed as the basis of authority most people did not remember when they gave their consent. Nor was there any record of their ancestors giving their consent. Regarding tacit consent, Hume points out that even if this is a criterion of consent, it is one that can never be applied. Most places fell under some jurisdiction and those that did not were without the necessary conveniences and comforts of the existing system, whatever the basis of its legitimacy. He concludes that the social contract doctrine is superfluous and unnecessary. He accepts the contention of Grotius and Pufendorf that civil society is formed because of self interest but regrets their conclusion to base political obligation in the natural law of keeping faith with one's promises. He concedes that while consent is the basis of legitimizing the origins of government it is interest that ensures the continuing existence of its authority. As governments secure peace and commodious living, it is not direct or tacit consent, but one's interests that obligates one to render obedience. Hume's defense of authority and obedience is akin to Burke but unlike the latter he does not exalt virtues of tradition and convention but regards self interest as the basis of obligation. Bentham rejects social contract as pure fiction and points out that the binding force of a contract comes from a government and from the habit of enforcement and not vice-versa. This habit of obedience will continue as long as the ruler(s) acts in the interest of the ruled, or more precisely if it is possible to maximize the greatest happiness of the greatest number.

Hegel rejects the contract doctrine, for it assumes separateness and autonomy of the individuals rather than their unity. Paradoxically, he accepts voluntarism, a core idea of the contract doctrine. He points out, in modern times claims are made for private judgement, private will and private conscience whereas in pre-modern times individual wills coincided with the will of the state. The contract doctrine, according to Hegel, conceives the state as a voluntary association with obligations freely chosen

145

and accords priority to private over public right, ignoring the fact that the former is dependent on the latter and not the other way around as the contract theory claims. The state is not a contractual institution for the protection of property rights of the individuals nor is it a private property of the monarch. The state is an ethical arrangement in which individuals realize their capacities. They are born into it with the capacity to acquire rights and duties that have originated as a result of human practices and which the state can sustain and do not choose it with natural rights. Hegelians and post-Hegelian German philosophers stress the organic unity, individuality and moral autonomy of the state and reject the contractarian arguments for its legitimacy. Bluntschili criticizes Pufendorf and Locke, and to a lesser extent Kant, for not considering the will of the person of the state as composed of the wills of each individual. Bluntschili considers the social contract theory as historically and logically absurd. Marx accepts Hegel's contention that the individual was a social creation and criticizes abstract individualism espoused by the contract doctrine. However, unlike Hegel for whom the state fulfills a person's rational nature, Marx believes in the emergence of a genuine community after the withering away of the state following a revolutionary transformation of society. Interestingly, recent communitarianism deriving inspiration from Hegel's anti-contractarianism accepts the community as a moral ideal and rejects Rawls' Kantian contractarianism. The feminists focus on the contract doctrine for its conception of the natural condition of the individual as being one of freedom and equality. Pateman considers the whole conception of society as a contractual association between free and equal citizens as part of the problem that needs to be addressed if women are to free themselves from the male dominance of modern societies. Locke, Kant and Rousseau are criticized because they explicitly exclude women from the class of rational subjects who consent to political rule. Moreover, the idea of the individual as a free and equal subject is a male classification because it accepts the pre-existing sexual division of labour that entrusts women with the tasks and responsibilities of the domestic sphere thereby freeing the man to concentrate on the public or political realm. Pateman (1988) points out that with few exceptions most contractarians conceived of women as subordinates of men with the establishment of the civil society. She does not agree with the claim of the contractualists that they have defeated patriarchy for what they have done is to replace fraternity with patriarchalism—father's right to rule. The sexual dominance of men over women replaces the dominance of the fathers over women. By maintaining relations between sexes as private the liberal theorists remove the subject from political enquiry, thus doing little to alter the status of women. By disregarding women as individuals in the same way as men, even reforms that grant them contractual opportunities as similar as men cannot alter the sexual basis of the social contract. She concedes that identifying the sources of women's subordination is only the beginning of reconstructing politics and institutions free from sex inequality. Coole (1993) agreeing with Pateman

146

points out that the idea of social contract, both in its individualism and a theory of justice operates with masculinity as its norm.

## EVOLUTIONARY THEORY

The Evolutionary Theory contends that the state is a product of historical growth and gradual evolution and that a variety of factors have contributed to its emergence. Among these the main

factors that have helped in the formation of the state are kinship, religion and political consciousness. The first of the earliest societies is the family. The desire to reproduce motivates the adolescent to move outside the old family and form a new one. Each new family is a union of two families. The kin comes into existence when consanguinity is recognized and grows into an order of society. The kin-relationship, according to MacIver, is a time-bracket while the political structure that binds the families and individuals that it includes is space-bracket. An ordering of society is not possible if human beings are merely conscious of their common descent through time; rather they have to be conscious of their present common interest and common nature. Kinship is reinforced by social relationship.

In the early kin relationships maternity was a far more definitive guide than paternity and the bond between the mother and her children was stronger and lasting than that of fatherhood, thereby, making it easy to trace descent through the mother and giving the family the misnomer of a matriarchal family. Sometimes, custom ordained that the bridegroom must leave his home and his people and enter the family group to which his bride belonged. In certain cases the chief or king owed his office to the right that marriage granted and which he stood to lose in the event of the death of his spouse. However, all these did not mean that the female wielded any power or exalted position, for, in reality, she was only a representative of transference. On closer examination it also revealed that the wife and the mother had a social rather a personal status that offset man's natural dominance. As authority developed and organizations grew men gained dominance of groups mainly because of their physical superiority. Domestication of wild animals, increased wealth, control of property, pursuit of pastoral industry and the institution of slavery reinforced this dominance. Of these factors control of wealth and property was the most important for that gave social dominance to the male.

The early patriarchal society was organized on the basis of kinship through males. Women were regarded as a form of property and polygamy was common. The patriarch had complete control of the home and with his death the eldest male descendant carried forward the authority. From the original patriarchal group probably there were groups and sub-groups, each headed by a male who formed the council of elders and assisted the patriarch. The patriarch later became the tribal chieftain with military, judicial and religious authority. The patriarchal society was governed with the help of customs that played a more important role than law. Yet, there

147

was no definite sense of morality or legality. The patriarch enforced customs becoming both the judge and executioner simultaneously. In the course of time, custom developed into law. The state arose when authority became government and custom was translated into law. The patriarchal society differed from modern society in being personal rather than territorial. Since kinship was the cementing factor the entire group migrated with its organization intact. The early kings were kings of their people and not of their land. The patriarchal society was exclusive, confining its membership to its people and it kept strangers out. It was non-competitive and communal where the group, their freedom and rights was all that mattered.

The next important factor in the rise and growth of social consciousness and state was religion. According to Gettel, kinship and religion were considered to be identical. Common worship

reinforced kinship by disciplining the early man to authority. Patriarchal religion was universally ancestor worship, for that ensured a sense of continuity and immortality and therefore, enforced strictly within the group. Rituals, like annual offering to the dead, created a sense of bond among the descendents. When the patriarch became the tribal chief he also assumed the role of high priest interpreting customs and often the magic-man or the medicine man. The combination of earthly authority with religious authority gave the chief a sense of aura instilling reverence and awe in his followers. When the patriarchal tribe began to expand by incorporation or conquest, nature worship arose to reinforce patriarchal religion. Religion and political rule were so intertwined that it was difficult to differentiate the two. Obedience to law and to authority rested largely on the divine power of the ruler and in the sacredness of immemorial institution.

Political consciousness was the third most important factor that led to the rise of the state. Once the early man settled down in a territory and took to cultivating the land and domesticating cattle, population began to increase, wealth accumulated and the idea of property developed. Economic life became complex and diverse. All these necessitated an organization that ensured order, security and protection to person and property. The state steadily grew with help of war and conquest, for more land was needed for the growing population and its needs. War and conquest not only helped in extending the area of government but also in consolidating political power. The victors in war became kings and nobles giving rise to stratification in society. Once the state came into existence it developed from simple forms to complex forms. The modern state the now familiar entity goes back to the sixteenth century.

## **THE RISE AND DEVELOPMENT OF THE MODERN NATION STATE**

This section examines the factors that gave rise to the nation states in Europe and studies the reasons because of which the nation state became the supreme form of the modern state. As regards the first question, the

148

reasons for the rise of the nation state are also coincidentally the factors in the formation of Europe and vice-versa. The creation of nation states in Europe has contributed to the distinct identity that Europe has. The state system of Europe has exerted exceptional influence in the world beyond Europe, for European colonization has positively drawn the political map of the modern world.<sup>4</sup> It is interesting, for a larger part of human history, human beings have lived without states but not without governments. States are historical phenomena emerging under particular conditions changing and quite fluid, without actually being fixed. The pre-state political communities were enormously divergent—all the more so since they often developed out of each other, interacted with each other, conquered each other and merged with each other to produce infinite varied forms, most of them hybrid. It may be possible to classify these into (1) tribes without rulers (2) tribes with rulers, (chiefdoms) and (3) city-states.

### **Tribes without Rulers**

There were no states where human beings lived in hunting and gathering communities, small agrarian units and the regions inhabited by sparsely populated nomadic and semi-nomadic people. Even today anthropologists point out to communities that have no states, for example, the Jale Pale of the New Guinea highlands, the pastoral Anuak, Dinka, Masai and Nuer of the South Sudan, the M'dendeuile and Arusha of East Africa and some pre-Columbian Amerindian tribes in North and South America. In all these, government began and ended with the extended family, lineage or clan. None was superior except for men, elders, parents and no one was inferior except for women, young and children. The kin defined social relations and its rights and obligations. Within the kin one's sex, age and marital status determined an individual's position. In the absence of institutional authority, except for what operated within an extended family, these societies were egalitarian and democratic. All adult males were equal. Public tasks were performed not by rulers and ruled but by leaders and followers. The absence of centralized authority also meant absence of permanent, specialized war-making armed forces or even popular militias. None of these societies had a system of rent, tribute or taxation that redistributed wealth, or a class of individuals with leisure. Institutional religion hardly played any role and every household chief was also his own

4 The four waves of state creation that created the present world's political map were (a) the nineteenth century withdrawal of Spanish and Portuguese colonialism from Latin America (b) the fall of dynastic empires at the end of the First World War in 1918 (c) collapse of European overseas empires in Asia, Africa, Caribbean and the Pacific regions after the Second World War and (d) the emergence of nations in Eastern and Central Europe after the collapse of the former USSR in 1989.

149

priest. However, the priest did not have the right to command obedience, levy taxes, have an organized following to enforce their wishes and did not exercise command in war. Their methods were persuasion and mediation but not coercion.

## **Chieftoms**

These existed in many societies in Southeast, West and South Africa, as well as over Southeast Asia, Polynesia, Hawaii and New Zealand. History tells us of tribes that destroyed the Mycenaean civilization and ruled Greece between 1000 and 750 BC. These tribes were the various Gothic, Frankish and other Germanic tribes as they were from the later centuries of the Roman empire and the Scandinavian tribes during the tenth century just before they became Christianized and turned towards more centralized forms of government. In chieftoms, the chief had an elevated position over other people with the right to command them. This right claimed as divine became the basis of succession from father to son. This led to frequent clashes and warfare. Most of these societies were polygamous. Women for their looks or their noble lineages were status symbols for their owners. Their labour was also a source of wealth. The natural result of polygyny was a large number of sons, candidates for succession when the time came, resulting in potential conflicts. Normally the chief's first or principal wife was descended from an eminent family and her offspring(s) enjoyed precedence over the rest. Next to the chief, society was divided into two different layers or classes—privileged group, small and consisting of the chief's extended family,



lineage or clan. They enjoyed special rights such as access to the chief, a higher compensation in case of injury or death and immunity from certain kinds of punishment that were considered degrading. They wore special insignia and clothing and in areas with moderate climate they were distinguished by tattoos. Their position in society depended exactly on their relationship to the chief. From these people the chief selected the provincial rulers and since they had some claim to succession they were rarely appointed to senior court positions. Below the royal lineage or clan were the numerous class of commoners: such as the ancient Greek labourers or thetes, subject to different kinds of discrimination, such as, not being allowed to own cattle (the Hutu in Burundi and Rwanda), ride stallions (the bonders in pre-Christian Scandinavia), wear feather headgear (the Americas) or bear arms. In an event of injury or death they got very little compensation and their punishment was savage. They were not blood relations of the chief. In parts of Africa the chief and the commoners belonged to different ethnic groups and did not share the same customs or speak the same language. The commoners owed allegiance to the chief. The chief had extensive powers especially in large territories he stood at the apex of a pyramid consisting of regional sub-chiefs. The chiefdoms became the first political entities to institute rent, tribute and taxation, forms of compulsory unilateral payments from the ruled to the rulers

150

leading to concentration of wealth in the ruling few. The precise nature of the wealth paid depended on the resources made possible by the environment and also on custom. Everywhere it consisted of staple crop like rice and grain. There could be prestigious objects also, such as fine domestic animals, clothes in various forms and in some societies, women. Some of the tributes paid to the chief's storehouses were directly by his tenants. The rest of the population made payments to the sub-chiefs who, having collected them, took their cut which was not fixed, and depended on how much they could get away without inviting the wrath of the chief and passed the rest on. Both the chiefs and sub-chiefs possessed additional sources of revenue originating in their right to exercise justice, such as fees, fines, the belongings of condemned persons and often bribes. There also existed some form of licensing system under which chiefs of all ranks demanded and received payment for granting their subjects certain privileges like the right to hold markets, engage in long-distance trade, go on raiding expeditions against other tribes (part of the booty went to the chief) and so on. In short, there was hardly any economic activity in which the chief was not involved and from which he did not get his share.

## City States

These were overwhelmingly rural with a livelihood that was hunting, gathering, cattle-raising, fishing and agriculture practiced at the subsistence level. Most of these people were nomadic or semi-nomadic. There were three types of cities in the first, the majority were ruled by petty chiefs, known as lugal in ancient Middle East, wanax in the Mycenaean world and kshatriya in India. This type differed from the chiefdoms, mainly by their more sophisticated administrative system and a more complex social structure. The second type of cities were not independent communities but served as either capitals or as provincial centers like Mesopotamia in 235 BC, China from the time of the first imperial dynasties; India during the periods of centralized empire (320-185 BC, AD 320-500 and AD 1526-1707) and pre-Columbian Latin America. The third type comprised of self-governing cities that existed in pre-dynastic Mesopotamia confined to the

Mediterranean littoral. Only in such self-governing cities were Greeks, Romans and possibly also Etruscans and Phoenicians (Carthage) able to come up with a new principle of government.

The earliest important political organization was the polis or the city-state in Greece that began as a common association for the security and for the satisfaction of daily needs but gradually became the pivot around which all human activity—moral, intellectual, social, cultural, aesthetic and practical life revolved. The Greek archipelago consisted of many islands among which Athens, Crete and Sparta were well-known. Mountainous terrain, valleys and rivers physically separated these islands. In spite of their territorial and political separateness, the Greeks shared cultural and social unity due to one language, common religious rituals and Olympic

151

festivals. The Greeks never called themselves Greeks but Hellenes. Most of the city-states were small and compact in size and population. Athens between 750-550 BC had 40,000 square miles of territory and 40,000 citizens and 400,000 mixed population. The limit on size was important, for the Greeks were convinced that good order could be sustained only in small cohesive communities. It was both self-sufficient and self-governing. It was the cradle to the ideas of democracy, constitutional government and the due process of law, which were transmitted through Rome to the modern Europe. Rome also put into practice the Stoic idea of a universal society and the need for a uniform system of law. A number of textbooks, case books and codes of law were devised by a group of trained lawyers at the level of theory and for practical use of officials. The Romans established a system of jurisprudence as a system of general rules by which actions could be classified clearly with definitions. Gaius, Paulus and Ulpian's treatises were systematic delineations of constitutional and political institutions. In order to unify the divergent peoples within the empire, to deal with the colonies it had conquered, to deal with aliens, to advance the idea of common citizenship and to settle commercial cases with foreign traders a system of law was needed and that was provided by the formulation of a law of nations (*jus gentium*). This worked alongside the Stoic law of nature (*jus naturale*), the law common to all nations and the law common to all human beings. Roman lawyers also attempted to distinguish between public law—in essence constitutional law—and private law that which concerned private individuals and the institution of private property.

Roman law is still a monumental achievement in its clarity and practicality. The Roman concept of a scientific jurisprudence has influenced the whole of Western thought (Curtis 1961 Vol 1: 117).

Approximately sixteen hundred years ago, Roman Empire under Theodosius I (379-95) was the last sole ruler and that split after his death into Western and Eastern Roman Empires. In comparison to the East the western side of the Empire sustained recurring attacks and thus became weak. In AD 410, the city of Rome was attacked by roaming Germanic tribes and fell in 476 AD following the dethroning of the last Roman Emperor of the West. The Eastern portion was economically safer than the West because the export trade in spices and other commodities continued through the Middle Ages until the Islamic Ottoman Empire challenged it in 1453. The centuries following the disintegration of the Roman Empire saw no other imperial power in Europe, which continued to be ravaged by wars. The political map continued to be drawn and

redrawn, as was evident from the presence of five hundred, more or less independent political units, with ill-defined boundaries in the late fifteenth century. This process continued till 1900 (Tilly 1975: 15). Five types of states can be distinguished since the fall of Rome in the fifth century: (1) traditional tribute-taking empires; (2) system of divided authority characterized by feudal relations, city-states

152

and urban alliances, with the Church (Papacy) playing a leading role from eighth to sixteenth centuries; (3) the polity of estates from the fourteenth to sixteenth centuries; (4) absolutist states from fifteenth to eighteenth centuries and (5) modern nation-states with constitutional, liberal democratic or single party polities locked progressively into a system of nation states (Held 1992: 78).

## **Empires**

Imperial systems or empires of varying sizes and grandeur have dominated the history of states over the centuries. Some, such as Rome and China retained institutional forms for considerable period of time. Empires have sustained themselves through focus on coercive means and the ability to make money and through accumulation and when this ability decreased, they disintegrated. All empires were expansionists, which was the main cause for their development. Empires having long distance trading routes met their economic requirements through the exaction of tribute that sustained the emperor, his administrative and military apparatuses. Paradoxically, in spite of being powerful, their administrative authority was limited since they lacked the institutions, organizations, personnel and information to provide for regular administration in their territories. Most empires contained a plethora of communities that were culturally diverse and heterogeneous. Ruling rather than governing, was intrinsic to empires for their dominance in social and geographical space was restrictive. The polities of empires busied themselves with conflicts and intrigue within dominant groups and classes and within local urban centres; beyond that use of military force was to knit peoples and territories together.

## **Feudalism**

Feudalism was a political system with an overlapping and divided authority. It took different forms between eighth and fourteenth centuries. Its distinguishing feature was a 'network of interlocking ties and obligations with system of rule fragmented into many small autonomous parts' (Poggi 1978: 27). Political power was local and personal in nature producing a 'social world of overlapping claims and powers' (Anderson 1974: 149). There was no one ruler or state sovereign in the sense of being supreme over a given territory and people (Bull 1977: 254). War was frequent and tensions endemic. The early roots of feudalism date back to the remnants of the Roman Empire and to the militaristic culture and institutions of Germanic tribal peoples (Poggi 1990: 35-37). There was a special relationship between a ruler or lord or king generally recognized or 'nominated' by followers on the basis of his military and strategic skills. The warriors swore faithfulness and obeisance to their lord and secured in return protection and privileges. In the late seventh century rulers bestowed vassals with the

153

rights of land, later called feudum ('fief') in the hope of securing continued loyalty, military service and flows of income. As a consequence, a hierarchy of lord, vassal and peasants, distinguished by a great chain of relations and obligations as major vassals sub-contracted parts of their lands to others. The vast majority of people were at the bottom of the hierarchy but they constituted the subject of a political relationship (Poggi 1978: 23). While the feudal kings were *primus inter pares* or first among equals they, with the exception of England and France, had diverse privileges and duties that included the need to consult and negotiate with the most powerful lords or barons, when taxes or armies were to be raised. The autonomous military capability that the lord was expected to maintain was for supporting their kings but this provided them with an independent power base which they at times used to promote their own interests. While some political forces pushed for centralization other sought local autonomy, thus, leading to disintegrative tendencies. In medieval Europe, agriculture was the basis of the feudal economy and its surplus were diverted for competing claims and the one that succeeded, constituted a basis to create and sustain political power. The complex network of kingdoms, principalities, duchies and other centres of power was challenged by the emergence of alternative powers in the towns and cities that depended on trade, manufacture and high capital accumulation. Different social and political structures emerged as independent centres like Florence, Venice and Sienna in Italy. Europe in the Middle Ages meant 'Christendom' securing overarching unity from the Holy Roman Empire and the Papacy. The Holy Roman Empire existed in some form from the eighth to the early nineteenth century. Under the patronage of the Catholic Church, the Empire represented an attempt at its zenith, to unite and centralize the fragmented power centres of western Christendom into a politically unified Christian empire. Countries from Germany to Spain and from northern France to Italy federated under the Empire. However, the complex power structures of feudal Europe, on the one hand, and the Catholic Church, on the other, circumscribed the actual secular power of the Empire. The Catholic Church was the main rival power to the medieval feudal and city networks and the Church, throughout the Middle Age, subordinated the secular to spiritual authority. It emphasized that Good lay, in the submission to God's will. In the absence of any theoretical alternative to the theocratic positions of Pope and Holy Roman Empire, this order was described as the order of 'international Christian society' (Bull 1977: 27). It was first Christian, regarding God as the arbiter of disputes and conflicts with reference to religious doctrine and was coated with presumptions about the universal nature of human community. The rise of national states and Reformation gave rise to the idea of the modern state that challenged western Christendom. Its basis was prepared by the development of a new form of political identity—national identity.

154

### **The Polity of Estates**

This can be traced to the crisis within feudalism that is understood to have begun around 1300. The decline of feudalism began with the emergence of new concepts and ideas, for example, the claims of different social groups or estates (nobility, clergy and leading townsmen or burghers) to political prerogatives, specifically to rights of representation. Though these were extensions of existing feudal relations they had some distinctive and new qualities.

In the first place, in the polity of estates the rulers present themselves primarily not as feudal superiors, but as the holders of higher, public prerogatives of non—and often pre-feudal origins, surrounded by the halo of a higher majesty; often imparted by means of sacred ceremonies (for example, the *sacre du roi*, consecration of a king). In the second place, the counterpart to the ruler is typically represented not by individuals but by constituted bodies of various kinds: local assemblies of aristocrats, cities, ecclesiastical bodies, corporate associations. Taken singly, each of these bodies—the 'estates' represents a different collective entity: a region's noblemen of a given rank, the residents of a town, the faithful of a parish or the practitioners of a trade. Taken together, these bodies claim to represent a wider, more abstract, territorial entity—country, Land, terra, pays—which, they assert, the ruler is entitled to rule only to the extent that he upholds its distinctive customs and serve its interests.

In turn, however, these interests are largely identified with those of the estates; and even the customs of the country or the region in question have as their major components the different claims of the various estates. Thus, the ruler can rule legitimately only to the extent that periodically he convenes the estates of a given region or of the whole territory into a constituted, public gathering (Poggi 1990: 40-41).

In these situations the rulers had to deal with estates and estates, had to deal with rulers resulting in the emergence of a variety of estate-based assemblies, parliaments, diets and councils which sought to legitimate and enjoy autonomous faculties of rule. The polity of estates meant dual power, the power split between rulers and estates, which did not last long. It was threatened by the estates seeking more power and by the monarchy hoping to undermine the assemblies in order to centralize power in their own hands. With the loosening of feudal traditions and customs, notions like nature and limits of political authority, rights, law and obedience began to engage political theorists.

## **Absolutist States**

From the fifteenth to the eighteenth centuries Europe had two types of

155

regimes: the 'absolute' monarchies of France, Prussia, Austria, Spain, Sweden and Russia and 'constitutional' monarchies and republics in England and Holland. These two regimes differed in conceptual and institutional sense but some of these differences were more apparent than real. Absolutism was made possible by the absorption of smaller and weaker political units into larger and stronger political systems; an invigorated ability to rule over a united territorial space; a tightened system of law and order enforced throughout a territory; the application of a 'more unitary, continuous, calculable and effective' rule by a single sovereign head; and the development of a relatively small number of states engaged in an 'open-ended, competitive, and risk-laden power struggle' (Poggi 1978: 60-61). The absolutist rulers claimed that they alone had the legitimate right of decision over state affairs as evident from the statement attributed to Louis XV, King of France from 1715 to 1774:

In my person alone resides the sovereign power, and it is from me alone that the courts hold their existence and their authority. That . . . authority can only be exercised in my name . . . For it is to me exclusively that the legislative power belongs .... The whole public order emanates from me since I am its supreme guardian .... The rights and interests of the nation . . . are necessarily united with my own and can only rest in my hands (cited in Held 1992: 83).

The absolute king claimed to be the supreme source of human law although he justified his writ rule as being derived from the law of God, backed by the divine right theory. He stood at the pinnacle of a new system of rule that was progressively centralized and his sovereign authority to be supreme and indivisible. All qualities were visible in the rituals and routines of courtly life. There were developments, six in all that are crucial to the history of state system: uniform system of rule within a territory, creation of new mechanisms of law-making and law-enforcement; the centralization of administrative power; extension of fiscal management; the formalization of relations among states through the development of diplomacy and diplomatic institutions and the introduction of a standing army. Absolutism accelerated the process of state-making that began to decrease social, economic and cultural disparity within states and expand the variation among them (Tilly 1975: 19).

One reason for the expansion of state administrative power was because of its ability to collect and store information about its subjects and use that for supervising them (Giddens 1985: 14-15). This meant the need to rely more on cooperative forms of social relations, for force alone could not be the basis of managing its affairs and sustaining its offices and activities. As a consequence there was an increased mutuality between the rulers and ruled, and since more reciprocity was involved there were more opportunities for subordinate groups to influence their rulers (Giddens 1985: 198). Briefly absolutism encouraged the development of new forms and limits on

156

state power—constitutionalism and for the eventual participation of powerful groups in the process of government itself. Absolute regimes in comparison to ancient emperor were limited despotisms, for they were not the sole source of law, of coinages, weights and measures, of economic monopolies and could not impose compulsory cooperation. The absolutist ruler owned only his own estates (Mann 1986: 478) and was weak in relation to powerful groups in society, for example, the nobility, merchants and urban bourgeoisie. Like its constitutional counterparts, the absolutist state tried to coordinate the activities of these groups and build up the state's infrastructural strength. A complex set of factors are responsible for the historical changes that changed medieval notion of politics. Struggle between the monarch and barons over the domain of rightful authority; peasant rebellion against excessive taxes and weighing social obligations; the spread of trade, commerce and market relations; the prospering of Renaissance culture with renewed interest in classical political ideas that included Athenian democracy and Roman law; changes in technology particularly with regard to military skills; the consolidation of national monarchies particularly in England, France and Spain; religious conflicts and the challenge to Catholicism's universal claims and the struggle between the Church and State were all contributory factors. By the end of the seventeenth century, Europe was no longer a mosaic of states. The claim of each state to supreme authority and control also meant the recognition of such a claim by other states as equally entitled to autonomy and respect within their own borders.



In international context, sovereignty signified the independence of the state, namely an acknowledgement of its sole rights to jurisdiction over a particular group and territory, acceptance of a similar right of other states and equal rights to self-determination. In international relations, the principle of sovereign equality of all states was to become pre-eminent in the formal conduct of states with one another. With the emergence of international society, there also emerged international law as exemplified by the Westphalian<sup>5</sup> model covering a period from 1648 to 1945 and its features are:

1. The world consists of, and is divided by, sovereign states, which recognize no superior authority.
2. The processes of law-making, the settlement of disputes and law-enforcement are largely in the hands of individual states subject to the logic of 'the competitive struggle for power'.
3. Differences among states are often settled by force: the principle of effective power holds sway. Virtually no legal fetters exist to curb the resort to force; international legal standards afford minimal protection.

<sup>5</sup> This came about after the Peace of Westphalia of 1648 that brought to an end the Eighty-years war between Spain and the Dutch and the German phase of the Thirty-years war.

157

4. Responsibility for cross-border, wrongful acts are a private matter concerning only those affected; no collective interest in compliance with international law is recognized.
5. All states are regarded as equal before the law; legal rules do not take into account asymmetries of power.
6. International law is oriented to the establishment of minimal rules of co-existence; the creation of enduring relationship among states and peoples is an aim only to the extent that it allows military objectives to be met.
7. The minimization of impediments on state freedom is the 'collective' priority (Cassese 1986: 396, Falk 1969).

The era of absolutist states and its constitutional counterpart ushered in a new international order, which had a enduring and contradictory quality rich in implications: an increasingly integrated states system simultaneously endorsed the right of each state to autonomous and independent action. As a result the state were 'not subject to international moral requirements because they represent separate and discrete political orders with no common authority among them' (Beitz 1979: 25). According to this model, the world comprises of separate political powers pursuing their own interests, and backed ultimately by their organization of coercive powers.

## **Modern State**

Absolutism, by concentrating political power in its own hands and in seeking to create a central system of rule, paved the way for a secular and national system of power. The English (1640-88) and French (1789) Revolutions marked the transition from absolutism to modern state with the following features of fixed territory, control of the means of violence, impersonal power structure and legitimacy. The nation-state or national state does not essentially mean that a state's people 'share a strong linguistic, religious and symbolic identity' (Tilly 1990: 2-3). Though important, it is necessary to separate the nation-state from nationalism, 'What makes the "nation" integral to the nation-state ... is not the existence of sentiments of nationalism but the unification of an administrative apparatus over precisely defined territorial boundaries' (Giddens 1987: 172). The modern state can be understood with reference to its forms: constitutional state, the liberal state, the liberal-democratic state and the single-party polity. Constitutionalism refers to explicit and/or implicit limits on political or state decision-making. These limits can be procedural as to how decisions and changes can be made or substantive preventing certain changes altogether. Constitutionalism stipulates the proper limits and forms of state action. An important doctrine in this context that emerged to become a central tenet of European liberalism was a state exists to safeguard the rights and liberties of citizens who are ultimately the best judges of their own interests. The state's scope and practice have to be restrained to ensure the maximum

158

possible freedom of every citizen. The liberal state is the effort to create a private space independent of the state and freeing the civil society—personal, family and business life—from unnecessary political interference and thereby limiting state's authority. The components of liberal state are constitutionalism, private property, the competitive market economy and the patriarchal family. The Western state, at first a liberal state becomes a liberal democratic state with the extension of franchise to the working class and women. The third type is the liberal representative democracy or a system of elected rulers who profess to represent the interests and views of the citizens within a framework of the rule of law. Election through two or multiparty system constitutes the life breath of representative governments. There is the one party or single party system that existed in erstwhile communist societies of East Europe and the Soviet Union and some Third world countries, on the basis that a single party can legitimately express the overall will of the society. The collapse of communism has ended the single party system. Even some third world countries, like Tanzania, have moved towards a multi-party system.

An important factor in the emergence of the modern state is the capacity of the states to organize the means of coercion (armies, navies and other types of military might) and to deploy them when necessary. Modern states spend considerable amount of their finances in acquiring military equipment and technology. Another crucial factor in the creation of the democratic nation-state is nationalism. The attempt to construct a national identity to bring people together within a framework of delimited territory gives the state a heightened power and status. National identity has been used to bring about mobilization and legitimacy though state-building and nation-building have never overlapped. In certain cases, nationalism has become a means to challenge the existing nation-state boundaries, e.g. Northern Ireland. The economic factor for the rise of the modern state is trade and commerce. The main features of the modern states system—the centralization of political power, the expansion of administrative rule, the emergence of massed

standing armies, the deployment of force—that exists in sixteenth century Europe in nascent form becomes part of the entire global system.

It all began with the European states' capacity for overseas operations by means of naval and military force for purpose of long range navigation. The Spanish and Portuguese were the early explorers followed by the Dutch and the English. By the middle of the eighteenth century, English power was on the ascendancy and had become dominant by the nineteenth century, so much so that England, the first industrial power also became the first world power. London became the centre of world trade and finance. The expansion of Europe across the globe, in turn, became a major source for expansion of state activity and efficiency. All the core organization types of modern society—the modern state, modern corporate enterprise and modern science—were shaped by it and benefited greatly from it (Modelski 1972: 37). While European state systems developed and expanded non-European civilizations—the Chinese, Indian and Middle East

159

progressively declined, and in this, capitalism played a crucial role with its origins in the sixteenth century. Capitalism penetrated and integrated the different and distant corners of the world, for its aspirations were never determined by national boundaries. The earliest political units that could be properly called states were France, Spain, Portugal, Britain, the countries comprising the Holy Roman Empire (Germany, Italy, Balkans, Austria Hungary) and Scandinavia and the Netherlands. This was in the seventeenth and eighteenth century occupying 1,450,000 square miles out of a global mass of 57, 000,0000 (Crevald 1999: 263).

Wallerstein (1980) points out that capitalism from the beginning has been 'an affair of the world economy and not of nation states'. He distinguishes between two types of world systems that have existed historically: world-empires and world economies. The former are political units characterized by imperial bureaucracies with substantial armies to exact tax and tribute from territorially dispersed populations, their capacity for success depend upon political and military achievements. World empires are inflexible and eventually displaced by the world economy that emerged in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries because of its gargantuan appetite for endless accumulation of wealth. This world economy is an economic unit that crosses boundaries of any given state and any constraint is on the state and not on the process of economic expansion. Wallerstein divides the modern world system into three components: the core (initially the northwest and central Europe); the semi-periphery (the Mediterranean Zone) and the periphery (colonies). Each zone of the world-economy is characterized, according to Wallerstein, by a particular kind of economic activity, state structure, class formation and mechanism of labour control. The world capitalist economy creates a new form of worldwide division of labour. While colonialism in its original form has practically disappeared. The world capitalist economy creates and reproduces massive imbalances of economic and political power among the different constituent areas. Initially the world capitalist economy took the form of expansion of market relations compelled by a growing need for raw materials and other factors of production. Capitalism invigorated this drive and was invigorated by it.

The development of capitalism can be explained partly due to the long-drawn changes in 'European' agriculture from as early as the twelfth century: changes resulting in part from the drainage and utilization of wet soils, which increased agricultural yields and created a sustainable surplus for trade. Connected to this was the establishment of long-distance trade routes in which the northern shores of the Mediterranean were initially prominent. A combination of agricultural and navigational opportunities helped invigorate the European economic dynamic and the constant competition for resources, territory and trade. Accordingly, the objectives of war gradually became more economic: military endeavour and conquest became more closely connected to the pursuit of economic advantage (Mann 1986: 511). There was a direct connection between success of military conquest and the triumphant pursuit of economic gain. As capitalism developed and

160

matured, the state gradually got more entangled with the interests of civil society partly for its own sake. To be able to pursue and implement policy of its choice it needed financial resources and for this reason it began to steadily coordinate the activities of the civil society. The other side of the process also meant that the civil society with its powerful groups and classes began to shape state action to suit their own interests. Weber analyzes the relationship between modern capitalism and the emerging modern state. He points out that the Marxist analysis is based on a deficient understanding of the nature of the modern state and of the complexity of political life. The history of the state and the history of political struggle cannot in any way be reduced to class relations: the origins and functions of the state implies that it is far more than a 'superstructure' on an economic 'base'.

## **MARXISM, ANARCHISM AND THE NATIONAL QUESTION**

Class, and not nationality is the key factor for Marx and Engels. Their vision of proletarian internationalism is an advancement of the French Revolution's declaration of human brotherhood. The phrase 'workers of the world unite' is the consequence of the belief that while the bourgeoisie in each nation has its own vested interest, the proletarians in all the countries have the same interest and the same enemy. On the basis of this view, they divide the world into advanced and backward civilizations and supported British imperialist expansion. They perceive the non-European societies as static without a sense of history and maintain these societies will change from the outside. Writing on India, Marx points out that England had to fulfill a double mission, one destructive and the other regenerative; 'the annihilation of the old Asiatic society and laying the material foundations of Western society in Asia' (cited in Avineri 1969: 132-33). Furthermore, Marx and Engels oppose the right of nations to self-determination. On the contrary, Bakunin uncompromisingly supports national self-determination for all including the great or small, weak or strong, civilized and non-civilized. He asserts,

because a certain country constitutes a part of some state, even if it joined the state of its own free will, it does not follow that it is under obligation to remain for ever attached to that state. No perpetual obligation can be admitted by human justice, the only justice which we recognize any

duties that are not founded upon freedom. The right of free reunion as well as the right of secession is the first and most important of all political rights; lacking that right, a confederation would simply be disguised centralization (cited in Maximoff 1953: 274-75).

During the First World War Lenin's plan was the conversion of the imperialist war into an international class-based civil war. He pleaded for self-

161

determination of the oppressed nationalities of Tsarist Russia and other such empires. He understood proletarian internationalism to mean two things: first, proletarian struggle in any particular area of nation has to be subordinated to the strategy and planning of the larger socialist movement. Second, any proletarian struggle, which wins its battle over the local bourgeoisie, must be capable and willing to direct all its energies for the overthrow of the international capital. Lenin was convinced that the socialist revolution in Tsarist Russia would be a catalyst for international socialist revolution for socialism in one country was unthinkable. He was more enthused about the right of self-determination than the other Bolsheviks, like Nikolai Ivanovich Bukharin (1888-1938). However, he also categorically stated that the right of self-determination cannot be higher than that of the interest of socialism itself, implying that once the Bolsheviks capture power it would be relegated to a secondary position. Therefore, in spite of the constitutional provision of the right to secede in the former Soviet Constitution the question of autonomy was never to become an issue within the highly centralized Communist Party structure.

## **NATION STATES IN THE DEVELOPING WORLD**

There has been a proliferation of new states after the Second World War mainly because of decolonization. For the first time since the emergence of the modern state system the third world nations have become full members of the world community. The great disparity in wealth and other indicators of human development between the older nations and these newly emerging ones is enormous, but asserting their national identity and continuing as independent states have been an important aspect of world history for the last five decades. This new phase of nation-building process completes the process of the emergence of new nations that began with the British withdrawal from North America at the end of the eighteenth century, the freedom of the Spanish and Portuguese colonies in South America in the nineteenth century and subsequent acceptance of European settled states in Canada, Australia and New Zealand. This process in the context of Asia and Africa that began after 1945 was acknowledged in January 1960, by the then British Prime Minister Harold MacMillan. He considered the emergence of new States as a notable historical development and though they have assumed different forms all of them are inspired by a profound sense of nationalism. Commenting on momentous changes in Africa, he remarked 'the wind of change was blowing throughout the Continent'.

## **GLOBALIZATION AND THE FUTURE OF THE STATE**

In the recent times the structures and processes of the world State system have been facing large-scale changes because of the force of globalization. The political foundation of the modern western style state has been undercut

162

by five factors: moral, economic, military, cultural and political, representing different segments of one general trend: globalization.

Revolution in transportation, communications and information has led to the shrinkage of the territorial space. Inventions like telephone, internet, radio, television, satellite television and jet planes have resulted in a situation, where the state no longer wields monopoly over information and communications and controls the access of its citizens to information. Migration, increase in international tourism, greater dependence on foreign companies at home and abroad for jobs or contracts, greater exposure and access to other cultures through the media have also led to changes in lifestyles and personal tastes and interests. This increasingly brings into focus notions like national identity and national culture. Held (1995) pointed out that globalization of information far from creating a common human purpose establishes the significance of identity and difference. This encourages people without their own states to demand for one giving rise to new nation states.

The advent of nuclear weapons and intercontinental missiles have virtually made every state including the powerful and mighty, defenseless. The former US President Ronald Reagan's confession about the impossibility of winning a nuclear war has removed one of the most important props of the state since the mid-eighteenth century that the state protects its citizens from foreign threats. The emergence of global markets, greater imports and multinational corporations has weakened its economic supremacy. Though Aristotle taught us that a state ensures justice yet this is not entirely correct. Ever since the Nuremberg and Tokyo trials (1945-46) it has been seen that states do inflict injuries and harm on its citizens, driving them to committing genocide. More recently, a fact has come to prominence that some groups, aided and abetted by the state power indulge in ethnic cleansing. Besides, there are international organizations, human rights groups and self appointed spokesperson for democracy. All these undermine the claim that the state is the moral arbiter of its citizen's lives. In the context of globalization of national politics, hi-tech and emergence of the world economy 'the national state has become too small for big problems and too big for small problems' (Bell 1990a: 14). The process of integration in Europe and the creation of NAFTA in America have drastically curtailed the earlier notions of state sovereignty and total domination. In the world village of today, nations co-exist as interdependent neighbours with a great degree of interaction and commonality. The problem today is that there exists a global economy but the political arrangements are still rooted in the sovereignty of states. The key task now is to reconcile global society with the sovereignty of states. The sovereign states often abuse power and the powerful ones do not want to strengthen international institutions. One argument of the stronger states is that international institutions do not work well because states in the international arena have no principles but only interests to protect. Coupled with this weakness there is yet another inadequacy, namely national bureaucracies that multiply into international bureaucracy. It is



163

also a fact that international institutions like the United Nations have not been very successful in protecting and promoting universal principles like human rights. If globalization is to succeed then international institutions have to perform better and that is only possible if there is an emergence of a responsive international civil society. As within the nation, the state power is restricted by the forces of civil society, which successfully monitor the process of globalization there is to be an alliance of the democratic states with a commitment to principles and not merely interests with active intervention of the civil society.

## 6 The Concept of Sovereignty

From the ancient times to the present day, the focal subject of political thinking has been state. In the view of Aristotle, the individual can be considered as a part of the state. He has said that the man living outside the state is either a beast or a god. That is why, he considered the state as natural institution and made it the focal point of his study. Gettell has called Political Science as "The Science of state", and according of Garner, "The state begins and ends with the state". Though, in the present era, according to some behaviouralists the concept of state is limited and inadequate to understand the procedure of politics, therefore, they think political system more appropriate in the place of state. But the reality is, that the word state has been opposed by some behaviouralists the concept of state is limited and inadequate to understand the procedure of politics. Therefore, they think political system more appropriate in the place of state. But the reality is, that the word state has been opposed by some liberals of the U.S.A. The word state has been sufficiently used even in the Marxist political theory. The Marxist writers have discussed the various forms of the state, e.g. pre-state society, stateless society, capitalist state and socialist state etc.

What is meant by State? In Politics, state is a word having scientific meaning. A common man, sometimes, used the word 'state' for government, society, association or nation etc., but those words have their separate and clear meanings. Use of state for government is a moral mistake. In fact, government is an element of the state which may be called a body for the fulfilment of the aims of the state. The Government changes but the state goes on. During world war II there was Churchill's Conservative Government, but after the war, there was Attlee's Government of Labour Party. Whereas, we use the word state for the U.S.A. U.K.. Japan etc., this is, sometimes, also used for the units of a federation, e.g., in India and In the U.S.A. But the use of this word in U.S.A. and India for their units, is not scientific. In fact, the meaning of this word in common language and as a term in Politics differs very fundamentally.

In ancient Greece, word 'Polis' was used for state, which, actually, meant

81

a city-state. The form of those small city-states of Greece was not exactly what the national state now are. Therefore, both of them can not be favourably compared. Later on, the Romans used the word state for big geographical area, but, Dr.Finer has rightly said that the existence of the

modern concept of state is not available in the Greek and Roman ideas. The modern view of the state came into existence in the beginning of the 16th century and, it was Machiavelli who used this word rightly from the modern point of view. In his book 'The Prince', he says, that "The Power which has authority over men" is the state.

These days, the state keeps our lives in order and maintains peace. Whereas, it gives assurance of security in life, it also creates the atmosphere of social co-operation, which has made the development of various cultures and civilizations possible.

Thus, state is, totally, in accordance with the nature of man, it is extremely essential for him and it is permanent also. The state is natural because it is a result of our natural instincts. Plato has said that no man is perfect. He has to accept the social bonds for the satisfaction of his physical and mental necessities. First, the family is organised. Many families form a village and some villages develop into cities. Thus, ultimately, a state comes into being, which is, in accordance with the nature of man. State is extremely essential because most of the necessities of the man can be fulfilled only with the help of the state. Today, we can not imagine the all-round development of the man without the state. In fact, the form of society, without the state, will lose all order and peace. Aristotle has rightly said "That the state comes into existence originating in the bare needs of the life and continuing in existence for the sake of good life."

## Definition of State

The political scientists have defined the state from their own point of view. The well known German writer, Schulze comments that so many interpretations of the state have been given that it is difficult to count them. In spite of it, there are similar elements in all those definitions. To understand the points of view of ancient and modern writers, it is necessary to study the definitions given by them.

Ancient Writers. Aristotle, the father of Political Science, has imagined the organisation of many human associations before the origin of the state. Man lived in families. Then clans came into being and the villages were formed out of clans. Man, in isolation can neither be happy, nor can he develop himself. Man develops his qualities only in the society. Because of this nature of man, Aristotle calls him "a social animal". The need of controlling the various associations was also felt. This need of the man was fulfilled by the' organisation named state, which is the best association. Clans and villages are included in it. Defining the state on this very basis, Aristotle says, "The state is a union of families and villages having for its end a perfect and self-sufficient life."

82

The well known writer of Roman Empire, Cicero says that the state, which is organised as an association by men, who are equal partners in the rights and advantages, which they can not get, out of the state, anywhere else because no other association can influence such a wide field. In fact, the individual has received many advantages, because of the origin of the state, which he had never received before. Defining the state on this very basis, he says. "The state is a numerous society united by a common sense of right and mutual participation in advantages."

In the medieval Europe, the influence of Roman thought seems to be clear. The ideas of the political scientists of this period are influenced by the Roman philosopher, Cicero. According to Grotius, the state is such an independent association of men who are united, by mutual co-operation for the general thinking of rights and advantages.

Above given discussion makes it clear that, according to the ancient writers, there are two characteristics of the state, (1) The state is higher than the other associations, and (2) all the people, collectively, get those advantages, which they can receive from the state.

Modern Writers. The idea of medieval state is not acceptable to the modern writers. Now, it is universally accepted, that there are four elements of the state (1) Population, (2) Territory, (3) Government, and (4) Sovereignty. The ideas of those modern writers have been discussed below, in detail, who have included all the four elements (Population, territory, government and sovereignty) of the state in these definitions.

Describing the state, Hall have considered it essential, in addition to the other elements, that group of persons should be free from foreign control. It should have free capacity of starting war and negotiating peace with the other states, and should have the right to have relations with the other such groups. According to Hall, "The marks of an independent state are that the community constituting it is permanently established for a political end and that it possesses a definite territory and that it is independent of external control."

Thus, according to Hall, the four elements, essential for a state, are (1) population, (2) government, (3) territory and with them all, (4) independence of that group of persons, from outside control. In fact, freedom from foreign control means sovereignty.

Prof. Laski calls the state as claiming supremacy over all the other associations. He says, "The state is a territorial society, divided into government and subjects, claiming, within its allotted physical area, a supremacy over all other institutions."

The best definition of state has, probably, been given by Dr. Garner. Its reason is that this definition embraces all the modern states. Besides, it seems to be proper for the various types of medieval states. In the modern world, there are states like, India, China, U.S.A. and Russia having big population and wide territory. On the other hand, there are San Marino, Monaco, Belgium

83

and Luxembourg etc., very small states whose population is not much. Keeping this fact in view, Dr. Garner says that the population of a state may be more or less. Another point, which he gives in his definition is that the group of persons, living in a fixed territory, may be independent or nearly independent of external control. From this point of view, his opinion is that a state should be either sovereign or nearly so. India, after achieving independence of her own accord, remained a member of the then British Commonwealth of Nations. It was, no doubt, a special type of external control, yet India was a state. During medieval times, the sovereign kings, sometimes, accepted another king as their higher authority. According to Garner, such territories

also could be called states. "The state," according to Garner, "as a concept of Political Science and Public Law, is a community of persons more or less numerous, permanently occupying a definite portion of territory, independent, or nearly so, of external control, and possessing an organised government to which the great body of inhabitants render habitual obedience."

The above given definitions make it clear that there are four inevitable elements of the state.

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

## What is meant by Sovereignty?

The word 'sovereignty' is a derivative from Latin word 'superannus', which means the highest authority. Thus, sovereignty means the supreme power of the state. This power separates the state from the other associations and individuals residing in it, and bestows the state with the coercive authority over them. According to Laski, "It is by possession of sovereignty that the state is distinguished from all other forms of human associations."

The concept of sovereignty is as old as the state itself. With the change in the form of the state, the point of view regarding sovereignty also went on changing. Because, there has been difference of opinion among the political scientists regarding the origin and aims of the state, therefore, they have not been unanimous about the sovereignty. Lord Bryce has said that this is the most controversial subject in the history of Politics. In fact, sovereignty is mainly a legal concept and it indicates the supremacy of the state from the legal point of view. By interpreting sovereignty it has been said that this is such a special quality of the state that no limit can be put legally on it except by its own will, nor can any other authority limit its authority. Thus, because of sovereignty the state has become the supreme association, and, on the other hand, no other foreign authority has any power to issue order to it nor to limit its authority. This is the legal aspect of sovereignty. When various philosophers discussed political, moral and popular sovereignty, the main controversy rose about it. In fact, these days, there can be any institution like the king, president or parliament for using the sovereign authority which has the supreme authority for making the laws, issuing the orders and taking political

84

decisions. These orders, laws and decisions are applicable to all citizens and associations. Not only this, if these are disobeyed the sovereign has the unlimited power to punishment.

Though, from legal point of view, sovereignty implies a supreme power which is used by the sovereign in an unlimited, undivided or unrestricted manner, yet it does not mean that it can be used arbitrarily. In the modern era, no sovereign can use it without reason, against the feeling of justice or against the traditions and customs well established in society. The history is a witness that the sovereigns who used it arbitrarily, there were struggles against them and efforts were made to take it away from them. Thus, when it is called unlimited and unrestrained authority, the implication is its legal aspect, according to which a sovereign, while taking a decision, issuing an order or awarding punishment, cannot be forced to consult or know the will of any individual or

institution. He has the power to take decisions according to his will or discretion which all persons and institutions have to obey,

## Definition of Sovereignty

Different writers of Politics have defined sovereignty in different words, but all agree on one point that sovereignty is the supreme power of the state. This is the highest authority. Everybody has invariably to obey the orders. Where there is lack of sovereignty, it can not really be called a state, the following are some definitions of sovereignty given by some writers.

According to Bodin "Sovereignty is the supreme power of the state over citizens and subjects unrestrained by the laws."

Grotius says that "Sovereignty is the supreme political power vested in him whose acts are not subject to another and whose will can not be overridden."

According to Burgess "Sovereignty is the original, absolute, unlimited power over the individual subjects and over all associations."

Jellinek says that "Sovereignty is that characteristic of the state by virtue of which it can not be bound except by its own will or limited by any other power than itself."

Willoughby defines that "Sovereignty is the supreme will of the state."

According to Pollock, "Sovereignty is the power which is neither temporary, nor delegated, nor subject to particular rules which it can not alter nor answerable to any other power on earth."

## Two Aspects of Sovereignty

The definitions of sovereignty given above have laid emphasis on two aspects of it. Internally, it is above all other persons and associations and, from external point of view, it is free from the control of any other state. Both the aspects of sovereignty have been discussed below:

(1) Internal Sovereignty.

(2) External Sovereignty.

85

(1) Internal Sovereignty. Every individual and association, within the state, has to accept the sovereign power of the state. The human society should obey, by nature, every order of the state. Even the greatest one has no right to claim superiority over the state. Similarly, no association, religious, political, social or economic has any authority to work against the orders of the state. The power to work within their jurisdiction is given by the state of these associations. Sovereignty itself accepts no restrictions from any corner. Discussing the internal aspect of

sovereignty Laski says, "It issues orders to all men and all associations within its area. It receives orders from none of them. Its will is subject to no legal limitations of any kind."

(2) External Sovereignty. External aspect of sovereignty implies that it is free from every outside control. If the policy of a country is framed because of pressure from any other country, that country can not be called a state. The questions like as to what should be their foreign policy and the policy regarding war, peace, trade agreements etc., are the questions of the country concerned decision regarding which is taken by itself, keeping its own interest in view. A country doing like that can be called a state. It does not mean that the obedience of international law is a limitation on sovereignty, because on the one hand, it obeys those laws according to its own will, on the other hand, these laws are, similarly, obeyed by all the other countries of the world also. Therefore, to strengthen universal brotherhood these limitations have been accepted by all the countries of their own accord. So, none restrains others.

## THE CONCEPT OF LEGAL SOVEREIGNTY

The first thinker to explain a sovereign state was Machiavelli (1469-1527), an Italian. He supported such a sovereign state whose king, being above morality, was arbitrary in the physical world. Though he did not explain the concept of sovereignty directly, yet he indirectly developed the idea of legal sovereignty in his book "Prince." His idea of state as an independent unit and to produce as a powerful organisation and the centre of authority, proves it that he, indirectly, accepted such a supreme authority which was higher than all the centres of authority present in the state.

From the point of view of the development of the concept of legal sovereignty, the modern era starts with the 16th century because the circumstances for development of this form of sovereignty had started upto this century. Firstly, in the struggle between the Pope and the empire, the Pope had retarded back as far as sovereignty was concerned, and the word 'world' had been dropped from the world empire. Secondly, the power of the feudal lords decreased by and by, and the power of the king became supreme. Thirdly, a new era started in Europe with the Industrial Revolution, in which the middle class cooperated in the establishment of a strong state so that law and order may be established and the development of the industries may be more rapidly.

86

It was the period when a strong monarchy was established in France and the French philosopher, Jean Bodin, in 1576, in his book 'Republique' gave modern interpretation of sovereignty. After that, various writers interpreted it according to their time and circumstances. The points of view of some prominent thinkers regarding sovereignty are discussed, in brief, below.

### Jean Bodin's concept of Sovereignty

In the modern era, Jean Bodin, a thinker of the 16th century, discussed the concept of legal sovereignty in definite and detailed terms. It was the time, when in France, because of Reformation, differences had arisen in the religions field. The Catholics were not ready to accept



any Protestant king and vice versa. Bodin was full of national ideas and he was feeling the need of such a civil authority in the state which may keep France an independent and sovereign against the other countries. He, in his famous book 'Republique' held that the main function of the supreme power was to frame such laws which may be equally applicable to all individuals and the other centres of authority, who, itself, may be above those laws. Defining sovereignty. Jean Bodin said that sovereignty is "The Supreme Power over citizens and subjects unrestrained by law." The following are the characteristic features of sovereignty as defined by Jean Bodin.

(i) Independence from outside control. Discussing the unlimited form of sovereignty, Bodin said that the sovereign of France was independent from the authority of the other kings and the Pope.

(ii) Independence from inside control. Bodin maintained that there is no internal control over the sovereign. Therefore, he declared that the power of the king was higher than the other rebellious lords, present in the state, and he has the authority to control them.

(iii) Highest authority of law-making. Sovereignty is the highest authority for law-making. That is why, the sovereign is above those laws which he makes.

(iv) Sovereignty is absolute. Bodin declared that sovereignty is neither unstable nor divine nor transferable nor is it answerable to any similar authority on earth.

(v) Sovereignty is indivisible. According to Bodin, sovereignty can not be divided, i.e., idea of two sovereignties in a state is unthinkable.

(vi) There are moral limits on sovereignty. According to Bodin, sovereignty can be limited in three ways, i.e. by divine rules, natural rules and the international rules. It is the moral obligation of the sovereign to have regard for the contracts entered into with the public. Similarly, it is his moral duty to honour the contracts entered into with the public. Similarly, it is his moral duty to honour the contracts entered into with the other sovereigns. Bodin has clarified that the sovereign may be above the laws which he has framed but he is not above those fundamental laws on which the state is based.

87

## **The Concept of Sovereignty of Grotius**

After almost half a century after Bodin, a Dutch jurist Grotius co-operated in the development of the concept of legal sovereignty. He saw sovereignty in the international context and said that sovereignty is free from the outside control, but he applied the international laws to the sovereign. Explaining the acceptance of international law by the various nations essential, he said that, just as, the people of a country are bound by the natural principles, and those principles control his behaviour, similarly, the various nations are under the natural laws for their mutual behaviour. He has also said, that the laws, guiding various nations, should be such as have been agreed upon by them. The laws, framed for nations, may be based on customs and traditions and it may also depend on the treaties and contracts agreed to between the nations.

Thus, if Bodin has discussed the internal aspect of sovereignty, Grotius had discussed the external aspect. He supported the existence of hundreds of sovereign and equal nations.

### **Thomas Hobbes' Concept of Sovereignty**

Hobbes was English political thinker of the 17th century. Just as, Bodin developed the idea of legal sovereignty in the 16th century to find out a solution of the circumstances of disorder, similarly, Hobbes established the theory of sovereignty in the 17th century England, to solve the problem of internal rebellion and political disorder. Hobbes felt that a powerful and unrestrained ruler was needed to cure the political disorder. So, he devoted his whole political thinking to the creation of a strong ruler.

Hobbes achieves this aim through the Social contract. He says that man entered the contract to end the state of nature and to lead a social and civilised life. According to Hobbes, there was law of jungle in the state of nature, i.e., might was right. At that time, there was an atmosphere of fear. Therefore, the people established a state which could provide them order, peace and security. According to Hobbes all the people handed over their natural rights to the sovereign. This contract was one-sided, i.e., there was no restriction on the sovereign. This contract was one-sided, i.e., there was no restriction on the sovereign. He lost nothing. This contract was final and unbreakable. Hobbes says that the breach of contract will take the people again into the state of nature, and they shall have to re-live in chaotic conditions. Thus, after establishing the civilised life, the people gave unlimited and arbitrary powers to the ruler.

The characteristic feature of Hobbes theory is that he made the arbitrary powers of the sovereign legally valid. He says that people, of their own accord, created the sovereign through contract. Thus, the sovereign of Hobbes who uses so many powers that he becomes more arbitrary than the sovereign of Bodin because those limits, which were imposed by Bodin, are not on him now. The characteristics of sovereignty, as discussed by Hobbes are as follows.

(a) The sovereign uses the unlimited, arbitrary and the supreme powers.

88

(b) He is the makers of laws but he is not bound by them.

(c) The sovereign is free from the limits of divine, moral and natural laws as imposed by Bodin.

(d) The people surrendered all of their rights to the sovereign. So, there is no power with him against the sovereign.

(e) The people can neither rebel against the sovereign nor can the powers be taken back from him by breaking the contract.

## **AUSTIN'S THEORY OF SOVEREIGNTY**

John Austin was an English writer. In the 19th century, he gave the theory of sovereignty from legal point of view in details. In 1832 he established his point of view in his "Lectures on jurisprudence." The impact of the ideas of Bentham and Hobbes is clean on Austin. He has discussed his theory logically.

Defining sovereignty, he says, "If a determinate human superior, not in the habit of obedience to a like superior, receives habitual obedience from the bulk of a given society, that determinate superior is sovereign in that society and that society (including the superior) is a society political and independent." The above given definition of sovereignty may be further explained as given below.

(i) Sovereignty is inevitable in a state. According to Austin, the presence of sovereignty is essential in a political society or state. This sovereignty resides in a person or a group of persons. In the absence of a definite sovereign, the society can not be called independent and political. This very sovereign framers and laws and gets them obeyed.

(ii) Sovereignty must be definite. According to Austin, sovereignty must reside in a definite person or group of persons, which may be recognised and may be shown. If sovereignty resides in a group of persons, that group of persons must be definite because the form of Austin's sovereignty is legal. Therefore, it is necessary that, in a state, there should be a definite authority who should be the source of law.

(iii) The sovereign power is unlimited. According to Austin, the sovereign has the unlimited power. On the one hand, his orders are obeyed by all the persons and associations, on the other hand, he does not obey the orders of anyone else like himself. Therefore, the will of the sovereign is supreme and unrestrained.

(iv) Sovereignty is indivisible. Austin says that sovereignty is a unit in itself and it can not be divided. It can not be divided among various associations because its division will destroy it.

(v) Freedom from internal and external control. The sovereign need not obey the orders of any superior person. All the individuals and associations within the state have to obey his orders. His power is supreme, therefore, he is free from external and internal control.

89

(vi) The sovereign is not bound by laws. The order of the sovereign is law. In fact, the show of his will is laws, because law indicates his will. Therefore, law can neither bind him, nor control him.

### **Criticism of Austin's Theory**

Austin's theory has been vehemently criticised on various grounds. Lord Bryce, Sir Henry Maine, Sidgwick etc. are the main critics. Austin does not limit the authority of the sovereign, whereas, according to his critics, every government of the world is limited. The theory of Austin is criticised on the following grounds:

(1) It is not applicable to democracies. According to Sir Henry Maine, sovereignty resides in the people, but Austin does not admit it. He puts forth only the legal aspect of it, but he forgets it that, in the state, there are popular sovereignty and the political sovereignty also. The legal sovereignty has to bow before the popular sovereignty. The theory of popular sovereignty is the supporter of democracy, but the state discussed by Austin can not be democratic.

(2) Order of the sovereign is not law. According to Austin, an order issued by the sovereign is law. But it can not be admitted these days. In the world, there are certain moral, religious and traditional such laws which are more effective than the laws framed by the state. Besides, the laws are not orders of some supreme person; in fact, laws are framed by the people on the basis of public opinion. There have been many arbitrary kings, in whose states, laws were framed on the basis of public opinion. The common law of England is based on traditions, it was never framed by any one.

(3) Sovereignty can not be definite. According to Austin, it is necessary for sovereignty to be definite. It is possible that Austin was right from legal point of view. But, in democracy, the sovereignty can not be definite. Popular sovereignty has no place in the theory of Austin. According to John Chipman Gray, "The real rulers of the society are undiscoverable".

(4) It is not applicable on federations. If the theory of Austin is considered true, it would be difficult to find out the residence of sovereignty in federations. In federations, the powers being divided between the centre and the states, the power is issued at both the places, and sovereignty lies in the constitution. This point is applicable in India and the U.S.A.

(5) Sovereignty is limited. According to Austin sovereignty is fully free internally and externally. Its power is unlimited, but actually it is not so. In fact, sovereignty in every country is limited by many factors. Many associations of the country limit its power. Besides, sovereignty is limited by international law also. Laski says that "The associations are in their sphere not less sovereign than the state itself."

(6) Basis of obedience is not power. According to Austin, sovereign is supreme. Therefore, it gets the laws obeyed on the basis of his power, and the people obey the laws mostly because of the fear of sovereign power. But the

90

basis of obedience of laws is the will of the people not force. According to Green, "Will, not force, is the basis of the state."

## **Nature and Characteristics of Legal Sovereignty**

It is not difficult to understand its characteristics, after discussing its various definitions and the two aspects. The characteristics are as follows:

(1) Originality. It means that sovereignty is an original power. It neither depends on any one else nor has it been taken from any one. It exists by itself. Wherever sovereignty resides, that is sovereign, not any one else.

(2) Absoluteness. Absoluteness is one of its qualities. It controls all the individuals and the associations. It frames laws, may repeal them and may amend them. These laws are applicable to all the citizens of the state. Those who disobey them are punished. In spite of all these facts, the sovereignty is above these laws.

Many writers have opposed the idea of the absoluteness of sovereignty. They say that there are various restrictions on sovereignty, and these regularise its limits. According to them, there are many restrictions on sovereignty because of natural or divine rules, moral principles, traditions customs, international laws etc. Bodin also admits the natural or divine rules as restrictions on sovereignty. He has said that the sovereign can neither take the personal property nor break the contracts. Bluntschli also feels that the sovereignty is limited by moral principles, permanent decisions and the rights of the citizens. According to Henry Maine, the sovereign can not go against the traditions and customs. According to Laski, international laws have restrained the sovereign power.

The above given point of view about sovereignty is not reasonable because, legally, these limits do not actually restrain sovereignty. If it accepts them, it is because of its own will, not because of outside pressure, but it accepts them, on moral grounds, according to its own will. The acceptance of international laws is based not on outside pressure, but the idea of the welfare of the mankind. Thus, the characteristic of absoluteness is present there. The sovereign, by its own will, accepts various restrictions.

(3) Permanence. The change of governments has no effect on sovereignty because it is permanent. The king may die, he may run away or he may abdicate, the sovereignty goes on. "The king is dead, long live The King," also proves this fact. Sovereignty is an essential element of the state. Therefore, till the state is, the sovereignty is there. It is when the state ends, that the sovereignty also ends. If the sovereign dies or the government changes, the sovereignty also ends. If the sovereign dies or the government changes, the sovereignty does not end. According to Garner, "It does not end with the death or temporary dispossession of a particular bearer, or the reorganisation of the state, but shifts immediately to a new bearer, as the centre of gravity shifts from one part of a physical body to another when there is an external change."

91

(4) All comprehensiveness of sovereignty implies that it covers every territory, everything and the people and has control over all of them. None is out of its control. The only exceptions are those who have been left out of its control, by its own will, e.g., foreign embassies, heads of foreign states, foreign army etc. This exception does not affect the sovereignty of the state because it is done because of international courtesy.

(5) Inalienability. Sovereignty is not alienable from the state. Sovereignty is the life of the state. Just as, if the soul leaves the body and the individual dies, similarly, if the sovereignty leaves the

state, it will die as a state. Lieber says that "sovereignty can no more be alienated than a tree can alienate its right to sprout or a man can transfer his life or personality without self-destruction."

(6) Indivisibility. Sovereignty can not be divided. This is a political fact. Division of sovereignty ends it. If there are two sovereign authorities in a state, those will be called two states. Sovereignty may lie in the organs of the state but it does not mean that it has been divided. According to Gettell, "A divided sovereignty is a contradiction in terms." The idea of indivisibility of sovereignty has not been accepted by the Pluralists and the federalists. According to them, sovereignty is divided and it is used from different centres. Pluralists consider the state as an association among the many associations existing in the society. Therefore, they say that all the associations in a society use sovereignty. Thus, the sovereignty is divided among the many associations in which the state is included. On the other hand, the Federalists hold that, in a Federation, sovereignty is divided between the centre and the units, because it is equally used at both the places. At the time of the formation of the constitution of the U.S.A. the theory of Dual Sovereignty was used by writers like Hamilton and Madison and declared that the centre and the units, both had sovereignty. The Supreme Court of the U.S.A. had accepted this theory of dual sovereignty.

The point of view about sovereignty given above is misleading. Whatever power the Pluralists may give to the other associations, the state controls them all. On the other hand, the federalists talk of dual sovereignty, but they forget that, not sovereignty, but the power of running the administration is divided between the centre and the units. Criticising the idea of dividing the sovereignty, Calhoun says, "Sovereignty is an entire thing; to divide is to destroy it. It is the supreme power in the state and we might just as well speak of half square or a half triangle as of a half sovereignty."

## **Different forms of Sovereignty**

Though sovereignty is mainly a legal concept, yet various writers have used it in different ways. Therefore, it is necessary for a student of politics that he should understand every point of view which has been discussed, thus far, about sovereignty, which influence the form and scope of the state. All these aspects and forms of sovereignty have been discussed below:

92

(1) Nominal or Titular and Real Sovereignty. In the modern states, the sovereignty resides somewhere else and seems to be somewhere else. The nominal or titular sovereignty is with the man who is said to be having sovereignty but can not make use of it. But that sovereignty is used by some one else in his name. It will be clear from the example of England. These days, in England, constitutional monarchy prevails. There the king or queen is powerless. She has got nominal sovereignty. She can not use this sovereignty according to her own will, though all work is done in her name. Meaning thereby that the sovereignty with her is nominal or ornamental. Even today the government of England is called Her Majesty's government. Every law is made in her name. In fact, she is a rubber stamp in the hands of the cabinet, which is used by the cabinet according to its will. This sovereignty is used by the cabinet and the Parliament of England. So, the queen of England is a nominal sovereign. Whereas, the cabinet and Parliament,



these are real sovereign. This division of sovereignty is available in those countries where the parliamentary government prevails. In India also, the President is the nominal head and the cabinet and the Parliament are the real sovereign.

(2) Legal and Political Sovereignty. In country, the legal sovereignty lies with the person or institution who has the full power of framing laws. It can make laws and can give final form of it. The lawyers admit only this sovereignty. In dictatorship, this power is with the dictator, because he himself exercises the power of making laws. Instead of one man, this legal sovereignty may be with a group of persons. These days, in the democratic countries, this legal sovereignty is with the parliaments. The parliament is authorised to make laws with queen in England and with the President in India. So, they are the legal sovereign. According to Garner, "The legal sovereignty is, therefore, that determinate authority which is able to express in legal form the highest commands of the state, that power which can override the prescriptions of divine law, the principles of morality, the mandates of public opinion." Thus, it can be said that in every politically organised society, there is sovereignty which is untrained, unlimited, indivisible, original and not-transferable. The command of this sovereign is law which is necessarily obeyed by all men and associations. This command may be even against the moral principles, divine laws or public opinion. This sovereignty is the legal sovereignty of that society. The following are characteristics of that sovereignty:

- This sovereignty is determinate and it lies in any person or group of persons.
- It is organised and definite and it is accepted by law.
- Legally it can announce the will of the state.
- It gives rights to the people, but they have no right against it.
- Its disobedience is a punishable crime.
- It is above divine laws, moral principles and public opinion.
- The lawyers and law courts accept its orders.

93

In addition to this legal sovereignty, there is sovereignty in the state, and that is political sovereignty. Though this authority does not make laws itself, nor can amend laws, yet the legal sovereign has to bow before it. It has always this political sovereignty in mind.

Dicey says, "Behind the sovereign which the lawyer recognises, there is another sovereign to whom the legal sovereign must bow.....that body is legally sovereign, the will of which is ultimately obeyed by the citizens of the state."

Defining the political sovereignty, Gilchrist writes, "The political sovereignty is sum total of the influences in a state which lie behind law." Thus, political sovereignty, in democratic countries, is the will of the people. This will is indicated by newspapers, platform and voting etc. The legal sovereign can not ignore the political sovereignty because if the legal sovereign does not do public welfare, people will dismiss it.

Relation between Legal and Political Sovereignty. In fact, legal and political sovereignty are two aspects of sovereignty of the state and not two sovereignties; these are of course, shown

scaparatly. In a good government, it is essential that these two aspects of sovereignty must be closely related. According to Ritchi, the problem of a good government is the problem of showing these two aspects of sovereignty rightly related mutually. It is in democratic countries that these two aspects of sovereignty can be seen, where the people are political sovereign and the parliament elected by them is legal sovereign. This legal sovereign has to work according to the will of their electors, i.e., the political sovereign. Till the legislature obeys the will of the people, the relations between the two aspects are cordial and it does more public welfare. If the legal sovereign does not behave according to the will of the people, there will be no possibility of the establishment of a welfare state, because the legal sovereign is elected for obeying the will of the political sovereign. If political sovereign is the master, the legal sovereign is its servant. Establishment of cordial relations between the two is necessary, otherwise, the people will make efforts, in the ensuing elections, to hand over the power to some other persons, so that a welfare state may be established.

### **De Facto and De Jure Sovereignty**

(i) De Facto Sovereignty. The de facto and de jure sovereignty are also differentiated. When a de jure sovereign is thrown out by force in a revolution or mutiny, and there is none to replace it as de jure sovereign, the person or persons holding sovereignty in such circumstances, is called the de facto sovereign. It is not necessary that de facto sovereign, is simultaneously, de jure sovereign also. Discussing the de facto sovereign, Garner says, that a person or group of persons who has the authority to get its orders obeyed by the people, form some time, he is the de facto sovereign. A person who dominates a state by force, he may be a king, self-appointed Council, military dictator, Priest or Prophet, his authority is based on physical or spiritual force

94

and not on legality. For example, Crommwell, who established his authority by ending the long Parliament in England, or Napoleon, who established his rule in France, by ending the Directory, was a de facto sovereign. Similarly in the U.S.S.R., the Bolshevik Rule after the revolution of 1917, the communist rule of Mao in China after ending the rule of Chiang-Kai-Shek, the military rule of Ne Win in Burma, military dictatorships in countries like Pakistan are all examples of de facto sovereigns. But a de facto sovereign becomes a de jure sovereign, if after, ruling for some time, it gets the recognition of the constitution, though elections and after being recognised by the foreign states.

(ii) De jure Sovereignty. De jure sovereignty is based on law. It is not based on the physical force of a man or group of men when a sovereign's government is on legal basis, he is called a de jure sovereign. He has the legal right to issue orders and to get them obeyed. In fact, for a de jure sovereign, it is essential that he should be de facto sovereign also, because if he is dismissed he remains de facto sovereign only. Whosoever becomes the de facto sovereign in his place, he either, after some time, becomes de jure sovereign also or he has to vacate the seat for de jure sovereign.

In fact, de facto sovereign should be de jure sovereign also because it is in this position that it is convenient for him to get his orders obeyed. Normally, a de facto sovereign, after some time,

being accepted by the people, becomes de jure sovereign also. A de facto sovereign changes his sovereignty into de jure sovereignty through elections. It gives moral right also to the sovereign to get his orders obeyed by the people and there remains no scope of any revolution or conspiracy by the people in favour of the previous de jure sovereign. Bryce has said that the power which is based on force only, it is naturally opposed by the people.

## **POPULAR SOVEREIGNTY**

Popular sovereignty means that the final authority lies with the people. In fact, it is originated as a result of the struggle of the people against the kings. Ancient Indian political scientists" also were not ignorant about popular sovereignty. The authorities of the Roman Empire also got their power from the people. In the 16th century, popular sovereignty came into being to oppose dictatorship. Rousseau, through his theory of General Will, established that the supreme power lies with the people. This was the basis of French Revolution also. Later on, this theory was accepted in the U.S.A. also. On the basis of this popular sovereignty, democratic governments were established. When all the adult persons of a country vote in the elections or make the laws themselves, the popular sovereignty is said to be present there. According to Ritchi, during the elections, people use their supreme power directly. According to Dr. Ashirvatham, "In actual practice popular sovereignty seems to mean nothing more than public opinion in time of peace and the might of revolution in the case of conflict.

95

### **Historical Background of the Theory of Popular Sovereignty**

The evolution of popular sovereignty had begun in the medieval period. Marsilio of Padua and William Ocean have studied the popular sovereignty extensively. Afterwards those thinkers who developed, this except are Locke and Rousseau. Following are their view points on the popular sovereignty.

#### **John Locke's Concept of Sovereignty**

John Locke was the second English thinker who supported the bloodless Revolution of 1688 in England. He also put forth his ideas through the Social Contract theory. He did not use the word sovereignty in his ideas in a planned way. He uses the supreme power in its place. This supreme power of his resides in the government, which is in itself a delegated authority. The public is above the government. When the government loses the confidence of the public, the people may remove him through rebellion, and may install a new government in his place.

According to Locke, the people entered into a contract for the protection of their rights which they had in the State of Nature—Life, liberty and Estate. These rights were with the people even after the contract. It was the duty of the government to protect these rights. Thus, the government of Locke's ideas did not possess arbitrary powers. The following are the characteristics of Sovereignty of Locke.

- (a) People gave all the rights to the government except the three natural rights—life, liberty and estate.
- (b) It is the duty of the government to protect these natural rights of the people.
- (c) If the government does not fulfill its duties well, the people have the right to dismiss it.
- (d) The people may rebel against the government.
- (e) Locke established limited sovereignty instead of a arbitrary sovereignty.

### **Rousseau's concept of sovereignty**

Rousseau found sovereignty vested in the whole political society. In fact, this is his best theory about sovereignty, i.e., "The Popular Sovereignty theory." For developing his concept, he combined the arbitrary sovereignty of Hobbes and the Popular Consent of Locke. He held that sovereignty is arbitrary, indivisible, non-transferable and infallible supreme authority. The only medium of showing this authority is the General Will. The fact, that Rousseau, in his theory on sovereignty, has used the arbitrary sovereignty of Hobbes and Popular Sovereignty of Locke, has been very well discussed by Heamshaw, when he says that the concept of sovereignty of Rousseau is nothing but "Hobbe's Leviathan with his head chopped off." The General Will used by Rousseau is, in fact, sovereignty because there seems to be no difference between the two.

96

Rousseau presents, through General Will, as another sovereignty, in the form of supreme arbitrary power. On the other hand, he says, to make it popular, that the General Will always represents the common interests of the people. He says, "What makes the will general is less the number of voters than the common interest uniting them." Discussing the arbitrariness of authority he says that "The dissenting minority may be 'forced to be free'," because they might not be knowing as to what their interest is. Thus, Rousseau does not give the right to oppose the General Will or Sovereignty. He says that if the opposition of minority is not stopped, they may feel more free to do it. Therefore, it is the duty of the sovereign that he suppresses those with force who oppose his actions. Only the General Will has the right to make laws because those will be based on common interests and their source will be the whole public. The characteristics features of the sovereignty of Rousseau are discussed below, in brief.

(a) He establishes the popular sovereignty theory. Hobbes and Locke had created a sovereign separate from the people, through their theories of social contract but Rousseau makes the people themselves sovereign.

(b) According to Rousseau the Social Contract, on the one hand, took place among the common people individually and, on the other hand, it was between the peoples as a Corporate body. Thus, the public received the sovereign power as a corporate body, which is represented by General Will, that is why, Rousseau says that the sovereignty lies in the people, and it is through the public as a whole that it works.

(c) Government is the agent of the General Will, and it has to work according to the will of its master. The government itself is not sovereign.

(d) The sovereignty is arbitrary and unlimited because the people have accepted it unconditionally. The control and direction of the General Will for the fulfilment of their common interests. That is why, he has said to this extent that the people may be forced to be free.

## **Challenges before Nation States**

The concept of Nation-state is based upon this theory that nation-states, on one hand, are free to determine their internal policies and on the other hand, at the time of determining their foreign policy they remain free from the influence of external power or in other words of other country or international institutions. This nation-state is the form of present legal sovereignty. In modern times there are numerous challenges before the nation-states. On one hand the pluralistic viewpoint of nation-state has created internal challenges before them and numerous powerful organisations attacked the monistic form of state and tried to weaken it. On the other hand the nation-states are being attacked from outside the nation and have rendered them to be powerless. In

97

the foregoing pages we studied the Pluralistic Theory of sovereignty. Here we shall discuss the external challenges before the nation-states.

## **Challenges before Nation-states from outside**

The external or outside challenges before the nation-states can be divided into the following groups:

1. Nation-states in relation to Power Blocs.
2. Nation-states in relation to world economy.
3. Nation-states in relation to imperialism.

### **1. Nation states in relation to Power Blocs**

The outside powers which, by attacking the sovereignty of nation-states are reducing their powers, include (a) United Nations, (b) Power Blocs and (c) Military and other Regional organisations.

(a) United Nations. United Nations organisation was formed after the Second World War was over. Its main objective was to save the nations from the war force. It wanted to finish those reasons which forced the world nations into fire of two world wide wars. The work was possible only when there were some chicks on nation-states regarding wars. The winner nations of the Second World War formed the United Nations Organisation and brought most of the world nations into the ambit of this organisation. Whenever there is a war situation in any part of the world the United Nations organisation forces the concerned nations to solve their mutual problems through mutual discussion and parleys not to wage war. According to the UNO charter

the United Nations organisation has the right to take military action against those nations which do not agree to start war several occasions have come before the United Nations organisation after it was formed when UNO took military action against those nations which were bent upon destroying world peace. These military actions and other types of dictates of the UNO interfere, actually, in the sovereignty of nation-states and put limitations on them.

The other sides of the powers of United Nations Organisations are also this that it has divided the world-nations into two blocs. On one hand there are those powerful nations who have supremacy on United Nations organisation and they use world politics through United Nations in such a way as protects their interests. The executive power/authority of the United Nations lies in the Security Council. The number of its members is 15. Among these fifteen nations there are five nations (United States of America, U.K., France, Russia and China) which are permanent members the rest 10 nations are chosen it yearly a non-permanent members. It is important that in order to take crucial decisions it is necessary to have majority vote of a nations and the presence of all the permanent members is a must in such majority vote. In this way the week of powerful permanent members have established their supremacy over the peace loving militarily weak and small but sovereign nations. This situation

98

provides opportunity to interfere into the internal as well external affairs of most of the nation-states.

(b) Power Blocs. After the end of the Second World War, though several announcements had been made for the establishment of world peace, coexistence and enhancement of mutual goodwill and the United Nations Organisation was also formed, but the war-winner nations also began to try to have their influence and establish their supremacy over the other nations. As a result the world was divided into two power blocs. The leadership of one of these two camps was taken by the leader of the capitalist camp, the United States of America and the other bloc was led by contemporary Communist Russia (USSR)). These blocs on the one hand, started to increase their power and on the other hand started to make efforts to include small, weak and neglected nations into their respective camps. The American Bloc included United States of America, England, France and many other West-European nations. The other Bloc included USSR, and many other East-European nations. Both these power blocs, despite armed with modern sophisticated weapons, were afraid of each other and avoided direct confrontation but the mutual tension remained for a number of years between them. In this situation of mutual tension both these blocs remained ready to under power each other, barring direct war. Thus the contemporary situation of mutual tension between them was termed as the 'cold war'. During the period of cold war they did not directly wage war against each other but did not spare any change when they did not try to decrease one's power, humiliate each other and undermine each other. Very soon the nation-states of the world started coming under the influence of either of them.

In the post war situation of the Second World War numerous nation states of Africa and Asia, after getting freedom from foreign imperialistic rule proceeded to lead their own free life. Both the power blocs started efforts to include these free nations into their respective fold. In order to keep their independence safe and lead a life of respect and honour these nations came together



into a new bloc. Pt. Nehru of India, Nasser of Egypt and Marshall Tito of Ugoslavia gave this bloc flesh and blood. This bloc came into existence with the name, "Non-Aligned Bloc". Later on the newly evolved independent nations became its members. The non-aligned nations resolved to keep themselves away from the two power blocs and adopted a policy of remaining equidistant from both these power blocs. This third bloc was anti colonial, pro-disarmament and made efforts to enhance mutual cooperation among the newly independent and developing nations. The Non-Aligned Movement (NAM) protected the small and weak nations of the world from the dangers which threatened their sovereignty.

**Change In the Position of Power Blocs.** With the start of last decade of the twentieth century the position of power blocs underwent a very drastic change. The leader of the former USSR, Mikhail Gorbachev adopted a new policy of Perestroika (reorganisation) and Glasnost (openness) in 1985. Due to

99

this, on one hand, a new life was infused in the economic, political and social life of the USSR, the people of USSR secured the change to lead their own life in their own way in an independent environment. On the other hand the control of USSR weakened on the east European nations. Soon the popular public opinion came out against the communist governments of these nations. Before 1989 the people of very powerful communist nations like Poland, Hungary, Czechoslovakia, Bulgaria, East Germany and Rumania removed the communist badges from chests and adopted one form or the other of democracy. Not even this, in 1991 the Soviet Union was disintegrated and it gave birth to numerous nations. The communist rule came to end there. Resultantly the communist bloc disintegrated.

As a consequence of the disintegration of the Communist Bloc, its opponent, the Capitalist Bloc remained as it is. As there is no opposition to this bloc, this bloc can not be termed as bloc. United States of America is the anti-potent nation of the world these days. The disintegration of the communist bloc brought end to the situation of cold war. Now the newly independent developing nation-states have got the opportunity to get organised and lead a free life of their own. Because of only one power bloc remaining in existence the very concept of Non Aligned movement seems to be irrelevant.

(c) **Military and other Regional Organisations.** After the Second World War was over the communist bloc and the capitalist bloc formed their own military organisation to establish their sovereignty over world nations. With this, the various regions of world saw the evolution of several regional organisations. All these organisations influenced adversely the independence of small nations, more or less. All the nations whether big or small, poor or rich, weak or strong began to depend on others for their internal or external policies. Here we describe these organisations briefly:

(i) **North-Atlantic Treaty Organisation (NATO).** In order to strengthen its bloc, USA formed a strong military organisation in 1949 in the name of North Atlantic Treaty Organisation (NATO). USA, England, France, West Germany, Belgium, Netherlands, Norway, Denmark, Luxemburg, Italy, Portugal, Canada and Iceland were included in this organisation. The main

objective of NATO was to face the challenge of the USSR and by making the small nations free from the threat of Soviet Union, to bring them under their influence. The power of NATO succeeded in putting restriction on the extension of influence of the Soviet Union. The control of USA over NATO is proved by the fact that the chief Military commander of NATO has always been an American.

(ii) Warsaw Pact. In order to keep restriction on the influence of NATO and to exert its influence on East European nations Soviet Union formed a very high military organisation in 1955 under Warsaw Pact. The members of this organisation were Soviet Union, Albania (it left organisation in 1968) Bulgaria, Czechoslovakia, Hungary, Poland, Rumania and East Germany. This organisation also worked for bringing the independent nations under the communist influence and helped the governments of such nations whole

100

heartedly in every sphere. With the scattering of the Soviet Union the Warsaw Pact also got disintegrated. Not only this, the member nations of the Warsaw Pact. These days, are trying to get themselves with North Atlantic Treaty Organisation.

(iii) European Union. The efforts of the European nations from the beginning of economic areas to the political areas to act as a community have also been to restrict the sovereignty of independent nation-states. In 1957 numerous European Nations formed European Economic Community (EEC) with the objective of helping the European nations in their economic development. Its members included France, Germany, Netherlands, Norway, Britain, Greece, Belgium etc. For its optimum system and for materialising the concept of forming a big organisation efforts were made to form a common parliament and a common cabinet. The European Economic Community development European Union in 1993. It has also been determined that by 1999 a system of common currency would be made for all the European nations. It is also hoped that in course of time it would help in forming common foreign policy and common defence policies for all the nations. The elected representatives of the parliaments of these nations meet every month in the form of European Parliament. As this Parliament goes on gaining strength, the strength of individual member nation states will go on decreasing.

(iv) Other Organisations. To fulfill common objectives in various fields concerned states have formed numerous organisations and they have been working very successfully. Due to these organisations the sovereignty of the concerned states has been made limited and there is restriction on the concept of nation-state. Organisation of Petroleum exporting countries-OPEC and South Asian Association of Regional co-operation-SAARC on some among these organisations.

## **(2) Nation-states in relation to World Economy**

In the present world there has been created a situation of a polar power bloc, in the absence of a bi-polar power bloc the cold war situation has come to an end, and because of this reason the possibilities of world peace look evident. But along with this situation, a new situation has taken birth which seems to engulf the entire world into its stomach. This situation is of Economic

Power. Although the efforts were started very early to establish sovereignty over poor and weak nations through economic power in place of military imperialism. But after the decade of 1980 the economic power provided a large scope of strengthening authority over newly independent states, backward economically by the imperialistic countries. United States of America, West European nations, Japan etc had developed economically and on the other hand developing countries were coming more and more under debt. Not only this, the economic condition of even America began to worsen, and it began to come before the world as the biggest debtor. The scattering of the communist world and the development of European common market brought forth the

101

importance of economic power. In 1990 Iraq succeeded over Kuwait. With this success the many western nations like USA became afraid that if Iraq, became successful in establishing its control over the extensive oil fields of Arabian bloc, the economy of these nations would scramble because the economy of western countries is based on the oil. Thus the USA with all its military strength attacked Iraq and freed Kuwait. In the same way East Asian countries/nations have an impact on the economic interests of USA. The cheaply manufactured clothes of Asian countries are actually in demand in United States of America. This had led to the large scale retrenchment of labour in America.

Keeping in view the above facts in mind the western countries including United States of America have been busy to evolve a new such policy everyday as to improve their economic condition and to drain in world money towards them, and they avail of the helplessness of the poor nations for implementing their policies and programmes.

(i) Increasing Domination of Multi-national companies. Multinational companies of United States of America and other affluent nations of the world with the huge wealth and modern developed techniques have been trying hard to establish their control over the markets of backward, poor developing nations of the world. The companies take in hand the manufacture of articles of daily use, utilising the rich natural resources of the countries, and amass huge profits by using their local markets. Being exploited gradually the nation becomes poor. Not only this, these companies bribe the rulers of these nations and force them to betray the interests of their nations. They also make efforts to get the rulers changed as and when they find such a chance. Numerous nations of the world have found themselves encircled by the net of these multi-national companies. The policy of globalisation has paved the way for draining out the resources of India to foreign countries through these companies.

(ii) The Dunkel Draft and general Agreement on Tariffs and Trade— GATT. The powerful and economically strong countries of the world including United States of America, Britain, Germany, France, Canada, Japan etc, want the markets of newly independent nations to open for their commodities and their goods should be sold there without any restrictions. They also want this people get work in these markets. Keeping this view a world wide agreement has been done in which the consent of 117 nations including India has been obtained. This agreement has hurt the interests of the developing countries of the world and has forced them to accept such

conditions that are totally against their interests and ultimately this agreement will restrict the independent existence.

(iii) Foreign Debts and International Monetary Fund. The United States of America and other rich nations of the world have given loans to poor developing countries and thus have entangled them in their loan net. Now they frame such policies as to exploit them at the most. The loan prone

102

nations are going on losing their strength to challenge their exploitation. To be forced to sign the GATT agreement is one of such numerous examples. The 1993 report of the world bank has said that the most burdened foreign loan countries are Brazil, Mexico and India. In 1992 the total loan liability of India was 820 crore American Dollar which interest was paid by taking new loans. In order to repay foreign loan the developing countries are being forced to curtail their exports instead of increasing it, and gradually the foreign loans are fattening. The loanee countries are forced to accept every type of condition imposed by the loaner countries. The Jack of these countries is going to be tightened more and more every day. Thus there is every possibility that along with the economic sovereignty being limited, the chances of curtailment of political sovereignty are very near.

### **(3) Nation-states in relation to imperialism**

Imperialism has constantly been causing danger to the freedom of the nation-states. As they find the circumstances favourable the powerful nations have been establishing their sovereignty over these nations, and destroying their freedom by enslaving them. Though the traditional form of imperialism has ended and the nation-states which had been made dependent by the imperialistic states after the Second World War have become independent, but in the present world imperialism has come in a new form. The supporters of imperialism give several arguments in their support but actually by renaming the form of imperialism a new they want to put a curtain on the much contemplations form of imperialism. At present there are two forms of imperialism (1) colonialism and (2) Neo-colonialism. These three forms-imperialism, colonialism and Neo-colonialism are minutely examined as under.

(i) Imperialism. It has been an intensive desire of the powerful nations from the very beginning to have their rule over the weak, since the beginning of life of man the powerful have ruled over the weak. The powerful societies forced the weak to come under their rule and thus extended the boundaries of the kingdom. When a nation, by winning another territory, form it a part of its area, the winning nation establishes its empire over the vanquished. According to another definition imperialism means, "a policy or operation" by a nation in which after establishing its national unity it makes another nation dependent for the extension of its industry and trade and establishes its own rule." For example Belgium, Netherlands, France, Portugal and Spain established their rule across the ocean and formed imperialism in the 19th century.

Though imperialism is not a new concept, empires have come to be established from ancient times, but during the 19th century imperialism spread all over the world. The small nations of

Europe brought distant nations of the world under their rule in order to exploit them. They succeeded in making dependent the nation of Asia and Africa as they secured there all such situations through which they could establish their empires.

103

(ii) Colonialism. Imperialism has become word of hatred, contempt, improper and very disordered. Now imperialists have renamed it in new situation. Under colonialism the people of powerful nations come to live in the weak and poor nations. In doing so they obtain the permission of their ruler, and with their help and support they are able to establish their sovereignty over these nations. In order to fulfil their nations interests they exploit the natural human and other resources of these poor and weak nations. They try to destroy the culture and civilisation of the dependent states' so that they forget their own traditions and customs. Language, traditions and customs are destroyed, the proud history is neglected. In other words it is tried to destroy all of the dependent states which afterwards the youth could restore the lost dignity and power.

(iii) Neo-colonialism. Neo-colonialism is the very refined form of colonialism. It can be described as such a strategy in which a colonial nation does not establish its sovereignty over the backward and weak nation but makes it under its rule (or dependent) through various after means. For this it sometimes provides help, sometimes pressurises them and makes them slave through financial, economic and technological means. Such a dependent nation can easily be exploited. At present neo-colonialism is such a developed and refined form of imperialism in which weak nations become hollow internally and attain the last stage of extinction but externally it blocs independent politically.

## **FACTORS IN THE RISE IMPERIALISM-FORMS AND METHODS**

There were several circumstances favourable for the establishment of imperialism in Africa and Asia. European nations availed of these circumstances fully and established their empire over various nations of these continents through different means. Following is the description of those favourable factors-forms and methods through which imperialism was established.

(1) Industrial Revolution as a major Factor. Industrial revolution played an important role in establishing imperialism in the world. Its role can be described as under.

(i) It was imperative to discover new markets for the sale of articles manufactured on a large scale. Industrial revolution had to large scale industrial production and it created a new situation. First of all, the small countries of Europe were manufacturing good on a very large scale that the production was more than the demands of the people of these nations. Hence a crisis was created to sell these goods in a market. Secondly the industries of these nations adopted a policy of protection. For doing this they put heavy customs duty on the imports so that imports could not be undertaken. In this way the sale of these goods was not possible in the European countries, so they had to find new nations of the world which could act as markets of their goods.

(ii) Search for industrial Revolutioners Nations. The industrial nations

104

of Europe knew very well that their goods could be purchased and absorbed in the countries which had not yet undergone industrial revolution and which are densely populated. The solution of this problem was seen in the Asian and African countries. These two continents had not witnessed industrial revolution so far and they were immensely populated.

With their entry into the nations of Asia and Africa they thought that if they succeeded in establishing political sovereignty in these nations, they would on one hand, could absorb their goods and on the other hand they would also succeed in the marketing competition with other European nations. Because of these circumstances various European tribes began making efforts to establish their empires.

(iii) Availability of Raw Material. Industrial nations of Europe were in great demand for raw materials for their manufacturing industries. Raw material in these nations was not available in as much quantity as was required for large scale production. Thus these nations searched such nations as could supply raw material as per their requirement. Asian and African countries had raw materials in abundance. For example, Congo and Malaysia produced Rubber in huge quantities, cotton was produced in Egypt and India in bulk quantities. Not only this, European nations were in great-demand for tea, sugar, tobacco, and cereals, they were also available in Asian and African "countries. So these nations thought it imperative to establish their political empire in these countries to ensure raw materials. In this way the European countries extended their territories.

(iv) Political Sovereignty imperative for Investment. Gradually the European nations amassed wealth (capital), in the end of 19th century these nations planned to exploit the Asian and African nations by investing their surplus capital in these nations. There poor nations had not only raw materials in abundance but had cheap labour, they wanted to ensure the safety of their capital. They used to say that block rulers were weak and they could not ensure safety of their capital so it was thought imperative to establish political sovereignty in these nations. Due to this reason on the French Capitalists request, France established its sovereignty on Morocco.

(2) The form of Imperialism was extreme Nationalism. The extreme nationalism of the European nations contributed a lot in the rootness of imperialism. This form of nationalism can be delineated as under:

(i) Storm of Nationalism in European Nations. 19th century is famous for the origin and evolution of nationalism in Europe, England, France, Germany and Italy witnessed the propagation of nationalism. Every nation tried to by pass another in the pursuit of becoming more powerful. For this political experts and writers propagated to increase the pride of their nation by organising the their people as per the circumstances of their action. Every nation began to prove better than the other. For this numerous arguments were advanced. In this way, by the end of 19th century such a blind nationalism evolved in Europe in which self nationalism was considered the pride of the nation.



105

This extreme nationalism gave birth to imperialistic aspirations and very soon there was a mad competition for establishing imperialism. Every nation of Europe felt pride in being called imperialistic.

(ii) Control over strategically important Regions. The propagation of extreme nationalism inspired the European nations to establish their empires in Asian and African nations, so they, in a planned way, started to establish their control over the strategically important regions of Asia and Africa. By doing so they could protect them from their competitive nations. England surpassed all in this pursuit. They established their control over strategically important nations like Hong Kong, Cyprus, Port said, Singapore and Aden. The other European nations also followed suit, and gave impetus to forming imperialism.

(iii) Use of the People of Dependent Nations for their selfish end. Nationalism of European nations motivated them to use the people of dependent nations for serving their selfish ends. They could increase their military power by recruiting their people in military. The English used the Indian army in their interests completely,. Secondly, they could carry the people of one colony to the other to work on this farms and in mines. They kept such people as their slaves and tortured them in humanly.

(3) Development of Means of Transport and Communication. Development of means of transport and communication helped a lot in the expansion of imperialism. By then industrial revolution had reached its climax, everyday there was a new invention. These inventions made the means of transport and communication modern. Steam powered ships carried imperialism to far off places-nations. Through these ships the European nations succeeded in sending manufactured goods to far off nations of the world and bringing raw materials for their industries from these nations. They could also bring and carry their soldiers here and there. In this way steam powered ship helped the European nations to expand imperialism in the Asian and African nations.

European imperialistic nations also developed means of transport and communication in their colonial nations. They got cheap labour in these nations. They laid a network of railways, roadways, telephones and telegraphs in their colonies. The railway and road network linked and interior parts of the colonies to the port cities so that they could carry raw material to their nations and bring manufactured goods to the interiors of the colonies. These networks also helped in the movement of soldiers from one place to another and to strengthen sovereignty over them. So with the development of these means the iron hands closed over the colonies and strengthened their sovereignty on them.

(4) Weak governments in Asian and African countries. Though in the ancient and medieval periods the Asian and African nations gave birth to numerous great civilisations, but in 19th century the governments of these nations weakened. Small rulers and heads (sardave) had declared their territories independent. They were enemies of one another and were engaged in armed

106

struggles. In order to serve their selfish ends they took help from the strong European nations. In the absence of strong central authority the foreign traders made these small rulers fight with one another and gradually they went on bringing them under their control. The story of expansion of imperialism in Asian and African territories was not of gallantry, bravery and power but of the mutual distrust, infighting and avarice and treachery.

From the study of 19th century it is revealed that at that time nationalism was being replaced by extreme nationalism, and African and Asian territories were disintegrating into regions, provinces and classes.

(5) Propagation of the Concept of Civilising the Backward People. Imperialism formation concepts on the mind and heart of the European people helped the spread of imperialism. In this respect the following view points are worth studying.

(i) Concept of Responsibility of the White People. The proponents of the imperialism have propounded that god has beloveted upon the white people of Europe the responsibility of civilising the backward tribes. So it was announced that the white people of European nations are going to Asian and African nations not to spread imperialism but to improve the lot of backward tribes there. The contemporary famous writer Rudyard Kipling called the backward tribes of Asian and African nations "white man's burden", and exhorted the white to complete this working happily. In the way French Political expert, Jules Ferry propounded that it is the great work of the civilised society to make the backward people civilised. These thoughts opened the doors of establishing imperialism by the white people.

(ii) To be a Christian a Sacred work. The Christian priests thought it a pious and sacred work to make people Christian. They sent missionaries to Asian and African countries to spread Christianity. They helped the backward people with money and converted them into Christianity after giving them a lot of baits. A number of traders and soldiers also helped a lot in this pursuit. To convert people into Christianity all the Christian people thought it a godly duty. Thus spread of Christianity also helped in the spread of imperialism. Like the Christian Missionaries the discoverers of new nations also played a significant role in the spread of imperialism. They went to far-off nations of Asia and Africa for which they had no prior knowledge. After studying the reports of these people governments of European nations first established their posts in these nations and then took the adjoining areas under their control, and finally established imperialism in these nations.

## **IMPERIALISTIC CONQUESTS OF ASIA AND AFRICA**

European nations discovered numerous new nations in America, Asia and Africa and by establishing their rule in these nations, spread imperialism of their respective nations. In some countries these tribes went and settled and made them their colonies. They tortured the original tribes inhumanly and destroyed them completely. As far as the history of spread of imperialism in

107

Asia and Africa is concerned it is a different one completely. The European tribes went to these continents for doing trade and commerce and so they established there their posts. Gradually, through military action they established their imperialism spread over a long span of time. And even in the later half of 20th century some remnants of imperialism are found in these nations. In the following description the history of imperialism in these continents will be delineated.

### **(A) British Imperialistic Conquest of India**

There is a long history of British Imperialism in India. In the 16th century of traders of Portugal, France, Holland and England had reached India and started their business activities and had also formed trading companies lawfully. In the last days of 1599 AD. The English traders formed East India Company and the Empress Elizabeth authorised this company to do business activities in India. The Britishers who came to India with the solve purpose of trading were encouraged by the favourable conditions here and they established their rule. After establishing their empire in India, they exploited it a lot. The true form of British Imperialism in India starts with the battle of Plassey, and the period between 1757 AD and 1947 AD. The period of two hundred years is termed the period of British Imperialism in India. From the battle of Plassey in 1757 to the Independence struggle in 1857 the British took most of India under their control. India became the part and parcel of British empire.

### **(B) Imperialism in China**

The expansion of imperialism in China can be described in the following chronological order.

(i) The opium battles led the foundation of imperialism. Because of opium China witnessed numerous battles. Before these battles several restrictions were imposed on foreign traders. British traders bought tea, silk etc from China and British goods could be brought into China. These traders brought opium into China stealthily in bulk quantities to earn huge profits. When the Chinese authorities destroyed their opium leader ships in 1839 AD, the British waged war against China and defeated her in the war. because of the defeat, the political sovereignty of the British was established China. They got huge amounts of money as a penalty, they got authority to trade through five ports and the Chinese government had to accept that the crimes committed by the British would not be heard by Chinese courts. Later on other foreign countries too forced China to accept these conditions. When the foreigners get such rights in a country, these rights are termed as Extra Territorial Rights. Now the Chinese government could not even impose customs duties. Very soon France also came forward to establish its empire there and it too forced China to enter into sameful treaties with her.

(ii) Expansion of Japanese Empire. Japan wanted to extend its influence over Korea where there was Chinese control. With the interference of Japan a battle (war) was inevitable. In the war Japan came out victorious. Resultantly

108

China liberated Korea and Japan took numerous islands including Formosa (Taiwan) under its control. Not only this, China had to give huge amount to Japan as a penalty.

(iii) Cutting of Chinese Melon. China did not have ample amount to give to Japan as penalty. France, Britain Russia and Germany provided the amount to China and in exchanged they divided China into spheres of their influences. These nations used the resources of their respective spheres of influence in interests and exploited their resources to the maximum. Other countries did not interfere in the sphere of influence of another country. This division was as under:

(a) Germany on Kiaochi bay and its complete monopoly on Shantung and Huangho valley.

(b) Russia on Liatung and it got monopoly over laying railway line in Manchuria.

(c) France on Kuangcho Bay and its monopoly over three Southern provinces.

(d) Britain on Veyie he Veyie port and its monopoly on yangtise valley. The above division is known by the name of 'cutting of the Chinese Melon'

(iv) Intrusion of America. America also wanted to avail of the pitiable condition of China. Due to the division of China into the spheres of influene America could to avail of the chance of exploiting China by its intrusion. So, America proposed 'Open Door Policy' which meant equal rights to all the foreign powers for China's root. Britain supported this policy of America because of fear of Japan and Russia.

In the Battle of Boxer China once again tried to get rid of the imperialistic powers but it was defeated and the imperialistic hold was strengthened with more rigidity. Gradually all the rulers of Chinese territories went on becoming the slaves of foreigners. They went on being metted under the clutches of foreigners in exchange of obtaining facilities, loans etc.

### **(C) Imperialism in South and South-east Asia**

South and South-east Asian nations include Nepal, Sri Lanka, Malaysia, Indochina (Laws and Combodia), Burma, Thailand or Scam and Phillipines various European tribes tortured these nations very much in order to expand trade first in these countries and then establish their sovereignty there. The British maintained peace treaty with Nepal due to being situated in the eat of the Himalayas and a Buffer state between Tibet and India, and after establishing control over India and bringing Tibet under their sovereignty Britain did not disturb the independence of Nepal. The incidents of establishing imperialism in South and South east India can be described as under:

(1) Control of Britain over Sri Lanka. Sri Lanka has a place of importance among the world nations in respect of tea and rubber production. After

establishing their control over this island nation the Europeans set up tea and rubber plantations here, and produced them in bulk quantities. First of all the Portuguese established their authority and later on Dutch (Hollandise) established their control. And in the last the British succeeded in bringing Sri Lanka under their control. It remained under British control by the middle of the 20th century.

(2) British Sovereignty over Malaya including Singapore. In the beginning the Portuguese had control over Singapore and Malaya. Later on the British established their authority. After Singapore and Malaya, Britain was able to establish its authority over entire sea-routes of South-east Asia as Singapore is situated on the Southern most tip of Malaya Peninsula. In this way the trading condition of Britain strengthened more than that other competitive nations.

(3) Sovereignty of the Dutch over Indonesia. The Dutch had established their authority over Indonesia from the very beginning. All the islands of Indonesia were under the control of the Dutch. Not only this, the Dutch also established their sovereignty over Malacca island.

(4) French Rule over Indochina. Indochina includes Laos, Cambodia and Vietnam. When Britain was entangled with China over opium war, at that time France tried to establish its control over Indochina's trade and commerce. It gradually established its political power over all the parts of Indochina and entrusted its government into the hands of a governor-general. Gradually the French finished the struggling power of Indochina and started exploiting it.

(5) Burma-a part of British Imperialism. In order to have trade ties and increase economic relations with Burma, France got authorisation from Burma to lay railway line from Tonkin to Maundley. Britain was scared of the efforts of France to establish control all over Southeast Asia, because it was causing danger to British empire. In order to control French expansionism Britain started war with Burma. Burma was defeated in the war. The English imprisoned the King of Burma and sent him to India and annexed Burma to their empire in 1886 A.D.

(6) Foreign Influence over Thailand. Thailand is also known by the name of Siam. Though it is situated between Burma and Indochina, it remained free forever. Despite all this it could not remain free from the influence of British and French influence. These two nations remained internal affairs.

(7) Control of America over Phillipines. America too had not lagged behind in the pursuit of empire formation, though it took part in the work only at the end of 19th century. Phillipines was under the control of Spain. The Phillipinoes started struggle against the rule of Spain. America sent its troops to Phillipines against Spain. Spain was defeated and America took Phillipines under its control. The Phillipinoes also revolted against the Americans but this revolt was suppressed by Phillipines remained under the control of America.

#### **(D) Imperialism in Centrol and West Asia**

Various European nations tried to expand their empires in control and West Asia. Its description is as under.

(1) Push and Pull between Britain and Russia for control over Iran and Afghanistan. At the end of 19th century Russia was sufficiently powerful Britain not only had to protect its interests in Iran and Afghanistan but was also scared of the expansion of influence of Russia in control Asia as it could create fear in the empires of Indian subcontinent Both Russia and Britain had taken vow to bring both these nations under their control, so it was natural to have differences of opinion. Meanwhile in 1907 AD there was treaty between Russia and Britain on the question of Iran and Afghanistan. The conditions of this treaty were:

(i) Russia promised not to take Afghanistan under its control,

(ii) Britain also promised that it would not annex Afghanistan.

(iii) Iran was divided into three segments. First was in the influence of Britain . Second under Russia and the third was neutral in which both of them could expand their influence. In this way we can say that Iran was divided by Britain and Russia in order to fulfil their interests.

(2) British and American Control over Iran. After the Russian Revolution the Russian interest lessened in Iran. On the other hand due to be attracted towards Iran. Very soon the Standard Oil Company of America and the Anglo-Persian Oil company of England established their control over Iran.

(3) British Influence over Tibet. Though in 1907 Russia and England entered into a treaty in which they consented that they would not interfere in Tibet, but with the end of empire in China in 1911 AD Britain extended its influence gradually over Tibet.

(4) Struggle for Sovereignty over Turkey. The European nations were looking with a questioning eyes the expanding influence of Germany over Turkey and other Asian nations. Germany made a plan and obtained a contract to lay railway line from Kustuntunia to Baghdad and from Baghdad to the Persian gulf. Through this plan Germany, on one hand could protect its interest and on the other hand it could make plan to advance towards Iran and India. In the beginning Russia, Britain and France opposed the treaty being done between Germany and Turkey, but later on Germany, France and England agreed to divide this region mutually. In the meantime the first world war started. Germany and Turkey were defeated and resultantly Syria, Philippines, Iraq and Arabian territory were snatched from Turkey. Now the control of the entire territory came under the control of England and France.

When oil resources were discovered in the Arabian Territory, the American oil companies made England and France their partners and obtained oil extracting facilities in Arabian Territory.

## **IMPERIALISM IN AFRICA**



The history of imperialism in Africa is more pitiable. The examples of torture the European tribes did there are not easily found elsewhere. Imperialism in Africa had two forms—One in which African people were made slaves and sent them to other countries and the other in which European nations took the entire Africa under their control and divide them among them according to their convenience. Both these forms are discussed with the following lines:

### **(A) Sale and Purchase of African Slaves**

European nations had little knowledge of the interiors of the African continent till the middle of the 19th century, though numerous European nations specially Spain had reached the coastal areas of American continents since 15th century. This period was the period when Spain had established the governments in American continents and finished the original tribes of the continents by killing them in large numbers. Now they needed the labourer who would work in the fields of their colonies. This necessity was fulfilled by the Spaniards by purchasing the slaves from Lisbon markets, who had been brought there from African countries, they sent these slaves to the fields of their colonies in American continents. In the beginning the sardars of the villages caught the villagers and sold them to the European traders. Afterwards European traders also attacked the coastal areas of Africa, caught the villagers as slaves and sent them to their colonies in American continents.

1. Slave Trade of the British. Though the slave trade was started by the Spanish in the beginning but gradually the European Tribes also started the trade of African slaves. The British government supported the slave trade by English traders. Not only this a very religious personality named John Hawkins went to Africa and he brought back countless African people as slaves. The British government also became partner in this trade and earned profit. In the 17th century a company was formed and the British government authorised this company to deal in slave trade. This trade went on for a longtime and at last came to an end in the middle of 19th century.

2. Inhuman Treatment with the Slaves. The description of slave trade would not be complete if we do not deal with the inhuman treatment by the European tribes with the slaves. European people caught a number of poor African village people as slaves and brought them to European countries or to their colonies. The villagers people protested their capturing, were loaded on the ships like goats and sheep. Half of them died of in sanitary conditions and suffocations. In the fields they were treated worse than animals. Because of fear, those who tried to feel were tortured beyond our imagination.

### **(B) The Conquest of Africa**

Till the middle of 19th century the European Tribes went on with the slave trade in Africa and when this trade came to an end these people conquered

112

entire Africa and divided it among themselves. Till the middle of the 19th century the Portuguese, the English, the Dutch and the French were confined to the coastal areas only,

because except Algeria in the north (controlled by the French and cape colony in the South (controlled by the English) the European people did not have any knowledge of the interiors of the African continent. But by the end of the last decade of the 19th century they had brought the entire Africa under their control and they divided the entire territory among themselves conveniently.

## **Consequences of Imperialism**

Imperialism established by the European nations in Asia and Africa had far reaching consequences. In brief they are as under.

(1) Loss of Independence. Imperialism resulted directly in the loss of independence of most of the nations of Africa and Asia. They were forced to live a life of slaves. It was not only a political dependence but also a complete dependence. The European imperialists not only abducted political independence but through economic exploitation these and through implementation of various plans, made these nations dependent economically also. In a few years they became poor, deprived and totally dependent upon their ruling nation. Not only this, it was also tried to create their mental state of slavery socially, religiously and culturally. Gradually they began to feel that every thing of Europeans is refined and best and their own inferior and discardable. The slave mentality bust the colonial nations the most.

(2) Economic Exploitation. Due to industrial Revolution in European nations discovered new markets for their bulk production on a large scale. In Asia and Africa they, not only, found such markets but favourable circumstances also, which prompted them to establish their empires in these continents. Due to establishment of their empires they exploited their colonies to the maximum. On one hand they looted the resources of the colonies and carried them to Europe, on the other hand they made them completely dependent economically. Local small scale and cottage industries were destroyed and agriculture was made controlled by brokers and middle man. The colonial nations became the exporters of raw-material and importers of European manufactured goods. Later on the imperialistic nations of Europe invested huge capitals in these nations and put up large scales industries there, so that they could produce bulk quantities of manufactured goods at low costs due to cheap labour and easy availability of raw materials at low costs, sell them then and there and earn large amounts of profits. In this way they exploited their colonies economically to the maximum.

(3) Religious conversion at a very large scale. European imperialistic nations are the followers of Christianity. They, along with establishing their empires, converted the people of their colonies into Christianity. For this they adopted every means, whether good or bad. This is the reason why large population of Christianity followers live in these nations today.

113

(4) Denial of Basic Rights. The history of tyrannies and tortures which the European imperialistic nations did on the people of their colonies is very dreadful. The imperialistic nations deprived the people of the colonies of their basic rights. They also snatched the rights

relating to individuals, families, societies and individual developments, and forced them to live a life of animals. They taught them that dependence is a good result and low mentality exeat them.

(5) Racism. The white people proved the black races of Asia and Africa to the inferior and backward. They propounded them to be White man's Burden. On the basis of the doctrine they announced that to make the black people civilised had been entrusted to the white people by god. Under this veil they divided the people into two races the whites and the Blacks. They found ways and means to keep the black people dependent for ever, wearing the mask of ruling the blacks, making them civilised, and developing them. They treated them in humanly and developed the slave instinct in them to remain dependent to the White for ever.

(6) Effects on Imperialistic Countries. Imperialism had also for reaching effects on the imperialistic countries. First, the imperialistic countries, in a very short period, became very rich. They made new plans and abducted the wealth of the defeated nations. Secondly, before the establishment of empires, these European small nations were unimportant on the world map but after establishing their control over the countries of Asia and Africa. They became the fore runners of world politics. Thirdly, mutual distrust and conformation also increased among the imperialistic countries. In order to protect their empires they generally, engaged them in armed struggles. Fourthly when these European races came in contact with the defeated races, they felt that the defeated races were more civilised, more cultured and more refined than the European races. The White people had learnt a lot from these black people or races.

(7) Destruction of their Culture. In order to rule their colonies permanently the foreign imperialists. Though it necessary to destroy their cultures gradually. In this pursuit they made constant efforts they glorified the foreign languages, foreign culture and foreign civilisation and criticised and branded their languages, civilisation and culture as inferior discardable and ancient. Due to propagation of foreign languages, and religion-conversion the colonial people began to consider the civilisation and culture better and began to feel proud to adopt the foreign way of life. As a result the culture of the defeated nations began to perish.

(8) Internal Conflicts and World Wars. Every imperialistic nation all over the world wanted to enslave the most regions or make most regions protectorates and exploit them. There was a mad-rush for establishing imperialism. It was natural the selfishness would lead to conflicts. In order to establish control over the nations of Africa and Asia the European imperialistic nations fought among themselves off and on and also avoided these conflicts

114

sometimes after making numerous treaties. In the last they were divided into two powerful blocs and become the reasons of first and Second World Wars.

## chapter 7 theories of power in the society

Apart from the forms of power, another equally important question is how power is distributed in the society, i.e. who holds power. Whereas politics as power implies a relationship, that is, it can

be used by somebody against somebody else, it also implies possession— something that one has and which one may use or abuse. If politics is the control over the wills of many by a few, the question arises who are these privileged ‘few’. There are a number of theories regarding the possession of power. We shall discuss the prominent ones. They are:

- i. Power of a class
- ii. Elitist theory of power
- iii. Pluralist theory of power
- iv. Power and Gender
- v. Patriarchy and Power

## POWER AND CLASS DOMINANCE

The first answer to the question as to who holds power and how to understand the nature of power in the society was provided by Marxism. It declared that power in the society belongs to the economically dominant class. As explained above, Marxism analyses power in its totality - as a unique and complex combination of political, economic and ideological dimensions. This power belongs to the class which controls the means of production in the society and is used by it to secure and consolidate its own position, and suppress and exploit the subordinate class(s). This dominant class was described by Marx as the ‘Ruling Class’. In Communist Manifesto, Marx and Engels wrote, ‘Political power, properly so called is merely the organized power of one class for suppressing

60

another’. Ever since the emergence of private property, society had been divided into two antagonistic classes—the propertied and the non-propertied, and power has been the privilege of the dominant class. In Greek society, power belonged to the masters; in the feudal society, it was the domain of nobility; and in the capitalist society, it belongs to the capitalist-industrial class. Control over the means of production involves control over the political and the ideological fields as well. Although in his later writings, Marx and Engels emphasized the point that power of the state in the capitalist society was not necessarily and always just an instrument of the capitalist class, yet, in the ultimate analysis, the politics of the state encouraged industrial activity and actually enriched the bourgeois class.

Marxist writers in the twentieth century have been equally concerned with analysing the nature of the class structure of the capitalist societies, changes in the nature of capitalism and how far power is an instrument of the dominant class. Though there are disagreements within Marxism and between the Marxists and the non-Marxists about the class structure of the capitalist societies and the role of politics in maintaining the class domination, there is a broad agreement that the structure of power is based upon a state which acts as an instrument to serve the interests of the ‘ruling class’ which dominates the mode of production. Classical Marxism basing their theory on historical materialism explained that the economic base determines the political structure of the society. Changes in the society do not come from the autonomous actions of the individuals but from fundamental and objective changes in the economic base of the society. The changes and power in the society could be explained only as a result of the struggle between the contending

classes. However, Gramsci, a Marxist writer in the inter-war period, added another dimension to class power and dominance. According to him, the domination of a class is achieved not only through the economic structure and coercion but also through the active consent of the non-propertied class(s). Terming it as 'Hegemony', he suggested that their consent is achieved through the use of intellectual, moral and political persuasion and leadership. This may involve greater concession to the subordinate classes and political forms such as democracy which allow some degree of choice, in order to maintain overall

61

view which preserves the power of the dominant class by distorting beliefs, common sense assumptions and popular culture.<sup>1</sup>

The rise of liberal-capitalist welfare state in the West after the second world war reduced the economic burden of the working class to a great extent. Marxism was faced with the question: how far the welfare state is an instrument of class power. In this context, contemporary Marxist writers have formulated a body of theory that is known as 'the relative autonomy of the state'. The main proponents of the theory are Ralph Milliband, Nicos Poulantzas, Claus Offe and others. The crux of their argument is that the social welfare policies have not challenged the capitalist system but have strengthened it by increasing its legitimacy in the eyes of the subordinate classes; economic growth has benefited the capitalist class much more than anyone else. In essence, economic growth is less an example of social welfare and more an example of class dominance. The Marxist writers have explicitly acknowledged the centrality of power to their analysis. As Ellen Wood says, 'the disposition of power is at the centre of Marxist political economy'. Similarly, Poulantzas asserts that inspite of changes, the politics still serves the interests of the ruling class even if the mechanisms of the relationship have changed. Politics still remains an act of securing conditions of capital accumulation, domination of capital and reproduction of the existing class relations. Though in the modern welfare state, a number of other classes have emerged, the two fundamental classes remain dominant. The role of the state is not to defend the interest of the economically dominant class on every specific issue but to provide for the Interest of the capital in general.<sup>2</sup> However, in the crisis, politics must act as an instrument to defend the imperatives of the capitalist system and hence still remains an instrument of class rule and repression. Though the state has acquired autonomy, it acts as its own right against both capital and labour. Taken as a whole, it still serves the interests of the owners of the means of production. Class power depends upon politics and politics depends upon class power.

Thus, inspite of autonomy, the class perspective -views the existence of the state apparatus as a necessary instrument to reproduce the conditions of class domination. If politics is the study of power, this mode of power is the power of economically dominant class in the society

62

## **ELITIST THEORY OF POWER**

In opposition to the theory of class power, the power theorists of Europe and America introduced the concept of Elite power. The essence of this theory is that power is concentrated in the hands of a small group of people in the society who take day-to-day decisions of the government. The rulers in the political system are few in number compared with the ruled. The term Elite originally meant the 'elect' or the 'best'. Politically it means that societies are always dominated by a minority (elite), the selected few, who take major decisions within the society and who concentrate power in their own hands. The theory has its origin in the classical political ideas, but it found its contemporary expression during the interwar period in the writings of Pareto, Mosca, Michel and the sociologists and political scientists associated with American science of politics. Pareto argued that in all societies, people can be divided into (i) small governing elite and non-governing elites, and (ii) the mass of population. This small elite can consist of administrators, dictators, warriors, wealthy men, religious priests or any other group of men in the society. Though the composition of elites may change over a period of time, i.e. they continue to circulate, but they are always present. 'History is a graveyard of aristocracy'. He rejected the Marxist view that political power is determined by economic class structure but declared that power belonged to men who exercise political skill. And it must always be so because of two reasons: i) a minority can organize itself better, and ii) it has some attributes which are very influential in the society they live. Similarly Mosca wrote that the rule of a governing elite is ensured by its superior organization and caliber; the domination of an organized minority over the unorganized majority is inevitable. The distinguishing character of the elite is the aptitude to command and exercise political power. Michels formulated the famous rule of 'iron law of oligarchy' by which he meant 'rule of the few'. He declared it as 'one of the iron laws of history, from which the most democratic modern societies, and within those societies, the most advanced parties, have been unable to escape'<sup>3</sup> The elite rule applies to all societies irrespective of their being liberal, socialist or communist.

The Elite theory claims that power in the society is the preserve of particular social groups and they hold power not only because

63

they are highly organized but also because they possess certain special qualities such as physical power, ability, skill, wealth, superior race etc. Empirical investigations of ruling elites carried out in America in 1920's came to the conclusion that a small number of people mainly from upper and upper middle class in the community and representing business interests were predominant in all spheres of life in the society. This elite has more power since political, economic and ideological powers are all concentrated in their hands. The nature of elites was investigated by a number of writers such as Karl Mannheim, Schumpeter, Anathony Down, Raymond Aron, Bottomore, Robert Dahl, C. Wright Mills etc. Mills, for example, in his book *The Power Elite* declared that three interlocking groups which dominated the 'command power' in American society were the political leaders, corporate leaders and the military leaders. Most of these elites groups, thought not elected, controlled the direction of American politics. The struggle for power virtually took place among these contending elites with the result that men in authoritative roles change from time to time, but power remained within the elite groups and never percolated to the masses. Even in democratic societies, government decisions and initiative of policy lie with the elites, unrestrained by masses.



Concern with the functioning of elites in politics is as old as the study of politics itself. However, the development of elite theory in the twentieth century was a reaction against Marxism and Western European socialist movements. Whereas Marxism emphasized the unified power of a particular class, the elitist theory argued that due to the separation of ownership and control of industry, such minorities were not necessarily owners of the means of production but might wield a variety of power resources. Any future society whether socialist or communist would also be subjected to minority rule. Genuine democracy was impossible in the face of elite rule. Power is not the monopoly of a particular group or a class. In understanding why elites develop, the crucial point is political and not economic. The elites are organized and the masses are not.

Thus if politics is power, then this power belongs not to a particular class but to a minority of elites in the society.

64

## **PLURALIST THEORY OF POWER**

If the elite theory of power was developed as a reaction against Marxism, the pluralist notion of power emerged as a reaction against the 'ultra realism' of Elitism. Whereas elitism saw power in the minority, pluralism sees power in the 'minorities'. Pluralism is a doctrine of diversity. It claims that power in the modern democratic societies does not belong to a single elite but to different groups and interests which compete for influence, are able to share power, and influence the decision-making at some level or the other.<sup>4</sup>

A prominent theory as a model of studying politics developed in the twentieth century is known as the Interest Group Theory. The importance of group interest was highlighted by Bentley and Truman who said that from family to nation i.e. family, peasant organizations, caste and races, political parties and organizations, —all can be classified into groups. Politics is nothing except the struggle among groups for controlling the activities of the government or influencing its decisions. This understanding of politics as an act of conflict and cooperation among various groups in society is called pluralism. It is associated with a number of names such as Maitland, Figgis, Lindsay, Barker, Laski, MacIver etc. The concept also became popular in the context of community power debates in 1950s and 1960s and continued till 1970 and 1980s in America and was expressed in the writings of Floyd Hunter, Robert Dahl and Plsby.

Pluralism is a highly empirical theory based upon observable phenomena. According to the pluralists, power is 'an ability to influence policy outcome'. Any actual decision-making reveals that it is impossible to identify a single group or elite which dominates policy making. Decision is a complex process which involves bargaining among a plurality of individuals and groups, and the final outcome is a compromise. Rejecting both the Marxist and the Elitist notions, the pluralistic theory lays stress on the plurality of factors affecting policy outcome. The decisions arrived at may not be the best but the desired one and result of compromise and agreement among a variety of different groups. Since power is a type of influence, it does not belong to a single factor like wealth, but can be anything like ability, reputation, popularity,

65

charisma, or general favourable position with regard to any value. Power is not simply property that can be given to one group or denied to another on the basis of social and economic position. It can be an important factor but not the only factor. Those having formal political authority such as the Parliament or the Prime Minister can be influenced by outside social groups such as trade unions, peasant organizations, mass movements. No one single group possesses power to the exclusion of others. Interests such as industrial, agricultural, businessmen and consumers, housewives, students and others balance each other in the pursuit of their own ends. Politics acts as a 'honest broker' and is independent of any particular interest. The individual has his views represented in policy-making, not only through elections but also through the participatory mechanism of group politics.

The pluralist notion thus emphasizes major feature of the process of government decision-making, the plurality of actors involved, the emphasis on subjective rather than objective interests and the fact that the policy outcome seldom reflects the values preferences of one single group. However, the pluralists also accept the fact that only a very small minority of the population organized into groups determines the policy in most areas. It is sufficient if the ordinary people join a group.

Since 1980s, pluralists have been on defence. The emphasis on decision-making has been criticized for ignoring the issues or decisions which are not raised because the power-that-be wishes to keep them off the agenda. Decision-makers may be in agreement on certain issues they should not discuss, say for example, the issue of corruption in high places. If all the major political groups do not raise the issue, then it may be difficult to take any decision in spite of the feelings of the masses. Again, many people do not participate in politics and a large number of interest groups which are not formally recognized by decision-makers, the system has nothing to offer to them. Finally, critics also allege that the pluralists understate the independent role which politicians play in shaping policy and in deciding which interests to respond to. So it is being felt now that the pluralists only capture one facet of the distribution of power in the society.

66

## **GENDER AND POWER**

Apart from the power of class elite and the dominant social groups, the feminist writers have drawn our attention to another kind of power in the society which is termed as power of gender i.e. domination of men as a group over women as a group. A major contribution of feminist scholars in the twentieth century has been to analyse the subordinate position of women in the society. Gender usually refers to the feminine and masculine attributes and social roles. But what is important is that this gender distinction structures every aspect of our life by constituting an unquestioned framework in terms of which society views men and women. Feminism views this gender difference as an elaborate, system of male domination and wants to make an end to this system. For them politics is a power structured relationship in which one groups of persons (i.e. women) is controlled by another group (i.e. men).

There is a strong tradition that due to biological differences, men are superior to women. Women's natural role of wife and mother are viewed as genetically programmed, and male

aggression and women passivity as harmonically produced. Feminist writers criticize this pro-gender biological evidence as fallacious. They argue that the attributes which society considers natural for women are created by social pressures and conditioning. Gender is a product of social relations of sexuality because kinship rests upon marriage. Every gender system exhibits an ideology that relies on repression by presenting gender categories as fixed.<sup>5</sup>

Gender inequality is expressed in many areas of social life which include culture, ideology and discursive practices. The gender division in the home and in wage labour, the organization of state, sexuality, the structuring of violence, and many aspects of social organization contribute to the construction of unequal relations between man and woman. Though gender relations take different form in different societies, history periods, ethnic groups, social classes and generations, yet they have one thing in common - the gender relations are unequal and men are superior to women.

There are three main theories of gender relations i.e. liberal, socialist and radical feminists, though a number of other perspectives have also come into existence such as black feminism, ecofeminism, materialist feminism, social feminism etc. The liberal feminists see the gender inequality and male dominance in the lack of education and political participation and representation of women. Radical feminists argue that gender differentiation is primarily a matter of gender inequality with male being the dominant gender. All aspects of women's life are affected by male domination. They analyse the issue of male violence towards women, men's abuse of women's sexuality and issue of reproduction. The socialist feminists

67

see gender inequality as the product of class relations. For them, man as well as capital are the beneficiary of this domination. They concentrate on how domestic labour and wage labour compel women to be subordinated by men.

The focus on gender as the centre of power relations in the society set the terms of debate for most of the feminist writings after 1970s. It was argued that this gender differentiation is expressed through a number of inequalities and discriminations against women in the family and occupation, unequal educational opportunities, devaluation of their work etc., and only a transformation of social organization of gender can lead to the disappearance of sexual inequality and domination of men over women.

## **POWER AND PATRIARCHY**

This notion of gender and power manifests in the concept of Patriarchy. Patriarchy in wider definition means 'the manifestation and institutionalization of male dominance over women in the society'.<sup>6</sup> It implies that if politics is power, then this power is enjoyed by men holding all important institutions and decision-making authority in their hands and depriving women of access to such a power. Maggi Humm has defined Patriarchy as a 'System of male authority which oppresses women through social, political and economic institutions...Patriarchy has power for man's great access to and mediation of the resources and rewards of authority structures inside and outside the home'.<sup>7</sup> According to Michael Mank, 'Patriarchy is male

domination, a system of social relations in which men as a class have power over women as a class'. These power relations are social constructs and not biological. This power can be economic such as the right to be serviced; sexual such as marriage and motherhood; cultural such as devolution of women's work and achievement; ideological such as representation of women as natural biological creatures inherently different from

68

men'. Historically, the domination of men over women has been secured in a variety of way such as i) gender indoctrination, ii) education deprivation, iii) the denial to women of knowledge of their own history, iv) by defining 'respectability and 'deviance' according to sexual activities, v) dividing women from one another, vi) by restraint and outright coercion, vii) by discrimination in access to economic resources and political power, and viii) by creating an overall ideology that women are inferior to men.<sup>8</sup>

Patriarchy is a historical institution formed by men and women in the long process of their own evolution. The social roles and behaviour deemed appropriate to men and women were expressed in values, customs and laws. However, the natural and biological differences between man and woman led to the formation of social institutions and practices based upon the relations of domination of men and the subordination of women. How did this happen? A number of reasons have been advanced by feminist theories. Let us consider a few of them Early liberal writers like Mary Wollstonecraft and J.S. Mill analysed male domination in the context of liberal values of justice, equality and rights and felt that the cause of women's oppression was the denial of the means to develop their reason. As Wollstonecraft pointed out, the main distinguishing mark of human beings was reason. By reason she meant 'the simple power of improvement'.<sup>9</sup> Similarly, the gender and the character, according to Mill, of women were not natural but the result of their lack of education. Women rarely accepted their own servitude as natural. More often, it is the unreasonable male habits that keep women in such servitude. Men, in complete ignorance, claimed that women were naturally inferior. In short, men, by depriving women of their legal, social, economic and political rights perpetuate male domination in the society.<sup>10</sup>

Marxist writers, on the other hand, locate Patriarchy and male domination in the materialistic context. Marx, for example, saw patriarchy as a cover for bourgeois property interests. Oppression is premised on the class and economic relations within capitalism. Women's oppression is rooted in the impersonal logic of capitalist expropriation. The family, private property, division of labour, domestic labour and the position of women are due to historical

69

and economic circumstances. Engles associated the subordination of women with the origin of private property and the rise of individual family which transformed the position of women from a free and equal productive member of society to a subordinate and dependent wife. Engles termed this as 'the world historical defeat of the female sex.'<sup>11</sup> Women were disassociated from the productive process and household management became a household service. The status of equality between sexes and their work changed into inequality and subjugation of women. Thus for Engles, the first form of exploitation can be observed in the family, namely, that the well-

being of the man is maintained on the basis of the repression of the women. The majority of women do not stay with men for love, but for the economic support. Thus the subordination of women was directly related to the mode of production. In short, Marxism recognized the power of patriarchy, analysed the material basis of women's oppression and equated the liberation of women's oppression and exploitation within the overall human liberation that only a socialist revolution could bring about.<sup>12</sup>

Another approach to the understanding of the power of patriarchy has been advanced by the Socialist Feminists. Socialist feminism analyses power of men over women in terms of class origin and patriarchal roots. They claim that patriarchy did not emerge with the origin of private property alone nor the end of private property will also bring destruction of patriarchal institutions. Patriarchy is cross cultural and cross nation, existing differently in different societies through the institutionalization of sexual hierarchy. Though not related with the origin of private property, the latter has helped in the perpetuation of patriarchy. For socialists, 'male supremacy and capitalism are defined as the core relations determining the oppression of women.'<sup>13</sup> A mutual relationship can be established between gender and class. Patriarchy and gender relations based on power and control intensified with the advent of private property but its origin are more intimate and distant. For example, in the modern capitalist societies, men and woman as workers in the labour force are exploited whereas women's oppression arises from her exploitation as a wage labourer and also from sexual hierarchy obtained within the society and family. So it is a double oppression. Socialist feminists have attempted to widen our understanding of the division of labour and oppression of women, and focus our

70

attention on both the productive and reproductive factors. Patriarchal power is both a combination of economic and sexual factors.

Anthropological studies in the twentieth century have provided sufficient ground to develop parallel theories of male domination in the society. Another feminist group called Radical Feminists has explained that the subordination of women to the patriarchal organization in society is determined by a male hierarchical order, that enjoys both economic and political power. It is a system of social relation in which men as a class have power over women as a class because women are sexually devalued.<sup>14</sup> This male domination is the religion of the entire planet and not related to the mode of production. It is the patriarchal organization which has its roots in the male biology and psychology, and not the class structure which defines women's position in the power hierarchy. Manifested through male force and control, the patriarchal system preserves itself through marriage and family. It is a sexual system of power, rooted in biology i.e. in the women's reproductive role rather than in economics or history. Hence the emancipation of women from male domination lies in the destruction of the biological family as the basic social organisation and revolutionizing the reproductive technology that would free women from the biological determined oppression. However, this view has been criticized on the ground that it considers the subjugation of women as naturally determined and considers man and woman as enemies rather than complimentary to each other.

Recent struggles in the status of women have enabled them to afford opportunities to exert some leverage within the system of patriarchy. Equal citizenship status, fundamental rights including political rights, no discrimination in pay between men and women, ' special provisions for improving their educational standards have changed the form of male domination considerably. Where women have economic power, they are able to control their lives better than otherwise. Modern technology is gradually removing most of the heavy work for which women are not physically well-equipped as men. With the latest advances in bio-technology and microbiology, birth control and small families, social reproduction may also cease to be the basis for female subordination. Again the existence of women groups and associations serve to increase the ability of women to counteract the dictates of patriarchal system. However,

71

all said and done, such reforms need to be integrated within a vast cultural revolution because the essence of patriarchy is less in the legal and social rights or economic determinism and more in the deep psychological roots of masculine psychology, thought and language.

Thus if politics is power, the patriarchal theory believes that power is exercised through male domination in the society.

## CONCLUSION

In analysing the holding, exercise and distribution of power, it is difficult to ascertain who actually uses resources in an effective way and the different interpretations of power - the class, elite, pluralist and patriarchal - present practical difficulties. In some cases, the various types merge into one another. Within a ruling elite, one can find several groups competing for power. In the pluralist society, analysts encounter a series of elites controlling several social groups. Against in the communist states which were based upon class power, elites could be found claiming to rule in the name of the people. And the patriarchal power cuts through all ideologies and is always present in all modes of power. Yet inspite of difficulties, the various models help us to distinguish among various power concentrations in the society. Distribution of power ranges from the hierarchical to the relatively equalitarian dimensions and each model points to the distinctive dimensions of power relationship. The elite model focus on the coercive nature of power or on the ability of the power holder to initiate policy. The pluralist model reminds us of the difference between active and potential power, the scope of different power wielders and the importance of consensual power. The class model points to the exploitative content of power whereas the patriarchal model exposes the extent of male domination in the society. Together they all provide different standards for evaluating the exercise and distribution of power within a particular society.

# CHAPTER 8 THEORIES OF CITIZENSHIP



Since the primary concern of the state is with the people, the first issue of politics is to select the principle that governs this relationship. Some rules must determine who are to be recognized as members of the state and how their membership is acquired. If membership entails certain rights and responsibilities, these must be allotted according to certain principles. The division of society into government and governed raises a number of questions regarding their mutual relations such as: what kind of persons should compose the government? are all people fit to become the rulers? what are the duties of the rulers? what rights should be extended to everybody? should discrimination be made among the citizens. All such questions involve an inquiry into the nature of citizenship and the relations between those who compose a state.

Citizenship has been a persistent social human need. It is as old as settled human community. It defines those who are and those who are not members of a common society. It is more than a label. According to Heater, he who has no sense of civic bond with his fellows or of some responsibility for civic welfare is not a true citizen, whatever his legal status.<sup>1</sup> The social and political ties which hold an individual in community with his fellows is the essence of citizenship. A citizen needs to understand that his role entails status, a sense of loyalty, the discharge certain duties and the enjoyment of rights not at individual level but in relation to the state as well.

## WHAT IS CITIZENSHIP

During the last 2500 years, the concept of citizenship has been invented and defined, reinvented and redefined in distinct contexts

112

such as Greek city states, Roman Republics and modern nation-state. The nature of citizenship', wrote Aristotle long back, '...is a question which is often disputed, there is no general agreement on a single definition'.<sup>2</sup> But still the term is very common throughout the world and it is a central concept of everyday political discourse. Formally, it is a relationship between an individual and the state by which the former owes allegiance and the latter owes protection. This relationship is determined by law and recognized by international law. The citizen is a citizen only through the state. According to Blackwell Encyclopaedia of Political Institutions, citizenship means 'a full and responsible membership of the state', In social sciences, it has been used to denote the status of individual in the development of the modern state.<sup>3</sup> According to D.W. Brogan, 'Citizenship has two aspects: i) that every citizen has the right to be consulted in the conduct of political society and the duty to contribute something to the general consultation, and ii) the reverse: the citizen who has a right to be consulted, is bound by the results of that consultation'.<sup>4</sup> According to Barbalet, 'Citizenship is in the nature of a political bond. Upon it depends how fast the bond is'. According to T.H. Marshal, citizenship is a status attached to full membership of a community, and those who possess this status are equal with respect to the rights and duties associated with it. However, since different societies attach different rights and duties to the status of citizen, there is no universal principle which determines necessary rights and duties of citizenship in general.<sup>5</sup> Following the line of Marshal, Bryan S. Turner in his book Equality has conceptualized modern citizenship in terms of three major dimensions. They are i) Civil citizenship i.e. equality before law, personal liberty, the right to own property and freedom

of speech, ii) Political citizenship i.e. political rights and access to popular institutions of political control, and iii) Social citizenship which involves a guarantee of basic level of economic and social welfare.<sup>6</sup>

In brief, the crux of citizenship is participation in the political community. However, any theory of political and social participation and rights must acknowledge that the role of the state in the development of citizenship is crucial because the conditions of citizenary are determined within each state depending upon the legal provisions. Different types of political communities give rise to different forms of citizenship. Making a comparison between

113

the Greek and modern concept of citizenship, Barbalet writes that whereas for Aristotle citizenship was the privileged status of the ruling group of the city state, in the modern democratic states, the basis of citizenship is the capacity to participate in the exercise of political power through the electoral process. Participation by citizens in the modern nation-state entails legal membership of a political community based on universal adult franchise and a civil community based on the rule of law. Today, it is equated with social, economic and political equality, social welfare and a means to enhance individual liberty.<sup>7</sup> Similarly, according to Heater, though citizenship began as a means of differentiating between inhabitants of the state, yet today it is a means of equalizing their status. The essentials of modern citizenship are political participation, social and welfare rights, communal identity and civic responsibility'.<sup>8</sup>

## **DEVELOPMENT OF THE IDEA OF CITIZENSHIP AND FACTORS FOR ITS GROWTH**

The idea of citizenship was developed by Greek city-states, and the classical political thinkers. Because of the internal strifes between rich and poor and wars with neighbours, the problem before these societies was how to bring social peace, i.e., by giving power to a few persons or spread it more widely. While Plato gave the idea of absolute authority to the Guardians, Aristotle developed the idea of citizenship. Political authority was distinctive because it was the authority of the office holder exercised over the members of the political community. For Aristotle, citizenship was concerned with securing stable government under the law. It consisted in the capacity to govern and to be governed, as a consequence of self-discipline and education, based upon full ownership of property. He defined citizen as 'one who has a share in the privilege of rule' and excluded certain categories such as slaves, aliens, women from it. In the Republican Rome and in the early imperial Rome, the idea of Roman citizenship also remained as one of privilege. Roman citizens were immune from the more humiliating forms of punishment such as crucifixion. But the idea of citizenship underwent a slow evolution as the nature of empire changed. The influence of jus gentium on the jus civile in the first two centuries narrowed the gulf between citizens and non-citizens. The famous decree of Caracalla in 212 extended citizenship to all subjects of the empire. However, as the proportion

114

of citizens increased, its significance declined. The participation in politics became meaningless and the magistracies ceased to have any independent influence and power. What Caracalla did by extending the citizenship to all was primarily to extend the burden of certain taxes and not to expand their political privileges and rights.<sup>9</sup>

The breakdown of Greek city states and the Roman empire and intellectual ascendancy of Christianity turned philosophers' gaze inwards or towards the next life. Man was considered to be the citizen of the whole world, or of the City of God. Earthly citizenship was not an essential part of good life. The revival of classical argument was done by Machiavelli who asserted that Roman freedom was preserved because of the virtues of its citizens. What citizenship contributed was self-discipline, patriotism, simple piety and a willingness to forgo private gains for the sake of public good.

Reformation, renaissance and industrial revolution in Europe produced a new political and social order, as a result of which the concept of citizenship also underwent a complete transformation. Modern citizenship has a history which parallels the growth of western capitalism, industrialization, creation of propertyless working class, the formation of professional middle class and the development of science and technology. It is associated with the extension of rights to the previously excluded groups such as working class. For example, the idea of citizenship in the French Revolution was associated with the rights. The declaration of 'Rights of Man and of the Citizens of France' is an important landmark in this direction. It also associated the idea of citizenship with political liberation. At the theoretical level, French Revolution was a major factor for the rise of modern citizenship because it ushered in an era of social change, political liberation and economic equality. Similarly, the fear of social revolutions in Europe led the English capitalist class to legalise the trade unions, extend the suffrage to working class and introduce social reforms.

Citizenship was also promoted through warfare. To wage a war, the state requires the commitment of population and this could be brought through extension of citizenship rights. Also warfare promotes social change through mass mobilization. People come to realize that if the danger to the country is to be shared, then the resources should also be shared. The war promotes full employment

115

and tight labour market and thus labour struggles are likely to put pressure on employers and government for expansion of citizenship rights. Examples of such expansion of democratic citizenship are Austria, Finland, Germany, Italy, Japan, Sweden etc. Apart from war, according to Bryan Turner, migration and egalitarian ideologies of twentieth century have also been sufficiently responsible for the growth of modern democratic citizenship. For example, modern citizenship in the American continent has to be understood in terms of the migrant nature of those societies which created a pluralistic culture and supported the struggle for citizenship rights. Moreover, the ideologies of socialism, communism, welfare state helped in the struggle for political, industrial and social rights. Of late, new social movements such as feminism and sabiteranism have been struggling to extend full citizenship rights to those who are still excluded from them.

According to Heater, apart from the political needs of participation and loyalty, three major factors have been responsible for the rise of citizenship. The first was philosophical. Theories of citizenship contain assumptions and beliefs about the nature of man: that man is a political animal and that the exercise of power is legitimate only if based on the consent and sanctioned by the people. Citizenship evolved as a means of institutionalizing this basic belief. The second factor was the military needs. Every state required for its protection some kind of military service from its members and citizens were those who bore arms in defence of their city. Both the Greek and Roman citizens had this responsibility. Even during the medieval period, conferment of citizenship originated in its recruitment into the defence system. Machiavellian concept of civic virtue also depended upon an armed citizenry. The modern nation-state also universally requires, when necessary, the duty of military service of some kind from its citizens. The third factor was Economic. Theorists from Aristotle onwards were worried whether citizenship should be confined to the propertied class or should be extended to everybody. Initially, only the propertied class was given this status. Similarly, the modern state which was born in internecine war required money to pursue these conflicts and money was available only with the capitalist class. So 'out of this alliance of the state with capital, dictated by necessity, arose the national citizen class, the bourgeoisie in the modern sense of

116

the word'. It was only when these three factors—philosophical, military, and economic coincided that the idea of modern citizenship evolved.<sup>10</sup>

## **THEORIES OF CITIZENSHIP**

As stated above, the concept of citizenship has been invented and defined time and again depending upon the changing socio-economic and political realities. Some of the most influential theories of citizenship in its long history of development are the following.

### **GREEK THEORIES OF CITIZENSHIP**

Different types of political communities give rise to different forms of citizenship. The idea and practice of citizenship was first thoroughly explored by Greek philosophers, for whom participation in public life was crucial to the full and proper development of human personality. The concept was developed by Aristotle in his book Politics. He held the view that man is a political animal, that he could reach the full potential of his life and personality only by participation in the affairs of the polis. Hence the question was who could participate and who could not. For Aristotle, citizen is a man 'who enjoys the right' of sharing in deliberative or judicial office'.<sup>11</sup> Citizens are 'all who share in the civic life of ruling and being ruled in turn',<sup>12</sup> those who 'must possess the knowledge and the capacity requisite for ruling as well as for being ruled, and the excellence of a citizen may be defined as consisting in 'a knowledge of rule over freemen from both points of view'.<sup>13</sup> This, according to Aristotle, calls for special abilities of character and intellect not found in all people. Some human beings he classifies as 'slaves by nature'. Others he considers by reason of their occupation, incapable of leading a life of virtue. Hence the conclusion was that 'one need not class all as citizens'. Citizens form an

exclusive group. In brief citizenship contained three elements: i) A citizen is a person who performs certain functions, ii) one such function is to participate actively in the exercise of authority, iii) the number of persons competent to share in this is limited. Citizenship was a bond forged by the intimacy of participation of these limited number of men in public affairs. The bond was a relationship which was guarded with some jealousy by those privileged to enjoy it. It was neither a right to

117

be claimed nor a status to be conferred on anybody outside the established ranks of the class. Indeed, Greek citizenship depended less on rights which could be claimed and more on responsibilities which had to be shouldered with pride. It was a privilege and a status which was inherited. Resident foreigners, women, slaves and the peasantry of the rural environment of the city were all excluded. Only citizens were allowed to own freehold property, and they were expected to fulfill the functions of politicians, administrators, judges, jurors and soldiers. For Aristotle, citizenship was the privileged status of the ruling group of the city-state and was confined to the effective participants in the deliberation and exercise of power.

However, another school of thought in the Greek period known as Stoicism had a different view of citizenship. This school was of the view that man and God are rational beings. Since all men are sons of God and because of the common attribute of reason, all men—of whatever race or social status, slave or free—are equal. For them, the only qualification necessary for citizenship was wisdom, and all men the world over and without distinction are capable of attaining this status by developing their rational faculties. Hence the concept of citizenship was open to universal application. A good citizen was that who obeyed the law, ‘the law of nature’, which was ‘a code consisting of fundamental principles of justice emanating from divine reason and discernible by man through the exercise of that same faculty’.<sup>14</sup> If the man-made laws clash with the laws of nature, the latter must take precedence over the former. These two elements of Stoic citizenship—the concept of relationship of God and man, and the combination of law and nature had profound influence on the Roman and Christian ideas of citizenship, though at practical level, their concept remained hollow.

## **ROMAN CONCEPT OF CITIZENSHIP**

Whereas the Greek concept of citizenship was exclusive and limited, it was left to the Roman philosophers and emperors to develop a form of citizenship which was both pragmatic and extensible in application. The legally-minded and administratively adept Romans developed a form of citizenship which was more complex, flexible and legalistic. The basic difference from the Greeks was that it was extended to the plebeians—the underprivileged aliens domiciled in Rome, traders and merchants. However, in

118

practice, the discriminations persisted. Consequently, as a result of plebian protests, the Twelve Tables were produced which remained the basis of Roman civil law for centuries. According to the Tables, citizenship entailed six privileges: i) service in the army, ii) voting in the assembly,

iii) eligibility to public office, iv) legal right of action and appeal, iv) intermarriage and vi) trade with other Roman citizens.<sup>15</sup> Citizenship opened up the possibilities of careers for which a non-citizen could be ineligible. In the fourth century, the Romans introduced three historically very significant adaptations to the basic concept of citizenship. Rome offered total incorporation of the defeated territories by conferring full Roman citizenship on its free male inhabitants. The concept of dual citizenship was also introduced. A man could become a citizen of his city as well as that of Rome. Moreover, Roman citizenship provided equality before law. Thus through this changed concept of citizenship, Romans annexed the loyalty as well as the territory of their defeated enemies and by making equality before law as the sole criterion, they eliminated race, religion or riches as the determinants of citizenship.

However, gradually the republican institutions began to crumble beneath the weight of mighty empire and important differences from the constitutional theory of citizenship began to emerge. By first century B.C., class status started to become more important than the rank of citizen. Landowners and the military class were treated with more respect than poor. Emperor Caracalla in 212 extended Roman citizenship to all men within the confines of empire except the slaves. However, since in practice class had already replaced citizenship as a realistic badge of status, Caracalla's decree finally debased the coinage of citizenship to virtual worthlessness. As the sense of honour declined, so did the sense of civic responsibility. The code of public duty decayed and the high standards of citizenship withered away.

## RENAISSANCE AND CITIZENSHIP

Following the collapse of Roman empire, the Graeco-Roman tradition of citizenship based upon tradition, law, education and requiring a concentration of loyalty towards the state, was temporarily almost lost as a political theory. This was restored only in the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries after the rediscovery of Aristotle's political theory and Roman law and history. Notable names in this context were Machiavelli and Bodin. Machiavelli argued that the

119

best form of government, though rare, is republican in which the people, endowed with a generous measure of virtues, guide the fortunes of the state. By virtue he meant two things—i) manly and martial qualities necessary to defend the state against internal and external disorder, and ii) the essential qualities of public mindedness, probity and patriotism; the citizen must guard the state against its seizure by a tyrant. Similarly, the French philosopher Bodin in his book Six Books of the Commonwealth devoted two chapters on citizenship. He rejected definitions which emphasized eligibility for public office or enjoyment of rights and privileges. What 'makes a man a citizen', he declared, 'was the mutual obligation between subject and sovereign by which, in return for the faith and obedience rendered to him, the sovereign must do justice and give counsel, assistance, encouragement and protection to the subject'. Legally, citizenship could be acquired by birth, adoption or enfranchisement but he rejected any equalizing function of the status, arguing that there never has been a state in which all citizens have been equal in rights and privileges. What was modern in Bodin's theory of citizenship was that he subjected the whole body of citizens to a single sovereign power, in spite of diversity of laws, language, customs, religion or race.<sup>16</sup>



## **LIBERAL THEORY OF CITIZENSHIP**

The foundations of modern citizenship were laid in the 17th century due to a number of new factors such as the emerging doctrine of state sovereignty, the increasingly felt need to define allegiance and rights, and the issue of the right to depose a monarch. The supporters of monarchical authority, most notably Hobbes, did not advance the concept of citizenship very far. In *Leviathan*, he argued that until the citizens consciously withdraw their support from the monarch, he must be deemed to act with their authority. Hence in normal circumstances, citizenship means the passive function of obedience. However, another philosopher John Locke placed much greater emphasis on the need for popular consent for the legitimation of government. By emphasizing the rights of citizens, he revolutionized political thinking. He maintained that if the state exists to protect the lives and liberties of citizens, the needs and wishes of the citizens must clearly be given high priority as an absolute right. But the question was: who were the people? Here even Locke was not a democrat; he held that effective political

120

power should be in the hands of property owning oligarchy.

It was the rise of nationalism and consolidation of nation states, spread of industrialization and capitalist economy, awakening of political consciousness among the urban working class, socialist doctrines and movements during eighteenth and nineteenth centuries which helped in crystallizing the liberal theory of citizenship. The theory was advanced by utilitarians, liberal idealist and social democrats, each contributing in its own special way.

The utilitarians like Bentham and Mill held that the essence of citizenship lies in individual liberty, participation and just apportionment of property. Making the ‘greatest happiness of the greatest number’ as the basic principle of citizenship also, Bentham and James Mill believed that this could be achieved politically by a democratic franchise. They held that citizens in the mass would vote for the representatives who would pursue policies beneficial to the whole community. But can the masses be trusted to act responsibly? Would the majority not misuse the freedom to the disadvantage of the minority. This was the question before J.S. Mill who struggled to reconcile the growing idea of democratic citizenship and individual liberty. He believed that since people are generally motivated by their self-interest and do not have any-developed sense of civic responsibility, mass democracy could lower the quality of life and become a threat to liberty. While it is true that people can become responsible citizens only through political participation and with a right to vote, but simultaneously it could lead to the domination of the wise and educated minority by the rude mass of people. Hence he laid a number of restrictions on the franchise with a view to enhancing the influence of superior middle class citizens and to keep the liberty intact. Mill also shared with the socialist belief that a more just distribution of the ownership of property and workers participation in the factory were essential for citizenship. This was necessary for two reasons: i) those who are industrious and hard working should not only get economic benefits but also political rights, ii) if citizenship is a pact of participation, then this sense of participation should also be reflected in the industry.

For the idealist liberals like T.H. Green, citizenship was the keystone and they emphasized on the creative form of citizenship

121

which lay dormant in the potential of the state and the consciousness of the individual. The essence of citizenship according to Green lies in 'promoting the good life for all irrespective of social class; to foster the moral nature of man and to provide a basic minimum of social welfare. The purpose of the state towards the citizens was to 'promote' and 'provide' an environment for good life. Three particular features of this concept of citizenship are worth mentioning: i) citizenship means positive freedom i.e. the positive capacity of the individual to develop his personality in the social context, ii) abolition of poverty by the state. No one could be a worthy citizen if his creative energies are devoted to subsistence. iii) the state must ensure a minimum level of welfare for all citizens but at the same time not intervene so forcefully as to weaken the capitalist and property system nor to lessen the individual's self-reliant pursuit of his freedom.<sup>17</sup>

Thus liberalism expanded the area of citizenship and embraced in real terms an increasingly large proportion of population. Also it deepened the level of rights and responsibility. At practical level, a great majority of citizens gave their loyalty to the state, helped in the development of capitalist economy and even fought and died for their country. For this, mere protection of law or a limited right to vote were not sufficient. It was increasingly felt that the state owed to its citizens measure of protection against poverty, ill health, illiteracy, unemployment etc.

During twentieth century, liberalism equated citizenship with an egalitarian state. The political participation, which was restricted to the property owning males during nineteenth century, was extended to all, including women. Universal adult franchise has become a norm in all democratic countries. The economic and social rights were also extended to increasing number of population. The social concept of citizenship was accepted by a number of states such as England, America, Scandanavian countries among others, although the process has been extremely hesistant.

If political participation is the test of citizenship, then spread of franchise opened the possibility of demands which the current institutions could not satisfy. Citizenship is distorted by the presence of gross economic and social inequalities. A large number of people in the democratic states are reduced to second class and third

122

class citizens. There is nothing new in this because they have always been like this. What is new is that democracy has given a consciousness to even the poor, ill-paid and unemployed that they do not enjoy their citizenship rights. The problem is universal in all countries whether rich or poor. This has led to a contradiction between political and economic-social citizenship. We shall study more about it in Marshal's theory of citizenship. But first let us see what Marxism to say on citizenship.

## MARXISM AND CITIZENSHIP

The expansion of citizenship in the modern state has been both an achievement as well as a limitation. While it declared that all persons as citizens are equal before law, yet the existence of economically unequal classes meant that the practical ability to exercise the rights was not available to all those who possessed them. In other words, the victims of the class system were unable to participate in the community of citizenship in which they had legal membership. This criticism of modern democratic citizenship has been the hallmark, of Marxist views on citizenship. Marxism has been suspicious of citizenship and considered it as being contrary to class interest of the proletariat. Since for Marxism, state is an instrument of the dominant class and is likely to wither away in the communist society, it saw citizenship as a subjective and temporary condition. Reacting to the modern democratic citizenship, which Marx called as 'bourgeois citizenship', he wrote that the state in its own way abolishes distinctions based on birth, rank, education and occupation when it declares birth, rank, education and occupation to be non-political distinctions, when it proclaims that every member of the people is an equal participant in popular sovereignty regardless of these distinctions. Nevertheless, the state allows private property, education and occupation and protects the unequal conditions generated by them. Far from abolishing these factual distinctions, the state presupposes them in order to exist. Though Marx did not reject the achievements of modern liberal democratic citizenship and believed that the extension of rights has been worthwhile and a 'big step forward' within the 'prevailing scheme of things', yet his point was that mere political emancipation in citizenship is inadequate. Instead he advocated a general human emancipation in which people were freed from the determining power of private property and its associated institutions. Thus the

123

limitations of citizenship which arise because of the class division of society could be overcome only through a social revolution in which the class basis of inequalities in social conditions will be overthrown. With, the establishment of a classless and stateless society, there will be no need for the status of citizen since the individual will have no political institutions with which to relate, from which to claim rights, and to which to owe responsibility.

However, the theory and practice of citizenship as evolved in the communist states in the twentieth century was quite different. Working on the Marxist line of thinking, Lenin in 1924 constitution banished both 'state' and 'citizen', and the Soviet people were identified as 'proletariats', 'peasants' and 'soldiers'. But the Stalin constitution in 1936 felt the need to restore both the state and the citizen. The constitution provided a number of rights to its citizens including the right to vote, freedom of conscience, speech, assembly and inviolability of person and his home. The list also included a number of duties such as 'observing the law, maintaining the labour discipline, honestly performing public duties, respecting the rules of the socialist community, safeguarding and strengthening, socialist property and defending the socialist fatherland. Above all, the state had the right to 'reform the traitors and counter-reactionaries'. A novel feature of the communist countries has been that thousands were completely stripped of their right to citizenship such as kulaks in Russia and landlords in China. They were not only disenfranchised but also exterminated. The idea of citizenship in such states placed greater emphasis on the need for a positive commitment by the individual than in the liberal democratic

countries. The citizen was expected to support the state as embodied in the party or the fatherland. In fact, the absorption of Marxist doctrine has often been less in evidence than adherence to collectivist mentality, productive labour, patriotic loyalty and civic duty.<sup>18</sup>

## MARSHALL'S THEORY OF CITIZENSHIP

T.H. Marshall in his book *Citizenship and Social Class* has explained the nature of citizenship in the context of welfare state in Europe. It provides an account of the emergence of citizenship in the modern nation-state in terms of historical development of capitalist society. But contrary to Marxist conclusion, Marshall argues that as capitalism evolved into a social system and as the

124

class structure developed, the concept of citizenship also underwent transformation. From being a system of rights which supported the market system and the propertied class, it changed to a system of rights which were opposed to market and a particular class i.e. rights of the non-propertied class. Through their antagonistic relationship, citizenship and class inequality mutually contributed to change each other. The development of citizenship rights helped in the necessary integration of the working class into the capitalist society and the decline of class conflict.

Marshall starts from the fact that citizenship is a status attached to full membership of a community and that those who possess this status are equal in respect of rights and duties associated with it. However, since there is no universal principle which determines necessary rights and duties of citizenship in general, different societies attach different rights and duties to the status of citizen. Talking in the context of England, he wrote that the development of the institutions of modern citizenship coincided with the rise of capitalism. As a doctrine, citizenship was the quest of the bourgeois class for greater representation in society in opposition to aristocratic privileges. Hence it undermined the customary privileges of feudal class and consolidated incipient capitalist class relations. Hence citizenship entailed legal and civil equality. The civil element of citizenship essentially laid in the rights necessary for individual freedom and the institutions most directly associated with it were the rule of law and a system of courts. However, while it undermined one set of class system (i.e. feudal), it promoted and secured a second because citizenship rights were civil rights and civil rights were those which promoted competitive market economy based upon private property. During nineteenth century, a number of political rights including the right to franchise were granted to the urban working class through the institution of bourgeois democracy to achieve some regulation of the capitalist economy. However, the full danger to the capitalist class could be avoided because the newly enfranchised working class was too inexperienced to wield political power effectively. But the working class was able to create trade unionism and through collective bargaining was able to wrest a number of concessions from the capitalist class to raise their economic and social status. Thus the collective exercise of rights by members of the working class in creating and using

125

trade unionism established 'the claim that they, as citizens, were entitled to certain social rights'

The addition of social rights in the twentieth century made the situation more complex as well as interesting. It brought 'citizenship and capitalist class' at war, because citizenship is based on the principle of equality, capitalism is based on inequality. Social citizenship attempted to reform capitalism through legislation. The gradual development of universal provisions for basic education, health and social security changed the nature of cash nexus between capital and labour. Legislation on minimum wages, hours of work, employment of children, working conditions, occupational safety and compensation of occupational accidents made the employees less vulnerable to the capitalist class. Thus the conflict between the two seemed inevitable. But the problem, according to Marshal, is more complex. Between the rival demands of capitalist class for profit and the working class for welfare, the state through positive intervention and by reformulating its taxation and expenditure policies has been able to resolve the conflict between the two. Though the creation of social citizenship has not removed the class inequalities, neither has it been able to fundamentally transform the economic basis of capitalism in terms of private appropriation of wealth—rather it has given rise to new forms of inequalities, nevertheless, it has been able to reduce certain social inequalities and especially those associated with the operation of the market. Thus citizenship has 'imposed modifications on the class'. But on the whole, it has created a 'hyphenated system' because it combines a progressive expansion of egalitarian citizenship rights with the continuity of de factor inequalities in terms of class, status and power.<sup>19</sup>

## CONTRIBUTIONS MADE BY ANTHONY GIDDENS

Anthony Giddens gives some other reasons for the development of the idea of citizenship. According to him, citizenship and democracy are both associated with the expansion of state sovereignty. The development of state's sovereignty meant increasing administrative power to supervise the subject population and to collect and store information about them. Since this could not be done through force, cooperation from other sections of the society became necessary. Hence citizenship was the result of the greater

126

reciprocity between the rulers and the ruled. Giddens calls this as 'two way expansion of power' or 'dialectics of control'. Citizenship was bound up with the new administrative ordering of political power and the politicization of social relations and day-to-day activities which follow in its wake.<sup>2u</sup>

The pursuit of equal membership in the new political set up coloured the concept of citizenship. The struggle for citizenship took many forms but the most important has been class conflict. First, it was the conflict of the bourgeoisie against the feudal privileges, followed by the struggle of the working class against the bourgeoisie. The struggle between the bourgeoisie and feudalism led to the separation of the state from the economy and the establishment of civil and political rights by the state. Also democracy was adopted as a means to protect the freedom and equality of the citizens. Later, the institutional changes led to the success of the working class to gain economic rights. These struggles produced the welfare state—the modern interventionist states. According to Giddens, the social and economic rights cannot be regarded as a mere extension of

civil and political rights, but are a part of an attempt to improve the worse consequences of the worker citizen's lack of control over his working conditions and place.

Thus in Giddens' assessment, class conflict has been the medium of extension of citizenship rights and the basis of the creation of an insulated economy, democracy and welfare state. The state sovereignty was a critical factor in the struggle for rights and to remould citizenship. These were major historical changes. But what is important is that there is nothing inherent about them; with the change in political and economic circumstances, they can be eroded. These rights still remain fragile achievements.

## CITIZENSHIP AND RIGHTS

The concept of citizenship involves the concept of rights. Citizenship is both a status and a set of rights. As American Chief Justice Earl Warren declared. 'Citizenship is man's basic right for it is nothing less than the right to have rights'<sup>21</sup> A citizen is someone who possesses rights which are denied to non-citizens and to resident aliens and foreigners. Similarly, according to Rawls, 'The position of equal citizenship is defined by the rights and liberties required by the principle of equal liberty and the principle

127

of fair equality of opportunity. When the two principles are satisfied, all are equal citizens'<sup>22</sup>. However, all rights are not citizenship rights. Citizenship is a status bestowed on those who are full members of a national community and citizenship rights are those which derive from and facilitate participation in this 'common possession'. They are rights of a person in the community of a nation-state which are ultimately secured by the state. These rights in a way impose certain limitations upon the state's sovereign authority, and entail certain duties from other persons. According to Marshall, the growth of citizenship has been 'stimulated by both the struggle to win (those) rights and by their enjoyment when won'. Examining the concept of citizenship in the context of social classes, Marshall pointed out that its unique element can be defined in terms of specific set of rights and the social institutions through which these rights are exercised. Tracing the development of the institutions of modern citizenship, Marshall writes that while capitalism created inequalities, citizenship created a status through which members shared equal rights and duties. The three elements of citizenship rights identified by Marshall are: Civil, political, and social. The civil element of citizenship is composed of rights necessary for individual freedom and institutions most directly associated with it are the rule of law and a system of courts. They include right to property, contract, freedom of speech, religious practice, assembly and association. Moreover, they can be used to create groups, associations, corporations and movements of every kind. They are a kind of power against the state. The political aspect consists of a set of political rights such as right to take part in the elections and right to serve in bodies endowed with political authority. Such rights are associated with the parliamentary institutions. The social component of rights subsumes the right to share the social heritage. Citizenship in the twentieth century has been associated more with the development of the idea of social rights. After the second world war, the belief that the state has a duty to ensure social justice and an adequate level of welfare for all its citizens has rapidly gained ground. The guiding principle of the policies commonly implemented has been that the state should raise



funds through taxing the rich and these funds should be used for educational and health services and protecting the citizens from illness, unemployment and old age etc. If by citizenship we mean the recognition of reciprocal rights and responsibilities,

128

then the state has an obligation to provide basic welfare to its citizens. The rich have an obligation to contribute funds for social welfare and the beneficiaries of the welfare state have an obligation not to abuse these rights and services. In this sense, the provisions for welfare are unrelated to the specific status of citizenship. Heater has called this aspect of citizenship as 'social citizenship'. This is a belief that since all citizens are assumed to be fundamentally equal in status and dignity, none should be so depressed in economic and social conditions as to make a mockery of this assumption. Therefore, in return for the loyalty and virtuous civic conduct displayed by the citizens, the state has an obligation to smooth out any gross inequalities by a guarantee of basic standard of living in terms of income, shelter, health and education. Essential minimum standard in these areas of life should be enjoyed as a right of citizenship, irrespective of wealth, bargaining power, sex, age or race. Further, no stigma should be attached to the communal source of provisions',<sup>23</sup>

Thus the modern idea of citizenship includes not only civil and political dimensions but also a social component. However, it would be imprudent to assume that the different component of rights of modern citizenship are equally guaranteed by the state. Not only are the civil and social rights founded on different principles and basis, there may exist some tension with each other. The social rights are always under a threat to be eliminated by the civil rights.

In recent years, the debate over citizenship rights has broadened to include recognition to a variety of groups such as groups struggling for the rights of women and ethnic minorities, rights of children, the poor of the third world, and even rights of animals and plants. Some writers have interpreted these new social movements as shifting and widening the definition of social and political membership to encompass previously excluded and oppressed social groups. They look to an expanded set of rights to match a broader and cosmopolitan concept of citizenship. In this way rights come to define our identity as citizens of a global community. However, inspite of popularity, the belief is unfounded because the hope that they can be included in a reformed and fuller concept of citizenship rights is practically not feasible.

129

## **CITIZENSHIP EDUCATION**

According to Professor Janowitz, effective citizenship rests on a rigorous and viable system of civic rights and obligations. In this context citizenship education becomes very important. The training for citizenship can be traced from Plato and Aristotle onwards. The basic objective of teaching of citizenship in any state is to convey to the learner the body of knowledge, set of values, attitudes and skills which are considered necessary for the sustenance and well-being of the nation. Citizenship education seeks to gain people's support for the nation's civic culture through a variety of educational processes. The Greeks expected from its citizens to fulfill the

functions of politicians, administrators, judges, jurors and soldiers on the one hand and obedience to the laws, submission to the government and a readiness to defend the state by recourse to arms on the other. During the period of Republican Rome, education became largely a family function, and the task of inculcating the characteristic Roman civic qualities into the boys fell on the fathers. The qualities were many: firmness, courage, religious reverence, self-restraint, dignity, prudence and justice. The boys were also expected to learn about the exploits of past heroes, singing suitably patriotic songs and learning by recitation the famous Twelve Tables. With the rise of modern-nation state, citizenship education was meant to foster a personal and perpetual relationship of allegiance between king and his subjects. During the eighteenth century Europe and American, it was concerned with the creation of national identity by fostering commitment to slowly evolving democratic values, national loyalty and patriotism. During nineteenth century, which was the century of nationalism, liberal democracy as well as socialism, state intervened to ensure the transmission of political values through the school system. To this end, the governments made widespread use of flags, patriotic songs and celebration of national anniversaries. The state came increasingly to take interest in the control of schools and a number of theorists argued and justified the 'nationalization of education'. The liberal writers like Bentham and Mill felt the general need for educational provisions. J.S. Mill was convinced that the advance of democracy depended crucially on the general spread of schooling. T.H. Green, who believed in the egalitarian form of citizenship, declared that the task of education should be to undermine

130

the class barriers and create means of bonding its citizens more tightly to the community. During twentieth century, citizenship education is more meaningfully viewed as democratic political education. Primarily political in nature, it addresses public affairs and is not directly concerned with personal or social activities. Its goal is to sustain and refine a democratic political community-a group of people who share both a commitment to certain principles such as freedom, equality, due process of law, justice, diversity, as well as involvement in governing process based on mutual consent. Here 'we the people' are the ultimate source of legitimate power and authority. The subject matter of citizenship education in these countries consists of a complex inter-relationship between individual and the democratic political community, responsible participation in public affairs, formal and informal political process including critical scrutiny of public officials, institutions and political operations. In short, citizenship knowledge in these countries consists of:

- i. knowledge of and respect for public law and policy at any level. This does not mean blind and unquestioning obedience to any set of rules; it is individual's duty, however, to abide by laws and policies which are formulated and applied for security and well-being of the society;
- ii. development of the skills and activities which go into making or changing public law and policy. The citizen must accept responsibility for effective participation in shaping or altering the rules which are required by the society at any time;
- iii. acquisition of knowledge necessary for effective participation. Knowledge about public issues and problems is vital for the participatory role of citizens; voting or seeking to influence government officials on the basis of pure emotions in the absence of

enlightenment about public policies is not meeting the responsibilities of effective citizenship;

- iv. the knowledge and behaviour which recognize and respect equal rights and opportunities for all in a diverse and pluralistic society. It also includes knowledge and behaviour which advance the individual self-reliance and responsibility in economic and social life.

131

## CRITICAL EVALUATION

According to Heater, citizenship as a useful political concept has been so much overloaded in the twentieth century that there is a danger of its being disintegrated.<sup>24</sup> The nature and utility of citizenship in the Greek city-state was totally different from the ways in which the concept has been realized in the modern nation-state. The concept which evolved to provide a sense of identity and community is on the verge of becoming a source of communal dissension. There are problems of disagreement over the interpretation and actualization of the idea of citizenship. More importantly, the granting of citizenship to virtually all inhabitants of the globe has given rise to a number of contradictory problems, some of which can be identified. Firstly, if citizenship means political participation, then there has been a tendency towards a low level of participation by the people in the political process. And yet if all citizens are equal, then they must have equal opportunity and motivation for participatory activity. Secondly, citizenship is distorted by the process of gross inequalities in economic and social spheres. In fact the concept of social citizenship is still an area for greater pessimism. Social equality has been achieved only in a fraction of countries. At global level, social citizenship is far from being a reality both in theory and practice. Thirdly, in underdeveloped countries where vast gaps exist between rich and poor, the benefits of citizenship are yet to reach to the low and marginal groups. These societies still cling to local, communal, religious or tribal loyalties and the sense of national cohesion is conspicuous by its absence. Fourthly, in the multicultural societies, serious tensions are emerging with regard to minority rights. And lastly the women liberation movements have put a serious question mark on the concept of citizenship because citizenship had deliberately excluded women not only from the political process but also from a number of social and economic rights.<sup>25</sup> Let us discuss a few of these criticisms in detail.

### LIBERTARIAN critique of citizenship

The modern western democratic tradition associates citizenship with the liberal version of individual rights. By 1980s, more citizens were enjoying freedoms of thought, expression, assembly and association. The state, in the name of welfare measures, intervenes positively in the life of the individual. The demands and opportunities

132

for the citizen to participate have never been greater. But of late, the reaction against this intervention has been equally powerful. There is a tendency to withdraw from civil concerns in order to pursue a private, family life and a revulsion to the need to participate democratically in

order to preserve political freedom. The proponents of elite theory argue that a view of politics which gives central role to citizenship in the sense of participation is an illusion. Political power is the handiwork of elites and at the very best, the involvement of citizens is limited in choosing between the competing elites on political agenda drawn up by the elites and on the goals determined by the elites. On the other hand, libertarian writers like Hayek and Nozic leave little room for rich citizenship because they see government as empire rather than being an institutional structure serving certain common good. The duty of the citizen, they claim, is to observe certain rules of this game such as to pursue one's own interest and observe the rights of others. They define citizenship in terms of forbearance, i.e. as not interfering in the rights of others rather than actually participating in the realization of certain communal values through political activity and political institutions. The duty of the citizen is not to attempt for certain common good but to maintain the legal framework which secures space for them to realize their private non-civic interests. In short, they have brought the conflict between political-social citizenship and socio-economic citizenship to the forefront once again.

### **FEMINIST critique of citizenship**

The women liberation movements have historically been a struggle against the presumption that sexual distinction made the human female not just different but that in legal, political, social, economic and cultural terms, she is inferior to his male counterpart. Feminists have argued that women are on the whole treated as second class citizen. They are considered as a different social class—defined as a class membership of fathers and husbands. Their opinions on public issues are considered to be borrowed from fathers or husbands. They vote less than men and tend to vote the same way as their men in the family.

For much of the historical time, women have been deprived of citizenship rights. As citizens they have been subject to the decisions of male political leaders. Male dominance has been used to exclude

133

women from political and economic decision-making. Women are under-represented in formal political institutions everywhere in the world whether in the legislature, executive, judiciary or bureaucracy. Political activity is primarily considered a masculine activity. Their voting right was achieved in stages even in the liberal democratic countries like England, France, America, Switzerland. In some countries they still do not have voting rights. Again women have no power over their rights and obligations. Public laws for women are made and enforced by men, whether they are property rights or rights to inheritance, obligations to their children, their education, nourishment, safety, employment selection, conditions of work etc. Marriage laws in many countries continue to place women at considerable disadvantage compared to their husbands with regard to property rights and marital status.

Another feminist argument is that by making a distinction between public (participation in the political affairs) and private (mainly domestic) spheres, women are deprived of participating and control over their private existence. It is in this context that the slogan of the women liberation movements in 1970s was 'The personal is political', i.e., the distinction between public and

private is a political and manipulative device to perpetuate male dominance and to keep women as second class citizens.

How to secure full citizenship for women? On this questions, there is great divergence of opinion within the feminist movement. The primary objective of the liberal feminists has been to bring women into full rights of democratic citizenship. The suffrage rights, more recent reforms such as participation of women on juries, equal pay, anti-discrimination legislation, reform in marriage laws, decriminalization of prostitution are seen as allowing women to become full citizens. The liberal feminists envisage a future where legal, political, social and economic rights will be achieved and women will be on equal footing with men in all spheres. This will be brought about by reason, persuasion and constitutional reforms. The family will remain but men will have equal role in domestic duties and women's career will not be hampered by rearing of children. This is what they call 'civic feminism'. Socialist feminists want to achieve this objective through expansion of free birth control, abortion, health care for women, child care centres and state recognition of domestic labour. The radical feminists go

134

a step forward and accord less significance to monogamy in order to facilitate the entrance of women into the public world with men.<sup>26</sup>

### **SUBALTERN critique of citizenship**

The existence of politically, economically, socially and culturally inferior classes and groups in the underdeveloped countries poses a serious challenge to citizenship. By subaltern groups, we mean people of 'inferior rank'. The word is used for the general attribution of subordination particularly in the underdeveloped countries of South Asian ex-colonial societies irrespective of class, caste, age, gender, office or any other way. This subordination can be understood in contrast to 'domination' by certain privileged groups in each and every sphere of life. Historically, property has been associated as an essential precondition of citizenship. The poor and the lower classes, because of their inability to meet this criterion, could not be considered as full citizens. Whatever relief to the poor was given was more an act of charity. Although the social citizenship rights in the modern liberal welfare states have changed the position of non-propertied classes and certain rights and services are made available to them irrespective of wealth, yet in the underdeveloped countries, citizenship still means domination of a large portion of population by a few elites. Though millions are classified as citizens in these states, only a small portion of that number can be truly said to enjoy it as a status of social dignity and source of effective rights. To the peasants and tribals scattered in villages and jungles, or the petty workers and lumpen masses huddled around megalopolitan slums and juggi jhopris, citizenship rights are meaningless. Deprivation experienced by these group is not only physical; it involves breaking down various ties of citizenship— whether it is acquisition of skills, education, access to justice or enjoyment of rights. Political consciousness, where it exists at all, is resigned acceptance of manipulation by local leaders or of sheer and utter impotence. In many states, social equality is denied as a valid test of citizenship. In short, for such people, the matter of civil, political and social citizenship still remains an act of domination rather than egalitarianism.

Effective citizenship in these state in future will depend on how far these groups are integrated into the society.

135

## CONCLUSION

The modern citizenship is a legacy of 2500 years of political thinking, popular pressures and educational preparations. The Greek city-states of Plato and Aristotle, Imperial Rome, renaissance, industrialization, French revolution, process of decolonization provided the most power emerging forces for the development and consolidation of the citizenship idea. At the turn of the century, we are perhaps in another period of comparable political creativity. While citizenship has been legally extended to a very large extent, a large majority of mankind has to live under regimes which have no idea of citizenship. Again how to remove poverty in societies marred by inequalities of wealth, property, income and ownership; the questions posed by unprecedented over-population and relentless destruction of nature are the problems which pose a great threat to citizenship. Hence the direction in which citizenship will evolve in the coming generations will depend on the extent to which mankind will be able to come to grips with these problems.