

SYLLABUS

B.A.LL.B. SEM III

Subject - Political Science- III

UNIT-I & II	Plato Aristotle Bentham Cicero Niccolo Machiavelli Jean Bodin Hugo Grotius Thomas Hobbes John Locke Rousseau Montesquieu Edmund Burke John Stuart Mill Karl Marx John Austin
UNIT - III	Liberalism Individualism Socialism Marxism Capitalism Constitutionalism Pluralism
UNIT-IV	Islamic Conception of State, Christian Conception of State, Hindu Conception of State
UNIT - V	Gandhism-Sarvodaya, Kautilya's-Arth Shastra, 19th Century- Political ideals

**Unit 1 & 2
WESTERN POLITICAL THOUGHT**

WHAT IS POLITICAL PHILOSOPHY

Expecting to get a straightforward definition of political philosophy is unnecessary, as like philosophy itself, it has no specific definition. However, it is important to note that political philosophy is an infrastructure of discipline which is directly under ethics as a sub-branch. A very easy way to define political philosophy is to first analyse its constituent words separately. Accordingly, a philosopher is a thinker about reality who asks fundamental questions that are of a universal character. Politics is simply a social science concerned about the creation and regulation of peaceful human co-existence via laws and legal structures in order to make the society a better place. Therefore, political philosophy can be defined as “an infrastructure of discipline which seeks to discover, as well as solve the deep rooted problems of social existence faced by man, thereby making possible the successful relationship between man and civil society”. Political philosophy is prescriptive, largely theoretical and universal in concept.

THE ESSENTIAL TASKS OF A POLITICAL PHILOSOPHER

It must be understood that political philosophy is strictly concerned with man and his existence in society (with other men). So, without much ado, it is stated that the major tasks of the political philosopher is to; firstly, analyse the nature of man and then secondly, evaluate the ways in which man relates or can relate with his society. These are the main tasks of a political philosopher. Accordingly, a political philosopher prescribes what standards a man should live by in society. This shows the reason for the close symbiotic relationship between ethics and (socio) political philosophy, as aside other things, they are both normative and prescriptive; and they extensively deal with human conduct and man’s relationship with the society. Some of the fundamental questions which a political philosopher could ask are;

- * What is the purpose of the state?
- * Should man be free?
- * Can one be justified to disobey the state?
- * Can one man really rule another?

THE ESSENTIAL FEATURES OF POLITICAL PHILOSOPHY

There are some basic ingredients which any political philosophy must have to qualify as such. These elements, which are connected to the essential tasks of a political philosopher, determine the nature of any political philosophy. Firstly, the basic element which determines any political philosophy is one’s metaphysical orientation (i.e. his ideology about the nature of man which could be idealistic or materialistic). In other words, for a political philosopher to prescribe for man, he must ask and answer (like an anthropologist) the question “what is man”? It is the answer to this question that a political philosopher would use to prescribe laws and rules based on his discoveries about man. Secondly, any political philosophy is a product of its epoch and time as the answers to the questions and problems of any political philosophy stems from the philosophers experience and culture. In this respect, two things come into play which are; “the ideas by other political philosophers before him” and “the events happening at the time”. These two things combine to shape the prescriptive ideas of any political philosopher; they help to enlighten one on how man can relate with his society.

POLITICAL SCIENCE

Political science and political philosophy would have almost been the same, as they are both contextually concerned with man and his relationship with society. However, political science is very different from political philosophy in concept. Unlike political philosophy which handles universal

and general questions, political science deals with particular questions and situations. Also, political science gives descriptive answers (it says “what is and what is not”) to these particular questions, unlike political philosophy which is prescriptive and normative in approach (it says “what ought to be and what ought not to be”). Again, political science applies empirical and investigative methods in its approach unlike political philosophy which uses analytical and evaluative methods. Lastly, political science is very practical and pragmatic unlike political philosophy which is largely theoretical and cerebral in nature, as it prescribes for the political scientist to implement. Accordingly, a politician is closer to being a political scientist than being a political philosopher. Also, most (if not all) political philosophers hardly implement their prescriptions.

POLITICAL THEORY

From the foregoing, it is obvious that the political philosopher and the political scientist cannot function in isolation, but together (although this may not always be the case). However, a political theory occurs as the by product of both the political philosopher and scientist. A political theory is naturally the end result of the prescriptions of a political philosopher and the pragmatic implementation of a political scientist. In other words, when a political philosopher prescribes a maxim and then a political scientist applies same; over time, what happens is, when such prescriptions become validated by the continuous application and successful practicability, it then passes as a political theory. It is perceived as a trusted principle that works.

1. Plato

This simplicity and inconclusiveness, however, hide an extremely ambitious set of goals. The first such project we encounter concerns the nature of a definition, a concept quite new in Socrates' time and largely at odds with the received wisdom of ordinary Greek citizens. That the nature of virtue could even be a question is remarkable to Meno (and presumably to Plato's early readers)--indeed, he opens the dialogue not by asking what virtue is, but rather if and how virtue can be taught. Thus, much of the initial dialogue is devoted to the idea that virtue must be rigorously defined before we can deal with subsequent questions about it. This point is at the heart of the Socratic elenchus, which seeks to clear the ground of received, unconsidered knowledge in favor of the pursuit of truth. Meno confidently offers a number of definitions of virtue, but each of them merely cobbles together various aspects of Greek cultural custom. Socrates then dissects these to show that they do not meet the requirements of a definition. Thus, on the pretense of determining what virtue is, Socrates actually pursues the prior project of showing what fundamental virtue is not. What is really accomplished in the Meno is not a theory about virtue but rather a theory about what is necessary to frame a good theory about virtue.

JUSTIFICATION OF PLATO'S UTOPIA

The term utopia simply means “an ideal state”. Plato’s political ideals and theory on a just state is perceived as being too utopian or perfect. Plato was only a political philosopher but never a political scientist or politician. It is one thing to prescribe an ideal but another to successfully implement such an ideal. Plato seemed to have reduced justice in the individual to mere psychology.

Likewise, regarding justice in the state, Plato erroneously talks about a strict stratification in which a single role is played by individuals that possess three parts. If for example, an individual qualifies as an auxiliary, it simply means that that part (to an extent) surpasses the other two parts in his soul, since that is what he knows how to do best. In such a case, can this individual still be perceived as good or just? So, it is clear that Plato talks about a state having three single parts, each to be handled by individuals that possess three parts. If justice in the man means an equal balance of his three parts, then justice in the state would not be possible as it restricts the individual to using only one of his three parts (which is reason, courage or appetite).

Although Plato means well by advocating the abolishment of family and private property for the guardians, so that they could be focussed on their ruling duty; he however possibly forgets or neglects the fact that doing this would have an adverse effect on the appetitive part of the guardians. Every normal human being would want to have a family or own some private property (achieved with personal means); but denying the guardians such opportunity would mean cheating their desires. And when the appetitive part of the ruler is affected, can he (according to Plato) still be good or just? Of course not! And if a ruler is not just, how can he rule a just state?

Plato universal elements in Plato's Political thought

- Rule of reason
- Theory of justice
- Division of labour
- Equality of women
- Property
- Rule of law
- Education
- social idealism

Plato View On Justice

- Traditionalism
- Radicalism
- Pragmatism
- Rationalism

Plato's Ideal State and Best Form of Government

Writing on the ideal state or polis, Plato describes it as a just state based on justice which is the earthly manifestation of the human soul. He identified two basic principles that underlie the polis as the mutual needs of the individuals that make up the polis and secondly, the various aptitudes to be realized. From this, he describes the polis as a natural growth with its modes and mores and based on the needs and aptitudes of its members. Plato shares the view that to establish or govern a state. Plato further identified three major social classes in the ideal state as the rulers, the soldiers and the producer or workers which corresponds to the soul's three operative elements and corresponds respectively to the Nous, Thumos and Soma. The Nous or Reason refers to the Philosopher Kings or rulers who with the aptitude of wisdom govern and legislate for the polis. They are the lovers of wisdom, truth and knowledge. This category of officials should neither marry nor own property.

The Thumos or Spirit refers to the soldiers or auxiliaries and guardians of the rulers. They are primarily concerned with the defence of the polis. This class must be sustained by courage and fortitude to keep order and control of workers. They must be subject to the Philosopher Kings and must possess neither property nor wealth.

The Soma or body refers to the producers, that is, the workers in the society. Members of this class are guided by desire for satisfaction of senses and with their desire and temperance provide the polis with material subsistence. They are subject to the Nous and Thumos and have no significant political responsibility. Members of this class can get married and own property. Plato contends that in an ideal state the harmony of these classes are safeguarded by justice especially as it concerns their duties and rights.

Plato extols "Aristocracy" as the best form of government where only the best rule for general interests. To this form of government, he describes others as inferior. He subsequently identified and describes other forms of government as degeneration from the ideal state. Specifically, he described Timocracy as a government of honour and ambition; degeneration from the ideal state where dissension exists between two elements of the governing class; the ruler and the guardian no longer experience cordial relations with their subjects. The violence of their opposition is resolved in compromise under which they distribute land and houses to private ownership, while the subjects

(producers) whom they once guarded as freemen are reduced to menials and constantly held in subjection.

Plato's relevance to modern day educators can be seen at a number of levels. First, he believed, and demonstrated, that educators must have a deep care for the well-being and future of those they work with. Educating is a moral enterprise and it is the duty of educators to search for truth and virtue, and in so doing guide those they have a responsibility to teach. As Charles Hummel puts it in his excellent introductory essay (see below), the educator, 'must never be a mere peddler of materials for study and of recipes for winning disputes, nor yet for promoting a career.

Second, there is the 'Socratic teaching method'. The teacher must know his or her subject, but as a true philosopher he or she also knows that the limits of their knowledge. It is here that we see the power of dialogue – the joint exploration of a subject – 'knowledge will not come from teaching but from questioning'.

Third, there is his conceptualization of the differing educational requirements associated with various life stages. We see in his work the classical Greek concern for body and mind. We see the importance of exercise and discipline, of storytelling and games. Children enter school at six where they first learn the three Rs (reading, writing and counting) and then engage with music and sports. Plato's philosopher guardians then follow an educational path until they are 50. At eighteen they are to undergo military and physical training; at 21 they enter higher studies; at 30 they begin to study philosophy and serve the *polis* in the army or civil service. At 50 they are ready to rule. This is a model for what we now describe as lifelong education (indeed, some nineteenth century German writers described Plato's scheme as 'andragogy'). It is also a model of the 'learning society' – the *polis* is serviced by educators. It can only exist as a rational form if its members are trained – and continue to grow.

Plato communism

Plato's theory of communism was one of his original ideas. In his attempt to build an Ideal state, a state where justice would reign supreme, Plato propounds a theory of new social order under which the ruling class surrenders both family life and private property in the interest of the state and lives under the system of communism. Communism is not the central idea of Plato's philosophy, it is justice that takes that place. He says that in order to reach the goal of justice education and communism are a necessity. He calls both education and communism supplementary.

DIVISION OF THE STATE ON SPECIALISATION OF LABOUR

**guardians follow
virtue of wisdom**

- small group of citizens, who were concerned with law making and to determine education.
- they had highest intellectual insight and most exalted moral character.
- philosopher kings

**police force or the
warriors follow
virtue of courage**

- maintenance of order within the state and standing defence against any attack

**tradesmen, artisans
follow virtue of
moderation**

- conduct menial work, seek and find their greatest happiness in gain and in sensuous pleasures.
- do not possess intellectual and moral fitness. this class corresponds to slaves.
- no rights, under strict subordination and control

Plato System of Education

AGE	SCHOOL	SPECIAL DEVELOPMENT OR STUDIES
Birth to 3years	Infancy	Bodily growth, sensory life, no fear, child reacts to pleasure and pain
4 to 6 years	Nursery	Play, fairy tales, nursery rhymes, myths, get rid of self-will
6 to 13 years	Elementary school	Play, poetry, reading, writing, singing, dancing, religion, manners, numbers, geometry
13 to 16 years	Instrumental Music	Play the cithara, religious hymns, memorize poetry (esp religious and patriotic), arithmetic (theory)
16 to 20 years	Gymnastics and the military	Formal gymnastics and military training. No intellectual training.
20 TO 30 years	Sciences	Coordination of reason and habits; interrelating the physical sciences
30 to 35 years	Dialectic	Philosophy, Psychology, Sociology, government, law , education
35 to 50 years	Service to State	
50 to end	Philosophers	Higher Philosophy

2. Aristotle

Aristotle was born in 384 BCE at Stagirus, a Greek colony and seaport on the coast of Thrace. His father Nichomachus was court physician to King Amyntas of Macedonia, and from this began Aristotle's long association with the Macedonian Court, which considerably influenced his life. While he was still a boy his father died. At age 17 his guardian, Proxenus, sent him to Athens, the intellectual centre of the world, to complete his education. He joined the Academy and studied under Plato, attending his lectures for a period of twenty years.

As Aristotle matured, he began to lecture on rhetoric. At the death of Plato in 347, Aristotle was invited by his friend Hermeas, ruler of Atarneus and Assos in Mysia, to his court where he spent three years and got married to Pythias, Aristotle returned to Athens after the death of Philip and left Alexander to continue with the challenge of leadership. Upon his return, he discovered that the Platonic school was flourishing under Xenocrates and that Plato's doctrine has become the dominant philosophy in Athens. He subsequently established his school which became known as the Lyceum. Aristotle subsequently devoted time and energies to his teaching and philosophical inquiries. Two types of teaching dominated Aristotle's lectures. The first was the more detailed discussions to a select caucus of advanced students which he usually administers in the morn while the second was the popular discourses in the evening for the general body of lovers of knowledge.

Following the sudden death of Alexander in 323 BC, the pro-Macedonian government in Athens was overthrown, and a general reaction occurred against anything Macedonian. Aristotle was accused of impiety and he fled to Chalcis in Euboea. His reason was that "The Athenians might not have another opportunity of sinning against philosophy as they had already done in the person of Socrates." In the first year of his residence at Chalcis he complained of a stomach illness and died in 322 BCE.

Aristotle Theory of Constitutions and Citizenship

This is one of the reasons why Aristotle excludes the mechanic class from citizenship. He says they have not the leisure time to sit in the assembly and so share in the ruling of the government. The best forms of government also exclude this class because no man (according to Aristotle) can practice virtue who is living the life of a mechanic or laborer. No Christian would agree with Aristotle on this last point, though it is undeniable that excessive manual labor does tend to deliberalize the soul. After all, if a man has to spend practically all of his waking hours working so as to eke out a bare existence for himself and family, he certainly cannot develop himself fully as a man by the cultivation of his mind, which demands leisure and relaxation

Aristotle's conception of the citizen would not be valid today. He failed to see the possibilities of representative government. Today we would say that the minimum requirement for citizenship is the power of voting for the representatives of the people who do the actual ruling in a democracy.

Constitutions, for Aristotle, are the essential structures of an organization. They define what the parts of an organization are, what these parts do, and how the parts are related to each other. When it comes to the constitution of a polis, the crucial questions are who rules (and to what extent), and what are the purposes their rule embodies? For these purposes, constitutions can be classified along two dimensions. One dimension has to do with the number (and type of person - wealthy? poor?) in the ruling group. The second dimension has to do with whether the ruling group follows aims that are "proper", that is, intended for the good of all, or "perverted", that is, only for the rulers' benefit. This gives us Aristotle's famous basic classification of constitutions:

	Proper	Perverted
One	Monarchy	Tyranny
Few	Aristocracy	Oligarchy
Many/All	"Polity"	Democracy

Every constitution embodies a certain conception of what justice is. But, according to Aristotle, there are two basic forms of justice, and both are inadequate (both are in some sense "extremes"). The first is the "democratic" conception of justice according to which justice is equality. According to Aristotle according to the democrat, since people can be found equal in some important respect (e.g. they may be born free), they should be treated equally in all respects. For Aristotle, this amounts to ignoring all the real and important differences among them, and is open to the damaging, if not fatal criticism that equality in one respect is not equal to equality in all respects. Real differences in people's capacities, inclinations, abilities and so on exist and need to be taken into account in the constitution of a polis that will embody moral virtue. The other basic conception of justice is the "oligarchical" : because people are unequal in one respect (especially in wealth, and in what wealth either indicates about a person or what it allows that person to do/become), people should be treated unequally in all respects. The democratic and oligarchic conceptions are like flip-sides of each other.

	Correct	Deviant
One Ruler	Kingship	Tyranny
Few Rulers	Aristocracy	Oligarchy
Many Rulers	Polity	Democracy

This six-fold classification (which is adapted from Plato's *Statesman* 302c-d) sets the stage for Aristotle's inquiry into the best constitution, although it is modified in various ways throughout the *Politics*. For example, he observes that the dominant class in oligarchy (literally rule of the *oligoi*,

i.e., few) is typically the wealthy, whereas in democracy (literally rule of the *dêmos*, i.e., people) it is the poor, so that these economic classes should be included in the definition of these forms. Also, polity is later characterized as a kind of “mixed” constitution typified by rule of the “middle” group of citizens, a moderately wealthy class between the rich and poor.

After his death, Aristotle's writings were held by his student Theophrastus, who had succeeded Aristotle in leadership of the

Aristotle property is of two kinds

1. Inanimate (non living)
2. Animate (living)

Property may be either private or social and private property is protected by the state.

Aristotle view on Slavery

Aristotle raises the question of whether slavery is natural or conventional. He asserts that the former is the case. So, Aristotle's theory of slavery holds that some people are naturally slaves and others are naturally masters. Thus he says:

But is there any one thus intended by nature to be a slave, and for whom such a condition is expedient and right, or rather is not all slavery a violation of nature?

There is no difficulty in answering this question, on grounds both of reason and of fact. For that some should rule and others be ruled is a thing not only.

THE IDEAL STATE

Initially, a state is defined as a “territorial entity divided into government and subject; and claiming within its allotted area, supremacy over all other institutions”. The word “ideal” simply means a “perfected standard”. Hence, an ideal state must be a state that is based on a perfected standard. Plato and Aristotle both prescribed what these perfected standards on which the state be based, should be, according to their metaphysical orientation about man. Though, quite a number, a few points on which they both agree are given next;

Aristotle father of political science

1. Separation of power
2. Supremacy of law
3. Modern treatment to the concept of property
4. Realist

COMPARING PLATO AND ARISTOTLE'S IDEAL STATE

i. For both, the end of the state is ethical; as justice is the basis for the ideal state. For Plato, the individual and the state are one, as they both have a tripartite nature of which justice is the result of a sound balance of these three parts. Aristotle asserts that the city-state (polis) comes into being for the sake of life, but exists for the sake of the good life.

ii. Critics of Democracy – Both perceived democracy as the worst form of government. For Plato, democracy is the worst of all lawful (best) governments and the best of all lawless (worst) ones. For Aristotle, “a perverted polity degenerates into democracy (a rule by the mob) which is a bad form of government.

iii. Education: A national concern – Plato prescribed that everyone must be given an equal opportunity in order to prove their mettle as regards where they belong in the social stratification. This is why he established the academy. For Aristotle, there should be laws guiding education as a national concern. For each is a part of the state and the care bestowed on each part, naturally tends towards the care of the whole. Aristotle, like Plato, also established a school “the lyceum”.

iv. Slavery and stratification of citizens -Both considered slaves as properties of their masters and justified the fact that some people are by nature slaves. The fact that both philosophers hail from aristocratic (wealthy) families could be the reason for this. Likewise, as regards the social

classifications of citizens, for Plato it is the “guardians”, “auxiliaries” and “artisans”. For Aristotle it is the “rich”, “middle class” and “poor”,

v. Size of the ideal state - Both prescribed that the ideal state be small in size, in order to attain perfection easier. The Greek state (Athens) was relatively small. Also, it happened that the whole of Greece was divided into small city states, of which each had their own autonomous government and ruling system.

CONTRASTING PLATO AND ARISTOTLE'S IDEAL STATE

i. Private property

Plato prescribed in his communism concerning the abolishment of private property, especially to the guardians and the auxiliaries. Plato says anything (property) that must be owned by them, must be owned collectively. This could be as a reason of their societal hierarchy and the tendency to abuse such privilege.

Aristotle on the other hand criticized the abolition of private property, as he recognizes the need to own such even though the private possession of goods must be within certain limits. He therefore preached against the excessive accumulation of goods and advised citizens to use their limited possessions for the benefit of the common good.

ii. Feminism

Plato's republic ideal state supports feminism, in that education for ruling as well as the job for ruling itself should be open to girls and women like the men. Thus, one's sex is generally irrelevant to one's qualifications for education or employment.

Aristotle asserts that the women are normally subordinate to men, for the male is by nature superior and the female inferior. The men rules but the women are ruled (though not as slaves). Thus, Aristotle accepts the customary patriarchal subordination of women to men.

iii. Concept of ruling

Plato's ruling ideology has been summarized as the “rule of the best man” – the philosopher king who alone knows the ideal standards for the state. Also, ruling is a skill; as the best man must be trained to rule. Ruling is also an ideal.

Aristotle's ruling ideology has been summarized as the “rule of the best laws” – a well ordered constitution which entails good governance. For him, although ruling is a skill and an ideal as well; it is also a science (although Aristotle understands politics as a normative or prescriptive discipline rather than as a “purely” empirical or descriptive inquiry).

iv. Family

Plato proposes the abolishment of the family in his communism, as he says the guardians and the auxiliaries shall have no wife of their own, but in common. Children should be separated from their parents at birth and raised by the state. Thus, there will be more unity and fewer disharmonies.

Aristotle disagrees and upheld that the family is the bedrock of the state and fundamental society established according to the law of nature to provide man's daily needs. He despised communism, in his words “...everybody is inclined to neglect something which he expects another to fulfil; as in families many attendants are often less useful than a few”.

Aristotle of revolution

Aristotle after his study of 158 constitutions comes out with a detailed analysis of causes of revolution and ways to prevent them.

Perhaps, his concept of Revolution is most potent testimony of his scientific rigor and empirical enquiry.

1. What is Revolution?

Aristotle, in Part V of 'Polities', offers two-fold meaning of revolution.

Firstly, A revolution means any major or minor change in the constitution.

Secondly, A revolution is also said to have occurred if ruling power has been transferred, even if the constitution remains the same.

2. Causes of Revolution:

Aristotle attempts a detailed analysis of the causes of revolution which can be broadly classified as

1. General causes

2. Revolutions in a particular kind of state

General causes of revolution include the desire of the people to be treated as equal. The states which are marked by greater extent of equality will be more stable. This explains the reason behind Aristotle's favour for a state in which middle class predominates. Thus, to Aristotle, lesser the inequality lesser will be chances of revolution.

The general causes of Revolution, in Aristotle's opinion can be tackled by

1. Inculcating habit of law abidingness among citizens.

2. Treating various classes with consideration.

3. Educating the citizens in spirit of constitution.

4. Awarding political offices on temporary basis.

5. Ensuring dispersal of political power in more individuals.

6. Rewarding people as much as possible.

7. Limiting foreigners from holding public offices. Aristotle also diagnoses the revolution in particular kind of state and outlines remedies to check them:

The specificity with which Aristotle deals with the causes and remedies of revolution illustrates the political insight of the theorist. This remains one of the greatest contributions of Aristotle in the realm of political science. Where political realism is at its high water mark.

Reason of revolution

1. Love of gain

2. Honour

3. Absolute power

4. Fraud

5. Force

6. Carelessness

7. Dissatisfaction

8. Races

9. Quarrels

Aristotle order of preferences

1. Ideals

2. Royalty

3. Pure

4. Mixed Aristocracy

5. Extreme oligarchy

6. Extreme democracy

3. Jeremy Bentham (1748-1832)

Jeremy Bentham was a British philosopher, economist, and jurist, who founded the doctrine of utilitarianism. He was born in London on February 15, 1748. A prodigy, he was reading serious treatises at the age of three, playing the violin at age five, and studying Latin and French at age six. He entered the University of Oxford at 12, studied law, and was admitted to the bar; however, he did not practice. Instead he worked on a thorough reform of the legal system and on a general theory of law and morality, publishing short works on aspects of his thought. In 1789 he became well known for his Introduction to the Principles of Morals and Legislation.

Bentham was the leader of the Philosophical Radicals, whose members included James Mill and his son, John Stuart Mill. They founded and edited the Westminster Review, which served as an outlet for their reformist ideas. Bentham died in London on June 6, 1832. In accordance with his wishes, his

body was dissected before friends. His skeleton, fully clothed and provided with a wax head (the original was mummified), is kept in a glass case at University College, London, which he helped to found.

Bentham further maintained that the sources of pleasure and pain are physical (good scenery), political (good laws), moral (public opinion) and religious (in relation with God). As such, he contends that it is then the task of legislators to manipulate these sanctions to promote the good and happiness of man. A central thesis in the Benthamite calculus of pleasure and pain is that everybody counts as one and nobody for more than one. He insisted that for the individual, the value of a pleasure or pain taken by itself depends on a number of factors including its duration, intensity, certainty (or uncertainty) and nearness (or remoteness). With regards to a group, he acknowledged that the number of persons affected becomes another factor. Here, the concept of hedonism in which pleasure is regarded as the chief good or the proper end of an action becomes admissible.

Bentham ideas are espoused through his doctrine of utilitarianism which he advocated as the basis for reform. The essential doctrinal kernel of utilitarianism is that all actions must be judged by their results, by their fruitfulness in pleasure which must find an actual expression in the lives and experiences of definite individuals. He claimed that one could scientifically ascertain what was morally justifiable by applying the principle of utility. Actions were right if they tended to produce the greatest happiness for the greatest number of people. Happiness was equivalent to pleasure. Through a kind of moral-mathematical calculation of pleasures and pains, one could tell what was a right or a wrong action. If all pleasures and pains were of the same order, then a utilitarian evaluation of moral, political, and legal activities would be possible. Also, Bentham argued, if values were based on pleasures and pains, then theories of natural rights and natural laws were invalid.

Bentham's doctrine of utilitarianism attracted significant criticisms. Appadorai observed that it assumes that the business aspect of human affairs alone governs man's conduct and does not seem to appreciate pure disinterestedness which it ultimately resolves into the pursuit of individual pleasure. Furthermore, it is argued that a sum of pleasure may be an attractive phrase but when it comes to estimates of human happiness or misery, such arithmetic in politics is not usually much helpful than politics in arithmetic. This is because there exists no proof that by pursuing the happiness of the greatest number will always produce the greatest happiness and since men are not equal, a particular pleasure may be felt unequally by different men. John Stuart Mill,

Bentham's ideas had great influence on the reforms of the latter part of the 19th century in the administrative machinery of the British government, on criminal law, and on procedure in both criminal and civil law. His other works include the Rationale of Judicial Evidence (1827) and the Constitutional Code (1830). As such the formula remains highly advocated for in the course of politics because it supplies a slogan which is imprinted in popular mind and also supplies a standard, with which one can assess state actions. The doctrine has also been described as a hook in the nostril of the Leviathan (The State) and supposes that The State should act to remove the disabilities that hinder the welfare of her subjects as the failure to do this erodes the State's right of sanctity.

4. Hugo

Hobbes and the Social Contract Theory

Hobbes began his political inquiry with an analysis of the human nature. For him, man is essentially selfish and is moved into action not by reason but by his emotions. He argues that man originally lived in a condition of natural warfare, that is, a state of homo homini lupus wherein man is wolf to his fellow man. This is the state of nature in which men lived without any form of government or political authority over them. Hobbes qualified this as the condition of ware, that is, everyman against everyman. This is a situation characterized by a perpetual struggle of all against all. In his attempt to explain this stage of human existence, Hobbes argued that since men are by nature equal and each

man has aspirations which he sought to achieve, that the pursuits of such desired ends will lead to conflict and war resulting from competition, diffidence and love for glory. Since law and justice were absent, the life of man for Hobbes was solitary, poor, nasty, brutish and short. This is the Hobbesian state of nature where there exist, no right, no wrong. Nothing is unjust and no common power over men. However, there was the fear of death and desire for peace and security. It is these conditions that propels man to enter into a bond or contract which culminated in the emergence of the state and civil society. Thus, Hobbes maintains that the only way to peace is for men to surrender all their rights to a supreme coercive power, the Leviathan. The contracting parties here as observed by Appadorai are not the community and the government, but subjects all of who will boldly surrender all their right to the Leviathan on the condition that everyone does same. From this contract, a state is created and this state must possess a government which is absolutely sovereign. This sovereignty is not held on condition because the sovereign is not party to the pact, but a result of it. The pact is not revocable at the pleasure of the subjects because men surrendered all their right to rebel to the sovereign which embodies in himself, the will of all. Here, the law is in general not counsel, but command. Hobbes concept of the sovereign need not necessarily be one man but may be located in an assembly of men who must perform the functions of the modern day government. It is important to note that Hobbes described the covenant through the individuals surrender their rights to self government as leading to the establishment of a common power, that is, a unity which has the power to enforce the contract. He called the emergent unity, the Leviathan or the mortal god to which we owe our peace and defence under the immortal God. This mortal god assumes the form of a Commonwealth. He further described the Commonwealth as one person, of whose acts a great multitude, by mutual covenants one with another, have made themselves every one the author, to the end he may use the strength and means of them all, as he shall think expedient, for their peace and common defence.

Grotius is called a father of international law he the first jurist who talked about the comprehensive and systematic way in international law. The law of nations included voluntary law. Such law either made by human will or God. His these theory of law of nature or law of nation by Prof. Sabine as "he is importance in the history of jurisprudence rests not upon a theory of state or upon anything that he had to say about constitutional law but upon his conception of law regulating the relation b/w the sovereign state". His conception of GROUTIUS is without defects because these theory is only for EU not for universe.

The concept of sovereignty influences every problem in legal philosophy. As the modern doctrine of a determinate authority within the state, it has its origin in the sixteenth century. At the time of the rise of powerful post-Reformation states and the destruction of the unity of Christendom, Grotius propounded a theory of sovereignty based on a doctrine of natural law independent of the will of God, and deriving its existence from the nature of man as a rational being who seeks a society consonant with his intelligence. Reason provided the basis for justice in the state and justice among states, both in peace and in war. -- It is the purpose of this work to analyse the concept of sovereignty in Grotius' book *De Jure Belli ac Pacis*. It is argued that the concept, when denoting the legally supreme will within the state, means something different than when it denotes the sovereign state, externally considered, in its relation to other states. The difference is explored chiefly by using the doctrine of rebellion to explain the nature of sovereign authority within the state; and doctrine of the just war. Grotian theory. It is concluded that sovereignty internally considered, and sovereignty externally considered, although of necessity, different in form (the first being defined by will, the second by consent) derive their content and meaning, and their force of obligation, from the same source in Grotian theory, the nature of man. Hence, the doctrine of sovereignty is rendered coherent by its foundation in the law of nature. The discussion is aided by an exploration, in the first chapter, of Grotius' method, his concept of sociability, and his scheme of laws and their relation to each other. Also, some problems with sovereignty itself, including the absence of an institutional sanction, are examined.

- Law of nations
- He is a father of international, law

The Sovereign and the Sovereignty

Hobbes located sovereignty in the commonwealth or Leviathan. In his view, sovereignty implies authority in all spheres of state activity. Here, the sovereign refers to one who takes up the person of the commonwealth and there could be no limitation to his authority. This forms the core of his absolutism. It is his view that the rights and faculties of the sovereign are as follows: The covenant of the social contract establishes the sovereign permanently and absolutely in power. The citizens are bound by the covenant and as such cannot alter the sovereign and his sphere of dominance or constitute another authority without his permission.

Sovereign power cannot be lost, since the sovereign is not a party to the covenant but product of it. This also implies that the sovereign cannot violate any part of the covenant. It is unjust for one to contravene the institution of the sovereign by the majority. Rather, he is obliged to consent to the majority. The subjects cannot accuse the sovereign of injustice since they mandated all his actions. In other words, the subjects are the authors of whatever they intend to accuse the sovereign. As such, they cannot punish the sovereign. Since the sovereign is the author of peace and defence, he has right to determine the means to pursue these ends. Consequently, he is the judge of whatsoever doctrine he adopts for the pursuit of peace and defence of the commonwealth. The sovereign has the power to hearing and deciding on disputes in legal and factual terms. He has the right to make war and peace as he deems necessary. The sovereign has the powers to choose his counsellors, ministers, magistrates and officers of the commonwealth both in peace and war. The sovereign has the right to punish offences or reward good life.

The sovereign has indivisible rights and powers. It is the powers that distinguish the sovereign. Hobbes identified three possible types of commonwealth in which the sovereign can operate. These are as follows:

- Monarchy which implies a situation where an individual usually the king assumes power of the sovereign.
- Aristocracy which implies an assembly of a part of all the people. It assumes the person of the people, that is, the assembly of the nobility nominated for the government of the commonwealth.
- Democracy which implies an assembly of all that will come together without distinction to assume the person of the entire people. It is referred to as popular commonwealth.

It is the views of Hobbes that there must be only three types of commonwealth, all of which must possess sovereign power which must be indivisible. He further maintains that what is mistaken as other forms of government are variations of these three forms of sovereignty. As such, those who are dissatisfied with monarchy described their resentment as tyranny those who are against aristocracy describe it as oligarchy while those against democracy called it anarchy. It is the position of Hobbes that mixed government defeats the goal of sovereignty since it divides the powers of the sovereign and thereby creating room for dissension against the peace and right of the people.

With regards to the sovereign representing the person of the people and also bearing private personality, Hobbes maintained that there will always be conflict between the private and public interests. He argued that monarchy will be preferable to other forms of government since it tends to draw private interests closer to public interests. Consequently, the wealth of the people in his view will become the wealth of the monarch to be protected and promoted. It is his view that the leaders are more prone to private interests in aristocracy and democracy and consequently tend to neglect the interests of the people.

Hobbes further identified other reasons which extol monarchy over other forms of government. Prominent among these reasons are:

The monarch being able to choose his advisers gets better informed than the sovereign assembly (democracy or aristocracy) whose sources of information are limited to the members alone. Resolutions of the monarch are subject only to the inconsistency of human nature, but those of democracy or aristocracy.

5. Cicero

Marcus Cicero is one of the outstanding statesmen and orators of the Roman empire. He was born in Arpinum under Rome and got influenced by the works of Plato and Aristotle. He defended the Roman constitution against the autocracy of his time. Consequently, his works, which represented a form of Stoicism, were preserved for the reading public at all future times. One remarkable fact about the work of Cicero is that they were merely compilations of previous works and as such had little originality. However, the merit of his writings is based on the fact that they were widely read.

Cicero's View of Law and Conception

For Cicero; philosophy is, "the teacher of life, the discoverer of laws and the guide to every virtue. As the teacher of life, philosophy as "a reflection on human experience" informs one's ideology of living and existence. Likewise, as the discoverer of laws and the guide to every virtue, philosophy as "the search for value and the best forms of life" helps to make society a just place to be and to live in.

Cicero view on

1. Law and justice.
2. Liberty.

6. Niccollo Machiavelli

This part examines the political philosophy of Niccollo Machiavelli. It specifically focuses on the contents of *The Prince* which outlined strategies recommended for the political leadership in the onerous task of pursuit, maintenance and utility of state power. It is noteworthy to emphasize that Machiavelli's ideas have attracted patronage from many modern political leaders.

THE STATE SITUATION IN MACHIAVELLI'S TIME

In connection with the fact that the political ideas and theory of a philosopher is connected to the circumstantial happenings of his era, Machiavelli is not an exception. Unfortunately, Machiavelli (as an Italian) lived during a time when the state experienced radical political instability. There was a constant overthrowing of governments and political powers, such that the state was synonymous to insecurity and strife. To begin with, Italy was divided amongst five large states; "the kingdom of Naples", "the duchy of Milan", "the aristocratic republic of Venice", "the republic of Florence" and "the papal state (where the pope was in charge)". For Italy to be divided amongst itself was a problem, as it was like the head of a man saying 'I do not need the body' and the body saying 'I do not need the legs' and so on. Italy was in a total state of confusion. It was all about whom and who had the opportunity to take all.

THE POLITICAL WORKS OF MACHIAVELLI

Machiavelli whom lived in the republic of Florence was forced to engage in some political writing, when the republic was overthrown by another in 1512. This made Machiavelli somewhat idle and led him to write about the possible fate of a state which was incapable of handling its political security; of a form of government which found it difficult in facing the political forces of its day. For any state to survive the tough terrain of political instability and insecurity there was a lot that the ruler had to do. This is what Machiavelli (whom out of necessity and not really conviction) set out to prescribe in his political writings. Most importantly, his major political works were "the prince" and "the discourses", of which he finished the former at about 1513. Some of his ideas in "the prince" were readdressed in his later work "*the discourses*". Both books talk about the same issue which is "the reason why states fall and rise and how statesmen can make them permanent". The "*prince*" which contains

Machiavelli's major political thoughts talks about absolute governments and monarchies. Some philosophers see it as an advice to the ruler on how to absolutize power while others see it as an expose on how the ruler betrays his subjects. But the underlying essence of the book is how to attain political stability (which was the basic need of the state during Machiavelli's time).

MACHIAVELLI'S META PHYSICAL ORIENTATION OF MAN

For Machiavelli, the unchanging nature of man was one of the foundational elements in the establishment of his political theory of state. For him, man is a being driven by the urge for material interest and the desire for power. Man was an egoistic being whom cared only about personal interest and who sought after self-preservation. Due to the state of arrested political development in his day, cruelty and murder had become the status quo of government and truthfulness, faithfulness, gentleness and the likes were perceived as immature characteristics which any enlightened individual who desires progress should avoid. Force, cunning, deception and selfishness were right as long as they produced the desired result; and this result was their justification. This era is usually referred to as "the age of bastards and adventurers". Political survival had a possibility only when the individual recognises the fact that he had to stand alone, and that every other person that breathes is a potential enemy. Hence, Machiavelli is seen as a political theorist of the master less man, of a society in which the individual stands alone, with no (other) motives and no (other) interests except those supplied by his own egoism.

MACHIAVELLI'S IDEOLOGY ABOUT POLITICS

From a general point of view, there is the idea that politics and morality are complimentary; for politics exists to establish peace in the state and peace can only operate where there is morality. But for Machiavelli, it is a different ball game. Politics is not connected to anything whatsoever; it is an end in itself as it stands alone. The need for politics is found in its ability to create stability in the state and to do this one does not have to follow the way of morality. Morality could work within the religious atmosphere but for politics, it is a different ball game as political life is a struggle. Religious virtues are largely a threat to political effectiveness as it would soften men and weaken a political society. Hence, the purpose of politics is "to stabilize and increase political power itself". The standard for politics is that anything which would help to successfully retain or attain power is just and acceptable. Therefore, the end justifies the means. Power is open to all but it is mainly for those who have the skill to seize it in a free competition. Machiavelli advocates for a constitution that gives legal rights only to those who have wielded real power, as revolutions would almost be impossible under such a rule.

MACHIAVELLI ON HOW TO ATTAIN POLITICAL STABILITY

For Machiavelli, success simply is an achievement of your purpose, regardless of how you achieve it. Also, in order for a ruler to attain a political end, power is usually very necessary. A ruler will perish if he is always good. Thus, it is necessary for a ruler to learn how not to be good. He must be as cunning as a fox in order to overcome his opponents and fierce as a lion in order to intimidate his enemies. One way to surpass one's enemies is via the use of deceit. A prince must sometimes be unfaithful but he must learn how to disguise this character well.

Machiavelli perceived power as an end in itself to be achieved without regard to moral standards or ethical character. A wise ruler would eliminate those who may have helped him in attaining superior position; for they would understand the evil schemes used by the ruler and could thus be a threat to his stabilized rule. So, everyone is a potential enemy. Although Machiavelli advocated immoral means in attaining political end, he still held that moral corruption amongst a people makes good government impossible. However, he still places stability (stable governments) above good governments. Even though moral virtues are good, it does not mean a ruler must practise them, if he ever wants to succeed politically. If the prince becomes good, he will hurt and ruin himself as politics

is a very rough terrain that accommodates only the tough minds. In other words, whether the prince chooses to be loved or feared by the people should not be a difficult choice. Even when the people are no longer willing to submit, the ruler must be ready to make them do it by force. It is better (according to Machiavelli) to be feared than to be loved, for you cannot force others to love you but you can compel them to fear you.

MACHIAVELLI'S ADVICE TO THE PRINCE (classification of govt.)

The prince must learn to be independent in every aspect. He must possess the virtue of "creative force" which is the key to maintaining a state and warding off enemies. A prince must train his own army and captain his own troops. He must never succumb to employing or borrowing mercenary troops from other states in order to fight a war. Under no circumstance should he rely on or take advice from outside forces, foreign powers or institutions, as they could bypass and betray him. He must rely on himself alone and therefore create his own fate if he has to be at least safe to some large extent. If a prince fails or succeeds, it is by his own hands. So, a prince should have the talent and the ability to counterfeit (fake) virtue. He also admonishes the prince to be undisturbed by the question of whether his actions would be called virtuous or vicious. It is what works that matters; the end justifies the means. A prince ought to do whatever is needed for the challenge at hand, as long as it leads to success. He could murder, be lenient, be loyal or be wicked and hard hearted. The choice of action depends on the circumstance. This finally goes to show that Machiavelli was mainly concerned with political stability and efficiency, and not really being evil or good per say.

When he classify between prince and Discourse. According to him Prince is only a strong supporter of the monarchy its wrong he also was a republican from heart. He support the republic type of government and also agrees about is good result. He can ensure greater equality of opportunity than other form of government.

Classification of Machiavelli.

There are only two forms of government in classification of Machiavelli:

- REPUBLIC
- MONARCHY

7. Jean Bodin

The book (Republic) was occasioned by the civil war in France and was designed to strengthen the king in an era when France was disturbed by wars and anarchies of wars. He advocated for absolutism of the state as a strategy to tackle the situation. For him, the sovereignty of the state should be recognised.

Basic Works of Bodin

Bodin conceives the family as the natural community from which other societies including the state and private property emanates. The family here implies the father, mother, children, servants and common property. He subscribed to the Roman conception that state jurisdiction ends at the threshold of the house from which he proposed the extreme control by the pater families over his dependents including his slaves and property. It is the pater families who becomes a citizen when he steps outside the house and acts in concert with other family heads. He further reasoned that many associations of family in search of common defence and mutual advantages merge to form villages, cities and corporation. A state eventually emerges, mostly through force when these associations are united in a sovereign authority. Although Bodin attributed the origin of state to conquest, he was however reluctant to justify force as an important attribute of the state after it is established. He further noted that a well ordered state cannot exist until a sovereign power is recognised over the units of families which make it. He distinguished state from band of robbers by observing that the state exerts lawful coercion which distinguishes it from band of robbers who strive on force. Jean Bodin had no clear theory of the end of the state which he defined as a lawful government of several households, of their common possession with sovereign power. He was however indefinite with regards to the end which the state should pursue for its members. For instance, while he observed

that the pursuit of happiness which in the views of Aristotle was the end of the state was insufficient to the aspirations of his era, he was also reluctant to restrict the state to the quest for material and utilitarian advantages such as peace and security of property. Writing on sovereignty, he maintained that the presence of sovereign power is the most important distinguishing feature between the state and all other associations in the society.

In his book "*Six Livres de la Republique*" a state is lawful government of several households and of their common possessions with sovereign power.

State sovereign power

1. Power to declare war and peace.
2. Commission magistrate.
3. Coin money.
4. Grant pardon.
5. Levy taxes.
6. Impose punishment.

Bodin on Sovereignty

"Sovereignty is the absolute and perpetual power of the state, that is, the greatest power to command." Jean Bodin

- By absolute, we mean that no higher authority exists over the sovereign
- Hence, rulers are not bound by laws
- Rulers are bound by "contracts"
- By perpetual, we mean that it is not bound by tenure
- At its crudest, it means that sovereignty lasts as long as the lifetime of he who possesses the power
- Sovereignty resides in the people or absolute monarchs
- Both have the right to recall the authority they bestow
- All political authorities are but custodians/agents of sovereign power.
- He helps his friends.
- He is charitable to men of goodwill.
- He is prudent in business.

8. Thomas Hobbes

Hobbes Social Contract Theory -

- Hobbes claims humans are naturally self interested but it is rational for them to behave morally to maximize this self interest.
- He uses the state of nature: the condition humans would have enjoyed prior to any social organization. In this state we all pursue benefits without qualms as there is no such thing as right and wrong: anything goes. People would be in competition with each other for food and resources and this means everyone will live in constant danger of being robbed or killed. The result would be a kind of 'war against all' in which each of us would live in continual fear and danger of violent death
- So the state of nature is bad for everyone so we want to escape it. Since the only escape consists in following rules which require cooperation between people (a kind of social contract) it is rational for us to agree to follow such rules so long as we can rely on others to do so too
- So Hobbes is claiming that there is no such thing as right and wrong independently of what is agreed by people living in civil society
- Hobbes thought that in order to ensure we all followed the agreement, we need a powerful sovereign to enforce the law. So the social contract involves handing absolute power over to the state. It is only if we know breaking the rules is likely to lead to more harm than good for ourselves that we can be protected from our selfish natures and so gain from the benefits of cooperation

**Criticisms of the Hobbesian social contract theory -
Are social agreements really to our advantage?**

The kinds of obligation produced by a Hobbesian contract may not be precisely the same as those we would normally regard as our moral obligations. After all the stronger you are in the state of nature, the better your bargaining power in negotiating the contract. Not everyone has the same to gain from cooperation and from restrictions on their power. A strong individual might only enter a contract which seemed advantageous and would be able to dictate the terms of the contract. So the theory seems to allow that the weaker e.g. the disabled, children, the elderly, might become enslaved by the stronger. It appears entirely possible to have negotiated a contract which involves using children as slave labour, or executing those who no longer are able to work, or culling the old and infirm. But it seems intuitively clear that such contracts would not be truly moral.

Justice is the advantage of the stronger

Plato argues that morality is indeed a matter of social convention but it is not an agreement we would willingly make. Not that is, if we fully understood what it entailed. Morality is in reality a means of a social contract, but one serving the interests of a minority rather than a society at large. So long as the majority abides by moral regulations they can be readily exploited by those who do so, namely the strong.

Karl Marx makes a similar argument when suggesting that morality is an expression of the ideology of the ruling class. Those in power regard certain behaviors as required by moral principles, namely those which their own class interests, e.g. the respect for private property. But the notion that this serves the interest of those required to abide by such principles is a deception. For Marx, this is illustrated by the fact that the ruling class regard theft as a great evil precisely because they own the property. Social history is a history of class struggle in which the interests of the dominant class are expressed in the dominant ideology, which includes 'moral' values. The world views presented by moralists will typically reflect their class interests. This doesn't mean that when I act morally I recognize myself to be expressing class interests, but nonetheless this is the correct explanation of such actions since they tend to ensure social order by regulating behavior and so serve to resist social change or revolution.

Why Don't Societies Fall into anarchy?

Hobbes has shown us why it may be prudent to act according to the dictates of morality in a situation where we are likely to be caught and punished for breaking the contract. However, in most societies we have ample opportunities to break moral rules. So why don't all but the most totalitarian states fall into anarchy? While many may be tempted by relatively minor transgressions of moral rules e.g. avoiding a bus fare, serious crime is still a minority occupation and it doesn't seem plausible that the only reason people avoid mugging each other is to simply avoid getting into trouble. Also, if Hobbes is right and we are by nature selfish then we should have no problems with doing the wrong thing to make gains for ourselves. But we do have, suggesting that perhaps Hobbes is wrong to say we are by nature selfish creatures. Are we capable of caring about anything other than our own welfare? Surely people do all kinds of actions that are motivated by concern for others and not just for their own satisfaction. Here we could consider the actions of a parent raising their child, soldiers who are prepared to die for their country, or the many charity workers who devote their lives to caring for the poor. To deny that people are ever motivated to act altruistically seems to fly in the face of the facts. So perhaps Hobbes had an overly pessimistic view of human nature and that we can behave morally without the need for an authoritarian state surveying our every move.

Are our motives genuinely moral?

Another criticism of Hobbes' position asks whether he has really given an account of moral obligation at all. If he is right that we can only trust ourselves to act morally because of the fear of being caught

and punished then it may be argued that our motives are not genuinely moral. This criticism rests on the plausible contention that moral actions must be motivated by the desire to do good, and cannot be self-serving. After all, we normally suppose that for an action to be genuinely moral I cannot do it simply for fear of the consequences. He is saying that people are forced to behave morally, not because morality is a good thing in itself, but because they are constrained and cannot exercise power. If they did have the power, it appears, they would be perfectly justified in behaving immorally. But surely this is not what we ordinarily understand by morality. Moral demands are distinct from the demands of prudence. To say that it is wrong to steal does not mean that it is imprudent or unwise, but rather that it is wrong.

THOMAS HOBBS AND JOHN LOCKE: POLITICAL PHILOSOPHERS OF THE SOCIAL CONTRACT

The concept of social contract is and has been used to evaluate the political relationship between leaders and rulers over the ages. Two major authorities that go side by side regarding the social contract theory are "Thomas Hobbes" and "John Locke". Talking about the social contract, both these philosophers presented a hypothetical (imaginary) account of a pre-political era, which they referred to as, the state of nature. Basically, the underlying element of their hypothesized "state of nature" was their metaphysical orientation and conception of man i.e. what they believed and thought man is. Generally, the idea of the social contract is an arranged agreement whereby the ruled and the ruler activate a covenant as to how the state affairs should be run. These social contract theories form the foundation of ideas regarding the origin of civil society.

HOBBS PHILOSOPHERS IDEAS

In order to successfully carry out an analysis of both philosophers ideas, a particular order would ensue, which is;

- Their conceptions on the nature of man.
- Their hypothesis on the state of nature.
- Their conceptions of civil human society.
- Their justifications of the social contract.

THEIR CONCEPTIONS ON THE NATURE OF MAN

Thomas Hobbes

Understanding Hobbes' ideal of the state of nature begins with comprehending his conception of man. Hobbes viewed man as an egoistic and selfish being. Although he did not specifically deny that man had any sort of ability for rationalism, he however emphasized that man's desires overshadowed his rationality. The resulting effect was that, man always sought to discover the most efficient means of satisfying his desires, even if it was by hook or crook. So, man according to Hobbes is a competitor for riches, honor, power, and command; and to achieve this, he is destined to become strifeful, warlike, envious and anything which would aid him in attaining to his desires.

THEIR HYPOTHESIS ON THE STATE OF NATURE

Thomas Hobbes

Accordingly, the pre-political era or state of nature, as presented by Hobbes was an era of strife and hostility. It was a time of each against all, man against man, and an insecure environment. Hobbes described the life of man during this era as, solitary (lonely), poor, nasty, brutish (harsh) and short. Like Thrasymachus, it was a time when justice was the interest of the strong, for might is right. Good and bad, virtue and vice, right and wrong became subjective and deterministic, according to the trend of the individual. This is a brief picture of Hobbes state of nature.

9. John Locke

Locke's Doctrine of Social Contract

Locke, unlike Hobbes maintains that the state of nature is a state of perfect freedom and equality. Men were their own judge and master, each seeking his own good individually. Locke insists that although man enjoyed liberty, that the state of nature was not a state of license. This is because, even if men had an uncontrollable liberty to dispose of his person or property, yet had no liberty to destroy himself.

What Locke is saying is that the law of nature which is reason, governs the state of nature. In it, men have inalienable rights and acknowledge duties. The law of nature in the views of Locke emphasized the preservation of all men. This is at variance with the Hobbessian notion which emphasized self preservation. Ironically, there existed no central authority to safeguard and interpret this law of reason and each individual was left to his own interpretation.

Consequently, while state of nature was not state a state of war as envisaged by Hobbes, it was in the views of Locke, a state of fears and continual danger, and man's enjoyment of his rights became insecure. As Appadorai puts it, the peace among men, was so precarious as not to be easily distinguishable from anarchy depicted by Hobbes. It is the need to avert this scenario that in Locke's view formed the basis for social contract.

The social contract here is a pact which men freely consent to in order to enter into a political society which will remove the inconveniences and uncertainties of the state of nature. Consequently, the state which emerges from the contract is expected to:

Establish laws received by common consent as the standard of right and wrong

Act as an acceptable and disinterested judge with authority to determine all differences according to established law

Must back and support the sentence of the judge when right, and give it due execution. In order to attain these objectives, Locke posits that men will enter into a social contract. It is a contract of all with all and its chief purpose is to form a single body politic or Commonwealth to which all must submit their natural right of enforcing the law of reason, in order that life, liberty and property may be preserved. This does not mean that they will

Locke unlike Hobbes locates the locus of power in the community and not the government and stress that the ensuing contract is not general but limited to only natural right of enforcing the law of reason. The legislative powers thus constituted is a function of popular consent and become the supreme power in the commonwealth which must not be arbitrary.

What Locke is saying is that government in this sense is only a trust, that is a delegated power from the people who alone can dispose of it. This has prompted Professor Carpenter to assert that if it is asked who, then, is sovereign in Locke's state, the answer is that there is none in Hobbes sense. The community is supreme but this supreme power manifest through a government which must act in strict compliance to the trust reposed on it, when the government acts to contrary, the community will exert its right to overthrow and replace the arbitrary government with another. Locke doctrine buttresses the advocacy for constitutional or limited government and in essence emphasize that governments may be dissolved but the civil society must remain intact. This doctrine found empirical authentication in the American Revolution of 1776.

Locke on natural right and property rights

Natural Rights

Natural **rights** are rights conferred by derivative natural laws. In general, natural rights in Locke's view seem to be rights of **self-ownership**. These rights protect our freedom to control our own lives consistent with the rights of others to do the same.

This raises a question: Does the natural right of **self-ownership** contradict Locke's claim that humans are created by and are, thus, the property of God?

Self-Ownership and Property Rights

Locke seems to believe that natural rights are something one owns. Persons also own themselves. Locke defends private property not for the sake of the rich and against the poor, but "against possible unconstrained encroachment by the state". Thus, Locke's views on property play a role in his argument for limited political authority.

10. Jean Jacques Rousseau

Rousseau's theory of education rests on two assumptions: that man is by nature good and that society and civilization corrupt the native goodness. Only through proper education in youth could the "natural man" come to being. Children should be kept from books until the age of 12 and youth should be taught "natural Rousseau's Doctrine of Social Contract

Rousseau's doctrine of social contract was a blend between the views as expressed by Hobbes and Locke. His conception of the state of nature was not as gloomy as Hobbes but not as optimistic as that of Locke. Rousseau maintains that men in the state of nature were free and equal, essentially good and sympathetic. The state of nature was as such a period of idyllic happiness which was governed by the law of self preservation. Man cannot therefore renounce his freedom without renouncing his humanity with its rights and corresponding duties.

However with the increase in human population and quest for private property, a time comes when men can no longer live as isolated savages who individually defend his rights. At this point man will be compelled by rational calculation to give up his natural freedom but is inadvertently confronted with the problem of establishing a form of association which protects with the whole collective force, the person and property of each associate, and in virtue of which everyone, while uniting himself to all, remains as free as before. This to Rousseau is the motif force for the emergence of civil society through the social contract.

His work *The Social Contract* (1762) starts with the famous declaration, "Man is born free; and everywhere he is in chains. Its catchphrase 'Liberté, Égalité, Fraternité', inspired the French Revolution. He argued that although man thinks himself the master of others, he still remains a greater slave than they." It is his position that it is only by surrendering to the general will, can an individual find his fullest freedom and that the general will is always right if it is directed essentially toward common good. In it, Rousseau asserts that the individual obeys only himself and remains as free as before, while enjoying the collective strength. In Rousseau's social contract, equality is guaranteed because every individual surrenders all his right over all as they have over him, and in essence, gains from all, the equivalent of everything he surrenders in addition to the greater power to preserve what he has. The supreme control of the community is thus embodied in the General will. Its members call it the state, when it is active, they call it the sovereign and when it is compared to others of its kinds, they call it power; Its members are individually called citizens because they share in the sovereign authority. Collectively, they are referred to as the people but in relation to laws of the state, they are called subjects.

The social contract therefore established not only the civil state but also the sovereign, citizenship and the people. In it man substitute justice for his instincts, uphold rights and duties and in the process, attains ultimate freedoms limited only by the General Will. In Rousseau's Social Contract, law is only an expression of the General Will and can be made only in an assembly of the whole people. The sovereign remains a collectively of the citizens acting as a people who pledge allegiance and loyalty to the General Will. Rousseau's ideals as encapsulated in the social contract inspired the French Revolution of 1789 which was a revolt against the despotic French monarchy.

ROUSSEAU AND THE GENERAL WILL

Whereas Hobbes created his unitary sovereign through the mechanism of individual and unilateral promises and whereas Locke prevented excessive concentration of power by requiring the cooperation of different organs of government for the accomplishment of different purposes,

Rousseau merged all individual citizens into an all-powerful sovereign whose main purpose was the expression of the general will. By definition, the general will can never be wrong; for when something contrary to the general interest is expressed, it is defined as the mere "will of all" and cannot have emanated from the sovereign. In order to guarantee the legitimacy of government and laws, Rousseau would have enforced universal participation in order to "force men to be free," as he paradoxically phrased it. In common with Hobbes and Locke, Rousseau required the assent of all to the original social contract. He required smaller majorities for the adoption of laws of lesser importance than the constitution itself. His main concern was to provide for legitimacy through universal participation in legislation, whereas Locke and Hobbes were more concerned to provide constitutional stability through consent. As a result, Rousseau's thought appears to be more democratic than that of his English predecessors. He has even been accused of laying the philosophical foundations of "totalitarian democracy," for the state he describes in Contract would be subject, at the dictates of its universal and unanimous sovereign, to sudden changes, or even transformations, of its constitution.

In the political thought of Hobbes, Locke, and Rousseau may be found theoretical consideration of the practical issues that were to confront the authors of the American and French constitutions. The influence of theories of the social contract, especially as they relate to the issues of natural rights and the proper functions of government, pervades the constitution making of the revolutionary era that began with the American Revolution and is indeed enshrined in the great political manifestos of the time, the American Declaration of Independence and Bill of Rights, and the French Declaration of the Rights of Man and the Citizen.

The constitutional experience of these two countries, and, of course, of England, had great influence on liberal thought in Europe and other parts of the world during the 19th century and found expression in the constitutions that were demanded of the European monarchies. The extent to which the ideal of constitutional democracy has become entwined with the practice of constitutional government will be apparent from the examination in the following section of the main features of constitutional government.

The real paradox of **General Will** is that of eliciting it. How to find General Will? To Rousseau General Will is not the totality of individual wills because individual's will has both common and selfish interests. It is not the will of the majority because majority is a part of the whole and not the whole.

It is the will which "must both come from all and apply to all" and what makes it General is "less the number of voters than the common interest uniting them". It may be registered by making difference of individual wills cancelling each other.

The residue is the General Will because only common element in the individual wills would be left after the selfish element in each will conflict with and cancel the similar element in other individual wills. It is thus the will of the people functioning as a corporate body.

Wayper says, "So much vagueness about something as important as finding of General Will is to be regretted. Rousseau, who has told us so much about the General Will, has not told us enough; indeed, he has left us in such a position that nobody can be sure what the General Will is on any particular question".

Criticism:

The theory of General Will has been subject to various criticisms some of which are stated below:

(1) This theory is based on the presumption of Social Contract. Society and state are not made by contract but are an evolution. Thus the very premises on which the theory of General Will is constructed are faulty

(2) It is paradoxical to find out the General Will. Rousseau conceived a small city-state where all the adults could participate in making the General Will.

Today it is not possible to have such city-states or village communities; in fact, it was not possible even during his own time.

Rousseau is against representative form of government. General Will, he says, is inalienable and cannot be represented except by the wholebody politic. In modern states, representation is the only possible method of government. In such states, majority represents the community. But Rousseau rejects the majority's will as General Will and there could be no other method to discover it.

(3) It is held by Rousseau that 'General Will' always wills common good and is therefore moral and absolute. This is a fallacious presumption.

No will can be made on a priori ground a moral will. The will of the State has to justify itself by its performance and achievement. It is only an individual that can accord it morality if he adjudges its achievement as moral.

(4) It is again a fallacious assumption that there is no conflict between common good and the good of the individual. To subordinate the individual on a priori assumption to the society and the state is to divest him of his personality; it is to install naked absolutism and decay all individual liberties and freedoms. It denies fundamental rights, which are the crux of democratic theory of state.

(5) Sovereignty is neither absolute nor sacred as Rousseau defines it on the basis of his theory of General Will. Sovereignty is limited by the purpose that it has to serve. Sovereignty exists because it is needed for performance of the end of the state. Sovereignty is not an end but a means to that end.

(6) General Will or the will of corporate body politic is a myth. It does not exist. It is fictitious to accord a personality or will to state, independent of that of the individual.

(7) To say that when individual is forced to obey the laws of the state he is being forced to be free and to obey his own real will is extremely a paradoxical argument. A thief is punished by law but to say that he willed his own punishment can only be a flight of imagination.

(8) MacIver says Rousseau equated 'will for the general good' with the 'will of the generality'. General will could be a will for the common good but to say that it is will of the Commonwealth is beyond facts of state life.

Value of the Theory:

However, the theory of General Will has served a useful purpose, in spite of all its illogicalities and contradictions:

(1) It refuted the theory of absolute and inalienable natural rights.

(2) It put the authority of the state on consent of the people.

(3) It provided the theory of popular sovereignty. Commonwealth is made sovereign.

(4) Sovereignty is provided an ethical basis in so far as it is based on 'General Will' which is moral and wills common good.

(5) It failed to guarantee individual freedom yet Rousseau based it on individual freedom. Rousseau gives the theory of 'General Will' to conciliate individual liberty and state sovereignty.

That is why Lord Morley said, "Would it not have been better for the world if Rousseau had never been born?" He feels if Rousseau had not lived the awful insanities of French Revolution might have been averted. Rousseau's phrases, Liberty, Equality and Fraternity became the guiding spirit of French revolution and have been influencing political philosophy and political movements since then. G.D.H. Cole has described the "Social Contract" as "by far the best of all text-books of political philosophy" and says that "Rousseau's influence, so far from being dead, is everyday increasing..."

Points to Remember

1. (i) The concept of General Will is the crux of Rousseau's philosophy.

(ii) It conciliates liberty and authority.

(iii) It is a refutation of theory of natural rights.

(iv) It is a plea for popular sovereignty.

(v) Commonwealth is an "association" and a corporate personality, not an "aggregation".

(vi) General Will is the will of the Commonwealth.

(vii) It wills common good and is moral and absolute.

(viii) Individual has no right against it, when he is forced to obey the General Will he is forced to be free.

(ix) State sovereignty is thus made absolute inviolate, indivisible and inalienable, even sacred.

(x) It is a will neither of the majority nor a sum total of individual wills; but will of the people functioning as body politic.

2. Criticism:

(i) The assumption of Social Contract on which the concept of General Will is based is wrong.

(ii) It is not practicable to ascertain the General Will.

(iii) General Will cannot be made on a priori ground moral will

(iv) It is wrong to assume that there is never conflict between individual good and social will.

(v) Sovereignty is neither absolute nor omnipotent.

(vi) General Will is myth.

(vii) To say that when individual is forced to obey the will of the state he is being forced to be wrong. Will for general good cannot be equated with 'will of the generality'.

3. Value:

(i) It refuted the theory of natural rights.

(ii) It is a plea for popular sovereignty and consent as the basis of state.

(iii) It is a plea for individual liberty.

(iv) Sovereignty is provided on ethical basis.

What is Social Contract Theory?

The concept of social contract theory is that in the beginning man lived in the state of nature. They had no government and there was no law to regulate them. There were hardships and oppression on the sections of the society. To overcome from these hardships they entered into two agreements which are:-

1. **Pactum Unionis**; and
2. **Pactum Subjectionis**.

By the first pact of unionis, people sought protection of their lives and property. As, a result of it a society was formed where people *undertook to respect each other and live in peace and harmony*. By the second pact of subjectionis, people united together and pledged to *obey an authority and surrendered the whole or part of their freedom and rights to an authority*. The authority guaranteed everyone protection of life, property and to a certain extent liberty. Thus, they must agree to establish society by collectively and reciprocally renouncing the rights they had against one another in the State of Nature and they must imbue some one person or assembly of persons with the authority and power to enforce the initial contract. In other words, to ensure their escape from the State of Nature, they must both agree to live together under common laws, and create an *enforcement mechanism* for the social contract and the laws that constitute it. Thus, *the authority or the government or the sovereign or the state came into being because of the two agreements*.

Analysis of the theory of Social Contract by **Thomas Hobbes**

- Thomas Hobbes theory of Social Contract appeared for the first time in Leviathan published in the year 1651 during the Civil War in Britain. Thomas Hobbes legal theory is based on **Social contract**. According to him, prior to Social Contract, man lived in the **State of Nature**. Man's life in the State of NATURE was one of *fear and selfishness*. Man lived in chaotic condition of constant fear. Life in the State of Nature was **solitary, poor, nasty, brutish, and short**.
- Man has a natural desire for *security and order*. In order to secure *self-protection and self-preservation, and to avoid misery and pain*, man entered into a contract. This idea of

self-preservation and self-protection are inherent in man's nature and in order to achieve this, they **voluntarily surrendered all their rights and freedoms** to some authority by this contract who must command obedience. As a result of this contract, the **mightiest authority is to protect and preserve their lives and property**. This led to the emergence of the institution of the ruler or monarch, who shall be the absolute head. Subjects had no rights against the absolute authority or the sovereign and he is to be obeyed in all situations however bad or unworthy he might be. However, Hobbes placed moral obligations on the sovereign who shall be bound by natural law.

- Hence, it can be deduced that, Hobbes was the supporter of **absolutism**. In the opinion of Hobbes, **law is dependent upon the sanction of the sovereign and the Government without sword are but words and of no strength to secure a man at all**. He therefore, reiterated that civil law is the real law because it is commanded and enforced by the sovereign. Thus, he upheld the principle of **Might is always Right**.
- Hobbes thus infers from his mechanistic theory of human nature that humans are necessarily and exclusively self-interested. All men pursue only what they perceive to be in their own individually considered best interests. They respond mechanistically by being drawn to that which they desire and repelled by that to which they are averse. In addition to being exclusively self-interested, Hobbes also argues that human beings are reasonable. They have in them the rational capacity to pursue their desires as efficiently and maximally as possible. From these premises of human nature, Hobbes goes on to construct a provocative and compelling argument for which they ought to be willing to submit themselves to political authority. He did this by imagining persons in a situation prior to the establishment of society, the State of Nature.
- Hobbes impels subjects to surrender all their rights and vest all liberties in the sovereign for preservation of peace, life and prosperity of the subjects. It is in this way the natural law became a moral guide or directive to the sovereign for preservation of the natural rights of the subjects. For Hobbes all law is dependent upon the sanction of the sovereign. All real law is civil law, the law commanded and enforced by the sovereign and are brought into the world for nothing else but to limit the natural liberty of particular men, in such a manner, as they might not hurt but to assist one another and join together against a common enemy. He advocated for an established order. Hence, **Individualism, materialism, utilitarianism** and **absolutions** are inter-woven in the theory of Hobbes.

Analysis of the theory of Social Contract by **John Locke**

- John Locke theory of Social Contract is different than that of Hobbes. According to him, man lived in the State of Nature, but his concept of the State of Nature is different as contemplated by Hobbesian theory. Locke's view about the state of nature is not as miserable as that of Hobbes. It was **reasonably good and enjoyable, but the property was not secure. He considered State of Nature as a Golden Age**. It was a state of peace, goodwill, mutual assistance, and preservation. In that state of nature, men had all the rights which nature could give them. Locke justifies this by saying that in the State of Nature, the natural condition of mankind was a state of perfect and complete liberty to conduct one's life as one best sees fit. It was free from the interference of others. In that state of nature, all were equal and independent. This does not mean, however, that it was a state of license. It was one not free to do anything at all one pleases, or even anything that one judges to be in one's interest. The State of Nature, although a state wherein there was no civil authority or government to punish people for transgressions against laws, was not a state without morality. The State of Nature was pre-political, but it was not pre-moral. Persons are assumed to be equal to one another in such a state, and therefore equally capable of discovering and being bound by the Law of Nature. So, the State of Nature was a **state of**

liberty , where persons are free to pursue their own interests and plans, free from interference and, because of the Law of Nature and the restrictions that it imposes upon persons, it is relatively peaceful.

- **Property** plays an essential role in Locke s argument for civil government and the contract that establishes it. According to Locke, private property is created when a person mixes his labour with the raw materials of nature. Given the implications of the Law of Nature, there are limits as to how much property one can own: one is not allowed to take so more from nature than oneself can use, thereby leaving others without enough for themselves, because nature is given to all of mankind for its common subsistence. One cannot take more than his own fair share. Property is the linchpin of Locke s argument for the social contract and civil government because it is the protection of their property, including their property in their own bodies, that men seek when they decide to abandon the State of Nature.
- John Locke considered property in the State of Nature as insecure because of three conditions; they are:-
 1. Absence of established law;
 2. Absence of impartial Judge; and
 3. Absence of natural power to execute natural laws.
- Thus, man in the State of Nature felt need to protect their property and for the purpose of protection of their property, men entered into the Social Contract. Under the contract, **man did not surrender all their rights to one single individual, but they surrendered only the right to preserve / maintain order and enforce the law of nature.** The individual retained with them the other rights, i.e., right to life, liberty and estate because these rights were considered natural and inalienable rights of men.
- Having created a political society and government through their consent, men then gained three things which they lacked in the State of Nature: laws, judges to adjudicate laws, and the executive power necessary to enforce these laws. Each man therefore gives over the power to protect himself and punish transgressors of the Law of Nature to the government that he has created through the compact.
- According to Locke, **the purpose of the Government and law is to uphold and protect the natural rights of men. So long as the Government fulfils this purpose, the laws given by it are valid and binding but, when it ceases to fulfil it, then the laws would have no validity and the Government can be thrown out of power. In Locke's view, unlimited sovereignty is contrary to natural law.** Hence, John Locke advocated the principle of - **a state of liberty; not of license** .
Locke advocated a state for the general good of people. He pleaded for a constitutionally limited government.
- Locke, in fact made **life, liberty and property**, his three cardinal rights, which greatly dominated and influenced the Declaration of American Independence, 1776.

Analysis of the theory of Social Contract by **Jean Jacques Rousseau**

- Jean Jacques Rousseau was a French philosopher who gave a new interpretation to the theory of Social Contract in his work "*The Social Contract*" and "*Emile*". According to him, social contract is not a historical fact but a hypothetical construction of reason. Prior to the Social Contract, **the life in the State of Nature was happy and there was equality among men.** As time passed, however, humanity faced certain changes. As the overall population increased, the means by which people could satisfy their needs had to change. People slowly began to live together in small families, and then in small communities. Divisions of labour were introduced, both within and between families, and discoveries and inventions made life easier, giving rise to leisure time. Such leisure time inevitably led people to make comparisons between themselves and others, resulting in

public values, leading to shame and envy, pride and contempt. Most importantly however, according to Rousseau, was the invention of private property, which constituted the pivotal moment in humanity's evolution out of a simple, pure state into one, characterized by greed, competition, vanity, inequality, and vice. ***For Rousseau the invention of property constitutes humanity's fall from grace out of the State of Nature.*** For this purpose, they surrendered their rights not to a single individual but to the community as a whole which Rousseau termed as general will.

- According to Rousseau, the original freedom, happiness, equality and liberty which existed in primitive societies prior to the social contract was lost in the modern civilisation. ***Through Social Contract, a new form of social organisation- the state was formed to assure and guarantee rights, liberties freedom and equality.*** The essence of the Rousseau's theory of General Will is that State and Law were the product of General Will of the people. State and the Laws are made by it and if the government and laws do not conform to general will, they would be discarded. While the individual parts with his natural rights, in return he gets civil liberties such as freedom of speech, equality, assembly, etc.
- The **General Will**, therefore, for all purposes, was the will of majority citizens to which blind obedience was to be given. The majority was accepted on the belief that majority view is right than minority view. Each individual is not subject to any other individual but to the general will and to obey this is to obey himself. His sovereignty is infallible, indivisible, unrepresentable and illimitable.
- Thus, **Rousseau favoured people's sovereignty.** His natural law theory is confined to the freedom and liberty of the individual. For him, State, law, sovereignty, general will, etc. are interchangeable terms. Rousseau's theory inspired French and American revolutions and given impetus to nationalism. He based his theory of social contract on the principle of ***Man is born free, but everywhere he is in chains.***

COMPARISON OF THE THEORY OF SOCIAL CONTRACT OF THOMAS HOBBS, JOHN LOCKE AND JEAN JACQUES ROUSSEAU

1. Hobbes asserts that without subjection to a common power of their rights and freedoms, men are necessarily at war. Locke and Rousseau, on the contrary, set forth the view that the state exists to preserve and protect the natural rights of its citizens. When governments fail in that task, citizens have the right and sometimes the duty to withdraw their support and even to rebel.
2. Hobbes view was that whatever the state does is just. All of society is a direct creation of the state, and a reflection of the will of the ruler. According to Locke, the only important role of the state is to ensure that justice is seen to be done. While Rousseau view is that the State must in all circumstance ensure freedom and liberty of individuals.
3. Hobbes theory of Social Contract supports absolute sovereign without giving any value to individuals, while Locke and Rousseau supports individual than the state or the government.
4. To Hobbes, the sovereign and the government are identical but Rousseau makes a distinction between the two. He rules out a representative form of government. But, Locke does not make any such distinction.
5. Rousseau's view of sovereignty was a compromise between the constitutionalism of Locke and absolutism of Hobbes.

CRITICAL APPREHENSION

1. Rousseau propounded that state, law and the government are interchangeable, but this in present scenario is different. Even though government can be overthrown but not the

state. A state exists even there is no government.

2. Hobbes concept of absolutism is totally a vague concept in present scenario. Democracy is the need and examples may be taken from Burma and other nations.
3. According to Hobbes, the sovereign should have absolute authority. This is against the rule of law because absolute power in one authority brings arbitrariness.
4. Locke concept of State of nature is vague as any conflict with regard to property always leads to havoc in any society. Hence, there cannot be a society in peace if they have been conflict with regard to property.
5. Locke concept of laissez-faire is not of welfare oriented. Now in present scenario, every state undertake steps to form a welfare state.

11. Montesquieu

Montesquieu was one of the great political philosophers of the Enlightenment. Insatiably curious and mordantly funny, he constructed a naturalistic account of the various forms of government, and of the causes that made them what they were and that advanced or constrained their development. He used this account to explain how governments might be preserved from corruption. He saw despotism, in particular, as a standing danger for any government not already despotic, and argued that it could best be prevented by a system in which different bodies exercised legislative, executive, and judicial power, and in which all those bodies were bound by the rule of law. This theory of the separation of powers had an enormous impact on liberal political theory, and on the framers of the constitution of the United States of America.

2. Major Works

Montesquieu's two most important works are the Persian Letters and The Spirit of the Laws. While these works share certain themes -- most notably a fascination with non-European societies and a horror of despotism -- they are quite different from one another, and will be treated separately.

4. The Spirit of the Laws
Montesquieu's aim in The Spirit of the Laws is to explain human laws and social institutions. This might seem like an impossible project: unlike physical laws, which are, according to Montesquieu, instituted and sustained by God, positive laws and social institutions are created by fallible human beings who are "subject ... to ignorance and error, [and] hurried away by a thousand impetuous passions". One might therefore expect our laws and institutions to be no more comprehensible than any other catalog of human follies, an expectation which the extraordinary diversity of laws adopted by different societies would seem to confirm.

Montesquieu's hold different set of government

1. God Or Natural Law
2. Man Or Positive Law
3. International Law
4. Political Law
5. Civil Law

4.1 Forms of Government

Montesquieu holds that there are three types of governments: republican governments, which can take either democratic or aristocratic forms; monarchies; and despotisms. Unlike, for instance, Aristotle, Montesquieu does not distinguish forms of government on the basis of the virtue of the sovereign. The distinction between monarchy and despotism, for instance, depends not on the virtue of the monarch, but on whether or not he governs "by fixed and established laws"

In a democracy, the people are sovereign. They may govern through ministers, or be advised by a senate, but they must have the power of choosing their ministers and senators for themselves. The principle of democracy is political virtue, by which Montesquieu means "the love of the laws and of our country" it "limits ambition to the sole desire, to the sole happiness, of doing greater services to our country than the rest of our fellow citizens" (SL 5.3); and it "is a self-renunciation, which is ever arduous and painful" (SL 4.5). Montesquieu compares it to monks' love for their order: "their rule

debars them from all those things by which the ordinary passions are fed; there remains therefore only this passion for the very rule that torments them.

Separation of power

Montesquieu's theory of separation of powers Though the history of the doctrine of separation of powers is traceable to the ancient times of Aristotle, and subsequently 16th and 17th century philosophers such as John Bodin and Locke. It was the French Jurist, Montesquieu who gave it a systematic and scientific formulation. In his book 'Esprit de Lois' (The spirit of laws), Montesquieu, for the first time, extensively discussed the doctrine and its form. According to Montesquieu's theory, it means that no one person or body should be vested with all three types of powers. In every state there are three kinds of powers, the legislative power, the power executing the matters falling with the law of nations, and the power executing the matters which fall within the civil law.

There must be a division of functions on the following basis: the legislature should make laws but not administer or enforce them, the executive must administer the made laws but neither influence the legislature in the making of the laws nor stand in judgment of the same and the judiciary must determine rights and uphold justice without taking over the functions of law-making or administration. He further said that such separation is necessary in order to ensure that justice does not become arbitrary and capricious. Montesquieu states that "when the legislature and executive powers are united in the same persons or in the same body of magistrates there can be no liberty, because apprehensions may arise, lest the same monarch or separate should enact tyrannical laws . There is no liberty if the judicial power is not separated from the legislative from the legislative and executive.

PRINCIPLES OF THE THEORY OF SEPARATION OF POWERS

No concentration of powers. Diffusion of powers needed System of checks and balances In short, the theory of the separation of powers merely means that a different body of persons is to administer each of the three departments of governments and that no one of them is to have a controlling power over either of the others. Such separation is necessary for the purpose of preserving the liberty of the individual and for avoiding tyranny.

CRITICISM It is not desirable because if there is complete separation of powers , the different organs of the government will not be able to work in co-operation and harmony. As a result, there would be frequently deadlocks which may bring the governmental machinery to a standstill. According to Mill, "the separation of powers will result in calash between the three organs of government, as each one will take interest only in its own powers". If all branches are made separate and independent of each others, each branch will try to safeguard its powers and will not protect the powers of other branches. In such case administrative efficiency cannot be attained

The theory of separation of powers makes a mistake in assuming that the three branches of government are equally powerful and can be independent of one another. The growth of administrative adjudication is another development which is against the doctrine of separation of powers. The executive is being vested with judicial powers as well as other duties otherwise the officers do not feel secure while performing their duties.

IMPORTANCE OF THE THEORY OF SEPARATION OF POWERS• It aims at individual liberty. It is a safeguard against despotism. • Its basic principle that concentration of powers leads to dictatorship is true for all time and ages. • The separation of powers saves the people from the arbitrary rule of the executive . • This theory lays down the principle that governments should act according to certain well established rules or law. • Each organ acts as a check upon the others. • It is desirable for maintaining the efficiency in the administration.

CONCLUSION• In the modern world, the Separation of Powers has come to not only mean organs such as the Executive, the legislature and the judiciary but also institutions such as the press and academic institutions. • Thus, in a modern society, implementation of Separation of Powers doctrine in its

strictest sense, the way Montesquieu envisaged it to be in his book *The Spirit of laws* is an extremely difficult task. Even civil institutions wield a lot of power in all spheres of governance.

12. Edmund Burke

Edmund Burke, author of *Reflections on the Revolution in France*, is known to a wide public as a classic political thinker: it is less well understood that his intellectual achievement depended upon his understanding of philosophy and use of it in the practical writings and speeches by which he is chiefly known. The present essay explores the character and significance of the use of philosophy in his thought.

1. Introduction , Philosophical and Historical Writings

Locke's *Essay concerning Human Understanding* of 1690 was the first attempt to give a survey of the mind's workings that was both comprehensive and post-aristotelian. It soon fostered intense interest in epistemology, psychology and ethics. The roots of human activity, Burke thought, were the passions of curiosity, pleasure and pain. Curiosity stimulated the activity of mind on all matters. Ideas of pain and of pleasure corresponded respectively to self-preservation and society, and society involved the passions of sympathy, imitation and ambition. Imitation tended to establish habit, and ambition to produce change. Sympathy did neither, but it did establish an interest in other people's welfare that extended to mental identification with them. The scope of sympathy could embrace anyone, unlike compassion, which applied only to those in a worse situation than oneself. Such width of concern had an obvious reference to the social order (and may express also Burke's thinking about the theatre). The passions, understood in Burke's way, suggested at once that society as such answered to natural instincts, and that it comprised elements of continuity and improvement alike. Burke then proceeded to show that self-preservation and its cognates suggested the complex idea of the sublime, and not least the idea of a God who was both active and terrible. Beauty, on the other hand, comprised a very different set of simple ideas, which originated in pleasure. Sublime and beautiful therefore sprang from very different origins.

The diverse views rejected by *A Philosophical Enquiry* were united by the pervasive assumption that human nature in an unschooled condition, as it came from the hand of nature, and understood without direct reference to God, was in some sense adequate to the human condition. Rousseau's *Discourse on Inequality* was at odds with Burke's view of the naturalness of society, and with his view that solitude, because unnatural, was a source of pain, as well as with Burke's position that sympathy, rather than merely compassion, was a key emotion. Political style: some parliamentary applications

Burke's life was spent in parliamentary affairs from the mid-1760s, and this made a difference to his style of intellectual activity. This did not lie primarily in developing the cast of his mind, and if in 1771 Burke stated that 'I have endeavoured all my life to train my understanding and my temper in the studies and habits of Philosophy', at the same time he concluded that 'my Principles are all settled and arranged'. This did not preclude intellectual innovation. The difference made by participation lay not least in his reasons for applying his mind, and consequently in how he did so. The reasons were to influence opinion, both in Parliament and from his position as a member of the legislative, and determine votes in the House of Commons itself. The matter common to both of these was Burke's view of the words central to political understanding.

An obvious inference from Burke's account of compound abstract words is that to use these is to touch the experience of reader or listener, and that persuasion was unavoidably central to discussing politics: this befitted a practical rather than a speculative subject. Indeed, these terms implied that the point of discussing politics must be to influence action, and nothing much else. Burke developed great skill in managing words, begun in debating at Trinity and carried forward through other venues, including the House of Commons. As such language was persuasive, its objective was to establish pro-attitudes and con-attitudes in mind of listener or reader.

This was not the only philosophical aspect in Burke's political practice. A major conceptual tool in discussing politics was relation. Relation is one of those terms which was common to both the scholastics and to Locke. It denotes both comparison and connexion. Comparison was an invaluable procedure because it enabled events, institutions and persons to be placed in any number of lights which would raise or lower their significance and standing. Connexion was scarcely less valuable, because the place that someone or something occupied could be used to sustain or criticise their role, as well as to demonstrate the value of co-operative contraries. Best of all, relation in either sense lent itself to a myriad of uses, for as4. Burke and the American Revolution

Political participation generated scepticism about Burke as a person, some of which was unjust, though all of it was to be expected. What was perhaps less predictable, and is certainly more interesting philosophically, is that this participation was a precondition of the practical thought which made Burke famous in his own time and has given him a leading place in the canon of Western political thought.

Burke on human right

Human rights have their beginning in revolution. The declarations of 1776 and 1789 make this much clear. However, in an age when universal human rights are still a lofty dream for most, the merits of conservatism, of the past and tradition, deserve acknowledgement. In looking at the promotion of human rights and human rights violations, the use of tradition as a tool for achieving human rights can ground the abstract in the concrete.

He criticises the Locke theory of Natural Law and also man can enjoy his human right if he is part of state. Burke makes a difference between civil and political right. Man cannot enjoy the right of an uncivil and civil state of together. He holds that all men have equal rights but not equal things. British constitution

It certainly was indiscreet at any period, but especially at his time of life, to parade enemies, or give his friends occasion to desert him; yet if his firm and steady adherence to the British constitution placed him in such a dilemma, he would risk all, and, as public duty and public experience taught him, with his last words exclaim, "Fly from the French Constitution"

Burke and the British Constitution

Burke also wrote in his *Reflections* about the superiority of the British Constitution. In this part of his book, Burke summarized the essence of his political conservatism.

He explained that throughout a nation's history, trial and error resulted in some laws and government arrangements surviving while others died out. Those that survived represented the wisdom of past generations and made up a nation's sacred constitution. A nation, he wrote, is a partnership among "those who are living, those who are dead, and those who will be born."

Burke acknowledged that changes and reforms might be necessary, but not the complete destruction of the inheritance from a nation's forefathers. He cited the English Glorious Revolution of 1688. It preserved England's ancient laws and liberties by making the will of Parliament superior to that of the monarchy.

Burke celebrated the British Constitution, which contained the inherited "rights of Englishmen," not some theoretical notion about the "rights of man." He therefore criticized many Enlightenment writers such as Rousseau who believed in "natural rights" and creating the perfect society.

In Burke's view, rule by king and Parliament in England, each limited in its role, was superior to rule by the people in France. He also described the English aristocracy, the landowning nobles, as "the great Oaks that shade a Country and perpetuate your benefits from Generation to Generation."

Burke was not enthusiastic about democracy. He defended the English monarchy based on inherited succession. He consistently opposed expanding the right to vote beyond property owners, who made up only a minority of the English population. Moreover, Burke warned, "democracy has many striking points of resemblance to tyranny," including the "cruel oppression" of the minority.

Burke summarized the British Constitution by saying, "We have an inheritable crown, an inheritable peerage [House of Lords], and a House of Commons and a people inheriting privileges, franchises [voting rights], and liberties from a long line of ancestors." Underlying all this, he concluded, was the will of God and an established Anglican Church supported by public taxes.

Burke's *Reflections on the Revolution in France* received a mixed reaction. King George loved it. Others, like the American patriot, Thomas Paine, condemned it. Burke himself warned of the "French disease" of revolution, spreading throughout Europe and even to Britain.

13. James Mill and the End of Government

The question with respect to government is a question about the adaptation of means to an end. The end of government has been described in a great variety of expressions. By Locke it was said to be 'the public good'; by others it has been described as being 'the greatest happiness of the greatest number.' These, and equivalent expressions, are just; but they are defective, inasmuch as the particular ideas which they embrace are indistinctly announced, and different conceptions are by means of them raised in different minds, and even in the same mind on different occasions.

James Mill maintained that in general terms the lot of every human being is determined by his pains and pleasures, and that his happiness corresponds with the degree in which his pleasures are great and his pains are small. He maintained that human pain and pleasure emanates from either our fellow-men or by causes independent of other men. We may assume it as another principle that the concern of government is with the former of these two sources: that its business is to increase to the utmost the pleasures, and diminish to the utmost the pains, which men derive from one another.

Of the laws of nature on which the condition of man depends, that which is attended with the greatest number of consequences is the necessity of labor for obtaining the means of subsistence, as well as the means of the greatest part of our pleasures. This is no doubt the primary cause of government; for if nature had produced spontaneously all the objects which we desire, and in sufficient abundance for the desires of all, there would have been no source of dispute or of injury among men, nor would any man have possessed the means of ever acquiring authority over another.

However, when nature produces the object of dispute that is insufficient for all, the source of dispute between men becomes exhaustive and every man has the means of acquiring authority over others in proportion to the quantity of those objects which he is able to possess. In this case the end to be obtained through government as the means, is to make that distribution of the scanty materials of happiness which would insure the greatest sum of it in the members of the community taken altogether, preventing every individual or combination of individuals from interfering with that distribution or making any man to have less than his share.

He further argued that when it is considered that most of the objects of desire and even the means of subsistence are the product of labor, it is evident that the means of insuring labor must be provided for as the foundation of all. The means for the insuring of labor are of two sorts: the one made out of the matter of evil, the other made out of the matter of good. The first sort is commonly denominated force, and under its application the laborers are slaves. This mode of procuring labor we need not consider, for if the end of government be to produce the greatest happiness of the greatest number, that end cannot be attained by making the greatest number slaves.

The other mode of obtaining labor in his view is by allurements, or the advantage which it brings. To obtain all the objects of desire in the greatest possible quantity, we must obtain labor in the greatest possible quantity; and to obtain labor in the greatest possible quantity, we must raise to the greatest possible height the advantage attached to labor. It is impossible to attach to labor a greater degree of advantage than the whole of the product of labor. This is because if you give more to one man than the produce of his labor, you can do so only by taking it away from the produce of some other man's labor. The greatest possible happiness of society is therefore attained by insuring to every man the greatest possible quantity of the produce of his labor.

James Mill is of the view that this can only be attained through one mode; the government, which emanates from the union of a certain number of men to protect one another and that this can best be attained when a great number of men combine and delegate to a small number the power necessary for protecting them all. Mill further identified two critical issues in relation to the power of government. There are three modes in which it may be supposed that the powers for the protection of the community are capable of being exercised. The community may undertake the protection of itself and of its members. The powers of protection may be placed in the hands of a few. And lastly, they may be placed in the hands of an individual. The many, the few, the one correspond to the three forms of government: the democratic, the aristocratic, and the monarchy.

The democratically.— It is obviously impossible that the community in a body can be present to afford protection to each of its members. It must employ individuals for that purpose. Employing individuals, it must choose them; it must lay down the rules under which they are to act; and it must punish them if act not in conformity to those rules. In these functions are included the three great operations of government—administration, legislation, and judicature. The community, to perform any of these operations, must be assembled. This circumstance alone seems to form a conclusive objection against the democratically form. Since it is expensive and difficult to assemble the whole of a community as often as the business of government requires, and since this will adversely affect performance. What they uniformly do is to choose a certain number of themselves to be the actors in their stead. Even in the case of a common benefit club, the members choose a committee of management and content themselves with a general control.

The aristocratically - This term applies to all those cases in which the powers of government are held by any number of persons intermediate between a single person and the majority. When the number is small, it is common to call the government an oligarchy; when it is considerable, to call it an aristocracy. The cases are essentially the same, because the motives which operate in both are the same. This is a proposition which carries, we think, its own evidence along with it. We therefore assume it as a point which will not be disputed. The source of evil is radically different in the case of aristocracy from what it is in that of democracy.

He maintained that the community cannot have an interest opposite to its interest. To affirm this or to wish that the community can within itself and with respect to itself have sinister interest would be a contradiction in terms. It is his opinion that one community may intend the evil of another; never its own. While he accepts that the community may act

His *Utilitarianism* Faustin remains the classic defence of the view that we ought to aim at maximizing the welfare of all sentient creatures, and that welfare consists of their happiness. Mill's defence of the view that we ought to pursue happiness because we do pursue happiness, has been the object of savage attack by, among others, F. H. Bradley in his *Ethical Studies* 1874 and G. E. Moore in *Principia Ethica* 1903. But others have argued that on this particular point, Mill was misinterpreted by his critics. His insistence that happiness was to be assessed not merely by quantity but by quality - the doctrine that a dissatisfied Socrates is not only better than a satisfied fool, but somehow happier, too - has puzzled generations of commentators. And his attempt to show that justice can be accounted for in utilitarian terms is still important as a riposte to such writers as John Rawls. Mill lays down "one very simple principle" to govern the use of coercion in society - and by coercion he means both legal penalties and the operation of public opinion; it is that we may only coerce others in self-defence - either to defend ourselves, or to defend others from harm. Crucially, this rules out paternalistic interventions to save people from themselves, and ideal interventions to make people behave "better". It has long exercised critics to explain how a utilitarian can subscribe to such a principle of self-restraint. In essence, Mill argues that only by adopting the self-restraint principle can we seek out the truth, experience the truth as "our own", and fully develop individual selves.

1. Distastefulness

2. Impossibility

The second most common criticism of utilitarianism is that it is impossible to apply - that happiness (etc) cannot be quantified or measured, that there is no way of calculating a trade-off between intensity and extent, or intensity and probability (etc), or comparing happiness to suffering

3. Impracticality

The third most common criticism is that it is too difficult to apply - that we cannot calculate all the effects for all the individuals (either because of the large number of individuals involved, and/or because of the uncertainty). The principle of utility is, essentially, a *description* of what makes something right or wrong - so in order for it to fail, someone must give an example of something which is useful but obviously wrong. The principle does not imply that we can calculate what is right or wrong - completely accurately, in advance, or at all! It does not harm the principle of utility at all merely to comment that it is difficult for us to work out what is right - it is merely a lament against the human condition.

4. Insufficiency (of scope)

One argument which some people propose as being more sensible than other criticisms, is that utilitarianism is "fine, so far as it goes", but that it fails to consider some sources of value, and that it will therefore produce the wrong results when these different sources conflict. There is potential for confusion here - sometimes "utilitarianism" is used to specifically for "hedonistic utilitarianism"; and, sometimes, it means a particular class of ethical theory (something like "value-maximizing consequentialism") ... under this meaning, an ethical theory which held the existence of plastic forks as supremely valuable, and therefore tried to maximize their number, would be "plastic fork utilitarianism".

On Liberty is one of Mill's most famous works and remains the one most read today. In this book, Mill expounds his concept of individual freedom within the context of his ideas on history and the state. *On Liberty* depends on the idea that society progresses from lower to higher stages and that this progress culminates in the emergence of a system of representative democracy. It is within the context of this form of government that Mill envisions the growth and development of liberty.

14. Marx

The Marxist theory of historical materialism claims society as fundamentally determined by the *material conditions* at any given time — this means the relationships which people enter into with one another in order to fulfill their basic needs, for instance to feed and clothe themselves and their families. In general Marx and Engels claimed to have identified five successive stages of the development of these material conditions in Western Europe.

Marx saw that each stage or epoch created a new class or invention that would lead to its downfall. However the downfall would not be an automatically negative event, since with each step humanity at large would benefit. Each passing stage would therefore raise the standard of living of the masses while at the same time be doomed to its own downfall because of internal contradictions and class conflicts.

Only the last two epochs are spared from this fate. With socialism the final oppressive class is overthrown and society is put under the dictatorship of the proletariat and thus advances into communism.

The first three stages are not given particular attention, since by Marx's time they had long come to pass. As such, he does not provide the principles of these stages as he does for capitalism and the stages that follow. However these epochs have common characteristics nonetheless.

Primitive communism

The First Stage: is usually called primitive communism. It has the following characteristics.

- **Shared property:** there is no concept of ownership beyond individual possessions. All is shared by the tribe to ensure its survival.

- **Hunting and gathering:** tribal societies have yet to develop large scale agriculture and so their survival is a daily struggle.
 - **Proto-democracy:** there is usually no concept of "leadership" yet. So tribes are led by the best warrior if there is war, the best diplomat if they have steady contact with other tribes and so fort.
- The primitive communism stage most likely begins soon after the dawn of humanity itself, at the stage where fire is developed, and communal living therefore becomes more convenient. Primitive communist societies tend to be very small, consisting of a maximum of a few hundred members, with size being dependent upon the environment. In this stage humanity is no different from any other animal, in that it has not yet found ways to bend nature to its will. This stage ends with the development of private property,^[citation needed] especially with the development of large scale agriculture. This in turn produces productive property, such as cattle and slaves.

Slave society

The Second Stage: may be called slave society, considered to be the beginning of "class society" where private property appears.

- **Class:** here the idea of class appears. There is always a slave-owning ruling class and the slaves themselves.
- **Statism:** the state develops during this stage as a tool for the slave-owners to use and control the slaves.
- **Agriculture:** people learn to cultivate plants and animals on a large enough scale to support large populations.
- **Democracy and authoritarianism:** these opposites develop at the same stage. Democracy arises first with the development of the republican city-state, followed by the totalitarian empire.
- **Private property:** citizens now own more than personal property. Land ownership is especially important during a time of agricultural development.

The slave-owning class "own" the land and slaves, which are the main means of producing wealth, whilst the vast majority have very little or nothing. The property less included the slave class, slaves who work for no money, and in most cases women, who were also dispossessed during this period. From a Marxist perspective, slave society collapsed when it exhausted itself. The need to keep conquering more slaves created huge problems, such as maintaining the vast empire that resulted (i.e. The Roman Empire). It is ultimately the aristocracy born in this epoch that demolishes it and forces society to step onto the next stage.

Feudalism

The Third Stage: may be called feudalism; it appears after slave society collapses. This was most obvious during the European Middle Ages when society went from slavery to feudalism.

- **Aristocracy:** the state is ruled by monarchs who inherit their positions, or at times marry or conquer their ways into leadership.
- **Theocracy:** this is a time of largely religious rule. When there is only one religion in the land and its organizations affect all parts of daily life.
- **Hereditary classes:** castes can sometimes form and one's class is determined at birth with no form of advancement. This was the case with India.
- **Nation-state:** nations are formed from the remnants of the fallen empires. Sometimes to rebuild themselves into empires once more. Such as England's transition from a province to an empire.

Criticism of capitalism ranges from expressing disagreement with the principles of capitalism in its entirety, to expressing disagreement with particular outcomes of capitalism. Among those wishing to replace capitalism with a different method of production and social organization, a distinction can be made between those believing that capitalism can only be overcome through revolution (e.g., revolutionary socialism) and those believing that structural change can come slowly

through political reforms (e.g., social democracy). Some critics believe there are merits in capitalism, and wish to balance it with some form of social control, typically through government regulation (e.g., the social market movement).

The center piece of Marx work is an incisive analysis of the strengths and weaknesses of capitalism. Marx argued that all commodity value is determined by labour content- both the direct labour and indirect labour embodied in capital equipment. For example, the value of a shirt comes from the efforts of textile workers put together plus the value of the person who made the looms. By imputing all the values of output to labour, Marx attempted to show that profits- the part of output that is produced by workers but received by capitalists- amount to unearned income. It is the opinion of Marx that the injustice of capitalist receiving unearned income justifies Historical Materialism

Marx argued that the highest determinant of human history is the sum of the relations involved in economic production. In other words, that the economic structure of society constitutes the real foundation on which rises a legal and political superstructure and to which correspond definite forms of social consciousness. What Marx is saying is that it is economic production that ultimately directs man's social advancement in history not other factors. Engels explained this further when he remarked that historical materialism implies that view of the course of history which seeks the ultimate cause and the great moving power of all important historic events in the economic development of society, in the change in the mode of production and exchange, in the consequent division of society into distinct social classes and in the struggle of these classes against one another. Marx notion of historical materialism presupposes that there exists two levels of relationship in the process of production; the relationship between man and nature on the one hand and relationship between man and man on the other. The relation between man and nature is determined by available forces of production. However, he observed that men not only act on nature in order to produce but also on one another, cooperating mutually in the exchange of activities which involves relations of production. Such relations often assume the nature of domination and subordination, exploitation and expropriation, oppression and repression between the owners of means of production and their exploited workers.

It is the views of Marx that the development in human society is dependent on the level of advancement between these spheres of relationships involved in the process of economic production. These relations of production are both complementary and contradictory. This is because although the owners of means of production and the exploited workers need each other in the process of production, their relation is often characterised by antagonistic class struggle which heightened the contradictions in each mode of production. Marx used the concept of class to describe the relationship of individuals to the means of production. He contended that every succeeding generation finds itself in possession of the productive forces required by the previous generation which serve it as the raw material for new production. At a stage, coherence arises in human history as the productive forces and social relation become overdeveloped. The emerging contradictions will metamorphose into a higher mode of production. Based on this logic, Marx identified five major historical epochs in the evolution of society as primitive communalism, slavery, feudalism, capitalism and communism which is preceded by socialism. From this he contended. Marx Notion of the State

Marx associated the emergence of state with the emergence of private property and located this phenomenon under the slave owning mode of production. It is his position that the state exist not for the interest of the generality of the populace but as a medium for the protection of the interest of the dominant and propertied class. Writing on the bourgeois state, Marx contended that it is nothing other than the form of organisation which the bourgeois necessarily adopt for internal and external purposes, for the mutual guarantee of their property and interests. In the Manifesto of the Communist party, Marx described the executive in a modern state as merely the committee for the management of the affairs of the whole bourgeoisie. From this he argued that the state and its agencies is only the

tool which the dominant class utilize to oppress the bulk of the masses of the society. In a nutshell, this constitutes Marx primary view of the state.

In his other works, *The 18th Brumaire of Louis Bonaparte* and *Class Struggle in France*, Marx however observed that the state may not represent the interest of any class and that in the case of the Bonapartist state, it is independent from and superior to all social classes, as being the dominant class. It is this new twist in conception of the state that resulted in the State Autonomy theory in which the state is conceived as a site and arena of class struggle with fractions competing for dominance within the state arena. In this sense, the state becomes a factor of cohesion and an institution regulating class conflict. The bourgeois state for him can only wither away as an instrument for the protection of private property under a communist society in the aftermath of the proletarian revolution that will establish the dictatorship of the proletariat. This is because the bourgeois state is like a sorcerer who is no longer able to control the powers of evil which he has called up by his spell.

Marx further contends that capitalism will inevitably lead to socialism. His argument is that technological advances enable capitalists to replace workers with machinery as a means of earning greater profits. He observed that the increasing accumulation of capital has two contradictory consequences. For instance, as the supply of available capital increases, the rate of profit on capital falls. At the same time, with fewer jobs, the unemployment rates rise and wages fall. In Marx terms, the reserve army of the unemployed would grow, and the working class would become increasingly impoverished and their working conditions would deteriorate and workers would grow progressively alienated from their jobs. The business climate will

Marx include.

- Dictatorship of the proletariat.
- Abolition of private property
- Existence of classless society
- The withering away of the State

The distribution of social surplus will be based “from everyone according to ability” to “everyone according to need.”

15. John Austin

John Austin is considered by many to be the creator of the school of analytical jurisprudence, as well as, more specifically, the approach to law known as “legal positivism.” Austin's particular command theory of law has been subject to pervasive criticism, but its simplicity gives it an evocative power that continues to attract adherents.

Austin’s theory of sovereignty (monistic view)

In the 19th century the theory of sovereignty as a legal concept was perfected by Austin, an English Jurist. He is regarded as a greatest exponent of Monistic Theory. In his book *Province of Jurisprudence Determined* (1832) Austin observed “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 superior) is a society political and independent.” To Austin in every state there exists an authority to which a large mass of citizen show compliance. This authority is absolute, unlimited and indivisible.

Austin’s theory of sovereignty depends mainly upon his view on nature of law. According to Austin “Law is a command given by a superior to inferior” the main tenets of Austin’s theory of sovereignty are as follows-

1. Sovereign power is essential in every political society.
2. Sovereignty is a person or body of persons. It is not necessary that sovereign should be a single person.

Sovereignty may reside in many persons also. Austin explains that a “Sovereign is not necessarily a single person, in the modern western world he is rarely so; but he must have so much of the

attributes of a single person as to be a determinate.” To Austin state is a legal order, in which there is a supreme authority, which is source of all powers. Sovereignty is concerned with man, and every state must have human superior who can issue commands and create laws. Human laws are the proper subjects of state activity.

3. Sovereign power is indivisible. Division of sovereignty leads to its destruction. It cannot be divided.

4. The command of sovereignty is superior to over all individuals and associations. Sovereign is not bound to obey anyone’s order. His will is supreme. There is no question of right or wrong, just or unjust, all his commands are to be obeyed.

5. Austin’s theory says that the obedience to sovereign must be habitual. It means that obedience should be continuous. He also includes that is not necessary that obedience should come from the whole society. It is sufficient, if it comes from the lay majority of people. Obedience should come from bulk of the society otherwise there is no sovereign.

In brief we can say that sovereignty according to Austin is supreme, indivisible and unquestionable. Like all other theories of sovereignty Austin’s theory is also not free from criticism. The first criticism is regarding sovereignty residing in a determinate superior. Even sovereign’s acts are shaped by so many other influences, such as morals, values and customs of the society.

3. Austin's Views

Austin's basic approach was to ascertain what can be said generally, but still with interest, about all laws. Austin's analysis can be seen as either a paradigm of, or a caricature of, analytical philosophy, in that his discussions are dryly full of distinctions, but are thin in argument. The modern reader is forced to fill in much of the meta-theoretical, justificatory work, as it cannot be found in the text. Where Austin does articulate his methodology and objective, it is a fairly traditional one: he “endeavored to resolve a law (taken with the largest signification which can be given to that term properly) into the necessary and essential elements of which it is composed” (Austin 1832: Lecture V, p. 117).

As to what is the core nature of law, Austin's answer is that laws (“properly so called”) are commands of a sovereign. He clarifies the concept of positive law (that is, man-made law) by analyzing the constituent concepts of his definition, and by distinguishing law from other concepts that are similar: “Commands” involve an expressed wish that something be done, combined with a willingness and ability to impose “an evil” if that wish is not complied with.

Rules are general commands (applying generally to a class), as contrasted with specific or individual commands (“drink wine today” or “John Major must drink wine”).

Positive law consists of those commands laid down by a sovereign (or its agents), to be contrasted to other law-givers, like God's general commands, and the general commands of an employer to an employee.

The “sovereign” is defined as a person (or determinate body of persons) who receives habitual obedience from the bulk of the population, but who does not habitually obey any other (earthly) person or institution. Austin thought that all independent political societies, by their nature, have a sovereign.

Positive law should also be contrasted with “laws by a close analogy” (which includes positive morality, laws of honor, international law, customary law, and constitutional law) and “laws by remote analogy”

Austin also wanted to include within “the province of jurisprudence” certain “exceptions,” items which did not fit his criteria but which should nonetheless be studied with other “laws properly so called”: repealing laws, declarative laws, and “imperfect laws”—laws prescribing action but without sanctions

Austin on Sovereignty

In modern times, the development of sovereignty as a theory coincided roughly with the growth of the state in terms of power, functions and prestige. In the nineteenth century, the theory of

sovereignty as a legal concept (i.e. sovereignty expressed in terms of law) was perfected by John Austin, an English jurist. He is regarded as the greatest exponent of the Monistic theory of sovereignty. It is called the Monistic Theory of Sovereignty because it envisages a single sovereign in the state. The sovereign may be a person or a body of persons. Furthermore, as sovereignty is considered to be a legal concept, the theory is called the Legal-Monistic theory of Sovereignty. John Austin, in his famous book, Province of Jurisprudence Determined (1832), stated his views on sovereignty in the following words: "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."

On an analysis of the above definition, we could find the following implications:

Firstly, sovereignty must reside in a "determinate person" or in a "determinate body" which acts as the ultimate source of power in the state.

Secondly, the power of the determinate superior is unlimited and absolute. He can exact obedience from others but he never renders obedience to any other authority.

Thirdly, the obedience rendered by a people to an authority occasionally will not turn the authority into sovereign power.

Fourthly, obedience rendered to sovereign authority must be voluntary and as such undisturbed and uninterrupted. Austin also points out that it is not necessary that all the inhabitants should render obedience to the superior. It is enough if the "bulk", i.e., the majority of a society renders habitual obedience to the determinate superior.

Fifthly, The sovereign is the supreme law maker. Laws are the commands of the sovereign which are binding upon all within the territorial jurisdiction of the state. Breach or violation of these commands leads to punishment from the sovereign.

Sixthly, sovereignty is one indivisible whole and as such incapable of division between two or more parties. There can be only one sovereign authority in a state.

Critical Evaluation of Austin's Theory :

The theory of Austin has been strongly criticised by many writers like Sidgwick, Sir Henry Maine and others. The main point of criticism against Austin's theory is that the theory is inconsistent with the modern idea of popular sovereignty. In his fascination for the legal aspect of sovereignty, Austin completely loses sight of popular sovereignty according to which the ultimate source of all authority is the people. It is also pointed out that sovereignty may not always be determinate. It is very difficult to locate the sovereign in a federal state. For example, in the federal state of USA, sovereignty resides neither with the President nor with the legislature, namely, the Congress. It resides with the people as expressed in the constitution. The same is the case in India.

Furthermore, Austin has been criticised for defining law as the command of the sovereign. But in many countries, customary laws are supreme and they are not issued in the form of commands. But such laws influence the conduct of even despots to a great extent. Sir Henry Maine cites the example of Ranjit Singh of Punjab who fits the Austinian conception of human superior. But even a despotic ruler like Ranjit Singh dared not change the customary laws which regulated the conduct of his people.

According to the advocates of the Pluralist theory of sovereignty, the state is an association like various other associations.

However, in spite of the criticisms levelled against the monistic view of sovereignty as propounded by

John Austin, it must be mentioned that Austin is an exponent of absolute and unlimited sovereignty purely from the legal or formal point of view. Fundamentally, he does not prescribe for an irresponsible sovereign, but maintains that the sovereign cannot be formally made responsible to any authority similar to himself: His authority is legally superior to all individuals and groups within his jurisdiction. Austin has done a distinct service by clearly distinguishing the legal from the political sovereign.

Renaissance
Law College

**Unit III
IDEOLOGIES**

1. Liberalism

Liberalism is a political philosophy or worldview founded on ideas of liberty and equality. Liberals espouse a wide array of views depending on their understanding of these principles, but generally they support ideas such as free and fair elections, rights, freedom, freedom of religion, free trade, and private property.

Liberalism first became a distinct political movement during the Age of Enlightenment, when it became popular among philosophers and economists in the Western world. Liberalism rejected the notions, common at the time, of hereditary privilege, religion, absolute, and the Divine Right of Kings. The 17th-century philosopher John Locke is often credited with founding liberalism as a distinct philosophical tradition. Locke argued that each man has a natural right to life, liberty and property and according to the social, governments must not violate these rights. Liberals opposed traditional conservatism and sought to replace absolutism in government with representative democracy and the rule of law.

The revolutionaries of the Glorious Revolution, American Revolution, segments of the French Revolution, and other liberal revolutionaries from that time used liberal philosophy to justify the armed overthrow of what they saw as tyrannical rule. The 19th century saw liberal governments established in nations across Europe, Spanish America, and North America.^[8] In this period, the dominant ideological opponent of liberalism was classical conservatism.

Liberalism also survived major ideological challenges from new opponents, such as fascism and communism. During the 20th century, liberal ideas spread even further, as liberal democracies found themselves on the winning side in both world wars. In Europe and North America, there was also the rise of *social liberalism*, which is related with social democracy in Europe. The meaning of the word "liberalism" began to diverge in different parts of the world. According to the Encyclopedia Britannica, "In the United States, liberalism is associated with the welfare-state policies of the New Deal program of the Democratic administration of Pres. Franklin D. Roosevelt, whereas in Europe it is more commonly associated with a commitment to limited government and *laissez-faire* economic policies."^[9] Consequently in the U.S., the ideas of individualism and *laissez-faire* economics previously associated with classical liberalism, became the basis for the emerging school of libertarian thought.^[12] Today, liberal political parties remain a political force with varying degrees of power and influence on many countries.

Principles of classical Liberalism given by the Hobhouse in his book "liberalism"

- | | |
|---------------------|---|
| A) Civil liberty | F) Domestic liberty |
| B) Fiscal liberty | G) Administrative geographical and racial liberty |
| C) Personal liberty | H) International liberty |
| D) Social liberty | I) Political liberty |
| E) Economic liberty | |

The idealist revision of liberalism:

The revision of liberal theory was accomplished between 1880-1900 and the oxford idealists of whom the Green was the foremost where the person responsibility for it. For him the state is simply a means and the end is the full moral development of the individual who compose it. bu

The 20th century term liberalism had assumed two meaning narrow and general.

General meaning positive midway between conservation and socialism and narrow meaning it talked about democracy as opposed to both of communist and fascists.

Marx on liberalism

Between Marxism and Liberalism there are a number of similarities, but at the same time a number of irreconcilable differences. Both concern themselves with some form of social change, and indeed they can both agree on the harmful way in which the state affects us. In this sense, both ideologies hold that a great deal of social and societal change must come about in order for us to reach our most beneficial state. However, whilst Liberals argue for an attempt to achieve a state that grants us the most freedom, Marxists argue that the state itself is the problem and that humanity will at some point grow tired of its oppressor and revolt to defeat the state, leaving the survivors better for it. During this essay I will attempt to devise an argument that will point out the flaws in the ideology of Liberalism and show how a Marxist would address these, primarily by arguing that the state is without fail an oppressor no matter how much freedom it claims to grant its citizens and that revolution is necessary to break us out of the illusion of

2. Individualism

Political and social philosophy that emphasizes individual freedom. Modern individualism emerged in Britain with the ideas of ADAM SMITH and JEREMY BENTHAM, and the concept was described by ALEXIS DE TOCQUEVILLE as fundamental to the American temper. Individualism encompasses a value system, a theory of human nature, and a belief in certain political, economic, social, and religious arrangements. According to the individualist, all values are human-centred, the individual is of supreme importance, and all individuals are morally equal. Individualism places great value on self-reliance, on privacy, and on mutual respect. Negatively, it embraces opposition to authority and to all manner of controls over the individual, especially when exercised by the state. As a theory of human nature, individualism holds that the interests of the normal adult are best served by allowing him maximum freedom and responsibility for choosing his objectives and the means for obtaining them. The institutional embodiment of individualism follows from these principles. All individualists believe that government should keep its interference in the lives of individuals at a minimum, confining itself largely to maintaining law and order, preventing individuals from interfering with others, and enforcing agreements (contracts) voluntarily arrived at. Individualism also implies a property system according to which each person or family enjoys the maximum of opportunity to acquire property and to manage and dispose of it as he or they see fit. Although economic individualism and political individualism in the form of democracy advanced together for a while, in the course of the 19th century they eventually proved incompatible, as newly enfranchised voters came to demand governmental intervention in the economic process. Individualistic ideas lost ground in the later 19th and early 20th century with the rise of large-scale social organization and the emergence of political theories opposed to individualism, particularly COMMUNISM and FASCISM. They reemerged in the latter half of the 20th century with the defeat of fascism and the fall of communist regimes in the Soviet Union and eastern Europe.

Individualism is the moral stance, political philosophy, ideology, or social outlook that emphasizes the moral worth of the individual. Individualists promote the exercise of one's goals and desires and so value independence and self-reliance and advocate that interests of the individual should achieve precedence over the state or a social group, while opposing external interference upon one's own interests by society or institutions such as the government.

Individualism makes the individual its focus and so starts "with the fundamental premise that the human individual is of primary importance in the struggle for liberation." Liberalism, existentialism and anarchism are examples of movements that take the human individual as a central unit of analysis. Individualism thus involves "the right of the individual to freedom and self-realization".

It has also been used as a term denoting "The quality of being an individual; individuality" related to possessing "An individual characteristic; a quirk." Individualism is thus also associated with artistic and bohemian interests and lifestyles where there is a tendency towards self-creation

and experimentation as opposed to tradition or popular mass opinions and behaviors as so also with humanist philosophical positions and ethics

Laissez-faire is an economic environment in which transactions between private parties are free from intrusive government restrictions, tariffs, and subsidies, with only enough regulations to protect property rights. The phrase laissez-faire is French and literally means "let [them] do," but it broadly implies "let it be," "let them do as they will," or "leave it alone."

Individualism Ethics.

Basically three arguments:

1. Ethical
2. Economic Arguments
3. Empirical arguments

Modern Individualism

The Modern Individualism is a reaction against the depositism of the state but unlike old individualism. It focuses its attention on the group rather than the individual. The two important causes that led to the growth of modern individualism.

1. Recognition of the heterogeneous character of the modern society.
2. Frustration caused in the first post war period of the feeling of recognition life today finds its expression through numerous groups. These groups fulfill the vital needs of man and are necessary channel of his welfare.

Critics of Individualism

1. State is not necessary evil.
2. Law do not curtail liberty.
3. Man can't judge is interest always
4. Survival is fittest doctrine is not good.
5. If there is an individual develop it develop state to.
6. Lack competition
7. We need for the human welfare.

3. Socialism

Socialism is a social and economic system characterized by social ownership of the means of production and co-operative management of the economy, as well as a political theory and movement that aims at the establishment of such a system. "Social ownership" may refer to cooperative enterprises, common ownership, state ownership, citizen ownership of equity, or any combination of these. There are many varieties of socialism and there is no single definition encapsulating all of them. They differ in the type of social ownership they advocate, the degree to which they rely on markets or planning, how management is to be organized within productive institutions, and the role of the state in constructing socialism.

A socialist economic system is based on the organizational precept of production for use, meaning the production of goods and services to directly satisfy economic demand and human needs where objects are valued based on their use-value or utility, as opposed to being structured upon the accumulation of capital and production for profit. In the traditional conception of a socialist economy, coordination, accounting and valuation would be performed in kind (using physical quantities), by a common physical magnitude, or by a direct measure of labor-time in place of financial calculation. On distribution of output there have been two proposals, one which is based on the principle of *to each according to his contribution* and another on the principle of *from each according to his ability, to each according to his need*. The advisability, feasibility and exact methods of resource allocation and valuation are the subject of the socialist calculation debate.

The socialist political movement includes a diverse array of political philosophies. Core dichotomies within the socialist movement include the distinction between reformism and revolutionary socialism and between state socialism and libertarian socialism. State socialism calls for the nationalization of the means of production as a strategy for implementing socialism, while libertarian socialists generally place their hopes in decentralized means of direct democracy such as libertarian municipals, citizens' assemblies, trade unions, and workers' councils coming from a general anti-authoritarian stance. Democratic socialism highlights the central role of democratic processes and political systems and is usually contrasted with non-democratic political movements that advocate socialism. Some socialists have adopted the causes of other social movements, such as environmentalism, feminism and liberalism.

Modern socialism originated from an 18th-century intellectual and working class political movement that criticized the effects of industrialization and private property on society. The revival of republicanism in the American Revolution of 1776 and the egalitarian values introduced by the French Revolution of 1789 gave rise to socialism as a distinct political movement. In the early 19th century, "socialism" referred to any concern for the social problems of capitalism irrespective of the solutions to those problems. However, by the late 19th century, "socialism" had come to signify opposition to capitalism and advocacy for an alternative post-capitalist system based on some form of social ownership. During this time, German philosopher Karl Marx and his collaborator Friedrich Engels published works criticizing the utopian aspects of contemporary socialist trends and applied a materialist understanding of socialism as a phase of development which will come about through social revolution instigated by escalating and conflicting class relationships within capitalism. Alongside this there appeared other tendencies such as anarchism, revolutionary syndicalism, democracy, Marxism and democratic socialism as well as the confluence of socialism with anti-imperialist and anti-racist struggles around the world. The socialist movement came to be the most influential worldwide movement and political-economic worldview of the 20th century. Today, socialist parties and ideas remain a political force with varying degrees of power and influence in all continents leading national governments in many countries.

Guild socialism

Guild socialism is a political movement advocating workers' control of industry through the medium of trade-related guilds "in an implied contractual relationship with the public". It originated in the United Kingdom and was at its most influential in the first quarter of the 20th century. It was strongly associated with G. D. H. Cole and influenced by the ideas of William Morris.

The guild socialists "stood for state ownership of industry, combined with 'workers' control' through delegation of authority to national guilds organized internally on democratic lines. About the state itself they differed, some believing it would remain more or less in its existing form and others that it would be transformed into a federal body representing the workers' guilds, consumers' organizations, local government bodies, and other social structures."

Syndicalism

Syndicalism is a type of proposed economic system, a form of socialism, considered a replacement for capitalism. It suggests that industries be organized into confederations or syndicates. It is "a system of economic organization in which industries are owned and managed by the workers."

Its theory and practice (or praxis) is the advocacy of multiple cooperative productive units composed of specialists and representatives of workers in each respective field to negotiate and manage the economy. Syndicalism also refers to the political movement (praxis) and tactics used to bring about this type of system.

For adherents, labour unions and labour training (see below) are the potential means of both overcoming economic aristocracy and running society fairly and in the interest of informed and skilled majorities, through union democracy. Industry in a syndicalist system would be run

through co-operative confederations and mutual aid. Local syndicates would communicate with other syndicates through the Bourse du Travail (labour exchange) which would cooperatively determine distributions of commodities.

Fabian socialism

As the anarcho-communists argued for a form of socialism so decentralized that it required the abolition of the state, a milder and markedly centralist version of socialism, Fabianism, emerged in Britain. Fabian Socialism was so called because the members of the Fabian Society admired the tactics of the Roman general Fabius Cunctator (Fabius the Delayer), who avoided pitched battles and gradually wore down Hannibal's forces. Instead of revolution, the Fabians favoured "gradualism" as the way to bring about socialism. Their notion of socialism, like Saint-Simon's, entailed social control of property through an effectively and impartially administered state—a government of enlightened experts. The Fabians themselves were mostly middle-class intellectuals—including George Bernard Shaw, Sidney and Beatrice Webb, Graham Wallas, and H.G. Wells—who thought that persuasion and education were more likely to lead to socialism, however gradually, than violent class warfare. Rather than form their own political party or work through trade unions, moreover, the Fabians aimed at gaining influence within existing parties. They eventually exercised considerable influence within Britain's Labour Party, though they had little to do with its formation in the early 1900s. The main work of fabianists is to remove the great injustice in capitalistic system. The principles which was issued in 1887 as the basis for the Fabian society "its aim at the reorganization of society by the emancipation n of land and industrial capital from individual and class ownerships.

State Socialism

State socialists believe that the state should continue to enjoy authority in the way it's enjoying but it should be improved. The people should be persuaded, educated and there should be vast propaganda against the evils which the existing state and allied institution are generating.

4. Marxism

Marxism is a worldview and method of societal analysis that focuses on class relations and societal conflict, that uses a materialist interpretation of historical development, and a dialectical view of social transformation. Marxist methodology uses economic and sociopolitical inquiry and applies that to the analysis and critique of the development of capitalism and the role of class struggle in systemic economic change.

In the mid-to-late 19th century, the intellectual tenets of Marxism were inspired by two German philosophers: Karl Marx and Friedrich Engels. Marxist analyses and methodologies have influenced multiple political ideologies and social movements. Marxism encompasses an economic theory, a sociological theory, a philosophical method, and a revolutionary view of social change.

There is no single definitive Marxist theory; Marxist analysis has been applied to diverse subjects and has been misconceived and modified during the course of its development, resulting in numerous and sometimes contradictory theories that fall under the rubric of Marxism or Marxian analysis.

Marxism builds on a materialist understanding of societal development, taking as its starting point the necessary economic activities required by human society to provide for its material needs. The form of economic organization or mode of production is understood to be the basis from which the majority of other social phenomena – including social relations, political and legal systems, morality and ideology – arise (or at the least by which they are directly influenced). These social relations form the superstructure, for which the economic system forms the base. As the forces of production (most notably technology) improve, existing forms of social organization become inefficient and stifle further progress. These inefficiencies manifest themselves as social contradictions in the form of class struggle.

According to Marxist analysis, class conflict within capitalism arises due to intensifying contradictions between highly productive mechanized and socialized production performed by the proletariat, and private ownership and private appropriation of the surplus product in the form of surplus value (profit) by a small minority of private owners called the bourgeoisie. As the contradiction becomes apparent to the proletariat, social unrest between the two antagonistic classes intensifies, culminating in a social revolution. The eventual long-term outcome of this revolution would be the establishment of socialism – a socioeconomic system based on cooperative ownership of the means of production, distribution based on one's contribution, and production organized directly for use. Karl Marx hypothesized that, as the productive forces and technology continued to advance, socialism would eventually give way to a communist stage of social development. Communism would be a classless, stateless, humane society erected on common ownership and the principle of "From each according to his ability, to each according to his needs".

Marxism has developed into different branches and schools of thought. Different schools place a greater emphasis on certain aspects of classical Marxism while de-emphasizing or rejecting other aspects of Marxism, sometimes combining Marxist analysis with non-Marxian concepts. Some variants of Marxism primarily focus on one aspect of Marxism as the determining force in social development – such as the mode of production, class, power-relationships or property ownership – while arguing other aspects are less important or current research makes them irrelevant. Despite sharing similar premises, different schools of Marxism might reach contradictory conclusions from each other. For instance, different Marxian economists have contradictory explanations of economic crisis and different predictions for the outcome of such crises. Furthermore, different variants of Marxism apply Marxist analysis to study different aspects of society (e.g. mass culture, economic crises, or feminism).

**CHART I
MARX'S THEORY OF HISTORY - ECONOMIC DETERMINISM**

Stages of History	Environment	Societal Relationships	Territorial Political Units	Classes	Source of Legitimacy	Economic System
Primitive Communism	Abundance	Harmony	None	None	None	None
Feudalism	Scarcity	Conflict	City-state	Noble vs. Peasants	Religion	Agrarian
Capitalism	Less Scarcity	Conflict	Nation-state	Bourgeoisie vs. Proletariat	Nationalism	Industrial
Socialism	Least Scarcity	Conflict	Regional Camps	Proletariat vs. Bourgeoisie	Working-class Consciousness	Highly Industrialized
Communism	Sufficiency	Harmony	Global Society	None	Equality	Nearly Automated

CHART II

WEBER'S TYPOLOGY OF DIFFERENT POLITICAL REGIMES

(THE TYPE OF REGIME LEGITIMACY INFLUENCES POLITICAL STABILITY)

TYPES OF LEGITIMACY	PROBLEM I	PROBLEM II	POLITICAL STABILITY
	Dealing with Transfer of Power	Dealing with the Phenomenon of Change	(Dealing with Problems I & II)
CHARISMATIC (Regime accepted by the People because of the personality of its leader)	Deals Poorly (Cannot Transfer Personality of Leader)	Deals Well (Can Must Necessary Political will)	Less Stable
TRADITIONAL (Regime accepted because it based on tradition and custom)	Deals Well (e.g, law of primogeniture)	Deals Poorly (Can not break with Tradition)	Less Stable
RATIONAL - LEGAL (Regime accepted because procedures are perceived logical and reasonable)	Deals Well (Elections, explicit line of succession)	Deals Well (Legislation, Amendments and judicial review)	Most Stable

**CHART III
MAJOR IDEOLOGIES**

Class Historical Economic Role of Nature of Source of Constituency Origins System Government Man Power

Conservatism	Nobility	18th Century	Mercantilism	Paternalistic (Strong Government)	Anti-Social	Land
---------------------	-----------------	---------------------	---------------------	--	--------------------	-------------

Liberalism	Middle Class	19th Century	Capitalism	Laissez Faire (Weak Government)	Social	Commerce
Socialism	Working Class	20th Century	Centrally Owned and Planned Economy	Interventionist (Strong Government)	Malleable	Numbers & Organizations

Social and political doctrine of Marx

1. Dialectical materialism .
2. Concepts of historical materialism and class war.
3. Theory of surplus value.
4. Law of concentration of capital.
5. Dictatorships of proletariat.
6. Statelessness
7. Religion
8. Revolution

Anarchism and Marxism are similar political philosophies which emerged in the nineteenth century. While Anarchism and Marxism are both complex movements driven by internal conflict, as ideological movements their primary attention has been on human liberation achieved through political action. Similarly, both have been intensely interested in abolishing social inequalities present in societies as a result of wage labour and the Industrial Revolution. In their most socially significant forms, both movements have been revolutionary, and have focused on the working class as the agent of revolution. As working class movements Marxism and anarchism have been sometimes allied and sometimes opposed groups. In particular revolutions there has been significant armed conflict between Marxist and anarchist groups.

Conflicts between anarchist and Marxist movements have emerged in terms of theory, strategy, practice and immediate political goals. Agreements between anarchism and Marxism have tended to focus on ideological convergence based around the concept of the working class as the group that creates real human freedom. The first major ideological conflict between anarchists and Marxists occurred within the First International, a European revolutionary communist political movement. The first major armed conflicts between anarchists and Marxists occurred during the 1917-1923 revolutions in the Russian Empire between urban anarchists, rural Makhnovist anarchists, the Marxist Menshevik Russian Social Democratic Party and the Marxist Bolshevik Russian Social Democratic Party. A major armed conflict occurred during the Spanish Civil War between the Spanish anarchist movement and the Communist Party of Spain, which at the time was under influence from the Soviet Union; see May Days.

5. Capitalism

Capitalism is an economic system in which trade, industry, and the means of production are largely or entirely privately owned and operated for profit. Central characteristics of capitalism include capital accumulation, competitive markets and wage labor. In a capitalist economy, the parties to a transaction typically determine the prices at which assets, goods, and services are exchanged. The degree of competition, role of intervention and regulation, and scope of public ownership varies across different models of capitalism. Economists, political economists, and historians have taken

different perspectives in their analysis of capitalism and recognized various forms of it in practice. These include *laissez-faire* capitalism, welfare capitalism, crony capitalism and state capitalism; each highlighting varying degrees of dependency on markets, public ownership, and inclusion of social policies. The extent to which different markets are free, as well as the rules defining private property, is a matter of politics and policy. Many states have what are termed capitalist mixed economies, referring to a mix between planned and market-driven elements. Capitalism has existed under many forms of government, in many different times, places, and cultures. Following the demise of feudalism, capitalism became the dominant economic system in the Western world.

Capitalism was carried across the world by broader processes of globalization such as imperialism and, by the end of the nineteenth century, became the dominant *global* economic system, in turn intensifying processes of economic and other globalization.^[8] Later, in the 20th century, capitalism overcame a challenge by centrally-planned economies and is now *the* encompassing system worldwide, with the mixed economy being its dominant form in the industrialized Western world. Barry Gills and Paul James write:

“ The process remains uneven, but notwithstanding the continuing importance of national and regional economies today, global capitalism is undoubtedly the dominant framework of economics in the world. There are many debates about what this means, but across the political spectrum ‘capitalism’ has become the taken-for-granted way of naming the economic pattern that weaves together the current dominant modes of production and exchange. ”

The term *capitalism*, in its modern sense, is often attributed to Karl Marx. In his magnum opus *Capital*, Marx analysed the "capitalist mode of production" using a method of understanding today known as Marxism. However, Marx himself rarely used the term "capitalism", while it was used twice in the more political interpretations of his work, primarily authored by his collaborator Friedrich Engels. In the 20th century defenders of the capitalist system often replaced the term *capitalism* with phrases such as *free enterprise* and *private enterprise* and replaced *capitalist* with *rentier* and *investor* in reaction to the negative connotations associated with capitalism.

1. Feature of capitalism existence and influences of the price mechanism.
2. Profit motive.
3. Private property.
4. Economic decisions.
5. Unplanned economy.
6. Freedom to choose one occupation.

Advantages of Capitalism

- | | |
|----------------------------|------------------|
| 1. Increase production | 5. Liberty |
| 2. High standard of living | 6. Personal care |
| 3. Technological progress | 7. Risk taking. |
| 4. Flexibility | |

Disadvantages of Capitalism

- | | |
|--|------------------------------------|
| 1. Monopolies | 4. Wastages of economic resources. |
| 2. Inequality in distributing of wealth. | 5. Religion inequality |
| 3. Unemployment | 6. Class conflict. |

Marxist Critique of Capitalism

- Karl Marx saw capitalism as a progressive historical stage that would eventually stagnate due to internal contradictions and be followed by socialism.
- Marxists define capital as "a social, economic relation" between people (rather than between people and things). In this sense they seek to abolish capital.

- Revolutionary socialists believe that capitalism can only be overcome through revolution.
- Social democrats believe that structural change can come slowly through political reforms to capitalism.
- Marxists define capital as "a social, economic relation" between people (rather than between people and things).
- Normative Marxism advocates a revolutionary overthrow of capitalism that would lead to socialism, before eventually transforming into communism after class antagonisms and the state ceased to exist.

Capitalism has been the subject of criticism from many perspectives during its history. Criticisms range from people who disagree with the principles of capitalism in its entirety, to those who disagree with particular outcomes of capitalism. Among those wishing to replace capitalism with a different method of production and social organization, a distinction can be made between those believing that capitalism can only be overcome with revolution (e.g., revolutionary socialism) and those believing that structural change can come slowly through political reforms to capitalism (e.g., classic social democracy).

Karl Marx saw capitalism as a progressive historical stage that would eventually stagnate due to internal contradictions and be followed by socialism. Marxists define capital as "a social, economic relation" between people (rather than between people and things). In this sense they seek to abolish capital. They believe that private ownership of the means of production enriches capitalists (owners of capital) at the expense of workers. In brief, they argue that the owners of the means of production exploit the workforce.

In Karl Marx's view, the dynamic of capital would eventually impoverish the working class and thereby create the social conditions for a revolution. Private ownership over the means of production and distribution is seen as creating a dependence of non-owning classes on the ruling class, and ultimately as a source of restriction of human freedom.

Marxists have offered various related lines of argument claiming that capitalism is a contradiction-laden system characterized by recurring crises that have a tendency towards increasing severity. They have argued that this tendency of the system to unravel, combined with a socialization process that links workers in a worldwide market, create the objective conditions for revolutionary change. Capitalism is seen as just one stage in the evolution of the economic system.

Normative Marxism advocates for a revolutionary overthrow of capitalism that would lead to socialism, before eventually transforming into communism after class antagonisms and the state cease to exist. Marxism influenced social democratic and labor parties as well as some moderate democratic socialists, who seek change through existing democratic channels instead of revolution, and believe that capitalism should be regulated rather than abolished.

6. Constitutionalism

Constitutionalism is "a complex of ideas, attitudes, and patterns of behavior elaborating the principle that the authority of government derives from and is limited by a body of fundamental law".

A political organization is constitutional to the extent that it "contains institutionalized mechanisms of power control for the protection of the interests and liberties of the citizenry, including those that may be in the minority". As described by political scientist and constitutional scholar David Fellman:

Constitutionalism is descriptive of a complicated concept, deeply imbedded in historical experience, which subjects the officials who exercise governmental powers to the limitations of a higher law. Constitutionalism proclaims the desirability of the rule of law as opposed to rule by the arbitrary judgment or mere fiat of public officials.... Throughout the literature dealing with modern public law and the foundations of statecraft the central element of the concept of constitutionalism is that in political society government officials are not free to do anything they please in any manner they choose; they are bound to observe both the limitations on power and the procedures which are set

out in the supreme, constitutional law of the community. It may therefore be said that the touchstone of constitutionalism is the concept of limited government under a higher law.

Characteristics of constitution

1. Right and duties
2. Suitable
3. Stable and flexibility.
4. Definite.

Type of constitution

1. Written
2. Unwritten
3. Rigid
4. Flexible
5. Unitary
6. Federal

7. Pluralism

The theory of pluralism has been developed mainly in our century, but its theoretical and practical roots go back far into the last century. Pluralism has flourished in the Anglo-Saxon world, but even though there is no tradition of pluralism in German history, some German thinkers developed ideas which came remarkably close to later English and American pluralists. They opposed political authoritarianism, the Hegelian concept of the 'state as such', and the notion of Roman law as the legal guideline. Georg Beseler and Otto Gierke tried to show a German common law tradition instead. Later Hugo Preuss came to bold democratic interpretations of this theory which put him at odds not only with other legal scholars, but with the Prussian state as well. The article deals with this development, as well as with the reception of Gierke's works by the English pluralists. Pluralism is a term used in philosophy, meaning "doctrine of multiplicity", often used in opposition to *monism* ("doctrine of unity") and *dualism* ("doctrine of duality"). The term has different meanings in metaphysics, ontology, and epistemology. In metaphysics, pluralism is a doctrine that there is more than one reality, while realism holds that there is but one reality, that may have single objective ontology or plural ontology. In one form, it is a doctrine that many substances exist, in contrast with monism which holds existence to be a single substance, often either matter (materialism) or mind (idealism), and dualism believes two substances, such as matter and mind, to be necessary. In ontology, pluralism refers to different ways, kinds, or modes of being. For example, a topic in ontological pluralism is the comparison of the modes of existence of things like 'humans' and 'cars' with things like 'numbers' and some other concepts as they are used in science. In epistemology, pluralism is the position that there is not one consistent means of approaching truths about the world, but rather many. Often this is associated with pragmatism, or conceptual, contextual, or relativism. Pluralism as a political philosophy is the recognition and affirmation of diversity within a political body, which permits the peaceful coexistence of different interests, convictions and lifestyles. Political pluralists are not inherently liberals (who place liberty and/or equality as their guiding principles) or conservatives (who place order and/or tradition as their guiding principles) but advocate a form of political moderation. Nor are political pluralists necessarily advocates of a democratic plurality, but generally agree that this form of government is often best at moderating discrete values.

Pluralists also seek the construction or reform of social institutions in order to reflect and balance competing principles. One of the more famous arguments for institutional pluralism came from James Madison in The Federalist Papers. Madison feared that factionalism would lead to in-fighting in the new American republic and devotes this paper to questioning how best to avoid such an occurrence. He posits that to avoid factionalism, it is best to allow many competing factions (advocating different primary principles) to prevent anyone from dominating the political system. This relies, to a degree, on a series of disturbances changing the influences of groups so as to avoid institutional dominance and ensure competition. Like Edmund Burke, this view concerns itself with balance, and subordinating any single abstract principle to a plurality or realistic harmony of interests.

Of course, pluralism recognizes that certain conditions may make good faith negotiation impossible, and therefore also focuses on what institutional structures can best modify or prevent such a situation. Pluralism advocates a form of realism here, or that one begins with a given socio-historical structure and goes from there.

It is contrasted to Monism, which holds that ultimately there is just one kind of substance, and to Dualism, which holds that ultimately there are two kinds of substance in the universe (or, in Philosophy of Mind, that the mind and matter are two separate substances). Arguably, Dualism is a specific case of Pluralism.

Pluralism is also the name of a largely unrelated ancient Greek Pre-Socratic school of philosophy, which includes Anaxagoras, Archelaus (5th Century B.C.) and Empedocles (see the section on the school of Pluralism).

Types of Pluralism

- In Metaphysics:
Pluralism is the belief that reality consists of many different substances.
- In Philosophy of Mind:

Pluralism is the belief that there is a plurality of basic substances making up the minds and bodies of humans.

- In Epistemology:
Pluralism is the claim that there are several conflicting but still true descriptions of the world, and that that no single explanatory system or view of reality can account for all the phenomena of life.
- In Ethics:
Pluralism is the supposition that there are many independent sources of value and that there is no single truth, even in moral matters.
- In Political Philosophy:

Pluralism is the acceptance of a multiplicity of groups with competing interests. This is closest to the concept most commonly in general conversational usage.

UNIT-IV

1. **The Concept of Islamic State**

The religious law of Muslim rulers went against the interests of the non Muslims populations of the country which was in majority. Another important medieval India was that it was a military in character. The income of state is the property of the society and its cannot be considered as the individual income of the Imam or his family members. No Hindu temple was allowed to be built nor temples to be repaired by bigoted Kings. Some rulers ordered the wholesale destruction of temples.

The conception of a state in Islam is that of a commonwealth of all the Muslims living as one community under the guidance and direction of a supreme executive head. Islamic state is a state in which every Muslim has a right to serve his life according to the principles of Quran and Sunnah.

Object of an Islamic state

The object of an Islamic state is to establish the system of prayers and Zakat and to patronize whatever God and his Prophet (Peace be Upon Him) regarded as virtuous and to forbid whatever they regard as evil.

“If we great them authority in this land will establish regular prayers and pay Zakat and enjoin what is virtuous and forbid what is evil.” (Surah Al Haj: 4)

Nature of Islamic political system

Islam is a complete code of life. It does not believe in the separation of religion from political science. Islam takes an integrative view of human life which it declares to be a preparation for the life hereafter the life in this world is meant for preparing for the eternal life of the next world, which is ever lasting. The concept of Islamic state should be understood on this very principle of Islam.

(I) Sovereignty of Allah

Sovereignty of Allah is the fundamental principle of the Islamic concept of state. In Islam, sovereignty does and can belong to Allah and no one can claim to be sovereign. He is omnipotent, omniscient, omniscipotent and omnipresent. The principle of Allah's sovereignty does not recognize the possibility of dictatorship absolute monarchy or autocracy in an Islamic state. “To Allah belongs the sovereignty of the heavens and the earth.” (42: 48)

“It is He who gives life and death He has power over all things.” (42: 48)

“He is the first and last, the Evident and the Immanent.”

(II) Khilafat

The Holy Quran proclaims the vicegerency of man. The institution of Khilafat came into being after the demise of the Holy Prophet (Peace be Upon Him). Under the sovereignty of Allah and the authority of his law, the caliph is the temporal ruler of the state and the defender of the faith. Quran says:

“And when the lord said unto the angels: Lo! I am about to place a khalifi (vicegerent) in the earth.” (2: 30)

“Lo! The earth is Allah's. He gives it for an inheritance to whom He will and lo! The sequel is for those who keep their duty, (unto Him).” (7: 128)

(III) Government by consultation

Mutual consultation among the Muslims is a commandment of the Holy Quran and an injunction of the Sunnah of the Holy Prophet (Peace be Upon Him).

Quran says:

“The affairs of state are run by their mutual consultation.” (Surah-Ash-Shura)

The institution of Maijis-e-Shoora was developed by the Khulfa-e-Rashideen after wards.

(IV) Obedience of the ruler. The Quranic injunction calls upon the Muslims to obey the supreme commander among them.

(V) Participation of public in state affairs

Muslims shall be consulted in the affairs of state through their leaders in whom they profess

confidence.

(VI) Equality of all mankind

In Islam, is no distinction or discrimination of man and man on the ground of race, colour, language, profession or country. All persons are equal in Islamic state.

(VII) Aml Al Maruf wall Nahi An-Al-Munkar (order good and punish wrong)

Islam enjoins the state to maintain morality. It asks the Muslims and the ruler to order good and punish wrong.

(VIII) Collection of Zakat

Collection of Zakat is one of the essential functions of the Islamic state and a primary duty of the Muslims.

Concept of state and Khilafat

Most of the jurists and philosophers upheld the idea of a single state known as the Khilafah under the leadership of Khalifah. The Islamic state existed under a single Khalifah for a long time. Later in some areas sultans or amirs started assuming power in different regions within the caliphate, and more than one Muslim state had come into existence now question is what is the status of those states in relation with Khilafat.

(I) View of Al-Mawardi

Most Mawardi defines caliphate as the institution replacing property in the defence of the faith and the administration of the world. It is demanded by the Shariah, not by reason."

(II) View of Al-Ghazali

The view of Al-Ghazali is, while the practical affairs of the state are to be left to the sultan or Amir Khalifah should devote himself to religious and spiritual functions.

(III) View of Ibn-Taymiyah

He declared that period of the Prophet could not be described as anything but nubuwwah. The Prophet's authority arose from his functions as a prophet and not the head of the state. Then he proceeded to separate the period of the first four caliphs from that of the umayyads, calling the former as Khilafat al Nabuwwah and the latter as Mulk. The Khilafat-al-Nabuwwah being inspired could not be passed on in succession or even imitated. The only thing that could be passed on was the principle of the supremacy of the Shariah. By doing this he provides that legal foundation for a multiplicity of states.

Classification of states by Ibn-Khaldun

Ibn Khaldun distinguishes four kinds of states as they had developed in the history of Islam.

(I) Khilafat

It was the ideal Islamic state established by the Holy Prophet (Peace be Upon Him) under Divine guidance of the Quran and maintained by the four Khulfa-e-Rashideen.

(II) Mulk under shariah

When the influence of the religion declined among the people the ideal state of khilafat was replaced by shariah. Although the outward form was Khilafat was preserved, but its inward form was changed though it was not so good as the ideal Islamic state, nevertheless, it was the second best, because it was still governed by the divinely promulgated shariah.

(III) Mulk under Sayasa Aqlia

The last state was the mulk or absolute monarchy under its rational regime, (siyasa aqlia) and political laws (qawanin siyasa) under it, shariah was merely a routine matter of religious injunction rites and rituals. The authority of the ulema to interpret it had ceased or rather it was confined to the duties of the judge or qazi the fatwas of the mufti, who were under the political of the ruler.

(IV) Siyasa madaniny

It was hypothetical state and never existed in actual life and history.

Duties of state

Following are the duties of Muslim state:

- (i) Each Muslim community must establish din in accordance with the first purpose of the law.
- (ii) A state must ensure the safety and welfare of all human beings under its governance.
- (iii) The state must establish conditions for a sound family system in accordance with shariah.
- (iv) The state must provide conditions for the growth of healthy minds e. g. by providing freedom of expression etc.
- (v) The state must ensure the economic well being of the community as a whole.

Distinguish between Islamic state & western concept of state

I. As to sovereignty

- (i) In Islamic state sovereignty belong to God.
- (ii) In western concept of state sovereignty belong to the people.

II. As to making authority

- (i) In Islamic state law making authority is only God.
- (ii) In western concept of state law making authority are people.

III. As to religion

- (i) In Islamic concept of state religion has important role and state religion in Islam.
- (ii) In west the state may not have religion.

IV. As to legislation

- (i) In Islamic state law making authority i. e. legislation is Majlis-Shura. The law making powers of Majlis-Shura are limited.
- (ii) In western concept of state the legislature is called parliament. It has unlimited powers of law making.

State under Delhi Sultanate:

1. Sultan head of state
2. Hereditary and nobility is in hand of sultan.
3. Sultan rule over military.
4. Ruled with help of ministers.
5. Wazir is prime ministers and financial head.
6. Diwan-i-arz.(military affairs ministry)
7. Diwan-i-isha (minister in charge of records and royal)
8. Diwan-i- rasalat (foreign minister)
9. Sadar -us- sadur (judicial affairs ministers)

2. The Christian Concept of the State

The contemporary Church of the postconciliar era has consigned the Syllabus to the dustbin of history. This is the case in no small measure because of the infiltration of the highest ranks of Holy Mother Church by Masons. However, it remains the case that the teaching of the Church is what it is, even though contemporary revisionists and positivists from within her ranks seek to flush the past

down the Orwellian memory hole. As Christopher Ferrara and Thomas Woods point out in *The Great Facade*, no pronouncement of the Church can be termed a "development of doctrine" if it indeed contradicts Tradition. That is why Catholics have the obligation to study the documents of the past, as an honest reading of them will reveal just how prophetic the popes of the past were concerning our own situation today."

Although a far cry from the overt Catholicism of his predecessors, Pope John Paul II's words above illustrate the fact that even a man who is very much a philosophical liberal sees problems with the socialist state, especially as its is violative of the natural law principle of subsidiarity.

Father Cahill described briefly the Christian concept of the State, a concept that will be elaborated on at some length below and in future installments:

"In marked contrast with non-Christian theories and avoiding the extremes of each, stands the Christian teaching on the origin, nature and purpose of civil society. Christians agree with Pagans, Liberals and Socialists in asserting that the immediate purpose of the State is to promote the temporal good and happiness of the people. But in Christian philosophy in contrast with most non-Christian schools man's temporal good is taken to include his moral and intellectual interests as well as his material well-being; and is regarded as subordinate to the eternal happiness which is man's ultimate end.

"Again, according to the Christian concept of the State, the members come before the State itself, which can never override man's inalienable rights, nor limit any of their natural rights, except for a sufficient cause connected with the public good. For the State as a corporate body comes into being solely with a view to the good of the members, and has no interests or rights of its own which are not founded upon the rights and interests of the families and individuals that compose it. Hence all the activities and laws of the ruling authority must be directed solely to promote the public good of the citizens. In so far as they clash with that, they are unlawful and invalid. . .

"Again, the State is not something apart from its members as the ancient pagans implied: nor is it a conventional society as the Liberals assert; neither is it the result of blind physical evolution, as the Socialists teach; but it is a union of families and individuals held together by reciprocal rights and duties. It is ordained by the natural law, which has determined its structures, its functions, and the extent and limitations of its powers. Its purpose is to supplement not to override, personal endeavor and the helps of family life.

"The State includes the whole organised nation with all the living forces that compose it. The central authority is only one element in it (albeit the most important one), and must not absorb the activities of other lesser forces or organisations, but should foster private initiative whether individual or collective, while directing it along lines conducive to the public good.

"Again, the State is subject to the same moral law as the individual person: and the government of the State in dealing with its own members as well as with other corporate bodies or individuals is bound by the laws of justice, charity and religion. The actual government or central authority in the State is usually also bound by positive laws-the fundamental laws of the constitution-which it cannot change without the clear consent of the people.

"Finally, the State cannot interfere with the legitimate action of the Church to which God has committed the duty of guiding and assisting men in the pursuit of their eternal happiness. The State might conceivably have been so constituted as to satisfy completely all that is required to supplement individual and domestic activities; and thus might have been the only type of a perfect and supreme society. But as a matter of fact, God has instituted the Church, another society equally perfect and supreme, and committed to it the care of man's eternal interests, which are thus withdrawn from the control of the State.

"Hence, although it is the natural function of the State to promote men's good and happiness, there are whole spheres of activity-religious, personal and domestic-reserved from its control, but even in these, the State is bound to afford protection and assistance where required."

Most of the rest of this monograph will be spent elaborating on the nature of the Christian concept of the State, elucidated as it has been by the authoritative teaching of Holy Mother Church. Again, while debate takes place among orthodox Catholic scholars concerning the application of received teaching in concrete circumstances (and sometimes revolves around the abandonment of the patrimony of the past in the postconciliar era), no orthodox Catholic scholar contends that the State is unnatural to man and that human social life can be organized successfully without a State that at least minimally recognizes the binding precepts of the Divine positive law and the natural law, to say nothing of an absolute subordination to the Social Kingship of **Jesus Christ** as exercised by Holy Mother Church.

3. THE HINDU THEORY OF THE STATE

Kautliya Arthasastra

Forms of state

- | | |
|----------------------|---------------------|
| 1. Swami (King) | 5. Kosha(Treasury) |
| 2. Janapada (People) | 6. Durga(Defence) |
| 3. Amatya | 7. Mitra (Allies) |
| 4. Danda | |

In Aryan

- | | |
|-------------|----------|
| • Monarchy | • Sabha |
| • Kingships | • Samiti |
| • Vidhtha | |

In gupta

- | | |
|-----------------------------|------------|
| • Central govt. | • Judicial |
| • Provincial administration | • Military |
| • Local administration | • Police |
| • Revenue administration | |

In rajput

- | | |
|-----------------------|----------------------|
| • Political condition | • Religion condition |
| • Economic condition | • Literature |
| • Social condition | • Fine arts |

The theory of divine origin of state is Hindu is King and People which is given by divine law which mention in latter Vedic period.

I. The Doctrine of Mdtস্যnydya (The Logic of the Fish)

AT the back of political thinking in India there was the process of dichotomy at work. The Hindu thinkers tried to understand the state by differentiating it from the non-state. Their method was logical as well as historical. That is, in the first place, they tried to investigate in what particulars the state analytically differs from the non-state ; and in the second place, they tried to picture to themselves how the prestatat condition developed into the statal, i. e., how the state grew out of the non-state. The chief solution of both these problems they found in the doctrine of Mdtस्या nydya or the logic of the fish. What, now, is the non-state according to the Hindus? The same question was asked by the philosophers of Europe in the form of the query, "What is the state of nature?" And the Hindu answer was identical with the European.

According to Hooker (i 554-1600) in the Ecclesiastical Polity the state of nature is a state of strife. The Leviathan of Hobbes (1 588-1679) declares similarly that the state of nature is a state of war and of

no rights. Spinoza (1632-77), also, expressed the opinion in his *Tractatus Theologico Politicus*, that the state of nature is a state of war and a state of the right of might. The non-state is thus conceived to be a war of "all against all", an "anarchy of birds and beasts", and a regime of vultures and harpies, as John Stuart Mill would have remarked. It is interesting to observe that in China also the state of nature was analyzed by Moh-Ti (t. 500-420 B. C.) in almost identical terms. In the non-state, as Su Hu explains in *The Development of Logic in Ancient China*, "each man has his own notion of right. Therefore one man has one notion of right, two men have two notions of right, and ten men have ten notions of right. The more men there are, the more conceptions of right will there be. Consequently each man approves his own notion of right and denounces every other man's. So they denounce one another."

The Hobbesian "law of beasts and birds" or the *Naturprozess* of Gumpłowicz is the logic (*nydya*) of the fish (*tnatsya*) in India. Should there be no ruler to wield punishment on earth, says the *Mahabharata* "the stronger would devour the weak like fishes in water. It is related that in days of yore people were ruined through sovereignlessness, devouring one another like the stronger fishes preying upon the feebler". In the *Manu Satnhita** likewise we are told that "the strong would devour the weak like fishes" if there were a virtual reversion to the non-state (if, for example, the king were not vigilant in meting out punishment to those that should be punished). The *Ramayana* 3 also describes the non-state region as one in which "people ever devour one another like fishes". And a few details about the conditions in this non state are furnished in the *Matsya-Purana*,* "The child, the old, the sick, the ascetic, the priest, the woman and the widow would be preyed upon", as we read, "according to the logic of the fish" (should danda or punishment fail to be operative at the proper time). The idea of the fish-like struggle for existence or self-assertion was thus a generally accepted notion in the "floating literature" of Hindustan. It found an important place in the exclusively political treatises also. It was exploited as early as the latter half of the fourth century B. C. by Kautilya, one of the first among the historical names in Hindu political science. According to his *Artha-shastra** the logic of the fish prevails while the state is unformed. "In the absence of the wielder of punishment the powerful swallows the powerless". And Kamandaka also, who followed several centuries after Kautilya, writes in his *Neetisara* * (*Digest of Politics*) that in the absence of punishment (*danda*) the destructive or ruinous logic of the fish operates through mutual animosities of the people and leads to the disruption of the world. Nor was the doctrine confined within the circle of academicians and theorists alone. We find it prevalent even among the diplomatists and practical statesmen, e. g. of the ninth century. In the declarations of the Bengali emperor Dharmapala "we are informed that his illustrious dynasty owed its origin to an "election" by the people. We are told further that it was "in order to escape from the logic of the fish", i. e. in order to escape from being absorbed into another kingdom, or to avoid being swallowed like a fish, that the people of Bengal "made his father Gopala accept the sovereignty". The medieval Hindu monarch was here using almost the same metaphor as was employed in the nineteenth century by Mill in his essay *On Liberty* when he explained how "in order to prevent the weaker members of the community from being preyed upon by innumerable vultures it was needful that there should be an animal of prey stronger than the rest, commissioned to keep them down". This theory of the non-state or the state of nature has had important bearings on other doctrines of Hindu political philosophy. For the present we have only to note that in India political speculation was not divorced from the general intellectual currents in the society. The Hindu political philosophers kept themselves abreast of the contemporary thought in other branches of inquiry. The logical apparatus and dialectical machinery used in political discussions were familiar instruments in the cultural milieu of the Hindu scientific world.

II. The Doctrine of Danda {Punishment, Coercion, Sanction}

Two "inseparable accidents" of the Hindu theory of the state are, first, the doctrine of *mamatva* ("mine"-ness) or *svatva* (*suam*), i. e. "one's own"-ness, *proprium* or property,

and secondly, the doctrine of dharma (i. e. law, justice and duty). And behind them both lies the doctrine of danda (punishment, restraint, or sanction) . Herein is to be sought the nucleus of the whole Hindu philosophy of sovereignty. A state is a state because it can coerce, restrain, compel. Eliminate control or the coercive element from social life, and the state as an entity vanishes. Danda is ilberhaupt the very essence of statal relations. No danda, no state. A dandaless, i. e. sanctionless, state is a contradiction in terms. We have noticed above that the absence of danda is tantamount to m&tsya-ny&ya or the state of nature. It is clear also that property and dharma do not exist in that non-state. These entities can have their roots only in the state. The whole theory thus consists of two formulae :

I. No danda, no state.

II. (a) No state, no dharma.

(b) No state, no property.

What, then, is the rationale of this danda? What is it that makes coercion the sine qua non of the state ? Why is it that the very idea of government should imply a restraint, a check, a control, a sanction? In Hindu political philosophy the answer to these questions is to be found in the " original nature of man".

Renaissance
Law College

Unit 5

1. Gandhism-Sarvodaya

Meaning of Sarvodaya:

Sarvodaya is a term meaning 'Universal Uplift' or 'Progress of All'. The term was first coined by Mohandas Gandhi as the title of his 1908 translation of John Ruskin's tract on political economy, "Unto This Last", and Gandhi came to use the term for the ideal of his own political philosophy. Later Gandhian, like the Indian nonviolence activist Vinoba Bhave, embraced the term as a name for the social movement in post-independence India which strove to ensure that self-determination and equality reached all strata of India society.

Although Sarvodaya was a social ideology in its fundamental form, India's immediate post independence requirement demanded that it be transformed into an urgent political doctrine. Emancipation of disparity between social classes was its objective, and it could be best implemented by political will and state machinery. It would affect in letter and spirit the singular objective of Sarvodaya; inclusive growth and progress. For Gandhiji and for India, this meant grassroots level uplift which began from the villages and from the most deprived classes, and then rose up to cover the upper lying social strata's.

For Gandhiji, however, this was a physical manifestation of Sarvodaya. The deeper ethos had an innate spiritual connect for him. His search of God had led him to the shanty of the most subjugated, and in the selfless service of this lowest of the lowly man, Gandhiji glimpsed God. The shanty became his shrine, and the heart of the deprived became his sanctum sanatorium. Gandhiji exalted aim of ultimately being one with the sublime appeared to be getting fulfilled by servicing the poorest of the poor. A vindication to this notion is provided by Gandhiji himself, when he wrote in Socialism of My Conception in 1936:

Man's ultimate aim is the realization of God, and all his activities, social, political, religious, have to be guided by the ultimate aim of the vision of God. The immediate service of all human beings becomes a necessary part of the Endeavour, simply because the only way to find God is to see Him in His creation and be one with it. This can only be done by service of all. And this cannot be done except through one's country.

Gandhiji sudden transmigration in 1948 did not leave much scope for him to see the seed of Sarvodaya flourish in free India. However, his associates, those who were equally zealously wedded to Sarvodaya thought, carried forward the activity under the watchful eyes of omnipresent Gandhiji. Foremost among these torchbearers of Sarvodaya were Acharya Vinoba Bhave, Jaiprakash Narayan and Dada Dharmadhikari. Under their able guidance and ceaseless striving, Sarvodaya ceased to be a mere initiative and became a momentous movement.

Sarvodaya seeks the happiness of each and all. Hence it is superior to the utilitarian concept of greatest happiness of the greatest number.' Dada Dharmadhikari highlighted the distinction between Sarvodaya and western Isms which speaks of three stages in the evolution of humanist thought; first came Darwin with his avocation of the principle of the survival of the fittest; next came Huxley with the doctrine 'live and let live' and today, 'Sarvodaya' going one step further asserts 'Live in order to help others live'.

The main tenets of the Sarvodaya philosophy as propounded by Gandhiji and subsequently explained by the pioneers of this movement are as follows:

1. Sarvodaya reiterates belief in God and, further, it identifies that belief with faith in the goodness of man and with services, of humanity.
2. It attaches importance to the principle of trusteeship as implying the abolition of private ownership and the application of the principle of non-possession to public institutions.
3. Sarvodaya envisages a new humanistic socialist society. Man will be the centre of such a society. Unless man cultivates values like love, sincerity, truth, an abiding sympathy etc., the emergence of a new society would only remain a pious dream. In this process of change the State has little role to play. The State, at best, can effect change at the level of the external behaviour of man. It fails to

influence the inner springs of life. This mental transformation is only possible through appeal and persuasion.

4. Sarvodaya visualizes a simple, non-violent and decentralized society. In capitalism and state socialism the individual becomes alone and isolated. Sarvodaya is opposed to both. In the scheme of Sarvodaya the people are endowed with real power. Democracy becomes meaningful and assumes significance only when its structure is reared on the foundation of village Panchayats.

The Sarvodaya movement inculcates this democratic awareness among the people especially among the ruralites. Again in the scheme of Sarvodaya decentralization of industry takes place through the organization of small-scale, cottage and village industries. The reason is not far to seek. In a country like India where there is acute shortage of capital and abundance of labour, any attempt at industrialization through high technology is doomed to failure. Moreover, the decentralization of production would prevent bureaucratization of the economic system.

5. Sarvodaya idea contains the content of egalitarianism. It rests on the principle of true equality and liberty. It stands opposed to exploitation of any kind.

6. The concept of Sarvodaya views work as an offering to the Lord. Further, the principle of equality of all religions finds better elucidation in some of the thinkers of Sarvodaya philosophy.

7. In Sarvodaya programme the standard of life is fundamental and not the standard of living. A rise in the standard of living might even lower the standard of life by reducing man's physical, moral, intellectual and spiritual standards and powers.

8. The Sarvodaya philosophy stands opposed to parliamentary democracy and party system. It is because the party system divides the society into various groups. J. P. Narayan wanted to replace the existing parliamentary system through political and economic decentralisation of powers and functions. Sarvodaya stands for establishment of an integrated cooperative society.

9. Sarvodaya programme gives prime place to planning. According to the scheme of Sarvodaya planning must proceed with two objects: removal of natural or man-made impediments in the road to the development of man and provision of means, training and guidance for it.

Sarvodaya movement entails economic, political, philosophical and ethical implications. They are as follows:

Economic implications:

Gandhiji concept of Sarvodaya aims at welfare of all. It is founded on the philosophy of limited wants. According to him, "Civilization in the real sense of the term consists not in the multiplication but in the deliberate and voluntary reduction of wants. This alone promotes real happiness and contentment and increases capacity for service." Our economy should be based on 'simple living, high thinking'.

He fought for an economy free from exploitation and corruption, limitation of human wants, equality and basic needs for all. In the words of Prof. V. P. Varma, "If the Bhoodan and Gramdan are techniques of agrarian revolution based on moral force, Sampattidan is a significant path in the transformation of capitalism into the Sarvodaya society."

The essential features of the economic philosophy of Sarvodaya as emphasized by Vinobaji constitute elimination of poverty, forging bonds of mutual help and fellow-feeling between big landholders and landless ruralites, revival or furtherance of Indian culture based on yagna, Dana and tapas, giving an opportunity to all political parties to work united in rooting out bitterness and self-aggrandizement and helping world peace.

Philosophical and ethical implications:

Sarvodaya aims at the spiritualization of politics. It seeks to replace party strifes, jealousies and competition by the sacred law of cooperative mutuality and dominant altruism. According to the concept of Sarvodaya, man is essentially good. Human character can improve either by Tapasya (self

effort) or by appeals made to him by others through such non-violent techniques as Satyagraha, non-cooperation and fasting.

Political implications:

Sarvodaya attaches importance to 'lokniti'. The concept of lokniti signifies self-restraint, self-abnegation, selfless service to the people, discipline, faith in God and performance of duties with benign motive. Sarvodaya condemns the majority rule, elections, political parties and centralization of power. Gandhiji wanted a 'Stateless democracy' in which even weakest have the same opportunity as the strongest. The ideal democracy will be a federation of Satyagrahi village communities based on non-violence.

Inspirations from Ruskin's Book:

Gandhi received a copy of Ruskin's "Unto This Last" from a British friend, Mr. Henry Polak, while working as a lawyer in South Africa in 1904. In his *Autobiography*, Gandhi remembers the twenty-four hour train ride to Durban (from when he first read the book, being so in the grip of Ruskin's ideas that he could not sleep at all: "I determined to change my life in accordance with the ideals of the book."² Gandhi advances the concept of Sarvodaya, which were the based on three basic principles:

- That the good of the individual is contained in the good of all.
- That a lawyer's work has the same value as the barber's in as much as all have the same right of earning their livelihood from their work.
- That is a life of labour, i.e., the life of the tiller of the soil and the handicraftsman is the life worth living.

The first of these I knew. The second I had dimly realized. The third have never occurred to me. '*Unto This Last*' made it clear as daylight for me that the second and third were contained in the first. I arose with the dawn, ready to reduce these principal to practice."³

Objects of Sarvodaya Movement:

The Sarvodaya Movement has as its target the establishment of a whole network of such self-supporting village communities. The family relationships which are confined at present to the blood group will be extended to cover the whole village where distinctions based on race, creed, caste, language and so forth will completely be eliminated. Agriculture will be so planned that all the people will have enough to consume. Industry will be conducted on a cottage basis till all the people in the village are gainfully employed. The needs of the village will be determined by the people of the village themselves, through Village Council, representative of the whole village.

Principles of the Sarvodaya:

- There is no centralized authority, and there is political and economic atmosphere in the villages.
- Politics will not be the instrument of power but an agency of service and *Rajniya* will yield place to *Loknity*.
- All people will be imbued with the spirit of love, fraternity, truth, non-violence and self-sacrifices. Society will function on the basis on the non-violence.
- There will be no party system and majority rule and society will be free from the evil of the tyranny of the majority.
- The sarvodaya society is socialist in the true sense of the term. All calling will be the same moral, social and economical values. The individual personality has the fullest scope for development.
- The sarvodaya society is based on equality and liberty. There is no room in it for unwholesome some competition, exploitation and class-hatred.

- Sarvodaya stands for the progress of the all. All individual should do individual labour and follow the ideal of non possession. Then it will be possible to realize the goal of: from each according to his work and to each according to his needs.
- There will be no private property, the instrument of exploitation and the source of social distinctions and hatred. Similarly, the profit motive will disappear, rent and interest to will go.
- The Sarvodaya Movement is based on Truth, Non-violence and Self-denial.
- The Sarvodaya Movement makes a sincere and bold attempt to create the necessary atmosphere to bring together such individuals with an unwavering faith in the Welfare of All
- The gain to the individual would be small. The development of each quality depends upon every other. If all the qualities are improved a little, then the individual would gain more.
- **Sarvodaya Movement:**
- Gandhi's ideals have lasted well beyond the achievement of one of his chief projects, Indian independence (Swaraj). His followers in India (notably, Vinoba Bhave) continued working to promote the kind of society that he envisioned, and their efforts have come to be known as the Sarvodaya Movement. Anima Bose has referred to the movement's philosophy as "a fuller and richer concept of people's democracy than any we have yet known." Sarvodaya workers associated with Vinoba, J. P. Narayan, Dada Dharmadhikari, Dhirendra Mazumdar, Shankarrao Deo, K. G. Mashruwala undertook various projects aimed at encouraging popular self-organization during the 1950s and 1960s, including Bhoodan and Gramdan movements. Many groups descended from these networks continue to function locally in India today.⁵

Conclusion

So, lastly we can conclude that Sarvodaya ideals are not practicable. Though the ideals of sarvodaya will be noble. Nobody can find fault with them, in the actual world. They will be found wanting. It will be almost impossible to establish a society strictly on the basis of great principles by Mahatma Gandhi and others. Sarvodaya doctrines are soaring and it is doubtful whether they can rest on the earth. The poor record of Panchayat Raj in India bears testimony to the backward condition in which people are. In the highly competitive world, one country can not succeed in having Gramraj. Unless all states in the world accept the Sarvodaya idea. The chances of having it is a particular country like India are bleak. As well as, it is difficult to bring a change of the heart in the youth, who is given to selfishness. People donated useless land in response to the Bhoodan. So, need of the present era for youth is 'Think Globally and Act Locally'.

2. KAUTILYA'S ARTHASHASTRA

Kautilya's Arthashastra is an excellent treatise on statecraft, economic policy and military strategy. it is said to have been written by **Kautilya**, also known by the name **Chanakya** or **Vishnugupta**, the prime minister of India's first great emperor, Chandragupta Maurya.

In **Arthashastra**, Kautilya mixes the harsh pragmatism for which he is famed with compassion for the poor, for slaves, and for women. He reveals the imagination of a romancer in imagining all manner of scenarios which can hardly have been commonplace in real life.

Centrally, Arthashastra argues for an autocracy managing an efficient and solid economy. It discusses the ethics of economics and the duties and obligations of a king. The scope of Arthashastra is, however, far wider than statecraft, and it offers an outline of the entire legal and bureaucratic framework for administering a kingdom, with a wealth of descriptive cultural detail on topics such as mineralogy, mining and metals, agriculture, animal husbandry and medicine. The Arthashastra also focuses on issues of welfare (for instance, redistribution of wealth during a famine) and the collective ethics that hold a society together.

The Arthashastra by Kautilya

Kautilya (also Chanakya) was the chief adviser of Chandragupta Maurya. The Arthashastra by Kautilya is another important source which throws a good deal of light on the Mauryan period. As Kautilya (or Chanakya), was directly concerned with the Mauryan government, his book gives a very valuable information regarding the political condition of India during the Mauryan period and the Mauryan administration.

Arthashastra is a unique book on the subject of politics and art of government in the literature of ancient India. This book is a huge work and has fifteen parts, each dealing with some aspects of the art of government. The Chanakya Niti of Kautilya is still very popular and some of the principles of Chanakya Niti are still practiced by some top corporate houses.

The history of ancient Indian political thought is the story of great minds. Manu and Kautilya, the ancient Indian thinkers have given us their rich political and administrative ideas and policies. Manusmriti holds a position of pre-eminence in the Hindu literature. It is the oldest and well-known smriti. Manusmriti or Manava dharmashastra is a "work of encyclopaedic scope."

Kautilya's Arthashastra is another great work on ancient political thought which was probably composed between 3rd-2nd Century B.C. Kautilya was the great Prime Minister of Chandragupta Maurya. Kautilya's Arthashastra is primarily a work on the art of government. In his political and administrative ideas, the focus of attention was the king. According to his philosophy, for the smooth running of administration and for the welfare of the people, the king had to be conversant in the four Vedas and four sciences of government (Anvikashiki, Trai, Varta and Dandniti). Kautilya's administrative and judicial structure was hierarchical in nature.

For understanding the Indian political thinking there are two major sources

(a) Human being and the other is

(b) His thoughts One of them of Mahatma Buddha and the later is Kautilya. But both have the opposite thinking as Buddha is considered Idealism and Kautilya Pragmatic. Because of this merit he (Kautilya) has a specific place in India thinkers. So, Sale tore says that "of all the school of ancient Indian political thought, the most noteworthy is that of Kautilya."

Nature of the state

Kautilya had discussed about organism of state. He considered seven organs of the State,

- | | |
|------------------------|---------------------|
| 1. Master or king | 5. Kosh or treasury |
| 2. Amatya or ministers | 6. Punishments |
| 3. Janpad or country | 7. Friend |
| 4. Durg or fort | |

Types of State

State : Such state in which the rule was based on conflict. Kautilya says that this conflict is natural because of heredity. In this two persons might be two brothers or the father and the son. He suggested that the problem could be solved by the minister's suggestions.

Vairajya : Such type of state was not appropriate for people, because of in such conditions a king could exploit the people by ruling on them

Dualism (sangh rajya) : There was miniature of republic states. These states had adopted dualism. These were independent and self-reliance but could not face the larger enemies. In such dualistic states king was not permanent and used to get together at critical occasions. In his time Mugdh was also a dualistic state. Therefore, he presented his views for making strong these states. Integration

method was good for these states. He says that the king should appoint detective for getting information, he (the king) should do everything with his best approach and ability. Kautilya supports to comprehensive function of state. He says that the function of it not only to secure but also to develop all-round development of its people. A state can fulfill all his need when it has economic backbone strength. Only on the basis of economic citizens can get their aims of life. A state should be adopted such policies by which export may be more than import, and makes a happy human being with his glorious future. A man may be got religion, work. He (man) may be led a happy life. Taking nature and functions there were two kinds of principles. One was nonmaterialistic and later one was materialistic. Former principle is emphasized on salvation of being life and the later one is on luxury life. Kautilya selects the mixture way of dual above and gives importance to mean, religious and work.

The Functions of the Monarch State

According to Kautilya the king is the first and foremost organ of the state. Without him the state is nothing. This type of state is harmful for its people. He says without a king there was nothing, there was corruption everywhere. Thus, the king emerges for protecting people. Thus, a king should be such who can get religion, economy and work. He may have specific abilities. Kautilya says, "The miseries of Demons (people) lies in the king. A king should not be selfish. He should think about his people." Kautilya says extraordinary person to him, Kautilya emphasizes on specific merits of king and says, "Because the king is best in himself. He may have the virtue of Rishi/saint as well as human being."

1. About the King and his Ideals

According to Kautilya the king should be all powerful and there should be no checks on his powers. But he should consult his ministers and respect the Brahmans. A king must be a highly educated and a cultured person, should have full control over his senses. He should save himself from his enemies, which are lust, anger, greed, vanity, haughtiness and love of pleasure. Service of the people should be the chief ideal of the king.

Another ideal before the king should be to save his people from external invasions and internal revolts. He should maintain a powerful army and a full treasury. He should be cunning as a fox, clever as a crow and brave as a lion.

2. About the King's Ministers

A king should appoint ministers both for assistance and consultation. It is difficult to run the government single-handed as single wheel cannot run a cart. These ministers should be men of high character and should be loyal, wise and brave. The king should consult his ministers, but he should not be a puppet in their hands, rather he should use his own judgment. The ministers should have team spirit and they should maintain perfect secrecy. Their meeting should be held at such a place where even the birds should have no access. A state which cannot keep its secrets cannot last long.

3. About the Provincial Administration

From Kautilya we come to know that the Mauryan Empire was divided into many provinces, each province was further divided into many districts and each district had many villages in it. Each province was under the charge of a governor who generally belonged to the royal family.

4. About the Administration of Towns

The administration of the capital and other big towns of the Mauryan Empire were carried on in a very systematic way. Pataliputra, the capital of Chandragupta Maurya, was divided in four zones. Each zone was put in the control of a "Sthanik" who was assisted in the discharge of his duties by a large number of junior officers.

5. About the Espionage System

Kautilya lays a great emphasis on the espionage system. He is in favour of keeping a large number of spies by the king, because they are very necessary for the stability and progress of the state. The king could keep his hand on the pulse of the nation only if he knew what was going on in his empire. These spies could also help him in keeping a strict watch over the activities of the state officials. The king should keep spies in his neighboring countries too, because by doing this he can save his country from foreign attacks. According to Kautilya, women can prove better spies than men.

6. About Shipping

Another important information that we get from Kautilya's Arthashastra is about Indian shipping. At each port a special officer was appointed whose main job was to control the movements of the ships and boats and to charge taxes from the merchants, travelers and fishermen. Generally all the ships and ferries belonged to the Government and shipping formed one of the chief sources of income of the Government.

7. About the Economic Condition of the People

Kautilya enjoins his king to improve the economic condition of his people because poverty is the chief cause of restlessness and rebellious spirit among them. So, whenever the king sees the signs of poverty he should at once take steps to root it out.

In this way we find that Kautilya's Arthashastra not only corroborates the information received from Megasthenes's 'Indika' but it also gives other useful information of great value.

Saptanga Theory of Kautilya

According to the Saptang Theory of Kautilya, there are seven parts or elements constituting a state. This is written in his famous book - "Arthashastra". The seven elements of a state are- 'Swami', 'Amatya', 'Janpad', 'Durg', 'Kosh', 'Dand' and 'Mitra'. All the seven elements are necessary for smooth functioning of the state. All of them should have proper coordination among themselves.

- **Swami** is the first and the most important element. Swami means the monarch. He should be a native of the soil and born in a noble family. He should be brave and well learned. He makes all the important appointments and supervises the government. He has to be virtuous and should treat his subjects like his own children. Kautilya has given extensive powers to the monarch but those powers are meant for the welfare of them subjects. In the welfare and happiness of his subjects, lies his own happiness.
- **Amatya** refers to the council of ministers as well as the supporting officials and subordinate staffs. They are meant for assisting the monarch in day to day affairs of the state. Amatya gives suggestions to king, collects taxes, develops new villages and cities, ensures defense of the state and all other tasks as assigned by the king.
- **Janpad** refers to territory and people of the state. The territory of the state should be fertile and should have abundance of forest, rivers, mountains, minerals, wild life etc. It should have good climate. People should be loyal to their king, hard working, disciplined, religious, ready to fight for their motherland, should pay taxes regularly and happily.
- **Durg** refers to forts. The state should have sufficient number of forts across its territory at strategic locations for ensuring defense against foreign invasions. Forts should be built near hills/mountains, deserts, dense forests and big water bodies. They garrison soldiers, store food grains for emergency and also serve as a hideout for the king when his life is in danger.
- **Kosh** means treasury of the state. Finance is life blood of any state without which it is almost impossible to run it. Money is needed for paying salaries, building new infrastructure, etc. The

treasury should be full of money and valuable metals and gems. It can be increased through taxation and plundering enemy states in war.

- **Dand** refers to military. The state should have a regular, large, disciplined and well trained military. It is crucial for the security of the state. The soldiers should be recruited from those families which are traditionally associated with military. The soldiers should be paid well and their families should be taken care of in most suitable way. Proper training and equipment should be made available. Well fed and well trained soldiers can win any battle. The king should take care of the soldiers and the soldiers will be ready to sacrifice even their life for him.
- **Mitra** refers to friends of the king. The monarch should maintain friendly relationship with traditional friends of his forefathers. He should also make new friendships. He should send gifts and other pleasantries for his friends. They should be helped in times of emergency. They should be loyal. Friends add to the power of the state. They are also important from foreign trade view point. In modern times, we see five elements of state- sovereignty, government, territory, population and international recognition. Kautilya gave his theory of state more than 2300 years ago and it is still relevant today. The king represented sovereignty, the amatya represented government, the janpad represented territory and population and the mitra represented international recognition of the state.
- Elements like kosh (treasury), durg (forts) and dand (military) are not held as essential elements of state in modern times. But it is also true that their importance is implied. No modern state can function and exist for long without these extra elements.

3. 19th Century ideals Political Ideology

Swami Vivekananda and Economics, this being largely on Politics and Swami Vivekananda . Admittedly it does cover the same ground at places, but then, neither the Swami nor the real world treat economics and politics as separate disciplines. This is also a work in progress, since there are other things which need to be addressed in order that the article becomes comprehensivebut as of now this is a short preview :

The Importance of Swami Vivekananda for understanding contemporary India

It is not a matter of doubt that Narendra Nath Dutta also more famously known as Swami Vivekananda had a profound effect on the idea of nation building in India. In many ways Swami Vivekananda has given and continues to give direction to those who want to actively be engaged with India and more importantly it's people. He remains along with Mahatma Gandhi and Babasaheb B.R.Ambedkar one of the most important political philosophers and icons of the country. He predates them both, in both in terms of their work as well their conceptions of the challenges that faced India and continues to face India. His answers are more practical in many ways than both Gandhi and Ambedkar. His views on society, religion, economics and politics as will be apparent from reading his writings have actually shaped India as we see it today. The fact that the religion of India "Hinduism" or Sanatana Dharma or Vedanta as he would like to call it, is what it is today, very different from what it was 100 years back and still survives intact and it's adherents can still make sense out of the changes is because of Swami Vivekananda who discussed the oncoming changes and made practical and far reaching predictions. As even an ordinary person without great erudition would notice, the society of India today is neither of Gandhi or of Ambedkar, but the mean lies with Vivekananda.

He spoke about using Non Violence as a method against your enemies predating Gandhi's Hind Swaraj, and as the leading authority on Gandhi today says, Gandhi was deeply influenced by Vivekananda. In his initial days Gandhi even went to meet Vivekananda, but since the Swami was very ill, he could not meet him and came back disappointed. Gandhi also realized that Vivekananda did not endorse his views about an ideal Indian village completely or his ideas about complete opposition of the East and West as he made out in Hind Swaraj. Vivekananda spoke about a synthesis of the best of both worlds

and was clearly conscious that technology of the West may indeed benefit the poor of India and for that he was very keen.

Vivekananda preceded Ambedkar in being vocal about caste discrimination and was prescient about its remedies as well as the pitfalls which may arise for those who want to remedy it. His discussion on caste discrimination, predate Ambedkar's on the same issue and their views are almost the same, with the crucial difference that Vivekananda wanted to make the change from within and Ambedkar wanted to make the changes by rejecting the system entirely. Interestingly Gandhi raised the question of Vivekananda and his spiritual guru "Ram Krishna Paramhans" as a breaker of caste in his correspondence with Ambedkar and Ambedkar agreeing to the same and recognizing the fact was of the view that Ram Krishna had not been able to have a deep impact on Hindu society. Interestingly Ambedkar who had extensive knowledge of both contemporaries as well as both Hindu and Brahmin scriptures chose not to utter a word about Swami Vivekananda. Infact till today a large section of the leftist intellectuals of the Dalit Bahujan movement is confused about how to deal with Vivekananda as to whether to accept him or reject him, since in many ways he anticipated their ideology and pointed out the pitfalls of pushing their ideology without recognizing the results of the same.

The importance of Swami Vivekananda in Indian socio-political thought .

Swami Vivekananda is also interestingly a person whose philosophy and reading of the conception of India, Hinduism and the people of India, is very much touched with his experiences in the United States of America and the New World, unlike most of India's other political philosophers like Mahatma Gandhi whose experience of the west came from the British and or Britain.

Swami Vivekananda is a man in any ways engaged with the ideas which still haunt us today. He is also a person who had traveled extensively across the world, speaking about India. He is possibly the foremost person of his times who confronts the question of caste, religion, minorityism, modernism, economics and politics of India and he brought a refreshing viewpoint to the same. He is articulate and very clear and with his writings and sayings managed to set the agenda which is still with us today as Nationalists.

Vivekananda is a radical traditionalist. His version and interpretation of high religious philosophy was also marked with a very specific political / economic outlook which arose from his concern about the people of his country, or his co-religionists. His vision is still relevant and broadly and startlingly still applicable in India today.

Interestingly his exploration of Hinduism and the condition of the people of India leads him to two broad presumptions, one that religion cannot be given on an empty stomach and two, the poor of India or as he would like to term the "sudra" should be awakened. This has led to attempts by socialists and communists to appropriate the legacy of Swami Vivekananda. However Vivekananda was clearly and completely against formal rigid equality though he did claim to be a socialist in a very colloquial sense. Vivekananda recognized clearly that for a society to work in the long run, man had to be given the opportunity to excel and make money ... and he has memorably and famously equalized the Grihasta making money with an anchorite (sadhu) praying in his cell.

He seems to be the first person to have discovered the link with what is today known in India " caste is class" theory and also to have seen that such was not a perfect formulation. His vision of combining and reading caste and class together is even by today's standard extremely radical and innovative.

He antedates Gandhi's thinking on non violence. He talks about democracy and self rule and the need to be rational in the application of our history and culture. He vehemently opposes the Aryan invasion theory and promotes the cause of the Shudra and the Pariah

He is the originator of the word "Dalit", a word to be used for the pariahs, since it is a direct translation from the word "suppressed" to describe the situation of the "pariahs" of his time. Interestingly he realized as well that the only way to destroy the caste system in India was through "free market".

Vivekananda is unique in that he is neither in thrall of the past, nor is he willing to discard everything from it. Gandhi himself realized that though Vivekananda looked to the past for inspiration he did not want to replicate the past. In that way he is the "middle path" between Gandhi and Ambedkar, and therefore reflective of the true Indian mean in society.

Swami Vivekananda's reading both on modern and ancient texts is vast and his capability of drawing apt practical lessons from them is unparalleled.

In the present tumultuous times therefore he stands as an inspiration of a very unique philosophy which is not inward looking yet very proud of being what it is. He is the person who puts the markers which comprise the clear boundaries of modern popular Hinduism as well modern Indian nationalism. He also recognizes the economics of his age and the impact on India.

Vivekananda and the Ideals of the Indian state

The question here is what sort of an Indian state would Swami Vivekananda have envisaged? It is a difficult to answer since Swami Vivekananda deliberately kept out of politics and consciously so. Yet, we can surmise some of the broad outlines that he would have looked forward to. I no doubt realize that my guess is as good as anyone else's as to what sort of Constitution would Vivekananda have wanted, but for the sake of consideration I would like to put forward the following:

(i) Vivekananda would have definitely wanted a more equal society, both in economic terms as well as in social terms, that much is clearly apparent from his writings. But as he was wont to say that he was not against inequality per se as it was the nature of things, but he was against "privilege".

(ii) Vivekananda would not have wanted a state under a planned economy, he was clearly of the view that the duty of a Grihastha was to create and distribute wealth:

(iii) Vivekananda would have wanted a country in which caste did not exist and indeed saw the future of caste doomed, however he would have been definitely against war in the name of caste consciousness and the annihilation of caste.

(iv) Vivekananda would have focused the constitution on the Grihastha and the family and put on them the onus of creating and distributing wealth in the society. He would have perhaps wanted the rich to be more integrated in the development of the society.

(v) Vivekananda, would have been a proponent of individual liberty and freedom, yet based on Bharatiya tradition.

(vi) Vivekananda is a democrat and skeptical of the rule of kings.

(vii) Vivekananda would have wanted a strong independent Indian state, a state which used its mechanism to help the poor. He would not be against modern technology if it was for the benefit of the poor.

(viii) He would have wanted a strong resurgent India. An India which would enjoy its rightful place in the world.

(ix) However he would have wanted a spiritual India and an India which has not forgotten its older culture and wisdom.

The Ideology of Swami Vivekananda

In the end if there is an "ideology" of Swami Vivekananda it can be said to be encapsulated by oft quoted following quote which still haunts us today:

“O India! With this mere echoing of others, with this base imitation of others, with this dependence on others this slavish weakness, this vile detestable cruelty — wouldst thou, with these provisions only, scale the highest pinnacle of civilisation and greatness? Wouldst thou attain, by means of thy disgraceful cowardice, that freedom deserved only by the brave and the heroic? O India! Forget not that the ideal of thy womanhood is Sita, Savitri, Damayanti; forget not that the God thou worshippest is the great Ascetic of ascetics, the all-renouncing Shankara, the Lord of Umâ; forget not that thy marriage, thy wealth, thy life are not for sense-pleasure, are not for thy individual personal happiness; forget not that thou art born as a sacrifice to the Mother's altar; forget not that thy social order is but the reflex of the Infinite Universal Motherhood; forget not that the lower classes, the ignorant, the

poor, the illiterate, the cobbler, the sweeper, are thy flesh and blood, thy brothers. Thou brave one, be bold, take courage, be proud that thou art an Indian, and proudly proclaim, "I am an Indian, every Indian is my brother." Say, "The ignorant Indian, the poor and destitute Indian, the Brahmin Indian, the Pariah Indian, is my brother." Thou, too, clad with but a rag round thy loins proudly proclaim at the top of thy voice: "The Indian is my brother, the Indian is my life, India's gods and goddesses are my God. India's society is the cradle of my infancy, the pleasure-garden of my youth, the sacred heaven, the Varanasi of my old age." Say, brother: "The soil of India is my highest heaven, the good of India is my good," and repeat and pray day and night, "O Thou Lord of Gauri, O Thou Mother of the Universe, vouchsafe manliness unto me! O Thou Mother of Strength, take away my weakness, take away my unmanliness, and make me a Man!"

Ambedkar

The political philosophy of Ambedkar may help in renegotiating the crisis of western political theory in particular and leading the struggles of the masses in general. One can see Ambedkar's association with the grand political streams such as liberal, radical or conservative through his writings. At same time he differentiates himself with these three dominant political traditions. Ambedkar's philosophy is essentially ethical and religious. For him, social precedes the political. Social morality is the central to his political philosophy. He is neither fierce individualist nor conservative communitarian. His conceptions of democracy internalises the principles of equality, liberty, and fraternity in its true spirit. Though there are many attempts but one may find difficulty in locating him in dominant political traditions. Often this may leads to misunderstanding of the essence of Ambedkar. Ambedkar's political thought demands new language to understand the complexity of his thought. Ambedkar has emerged as a major political philosopher with the rise of dalit movement in contemporary times. There are several attempts to understand Ambedkar and his philosophy. Confusion prevails among scholars due to the existence of diverse, and sometimes, contradictory theoretical assessment of Ambedkar. The social context of the scholars and their subjective positions play major role in the assessment of the thinker and very often the opinions of scholars evoke extreme reactions which either elevate or demean Ambedkar. Though he had a great influence on Indian politics from the nationalist movement onwards, till eighties, there has been not much academic debate on Ambedkar. The communities of knowledge and centres of power either ignored or deliberately marginalized him as a thinker and social scientist. Ambedkar is nowhere mentioned in the contemporary Indian philosophy and the philosophical discourses of India. This exclusion of Ambedkar has to be understood with the implicit politics of the writers on Indian philosophy. Very interestingly, the masses /communities of under privileged of Indian society brings him into the forefront. It is not exaggeration to say that there is no major village in the country without the statue of Ambedkar. He is the most celebrated symbol of the contemporary times. Due to the masses/Dalit communities symbolic association with Ambedkar, political parties and academics ranging from conservatives to radicals, are forced to look at Ambedkar. The celebration of Ambedkar has the undercurrent of failure of Indian democratic State to reach the majority of this nation and the assertion of these ignored communities. In other words, Ambedkar's philosophy is a search towards the theories of social reconstruction of Indian society.

Ambedkar: Social proceeds political

Ambedkar thought, as reflected in his writings and speeches, has great importance in tracing the history and growth of social thought in India. It is necessary to understand the philosophy of Ambedkar which is the theoretical foundation for the Dalit movement. The core of political thinking of Ambedkar is contained in two of his statements- the rights are protected not by law but by social and moral conscience of society, and a democratic form of government presupposes a democratic form of society. He considers democracy essentially as a form of society, or a mode of associated living, and a social conscience is the only safeguard of all rights. The roots of democracy are to be searched in

social relationships, in terms of associated life among the people who form a society. For him, social relationships are the key to democracy. Ambedkar is a social democrat in spirit and practice. His special contribution to political thought lies in his linking up liberty, equality and fraternity to the concept of social democracy, which in turn, he relates to democracy as a form of government. He further reminds us of the limitations of social democracy in everyday functioning. As he categorically stated while addressing the constituent assembly (November 25, 1949), 'Political democracy can not last unless there lies at the base of it social democracy' which means, a way of life which recognizes liberty, equality and fraternity as the principles of life.' In this sense he defined democracy as a form and method of government whereby revolutionary changes in the economic and social life of people are brought about without bloodshed.

In most of the speeches and writings of Ambedkar, the central theme is social reformism. He often debated and confronted the issue of precedence of social over political issues. Politics have to be necessarily connected to social issues. The very foundations of democracy lie in associated living in society. On the issue of giving primacy to social over political, he differs with the Congress and the socialists. This is well reflected in all his writings in general, and 'Annihilation of caste' and 'What Congress and Gandhi have done to Untouchables' in particular.

In contemporary times, once 'caste' got theoretically recognized and established as the Indian social reality, the established political and social theories got new meanings. Ambedkar as a thinker got prominence because of his scholarly conceptualization of the institution of caste and its functioning in Indian society. He interpreted the Indian social world in order to change the lives of the Dalit masses who are the victims of caste system. The situation demands proper assessment of Ambedkar's political philosophy in relation to other prominent political streams of the time. Ambedkar is a real philosopher in the Marxian sense. He has interpreted the Indian social reality in order to change it.

In estimating Ambedkar's political philosophy, the study will consider the following questions: What is his conception of the human being and society? What are his conceptions of rights, freedom and justice that flow in both his thought and action? What are the cultural and historical roots of these conceptions in his thought? In what way does he connect democracy and social inequality? How does he resolve the question of individual and community? What kind of theory does he propose in bringing out the relationship between State and religion? How did he perceive the role of Dalit movement (Depressed class) in India's democratic future?

Political Philosophy of Ambedkar

Ambedkar is influenced by all the major political traditions of his times. His political thought has emerged from the three grand traditions of political thought, i.e. liberal, conservative and radical. The unique feature about him is that he has transcended all these traditions. He was influenced by the ideas of John Dewey, the pragmatic American and his teacher. The Fabian Edwin R. A. Seligman had considerable impact on his thought. He often quoted Edmund Burke, the conservative thinker of British, though we can't brand Ambedkar as a conservative. Ambedkar's notion of liberty comes close to T.H. Green.

Ambedkar philosophy is primarily ethical and religious. He thoroughly explored the Indian traditions and its philosophical systems in a unique way. He developed political concepts like democracy, justice, state and rights from his understanding of Indian society and the functioning of its institutions on the moral grounds. He is very critical of the institution of caste, which influences all the spheres of individual's life and the Indian society as a whole. He further discusses how the individual is related to the society and how the individual's freedom is limited by other social forces. He is critical of authoritarian Hindu social order and argued in favor of a democratic society. He probed into the moral and social foundations of India and gave new meaning to the lives of disadvantaged people. His was a rationale approach. Reason plays a role in his writings and speeches. The methodology he used is very scientific rather than speculative. He was influenced by the assumptions of modernity. He is

well informed in many areas of Indian history, polity, culture, anthropology and philosophy. He quotes many thinkers in his writings, those who have influenced him.

The notion of community is central to his thinking. To say that individuals make up society is trivial; society is always composed of classes. It may be an exaggeration to assert the theory of class conflict, but the existence of definite classes in society is a fact... an individual in a society is always a member of a class. A caste is an enclosed class. Brahmins created caste and it is extended to other servile classes. Caste is an endogamous unit and also a communal unit. His political theory was premised on a moral community. It was as an ideal to be realised. He was very much critical about the Hindu social order. He argues that Hinduism is not qualified to be a community. Buddhism was projected as the ideal having the value of community grounding on morality. He considers that Buddhism attempted to found society on the basis of 'reason' and 'morality'.

His conception of community is very novel. He does not conform to either Hindu ideal community or Marxist conception of community based on participation in production process. His conception of community is moral and ethical. It is not automatically available for participation in common affairs. His idea of community has to be created through hard and torturous process of moral transformation.

On Democracy

Ambedkar had a lengthy discussion on democratic form of government in his writings. His conception of democracy is different from the parliamentary democracy of Western Europe. Democracy came with the principles of liberalism. His conception of democracy is different from parliamentary forms in a significant way. Parliamentary democracy has all the marks of a popular government, a government of the people, by the people and for the people. Ambedkar considered the problems and expressed discontent against the parliamentary democracy in nations like Italy, Germany, Russia, Spain and some other European nations in proposing the parliamentary democracy in India. Ambedkar finds reasons for the failure of parliamentary democracy that 'parliamentary democracy gives no free hand to dictatorship and that is why it became a discredited institution in the countries like Italy, Spain and Germany which readily welcomed dictatorships'. The nations that are opposing dictatorship and pledged to democracy too find their discontent with democracy. First, parliamentary democracy began with equality of political rights in the form of equal suffrage. There are very few countries having parliamentary democracy that have not adopted adult suffrage. It has progressed by expanding the notion of equality of political rights to equality of social and economic opportunity. It has recognized that corporations, which are anti-social in purpose, cannot hold the state at bay. With all this, 'the reason for discontent is due to the realization that it has failed to assure to the masses the right to liberty, property or the pursuit of happiness. The causes for this failure may be found either in wrong ideology or wrong organization or in both.' He elaborated this point by pointing out the fault with both wrong ideologies and bad organization in carrying the ideals of democracy. The idea of freedom of contract is one of the responsible factors for parliamentary democracy in terms of ideology. Parliamentary democracy took no notice of economic inequalities and didn't care to examine the result of freedom of contract on the parties to the contract, in spite of the fact that they were unequal in bargaining power. It didn't mind if the freedom of contract gave the strong the opportunity to defraud the weak. The result is that parliamentary democracy in standing out as a protagonist of liberty has continuously added to economic wrongs towards the poor, downtrodden and disinherited class.⁷ The second wrong ideology which has vitiated parliamentary democracy is the failure to realize that political democracy can not succeed where there is no social and economic democracy'.⁸ He illustrated this point by comparing the collapse of parliamentary democracy in the countries of Italy, Germany and Russia with England and USA. He felt that there was a greater degree of economic and social democracy in the latter countries than existed in the former. 'Social and economic democracy are the tissues and fiber of a political democracy. The tougher the tissue and the fiber, the greater the strength of the body. Democracy is another name for equality. Parliamentary democracy developed a passion for liberty. It never made even nodding acquaintance with equality. It

failed to realize the significance of equality and didn't even strike a balance between liberty and equality, with the result liberty swallowed equality and has made democracy a name and a farce. More than bad ideology, bad organization is responsible for failure of democracy. All political societies get divided into two classes- the rulers and the ruled. This is almost stratified that rulers are always drawn from the ruling class and the class that is ruled never become the ruling class. This happens because generally people do not see that they govern themselves. They are content to establish a government and leave it to govern them. This explains why parliamentary democracy has never been a government of the people or by the people and why it has been in reality a government of the hereditary subject class by a hereditary ruling class. It is this, a vicious organization of political life which had made parliamentary democracy such a dismal failure. It is wrong to believe that democracy and self government automatically became realities of life. In fact, the existing governing class is inconsistent with democracy and self-government and made all its efforts to retain its power to govern. Ambedkar felt that self-government and democracy become real not when the constitution based on adult suffrage comes into existence but when the governing class loses its power to capture the power to govern. In some countries the servile classes may succeed in ousting the governing class from the seat of authority with just by adult suffrage. In some other countries the governing class may be so deeply entrenched that the servile classes will need other safeguards besides adult suffrage to achieve the same end.

Ambedkar accused the western writers that they were superficial and have not provided the realistic view of democracy. They superficially touched the constitutional morality, adult suffrage and frequent elections as the be-all and end-all of democracy. Ambedkar proposed a written constitution for an effective democracy. The habits of constitutional morality may be essential for the maintenance of a constitutional form of government and he puts more emphasis on the moral society and its customs than the written legal law in governing its people. He heavily invested on social morality for effective functioning of the democratic form of government. He reminds us very often, in devising the constitution one has to keep in mind that the principle aim of the constitution must be to dislodge the governing class from its position and to prevent it from remaining as a governing class forever

Tilak

Tilak's main field of concern was politics. It is here that the main contribution of B.G. Tilak is to be found. Tilak, along with his associates Lajpat Rai and Bipin Chandra Pal, was responsible for bringing in a new kind of political thinking and action in the Congress. He analysed the national movement with a sharp focus on its objectives, and the nature of the Indian National Congress in his time. He was convinced that the Indian National Congress had to be transformed into a Congress of the people. It was to be made truly national and democratic, and its old methods of action had to be given up. It had to be more active and dynamic in fighting for its objectives. Now we propose to discuss in brief some of his important political ideas.

Philosophical Foundation of Tilak's Political Thought': Swaraj Tilak was not an armchair thinker, nor was he a political philosopher in the academic sense. He was a practical politician and his main task was the political emancipation of India. Tilak's political philosophy was rooted in the Indian tradition but it did not reject all that was western. I was inspired by the ancient Indian spiritual and philosophical works. Thus, he imparted a spiritual connotation to his notion of Swaraj. In his view, Swaraj was more than a political or economic concept. Swaraj was more than a law and order mechanism. It was also more than an economic order providing the necessities of life or the luxuries of a pleasurable life. Swaraj, according to him, was full self-government-political, social, economic and spiritual. Thus, Swaraj was something more than mere home rule. Home rule simply indicated a political arrangement of self-rule without severing British connection. Beyond this, Swaraj also implied enlightened self-control of the individuals inspiring detached performance of their duties. Tilak felt that materialism debases human life and reduces it to an animal level. Tilak wanted men to rise above the level of animal pleasures through self discipline and self-efforts and attain true

happiness by sublimating their desires. Hence, he conceives the fulfillment of human life not only in enjoying rights, but also in selfless performance of duties. Man needs the rights to perform his duties not for the selfish pursuit of animal desires. Man has duties to himself, to his family, to his kith and kin and also to his fellow beings and countrymen. He has to work for the moral, spiritual and material well being of all of them. This is his duty. However, all this would be possible only if men and women were free from any kind of domination and control. For the realization of this Swaraj, Tilak accepted the suitability of the western liberal institutions and concepts like constitutional government, rule of law, individual freedom, dignity of the person. and so on. Thus, Tilak's political philosophy represented an interesting mix of the ancient Indian value system and western liberal institutions.

Swadeshi

Swadeshi was the positive part of boycott which was only a negative weapon. The Swadeshi movement exhorted the people to use indigenous products even if they were crude and costly. It also urged the educated Indians to enter the field of production, instead of pressing for bureaucratic jobs. The swadeshi movement also included in it a plan to train Indians in the art of industry and commerce. Obviously, the success of the swadeshi movement depended upon the success of boycott. The more the people resolved to boycott foreign goods, the more would be the demand for swadeshi goods. Swadeshi was thus a positive programme to reconstruct Indian industry, trade and craft and rescue it from its dilapidated condition. Besides, it was also a powerful political weapon to cripple imperial interests in the domination of the country.

Passive Resistance

The last but not the least weapon of the nationalists was Passive Resistance. In a sense, it was an extension of boycott. Boycott implied a determination not use foreign products and not to assist alien bureaucracy in carrying out the administration of the country. passive Resistance urged the people to go one step further. It insisted upon payment of taxes and revenues to the alien authorities. It also included a programme to train people for self-rule. This training was to be provided to the people by organizing our own administrative units parallel to those instituted by the British. The villages, talukas and districts were to have parallel institutions like courts, police etc. Thus, Passive Resistance was a revolutionary programme. It amounted to a silent revolt against British imperialism.

Gopal gokhale

Swadeshi was the positive part of boycott which was only a negative weapon. The Swadeshi movement exhorted the people to use indigenous products even if they were crude and costly. It also urged the educated Indians to enter the field of production, instead of pressing for bureaucratic jobs. The Swadeshi movement also included in it a plan to train Indians in the art of industry and commerce. Obviously, the success of the swadeshi movement depended upon the success of boycott. The more the people resolved to boycott foreign goods, the more would be the demand for Swadeshi goods. Swadeshi was thus a positive programmed to reconstruct Indian industry, trade and craft and rescue it from its dilapidated condition. Besides, it was also a powerful political weapon to cripple imperial interests in the domination of the country.

Political Goals and Programme

Gokhale's understanding of the British rule in India was one of the factors that determined his political goals and programmes. As noted earlier Gakhale sincerely believed that India's connections with the British were going to help her in many ways in the long run and hence any idea of severing these connections was always repugnant to his mind. The political goal which he put forward, therefore, was that of self-government for India. The earlier Congress leaders were satisfied with the idea of the 'good government' which meant an efficient and enlightened government. But Gokhale, like Dadabhai Naoroji, gradually realised that no good government was ever possible without having

self government.'Moreover, he felt that the British had given good government in the sense that they had established law and order in the society but then the time had come to associate the Indians with the work of government and this was possible only if the British granted self-government to India. In his Presidential address to the Banaras Congress (1905) Gokhale said, "Now the Congress wants that all this should change and that India should be governed, first and foremost, in the interests of the Indians themselves. This result will be achieved only in proportion as we obtain more and more-voice in the government of our country." Thus, instead of insisting only on 'good government' Gokhale went a step further and demanded self-government for India. But what did self-government mean? Gokhale's idea of self-government was different from that of the extremist thinkers like Aurobindo or Bipin Chandra Pal. By self-government he never meant complete independence for India. He wanted self-government only within the limits of the British Empire. In other words, he wanted that kind of a rule which existed in the self-governing colonies of the British Empire. The extremists like Aurobindo wanted complete independence for India, having no connection with Britain. Gokhale did not go to that extent while demanding self-government. Neither did he prefer the term 'Swaraj' for self-government, as Tilak did. Tilak's concept of Swaraj had wider implications and it ultimately aimed at the attainment of complete independence. Gokhale in no way hinted at complete independence. Again, for Tilak, Swaraj was the birth right of the people for which no specific conditions were required. Gokhale on the other hand thought that people should qualify themselves to be worthy of representative institutions. He thought it reasonable that the sense of responsibility required for the "proper exercise of the political institutions of the west can be acquired by an eastern people through practical training and experiment only," Gokhale sincerely believed that this 'practical training and experiment' on the part of the Indians would be better achieved if India maintained the British connection. Having fixed the goal of 'self-government' Gokhale designed a political programme and devised appropriate methods to implement it. His political programme envisaged several reforms. These reforms could be grouped under four heads.

- i) Those which aimed at securing a larger share of the people in the administration and control of their affairs; these included a reform of the Legislative Council, the appointment of Indians to the Secretary of State's Council and the Executive Councils in India and a steady substitution of the Indian for the European agency in the public service of the country,
- ii) Those which sought to improve the methods of administration, such as the separation of judicial from executive functions, police reforms and similar proposals,
- iii) Those which proposed a readjustment of financial arrangements with the object of securing a reduction of burdens of the taxpayers and a more efficient application of the available resources. Under this head came reduction of military charges, the moderating of land assessments, etc.
- iv) Those which urged the adoption of measures calculated to improve the condition of the masses. These included a vigorous extension of primary education, facilities for industrial and technical instruction, grants for improved sanitation and a real attempt to deal with the alarming indebtedness of the peasantry. Gokhale believed that if the Indians concentrated all their energies on some such programme they might, within a reasonable time see results which would not be altogether disappointing. In his Presidential address at the Banaras Congress (1905) Gokhale expressed his hope that for the first time since the Congress movement began the Radical and Liberal party in England would come into real power and a strong current had already set in England against that narrow and aggressive imperialism. It was this hope that motivated Gokhale to go for a programme which he had proposed on the Congress platform.

IDEOLOGICAL INFLUENCES ON LOHIA'S THOUGHT

The thought process of Lohia was shaped not only by the enormous volume of knowledge he acquired through the study of various philosophers of East and west but also his practical knowledge of political movements. The academic background of his family, his early association with freedom movement, teachings of Gandhi and Tilak had influenced his thought. Infact Gandhian influence on

Lohia was the deepest. He tried to blend western ideals with Gandhian thought. The concepts of non-violence, Satyagraha were attractive to him infact he got his doctoral degree from Berlin University in 1932 on the subject of "Salt and satyagraha." Tilak was another leader who influenced Lohia. He organised a small mourning and shut down on Tilak's death in 1920. While abroad, he came in contact with international socialists and influence of socialism and Maxism was effective in his thoughts. While in Germany he also developed an interest in international relations. He attended the proceedings of the League of nations, this sowed the seeds of internationalism in him. In his later political life Lohia propagated the ideals of world government, and international peace. When he returned back to India the Indian socialists who were in C.S.P. (Congress socialist Party), influenced Dr. Lohia. In all different ideological forces had a sway on his thoughts. Though influenced by Marxist thought Lohia tried to project a new theory of socialism taking into consideration the socio-economic conditions of India. He challenged certian basic assumptions of Marxism. Whle Acharya Narendra Deva the earliest socialist thinker wanted to combine marxism with demoiocracy. Lohia wanted a theory that could suit the Asian and other developing countries. He found that this aspect of Asian problems have been completely neglected by Marx. It was in the year 1952 at Panchamarchi session of the socialist party, Lohia forcefully expounded his new thesis. He wanted European ideology should be discarded and India should develop its own ideology to suit to the domestic conditions. In the process he disagreed with some socialist thinkers who wanted to "indgenise marxism." Infact he found many flaws in the traditional Marxist theory. There are many internal contradictions in that theory. No national movement can completely be dependent on the ideas of one man. Marxism is essentially an European ideology. It is limited by ethnocentric considerations. It takes into account only European nations interests and cannot be universal. He found the Marxist theory which explained the growth of capitalism from feudalism to be incorrect. The Marxist theory of development of capitalism is faulted on two accounts. The linkage between capitalism and imperialism has not been explained clearly. The colonial people and their societies have some peculiar problems, that requires a deeper probe into working of the social institutions of these countries. Marx did not use a deeper analysis of the problems of colonial countries despite his sympathies to them. He was tied to European interests. Marx thought imperialism is to be the highest state of capitalism. This point has been refuted by Lohia. He argues that both capitalism and imperialism develop simultateously. The developments in America, Japan and Germany clearly indicate that right from beginning the capitalist sections were seeking external source of power. Capitalism builds itself upon exploitation of others by exporting goods to these colonial countries. Secondly Marx only described the formation of capital in the western Europe. Here capitalism developed on the basis of exploitation of colonies. But there is a world outside Europe. How capital is formed in these colonial countries cannot be forgotten. Capitalist formation allover the world are related to each other. We cannot separate and develop only Eurocentric theory. Again the doctrine of surplus value which is central to marxism is criticized by Lohia. Theory of surplus value presumes the capitalist makes the profit from the value of wealth created by labour. Labor gets a partial wage and the extra amount goes to capitalists as profit. But according to Lohia the amount of surplus varies from developed countries to colonial countries. The form of exploitation in developed and colonial countries is different. The nature of demands also varies in two contexts. Lohia proved that "in case of colonies 99% of labour is transfered in the form of surplus value. While in developed countries it is only 10%. It is for this reason that the surplus value in both the cases cannot be taken together." Lohia again questioned Marx's presumption that capitalism results in impoverishment or labour. In Europe capitalism had led to a steady improvement of the living standard of the workers. The working class gradually was transforming itself into middleclass because of fall out of capitalist production. But Dr. Lohia was a bitter critc of capitalism. He held that the capitalist mode of production leads to unhealthy competition and is based on selfishness and avarice. Capitalism is opposed to social values like equality and prosperity. Socialism is certainly superior to capitalism, because it is not based on the idea of the use of exploitation of others for one's own aggrandizement

or enrichment. History is a proof that the capitalists for their own profit would betray their motherland. Lohia cites the example of France, where some sections of capitalists welcomed Hitler's invasion of their country. As a reactionary ideology capitalism if practiced in the third world would result in giving protection to profit, black marketing and exploitation. While agreeing the phenomenon of class struggle as inevitable in any society, Lohia argued, in the Indian context it takes a different shape. Here the class antagonism between workers and employers is not as strong as antagonism between different castes. Despite many social and religious reforms, caste never died. It is at sometimes severely rigid while it loosens during other periods. Lohia explained the linkages between the caste and class in the Indian context. "Caste represents conservative forces of stagnation, inertia and prescriptive rights. Classes represent dynamic forces of social mobilization. History is internal movement between castes and class. Castes loose into classes and classes crystalize into castes."

Asian type of political systems : Dr. Lohia found that the Asian political systems are different from the European model where democracy has taken firm roots. In Asian countries politics is based on caste, religion and race. The government policies are based on repression and opposition politics are based on armed rebellion or assassination. Then there is the problem of the rise of a new class of bureaucrats with Europeanized habits. The leadership is inactive. There is no comprehensive social philosophy. While some of these faults can be found in India, it cannot be said Indian political system lacked a coherent social philosophy. In fact various philosophies had their impact on the Indian social system like Gandhism, Sarvodaya and socialism. Even militant nationalism had its way. Lohia is certainly aware of this. He tried to develop a coherent ideology based on his readings and experience. We find in him both the ideas of Gandhism and revolution simultaneously operating. Although not a religious man like Gandhi, Lohia had highest regard for him. He found the weapon of Satyagraha, is most effective for the social systems of countries like India. His reasons are rational. Satyagraha is superior either to constitutional remedies or to revolutionary politics based on violence. The former is bound to be tardy, in countries where there is so much poverty. The revolutionary violent politics can never assure us permanent results. He said, "Satyagraha, combining moral and spiritual methods, with pragmatic considerations leads not only to the achievement of aims but also to the purification of those who struggle." Lohia gave full support to 1942 quit India movement. He had also high praise for Gandhi's Satyagraha in South Africa. For the Asian countries, Dr. Lohia suggested the "Four Pillar state". In this system a method is made to synthesize the twin concepts of centralization and decentralizations. In this scheme the four components of state, village, mandal, the province and the central government retain importance. They are integrated in a system of functional federalism. Their cohesiveness is bound by performance of functions. Lohia wanted a truly non-violent society formation. This can be achieved only on the basis of decentralization. He found both socialism and capitalism are based on the productive aspects of economic activity rather than the distributive aspect. With a view to enlarge production they resort to large scale production which inevitably leads to mechanisation and centralization. In both systems individuals are alienated. So Lohia wanted a 'new socialism' for India. He gave a call to combine the socialist principles with four Gandhian ideas : Satyagraha, ends and means principles, Small machine technology and political decentralization. In a centralized social system human beings are relegated into background. They would be cogs in the machines without any individuality. A decentralised polity provides full scope for all round development of individual personality. In the model "Chauk Hamba" he developed for the Indian society, in which the power increasingly belonged to the small units of direct democracy. The rule of nominated bureaucrats should be replaced by the rule of direct democracy. The units of direct Democracy village, town, district - shall take share in the sovereignty of the Republic. In his scheme the office of collector is to be abolished. He would be under district control. Not less than 1/4 the total revenue and of plan money shall be spent under the initiative and control of district and village assemblies and executives.

Dayananda

Political ideal of Dayananda

1. Swarja
2. Religion and politics relations
3. Faith in enlightened monarchy
4. Faith in Swadeshi
5. Faith in democracy
6. Love for education
7. Decentralization of authority
8. Functions of state
9. Ahinsa
10. Government authority
 - Rajya sabha
 - Dharma sabha
 - Vidya sabha
11. Chakaravaty ruler

Raja Ram Mohan Rai

- | | |
|---------------------|----------------------------|
| 1. Political idea | 7. Judicial system |
| 2. Religious idea | 8. Settlement of Europeans |
| 3. Social idea | 9. Female inheritances |
| 4. Economic ideas. | 10. Humanism |
| 5. Education | 11. State activity |
| 6. Freedom of press | |