

Semester-2

Unit-I

Power

Power is the ability to make someone to do anything that he never intended to do. Power cannot be measured but is always based on social, political and economic achievements in a country. Power is always constant and dynamic.

In social science, politics, and ethics, **power** is the ability to coerce, influence or control the behavior of people. The term "authority" is often used for power perceived as legitimate by the social structure. Power can be seen as evil or unjust, but the exercise of power is conventionally accepted as endemic to humans as social beings. In business, power is often expressed as being "upward" or "downward". With downward power, a company's superior influences subordinate. When a company exerts upward power, it is the subordinates who influence the decisions of their leader or leaders.

The use of power need not involve force or the threat of force (coercion). At one extreme, it more closely resembles what English-speaking people might term influence or manipulation, although some authors distinguish "influence" as a means by which power is used.

Bases of Power

Social psychologists John R. P. French and Bertram Raven, in a now-classic study (1959), developed a schema of sources of power by which to analyse how power plays work (or fail to work) in a specific relationship.

According to French and Raven, power must be distinguished from influence in the following way: power is that state of affairs which holds in a given relationship, A-B, such that a given influence attempt by A over B makes A's desired change in B more

likely. Conceived this way, power is fundamentally relative – it depends on the specific understandings A and B each apply to their relationship, and, interestingly, requires B's recognition of a quality in A which would motivate B to change in the way A intends. A must draw on the 'base' or combination of bases of power appropriate to the relationship, to effect the desired outcome. Drawing on the wrong power base can have unintended effects, including a reduction in A's own power.

French and Raven argue that there are five significant categories of such qualities, while not excluding other minor categories. Further bases have since been adduced – in particular by Gareth Morgan in his 1986 book, *Images of Organization*.

Legitimate Power

Also called "Positional power," it is the power of an individual because of the relative position and duties of the holder of the position within an organization. Legitimate power is formal authority delegated to the holder of the position. It is usually accompanied by various attributes of power such as uniforms, offices etc.

Referent Power

Referent power is the power or ability of individuals to attract others and build loyalty. It is based on the charisma and interpersonal skills of the power holder. A person may be admired because of specific personal trait, and this admiration creates the opportunity for interpersonal influence. Here the person under power desires to identify with these personal qualities, and gains satisfaction from being an accepted follower. Nationalism and patriotism count towards an intangible sort of referent power. For example, soldiers fight in wars to defend the honor of the country. This is the second least obvious power, but the most effective. Advertisers have long used the referent power of sports figures for products endorsements, for example. The charismatic appeal of the sports star supposedly leads to an acceptance of the endorsement, although the individual may have little real credibility outside the sports arena. Abuse is possible when someone that is likable, yet lacks integrity and honesty, rises to power, placing them in a

situation to gain personal advantage at the cost of the group's position. Referent power is unstable alone, and is not enough for a leader who wants longevity and respect. When combined with other sources of power, however, it can help you achieve great success.

Expert Power

Expert power is an individual's power deriving from the skills or expertise of the person and the organization's needs for those skills and expertise. Unlike the others, this type of power is usually highly specific and limited to the particular area in which the expert is trained and qualified. When you have knowledge and skills that enable you to understand a situation, suggest solutions, use solid judgment, and generally outperform others, people will have reason to listen to you. When you demonstrate expertise, people tend to trust you and respect what you say. As a subject matter expert, your ideas will have more value, and others will look to you for leadership in that area.

Reward Power

Reward power depends on the ability of the power wielder to confer valued material rewards, it refers to the degree to which the individual can give others a reward of some kind such as benefits, time off, desired gifts, promotions or increases in pay or responsibility. This power is obvious but also ineffective if abused. People who abuse reward power can become pushy or be reprimanded for being too forthcoming or 'moving things too quickly'. If others expect that you'll reward them for doing what you want, there's a high probability that they'll do it. The problem with this basis of power is that you may not have as much control over rewards as you need. Supervisors probably don't have complete control over salary increases, and managers often can't control promotions all by themselves. And even a CEO needs permission from the board of directors for some actions. So when you use up available rewards, or the rewards don't have enough perceived value to others, your power weakens. (One of the frustrations of using rewards is that they often need to be bigger each time if they're to have the same motivational impact. Even then, if rewards are given frequently, people can become satiated by the reward, such that it loses its effectiveness).

Coercive Power

Coercive power is the application of negative influences. It includes the ability to demote or to withhold other rewards. The desire for valued rewards or the fear of having them withheld that ensures the obedience of those under power. Coercive power tends to be the most obvious but least effective form of power as it builds resentment and resistance from the people who experience it. Threats and punishment are common tools of coercion. Implying or threatening that someone will be fired, demoted, denied privileges, or given undesirable assignments – these are examples of using coercive power. Extensive use of coercive power is rarely appropriate in an organizational setting, and relying on these forms of power alone will result in a very cold, impoverished style of leadership.

Types of Power

Power can be of various types depends upon its source and backing. In general terms we can divide power into two forms:

- 1. Private Power:** Private power is known as the ability of a person to get some work done under the influence of his/her private property, force, ideology, economic means or social status.
- 2. Public Power:** Public power is generally known as the authority. Public power is the power possess by a person who is an official of a state and carrying the backup of law behind.

One can further divide the power into following types:

Political Power:

The analysts of power cannot restrict themselves to the realm of 'political power.' Economic and ideological forms of power also play a significant role as the support bases of political power. 'The concept of political power', in the words of Alan Ball, 'is key

concept in the study of politics for if politics is the resolution of conflict, the distribution of power within a political community determines how the conflict is to be resolved, and whether the resolution is to be effectively observed by all parties.’

In order to identify the nature and the essential features of political power it is necessary to distinguish between the formal and informal organs of such power. Legislature, executive and judiciary that are traditionally recognized organs of power in a state, represent the formal organs. Executive and Legislature, taken together, make laws, policies and decisions that regulate the allocation of values in a society. Thus, formal organs of political power play an effective role in a state.

Informal organs of political power are also important. They take the form of political parties in power and in opposition. They also represent a large number of pressure groups, public opinion, popular movements, etc. The political power is not the prerogative of the formal organs of the state alone. It is a known fact that in independent democratic states, public opinion, popular movements and organized interests directly influence the decision-making processes. Even in the international sphere, organized groups of nations exercise their influence on the super powers and make them change their economic and foreign policies.

Economic Power:

Economic power is the power that comes from the possession of material things, especially the major means of production and distribution. It is a significant factor that influences politics. Those who possess economic power in a liberal democracy exercise their influence on politics in variety of ways. The pressure groups that represent them are stronger, more organized and more vocal. Besides, the big business houses extend a large amount of financial help to political parties and even to the candidates seeking elections. The political class – the recipient of such help pay lip service to the interests of the masses but are secretly safeguard the interests of their financiers.

Ideological Power:

Ideological power helps to provide a more subtle base of political power. The set of ideas promoted by the ruling class in relation to the system of government constitute political ideology. The political ideology provides legitimacy to the ruling classes and helps them maintain their stronghold on political power. Political ideology not only upholds and promotes a set of beliefs, but it is always action oriented. It puts forward a 'cause' for which people are not only prepared to fight but even sacrifice their lives. However, ideology is often devoid of reasons. It picks certain convenient formulae and elevates them to the level of 'absolute truth' by exploiting people's sentiments. Thus, ideological power represents more often the manipulative power of the dominant class which holds sway on the thinking and emotions of the people.

Power should be used legitimately on citizens who in absolute trust, yielded their votes, support, time, energy and life to queue in order to elect their leaders. It should not be incessantly used to domineer. And any attempt to do this could be termed 'criminal and betrayal trust'. The essence of true power is to serve the people and not to sever the people's lives. It is to care for the people and not to crush them. So, any leader, be it a political, social, economical, traditional, etc., who uses power in direct opposite to the principle of the rule of law, only proves himself to be immature and incapable to lead.

Authority

The word **authority** (Derived from the Latin word *auctoritas*) can be used to mean power given by the state (in the form of government, judges, police officers, etc.) or by academic knowledge of an area (someone can be an authority on a subject).

Authority is a Power that is delegated formally. It includes a right to command a situation, commit resources, give orders and expect them to be obeyed; it is always accompanied by an equal responsibility for one's actions or a failure to act.

In government, the term authority is often used interchangeably with power. However, their meanings differ: while power is defined as "the ability to influence somebody to do something that he/she would not have done", authority refers to a claim of legitimacy, the justification and right to exercise that power. For example, while a mob has the power to punish a criminal, for example by lynching, people who believe in the rule of law consider that only a court of law has the authority to punish a criminal legally as the law says.

Since the emergence of social sciences, authority has become a subject of research in a variety of empirical settings: the family (parental authority), small groups (informal authority of leadership), intermediate organizations such as schools, churches, armies, industries and bureaucracies (organizational and bureaucratic authorities), and society-wide or inclusive organizations, ranging from the most primitive tribal society to the modern nation-state and intermediate organization (political authority).

The definition of authority in contemporary social science remains a matter of debate. According to Michaels in the *Encyclopedia of Social Sciences*, authority is the capacity, innate or acquired for exercising ascendancy over a group. Other scientists argue that authority is not a capacity but a relationship. It is power that is sanctioned and institutionalized.

Max Weber, in his sociological and philosophical work, identified and distinguished three types of legitimate domination (Herrschaft in German, which generally means 'domination' or 'rule'), that have sometimes been rendered in English translation as types of authority, because domination isn't seen as a political concept in the first place. Weber defined domination (authority) as the chance of commands being obeyed by a specifiable group of people. Legitimate authority is that which is recognized as legitimate and justified by both the ruler and the ruled.

Need of an authority in every organized life:

Every organized life requires a set of authority. A social organization like a family or a school, or a university, or a church, or an economic institution, such as a business company, or an industry, or a political institution like government, can function effectively only if there is a seat of authority, based on certain norms, rules and principles, which are observed with a fair degree of willingness. Such an authority can command obedience without use of brute force. The term 'authority' indicates the people who are considered as having the right to make pronouncement and thus such persons have the right to receive obedience as well.

Characteristics of Authority

1. **Legitimacy:** The first characteristic of the authority is that it carries the acceptance of the subjects comes under its area of influence. If it is not accepted to the subjects it is not authority but the power only.
2. **Dominance:** The authority dominates in its area and every action taken by it creates some kind of reflection of its dominance on the area and the subjects living in it.
3. **Reason:** Authority always carries proper reason to perform the actions it is performing.

4. **Responsibility:** Authority or the authorized person bears the load of responsibility as the person authorized is supposed to fulfill the desires of the people coming under the influence of its actions.
5. **Sanction:** Authority has the power or backing of the sanction as the person who is authorized avails the powers allotted by some other superior authority.
6. **Permanence:** Authority is permanent because the power of the authority comes with the position and the person only changes but the position stays forever.

Types of Authority

Weber divided legitimate authority into three types which are based upon its source:

- The first type discussed by Weber is **Rational-legal authority**. It is that form of authority which depends for its legitimacy on formal rules and established laws of the state, which are usually written down and are often very complex. The power of the rational legal authority is mentioned in the constitution. Modern societies depend on legal-rational authority. Government officials are the best example of this form of authority, which is prevalent all over the world.
- The second type of authority is **Traditional authority**, which derives from long-established customs, habits and social structures. When power passes from one generation to another, then it is known as traditional authority. The right of hereditary monarchs to rule furnishes an obvious example. The Tudor dynasty in England and the ruling families of Mewar, in Rajasthan (India) are some examples of traditional authority.
- The third form of authority is **Charismatic authority**. Here, the charisma of the individual or the leader plays an important role. Charismatic authority is that authority which is derived from "the gift of grace" or when the leader claims that his authority is derived from a "higher power" (e.g. God or natural law or rights) or "inspiration", that is superior to both the validity of traditional and rational-legal authority and followers

accept this and are willing to follow this higher or inspired authority, in the place of the authority that they have hitherto been following.

Authority is always legitimate. Authority is that point where the decisions are taken and authority is always based on consent. Authority is more democratic than power. Some scholars regard authority as a species of power. For example, Weldon defines authority as “power exercised with the general approval of the people concerned.”

Legitimacy

In political science, **legitimacy** is the popular acceptance of an authority, usually a governing law or a régime. Whereas "authority" denotes a specific position in an established government, the term "legitimacy" denotes a *system* of government — wherein "government" denotes "sphere of influence". Political legitimacy is considered a basic condition for governing, without which a government will suffer legislative deadlock(s) and collapse. In political systems where this is not the case, unpopular régimes survive because they are considered legitimate by a small, influential élite. In Chinese political philosophy, since the historical period of the Zhou Dynasty (1046–256 BC), the political legitimacy of a ruler and government was derived from the Mandate of Heaven, and unjust rulers who lost said mandate therefore lost the right to rule the people.

In moral philosophy, the term "legitimacy" is often positively interpreted as the normative status conferred by a governed people upon their governors' institutions, offices, and actions, based upon the belief that their government's actions are appropriate uses of power by a legally constituted government. In law, "legitimacy" is distinguished from "legality" (see color of law), to establish that a government action can be legal whilst not being legitimate; e.g., the Gulf of Tonkin Resolution, which allowed the United States to wage war against Vietnam without a formal declaration of war. It is also possible for a government action to be legitimate without being legal; e.g., a pre-emptive war, a military junta. An example of such matters arises when legitimate institutions clash in a constitutional crisis.

The Enlightenment-era British social philosopher John Locke (1632–1704) said that political legitimacy derives from popular explicit and implicit consent of the governed: "The argument of the *Treatise* is that the government is not legitimate unless it is carried on with the consent of the governed." The German political philosopher Dolf Sternberger said that "legitimacy is the foundation of such governmental power as is exercised, both with a consciousness on the government's part that it has a right to

govern, and with some recognition by the governed of that right." The American political sociologist Seymour Martin Lipset said that legitimacy also "involves the capacity of a political system to engender and maintain the belief that existing political institutions are the most appropriate and proper ones for the society." The American political scientist Robert A. Dahl explained legitimacy as a reservoir; so long as the water is at a given level, political stability is maintained, if it falls below the required level, political legitimacy is endangered.

The term legitimate comes from the Latin for 'lawful'. In the most basic sense, a state is legitimate if it exists and operates according to the law. But this definition is too shallow: if a country has no laws about how a government can come to power, then no matter how the government came to power, it will be legitimate. Or again, if a government is elected lawfully, but then changes the laws to create a police state ruled by a dictatorship, the dictatorship will be legitimate. But this is not what we mean by a legitimate government.

If a government is legitimate, then in some way, the fact that it has power is right or justified. If it is right it has power, then we can argue that we ought to obey it. If it is objectionable that it has power, then we don't have an obligation to obey it.

Sources of Legitimacy

Max Weber proposed that societies behave cyclically in governing themselves with different types of governmental legitimacy. That democracy was unnecessary for establishing legitimacy, a condition that can be established with codified laws, customs, and cultural principles, not by means of popular suffrage. That a society might decide to revert from the legitimate government of a rational–legal authority to the charismatic government of a leader; e.g., the Nazi Germany of Adolf Hitler, Fascist Italy under Benito Mussolini, and fascist Spain under General Francisco Franco.

The French political scientist Mattei Dogan's contemporary interpretation of Weber's types of political legitimacy (traditional, charismatic, legal-rational) proposes that they

are conceptually insufficient to comprehend the complex relationships that constitute a legitimate political system in the twenty-first century. Moreover, Dogan proposed that traditional authority and charismatic authority are obsolete as forms of contemporary government (e.g., the Islamic Republic of Iran (est. 1979) rule by means of the priestly Koranic interpretations by the Ayatollah Khomeini). That traditional authority has disappeared in the Middle East; that the rule-proving exceptions are Islamic Iran and Saudi Arabia. Furthermore, the third Weber type of political legitimacy, rational-legal authority, exists in so many permutations no longer allow it to be limited as a type of legitimate authority.

Types of Legitimacy

Legitimacy is "a value whereby something or someone is recognized and accepted as right and proper". In political science, legitimacy usually is understood as the popular acceptance and recognition by the public of the authority of a governing régime, whereby authority has political power through consent and mutual understandings, not coercion. The three types of political legitimacy described by German sociologist Max Weber are traditional, charismatic, and rational-legal:

- Traditional legitimacy derives from societal custom and habit that emphasize the history of the authority of tradition. Traditionalists understand this form of rule as historically accepted, hence its continuity, because it is the way society has always been. Therefore, the institutions of traditional government usually are historically continuous, as in monarchy and tribalism.
- Charismatic legitimacy derives from the ideas and personal charisma of the leader, a person whose authoritative persona charms and psychologically dominates the people of the society to agreement with the government's régime and rule. A charismatic government usually features weak political and administrative institutions, because they derive authority from the persona of the leader, and usually disappear without the leader

in power. However, if the charismatic leader has a successor, a government derived from charismatic legitimacy might continue.

- Rational-legal legitimacy derives from a system of institutional procedure, wherein government institutions establish and enforce law and order in the public interest. Therefore, it is through public trust that the government will abide the law that confers rational-legal legitimacy.

Unit-II

Liberty

LIBERTY: Liberty is derived from a Latin word “Liber”, which means free or independent. Being a theme emanating from a normative theory, a precise meaning cannot be arrived by liberty. The concept of liberty occupies a very important place in civics. It has made powerful appeal to every man in every age. It is the source of many wars and revolutions. In the name of liberty war, battles, revolutions and struggles have taken place in the history of mankind. Liberty means the unrestricted freedom of the individual to do anything he likes to do. But this sort of unrestricted liberty is not possible in society.

Liberty is not a license to do anything one pleases, as this would end up in anarchy, the very extreme of liberty. Restrictions are necessary in the interest of general welfare. They are imposed in the form of laws. Law is the condition of liberty. While laws are restrictions to liberty, it is imperative that, the so imposed laws are not unjust as excessive and stringent restrictions hamper the intellectual and moral growth of the individual. Liberty has two aspects. They are Negative aspect and Positive aspect.

DEFINITIONS OF LIBERTY: “Liberty means the power of doing what we ought to do” – Montesquieu.

“Liberty means the absence of restraints” – Prof Seely.

The meaning of liberty finds its positive affirmation in the thought of T.H.Green who describes it as the power to do or enjoy something that is worth doing or enjoying in common with others. Liberty is the eager maintenance of that atmosphere in which men have the opportunity to be their best selves.

Liberty means the positive power of doing or enjoying – T.H. Green.

Taken together, it must be understood that, liberty exists not merely in the absence of restraints but in the presence of opportunities as well. The following definition embraces both aspects of liberty.

“Liberty is the product of Rights. It is the maximum opportunity to do desired things with a minimum of controls and regulations consonant with a well – ordered society.

Negative and positive concepts:

The real meaning of liberty is involved in the dilemma of its negative and positive aspects and dimensions. In this regard, the question of the proper relationship between liberty and authority becomes significant. The negative dimension of liberty is contained in an affirmation of the ‘absence of restraint’ which in idealist terms means to hinder the hindrance to good life.” In this realm, Prof. Bernard Bosanquet’s version becomes pertinent when he says, “Liberty is an essential condition of life whereby man can seek the best possible development of his ‘self.’ While attempting to answer a pertinent question as to when a man is free he distinguishes between one’s ‘actual self’ and the ‘higher self’ that in fact guides and directs a rational purpose. Thus, liberty according to Bosanquet, is ‘a state of mind’ instead of an ‘absence of physical restraint.’

Even a person of socialist orientation like Laski treated liberty initially as set of restraints that seek to limit the authority of the state. However, later he revised his views when he introduces the element of ‘moral development’ of the personality of the individual in the real meaning of liberty. Again, in 1929, he seems to have further updated himself when he stated, “I mean by liberty the absence of restraint upon the existence of those social conditions which are the necessary guarantees of individual happiness”. However, Prof Isaiah Berlin identifies it with the ‘free choice’ of an individual. In this sense, liberty is the absences of obstacles to the fulfillment of a man’s desires”

KINDS OF LIBERTY:

To have an easy understanding, Liberty can be stated as “ a state of freedom especially opposed to political subjection, imprisonment, or slavery.

Writers like Mac Iver, Laski and others classified liberty in to specific varieties. They are,

1. Natural Liberty,

2. Social / Civil Liberty

3. Moral Liberty.

Social / Civil liberty if further classified in to

1. Person liberty

2 Political Liberty

3 Economic Liberty

4. Domestic Liberty

5. National Liberty

6. International Liberty

1. Natural Liberty: It implies complete freedom for a man to do what he wills. In other words, it means absence of all restraints and freedom from interferences. It may be easily understood that this kind of liberty is no liberty at all in as much as it is euphemism for the freedom of the forest. What we call liberty pertains to the realm of man’s social existence. This kind of liberty, in the opinions of the social contractualists like Hobbes, Locke and Rousseau was engaged by men living in the “state of nature” – since where ther was not state and society. This kind of liberty is not possible at present. Liberty cannot exist in the absence of state. Unlimited liberty might have been engaged only by few strong but not all.

2. Social Liberty: Social liberty relates to man's freedom in his life as a member of the social organization. As such, it refers to a man's right to do what he wills in compliance with the restraints imposed on him in the general interest. Civil or social liberty consists in the rights and privileges that the society recognizes and the state protects in the spheres of private and public life of an individual. Social liberty has the following sub categories:

(a) Personal Liberty: Personal liberty is an important variety of social liberty. It refers to the opportunity to exercise freedom of choice in those areas of a man's life that the results of his efforts mainly affect him in that isolation by which at least he is always surrounded.

(b) Political Liberty: It refers to the power of the people to be active in the affairs of the state. Political liberty is closely interlinked with the life of man as a citizen. Simply stated political liberty consists in provisions for universal adult franchise, free and fair elections, freedom for the avenues that make a healthy public opinion. As a matter of fact political liberty consists in curbing as well as constituting and controlling the government.

(c) Economic Liberty: It belongs to the individual in the capacity of a producer or a worker engaged in some gainful occupation or service. The individual should be free from the constant fear of unemployment and insufficiency.

(d) Domestic Liberty: It is a sociological concept that takes the discussion of liberty to the sphere of man's family life. It implies that all associations within the state, the miniature community of the family is the most universal and of the strongest independent vitality. Domestic liberty consists in **1.** Rendering the wife a fully responsible individual capable of holding property, suing and being sued, conducting business on her own account, and engaging full personal protection against her husband. **2.** is establishing marriage as far as the law is concerned on a purely contractual basis, and leaving the sacramental aspect of

marriage to the ordinance of the religion professed by the parties and 3. seeing the physical, mental and moral care of the children.

(e) National liberty: It is synonymous with national independence. As such, it implies that no nation should be under subjection of another. National movements or wars of independence can be identified as struggles for the attainment of national liberty. So national liberty is identified with patriotism.

(f) International Liberty: It means the world is free from controls and limitation, use of force has no value. Dispute can be settled through peaceful means. Briefly all countries in the world will be free of conflicts and wars. Peace will prevail. In the international sphere, it implies renunciation of war, limitation on the production of armaments, abandonment's of the use of force, and the pacific settlement of disputes. The ideal of international liberty is based on this pious conviction to that extent the world frees itself from the use of force and aggression it gains and peace is given a chance to establish itself.

3. Moral Liberty: This type of freedom is centered in the idealistic thoughts of thinkers from Plato and Aristotle in ancient times to Ruusseau, Kant, Hegel, Green and Bosanquet in modern times. moral liberty lies in man's capacity to act as per his rational self. Every man has a personality of his own. He seeks the best possible development of his personality. At the same time he desires the same thing for other. And more than this, he pays sincere respect for the real worth and dignity of his fellow beings. It is directly connected with man's self – realization.

Equality

Equality is an important theme of normative political theory, which also is an important ideal of democracy. This lesson examines and explains the different senses in which the concept of equality is used. The lesson also examines the relationship that exists between liberty and equality. Further it examines the measures by which equality is achieved.

Equality is a multiple dimensional concept. It possesses more than one meaning. In general terms it means that ‘whatever conditions are guaranteed to me, in the form of rights, shall also, and in the same measure, be guaranteed to others, and that whatever rights are given to others shall also be given to me’.

According to Oxford English Dictionary, the term equality dignity implies the following;

- i.) the condition of having equal dignity, rank or privileges with others;
- ii.) the condition of being equal in power, ability, achievement or excellence;
- iii.) fairness, impartiality due proportion, proportionateness;

Further, equality does not mean identical treatment as people differ in want, capacity and need. A mathematician, for instance, cannot be given an identical treatment with that of a brick layer. Similarly, equality does not mean an identity of reward. It no doubt, implies fundamentally a certain leveling process. The idea of equality has two sides- positive and negative. In a positive sense, equality means the provision of adequate opportunities for all. The term ‘adequate opportunities’ however is not a synonym of the term ‘equal opportunities’ as men differ in their needs and capacities and also in their efforts. They need different opportunities for their individual self-development. In a negative sense,

equality means the absence of undue privileges and arbitrary discrimination based on race, religion, and sex.

Equal opportunities for all, according to some scholars in fact refers to appropriate opportunities for all. The idea of equality of opportunity demands that factors like wealth or birth or class should not determine or limit one's opportunities. It means that each person should have equal rights and opportunities to his own talents or to lead a good life and develop his personality. J. Rees however, says while natural inequalities of physical strength, beauty etc. has to be accepted but social inequalities are alterable. In this background the concept of reverse discrimination or compensatory justice favoring some oppressed communities with a view to undoing centuries old injustice done to them or to raise them to the level of others, has also been justified. However, there are differing views, which state that granting privileges to individuals because of their race or sex is as discriminatory and unjust as denying them opportunity and jobs for the same reasons. In the end, it must be acknowledged that the idea of equality implies that all human beings should be treated equally in respect of certain fundamental traits common to all like human nature, human worth and dignity, human personality, etc. Immanuel Kant, the father of modern idealism rightly says, "treat humanity in every case as an end, never solely as a means.

DEFINITION OF EQUALITY:

Equality means, that whatever conditions are guaranteed to us, in the form of rights, shall also in the same measure be guaranteed to others, and that whatever rights are given to others shall also be given to us.

"The Right to Equality proper is a right of equal satisfaction of basic human needs, including the need to develop and use capacities which are specifically human." -D.D Raphall

“Equality means that no man shall be so placed in society that he can over-reach his neighbour to the extent which constitutes a denial of latter’s citizenship.” -Laski

“Equality means equal rights for all the people and the abolition of all special rights and privileges”. -Barker

Equality like liberty is an important theme of democracy. Liberty and equality were understood to be one. Both the terms were considered to be of great importance since 19th century. Broadly speaking, equality implies a coherence of ideas that cover spheres ranging from man’s search for the development of his personality in the society in which the strong and the weak live together, and both have the right of being heard.

Theory of Equality: Men are equal on their broad relationship in society. It is true that no government can equate dwarf to a tall man, and a stout to a lean man, but social institutions can extend to each individual, the status and the dignity of a human being, Viewed thus, the idea of equality has two side – positive and negative that may be discussed as under:

KINDS OF EQUALITY: There are different kinds of equality. They are,

Natural Equality: Natural equality rests on the principle that nature has created every one as equals. On the contrary, in reality we can seldom find such equality, as the world is prone with more inequalities than equality. People differ greatly in their intelligence, height, colour, physical strength and mental makeup. Natural equality is meant as the provision of equal treatment and equal opportunities to all human beings, irrespective of natural differences.

Civil Equality: It implies of all before law. Irrespective of their status and position, all people should be treated equal and no discrimination should be made on the basis of caste, creed, sex place of birth etc. Equal rights should be available to all the people and nobody should be denied enjoyment of any right.

Political Equality: Political equality is best guaranteed in a democracy. All citizens should have the right to participate in all affairs of the state without any discrimination on grounds of sex, race, religion, creed etc. Everything should be open to all people. It means the enjoyment of political rights such as right to vote, right to contest in the election, right to hold public offices etc. It enables people's political participation and the principle of universal adult franchise is a manifestation of political equality.

Social Equality: Social equality implies that no one should be regarded as high or low on the basis of his caste, colour, race or religion and no one person should be given special privileges on any of these consideration. It stands for equality of status and absence of social barriers. It implies the abolition of social distinctions and strives for the establishment of class less society. In reality, there is no social equality as the Indian society is divided into different castes.

Economic Equality: It means that there should be equal opportunity to all citizens in matters of availability of consumer goods, wealth and property. Similarly everyone should have the same facility for jobs, work and in industry. There should be equal wages for equal work.

International Equality: In means the principle of equality shall be extended to all people in all the countries. The same is true of nations and states. There cannot be different treatment between states and between peoples.

OBJECTIVES OF EQUALITY: Equality has the following objectives:

1. No individual or group of individuals is vested with special privileges that are not available to other members of the society.
2. Everyone must be provided with adequate opportunities for the development of their personalities.

3. There should be no discrimination among the people. Even if there is any discrimination, it should be based on reasonable grounds.

4. Rights must be granted to all equally and all must have equal access to opportunities leading to authority.

LIBERTY AND EQUALITY: there is no consensus among the scholars of political science regarding the understanding of the relation between liberty and equality. They hold the view that liberty is against equality. They do not go together. They cannot exist side by side. However there can be no equality without liberty. Liberty is very essential for achieving equality.

Justice

JUSTICE : The important elements of justice are,

1. Law
2. Liberty
3. Rights
4. Equality

This includes fraternity also, in this section relevant aspects of justice are described.

Origin of Justice: Justice is derived from Latin “Justitia” meaning the idea of the word of joining or fitting, the idea of bond or tie. Justice is an important concept in politics, philosophy, law and ethics.

It has been analysed and defined by different philosophers in different ways. The quest for justice began with the beginning of human thinking. Justice has been understood differently in different contexts. There are many wars, struggles, revolutions and social movements, which were inspired by the idea of justice as well as other ideals like liberty and equality. Of all other ideals to understand the political civilization of a nation, we tend to focus on the degree of justice as realized in its judicial administration and social and political life, both as between the private citizens and the wielders of governmental authority.

The term justice has not remained static rather it has changed with the change of time and circumstances. It is closely associated with the religion, morality, equality, liberty, property, law, politics and economic system.

Different social systems perceive different conceptions of justice. In this lesson we shall study about the sources of justice, the relevance of justice in a society and about legal justice which is one among the different kinds of justice.

MEANING OF JUSTICE:

It is difficult to give a precise meaning of the term 'Justice'. Political thinkers and jurists had given different meanings and definitions. The reason for this is that the contents and implications of justice differ from country to country and also form time to time.

What was justice in the past is not justice in the present day. Therefore it is difficult to define justice. In the ordinary sense justice means to give an aggrieved party what is due to it and punish an individual or a group of individuals or an agency whenever and offence is committed.

This is done on the basis of the law and in accordance with the basic principles of justice.

There are three kinds of justice according to Aristotle. They are.

- 1. Retributive justice:** This giving punishment to an individual for the crime committed by him.
- 2. Compensatory justice:** This is a principle which suggests giving compensation to a victim of a crime (or a criminal).
- 3. Redistributive justice:** According to this principle benefits and burdens are redistributed.

Aristotle's ideas in morals and justice are found in his book entitled "Nichomachean Ethics". There are thinkers like Adam Smith and John Rawls who had dealt with justice.

SOURCES OF JUSTICE: sources of justice mean the sources of the idea of justice. Sir Ernest Barker has identified that there are four sources of the idea of the justice. They are:

1. Religion
2. Nature
3. Economics and
4. Ethics

1. Religion as the origin of Justice: Religion has always have been important source of justice. St. Thomas Aquinas of the great Roman Church in the middle ages had maintained that the words and deeds of Jesus, church fathers and preachers formed the basis of law and consequently of justice. The Catholic church head, the pope is regarded even today as the fountain of justice. Similar are the views of the leaders of other religions of the world. In Hinduism Manu is regarded as the ancient law giver. This the scriptures of all religions and the preachings of religious leaders have always the force of law and justice.

2. Law of nature: It is another source of justice. Survival of the fittest, law of the jungle and might is right are sayings which refer to how justice was rendered where there was no civilized government. Besides there is in the heart of every human being a sense of doing the right and avoiding doing the wrong. This has led to concepts like, “man is free”, ‘man should be treated equal’, and ‘man’s brotherhood’.

3. Economics is another source of justice. Man by nature and needs, to satisfy his hunger and in course of time to improve his standard of living enters into economic activities. When several men and organizations attempt to do the same, differences, conflicts and clashes take place. These lead to settlement procedures. These form the basis of justice and law.

4. Ethics: This is yet another source of justice. The underlying principle is that rendering of justice should have its bases on morals and sense of doing the right thing. No one should be punished for an offence which he has not committed or not done. But the guilty should not be left out without punishment. This kind of justice based on ethics first

originated in England when there was no democracy. The king or queen in England was regarded as the “keeper of the conscience” and “fountain of justice”.

Evolution of justice:

Justice is essentially a normative concept, cutting across the domains of religion, ethics and law, though its ramifications cover social, political and economic domains. So great is the diversity of its connotations that it is not easy to abstract to one specific meaning. Generally justice is associated with judicial organizations.

JUSTICE AND SOCIETY:

Availability of equal opportunities for the development of personality to all the people in society, without any discrimination on the basis of caste, colour, sex or race. The name given to such a manifestation of justice so as to fulfill the above said purpose, is called social justice.

In India, the social stratification is visibly seen to have numerous fragmentation and inequality. The pursuit of the nation by and large in the context of a welfare state is to ensure “social justice” to every man. No one should be deprived of justice because of these differences. Social justice is essential for the enjoyment of social equality and social rights. These are dependent on economic equality and rights.

Justice can be ensured in a society only when the social system is free from exploitation of man by man, and where the privileges of the few are not built upon the miseries of the many. It is pertinent to mention the words of Daniel Webster who said “Justice is the cheapest interest of man.”

LEGAL JUSTICE: Legal justice is categorized as one among the various kinds of justice such as natural, political, social economic, administrative, distributive, and corrective justice. Legal justice is related to the law making process and the judicial system of society. It has two specific meanings:

1. Law should be reasonable,
2. Each one should get justice according to law.

1. Law should be reasonable: Legislature is the law making body of the state. The laws made by the legislature should be rational and reasonable. Laws should be equal of all and there should not be any unreasonable, and unjustifiable discriminations, since the sole purpose of law was the well being of the whole community, these should be equal for equals and unequal for unequals. Often laws are made to deal with outmoded social customs. Sometimes laws are made to fight against those reactionary, inhuman religious and social practices which hinder social development. These laws are not generally accepted by conservative forces and vested interests and are opposed by them. But this does not affect the rationality of the laws. If the laws must be rational and just, the law making institutions should be rational and just. In modern times it is well accepted that the right to make laws should be vested only with the representatives of the people. This is one of the features of democracy. In many liberal democracies, the independent and impartial judiciary is authorized to look into the justifiability of the laws made by legislatures. The judiciary is regarded as the watchdog of the constitution and the protector of rights. In such democracies often, the legislature and judiciary get into conflict with each other which may lead to a deadlock, hampering good governance, for which the legislature and judiciary exist in any democracy.

2. Each one should get justice according to law: This implies that each one should be able to have impartial justice from the judicial system. It means equal protection of law. There are two requirements for equal protection of law. Firstly judicial process should be simple and it should not be costly. For a poor man, it is cheaper to suffer injustice than to have justice through the judicial process. This should be removed and every man should be ensured justice in the most viable way. Secondly the other requirement of justice through the courts is that the courts should be independent and impartial.

The executive should not have control over the judiciary. The theory of separation of powers is intended to maintain the independence of the judiciary. For the impartiality of the judiciary, the pay, service conditions and the qualifications of judges should be proper, so that they may decide cases without any pulls, pressures or strains.

Unit-III

Political Culture

Political culture consists of people's shared, learned beliefs about their political system and their role within that system. Political culture influences the way people see their political world. Political culture also influences what people value most in their political world. Some political cultures place a high value on individual freedom while other cultures prize community solidarity.

These political values shape people's roles and behavior within their political world. For example, societies that prize community solidarity expect the individual to be part of a community, to define themselves as members of a community, and to participate in community life.

Gabriel Almond and Sydney Verba, two pioneering scholars, identified five important dimensions of political culture:

1. a sense of national identity
2. attitudes toward one's self as a participant in political life
3. attitudes toward one's fellow citizens
4. attitudes and expectations regarding governmental output and performance, and
5. attitudes toward and knowledge about the political process of decision making.

Political culture is defined by the *International Encyclopedia of the Social Sciences* as the "set of attitudes, beliefs and sentiments that give order and meaning to a political process and which provide the underlying assumptions and rules that govern behavior in the political system". It encompasses both the political ideals and operating norms of a polity. Political culture is thus the manifestation of the psychological and

subjective dimensions of politics. A political *culture* is the product of both the history of a political system and the histories of the members. Thus it is rooted equally in public events and private experience.

María Eugenia Vázquez Semadeni defines political culture as "the set of discourses and symbolic practices by means of which both individuals and groups articulate their relationship to power, elaborate their political demands and put them at stake."

The term political culture was brought into political science to promote the American political system. The concept was used by Gabriel Almond in the late 50s, and outlined in *The Civic Culture* (1963, Almond & Verba).

The clearest definition of a **political culture** is a distinctive and patterned way of thinking about how political and economic life ought to be carried out. One might, at this point, think of labels like 'Republican,' 'Democrat,' or something similar. But it's important to point out that a political culture is *not* the same thing as a political ideology.

Political culture is the set of attitudes, beliefs, and sentiments which give order and meaning to a political process and which provide the underlying assumptions and rules that govern behavior in the political system. It encompasses both the political ideals and the operating norms of a polity. Political culture is thus the manifestation in aggregate form of the psychological and subjective dimensions of politics. A political culture is the product of both the collective history of a political system and the life histories of the members of that system, and thus it is rooted equally in public events and private experiences.

Political culture is a recent term which seeks to make more explicit and systematic much of the understanding associated with such long-standing concepts as political

ideology, national ethos and spirit, national political psychology, and the fundamental values of a people. Political culture, by embracing the political orientations of both leaders and citizens, is more inclusive than such terms as political style or operational code, which focus on elite behavior. On the other hand, the term is more explicitly political and hence more restrictive than such concepts as public opinion and national character.

The concept of political culture can be seen as a natural evolution in the growth of the behavioral approach in political analysis, for it represents an attempt to apply to problems of aggregate or systemic analysis the kinds of insights and knowledge which were developed initially by studying the political behavior of individuals and small groups.

More specifically, the concept of political culture was developed in response to the need to bridge a growing gap in the behavioral approach between the level of microanalysis, based on the psychological interpretations of the individual's political behavior, and the level of macro analysis, based on the variables common to political sociology. In this sense the concept constitutes an attempt to integrate psychology and sociology so as to be able to apply to dynamic political analysis both the revolutionary findings of modern depth psychology and recent advances in sociological techniques for measuring attitudes in mass societies. Within the discipline of political science, the emphasis on political culture signals an effort to apply an essentially behavioral form of analysis to the study of such traditional problems as political ideology, legitimacy, sovereignty, nationhood, and the rule of law.

The political scientist Daniel J. Elazar (1934–1999) was a pioneer in the study of political culture. In the course of his work he identified four types of political culture: individualist, statist, civic republican, and traditionalist.

In an individualistic political culture, the person is treated as an individual on his or her own terms. The central value is the liberty and integrity of the individual in society.

In a statist culture, people are raised to believe that the individual should serve the interests of government and other institutions of the state. Statist systems have adopted a wide range of ideologies from communism to fascism. Respect for the rule of law and an orderly society are the primary values of statist cultures. Loss of individual freedom is the price.

In a republican culture, the ideal society is a free republic of virtuous citizens who are dedicated to the common good of the community. The good citizen exhibits civic virtue putting the good of the community over himself, and by taking an active role in the community.

A traditionalistic culture seeks to preserve customs and traditions of the past. Its members accept those traditions as rules of behavior. They venerate those traditions and seek to preserve them. Traditions provide the answers to how society should be governed, how justice should be administered, and the relationship of the individual and society. In a traditionalistic culture, the image of the good society is an extended family in which everyone performs their assigned role, authority figures are respected, people are bound together by social ties, and the status quo is preserved.

Types of Political Culture

Different typologies of political culture have been proposed. According to political scientist William S. Stewart, all political behavior can be explained as participating in one or more of eight political cultures: anarchism, oligarchy, Tory corporatism, fascism, classical liberalism, radical liberalism, democratic socialism, and Leninist socialism. Societies that exemplify each of these cultures have existed historically.

Gabriel Almond and Sidney Verba in *The Civic Culture* outlined three pure types of political culture based on level and type of political participation and the nature of people's attitudes toward politics:

- **Parochial-** Where citizens are only remotely aware of the presence of central government, and live their lives near enough regardless of the decisions taken by the state, distant and unaware of political phenomena. They have neither knowledge nor interest in politics. This type of political culture is in general congruent with a traditional political structure.
- **Subject-** Where citizens are aware of central government, and are heavily subjected to its decisions with little scope for dissent. The individual is aware of politics, its actors and institutions. It is affectively oriented towards politics, yet he is on the "downward flow" side of the politics. In general congruent with a centralized authoritarian structure.
- **Participant-** Citizens are able to influence the government in various ways and they are affected by it. The individual is oriented toward the system as a whole, to both the political and administrative structures and processes (to both the input and output aspects). In general congruent with a democratic political structure.

Almond and Verba wrote that these types of political culture can combine to create the civic culture, which mixes the best elements of each.

Arend Lijphart wrote that there are different classifications of political culture:

- First classification:
 - Mass political culture
 - Elite political culture
- Second classification (of elite political culture):
 - coalitional
 - contradictory
- Lijphart also classified the structure of society:

- homogeneous
- heterogeneous

Political Socialization

Political socialization is a lifelong process by which individuals learn political attitudes and behaviors. It is part of the broader socialization process whereby an individual becomes a member of a particular society and takes on its values and behaviors. Social and cultural conditions mediate political socialization.

Political socialization is the “study of the developmental processes by which people of all ages and adolescents acquire political cognition, attitudes, and behaviors”. It refers to a learning process by which norms and behavior acceptable to a well running political system are transmitted from one generation to another. It is through the performance of this function that individuals are inducted into the political culture and their orientations towards political objects are formed.

Political socialization is the process by which political culture is transmitted in a given society. It occurs at both the individual and community level, and it extends beyond the acquisition of political culture to encompass the learning of more sophisticated political ideas and orientations. Political socialization is a lifelong process and a variety of individuals and institutions contribute to its shaping effect. For example, individuals are politically socialized by such groups as their family, peers, and social class. Furthermore, they are socialized by existing laws, media, religion, education, their own gender, and more. Basically, the process is never ending and the factors which shape it are all encompassing.

Those groups and institutions which contribute to the process of political socialization are known as the agents of socialization. These sources affect the development of political values and attitudes differently, but they all contribute to the individual's understanding of and orientations toward politics. The primary agents of socialization are those that directly develop specific political orientations such as the family. Whereas, the secondary

agents of socialization tend to be less personal and involved in the process of socialization in a more indirect manner such as the media.

Basic political attitudes and values tend to be formed early in childhood and tend to be relatively consistent throughout life. Thus, the family is a very important agent of political socialization. However, the degree to which these basic political orientations are retained by the individual varies as a result of the discontinuities one experiences in their political socialization. Hence, this is where the other agents of political socialization become fundamental factors in one's political development.

Agents of Political Socialization

People are not born with political ideas, nor do we manufacture them: We learn them through a process called political socialization. Beginning in early childhood and throughout our lives we are exposed to a variety of individuals and groups known as agents for political socialization. These individuals or groups teach us about their political opinions and the workings of the political system. Some of these agents have a greater impact on our independent personal beliefs than others. Agents for political socialization include; our families, schools, peer groups, media, and secondary groups.

Family

The family plays a major role as an agent for political socialization, because it has the earliest access and most influence. Through parents children can feel a sense of belonging to a particular political party. This feeling of belonging can become very resistant to change throughout their adult lives. When parents discuss their political opinions in the home; their children absorb this information and tend to adopt their views.

Educational Institutions

The schools do not play an important role in influencing individuals' opinion however; they provide political education within a neutral environment. Schools generally teach

children the values of the community in which they live. They provide children with civics classes and many socializing experiences. In civics classes children are taught how to comprehend and participate in the political world. They are taught many of the rituals and symbols of government. This produces in many children a supportive attitude toward the government.

Peer Groups

As children grow older and spend less time in the home with their parents, peer groups begin to play an important role. They become a major social influence, as people tend to identify with their peer groups. Peer groups have the most impact when they get involved with political discussions and/or activities. These discussions and/or activities can be a major cause for change in an individual's political concerns and opinions.

Media

Newspapers, radio, and television are part of our everyday lives. They offer information that keeps us informed about the political activities of our world. Although the media offers a vast amount of information most people use it primarily for entertainment purposes. When people use the media for information they tend to select only what interests them and supports their particular political views.

When a major political event occurs within our lifetime, the media is generally the only source we have to gain information. The media does however have a major flaw in that sometimes it can cause people to become disaffected and cynical with the continuous coverage of lengthy campaigns and political scandals.

Secondary Groups

A secondary group is a group that individuals join voluntarily. People belong to many different types of organizations; some of these have an impact on their political views while others have no impact.

A secondary group may have an impact if an individual can identify the groups' values and relate it to an aspect of politics. This is most likely to occur if the group engages in political activities designed to promote their specific ideas.

There are some secondary groups that an individual may choose to join that merely joins together people who already hold the same values and objectives. Since these people already have the same opinions there are not likely to form new ones, but they tend to reinforce the beliefs and opinions the members already have formed.

Agents for political socialization influence every individual, and continue to influence us throughout our entire lifetime as our knowledge and values change in response to life's changes.

Types of Political Socialization

1. Manifesto or Formal
2. Non-manifesto or informal

Political Modernization

Modernization originally referred to the contrast and transition between a 'traditional' agrarian society and the kind of 'modern' society that is based on trade and industry. A traditional society is 'vertically' organized by hierarchical division by class or caste — a specialization of prestige. But a modern society is 'horizontally' organized by function, such that the major functions are performed by modular social systems. These major social systems include the political system, the public administration (civil service), the armed forces, the legal system, the economy, religion, education, the health service and the mass media. So, while a traditional society is like a pyramid of top-down authority, a modern society is more like a mosaic held together by the cement of mutual inter-dependence.

A further contrast is that traditional societies consist of a single, unified system with a single centre of power; while a modern society is composed of a plurality of autonomous systems which interact with each other, influence each other, but do not absorb each other. Modern societies are fundamentally heterogeneous with multiple centres of power; and this is no accident but intrinsic to their nature.

Political Modernization

The political aspects of modernization refer to the ensemble of structural and cultural changes in the political system of modernizing societies. The political system comprises of all those activities, processes, institutions and beliefs concerned with the making and execution of authoritative policy and the pursuit and attainment of collective goals. Political structure consists of the patterning and interrelationship of political roles and processes; political culture is the complex of prevailing attitudes, beliefs and values concerning the political system.

The overall process of modernization refers to the changes in all institutional spheres of a society resulting from man's expanding knowledge of and control over his environment.

Political modernization refers to those processes of differentiation of political structure and secularization of political culture which enhance the capacity – the effectiveness and efficiency of performance –of a society's political system.

The political framework of modernization is essentially rooted in the changing sources of legitimation of authority and process of its diffusion and centrality in the social structure. In a society having a traditional polity source of power is in the traditionally established and institutionalized offices of kings or chiefs. In such a system authority has a hierarchical character and not consensual.

Democratic political framework radically alters such role structure with regard to power. Power ceases to have a closed hierarchical characters, the sphere of political action is broadened to the level of mass participation.

Political modernization can be viewed from historical, typological and evolutionary perspectives.

Historical political modernization

It refers to the totality of changes in political structure and culture which characteristically have affected or have been affected by those major transformative processes of modernization like secularization, commercialization, industrialization etc which were first launched in Western Europe in the 16th century and which subsequently have spread, unevenly and incompletely throughout the world.

Typological political modernization

It refers to the process of transmutation of a pre modern traditional polity into a post traditional modern polity.

Evolutionary political modernization

It refers to that open-ended increase in the capacity of political man to develop structures to cope with or resolve problems to absorb and adapt to continuous change and to strive purposively and creatively for the attainment of new societal goals. From the historical and typological perspectives political modernization is a process of development toward some image of modern polity.

Major characteristics of political modernization

As the dominant empirical trend in the historic evolution of modern society, differentiation refers to the process of progressive separation and specialization of roles, institutional spheres and associations in the development of political systems. It includes such universals as social stratification and the separation of occupational roles from kinship and domestic life, the separation of an integrated system of universalistic legal norms from religion, the separation of religion and ideology and differentiation between administrative structure and public political competition. It implies greater functional specialization, structural complexity and interdependence and heightened effectiveness of political organization in both administrative and political spheres.

The second is the notion of equality as the central ethos and ethical imperative pervading the operative ideals of all aspects of modern life. Equality is the ethos of modernity; the quest for it and its realization are at the core of the politics of modernization. It includes the notion of universal adult citizenship, the prevalence of universalistic legal norms in the government's relation with the citizenry and the predominance of achievement criteria in recruitment and allocation to political and administrative roles. Even though these attributes of equality are only imperfectly realized in the modern politics, they continue to operate as the central standards and imperatives by which modernization is measured and political legitimacy established. Popular participation or involvement in the political system is a central theme in most definitions of political modernization.

The third characteristic is that of capacity as the constantly increasing adaptive and creative potentialities possessed by man for the manipulation of his environment. The acquisition of enhanced political administrative capacity is the third major feature of political modernization. It is characterized by an increase in scope of polity functions, in the scale of the political community, in the efficacy of the implementation of political and administrative decisions in the penetrative power of central governmental institutions and in the comprehensiveness of the aggregation of interests by political associations. The political modernization process can be viewed as an interminable interplay among the process of differentiation, the imperatives and realizations of equality and the integrative, adaptive and creative capacity of a political system. Political modernization is the progressive acquisition of a consciously sought and qualitatively new and enhanced, political capacity as manifested in the effective institutionalization of new patterns of integration and penetration regulating and containing the tensions and conflicts produced by the processes of differentiation and of new patterns of participation and resource distribution adequately responsive to the demands generated by the imperatives of equality and the continuous flexibility to set and achieve new goals.

The old traditional authority structures –feudal or religious authorities close their importance. A single, secular and national political authority emerges and there is centralization of authority. There is a growth of a network of differentiated and specialized political and bureaucratic institutions to meet the challenges of ever changing political system. There is increased differentiation and specialization of political and bureaucratic institutions.

There is a growing involvement and participation of people in the modern political system. The main agents to bring about the process of modernization in the political system are: colonialism, elites, revolutionary leaders, political parties, military and bureaucracy.

Since modernization is dynamic, it is more useful to consider modernization as a process than as a state. A 'modern' society based on the process of modernization: this is 'modernity'. Modernization can be seen as the general mechanism by which the social transformation from agricultural dominance to domination by trade and industry takes place, and the permanent continuation of this process. The same way, political modernization reflects the transformation in political trends and operations. Rationalization of authority, differentiation of structures and expansion in people's participation are general terms found in a politically modernize society.

Liberalism

Though liberalism is a well-known political doctrine especially in the context of democracy, it is not exactly a well structured ideology in the sense Marxism, socialism or fascism are. It is more like an umbrella school of thought that is based on the ideas of liberty and equality that themselves may have varied subtexts relative to worldview of the liberal thinkers defining them. The term is rooted in the Latin word *liber*, which means free. Thus, the English term 'liberalism' entails the existence of a democratic order wherein people enjoy various sorts of freedom besides being politically and socially equal. Liberalism that is majorly associated with Western liberal democracies invariably favours free market economy or markets with limited and reasonable state control, constitutionalism, free and fair elections, freedom of religion and protection of human rights.

Liberalism as a political ideology, in fact, made its appearance after European Renaissance and its resultant phase, the Age of Enlightenment, which had demolished many metaphysical theories that, until then, had their sway in almost all human affairs. For instance, the Divine Origin Theory that had politically empowered the church and justified absolute monarchy as a legitimate form of government came to be discredited in the writings of John Locke who was the earliest British liberal thinker and is rightfully called the father of liberalism. In place of Divine Origin Theory, Locke presented his Theory of Social Contract that had significant liberal principles such as natural rights of people including right to life, liberty and property, rule of law and a government with the consent of the governed. Subsequently, liberalism was the driving force behind American and French Revolutions whose perpetrators were hugely inspired by liberal ideas to cause the downfall of unjust and oppressive rules. Quite a few governments in Europe and Americas became committed to liberalism in the nineteenth century. Though liberalism had to face serious challenges from other political ideologies such as communism and fascism in nineteenth and twentieth centuries, it managed to withstand the onslaughts. As a result of this, in the present day world liberalism has a dominant presence in many countries.

Core Ideas of Liberalism:

Though a few ideas that are essential notions of liberalism such as equal rights of men, freedom of speech and freedom of the governed could be traced in some of the philosophical and intellectual traditions of Ancient Greece, as a political ideology it is a modern concept that emerged in the seventeenth century. Since then it has stirred the intellectual faculties of quite a few thinkers across the world who put forth a sizable body of various and sometimes differing ideas that constitute the principles of liberalism. Nevertheless, the wide array of ideas makes the task presenting a compact definition of liberalism a daunting exercise. It is not surprising, therefore, that one notices "separate and often contradictory streams of thought" as part of liberalism.

In spite of the fact that liberalism appears to be an amalgamation of varied and differing notions, we can still identify some core ideas that are the essentials of the ideology. It is widely held that liberalism is "a philosophy about the meaning of humanity and society." According to John Gray, a renowned political thinker, individualism, egalitarianism and universalism are prominent components of liberalism. Individualism asserts the dignity and worth of individual that should not be undermined because of the coercion of society. An individual despite his social standing, political views and economic status must have the freedoms that are available to everyone in a democratic polity. Egalitarianism is one of the cardinal principles of liberalism. In the absence of social and political equality one cannot imagine the existence of a liberal democracy. It must, however, be underscored that liberal thinkers do not usually stress on economic egalitarianism for quite a few of them believe that any project that seeks to establish economic equality conversely injures the principle of individual liberty. However, all the liberal thinkers do not hold such a view; a few of them, in response to the problems of the underdeveloped and developing nations, approve of economic equity rather than economic equality. Social equality is characterised by weakening the primacy of racial, religious, linguistic, (in case of India, casteist) and gender differences for the sake of a society based on true social egalitarianism. Weakening of religious primacy is a very significant factor because it

helps establish a secular society and polity that is one of the hallmarks of liberalism. The principle of universal adult suffrage epitomises the gist of political egalitarianism. Additionally, the electoral process must be truly transparent and free wherein political parties representing varied political ideologies should have complete freedom to compete and contest.

The three famous thinkers of the Age of Enlightenment viz. Thomas Hobbes, John Locke and Jean Jacques Rousseau laid down the foundation of political liberalism. Of the three the first two are significant from the point of view of early phase of liberalism. Though their theories of Social Contract differ from each other in many respects, they were among the earliest thinkers who released socio-political affairs from the clutches of religion and helped develop political discourse on secular lines. Hobbes theory of social contract revealed the origin and ends of the state and also ascertained the justification for the existence of political authority. However, Hobbes was not exactly a liberal thinker as he held that absolute monarchy was the ideal form of government. John Locke's prominence as a founding thinker of British liberalism is because of his insistence on certain natural rights such as right to life, liberty and property, which according to him are inalienable and the political authority cannot abrogate them under any circumstances. Moreover, Locke had underlined the rights of the people to constantly monitor the functioning of the political authority and remove from power a corrupt ruler. His social contract was based on the availability of natural rights to the people and rule of law which have ultimately become the core principles of liberalism. Locke's advocacy for a responsible political authority helped develop the concept of a limited government, another principle of liberalism that was very much favoured by the liberal intellectuals till the end of the nineteenth century.

Among the prominent liberals who expounded their thought between seventeenth and nineteenth centuries particularly in England, the contributions of two of them is monumental in the history of liberalism. Adam Smith lived and wrote at a time when industrialism was in the initial stages. Through his concept of *laissez-faire* he advocated a bare minimum state control in the economic affairs. He fervently argued for commercial

activities that should be absolutely free of state interference. John Stuart Mill originally belonged to the school of utilitarianism. However, the publication of his remarkable essay, *On Liberty*, in 1859 made him one of the tallest liberal thinkers. Dealing with the most significant principle of liberalism Mill argued, "the only freedom which deserves the name, is that of pursuing our own good in our own way." Thus, the combination of *laissez faire* with the passionate advocacy of Mill for liberty produced the kind of liberalism that was firmly embedded in capitalism. During the twentieth century Friedrich Hayek, who later came to be associated with neoliberalism, was the prominent exponent of this brand of liberalism. In his book, *The Road to Serfdom*, published in 1944, Hayek contended that creation of free markets serves as a deterrent to the emergence of a totalitarian government. This is, however, considered to be a negative version of liberalism. In the late nineteenth century, a British thinker, Thomas Hill Green presented his positive version of liberalism by rejecting the cardinal idea of negative liberalism that an individual is always driven by self-interest. Green also emphasised on the moral facet of human personality. He provided enough space to society and state in ensuring individual liberty and human dignity. Green's views majorly influenced the modern version of liberalism.

Most liberals believed that limitation on governmental authority would automatically ensure the corresponding increase in the freedom of the people. Consequently, thinkers such as Baron de Montesquieu and James Madison put forth theories of 'separation of powers' suggesting that the powers of the three organs of the government--legislature, executive and judiciary-- must be separated to circumvent the possibility of a government turning into an absolute dictatorial machinery. The adherents of social liberalism have an abiding faith in a limited constitutional government that also makes available social services with the purpose of protecting equal rights of the people. Modern school of liberalism which is often called Social Liberalism, recommends a larger and effective role of the government in the economic affairs of the state because in the absence of economic and material benefits, mere constitutional guarantees of individual rights become a charade. Modern school of liberalism firmly establishes a link with a liberal

democracy which is diametrically opposed to what Mills called as the tyranny of majority. Modern liberals such as Alexis de Tocqueville keenly insist that a democracy committed to liberalism must create proper safeguards to protect the right of the minorities.

Liberty and equality have always been the central ideas of liberalism while various thinkers have kept adding other notions such as pluralism, toleration etc. to the doctrine. For free market proponents like Smith, Mill and Hayek liberty, especially in economic affairs, is of paramount importance while socially committed liberals such as Voltaire equality should have primacy over liberty. In the words of Voltaire "equality is at once the most natural and at times the most chimeral of things." The belief that any state project to establish an egalitarian society necessarily leads to the denial or undermining of individual liberty is fallacious. In fact the two notions are complimentary to each other and in the absence of any one of them liberalism turn out to be a charade. The real test for a liberal polity is, therefore, to ensure liberty of the people along with guaranteeing equality. In this context John Rawls theory of social justice assumes to have greater significance. Rawls' theory is a brilliant endeavor to fuse the concepts of liberty and equality in such a way that the concept of social justice becomes a reality. The essence of the theory is consisted of the two principles. The first one speaks about each one having the same claim over basic liberties that are available to every other member of the society. The second principle provides that social and economic inequalities are to satisfy two conditions: a) they are to be attached to offices and positions open to all under conditions of fair equality of opportunity; b) they are to be the greatest benefit of the least advantaged members of society. Rawls believed that his theory of social justice can be truly translated into reality in constitutional democracy wherein markets do exist with state regulation. John Rawls has been the foremost liberal thinker of the twentieth century.

In its history of three hundred years, liberalism has attracted admiration and condemnation from intellectuals and thinkers depending on their ideological affiliations. It is quite strange that while a group of scholars argue that liberalism is in fact the driving

force behind feminism while another groups holds the contrary view emphasising that a democratic polity having liberalism as the operating principle does not effectively step up the process of realization of feminist objectives. A major attack on liberalism came from Edmund Burke who by criticising the ideals of French Revolutions viz. liberty, equality and power of rationality had in fact defended conservatism. The advocates of conservatism assault the concepts such as liberty, progress and material well-being of the people on the ground that they damage the traditional values of a community. The supporters of classical Marxism reject the idea of a state based on liberalism for, in their opinion, it invariably helps capitalists, the exploiters of the working class. in any case the ultimate objective of classical Marxism is to establish a classless, stateless socialist society. The idea of social democracy developed in the twentieth century that attempts to invalidates the glaring defects of capitalism by means of pro-people reforms. It also accommodates the institution of state by allotting it significant role to bring about the desired social and economic reforms. Presently, quite a few democratic states have committed themselves to the objectives of social democracy.

Marxism

No other economic-political ideology has had so much impact all across the world as Marxism had during the twentieth century. Prior to the collapse of the USSR in the late 1980s more than half the population of the world was living under various sorts of communist regimes, all of which officially claimed to be based on Marxist ideas. Marxism is in essence an economic philosophy that presents its own worldview about social and political phenomena.

The concepts involved in Marxian theory are:

- a) materialistic interpretation of history;
- b) a dialectical approach to understand social change and,
- c) a critical assessment of the history of capitalism.

Most ideas that jointly go by the name of classical Marxism are based on the writings of Karl Marx (1818-1883), a German philosopher, economist, sociologist, historian, journalist and revolutionary socialist whose ideas had tremendously shaped the progress of almost all areas of knowledge and they still continue to have been influential in various disciplines of knowledge. In 1848, Marx in collaboration with Friedrich Engels (1820-1895) wrote a slim booklet of twelve thousand words, *The Communist Manifesto*, that was to change the course of world history permanently in less than seventy years after its publication. Engels was a political philosopher of German-English descent who met Marx in September 1844, and their friendship produced a markable body of revolutionary ideas. Besides the Communist Manifesto, the two friends also co-authored *The Holy Family* and had also brought about a revolutionary political newspaper from Cologne that had a short life because it was banned by the German authorities. Though Marx produced a huge amount of books, his most celebrated work is *Capital*, a critique of capitalist economy, in three volumes. Marxism is an ever-increasing increasing ideology. Many scholars across the world keep interpreting, reinterpreting, adding new dimensions and adapting the classical theory of Marxism in different settings and at

different times. What we are going to discuss here are the basic ideas of classical Marxism to which Karl Marx himself preferred to call scientific socialism.

DIALECTICAL MATERIALISM

The foundation of Marxism is what is known as philosophical materialism according to which the universe and all things that are included in it are natural and therefore put up with the laws of nature. The implication of such a view is that there is nothing in the universe that can be called supernatural. Marx and Engels sought inspiration from various sources and combined them with their basic view of philosophical materialism to build up their own idea of dialectical materialism. The term dialectics is derived from the Greek Word *dialego*, which means to debate or to discourse. In ancient Greece the philosopher applied the method of dialectics to find out truth by considering the contradictory arguments about a given premise. Thus, dialectics is a logical method of argument through which a disagreement can be resolved. It has been in use since long as Plato has employed the method to write his dialogues of the *Republic*. Besides Plato, Marx was also influenced by the writings of a couple of German philosophers such as Immanuel Kant, G. W. F. Hegel and Ludwig Feuerbach. In the context of the dialectical materialism he turned Hegel's dialectic of the ideas into dialectic materialism. Hegel presented a three-fold dialectics of ideas to describe three stages of social development. Hegelian dialectic comprises a *thesis* that leads to the creation of a counter force i.e. *antithesis* and the consequential conflict between the two is ultimately resolved by *synthesis*.

Though Marx was inspired by the Hegelian dialectic, he rejected Hegel's idealism for the defence of his materialism. In his magnum opus, *Capital*, Marx says: "My dialectic method is not only different from the Hegelian, but is its direct opposite. To Hegel, the life-process of the human brain, i.e. the process of thinking, which, under the name of 'the Idea', he even transforms into an independent subject, is the *demiurgos* of the real world, and the real world is only the external, phenomenal form of 'the Idea'. With me,

on the contrary, the ideal is nothing else than the material world reflected by the human mind, and translated into forms of thought." Similarly Engels is of the opinion that nature is dialectical. Thus, dialectical materialism in essence asserts that all that exists in the universe is material and the process of evolution is continually on all across the universe. It emphasises that universe is a unified entity wherein all phenomena are not only connected to each other but also depend upon each other. The most important assertion is that it is only through scientific research that the truth of the universe can be unraveled.

So far as materialism is concerned Marx and Engels were inspired by Feuerbach but, as they have modified dialectics to suit their purpose they did the same in case of Feuerbach's idea of materialism. Feuerbach had embedded his concept of materialism in idealistic and religious-ethical bedrock. Marx and Engels borrowed the essence of the idea and developed their scientific philosophical notion of materialism. Justifying the modification Engels had commented that though Feuerbach was a proponent of materialism, he was stuck in the traditional-idealist mode and that "the real idealism of Feuerbach becomes evident as soon as we come to his philosophy of religion and ethics."

Dialectical materialism asserts that since entire nature is a single entity, all the natural phenomena are interconnected and because of which no single natural phenomenon can be properly understood in isolation. We can comprehend natural phenomena only in relation to the entirety of nature. Secondly, according to dialectical materialism nature is constantly in the process of change. It is moving, mutating and expanding. Such a view of nature rejects the metaphysical idea according to which nature is in a state of rest and immobility. As per dialectical materialism an attempt to find meaning in nature should also take into accounts its perpetual mobility and mutation. In order to emphasise the point Engels said: "All nature, from the smallest thing to the biggest. From grains of sand to suns, from protista (the primary living cells) to man, has its existence in eternal coming into being and going out of being, in a ceaseless flux, in un-resting motion and change." Therefore, dialectical materialism considers natural phenomena as interconnected

segments of a totality of nature as well their distinctive characteristic of perpetual mobility.

Thirdly, dialectical materialism insists that any quantitative change necessarily leads to a qualitative change. Such a position is also opposite of the metaphysical viewpoint according to which the process of development is a straightforward course of growth leading to no change in the essence of the original phenomenon. According to dialectical materialism the process of quantitative change not only brings about a qualitative change but it sets off a series of rapid changes in which one phenomenon leads to another in a natural process. Therefore, dialectical materialism presents an onward and upward course of development process and rejects the notion of circulatory movements of development in which past phenomena keep repeating. Engels pointed out that "nature's process is dialectical and not metaphysical, that it does not move in an eternally uniform and constantly repeated circle. but passes through a real history. Here prime mention should be made of Darwin, who dealt a severe blow to the metaphysical conception of nature by proving that the organic world of today, plants and animals, and consequently man too, is all a product of a process of development that has been in progress for millions of years."

Fourthly, dialectical materialism reveals that all natural phenomena possess their inbuilt contradictions. Their negative and positive traits are inherently stored within them because of which the extinction or death of a phenomenon naturally generates something new which sustains the onward course of development and the process of qualitative changes. In this context the observation of Lenin is pertinent. He said, "In its proper meaning dialectics is the study of the contradiction *within the very essence of things.*" Dialectical materialism is, therefore, a negation of the metaphysical viewpoint of nature and its development. Its core point is that nature is a material phenomenon which is in constant motion generating new phenomena in its onward and upward process of development. The onward march of nature is in accordance to the laws of movement of matter and not because of what Hegel calls a driving force or universal spirit.

Marx insisted that matter is an objective reality that is independent of human consciousness and exist outside it. In this sense matter is of primary importance while human consciousness is secondary which derives from and reflects the material realities. Therefore, idea or thought is, in fact, a product of matter, the most perfect form of which is human brain, the source of all thoughts. According to dialectical materialism, it is meaningless to separate idea or thought from matter. According to Engels, "The material, sensuously perceptible world to which we ourselves belong is the only reality...Our consciousness and thinking, however suprasensuous they may seem, are the product of a material, bodily organ, the brain. Matter is not a product of mind, but mind itself is merely the highest product of matter."

The idealists thinkers hold that the nature is composed of things, many of which are beyond the faculty of comprehension of human mind. The metaphysical view is also similar to this. However, according to dialectical materialism every natural phenomenon can be understood by human mind. The need is to observe, compare, experiment, practice, in short get engaged in scientific pursuit that can ultimately reveal the truth of every natural phenomenon.

Historical Materialism:

An exercise to understand historical/social developments by employing the tool of dialectical materialism is known as *historical materialism* in Marxist terminology. Some Marxist scholars prefer to call it materialistic interpretation of history. It is obvious that material conditions, for instance geographical realities, do influence the course of social development. However, according to historical materialism the impact of geographical environment is not of a seminal nature because social changes appear at much faster pace than the changes and development of geographical phenomena. Citing from European history Marx pointed out that during the last three thousand years three different social system appeared viz. the primitive communal system, the slave system and the feudal

system. However, during the same period geographical environment almost remained as it was in the past and whatever changes that took place in geographical realities of Europe were insignificant.

Moreover, historical materialism holds that even growth in population, which is also a material reality of a society, does not determine the nature of a social system. Population growth may accelerate or retard the process of development of society, however, it cannot be the major determining factor in social development. The reason is that population growth does not provide an answer to the changes in social systems. In other words, an increase in population fails to explain that why a primitive communal system got transformed into the slave system and why the slave system was replaced by the feudal system. The growth in population does not result into the emergence of a higher kind of social system. For instance, Indian population is more than five times the population of the USA but that does not make Indian social system higher than that of the USA.

The obvious question that arises is, if geography and population growth are not the determining forces of social transformation then which is the determinant force? According to historical materialism the modes of production of material values, are the real forces that bring about change in social system. In order to live and improve living conditions people produce things of material values. The instruments of production that are put to use in producing things of material values require for their operation labour skills and all these factors may be jointly defined as the productive forces of society. Another facet of the process of production is the cooperative venture in which all men take part to exploit nature to create material values. Thus, production is not an activity that can be carried out by an individual in isolation. It is a task that can only be accomplished by cooperation of men and that is why it is known as social production. In order to produce material values men join hand with other men in a relationship of mutual help which is not based on any kind of exploitation? The relations of production

may be of hierarchal nature or may change from one kind of relation to another kind of relation of production. Nevertheless, despite hierarchy and ever changing characteristics, the relations of production remain fair and just. To quote Marx: "In production, men not only act on nature but also on one another. They produce only by co-operating in a certain way and mutually exchanging their activities. In order to produce, they enter into definite connections and relations with one another and only within these social connections and relations does their action on nature, does production, take place."

Historical materialism suggests that an important feature of production is that it keeps changing. At different stages of development different modes of productions keep appearing. Consequently, with the change of mode of production social system, political institutions, spiritual life and the views of the people also change. Therefore, the nature of a social system is determined by its mode of production. This is a very significant point because according to this viewpoint the real history is not the record of the lives of kings and queens and their exploits, expeditions and intrigues. The real history is the story of the development of production, of the producers of the material values of the labourers who have always been the major force in producing material values.

Furthermore, every change in the mode of production bring about change in men's relation of production and their economic relations. Though relations of production depend on development of productive forces, they do react upon the development of productive forces which may either accelerate or retard it. The significant point is that relations of production should be in conformity with the development of productive forces to ensure maximum growth of production. Otherwise, a mismatch between relations of production and the pace of growth of production will result in crisis of production and destruction of productive forces. In order to prove the point Marx cites the example of capitalist mode of production in which private ownership of the means of production is in conflict with the productive forces. It is, according to Marx, bound to result in the destruction of productive forces which can make a social revolution

imperative to define new relations of production in accordance with the kind of productive forces. This will lead to the creation of a socialist system. Thus, according to historical materialism five types of relations of production are identified in history viz. primitive communal, slave, feudal, capitalist and socialist.

Critique of Capitalism

Though capitalism is an inevitable and much progressive stage in history, according to Marxism, it is bound to collapse because of its internal contradictions and ultimately will be followed by socialism. In view of Marxism, capital is a "social, economic relation" between people and not a relation between people and things. Private ownership of the means of production, which is an integral feature of capitalism, helps only the bourgeoisie (capitalists) to keep amassing wealth whereas the real producers of material values, the proletariat (workers), get poorer. In other words the owners of means of production are the parasites who do nothing but go on increasing their wealth by exploiting the workers. Marxism raises a basic question: Why something, a material value, costs twice or thrice as much as something else? The answer can be found in 'the labour theory of value', according to which all commodities are the products of labour. Now, the question is how can commodities that are produced by different kinds of labour can be compared and put into ratios? The answer of Marx that we find in the *Capital* is "whenever, by an exchange, we equate as values our different products, by that very act, we also equate, as human labour, the different kinds of labour expended upon them."

Commodity Fetishism or Alienation:

In view of Marx the exchange value of a commodity can be called equivalent of its price only if "socially necessary labour-time" was put in its production. The 'money-form' not only reduces the heterogeneous labour to abstract labour-time but it may not be even rational. This point can be understood by considering labour production situation under feudalism. The land is owned by the landlord. The peasants till the land and do the harvesting. Then the landlord makes the decision how much portion of the produce he is

going to take and how much should go to the peasants. Marx observes that in feudalism "there is no necessity for labour and its products to assume a fantastic form different from their reality" because the payments are made in kind. Thus, the relations of the agriculture workers with their production remain personal and real. In capitalism the labour-production relationship turns into 'commodity fetishism' which is a kind of alienation, a situation in which exact social relations between men are reduced to an absurd form of a relation between things. This degenerates the worker into a commodity who is for sale 'on the market'. In capitalism men lose the very essence of humanness and are reduced to mutually interdependent commodities that are embroiled in generalized exchange. According to Marx political economy from Adam Smith to Locke "has never asked the question why labour is represented by the value of its product and labour-time by the magnitude of that value. These formulae, which bear it stamped upon them in unmistakable letters that they belong to a state of society, in which the process of production has the mastery over man, instead of being controlled by him..."

Surplus Value:

In societies that are not under capitalism the concept of social surplus is well known. Social surplus is actually surplus labour or the labour time that is not put to use to maintain the worker. According to Marxism, the social surplus in capitalism gets transformed into 'surplus value'. It can be plainly defined as value created by the proletariat (worker) but is not used for his 'maintenance'. The workers by putting in their labour convert the raw materials into commodities that fetch far more value in terms of money than what has actually gone into its production. It is the labour of the worker that is for sale on the market. In capitalism no bourgeoisie (capitalist) hires a worker whose product is of lesser value than his wages. Marx was not oblivious of the machines that help in producing commodities. He points out that machine do help in enhancing the efficiency of workers; however, machines too need workers for getting operated. Moreover, machines are not self-existent. They also require what Marx calls as "concealed labour power" because they are also produced by human workforce. The

noteworthy point is that the surplus value of a commodity is created by the labour of a worker and under capitalist economy it does not go to the worker but pocketed by the capitalist. This in essence leads to the next important point that is exploitation.

Exploitation:

It is a well-known fact of history that proletariat (workers) have always been exploited. Marx too acknowledges the fact. He observes that the exploitation of the working class in slavery and feudalism has always been too obvious. In capitalism, however, the things get a bit complicated. Since social relations get transformed as 'impersonal' and disguised, exploitation too assumes the impersonal and disguised form. Marx concedes this much that under capitalism proletariat s (workers) get the wages as per their capacity to produce. In this sense workers are not swindled by the employers. It is also true that workers are not employed against their will. Force is usually not used against the workers to make them work. The decision of the worker to join the workforce is his own. He voluntarily makes himself available for work in return of wages. Nevertheless, Marx argues that under capitalism instead of open and naked slavery it is 'wage slavery', a different kind of slavery. In 'wage slavery' the worker lives under the illusion of being free to sell his labour but ultimately he has to sell it to those who own the means of production and the sources of life. The most obvious factor of capitalism is the domination of the bourgeoisie (capitalists) over the economic and social systems. It must, however, be underscored that capitalism cannot survive in the absence workforce that creates all material values. The surplus value generated by the workers is pocketed by the capitalists openly because under the capitalist system it is legitimate for the owners of means of production to amass the surplus value by calling it 'profit'. Marx, therefore, holds that there is definite and systematic exploitation of workers under capitalism. The exploitation keeps increasing with the expansion of capitalist economy. For instance, if a capitalist exploits, say 100 workers by pocketing the surplus value, he is most likely to open another industrial unit with the capital that he has amassed as 'profit'. With another productive unit now he is exploiting 200 workers and so on. It is obvious, therefore, that

the most industrialised society under capitalist economy is also the most exploitative society.

Contradictions of Capitalism:

The most conspicuous contradiction of a capitalist economy is between the amassing of wealth by the capitalists that has been generated as a social product. The capitalist keep increasing the exploitation of the working class by expanding the means of production that is made possible because of the constant misappropriation of surplus value. The workers, the real producers of commodities in capitalism are never in a position to make use of most of the commodities they produce. For instance, most workers engaged in automobile industry are not in a position to buy cars. This is also true about other commodities that remain beyond the reach of workers on account of their low wages. Secondly, a situation of recession badly ruins the workers more than the capitalist. With the first sign of recession workers get laid off that further deteriorates their already precarious conditions. Capitalists hardly suffer in a situation of depression or recession because of their assets and also because the government under capitalism is always at service to come to the rescue of the capitalists. Therefore, the government usually gives relief to the capitalists in the form of tax breaks, subsidies, bailouts etc. Marxism asserts that under these contradictions that are inherent in the capitalist economy, capitalism will cave in under its own weight.

PROLETARIAN REVOLUTION

The exploitation of the proletariat at the hands of the bourgeoisie is bound to lead to a situation in which the proletariat will be left with no alternative but get rid of the yoke of bourgeoisie exploitation by bringing about a violent revolution. Karl Marx advocates that the working classes across the world should overthrow the bourgeoisie and the productive forces everywhere should be collectively owned. Marx and Engels point out that class struggle has always been in existence at all stages of historical development. In the Communist Manifesto the two revolutionary philosophers emphasise: "The history of all

hitherto existing society is the history of class struggles. Freeman and slave, patrician and plebeian, lord and serf, guild-master and journeyman, in a word oppressor and oppressed, stood in constant opposition to one another, carried on an uninterrupted, now hidden, now open fight, a fight that each time ended, either in a revolutionary reconstitution of society at large, or in the common ruin of the contending classes."

Capitalism that has emerged after extremity of feudalism has brought in new form of exploitation which is more subtle, disguised but also more absolute and unrelenting. The two classes constantly in the state of struggle under a capitalist economy are the bourgeoisie (the exploiters) and the proletariat (the exploited). As society becomes more industrialised with the expansion of capitalist economy, the exploitation of the proletariat too increases reaching a point where the exploited workers will get united against the bourgeoisie and dismantle the foundations of capitalism. In the *Communist Manifesto*, Marx and Engels exhort the workers of the world to get united for getting free from capitalist exploitation and to usher in an era wherein the working classes become the rulers. The famous words of the *Communist Manifesto* are: "The Communists... openly declare that their ends can be attained only by the forcible overthrow of all existing social contradictions. Let the ruling classes tremble at a communist revolution. The proletariat have nothing to lose but their chains. They have a world to win. *Working men of all countries, unite!*"

A violent revolution guided by the proletariat is an essential and inevitable stage in the transformation of society from capitalism to socialism. According to the Marxist revolution works like a midwife to socialist society. It is the only course that helps decimation of the oppression of the bourgeoisie and usher in an era of dictatorship of the proletariat. Marxism does not dither to recommend the use of violence to end the dominance of the exploiters. Marxists believe that the very institution of state is a structure of violence that maintains its oppressive control with the help of its coercive mechanisms such as military and police. A cursory glance at world history can make us

realise that the ruling classes, the exploiters of the ruled, have always established and sustained their dominance with the help of the violent and coercive mechanisms that are the vital components of state. Marxism would have preferred to establish the rule of the proletariats by peaceful means, however, they are of the fact that the ruling classes, the exploiters never surrender their power of their own accord. On the contrary, the moment they get wind of any threat to their dominance they use the worst kind of violent force to suppress the revolutionaries. It is, therefore, necessary for the proletariats to annihilate the bourgeoisie in a violent revolution to establish their own dictatorship.

The Dictatorship of the Proletariat:

After bringing about a violent revolution, the proletariats have to establish a dictatorial rule of their own. In all the relevant documents of classical Marxism (scientific socialism) we find clear references about a proletarian revolution and thereafter the establishment of the dictatorship of the proletariats. Any deviation from the inevitable path is considered opportunism or revisionism by the classical Marxists. The Marxist hold the view that dictatorship of the proletariats is a necessary condition in all the societies that have been under the oppression of capitalism and where the working classes have brought about the revolution in order to create a socialist society. The dictatorship of the proletariats is a socialist state in which the working classes are in complete control. The term 'dictatorship of the proletariat' was actually coined by Joseph Weydemeyer, a Prussian military officer, a journalist, politician and Marxist revolutionary, and later adopted by Marx and Engels. The dictatorial rule of the workers is, according to Marxism, is a temporary phase during which the remnants of capitalism and the counter-revolutionary elements will be thoroughly wiped out. It will also be ensured that capitalism does not raise its head even in future. The proletariats will put together a social structure that will be absolutely socialist without the presence of classes. Thus, the dictatorship of the proletariats will be followed by a classless and stateless society that can truly be called a socialist society.

Withering Away of State:

The final destination of a socialist society to get rid of the institution of state. The phrase *withering away of state*, which is usually quoted to refer to the stateless society, was actually used by Engels who made it absolutely clear that the institution of state had always been a necessary evil. In his words: "State is at best an evil inherited by the proletariat after its victorious struggle for class supremacy, whose worst sides the proletariat...cannot avoid having to lop off at the earliest possible moment, until such time as a new generation, reared in new and free social conditions, will be able to throw the entire lumber of the state on the scrap-heap." The justification for finishing off the institution of state is that during the phase of the dictatorship of the proletariat the antagonistic classes will be abolished and thus a new society, a socialist society, a classless society will come into existence that will have no use for the coercive institution of state. In the *Communist Manifesto* state is portrayed as a mechanism of class rule. In the absence of classes, it loses its utility. At the final stage of proletarian rule state will decline and collapse because, the *Manifesto* declares, "the state is unnecessary and cannot exist in a society in which there are no class antagonisms."

Socialism

The concept of socialism poses a problem of comprehension because of its various definitions. Many scholars have offered various versions of the concept which differ with each others in many respects. Nevertheless, there are also common elements that appear in the descriptions of the scholars. There are forty definitions of socialism in the *Dictionary of Socialism* and if we make an attempt to identify the common elements included in these definitions we can enlist these: criticism of the institution of private ownership and control of capital from social point of view; collective control of means of production and also of distribution and exchange of material values; society based on the principle of social justice. A scholar, Bhikhu Parekh, in his famous book *The Concepts of Socialism* names four main principles that are usually associated with a society that is based on the concept. They are sociality, social responsibility, cooperation and planning. Another writer Michael Freedman mentions five principles that are common among the various versions of the socialists. Firstly, society is not merely an assortment of individuals but something more substantial than that. Secondly, welfare of human beings is necessary and desirable purpose of every society. Thirdly, human beings by nature are active and productive. Fourthly, all human beings are equal and lastly, history has a forward and progressive course and human beings are capable of bringing about positive change in conditions if they so desire.

Origin and Meaning of Socialism

The idea of a socialist style of living or a closely-knit community living is very old. It is believed that in ancient Persia primitive socialist institutions did exist. We can also discern socialist ideas in political philosophies of Plato and Aristotle. So far as the coining of the term 'socialism' is concerned the credit goes to Saint Simon. The term was employed by Simon to reject 'individualism' that was a cardinal principle of liberalism. He was very much impressed by the emerging epoch of science and technology in which he saw the potential opportunity of establishing an egalitarian society by eliminating the evils of capitalism such as stratification of society into classes. He was a passionate

supporter of an equitable society in which each one would get the ranking according to his capacity and the reward as per her contribution to social production. On account of the potentialities of science and technology he could visualise a progressive and prosperous society that only needed the administrative efficiency and expansion of industrialism to establish a socialist society.

Besides industrialism and administrative efficiency, the earlier socialists also thought of creating a rationally managed economy that should be founded on proper planning to ensure multilateral material and scientific progress. Thus, planned economy is a significant part of socialist economy. The contributions of Robert Owen, Charles Fourier, Pierre-Joseph Proudhon, Louis Blanc and Saint Simon to the earliest socialist thought in the modern world are universally recognised. They were, in fact, moved by poverty and deprivation that appeared in western societies as a spin-off of Industrial Revolution. Their conscience pinched them to devise reliable measures through which the wretched conditions of the have-nots of society could be made better. Consequently, many of them suggested that the terrible poverty of the people could be removed by introducing socioeconomic reforms. Robert Owen believed that the situation could improve by dividing society into smaller and manageable communities, no member of which would own private property. Robert Owen contended that human nature, thought and action were largely shaped by the social environment and for that reason he advocated reforms in social environment. Another socialist thinker, Charles Fourier differed with Owen on this count. He was an advocate of individualism and believed that individual freedom in all the aspects of human life could not only enhance a person's creativity but also make him happy. In the middle of the nineteenth century the socialist ideas of Owen and Fourier were put to practice in Europe and America. For instance, Owen who himself was an industrialist purchased a large tract of land in the state of Indiana in the USA and established on it a social organisation named New Harmony in 1825. It was prototype of a socialist society having self reliance, community ownership of property and cooperation as its operative principles. The experiment, however, failed leaving Owen badly

impoverished. The committed socialist as he was, Owen later got engaged in organising trade unions and promoting cooperative business ventures.

A confusion may arise because the term 'socialism' is also freely used to describe the ideas of Karl Marx and Friedrich Engels. Marxism is also defined as communism and scientific socialism. The perplexity is the result of the times during which these ideas were being advocated. Socialists such as Saint Simon, Robert Owen et al were promoting their socialist ideas before Marx and Engels could develop a systematic theory of socialism. But Marxism differed with the earlier socialists in many respects. The notable differences are in regard with dialectical materialism, class struggle, violent revolution and withering away of state, the essential ideas of Marxism are not to be found in the concept of socialism preached by the earlier socialists. Another difference is on the issue of atheism. Marxism is purely a materialistic interpretation of human existence in which religion does not have a place. Though, all socialists are not religious but some of them profess religion. Socialism insists on transforming a capitalist and exploitative society by means of reforms and evolution whereas Marxism advocates a violent proletarian revolution to overthrow a capitalist society. It was Marx who called his theory as scientific socialism and the theory of his predecessors as utopian socialism.

Core Ideas of Socialism

Like Marxism, socialism is also an economic ideology that believes in the abolition of private ownership of means of production and state control over economic resources of a state. Socialism emphasises the fact that human beings are essentially social beings and therefore most of their productive actions are possible in cooperation with other members of society. In this sense the commodities that human beings produce are social outputs. Socialism, therefore, holds that society is justified to have social control over material values, property and commodities because they are the products of social cooperation. This point of view is diametrically opposed to the position of the capitalists who consider private ownership of means of production and property sacrosanct and by amassing

wealth perpetuate their domination over ruling elite and social institutions. The liberal democracy that trumpets individual freedom and fair and equal opportunities for all is a political system that for the most part favours the capitalist class because they possess the material means to exploit the opportunities. Fair and equal opportunities for all can be called a judicious principle if all the members of society fairly equal. In a society where a numerically smaller group has taken control of almost all the material resources of society, the sounding off about individual liberty and equal opportunity for all sound like a cruel joke. Socialism contends that true freedom and true opportunities for all can only be possible if the private ownership of material resources is replaced by state control of all means of production.

All the socialists do not agree on the issue of what should be taken over by the state and what should be allowed to be privately owned. Sir Thomas More, the renowned English humanist, in his celebrated treatise *Utopia* (1516) recommends that almost everything except a few items of personal use should be socially controlled. On the contrary some other socialists hold that only the major means of production should be taken over under social control and comparatively medium sized businesses, houses farms, shops etc can be allowed to be owned by individuals. Proudhon, the renowned French politician, economist and philosopher in his work, *What is Property?* (1840) famously declared, "property is theft." Proudhon advocated the creation of a society in which all its members would have a joint claim over land, natural resources and other means of production to lead a cooperative, productive life. The operative principle of such a society, according to Proudhon, would be mutualism which would help people exchange commodities and socially created products on the basis of mutually executed contracts. These interactions among individuals would be free from state intervention because Proudhon was the first important thinker belonging to the modern era who declared himself an anarchist for whom state remained a coercive institution. Classical Marxism too holds similar view about state.

As per socialist economy, the goods should be produced and services must be made available for satisfying the needs and requirements of society. In other words the motive behind production and services must be social utility. Such an economic view is in total contrast of the capitalist economy which believes that the motive of production and services should be profit making for the individual capitalist. Socialist economy recommends that the means of production should either be owned by workers cooperative units or socially owned. The workers should also manage the means of production with the ultimate objective of producing commodities for the benefit and use of society. In a socially owned unit of production there is no place for managerial hierarchy. Nevertheless, hierarchy among the technocrats based on the level of technical knowledge is acceptable. The list of prominent philosophers, scientists, litterateurs, politicians, economists, social scientists, intellectuals and artistes who sincerely believe in socialism is very long. Here it is suffice to note what one of the greatest scientists of all times, Albert Einstein, has to say about socialism. "I am convinced there is only one way to eliminate (the) grave evils (of capitalism), namely through the establishment of a socialist economy, accompanied by an educational system which would be oriented toward social goals. In such an economy, the means of production are owned by society itself and are utilized in a planned fashion. A planned economy, which adjusts production to the needs of the community, would distribute the work to be done among all those able to work and would guarantee a livelihood to every man, woman, and child. The education of the individual, in addition to promoting his own innate abilities, would attempt to develop in him a sense of responsibility for his fellow-men in place of the glorification of power and success in our present society."

Fascism

Fascism, as a political ideology, usually has a harsh and negative connotation. It stands for radicalism, authoritarianism and ultra-nationalism. Fascism aims at creating a nation in which all individuals should have a common ancestral and cultural identity and it should a totalitarian form of government. It presupposes the existence of a national community having purity of race as its distinctive quality and abhors the presence of people of other races or the progenies of inter-racial marriages. In political terms, it detests pluralism and imagines establishing a monolithic society comprising of a people who are considered to be physical fit, disciplined and ever prepared to sacrifice everything for the enrichment and glory of the nation. It advocates ideological indoctrination of the common masses and to use their force either for subjugation or annihilation of the minorities whose members are perceived to be "the other" belonging to foreign races, religions and culture. Fascism had played havoc in Europe immediately after its appearance as a political ideology first in Italy and later in Germany in the first half of the twentieth century. It was started as an ideological movement in Italy during the course of World War I by a political group who preferred to call itself as national syndicalists. Fascism rejects the political views of both the Rightists and the Leftists because its political programme differs completely with the two ideological groups. Its major thrust is to establish a totalitarian rule of a national community whose members are perceived to be naturally superior than the people belonging to other races and culture whom the fascists consider people of low or inferior races. Though Fascist maintains that their political agenda is different from the Rightists, their programmes and practices reveal that they can actually be called a far-right ideological group.

DEFINITION OF FASCISM

The term 'Fascism' is derived from the Latin root word *fasces* that stands for the description of an image, a bundle of rods tied around an axe, which was a symbol of the

civic magistrate in ancient Rome. The image of the *fasces* epitomized strength through unity. It is matter of common knowledge that a single rod in itself remains weak and can be easily broken into pieces but it becomes the part of a strong entity when it joins with other rods to create a bunch which cannot be easily broken. Thus by adopting the name of Fascism, the proponents of the ideology in twentieth century aimed at emotional unity of the people of Italy by reminding them of the past glory of the Romans when all the members of the nation were supposed to be uni-racial, disciplined, strong, political masters of the entire Europe and parts of Asia and Africa, warriors and much superior than all other races. The Fascists of Italy had also claimed that their nation could regain its lost glory and grandeur if their political agenda was wholehearted supported by the genuine and pure Italians. It was a shrewd and cunning move on the part of the pioneers of Fascism to emotionally blackmail the people of Italy.

Fascism is defined in different terms by the scholars mainly because after its first appearance in Italy in the beginning of the twentieth century, similar concepts appeared in other countries which obviously differed in details with the original Italian version. Roger Griffin defines fascism as "a genuinely revolutionary, transclass form of anti-liberal, and in the last analysis, anti-conservative nationalism", which is rooted in the imaginary racial and cultural superiority of a nation. In the words of Mussolini "Fascism is a revolutionary doctrine against liberalism since it wants to reduce the size of the State to its necessary functions." Another expert Robert Paxton in his book, *The Anatomy of Fascism*, expresses that fascism is "a form of political behavior marked by obsessive preoccupation with community decline, humiliation, or victimhood and by compensatory cults of unity, energy, and purity, in which a mass-based party of committed nationalist militants, working in uneasy but effective collaboration with traditional elites, abandons democratic liberties and pursues with redemptive violence and without ethical or legal restraints goals of internal cleansing and external expansion."

On account of these representative definitions we can discern a few features of fascism like it is a political ideology that rejects liberalism, communism and conservatism. The other feature is that it aims in building up a nation that is consisted of the ostensibly superior people in terms of race and culture and to govern such a state with the help a totalitarian and dictatorial authority. Thirdly, fascism despises the presence of racial, religious or ideological minorities in their nation. "The other" people should either be enslaved or completely annihilated. Fourthly, fascism stands for regulation of economic activities by the despotic authority so as to transform the fascist state into a prosperous and industrially advanced state. Fifthly, fascists present a very romantic albeit imaginary description of the past glory and prominence of its nation in order to emotionally exploit the susceptible common people to mobilise their support for the implementation of their ideology. Sixthly, fascism recommends use of violence against people of other races, religion and culture to cleanse the nation of the fascists and it also prescribes war as a desirable means for the conquest and annexation of other states that are under the control of the 'low and inferior people'. Lastly, fascism propagates and promotes the idea of society dominated by masculine, virile and macho traits especially to attract the youths.

BASIC PRINCIPLES OF FASCISM

On account of its theory and its application in Benito Mussolini's Italy and Adolf Hitler's Nazi Germany we can identify certain core principles of fascism. The foremost principle is nationalism. An obsessive attachment with the geography and people of an organic nation, which is defined as nationalism is very dear to the fascists. Fascism believes that a nation remains weak and oppressed because of the presence of people of inferior and foreign races, religions and cultures in the midst of a superior nation which forms the bulk of the majority of a state. The presence of 'the other' within the boundaries of a state leads to racial and cultural conflicts that weaken a nation. Thus, instead of the class struggle as propounded by the communists, the fascist emphasise racial and cultural struggle that goes on in a society. The fascist definition of a nation is a group of people who belong to one race, one religion and one culture and in a given geographical territory

they constitute the majority. The fascists argue only the members of such a nation can share an emotional and spiritual bond with each other and with the territory they reside in. Mussolini declared in 1922: "For us the nation is not just territory but something spiritual... A nation is great when it translates into reality the force of its spirit."

In respect with foreign relations a fascist state openly advocates expansionism and occupation of foreign lands as an integral part of the foreign policy. The fascists regard imperialism as a necessity as well as the characteristic of an energetic and spirited nation. According to *Italian Encyclopedia* of 1932: "For fascism, the growth of empire, that is to say the expansion of the nation, is an essential manifestation of vitality, and its opposite a sign of decadence." It was this particular principle of fascism that created huge devastation in terms of life and property not only in Europe but the world over in the two World Wars in the first half of the twentieth century. Hitler and his Nazism had emerged as the worst face of fascism in the inter-war period in Germany and under the leadership of Hitler the Nazis blatantly pursued a policy of expansionism because, as per their logic, they were creating a 'living space' for the German nation. Related to a foreign policy that unabashedly believes in the occupation of foreign lands for the benefit of the fascist state, are the principles of violence and militarism without which the conquests of foreign states cannot be possible. Use of force and promotion of militarism are the virtues of a state as per the ideology of the fascists. The ideals like nonviolence or pacifism are, according to the fascists, signs of a coward and meek nation. On this issue Mussolini spoke: "War alone brings up to their highest tension all human energies and puts the stamp of nobility upon the peoples who have the courage to meet it."

The third important principle of fascism is that it favours a totalitarian state ruled over by a despotic authority and vigorously opposes liberal democracy. Delineating the totalitarian feature of a fascist state Mussolini stated: "The fascist conception of the State is all-embracing; outside of it no human or spiritual values can exist, much less have value. Thus understood, fascism is totalitarian, and the fascist State—a synthesis and a

unit inclusive of all values— interprets, develops, and potentiates the whole life of a people." Such a totalitarian state for being effective should have a strong and forceful form of political rule. It is for this reason fascism rejects democracy, which can neither be strong nor an effective form of government to implement the fascist political agenda. In Germany, the Nazi fascists propagated during the inter-war period that it was because of pluralism that the German nation suffered in the World War I and it would suffer again if a strong political order was not opted for. Carl Schmitt, a theorist of Nazism observed that a "strong state which guarantees a totality of political unity transcending all diversity" was needed to do away with a "disastrous pluralism tearing the German people apart." The fascists prefer a ruthless demagogue to take charge of a fascist state. His commands should be indisputably obeyed by all and whose actions as 'the leader' of a fascist state must be beyond public censure or accountability. Therefore, Mussolini was such a leader, *Duce* in Italy and Hitler was *Fuhrer* in Germany.

Fourthly, social Darwinism, according to which a socially and biologically strong nation can alone have the right to rule and subjugate the lands and people, belonging to weaker nations, is a significant principle of fascism. Fascists recommend the creation of such a nation by annihilating the members of foreign stock because they are not only 'the other' but also necessarily belong to inferior and weak races. As Darwin had suggested that the biologically fittest specie alone can survive, the fascists too argued that the strongest and the ablest race had the natural right to dominate the people of weaker races. According to Alfred Rocco, an Italian fascist writer, "Conflict is in fact the basic law of life in all social organisms, as it is of all biological ones; societies are formed, gain strength, and move forwards through conflict; the healthiest and most vital of them assert themselves against the weakest and less well adapted through conflict; the natural evolution of nations and races takes place through conflict." In Nazi Germany, the Aryan race to which most Germans belonged was projected as the martial race that had a natural right to subjugate the people of weaker races and rule over the entire world. In order to create a strong and healthy nation of the Germans the Nazis, as per an estimate, massacred close to three lakh physically weaker and disabled people.

Fascism can thrive only on propaganda and a concerted programme of indoctrination. Therefore, the fifth significant principle of fascism is to indoctrinate people by making extensive use of media, education, public speeches and written material. Propaganda had been an effective means of indoctrination for the fascists of Italy and the Nazis of Germany. Complete control over education is a prime objective of the fascists because by disseminating false stories about the past glory and grandeur of a so-called pure and fittest nation through school text books the fascists planners make attempts to create a new race fully committed to fascist ideals. Besides, spreading falsehood about their own greatness and prominence, the fascists also accuse the members of the minority races, religions and cultures for their so-called crimes, betrayals and seditious activities. Fascism badly needs 'the other' who can be portrayed in the worst possible terms as the enemy and the traitor in the midst of the 'naturally superior nation.' Since fascist indoctrination is only possible through falsehood and hypocrisy, the fascists hate every attempt to study ideology, especially historical account, in an objective, scientific and dispassionate manner. Fascism is the antithesis of academic and intellectual culture. Hitler detested intellectuals and university professors. He opined: "When I take a look at the intellectual classes we have – unfortunately, I suppose, they are necessary; otherwise one could one day, I don't know, exterminate them or something – but unfortunately they're necessary."

Sixthly, on economic issue the fascists rejected both the capitalism and communism. Instead they declared that they preferred a 'third position', that may have features of the two economic systems depending on the economic conditions prevalent in a state. The kind of economy that was developed in fascist Italy was called the corporatism wherein the national economic affairs were collectively managed by the employers, workers and the government officials. Though fascism is exceedingly anticommunist, it simultaneously aims at the destruction large-scale private enterprises. The fascists recommend state regulation of privately owned means of production and properties and not their nationalisation. However, as already has been pointed out, the fascists may not

have a consistent economic policy. They are like to change it in view of the demands of the situation. For instance, in Nazi Germany, some businesses were nationalised while close regulation was recommended for other business ventures. Theoretically, the fascist economic system, the corporatism, is supposed to empower workers along with employers and bureaucrats, in reality it leads to absolute control of the employer and the government officials over businesses.

Hitler was deadly against empowering workers. Consequently, he made a law in 1934, Law for the Ordering of National Labour, according to which the workers factory organisations were badly suppressed and were denied to play any role even in matters of fixation of wages and determination of working conditions. In Italy, the economic policies were designed in such manner that they enhanced state power and helped disseminate party ideology. Consequently, almost all the trade unions and related organisations of the workers came to be controlled by the fascists. Though, the fascists were never receptive to free-market economy or *laissez-faire*, they became its vehement critics after Great Depression. They strongly condemned finance capitalism, the practice of charging interest and profiteering. In Germany, the condemnation of free-market economy was more intense because financial activities were majorly controlled by the Jews, the people of an 'inferior race, religion and culture', who were supposedly fleecing the martial Aryan race of its material resources. The 'parasitic' Jews were intensely despised and so was the profession they were engaged in. Since fascism attaches much more importance to the community rather than individuals, it recommends that private property should be regulated in such manners that its benefits should largely help the nation rather than individuals. At the same time fascism does not favour complete nationalisation or workers empowerment. Like every other thing economic activities too should be created, promoted and utilized exclusively for the benefit of the so-called 'superior organic nation.'

In conclusion it can be said that fascism is essentially an inhuman and dangerous political ideology. It presupposes the existence of a 'pure', 'superior' and 'martial' race that has a natural right to be the ruler of the world. This so-called martial race also has the natural right to subjugate 'the other' people and their lands precisely because 'the other' people are supposedly belong to the 'weaker' and 'inferior' races. Such ridiculous claims do not stand the tests of history and science. Since the time of the invention of wheel, the populations across the world had been on the move. With tremendous growth of science and technology the mobility of the people increased many fold. The wars, international trade and imperialism have resulted in intermixing of races. In view of this there is hardly any stock of people which can rightfully claim the absolute racial purity and superiority. Fascism is an extremely violent and militant political ideology that had caused unimaginable miseries and devastation to the world in general but to the continent of Europe in particular. The two most popular proponents of fascism had been Benito Mussolini and Adolf Hitler. They also happened to be the most hated historical characters by most of the civilised people.

Gandhism

The political ideology that goes by the name Gandhism, is in fact an assortment of Mohandas Karamchand Gandhi's ideas on social, political and economic issues that are spread across his writings, letters and speeches that have been well preserved. Though, we can hardly find anything that can be rightfully described 'original' in the collection of these ideas, the revival and, to an extent, successful application of some of the very old notions makes Gandhism a significant political ideology of the twentieth century. Gandhi was neither a political philosopher nor a system builder; he was however, a politician, a freedom fighter and an amazingly successful mass leader. During the course of his long crusade against British imperialism, first in South Africa and later in India, he brought out weeklies, wrote books, made innumerable speeches and penned thousands of letters in which he also gave expression to his positions on many social, political and economic issues which serve as the foundation of Gandhism. Gandhi, himself was aware of the fact that he did not make any original contribution to socio-political thought as he explained: "There is no such thing as "Gandhism," and I do not want to leave any sect after me. I do not claim to have originated any new principle or doctrine. I have simply tried in my own way to apply the eternal truths to our daily life and problems...The opinions I have formed and the conclusions I have arrived at are not final. I may change them tomorrow. I have nothing new to teach the world. Truth and non-violence are as old as the hills."

BASIC IDEAS OF GANDHISM

It is widely acknowledged that Gandhi played the most crucial role in the Indian freedom struggle and many of his political strategies that he employed to fight against the most powerful imperial power of the time proved successful. Prior to his appearance on Indian political horizon, the freedom struggle, in the mode of the Indian National Congress, was essentially elitist in character. The INC was completely dominated by persons who belonged to the privileged section of Indian society, many of them were educated in

foreign, mostly British, universities. The teeming Indian masses were almost unaware of the so-called political agitation against the foreign rulers, the members of the INC were engaged in. It was Gandhi who first time reached to the masses through some of his novel political strategies and in the process converted a highly elitist INC into a broad-based mass movement. Nonetheless, it must also be underlined that Gandhi could achieve this unbelievable success by sacrificing many liberal, democratic and secular principles that were originally the ideals of INC. Thus, to begin with, the first important idea of Gandhism is the mixing of religion and politics.

Gandhi's worldview was essentially the worldview of a practicing Hindu. Gandhi never concealed the fact that he was a devout Hindu; on the contrary he expressed that he was proud of being a devout Hindu. He did not believe in the secular principle of separation of religion and politics. In fact, he wanted to 'introduce religion into politics'. In a letter to Horace Alexander written in 1926, Gandhi expressed: "In my own humble opinion, we endlessly divide life into watertight compartments, religious and other, whereas if a man has true religion in him, it must show itself in the smallest details of life. To me sanitation in a community like ours is based upon common spiritual effort. The slightest irregularity in sanitary, social and political life is a sign of spiritual poverty." It is through this overtly religious stance he could win over the masses of Indians a majority of whom were extremely poor, illiterate and superstitious. This was certainly a commendable achievement for a freedom fighter but making use of religion for political gains or accommodating the prejudices of the common people to seek their support for a political project remains a controversial issue.

The second significant idea of Gandhism is, what is known as ***Satyagraha***. The term is a combination of two Sanskrit words, *satya* (truth) and *graha* (force). Therefore, in English the term Satyagraha is usually translated as truth-force. However, Gandhi himself preferred to translate it as soul-force. In the context he said: 'Its (Satyagraha's) equivalent in the vernacular rendered into English means truth-force. I think Tolstoy called it also

soul-force or love-force, and so it is." Gandhi firmly believed that truth must encompass all aspects of human life including the political processes. He was aware of the fact that the ideal of absolute truth could remain elusive but he opted for himself a journey to reach the destination of truth by experimenting with the versions of truth in a process of trial and error. His commitment to truth was because he believed, "truth is far more powerful than any weapon of mass destruction." His concept of Satyagraha was completely nonviolent. Though he employed it as a political strategy to challenge British imperialism, he forcefully insisted that anyone who intends to practice Satyagraha must also be committed to non-violence (*ahimsa*). According to him the slightest use of violence could degenerate Satyagraha into Duragraha (evil-force). Gandhi also insisted that his notion of Satyagraha was different from the concept of passive resistance. In his words: "the Satyagraha differs from passive resistance as the north pole from the south. The latter has been conceived as a weapon of the weak and does not exclude the use of physical force or violence whereas the former has been conceived as the weapon of the strongest and exclude the use of violence in any shape or form."

Thus, **non-violence** that is often referred to as an element of Gandhism is in reality an important characteristic of his strategy of Satyagraha. Gandhi borrowed the idea of non violence from various religious sources the notable among them were Jainism, Buddhism and Christianity. He was against the use of violence even for the accomplishment of an objective which could, in popular perception, be defined as just. In this respect he was diametrically opposed to Machiavelli for whom end justified means; for Gandhi it were the means that justified end. He once said: "What difference does it make to the dead, the orphans, and the homeless, whether the mad destruction is wrought under the name of totalitarianism or the holy name of liberty and democracy?" He was of the opinion that non-violence was relevant not merely in political struggle or public causes but its practice could help even an individual because being non-violent he could be free of anger, obsession and destructive impulses. Some of his other beliefs such as vegetarianism and

prohibition of milch and draught animals, in particular, ban on cow slaughter could be viewed as extensions of his idea of nonviolence.

Gandhi used his strategy of Satyagraha successfully both in South Africa and India, In its application Satyagraha emerged as a political weapon that, though was deeply embedded in truth and non-violence, had a couple of techniques to make it successful. Some of these techniques included peaceful methods like fasting, arbitration and negotiation as well as agitation based practices like demonstration, picketing, economic boycott, non-payment of taxes, non-cooperation, civil disobedience etc. Though Gandhi had used these techniques in the course of Indian freedom struggle, the three of these were comparatively used more often. The idea of civil disobedience was originally advocated by the American political thinker Thoreau. Gandhi borrowed it for application first in South Africa and later in India. The main thrust of civil disobedience is to defy an unjust law. Commenting on the significance of civil disobedience Gandhi said: "When you have failed to bring the error home to the lawgiver by way of petition and the like, the only remedies open to you if you do not wish to submit to error, are to compel him to yield to you either by physical force or by suffering in your person, by inviting the penalty for breach of his laws. Hence, Satyagraha largely appears to the public as civil disobedience or civil resistance."

Non-cooperation was another technique that Gandhi used as part of his strategy of Satyagraha to counter the oppressive and exploitative foreign rule over India. Explaining the technique of noncooperation Gandhi had said: "Non-violent non-cooperation is the method whereby we cultivate the fresh public opinion and get it enforced when there is complete freedom of opinion that of the majority must prevail." In a way almost all the techniques of Satyagraha are inter-connected. If the rulers force upon the people, civil disobedience is the recommended technique. If the unjust laws are not revoked the people are advised to begin a non-violent noncooperation movement against the unjust rulers. Non-cooperation, as practiced by Gandhi took on various modes like boycott of foreign

goods (*swadeshi*), non-payment of taxes, salt satyagraha, strike, picketing and so on. Gandhi had also used another technique i.e. fast quite often. For a foreigner, it appeared quite a novel idea that an aggrieved person would go on punishing himself by fasting to force the adversary to redress his grievance. However, in Indian historical traditions such instances had been reported that a wronged person or a group of wronged persons on account of sheer moral force had compelled the powerful adversary, often a ruler, to accede to the demands of the victims. Gandhi made a successful use of the technique of fast on many occasion against the foreign rulers and sometimes against his own people. For instance, his last fast unto death was in protest against the communal Hindus and Sikhs who were killing the Muslims of North India to take over their properties and mosques. The technique of fast can only be successful if the position of the agitator is truthful and just.

Third important idea that is a typical feature of Gandhism can be identified as his critique of socialism. Though he showed interest in addressing the problems of the have-nots of Indian society and occasionally had also suggested measures to improve the conditions of the poor people including workers, he refused to prescribe socialism as a policy for India. He had his own reasons to object to the socialist alternative particularly of the Russian variety regarding which he observed: "From what I know of Bolshevism, it not only does not preclude use of force, but freely sanctions it for the expropriation of property and maintaining the collective ownership of the same. And if so, I have no hesitation in saying that the Bolshevik regime in its present form, cannot last for long. For it is my firm conviction that nothing enduring can be built on violence." Since non-violence was an article of faith for Gandhi he was obviously opposed to Marxist brand of socialism that prescribed a violent proletarian revolution as an inevitable stage before the creation of a classless, stateless socialist society. However, Gandhi approved of the basic principles of measures to implement ideas such as abolition of private property, doing away with exploitation of workers, elimination of capitalism and so on not because they were the features of Western socialism but, as he believed, were based on the teachings

of the Upanishads. In his view, "Socialism was not born with the discovery of the misuse of the capital by capitalists. As I have contended, socialism even communism, is explicit in the first verse of Ishopanishad. What is true is that when some reformers lost faith in the method of conversion, the technique of what is known as scientific socialism was born. I am engaged in solving the same problem that faces scientific socialists." It is apparent from this excerpt that Gandhi approved of certain socialist ideas not because they were part of a scientific theory that Marx developed but because he could identify the traces of them in a religious scripture!

The bottom line of the issue is that Gandhi was prepared to do away with the evils of capitalism and was interested in creating a classless society. However, he intended to do it through non-violent methods. In place of Marxist socialism, he presented his own idea of *Sarvodaya* that could be roughly translated as 'progress of all'. In fact, Gandhi used the term as title for his translation of John Ruskin's book, *Unto This Last*, in 1908. Gandhi, unfortunately could not get the opportunity to implement the ideas of Savodaya in independent India but some of his staunch followers such as Vinoba Bhave and Jai Prakash Narayan did make attempts to implement this Gandhian ideology. They undertook various projects during the 1950s and 1960s such as *Bhoodan* (gifting of land) and *Sharamdan* (gifting of labour) to uplift the conditions of landless labourers. Initially, they with modest success but ultimately the project for implementation of Sarvodaya in independent India was a dismal failure.

An important idea of Gandhism is **decentralisation of governance**. He wanted to make village as the basic administrative unit and totally self-reliant component of a huge confederation of villages that was to be the India of his dream. When India was at the threshold of independence Gandhi said in 1946: "Independence must begin at the bottom. Thus, every village will be a republic or panchayat having full powers. It follows, therefore, that every village has to be self-sustained and capable of managing its affairs even to the extent of defending itself against the whole world...In this structure composed

of innumerable villages, there will be ever widening never ascending circles. Life will not be a pyramid with the apex sustained by the bottom. But it will be an oceanic circle whose centre will be the individual, always ready to perish for the village, the latter ready to perish for the circle of villages, till at last the whole becomes one life composed of individuals never aggressive in their arrogance but ever humble, sharing the majority of the oceanic circle of which they are integral units." It is true that a huge country like India with its heterogeneity in terms of culture and geographical terrain, does require decentralisation of governance because the acute problems of remote areas and villages can neither be properly understood nor effectively solved by the central government administrators of Delhi or the state government officials from the state capitals.

Gandhi was not particularly convinced of the efficacy of either party-based democracy or the parliamentary form of governance. His slogan, 'go back to villages', was not merely an appeal to ruling elite to pay attention to the many problems that the villagers in India, the overwhelming majority of the country, were confronted with but was also his ideological preference for decentralized administrative structure wherein the whole of India would be governed by panchayats and locally elected councils. He did not favour concepts like 'Union Government' or 'State Government' that were ultimately introduced in India by the Constitution. Gandhi wanted self-government by local communities. His idea was, in fact, in tune with his spiritualism, according to which all things good and true should come from within. Therefore, the governance should also not be imposed from outside or from above. He explained, "Self-government means continuous efforts to be independent of the government control whether it is foreign or whether it is national." He was not oblivious of the fact that in a huge country like India the institution of the state could not be altogether abolished. He conceded that state and its machinery could be allowed to exist but their powers should be drastically reduced. In this context he said, "I admit that there are certain things which cannot be done without political power, but there are numerous other things which do not at all depend upon the political power. That

is why a thinker like Thoreau said that, ‘that government is best that governs the least’...a nation that runs its affairs smoothly and effectively without much state interference is truly democratic.”

His economic ideas too had the bearing of his basic approach. He wanted to see India a self-reliant and self-sustained country in the field of economy. Though he was not an economist, he thought over the economic problems of India and suggested certain ideas which were typically his own. According to him, “I am not an economist, but India may become a self-sustained country, growing all the produce she needs.” Since it is impossible for a country to produce everything it needs, Gandhism recommends limitation of wants. In this respect too Gandhi advocated to emulate the traditional Indian way of life that is shunning material desires and striving for spiritual enrichment. He wanted Indian economy to grow but not at the cost of its spirituality. He was opposed to industrialisation of Indian economy on the lines of Western countries. Instead he advocated promotion of “small scale production carried on by individual or cooperative effort for the equal benefit of all concerned. All the large scale collective production shall be eventually brought under collective ownership and control, and in this behalf the state shall begin by nationalizing heavy transport, shipping mining and the heavy industries. The textile industry shall be progressively decentralized.” Thus, Gandhian economy can be called an amalgamation Fabian socialism and spirituality.

The most controversial aspect of his Gandhian economy is the **doctrine of Trusteeship**. It can be defined as an attempt to do away with capitalism without disposing of the capitalists. His commitment to non-violence would not let him recommend a violent revolution for the destruction of the capitalists and for that reason he prescribed a non-violent persuasive strategy to deal with the capitalists. He said, “In reality the toiler is the owner of what he produces. If the toilers intelligently combine, they will become an irresistible power. If I thought it inevitable I shall not hesitate to preach it and teach it.” The efficacy and practicability of the doctrine of trusteeship has been questionable and

the critics did not mince the words in saying so to Gandhi himself. He however, wanted to make it the economic ideology of independent India. He was opposed to capitalism but he was also against forcible confiscation or nationalisation of the properties of the capitalists. He believed in the equitable distribution of material resources. As per the doctrine of trusteeship the capitalist of industries should not be thought about by the workers as the owners of the means of production and the capitalists themselves should not think or behave like owners of the industries; they should be treated as the trustees of the industries. He recommended that instead of conflict between the workers and the trustees of the industries there should be a relationship of mutual respect and cordiality.

Gandhism can be defined as a spiritual approach to political and economic issues. Gandhi was neither a political thinker nor an economist. His primary concern was to achieve freedom for India from the yoke of British imperialism. In the capacity of a freedom fighter he was the tallest leader that modern India had produced. His strategy of Satyagraha based on non-violent, non-cooperation was a novel weapon to fight against the mightiest imperial power and Gandhi, to some extent was successful in employing the strategy at different stages of the history of India's freedom struggle. However, the practical worth of Satyagraha to counter the repression of all kinds of adversaries has always been doubtful. For instance, it is debatable whether Satyagraha would have been a successful political weapon against an adversary like Hitler. The most objectionable aspect of Gandhism is its proclivity of using religious symbols, icons, idioms and viewpoint for political purposes. This is an extremely controversial approach in a plural society like India. Gandhi had the right to be a devout Hindu personally but as the chief leader of India's nationalist movement he had no right to paint the movement in the hue of religion. His idea of converting India into a confederation of self-reliant and self governing villages was more fantastic than feasible. Same is true about his economic doctrine of trusteeship. To believe that the capitalist could be convinced to treat themselves not the owners but mere trustees of their properties can only be called a preposterous idea.