UNIVERSITY OF CALICUT
SCHOOL OF DISTANCE EDUCATION

STUDY MATERIAL

Core Course

BA POLITICAL SCIENCE

VI Semester

MODERN POLITICAL THOUGHT

Prepared by: Dr. G. Sadanandan,
Associate Professor & Head,
PG Department of Political Science,
Sree Kerala Varma College, Thrissur.

Layout: Computer Section, SDE

© Reserved
Module I : SOCIAL CONTRATUALISTS
   : John Locke : State of nature, natural rights, nature and functions of state.
   : J.J. Rousseau: State of nature, social contract and general will.

Module II : UTILITARIANS
   : Jermy Bentham : Pleasure pain theory.
   : J.S. Mill: Modification of Benthams theory, on Liberty and representative government.

Module III : IDEALISTS
   : Hegel : On Dialetics, state and freedom.
   : T. H. Green: State, freedom and rights.

Module IV : SOCIALISTS
   : Karl Marx – Basic Principles of Marxism – a critical appraisal.
   : V.I Lenin- Imperialism, role of Communist party.

Module V : MODERN INDIAN POLITICAL THOUGHT
   : Gandhiji: Sathyagraha, Non-violence, Ramarajya and his economic ideas.

Module VI: CONTEMPORARY POLITICAL THOUGHT
   : John Rawl's : Theory of justice and Political Liberalism
   : Germsci: Theory of Hegemony.
MODULE I

SOCIAL CONTRATUALISTS

THOMAS HOBBES (1588-1679)

Thomas Hobbes is one of the greatest political thinkers that the world has ever produced. His status as a political thinker and philosopher was not fully recognized until the 19th century. His major work the “Leviathan” is the greatest, perhaps the sole masterpiece of political philosophy written in the English language. What makes Leviathan a masterpiece of philosophical literature is the profound logic of Hobbes’ imagination, his power as an artist. Hobbes is now regarded as the father of modern political science. It is he who for the first time systematically and scientifically expounded the absolute theory of sovereignty. Though he was by no means liberal, modern commentators like Miachel Oakeshott believe that his political doctrine has greater affinities with the liberalism of the 20th century than his authoritarian theory would initially suggest. John Rawls, for example, thinks that Hobbes’ state of nature is the classical example of the prisoners’ dilemma of game theory.

Thomas Hobbes was prematurely born in 1588 in Westport near Malmesbury in England. He was a witness to the great political and constitutional turmoil caused by the English civil war and his life and writings bear clear imprint of it. After his education at Oxford, Hobbes joined as tutor to the son of William Cavendish in 1608. He remained closely connected with the Cavendish family for a long period of his life. His first publication was a translation in English of Thucydides’ History of the Peloponnesian war in 1629. besides, just before he died at the age of 86 he translated Homer’s Odyssey and Illiad into English. Hobbes learnt scholastic logic and physics at Oxford university. He met several eminent scholars and scientists like Galileo, Kepler, Descartes, Gassendi. He became convinced that everything including man and society, morals and politics cold be explained on the basis of laws of motion. Keplers’ laws of planetary motion and Galileo’s laws of falling bodies made a deep impact on his mind. The important works of Hobbes include the Leviathan, Elements of Law, De civie, De corpore Politics etc. In his Elements of Law (1950) Hobbes demonstrated the need for undivided sovereignty but the arguments for this were not derived from the theory of Divine Right of Kings. In 1647 Hobbes fell seriously ill and never recover fully. From 1647 he started developing symptoms which indicated Parkinson’s disease. But in spite of ill health his famous work, the Leviathan appeared in April 1650. As William Ebenstein has rightly pointed out, the Leviathan is not an apology for the Stuart Monarchy nor a grammar of despotic government but the first general theory of politics in the English language.

Hobbes stress was on self-interest and fear as the two fundamental human motivations which needs to be controlled by an omnipotent sovereign power. The presence of a sovereign separated a state of nature from sovereign power.

STATE OF NATURE AND HUMAN NATURE

Hobbes political theory is derived from psychology which, in turn, is based on his mechanistic conceptions of Nature. Hobbes, like Machiavelli, was concerned with the secular...
Origins of human conduct. Contrary to Aristotle and medieval thinkers, who saw human nature as innately social, Hobbes viewed human beings as isolated, egoistic, self interested and seeking society as a means to their ends.

According to Hobbes, prior to the formation of state or common wealth, there existed state of nature. Men in the state of nature were essentially selfish. Individuals were creations of desire, seeking pleasure and avoiding pain. Pleasures were good and pain bad, which was why men were sought to pursue and maximize their pleasure and avoid pain. The pleasure were good and pain bad, which was why men were sought to pursue and maximize their pleasure and avoid pain. The pleasure-pain theory was developed in a coherent and systematic theory of human behavior and motivation by the Utilitarians especially Jeremy Bentham in the 18th century. In addition to being creatures of pleasure and pain, Hobbes saw individuals constantly in motion to satisfy their desires.

Hobbes asserted that every human action, feeling and thought was ultimately physically determined. Though the human being was decent on his life he was able to, some extent, to control these motions and make his life. According to Hobbes, it was reason that distinguished humans from animals. Reason enables the individual to understand the impressions that sense organs picked up from the external world, and also indicated an awareness of one’s natural passions.

According to Hobbes, human condition in the state of nature is derived from the nature of man, his basic psycho physical character, his sensations, emotions appetites and behavior. Hobbes believes, that like all other things in nature man is primarily a body governed by law of motion which permeates the entire physical world.

Men in the state of nature possessed some natural instincts like competition, diffidence and glory. Men are naturally equal in mind and body. Basic equality of man, according to Hobbes is a principal source of trouble and misery. Men have in general equal faculties, they also cherish like hopes and desires. If two men desire the same thing, which they cannot both obtain, they become enemies and seek to destroy each other. According to Hobbes, passions of desire and aversion are the root cause of conflict in the state of nature. Everybody is moved by the natural impulse of self preservation and desire and possess the objects or goods that are conducive to his existence.

Competition for goods of life becomes a struggle for power because without power one can not retain what one has acquired. One cannot retain power without acquiring more power. Thus it turns out to be a struggle for power after power which ceases only in death. Sense of insecurity, fear and pride aggravate this tragic condition. Hobbes in his Leviathan wrote thus: in the state of nature we find three principle causes of quarrel. First, competition; second, diffidence; third, glory. The first maketh men invade for gain; the second for safety; and the third, for reputation.

Thus it is clear from the above statement is that what is central to Hobbes’ psychology is not hedonism but search for power and glory, riches and glory. Power is, of course, the central feature of Hobbes’ system of ideas. As Michael Oakeshot in his Hobbesian Leviathan has rightly pointed out “Man is a complex of power; desire is the desire for power, pride is illusion about power, honor opinion about power, life the unremitting exercise of power and death the absolute loss of power.”

According to Hobbes, conflict is inherent in human psychology. It is implanted in man’s inordinate pride covetousness, sense of fear and insecurity etc. Hobbes also mentions another cause of conflict which cannot be traced to psychological egoism. This relates to the difference among men about what is good and evil, desirable and undesirable. In the state of nature, therefore, men are in a condition of “war of every man against every man” Force and fraud the two
conditional virtues of war, flourish in this atmosphere of perpetual fear and strife fed by three psychological causes, namely competition, diffidence and love of glory. The combined effect of the factors is that Hobbesian state of nature is a “war of every man against every man” The life of man is “solitary, poor, nasty brutish and short “ In this dismal picture of state of nature, there can be no morality, justice, industry and civilization. In this state, however, there is a right of nature, natural right of every man to everything even to one another’s life.

The other important concept of Hobbes associated with state of nature is his conception of Natural right. According to Hobbes the Right of nature is the liberty each man has to use his own power as he will himself for the preservation of his own nature, that is to say of his own life and consequently of doing anything in his own judgment, and reason, he shall conceive to be the aptest means there into.”The concept of natural Right is considered to be the most important contribution of Hobbes to modern political theory.

In the state of nature individuals enjoyed complete liberty, including a natural right to everything even to one another’s bodies. The natural laws which were dictates of reason. Subsequently Hobbes argued that the laws of nature were also proper laws since they were delivered in the world of God. These laws were counsels of prudence. Natural laws in Hobbes theory did not mean eternal justice, perfect morality or standards to judge existing laws as the stoics did. They did not imply the existence of common good for they merely created the common conditions which were necessary to fulfill each individual good.

SOCIAL CONTRACT

After presenting a dismal picture of the state of nature, Hobbes proceeds to discuss how men can escape from an “intolerably miserable condition”. In order to escape from such a state of affairs, men to the state of nature themselves entered into a contract or covenant. Since the first law of nature enjoined individuals to seek peace, the only way to attain it was through a covenant leading to the establishment of a common wealth or state. Individuals surrendered all their powers through a contract to a third party who was not a party to the contract but nevertheless received all their powers that were surrendered. The common wealth was constituted when the multitude of individuals were limited in one person when every person said to the other “I authorize and give up the right of governing myself to this man or to this assembly of men on the condition that thou give up the right to him, and authorize all his actions in like manner. This is the generation of that great Leviathan or rather of that Mortal God to which we owe under the immortal God our peace and defense ---- “ It is clear from the above statement that no individual can surrender his right to self preservation.

Hobbes makes a distinction between a contract and a covenant. The mutual transferring of right is that which men call contract covenant is a special kind of contract. Covenant is a special kind of contract which implies trust and promise for future performance.

Hobbesian contract is a unilateral contract in which the contracting individuals obligate themselves to the resultant sovereign. According to William Ebenstein, Hobbesian social contract is made between subjects and subjects and not between subjects and sovereign. The sovereign in not a party to the contract but its creation In this conception of social contract, the sovereign cannot commit many breach of covenant because he is not a party to it. The sovereign must treat all the individuals equally in matters of justice and levying taxes. Once the sovereign power was created, it would be bestowed with all powers. As has been rightly pointed out by Hobbes in his Leviathan,
“This is the Generation of that Great Leviathan, or rather of that Mortal God to which we owe under the Immortal God, our peace and defence”.

NATURE AND ATTRIBUTES OF HOBBESIAN STATE

Before and after Thomas Hobbes, the concept of political absolutism has been defended by various scholars on various grounds. But Hobbes was the first political thinker to defend absolutism on scientific grounds. Hobbes freed the doctrine of sovereignty of limitations imposed by Jean Bodin and Grotius.

Hobbes saw the sovereign power as undivided unlimited inalienable and permanent. The contract created the state and the government simultaneously. The sovereign power was authorized to enact laws as it deemed fit and such laws were legitimate. Hobbes was categorical that the powers and authority of the sovereignty had to be defined with least ambiguity.

The following are the major attributes of Hobbesian sovereign.

1. Sovereign is absolute and unlimited and accordingly no conditions, implicit or explicit, can be imposed on it. It is not limited either by the rights of the subjects or by customary and statutory laws.

2. Sovereignty is not a party to the convenant or contract. A sovereign does not exist prior to the commencement of the contract. Contract was signed between in the state of nature mainly to escape from a state of war of every man against every man. The contract is irrevocable.

3. The newly created sovereign can do no injury to his subjects because he is their authorized agent. His actions cannot be illegal because he himself is the sole source of law and the laws are subject to his interpretations.

4. No one can complain that sovereign is acting wrongly because everybody has authorized him to act on his behalf.

5. Sovereign has absolute right to declare war and make peace, to levy taxes and to impose penalties.

6. Sovereign is the ultimate source of all administrative, legislative and judicial authority. According to Hobbes, law is the command of the sovereign not its counsel.

7. The sovereign has the right to allow or takes away freedom of speech and opinion.

8. The sovereign has to protect the people externally and internally for peace and preservation were basis of the creation of the sovereign or Leviathan. Thus Hobbesian sovereign represents the ultimate, supreme and single authority in the state and there is no right of resistance against him except in case of self defense. According the Hobbes, any act of disobedience of a subject is unjust because it is against the covenant. Hobbes believes that covenants without swords are mere words Division of sovereignty means destruction of sovereign which means that men are returning to the old state of nature where the life is intolerably miserable.

By granting absolute power to the sovereign some of the critics even went to the extent of criticizing Hobbes as one of the founding fathers of totalitarian Fascism or Communism. However, William Ebenstein in his well known work ‘Great Political Thinkers’ has opposed this charge in the following grounds.
Firstly, government is set up, according to Hobbes, by a covenant that transfers all power and authority to the sovereign. This contractual foundation of government is an anathema to the modern totalitarians.

Second, Hobbes’ assigns to the state some fundamental functions such as to “maintain order and security for the benefits of the citizens”. By contrast, the aim of modern totalitarian state is anti-individualistic and anti-hedonistic.

Third, Hobbesian state is authoritarian, not totalitarian. Hobbes’ pleads for equality before law so that rich and mighty have no legal advantage over poor and obscure persons. Hobbes’ authoritarianism thus lacks one of the most characteristic features of the modern totalitarian state: inequality before law and the resulting sense of personal insecurity.

Fourth, Hobbes holds that the sovereign may be one man or an assembly of men where as modern totalitarianism is addicted to the one man leadership principle.

Fifthly, Hobbes recognizes that war is one of the two main forces that drive men to set up a state. But wherever two main force that drive men to set up a state. But whenever he speaks of war, it is defensive war and there is glorification of war in the Leviathan. By contrast totalitarian, imperialist fascist look on war as something highly desirable and on imperialist war as the highest form of national life.

This it is clear from the above discussion that Hobbes’ theory of sovereignty is the first systematic and consistent statement of complete sovereignty in the history of political thought. It was Hobbes who first propounded a doctrine of the absolute and unrestricted sovereignty of the state. His sovereign enjoys an absolute authority over his subject and his powers can neither be divided nor limited either by the law of nature or by the law of God.

Hobbes’ Leviathan is not only a forceful enunciation of the theory of sovereignty but also a powerful statement of individualism. As Prof. Sabine has rightly pointed out, in Hobbesian political philosophy both absolutism and individualism go hand in hand. Granting absolute and unlimited power to the state is, in essence, an attempt to provide a happy and pleasurable life to the individuals. Hobbes is no liberal or democrat but he is a thorough individualist not because he believes in the sanctity of individual man but because for him the world is and must always be made up of individuals.

JOHN LOCKE (1632 - 1704)

Liberalism as a political ideology began with John Locke. No political thinker had influenced political theorizing on two different countries in two different continents as Locke did. He was the guiding and spiritual father of the 18th century enlightenment period, particularly for philosopher like Rousseau and Voltaire. He was acknowledged as the founder of modern empiricism with Hume, J.S. Mill, Russel etc as its exponents.

A profound and extensive study of John Locke has been one of the most remarkable achievements of recent philosophical scholarship. Perhaps no other political thinker has received greater attention at the hands of historians of thought with the last fifty years. Locke was interpreted as a collectivist because of his insistence that the community would be ruled by the will of the majority. He was seen as a champion of individuality. He was depicted as an enemy of patriartism, preparing the grounds for women’s equal rights.
John Locke’s life coincided with one of the most significant epochs of British history that saw the transformation of absolute monarchy into parliamentary democracy. It was a period of the historic Glorious Resolution of 1688 with Locke was closely associated with the Lord Ashley, Locke’s friend and patron who was charged with conspiracy to exclude Charles II from acceding to the throne.

Locke was born in a Somerset village in England in the summer of 1632. His parents come from Puritan trading and land owning families and were sympathetic to the parliamentarians and the Whigs during the civil war. His father was a notary while his grandfather was a tanner and clothier. Locke went to Westminster school in 1647, and then enrolled himself in Christ church college as a student in 1652 for 15 years till 1667. Locke’s first works were written at Oxford, namely the Two Tracts on Government in 1660-1662 and the Essays on the Law of Nature in Latin in 1664. In both these writings he argued against religious toleration and denied consent as the basis of legitimate government.

Locke published his Two Treatises of Government in 1690. The same year saw the publication of his famous philosophical work, the Essay Concerning Human Understanding Locke’s other important writings were the Letters Concerning Toleration (1689) and Some Thoughts Concerning Education (1693). The Two Treatises of Government consists of two parts – the first is the refutation of Filmer and the second, the more important of the two, is an inquiry into the “True Original, Extent and End of Civil Government” The work was mainly to justify the historic glorious revolution.

Locke played an important role in the repeal of the Act for Regulation of printing in 1695 and in the re-coining of the debased English currency in the 1690s. Before his death in 1704, he attained fame, both nationally and internationally.

**STATE OF NATURE**

In order to explain the origin of political power, Locke began with a description of the State of Nature. Locke’s description of State of Nature was not as gloomy and pessimistic as Hobbes’. As all of us know, the State of Nature is the stock in trade of all contract theories of the state. It is conceived as a state prior to the establishment of political society. Locke believes that man is a rational and social creature and as such capable of recognizing and living in a moral order. He is not selfish, competitive and aggressive.

The Lockean state of nature, far from being a war of all is a state of ‘Peace good will, mutual assistance and preservation”. It represents a pre-political rather than a pre-social condition. Men do not indulge in constant warfare in it, for peace and reason prevail in it. The state of nature is governed by a law of nature. This law “obliges every one, and reason, which is that law, teaches all mankind, who will but consult it, that being all equal and independent, no one ought to harm one another in his life, health, liberty or possessions for men being all the workmanship of one omnipotent and infinitely wise maker; all the servants of sovereign master, sent into the world by his order, and about his business; they are his property whose workmanship they are, made to last during his, not one another’s pleasure…………”

In the Lockean state of nature men have equal natural rights to life, liberty and property togetherly known as Right to Property. These rights are inalienable and inviolable for they are derived from the Law of Nature which is God’s reason. Everyone is bound by reason not only to preserve oneself but to preserve all mankind in so far as his own preservation does not come in
conflict with it. Men are free and equal and there is no commonly acknowledged superior whose orders they are obliged to obey. Everybody is the judge of his own actions. But though the natural condition is a state of liberty, it is not a state of license. Nobody has the right to destroy himself and the destroy the life of any other men. Because there is no common judge to punish the violation of natural law in the state of nature, every individual is his own judge and has executive power of punishing the violators of law of nature. William Ebenstein in his ‘Great Political Thinkers’ wrote that the law of nature in the Lockean state of nature is deficient in three important points. First, it is not sufficiently clear. If all men were guided by pure reason they would all see the same law. But men are biased by their interests and mistake their interests for general rule of law. Second, there is no second party judge who has no personal state in dispute. Third, in the state of nature the injured party is not always strong enough to execute the law. In other words, in the Lockean state of nature there are some short comings and inconveniences. Absence of a law making body law enforcing agency and an impartial judicial organ in the state of nature where the serious short comings in the state of nature. Thus we find that the state of nature, while it is not a state of war is also not an idyllic condition, and, therefore, it has to be superseded sooner or later. Conflict and uncertainties are bound to arise on account of the selfish tendencies in human nature. The state of nature is always in danger of being transformed into a state or war. Where everyone is the judge in his own case and has the sole authority to punish peace is bound to be threatened.

NATURAL RIGHTS

The concept of Natural rights forms an important theme in Lockean political philosophy. According to Locke, men in the state of nature possessed some natural rights like right to life, liberty and property. These natural rights are derived from natural law and are limited by it. The freedom of man and liberty of acting according to his will is grounded on having reason, which is able to instruct him in that law he is to govern himself by, and make him know how far he is left to the freedom of his own will”. The end of law is not to abolish or to restrain but to preserve or enlarge freedom for in all the states of created beings, where there is no law there is no freedom.”

According to Locke, Right to Property is intimately connected with right to life and liberty as its necessary consequence. Sometimes Locke sums up all natural rights in the right to property. Life and liberty are more important than property. Man creates property by mixing his labour with the objects of nature. In the beginning all things were held in common. But common ownership is not sufficient to provide men with means of life and satisfy their needs. Man must mix his labour with resources provided by nature to enable him to make use of them in a more efficient and profitable way. Since man owns his own person his body and limbs, the object with which he mixes his labour becomes his own property by right. This is the origin of the famous labour theory of value common to both the classical and Marxian economics. Locke does not believe that man has an unlimited right of appropriation.

According to Locke, in the state of nature individuals are conscious of these natural rights for they are subject to reason. The state of nature is distinguished from the civil society by the absence in it of a common organ for the interpretation and execution of law of nature. Hence in the state of nature every individual is the interpreter and executor of law of nature. Variety in interpretation leads to chaos and confusion and consequent insecurity of life and property. Hence it is necessary to replace the state of nature into civil society in which there would be a known law accepted by all and applied by an impartial and authoritative judge whose decision would be
enforced by the state. Thus Lockean state was created by entering into contract by the men in the state of nature.

**SOCIAL CONTRACT**

According to John Locke, men in the state of nature entered into a contract due to some inconveniences such as absence of common law making, law-enforcing and law interpreting agency capable of protecting natural rights. Therefore, the problem is to form a civil society by common consent of all men and transfer their right of punishing the violators of Natural Law to an independent and impartial authority. Lockes’ contract was a contract of each with all, a surrender by the individual of his personal right to fulfill the commands of the laws of Nature in return for the guarantee that his rights as nature ordains them - life, liberty and property - would be preserved.

Locke in his ‘Two Treatises on Government’ wrote the nature of the contract thus: Each individual contracts with each to unite into and constitute a community. The end for which this contract is made is the protection and preservation of property, in the broad sense of the word - that is, life, liberty and estate - against the dangers both from within and without the community”. According to Lockean contract, each individual agrees to give up not all his natural rights but that one of interpreting and executing the law of nature and redressing their own grievances. But this right is given not to any person or group of persons but the community as a whole, that too on the under standing that the natural rights of the individual to life, liberty and property will be guaranteed by the community.

The Lockean contract was, thus, not general as with Hobbes but limited and specific in character. Locke wrote in book II thus: “Men being as has been said by nature all free, equal and independent, no one can be put out of this estate and subjected to the political power of another without his own consent, which is done by agreeing with other men, to join and invite into a community for their comfortable safe and peaceable living, one amongst another, in a secure enjoyment of their properties, and a greater security against any that are not of it. This any number of men may do, because it enquires not the freedom of the rest they are left, as they were, in the liberty of the state of nature: when any number of men have so consented to make one community or government, they are thereby presently incorporated and make one body politic, wherein the majority have a right to act and conclude the rest”. As such Lockean social contract was a contract with the community as a whole resulted in the establishment of that common political superior - the state- which was supposed to enforce the law of Nature.

After they have set up a political or civil society, the next step is to appoint a government to declare and execute the natural law. Locke calls this process as the supreme authority established by the commonwealth or civil society. In other words, there are two aspects in Lockean contract- one by which the civil society is established and the other which creates the government. While the first is the product of a contract, the second is only a fiduciary power to act for certain ends and there remains still in the people a supreme power to remove or alter the legislative, when they find the legislative act contrary to the trust reposed in them. The relationship between society and the government is expressed by the idea of trust because it obviates making the government a party to the contract and giving it an independent status and authority.

According to Locke, the newly created government has three functions - legislative, executive and federative. The legislative is the supreme power to which all other powers, particularly executive must be subordinate. The executive power is subordinate to the legislative
and is responsible to it. The federative power is concerned with foreign affairs. Though the legislative power is supreme it is not arbitrary. It exists for common good which is the preservation of freedom and protection of property. Further, the legislative cannot rule by arbitrary decrees, but only by duly promulgated and established laws.

STATE : ITS NATURE AND FUNCTIONS

Lockean state is characterised by certain features. The first and most important feature is that the “state exists for the people who form it and not they for it”. Locke further insists that all true states must be founded on consent of the governed. For Locke, men were by nature free, politically equal, creatures of God subject to the laws of nature; and possessors of an executive power of the laws of nature; they became subjects of political authority only by their consent. Without consent there was no political community. Locke spoke of two kinds of consent: express or direct and tacit consent. Express consent was an explicit commitment given at the time when the commonwealth was instituted.

According to Locke, the true state must be a constitutional state in which men acknowledge the rule of law. Locke believes that there can be no political liberty if a man is subject to the inconstant, uncertain, unknown, arbitrary will of another man. Government must, therefore, be established standing laws, promulgated and known to the people, and not by extemporary decrees.

All true states, according to Locke, were established by consent. He assumed that a minority would consent in all things to rule by the majority. Through initial and continuing consent, Locke met the critique of Filmer by insisting that legitimate power combined power with right. A good government could not be arbitrary, it was bound by the general laws which were public and not subject to individual decrees. All individuals would be governed by the same rules as everyone else, otherwise it would isolate the natural moral equality of individuals. He clarified that people could use force only against unjust and unlawful authority. The right of obedience could be exercised by the majority, and not by one person or a small group.

Fourthly, Lockean state is limited. It is limited because it derives power from the people and because it holds power in trust for the people. It is limited moreover, by Natural Law in general and by one most important Natural Law in particular.

Lockean state is a tolerant state which will respect differences of opinion particularly in religious matters. Religious toleration was a topic a great importance in Locke’s time and in consonance with his general philosophy and political theory he placed great emphasis on it. According to Locke, conscience cannot be subject of external control. A man is free to profess any religion he likes. The state should not in any case resort to religious prosecution. It should not enforce practices relating to faith. However, Locke imposes certain limitations on religious toleration. He wrote that “no opinion contrary to human society, or to those moral rules which are necessary for the preservation of civil society are to be tolerated because” promise, covenants, and oaths, which are the bonds of human society, can have no hold upon an atheist. The taking away of God, though, but even in thought dissolves all”. Lockean state is also a transformer state, transforming selfish interest into public good. As Locke has pointed out, the end of the state is good of the community.

According to Locke, sovereignty remains with the community but is exercised by the majority. According to Prof. Vaughan, Locke had no clear cut theory of sovereign at all, the sovereign of civil government is the individual. Prof Vaughan’s view was almost held by Prof
Ernest Barker when he wrote that “Locke had no clear view of the nature and residence of sovereignty” Locke in his works admits that behinds the authority of the legislature there is an ultimate sovereignty of people which later writers, particularly JJ Rousseau termed as popular sovereignty. The doctrine of popular or national sovereignty cannot properly ascribed to Locke.

JEAN JACQUES ROUSSEAU (1712- 1778)

Jean Jacques Rousseau was the greatest political thinker that the French has ever produced. In the entire history of political theory, he was the most exciting and most provocative. He was a genius and a keen moralist who was ruthless in his criticism of eighteenth century French society. He was one of the most controversial thinkers, as evident from the conflicting, contradictory and often diametrically interpretations that existed of the nature and importance of his ideas. His philosophy is highly personal, an expression of his own fierce insistence on independence and liberty, but at the same time paradoxical and complex. He is best remembered for his concept of popular sovereignty and the theory of general will, which provides a philosophical justification for democratic governance. Others viewed him as a collectivist. Many saw him as an incomparable democratic who recognized autonomy though some viewed him as a precursor of modern totalitarians. To many, he was an advocate of revolutionary changes while others regard him as a defendant of status quo.

Rousseau was born in June 28, 1712 in the city of Geneva Rousseau’s mother died a few days after giving birth to him, and his father was unable to raise Rousseau in any inherent fashion. His parents were protestants, but Rousseau got converted to Catholicism under the influence of Madame de Warens, his lover. During his life time he accomplished many things including mastery in writing on music, politics education, culture etc. At the age of 30 Rousseau went to Paris. From 1743 to 1744, Rousseau became the secretary of the French Ambassador in Venice. He developed an intimate relationship with Theresele Vasseur in 1745, who subsequently became the mother of his five children. All his children were abandoned in an orphanage.

Rousseau made a passionate appeal for human equality. As a political moralist and a constitution builder he made utopian demands. In his well known work Discourses on Origins of Inequality(1755) he described how contemporary society fell short of civilized standards .In the Social Contract (1762) he stipulated and portrayed a decent and human society. He mainly focused on whether human beings could enjoy both civilization and freedom, society and integrity. He propounded the concept of general will as the real basis of legitimate power and authority.

In 1750, Rousseau became famous by winning an essay competition with his discourse entitled” Has the Progress of Science and Arts contributed to corrupt and purify morality”. The unconventional Rousseau had stated that “our souls have been corrupted in proportion to the advancement of our sciences and our arts towards perfection “. Here, he extended the arguments of Machiavelli and Montesquieu about the relationship between luxury and affluence growth, moral decline and loss of human liberty. Rousseau’s severe criticism of luxury and artificiality, rejection of sophistication angered his contemporarie. He believed that the arts and sciences originated in human vices as masks to conceal and rationalize human depravity. He defended simplicity, innocence, poverty and virtue as opposed to refinement wealth etc. In many respects, Rousseau’s theory had a striking resemblance to the subsequent indictment by Gandhi of modern westernized, materialistic and technological civilization.
STATE OF NATURE

Rousseau built his political theory on the conception of pre-political state of nature. The reason is that he grew up in the rigorously Calvinist atmosphere of the small city of Geneva. Throughout his life, inspite of his conversion to Catholicism and a great humiliation which he suffered in Geneva, his love for his home strongly shaped his political thought. As he was restless man by nature he was never completely at home in any profession. He could never tolerate external restraint.

In the Discourse on Inequality published in 1754, Rousseau started with the analysis of human nature. He considered the natural man, living in natural surroundings or in the state of nature as a noble savage. Man, as a natural animal lived the happy and care free life of the brute, without fixed abode without articulate speech, with no needs or desires that cannot be satisfied through the mere instinct. According to him, men in the state of nature were equal, self sufficient and self controlled. Their conduct was based not on reason, but on emotions of self interest and pity. Man’s first feeling was that of his own existence, and his first care that of self preservation. Hunger and other appetites made him at various times experience various modes of existence.

According to Rousseau, men in the state of nature lived in isolation and had a few elementary, easily appeased needs. It was neither a condition of plenty or scarcity, neither there was conflict nor cooperative living. There was no language or knowledge of any science or art. In such a situation man was neither happy nor unhappy, had no conception of just and unjust virtue or vice. The noble savage was guided by two instincts- self love or the instinct of self preservation and sympathy or the gregarious instinct. As these instincts are always beneficial, man is by nature good. But self love and sympathy often come in to clash with each other hence, according to Rousseau, man takes the help of a sentiment to resolve the clash, which men can conscience. But since conscience is only a blind sentiment, it will not teach men what is in fact right. Conscience, therefore, requires a guide and that guide is reason which develops in man as alternate courses of action present themselves before him. Rousseau’s taught that reason was the outgrowth of a artificial life a man in organized society and that the results of its development were calamities. The noble savage was Rousseau’s ideal man.

State of nature did not last forever. In course of time the noble savage who lived in isolation discovered the utility and usefulness of labour which gave rise to the idea of property. Property led to the domination of one man over other.

SOCIAL CONTRACT

Rousseau in his work Social Contract presented theory of the state. In the development from the state of nature, there comes a time when individuals can no longer maintain themselves in primitive independence; it then becomes necessary to self preservation that they should unite to form a civil society- a political society. Rousseau admitted that the problem is to find a form of association which will defend and protect with the whole common force the person and goods of each associate, and in which each, while uniting himself with all, may still obey himself alone, and remains as force as before. This is the fundamental problem of which the social contract provides the solution.

In the first chapter of his major work entitled Social Contract, Rousseau wrote thus: “Man is born free and everywhere he is in chains. One who believes himself the master of the rest is only more of a slave then they…” This means that the liberty and equality that characterise the state of
nature, in whatever sense the term is used are in the civil state gone. Rousseau justified their disappearance by proving that they were not gone at all, subsisted as fully after as before, the institution of government.

Rejecting historical and force theories of the origin of the state, Rousseau made it clear that political society was created through social pact, since only by agreement and consent could authority be justified and liberty retained. Rousseau held that each individual gave up his natural rights to the community as a whole. The social contract involves the total alienation of each associate, together with all his rights to the whole community: for in the first place as each gives himself absolutely the conditions are the same for all: and this being so no one has any interest in making them burdensome to others”. According to Rousseau each person in the state possessed an equal and in alienable portion of the sovereignty of the whole and gained back, under the protection of the state, the rights he had given up.

The social contract of Rousseau can be summarized in the following: “Each of us puts his person and all his power in common under the supreme direction of the general will and in our corporate capacity, we receive each member as an indivisible part of the whole” This act of association creates a moral and collective body. The contract is calculated to create the community and yet the community is part of the contract.

The social contract of Rousseau was social and not governmental. According to Rousseau, the social contract was the total surrender of the whole community. The state is not something external to the individual, but the essence of his being. There could be no conflict between authority vested in the people as a whole and their liberty as individuals. Viewed in this way, the social contract is not a contract which men make with their future ruler. According to Rousseau, government is their mere agent. The Sovereign cannot “impose upon its subjects any fetters that are useless to the community, nor can it even wish to do so “The sovereign here means the community in its collective and legislative capacity.

**GENERAL WILL**

The doctrine of general will occupies an important place in Rousseau’s political philosophy. By making General will Sovereign and individuals as participants in the General will, Rousseau reconciled authority with freedom as none before him had done. In order to understand how Rousseau achieved this end, we need to know more about the meaning, nature and characteristics of general will and other related wills. By introducing the concepts of General will, Rousseau fundamentally alters the mechanistic concept of the state as an instrument and revives the organic theory of the state which goes back to Plato and Aristotle.

In the Discourse on Political Economy, where he had first stated the concept of general will, Rousseau says that “General Will tends always to the preservation and welfare of the whole and every part, and is the source of the laws constitutes for all the members of the state, in relation to one another and to it the rule of what is just and unjust” According to Rousseau, the actual will of the individual is his impulsive and irrational will. It is based on self interest and is not related to the well being to the society. Such a will is narrow and self conflicting. The real will of the individual, on the other hand, is rational will which aims at the general happiness of the community. The real will promotes harmony between the individual and society. The real will is based on reason. Rousseau believes that an average man has both an actual and a real will.
The general will is the sum total of the real wills of the individuals in the society. It represents the common consciousness of the common good after proper discussion and deliberation. The chief attribute of the general will is not its sovereign power but pursuits of common interests and its public spiritedness. In the Discourse on Political Economy Rousseau had already dealt with the problem of General will. The character of the General will is determined by two elements: first, it aims at the general good and second it must come from all and apply to all. The first refers to the object of the will, the second, to its origin.

Rousseau makes a distinction between will of all and general will. The General will considers only the common interests whereas the will of all takes private interest into account and is no more than a sum of particular wills. Thus the will of all is the aggregate of all the wills of the individuals of the community about their private interest, wills partly clash and partly coincide mutually. But the general will represents the aggregate of these wills which is common to all individuals. In other words, the essential difference between the will of all and general will is one of motivation, i.e., service to the community without any prejudice or discrimination.

CHARACTERISTICS

The following are some of the important features of general will. Firstly, Rousseau’s General will is permanent. It is rational and not impulsive. It is not eternal but permanent and imparts stability to national institutions.

Secondly, Rousseau’s general will is inalienable and indivisible. Rousseau locates sovereignty in the General will. General will and Sovereign are in alienable just as life of the individual is inalienable. Whereas Hobbes sets up a ruler as sovereign, Rousseau draws up a sharp distinction between sovereignty, which always and wholly resides on the people and government, which is but a temporary agent of the sovereign people. Rousseau saw the government as an agent of the General will, the sovereign entity of the body politic. Like Montesquieu, he believed all forms of government were not suited to all countries.

Rousseau’s general will is not self-contradictory. It gives touch of unity of national character. His general will is unrepresentative because sovereignty lies in the community which is collective body and cannot be represented but by itself. As soon as a nation appoints representatives, it is no longer free; it no longer exists. Finally, General will is infallible because it is an organisation and synthesis of the real wills of the individuals which aims at the general welfare of the community. It is based on reason rather than on emotions and instincts. Moreover, it is infallible in the sense that it can never be factually wrong but that it is morally right and an essentially sound will.

According to Rousseau, General will would be the source of all laws. The human being would be truly free if he followed the dictates of the law. Each individual would have to be a law maker, consenting to obey a law if it maximised freedom. It was for this reason that he desired the free state would be a consensual and participatory democracy. He was categorical that the general will could emerge only in an assembly of equal law makers. Only the legislative will, which was sovereign could be the General will. The General will could not be the will of majority. The general will would always aim and promote the general interests and will of all its members. Rousseau saw the government as an agent of the general will, Sovereign entity in the body politic.

From the above, it is clear that Rousseau’s concept of Sovereignty is different from both Hobbes and Locke. In Hobbes, people set up a sovereign and transfer all powers to him. In
Locke’s social contract the people setup a limited government for limited purposes, but Locke shuns the conception of sovereignty popular or monarchical as a symbol of political absolutism. Rousseau’s sovereign, on the other hand, is the people, constituted as a political community through social contract. Unlike all other major Political thinkers, Rousseau considers sovereignty of the people inalienable and indivisible.

Rousseau’s theory of General will has been criticized as incomplete and vague. In actual practice it is very difficult to distinguish the general will from the will of all. The general will is not the will of everybody in the community because that will merely be the will of all. Further, Rousseau’s theory of General will is rather abstract and narrow. Prof Vaughan criticized Rousseau’s General will has Hobbes’ Leviathan with its head chopped off. Further, Rousseau’s doctrine of General will is too abstract and there was difficulty with regard to its location or identification. Prof Sabine, C.L Wayper and others made scathing attack on Rousseau’s theory of General will.

Notwithstanding such criticisms, the significance of Rousseau cannot be ever diminished. As Prof Willam Ebenstein has rightly pointed out, Rousseau was the first modern writer to have attempted, though not always successfully, to synthesis good government with self government in the key concept of the general will. Rousseau was clearer than the conventional liberal doctrines that the end of government is not confined to the protection of individual liberty but also includes equality because “liberty cannot exist without equality”

Rousseau’s theory like Marx’s, was international in character. There was a conception of the human family and an international federation as the end of his political ideal. He also projected the body politic as moral being which would preserve the welfare of the whole as well as its constituent parts. Rousseau was seen as the spiritual father of the French revolution of 1789. Edmund Burke referred to him as the insane Socrates of the National assembly”

There was no denying the fact the Rousseau’s political philosophy was one of the most innovative striking, remarkable and brilliantly argued theories. His most spectacular achievement was that he understood the pivotal problem that faced individuals in society- how to reconcile individual interests with those of the larger interests of the society. He had the most rigorous and revolutionary theory of sovereignty conceived as omnipotent and omnipresent. For Rousseau, sovereignty is not a mere legal thing. It is the sum total of all virtues and even freedoms. Rousseau’s influence has changed the last three centuries. In the 18th century he was seen as a critic of the status quo. In the 19th century, he was seen as an apostle of the French revolution and the founder of the romantic movement. In the 20th century he has been hailed as the founder of the democratic tradition, while at the same time assailed for being the philosophical inspiration of totalitarianism. In addition, we can also find presence of Rousseau in Rawlsian theory of distributive justice.
JEREMY BENTHAM (1748 -1832)

Jeremy Bentham, the founder of Utilitarianism combined throughout his active life the careers of philosopher, a jurist and that of social reformer and an activist. Though trained to be a lawyer, he gave up the practice of law in order to examine the basis on the principle of the greatest happiness of the greatest number was aimed at rearing the fabric of felicity by the hands of reason and law. He championed reforms of prison, legislation and parliament, and stressed the need for a new penal code for England. It was for this reason that some scholars particularly J S Mill, has regarded him as a progressive philosopher, an enemy of the status quo.

Utilitarianism is essentially a British school of political theory. It consisted of a group of writers, politicians, administrators and social reformers. The most famous members of the group are Jeremy Bentham, James Mill and John Stuart Mill. Their primary theoretical interest lay in conceiving a frame work of political rules leading to a science of politics. In practice they emphasized on the necessity of legal and social reform and evolving efficient political institutions.

Bentham was born in 1748 in the family of a wealthy and successful attorney. He lost his mother at the age of 10. As a child, Bentham’s major source of enjoyment was reading books with no inclination to play. After an Oxford education of Queen’s college, Bentham began attending the London law courts in 1763 and was called to Bar in 1769. He never pleaded a single case and gave up the idea of practicing law in the conviction that the whole system of law needed overhauling. Like Hobbes, he has deeply interested in Science. The French Philosophers Claude Adrien Helvetius (1715- 1771) and Cesare Bonesana, Marquis of Beccaria (1738 1794) etc inspired and influenced him. It was generally believed that he came across the phrase “the greatest happiness of the greatest number” with which his name was closely associated in the 1767 English translation of Beccaris’s Essay on Crimes and Punishment(1764). But some scholars, on the other hand, contend that he borrowed the above idea from Joseph Priestly (1733-1804). From Helvetius, Bentham realized that legislation was the most significance of all worldly pursuits. Legislation could bring about suitable reforms since all human beings were fundamentally alike and their differences were due to their upbringing, environment and education. From the early 1770s, the study of legislation became Bentham’s most important preoccupation. He did not practice law, but concentrated on writing about what the law should be rather than what it was.

In the mid 1770’s Bentham wrote a lengthy critique of William Blackston’s (1723-1780) commentaries on the Law of England. A portion of this Critique was published in 1776 as “ A Fragment on Government “ arousing the interest of the Earl of Shelbourne, a whig aristocrat. Impressed by Bentham’s work, the earl invited him to stay in his country house at Bowood, Wilshire. This was the beginning of a close relationship, based on common ideas and purpose. Interestingly, A Fragment on Government was first published anonymously, encouraging considerable speculation about its authorship. Coincidently Adam Smith’s well known book Wealth of Nation was published in the same year (1776).
Bentham welcomed the French Revolution and sent his reform proposals, though none were adopted. But he was made and honorary citizen of France in 1792 for his Draught of a New Plan for the organization of the Judicial Establishment of France. Among the major works of Bentham include A Fragment of Government (1776), Introduction to the Principles of Morals and Legislation (1789), Discourse on Civil and Penal Legislation (1802), A Theory of Punishment and Rewards (1811), A Treatise on Judicial Evidence (1813).

PLEASURE PAIN THEORY

Utilitarianism as a school of thought dominated English political thinking from the middle of the eighteenth century to the middle of the nineteenth. Some of the early utilitarians were Francis Hutcheson (1694-1746), Hume, Helvetius, Priestly, William Paley and Beccaria. But it was Jeremy Bentham who systematically laid down its theory, and made it popular on the basis of his innumerable proposals for reform. As Russel has rightly pointed out, “Bentham’s merit consisted not in the doctrine, but in its vigorous application of it to various practical problems”. Through James Mill, Bentham developed close links with Thomas Malthus and David Ricardo getting acquainted with the ideas of the classical economists.

The basic principle of utilitarianism was that human beings sought happiness that pleasure alone was good and that the only right action was that which produced the greatest happiness of the greatest number. Utilitarians reiterated the ideas of the Greek thinker Epicures, who had stated that individuals sometimes pursued pleasure wisely and at other times unwisely. In the hands of Bentham, the pleasure pain theory evolved into scientific principle to be applied to the policies of the state, welfare measures and for administrative penal and legal reforms.

Utilitarianism is a philosophy which is based on the hard realities of human existence. It is revolutionary and essentially empirical in character. It discards the abstract principles and notions of Thomas Paine’s “Age of Reason”. In the opinion of Prof G H Sabin Utilitarianism owes its rise in England Principally into two factors: (1) The influence of the excess of French Revolution in the English mind and, (2) the rise of empiricism. It was an attempt to establish ethical and political theory upon a thorough going scientific empiricism.

The Utilitarian philosophy is primarily an ethical theory. It is based on the psychological doctrine of hedonism which proceeds on the assumption that man is a sentiment being, a creature of feeling and sensibility. Man is pleasure seeking and pain avoiding animal. Pleasure versus pain is the mainspring of all human actions.

Jeremy Bentham began the first chapter of ‘An Introduction to the principles of Morals and Legislation’ thus: Nature has placed mankind under the governance of two sovereign masters, a pain and pleasure. It is for them alone to point out what we ought to do as well as to determine what shall we do. On the one had the standard of right and wrong, on the other the chain of causes and effects are fastened to their throne. They govern us in all we do in all we say, in all we think: every effort we can make to throw off our subjection, will serve but to demonstrate and confirm it. In words a man may pretend to abjure their empire; but in reality he will remain subject to it all the while… the principle of utility recognizes this subjection and assumes it for the foundation of that system, the object of which is to rear the fabric of felicity by the hands of reason and law.

Bentham contended that human beings by nature are hedonists. Each of their action was motivated by a desire to seek pleasure and avoid pain. Every human action had a cause and a motive. As Bentham himself has pointed out “take away all pleasures and pain you have no desire
and without a desire there can be no action”. Bentham viewed hedonism not only as a principle of motivation, but also as a principle of action.

For Bentham, Utilitarianism was both a descriptive and normative theory. It not only described how human beings act so as to maximise pleasure and minimize pain, but it also prescribed or advocated such action. According to the principle of greatest happiness of the greatest number (Principle of utility) the cause of all human action is a desire in terms of pleasure; a thing action is useful if it brings about happiness, that is pleasure. “By utility is meant that property in any object, whereby it tends to produce benefit, advantage, pleasure, good or happiness”. A person’s interest also has the same content – that of pleasure - something is in the interest of a person which tends to add to the sum total of his pleasures or diminish the sum total of his pains”.

Bentham has, thus, provided a simple test for measuring every individual and governmental action. To him every action whether individual or collective if it increases the happiness of the party concerned is good, if not it is bad. All actions are, therefore, to be judged by their pleasure or pain value. Pleasure and pain are thus our sovereign masters.

In the principles of Morals and Legislations Bentham listed fourteen kinds of simple pleasures that move human beings - including the pleasures of sense, wealth, skill, power, benevolence, good name, memory, imagination, expectation, association and relief etc. In addition to 14 simple pleasures, Bentham has included 12 pains in his major work. The simple pains include the pains of privations, sense, awkwardness, enmity, ill name etc.

All pains and pleasures, according to Bentham, are effects produced by external causes but individuals do not experience the same quantity of pleasure or pain from the same cause and this is because they differ in sensitivity or sensibility. Bentham had listed around 32 factors which influence sensibility and these should be taken into account in any computation of the total amount of pleasure or pain involved in any given act. These factors are health, strength, hardness, bodily imperfections, quality and quantity of knowledge, strength of intellectual powers, firmness of mind, bent of inclination.

Bentham believes that every individual is the best judge of his own happiness. The state could increase pleasure and diminish pain by the application of sanctions. He has prescribed four types of sanctions of pleasures and pain. They are (1) Physical sanctions (2) Political and legal sanction (3) Moral or popular sanction (4) Religious sanction. The Community, according to Bentham, is a fictitious body and its interests are the sum total of the interests of the several members who compose it.

Bentham attaches some conditions to the principles of pleasures pain theory. They are 1) it must be clear and precise 2) it must be the single and sufficient account of motivations and 3) it must be applicable by means of moral calculus. Thus Bentham’s doctrine of utility applied not only to morals but also legislation and politics.

Bentham also provided a calculus (Felicific calculus) for determining the balance between pleasure and pain from any action. According to the Felicific calculus, one must give a numerical value to the intensity, duration, certainty or uncertainty and propinquity or remoteness of the pleasures and pains of the persons affected by one’s actions and one must undertake the action only if the value of the pleasure is higher than the value of the pain.

Bentham was confident that a society in which the individual tried to maximize his own happiness would be far better than one in which he had to maximize the happiness of others. He
saw an integral link between the happiness of an individual and that of the community and offered the principle of utility as a yardstick to a legislator to frame laws in order to obtain the overall happiness and welfare of the community. He repeatedly stressed that a person’s actions and policies had to be judged by his intention to promote the happiness of the community.

Bentham distinguished pleasures quantitatively rather than qualitatively when he pointed out that “the pleasure of pushpin is as good as poetry”. He did not differentiate between pleasures and in that sense he was not an elitist. He did not assign any inherent grading to activities and treated them at par in terms of their contributions to individual happiness. He taught men to govern by the simple rule of the “greatest happiness of the greatest number” which, in practice, could be discovered by a felicific calculus.

CRITICISMS

Bentham’s pleasure pain theory has been criticized as mechanical, uninspiring and unimaginative. His theory lacked originality and was full of prejudices and speculation. He was very much confused and contradictory in his own theoretical adventures. Prof. Carlyle has branded Benthamism as the “Pig Philosophy” just to remind us that hedonism of the kind is not very satisfactory; the happiness is much more than pleasure.

Bentham’s theory has been demand for its materialism and for its neglect of the moral sense. What Bentham wanted to do was to establish a standard of right or wrong, good and evil related to calculable values. His psychological appreciation of human nature was inadequate. Many factors, beside pleasure and pain, motivate individual and communal action.

Bentham distinguished pleasures and pains quantitatively rather than qualitatively. But pleasures and pains differ both quantitatively and qualitatively. Bentham’s doctrine of pleasure pain theory stands for the greatest number. But there is no logical connection between happiness of the greatest number and is considerably independent of state legislation and state action. Bentham believes that pleasures and pains could be arithmetically calculated with the help of an apparatus known as “Felicific calculus”. However, modern researches in experimental psychology show that felicific calculus of pleasures with which Bentham supplied us turns out to have no practical significance at all. He provides no scale of values with which to measure the various factors and no way of determining the relative importance of the factors he lists. How actually could we measure the fecundity or purity of a pleasure?

AN ESTIMATE

In spite of criticisms levelled against Bentham’s Pleasure Pain theory, his services to political philosophy are immense and enormous. Bentham’s main contribution to political thought was not that he offered a novel principle of political philosophy but he steadily applied an empirical and critical method of investigation to concrete problems of law and government. Bentham exercised a great influence upon theories of sovereignty and law. Law was not a mystic mandate of reason or nature, but simply the command of that authority to which the members of community render habitual obedience. He considered the powers of the sovereign as indivisible, unlimited inalienable and permanent. As professor Sabine has rightly pointed out, Bentham’s greatest contribution was in the field of jurisprudence and government.
Bentham’s great service to political thought lies in his devising a system and method of legislation that would surely confirm to and serve the great end of human existence, ie, the greatest happiness of the greatest number. He was a reformer who was highly critical of the rights of man. He insisted that the state exists for man not man for the state. Bentham advanced numerous ideas which have been central to the liberal creed of the 19th century.

JOHN STUART MILL (1806-1873)

John Stuart Mill was the most influential political thinker of the nineteenth century. J.S Mill was the son of James Mill who was a disciple and close friend of Jeremy Bentham. In his political theory, liberalism made a transition from laissezfaire to an active role for the state, from a negative to a positive conception of liberty and from an atomistic to a more social conception of individuality. While Mill was a liberal, he could also be regarded at the same time as a democrat, a pluralist, cooperative socialist and a feminist.

John Stuart Mill was born in London on May 20, 1806. His father James Mill came from Scotland with the desire to become a writer. Initially his father tried journalism and then concentrated on writing history of British India, which took him 11 years to complete. It remained one of the important works on Indian History of the 18th century and is still used as a reference book. Immediately after the publication of History of British India, James Mill was appointed as an Assistant Examiner at the East India house. It was an important event in his life as this solved his financial problems enabling him to devote his time and attention to write on areas of his prime interest, philosophical and political problems. In the beginning, he thought of a career in law for him, but when another vacancy arose for another assistant examiner in 1823, John Stuart got the post and served the British government till his retirement.

In his thinking John Stuart Mill was greatly influenced by the dialogues and dialectics of Plato and the cross questions of Socrates. His studies of Roman Law by John Austin, Wealth of Nations by Adam Smith and Principles of Ricardo had, in large measure, affected his reasoning. He had inhibited Bentham’s principles from his father and Bentham himself and found the principles of utility the keystone of his beliefs. Among other influences, a special mention is to be made of the impact exercised on J.S Mill by his own wife Mrs. Taylor whom he used to call a perfect embodiment of wisdom, intellect and character. She touched the emotional depths of Mill’s nature and provided the sympathy he needed.

J.S. Mill was a prolific writer and he wrote on different branches of knowledge with equal mastery. By the age of 20 Mill started to write for news papers and periodicals. His System of Logic (1843) tried to elucidate a coherent philosophy of politics. The logic combined the British empiricist tradition of Locke and Hume of associational psychology with a conception of social science based on the paradigm of Newtonian physics. His Essay On Liberty (1859) and the Subjection of Women (1869) were classic elaborations of liberal thought on important issues like law, rights and liberty. His The Considerations of Representative Government (1861) provided an outline of his ideal government based on proportional representation, protection of minorities and institutions of self-government. His famous work Utilitarianism (1863) endorsed the Benthamite principle of the greater happiness of the greatest number yet made a significant departure from the Benthamite assumptions. It was written an exposition and defence of the pleasure pain philosophy applied to ethics, but he makes so many changes that there is little left of the original creed. He sees that human nature is not entirely moved by self interest, as Bentham and his father had taught, but is capable of self sacrifice.
MODIFICATIONS OF BENTHAM'S THEORY.

J.S. Mill was a close follower of his teacher, Bentham and his services to Bentham are exactly the same as the service of Lenin to his master, Marx. He saved Benthamism for death and decay by removing its defects as Lenin made Marxism up to date. Mill criticised and modified Bentham’s utilitarianism by taking into account factors like moral motives, sociability, feeling of universal altruism, sympathy and a new concept of justice with the key idea of impartiality. He asserted that the chief deficiency of Benthamite ethics was the neglect of individual character, and hence stressed on the cultivation of feelings and imagination as part of good life poetry, drama, music, paintings were essential ingredients both for human happiness and formation of character. They were instruments of human culture. He made happiness and the dignity of man, and not the principle of pleasure, the chief end of life. He defined happiness to mean perfection of human nature, cultivation of moral virtues and lofty aspirations, total control over one’s appetites and desires, and recognition of individual and collective interests.

Mill retained the basic premises of utilitarianism, but distinguished between higher and lower pleasures, and that greater human pleasure meant an increase not merely in the quantity but also in the quality of goods enjoyed. He insisted that human beings were capable of intellectual and moral pleasures, which were superior to the physical ones that they shared with the animal. He summarised the differences as follows. “It is better to be Socrates dissatisfied than a fool satisfied. And if the fool or the pig is of a different opinion it is because they only know their own side of the question. The other party is in comparison knows both the sides.

Mill pointed out that every human action had three aspects:

a) The moral aspect of right or wrong
b) The aesthetic aspect (or its beauty); and c

c) The sympathetic aspect of its loveableness. The first principle instructed one to approve or disapprove, the second taught one to admire or despise, and the third enabled one to love, pity or dislike. He regarded individual self-development and diversity as the ultimate ends, important components of human happiness and the principal ingredients of individual and social progress.

Mill used the principle of utility which he regarded as the ultimate appeal on all ethical questions to support his principle of liberty, but then it was utilitarianism based on the permanent interests of the individual as a progressive being. He made a distinction between toleration and suppression of offensive practices. In case of offences against public decency, majority sentiment would prevail. Beyond these, the minorities must be granted the freedom of thought and expression, and the right to live as they pleased.

In one another respect J.S. Mill definitely makes an improvement over the utilitarian theory of Bentham. Bentham had not spoken about the social nature of morality that society itself has a moral end - the moral good of its members. From the contention that every individual desires his own happiness Mill held that the individual should desire and promote the general happiness. It is thus obvious that Mill stood not for an individual’s happiness but for the happiness of all. He regarded utility as a noble sentiment associated with Christian religion.

In addition to the above differences Mill also tried to reconcile the interests of the individual and society. He spoke of nobility of character a trait that was closely associated with altruism meaning that people did what was good for society rather than for themselves. Mill saw social feelings and consciences as part of the psychological attributes of a person. He characterised
society as being natural and habitual for the individual was a social person. Mill also stated that pleasures and pains could not be measured objectively. The felicific calculus was absurd; one had to rely upon the judgement of the competent and wise. He described the state as an instrument that would bring about transformation of the human being. In the opinion of Prof. Sabine, “Mill’s ethics was important for liberalism because in effect it abandoned egoism, assumed that social welfare is a matter of concern to all men of good will, and regarded freedom, integrity, self respect and personal distinction as intrinsic goods apart from their contribution to happiness”.

LIBERTY

Mill’s ideas on liberty had a direct relationship with his theory of utility or happiness. Mill regarded liberty as a necessary means for the development of individuality which was to become the ultimate source of happiness. There was only one road for him to take and that was the road of the higher utility. In his well known work, On Liberty, Mill thoroughly examines the problem of the relationship between the individual on the one side and the society and state on the other.

According to J.S. Mill, Liberty means absence of restraints. J.S. Mill believes that an individual has two aspects to his life; an individual aspect and social aspects. The actions of the individual many be divided into two categories: (1) Self regarding activities and (2) Other regarding activities. With regard to activities in which he alone is concerned, his liberty of action is complete and should not be regulated by the state. However, in action of the individual which effects the society, his action can be justifiably regulated by the state or society. In his On Liberty, J.S. Mill wrote thus: the sole end for which mankind are warranted individually or collectively in interfering with the liberty of action of any of their members is self preservation. That is the only purpose for which power can be rightfully exercised over any members of a civilised community against his will is to prevent harm to other.

Mill defended the right of the individual to freedom. In its negative sense, freedom meant that the society had no right to coerce an unwilling individual except for self defence. In its negative sense, it meant the grant of the largest and the greatest amount of freedom for the pursuit of the individual’s creative impulses and energies and for self development. If there was a clash between the opinion of the individual and that of the community, it was the individual who was an ultimate judge, unless the community could convince him without resorting to threat and coercion.

Mill has laid down the grounds for justifying interference. An activity that pertained to the individual alone represented the space over which no coercive interference either from the government or from other people was permissible. The realm which pertained to the society or the public was the space in which coercion could be used to make the individual conform to some standard of conduct. Mill in his On Liberty wrote thus: “the only part of the conduct of any one, for which is amenable to society is that which concerns others. In the part which merely concerns himself, his independence is, of right absolute. Over himself, over his own body and mind the individual is sovereign.”

Mill defended the right of individuality, which meant the right of choice of the individuals. As for as self regarding actions are concerned, he explained why coercion or state action would be detrimental to the self development of the individual. First, the evils of coercion outweighed the good achieved. Second, individuals were so diverse in their needs and capacities for happiness that coercion would be futile. Since the person was the best judge of his own interests, therefore he had the information and the incentives to achieve them. Third, some diversity was in itself good, it should be encouraged. Last freedom was the most important requirement in the life of a rational
person. Mill contended that positive liberty was inherently desirable and it was possible if individuals were allowed to develop their own talents and invent their own life styles. Hence he made strong case for negative liberty and liberal state and society were essential requirements.

Mill asserted that society could limit individual liberty to prevent harm to other people. He regarded liberty of conscience, liberty to express and publish one’s opinions, liberty to live as one pleased and freedom of association as essential for a meaningful life and for the pursuit of one’s own good. His defence of freedom of thought and expression was one of the most powerful and eloquent exposition in the western intellectual tradition. The early liberals defended liberty for the sake of efficient government whereas for Mill liberty was good in itself for it helped in the development of a humane, civilized, moral person. In the opinion of Prof. Sabine, liberty was “beneficial both to society that permits them and to the individual that enjoys them”.

According to Mill, individuality means power or capacity for critical enquiry and responsible thought. It means self development and the expression free will. He stressed absolute liberty of conscience, belief and expression for they were crucial to human progress. Mill offered some arguments for liberty of expression in the service of truth:

a) the dissenting opinion could be true and its expression would promote humankind of useful knowledge; and

b) even if the opinion was false, it would strengthen the correct view by challenging it. Mill defended freedom of association on some grounds. First ‘When the thing to be done is likely to be done better by individuals than by government. Speaking generally, there is no one first to conduct any business or to determine how or why whom it shall be conducted all those who are personally interested in it”. Second, allowing individuals to get together to do something, even if they do not do it as well as the government might have done it, is better for the mental education of these individuals. The right of education becomes a ‘practical part of the political education of a free people taking them out of the narrow circle of personal and family selfishness”. Third, if we let government do everything there is the evil of adding unnecessarily to its power.

It is evident from above observation that On Liberty constituted the most persuasive and convincing defence of the principle of individual liberty ever written. He regarded individual character as a result of civilization, instruction, education and culture. For Mill happiness means liberty and individuality. Liberty was regarded as a fundamental prerequisite for leading good, worthy and dignified life. He considered liberty as belonging to higher and advanced civilizations and prescribed despotism with severe restrictions in case of lower ones. It is generally believed that Mill’s essay on liberty was essentially written with the purpose of defending the idea of negative liberty. The theme in on liberty was not the absence of restraints but the denial of individual autonomy by the coercion exercised by a moral majority and public opinion. Mill’s doctrine of liberty has been subjected to serve criticisms. Prof Ernest Barker has tried to criticise Mill’s conception of liberty when he wrote that “Mill is a prophet of empty liberty and abstract individual. “Mill had no clear cut philosophy and theory of rights through which alone the concept of liberty attains a concrete meaning. Earnest Barker’s observation followed from the interpretation that the absolute statements on liberty like the rights of one individual against the rest was not substantiated when one assessed Mill’s writings in their totality. For instance, his compartmentalisation between self regarding and other regarding actions, and the tension between his tilt towards welfarism which conflicted with individualism were all indications of this incompleteness. But the point Prof. Barker ignored was the fact that the tension that emerged in Mill was an inevitable consequence of attempting to create a realistic political theory which attempted to extend the frontiers of liberty as
much as possible. In fact, no political theorist including the contemporary thinkers like John Rowls, Nozick etc are free from this inevitable tension.

**REPRESENTATIVE GOVERNMENT**

Mill began his views on Representative government by stating that we can only decide which is the best form of government by examining which form of government fulfils most adequately the purposes of government. For Mill, a good government performs two functions: it must use the existing qualities and skills of the citizens to best serve their interests and it must improve the moral, intellectual and active qualities of these citizens. A despotic government may be able to fulfil the first purpose, but will fail in the second. Only a representative government is able to fulfil these two functions. It is a representative government that combines judiciously the two principles of participation and competence which is able to fulfil the two functions of protecting and educating the citizens.

Mill regarded Representative democracy as necessary for progress as it permitted citizens to use and develop their faculties fully. It promoted virtual intelligence and excellence. It also allowed the education of the citizens providing an efficient forum for conducting the collective affairs of the community. Interaction between individuals in a democracy ensured the possibility of the emergence of the wisest and recognition of the best leaders. It encouraged free discussion which was necessary for the emergence of the truth. He judged representative democracy on the basis of how for it promotes the good management of the affairs of the society by means of the existing faculties, moral, intellectual and active, of its various members and by improving those faculties.

Mill tried to reconcile the principle of political equality with individual freedom. He accepted that all citizens regardless of their status were equal and that only popular sovereignty could give legitimacy to the government.

J.S. Mill hopes that democracy was good because it made people happier and better. Mill laid down several conditions for representative government. First such a government could only function with citizens who were of an active self helping character. Backward civilizations, according to Mill, would hardly be able to run a representative democracy. Second, citizens had to show their ability and willingness to preserve institutions of representative democracy. Influenced by De Tocqueville’s thesis on majority tyranny, Mill advocated a liberal democracy which specified and limited the powers of legally elected majorities by cataloguing and protecting individual rights against the majority. He pleaded for balancing the numerical majority in a democracy by adjusting franchise.

Mill recommended open rather than secret ballot, for voting was a public trust which should be performed under the eye and criticism of the public. Open voting would be less dangerous for the individual voter would be less influenced by the sinister interests and discreditable feelings which belong to himself either individually or as a member of a class. Mill emphasised that representative democracy was only possible in a state that was small and homogeneous.

Although a great champion of equal voting rights, universal suffrage are guaranteed in democracy, Mill was fully aware of the weaknesses and danger of democracy. His mind was particularly upset by the inadequate representation of minorities in parliament and the tyranny of the majority over the minority. In order to ensure adequate representation of minorities, Mill supported the system of proportional representative first proposed for parliamentary elections by Sir Thomas Hare in England and propounded its theory in his work: “Machinery of Representation” In addition to proportional representation he has advocated plurality of votes to the higher educated citizens.
MODULE III

IDEALISTS

GEORGE WILHELM FRIEDRICH HEGEL (1770-1831)

Hegel is the most methodologically self conscious of all philosophers in the western tradition. He was born in Stuttgart on 27 August 1770, the eldest son of a middle class family. His father was minor civil servant in the Duchy of Wurttemberg. The duchy was a protestant enclave surrounded by catholic territories. Several generations of Hegel’s had been ministers in the protestant church, and Hegel’s mother who died when he was only 11, probably envisaged a carrier in the clergy for her son. From his earliest years, Hegel developed a strong sense of his religious identity. Though he did not become an orthodox Lutheran in belief, his protestant heritage is still fundamental for understanding his thought. After receiving his first Latin lessons from his mother, Hegel attended a Latin School from the ages of 5 to 7. He was then sent to the Gymnasium in Stuttgart which he attended for the next eleven years.

After graduating from the gymnasium, Hegel went to a seminary to train protestant clerics for the duchy of Wurttemberg. He was highly critical of the reactionary theory of some of his professors who attempted to use Kant’s doctrine of practical faith to buttress traditional dogmas. In 1793 he got the Degree of Doctor of Philosophy at the university of Jens and later became a Professor. In 1816 he was appointed professor of philosophy at the university of Heidelberg and in 1818 he became professor of philosophy at the Berlin University. Along with this assignment, Hegel also worked the official advisor of emperor of Prussia.

By this time, Hegel became quite famous, and the Prussian minister of Education offered him the prestigious chair of philosophy at the university of Berlin, succeeding Fichte. Berlin was the intellectual centre of Germany and Hegel accepted the offer and taught at Berlin from 1818 till his death in 1831. This period was the most eventful period in his life. He wrote his famous work ‘Philosophy of Right’ and lectured on the philosophy of history, religion, aesthetics and history of philosophy. In all these diverse areas he covered many aspects of political theory.

Hegel was the founder of modern idealism and the greatest influence in the first half of the eighteenth century, when the entire academic community in Germany was divided between Hegelians, the Left Hegelians and the Right Hegelians. He innovated the dialectic and the theory of self-realisation. Hegel wrote extensively on various aspects of political philosophy. Among the principal works include the Phenomenology of Spirit ‘ (1807) Science of Logic (1812-16), Encyclopaedia of the Philosophical Science (1817) Philosophy of Right (1821) Philosophy of History (1837). The essence of Hegel’s philosophy is to be found in his first book ‘the Phenomenology of Spirit’ This was not a political treatise, but a quest for universal reality. In this work Hegel starts with consciousness and its bearing on reality. His ‘Encyclopaedia of Philopshical Science’ is the fullest treatment of his general philosophical system that he ever produced. In his Philosophy of History’ Hegel gives a dialectical interpretation. History, according to Hegel, is a process by which spirit passes from knowing nothing to the full knowledge of its self.
SOURCES OF HIS THOUGHT.

The foundation of Hegel’s thought had already been laid, and he had drawn his ideas from different sources. He had studied Greek literature and his political philosophy was influenced by the writings of Plato and Aristotle. The idea of Giest or of a Universal Mind, he had borrowed from Plato’s idea of good as an ultimate reality. From Aristotle he borrowed the element of reason as the supreme governing principle of the world. He combines both Plato and Aristotle when he declares his stand in the very opening paragraph of his Phenomenology of Spirit, ‘what is rational is real and what is real is rational’.

Besides the Greek political theory, Hegel’s thinking was also influenced by the French revolution in a very large measure. He fell under the spell of the French revolution and declared it ‘a glorious mental Dawn’ from Rousseau’s doctrine of General will, he derives the doctrine of his Real will. Hegel’s philosophy was also a reaction against David Hume.

DIALECTICS

The distinctive feature of Hegel’s philosophical system is his dialectical method which has been described as the logic of passion.’ Hegel borrowed this method from Socrates who is the first exponent of Dialectic method. Dialectic simply means to discuss. Socrates believed that one can arrive at the truth only by constant questioning. It was the process of exposing contradictions through the method of discussion.

Hegel’s dialectic method played a crucial role in his political philosophy. By applying the categories of a thesis, an antithesis and a synthesis, Hegel’s major thrust was to solve the problem of contradiction. It attempted to reconcile the many apparent contradictory positions and theorems developed by earlier thinkers. As a method of interpretation it attempted to reconcile the various traits developed in the past.

Having taken a clue from Socrates, Hegel argued that absolute idea or the spirit, in search of self realisation moves form being to non being to becoming. In other words, an Idea moves form a thesis to anti-thesis until a synthesis of the two is found. Synthesis has in its elements of thesis as well as anti thesis. In due course the synthesis itself acquires the status of a thesis and gives rise to its own anti thesis. This process will go on continuously in every society. Hegel’s method can be described as Dialectical idealism. It means that every Idea (Thesis) gives rise to a counter Idea (Anti-thesis) and the original idea and counter idea merge to give rise to new idea (synthesis). This new idea, in due course, itself becomes a thesis and gives rise to its anti thesis and the process goes on. Hegel believes that Dialectical idealism was a logical apparatus for interpreting the history in its true perspective.

According to Hegel, Dialectics as the only true method for comprehending pure thought. He described dialectic as ‘the indwelling tendency outwards by which the one sidedness and limitation of the predicates of understanding is seen in its true light….. The Dialectical principle constitutes the life and soul of scientific progress, the dynamic which alove gives immanent connect and necessity to the body of science.” ‘In the Phenomenology of Spirit, Hegel gave an example of its use in human consciousness but a more comprehensive political use was found in the Philosophy of Right, in which the dialectical process reflected the evolution of world history from the Greek world to Hegel’s time.

For Hegel, there was a dialectical pattern in history, with the state representing the ultimate body highly complete formed as a result of synthesis of contradictory elements at different levels.
of social life. However, the relationship between synthesis and contradiction was within concepts shaped by human practices.

According to Hegel, contradiction or the dialectic is a self – generating process- it is the very moving principle of the world. Dialectics is a theory which explains how history is the story of the continuous development of the spirit. History is the process by which the spirit passes from knowing nothing to the full knowledge of itself. Hegel applied his dialectical method to the explanation of the progress of society and its institutions. Hegel’s own use of dialehtical method originated with his identification of Kantian critical theory which meant rejection of the enlightenment philosophical method based on the scientific approach of studying nature.

Having stated his dialectical method, Hegel argued that a phenomenon can be best understood according to the law of dialectics, i.e, when contrasted with its opposite. Pleasure is best understood in opposition to pain, heat in opposition to cold, goodness in opposition to badness and so on Hegel has given several instances of thesis anti-thesis and synthesis. The following examples given by him are note worthy.

1. Family is the thesis, civil society is its anti-thesis and state is the synthesis.
2. Despotism is thesis, democracy is its anti thesis and constitutional monarchy is the synthesis.
3. Inorganic world is the thesis, organic world is its anti-thesis and human beings are the synthesis.

STATE

Hegel is seen as the great modern spokesman for communitarians and as a pioneering critic of liberalism. Some historians regard his political philosophy as the major conceptual alterative to liberalism. According to Frederick Beiser’, “Hegel’s significance as a political thinker lies less in his defence of communitarianism or his critique of liberalism than in his attempt to synthesise communitarianism with liberalism in a single coherent conception of the modern state. The most important contribution of Hegel to political philosophy is his theory of the state. Hegel regarded the state as the embodiment of the Giest or the Universal mind. The state was the representative of the Divine Idea or Divine Purpose.

Hegel’s theory of state is based on the basic premise about the gradual unfolding of Reason or Spirit or Absolute Idea through a dialectical process. Reason gets its perfect realisation only in the state. His theory of state is rooted in the axiom: ‘what is rational is real and what is real is rational’. The state is rational, state is real; there fore what is rational is real He considered the state as the ‘ March of God on Earth or the ultimate embodiment of reason. State is the embodiment of reason because it emerges as a synthesis of family thesis and civil society (antithesis). Family fulfils mans biological needs – food, love and sex It is the first manifestation of spirit but it cannot fulfil the higher or more complex needs for which we need a civil society. While the basic feature of family is unity based on love, the civil society is necessary for the fulfilment of this competitive self interest and for the satisfaction of diverse human needs particularly the economic needs which the family cannot fulfil. The civil society is organised on the basis of individuals’ material needs. It is less selfish than the family. Civil society educates the individual where he begins to see that he can get what he needs only by willing what other individuals need. Such unity is realised only when the tension involved in the contradiction between family and civil society in transcended in the final synthesis of the state. The state looks after the universal interests of the whole community and it acquires an organic character.
Hegel’s account of the structure of the state explain it in essentially organic terms. Throughout the Philosophy of Right, Hegel constantly refers to the state as an organism, using this concept to define this views of the in opposition to other. What Hegel means by the concept or the idea of the state is, indeed, its organic structure. Hegel attributes three fundamental and general features to the organic state. First, the whole exists for each of the parts as much as each of the parts exists for the whole, in other words, the individual is as much a means as an end for the state. Second, that there must be life in each part of the state so that each has some degree of autonomy or independence. Third, each part, in maintaining itself and seeking its own self interest also promotes the interests of the whole.

It is clear from the above features that Hegelian state does not exist for the individuals but the individuals exist for the state. For Hegel the whole state is greater than the parts (individuals ) that constitute it. The individuals importance is only due to the fact that they are members of the state. Thus Hegel makes the individuals totally subordinate to the state. According to Hegel, the individual is tied to the state not through virtue but through self interest. The individual can recognise that his own private interest depends upon his participation in public life and that he does not have to sacrifice himself for the public good.

Hegel perceived the state as an end in itself; it was mind realising itself through history. As an idealist, Hegel viewed the state as organism having the highest right over the state as an organism having the highest right over the individual whose highest duty, in turn, is to be a member of the state. For Hegel the organic concept meant primarily a state having a unified but differentiated structure. The state must possess unity in difference. The principle of unity is a single centralised authority which consists in a monarch, a parliament and a civil service or administration.

According to Hegel, rights are derived from the state and therefore, no man can have any right against the state. The state has an absolute fixed end in itself. The state was an end and the individuals are its means. Prof. L.T Hobhouse has summed up the Hegelian concept of the state by calling the state “as a greater being, a spirit, a super-personality entity, in which the individuals with their private conscience or claims of right, their happiness or their misery are merely subordinate elements”. The state also represented highest social morality and it laid down the standard of morality for its individual members. As prof. C.E. M Joad has rightly pointed out, just as the personal abilities of all its individuals in the state are transcended by and merged in the personality of the state. So the moral relations which each citizen has to each other citizen are merged in or transcended by the social morality which is vested in the state. Hegel regarded the state as a mystic transcendental unity, the mysterious union of all with all the greater whole which embraces all other institutions of social life.

FREEDOM

All scholars agree there is no more important concept in Hegel’s political theory than freedom. There are good reasons for such rare unanimity. Hegel regards freedom as the foundation of right as the essence of spirit and as the end of history. Hegel has several distinct but related concepts of freedom which appear in scattered places in his writings. First and foremost he understands freedom as autonomy i.e the power of self government, the capacity to make and follow one’s own laws. Hence he writes in the Philosophy of World History..... only that will which obeys that law is free; for it obys itself and is self sufficient and therefore free.
Hegel's concept of freedom was based on the old Greek idea of an individual finding his true self freedom and personality in and through the state. Hegel regards freedom as the very essence of man. To renounce freedom is to renounce humanity. Hegelian concept of freedom consists in rendering obedience to the real will or the reasonable will. In this concept of freedom he was very much indebted to Rousseau and Kant. In developing their theories of freedom, in fact both Kant and Hegel have started from Rousseau's concept of moral freedom and the peculiar and distinctive quality of man and both consider the state entirely in its relation to this freedom. Accounting to Kant, freedom consists in obedience to any moral will but according to Hegel freedom consists in obedience to the dictates of social morality to the moral will of the community.

According to Hegel individual freedom was a social phenomenon. It consisted in participation in the moral life of the community. Freedom to Hegel meant willing of what is rational of what the spirit would desire and the power to perform it. It consisted in total obedience to the state and performance of duties. As prof C.L. Wayper has rightly pointed out, his real will implies him to identify himself with the spirit. The spirit is embodied in the state. Therefore, it is his real will to obey the dictates of the state. Indeed the dictates of the state are his real will. Thus the commands of the state give man his only opportunity to find freedom. Hegel, therefore, has nothing to do with the notion that men are free to make laws and constitutions and institutions as they will; every thing is determined by the working of the sovereign of the universe - Reason.

Hegel also conceives freedom as independence or self-sufficiency, i.e., not depending on anyone other than oneself. He defines freedom in these terms when he writes in the Philosophy of World History. ‘Spirit is self sufficient being, and just this is freedom.’ A similar account of freedom appears in the Philosophy of Right when Hegel explains that the will is free if it relates to nothing but itself so that every relationship of dependence on something other than itself falls away. This sense of freedom is closely connected with autonomy, for an autonomous being is independent in not depending upon anyone else to govern itself.

Finally in the Philosophy of Right, Hegel sometimes formulates positive freedom in terms of self-determination. Self-determination essentially means two things:

1. That the self and not force outside itself determines its actions and
2. that in determining itself it makes itself determinate, turning what is merely potential intended into something actual realised and organised. Self determination is closely connected with autonomy: Self-determination means that the self is autonomous because it determines itself into action according to principles it gives itself, i.e the will having itself for its own object and end. Hegel thinks that the very essence of the self consists in freedom like Rousseau and Kant, he maintains that the distinctive feature of a rational being is its freedom more specifically, its autonomy, its power to act on universalizable principles. Further, Hegel maintains that we become free only if we are self conscious that we are free, having the power to make freedom the goal of our actions; a slave who does not know that it is free will never achieve its freedom.

In the philosophy of Right, Hegel provides a more detailed account of freedom specifying three fundamental moments necessary for freedom. These three moments – Universality, particularity and individuality - correspond to the structure of the concept in his Logic. According to the moment of universality, a free person must have the power of self awareness, the capacity to abstract form all specific situations and to be aware of itself apart from them. According to the principle of particularity, to be free a person must choose a particular option and act in a particular
situation. Hegel describes the principle of individuality as one of self limitation: one accepts oneself because one accepts one situations in life.

CONCLUSION:

Hegel is undoubtedly one of the greatest political thinkers of modern times. He is regarded as pragmatic thinker because he tried to idealise and rationalise the actual existing Prussian state. In his Science of Logic and Encyclopaedia, Hegel gave as a systematic exposition of the method of dialectics and integrated it with his political philosophy as outlined in the Philopshy of Right. According to Prof. Sabine, Hegel’s theory of freedom was a part of the widespread reaction against the violence of the French Revolution which Burke began.

Hegel exerted considerable influence on subsequent political theory particularly Marxism and Existentialism. He has been claimed as the philosophical inspiration by both Communist and Facists. The British idealist T.H.Green adapted Hegelianism to revise liberalism in the late 19th century.

THOMAS HILL GREEN (1836-1882)

T.H. Green was born in Yorkshire in 1836. He was the son of a clergyman in the church of England. For a period of fourteen years he was educated at home. Green entered Oxford in 1855 and was intimately associated with it until the last day of his life. The regular studies did not appeal to him and more than to Hegel, but he read widely and profitably in many fields. In 1860 he was elected a fellow of Balliol and continued in this capacity right up to 1878. In 1879 he was chosen an whyte professor of Moral philosophy. Green’s teaching at the university of Oxford covered a wide range of subjects including history, ethics, logic, metaphysics, education and history of philosophy. He was a frequent campaign speaker for the liberal party, served as member in several committees and commissions. He was stricken with blood poisoning in 1882 and died comparatively at an early age of 46.

Green was most influential during his lifetime as a teacher and it was not until his death his most important works were published. His most important work ‘Lectures on the Principles of Political Obligation’ were first delivered during his tenure of the chair of Moral Philosophy at Oxford which was published in 1882. Like wise his Prolegomena to Ethics’ was published after his death. Other books written by Green were Lectures on Liberal Legislation and Freedom of Contract’ and Lectures on the English Revolution.

His Principles of Political Obligation was an attempt to restate political theory in all its branches in the light of the concept of general will working towards rational and moral ideals. His prolegomena to ethics is fully occupied with an attack on the earlier utilitarian doctrine of pleasure as expounded by Jeremy Bentham. In his Lectures of the English Revolution, Green sees typically in the civil war, something of which the justifying fruit was that England was saved from catholic reaction.

Green was profoundly influenced by classical Greek thought, German Idealism and English liberalism. The ultimate basis of his philosophy is to be found in the writings of Plato and Aristotle. He learnt from Plato and Aristotle that man is by nature a social and political animal and the state was a partnership in virtue and civic duties. That law is the expression of pure and poisonless reason; that righteousness consists for each man with fulfilment of his appointed function in the
life and section of the community. All these high ideals of the Greeks played a considerable part in shaping the political reasoning of T.H. Green.

Another and more important influence of the political ideas of T.H. Green was that of German Philosophy. Green drew his inspiration from the writings of Kant and Hegel. In developing their theories both Kant and Hegel had started from Rousseau’s doctrine of moral freedom as the distinctive quality of man and both consider the state entirely in relation to this freedom. Rousseau’s doctrine of general will also influenced the writings of Green. He discusses the conception of the general will in connection with an effective criticism of the Austinian definition of sovereignty. Green’s philosophy was not only a reaction against individualism, Hegelianism and Benthamism but it was also against certain interpretations of 19th century science.

GREEN’S VIEWS ON STATE.

T.H. Green was the first man in the nineteenth century to construct a comprehensive philosophy of state. Green does not believe in the social contract theory of the origin of the state. The social contract theory has been rejected on the ground that it makes the state voluntary association. He also rejected the force theory of the origin of the state because it makes the force as the very basis of the state. According to Green, the basis of state is neither consent or contract or force but it is will of the people who compose it.

There is a direct relationship between his metaphysics and politics between which his ethics serves as a necessary interlude. It is this perfect harmony between a speculative thought and the practical problems that has conferred on Green a unique position in the history of English political thought. According to Green, state is a means to an end and that end was the full moral development of the individuals who compose it. His ethics made him to believe that every man has a worth and dignity which forbids his exploitation for any purpose what ever. The life of the state, he insisted, has no real existence except as the life of the individual composing it. Green wrote in his well known work Principle of Political Obligation thus: To speak of any progress or improvement or development of a nation or society or mankind except as relative to some greater worth of persons is to use words without meanings’ It is in this context he regarded the function of state as being negative. According to Green, the state cannot teach morality to man nor can it make man moral since morality consists in the disinterested performance of self imposed duties. It is to remove obstacles which prevent men from becoming moral.

Green regards state as natural and necessary institution. He regards it as an ethical institution essential to the moral development of man. Its primary purpose was to enforce rights. The authority of the state is either absolute or omnipotent. It is limited both from within and without. It is limited from within because the law of the state can deal only with the externality of an action and intentions. It is limited again by the fact that in exceptional circumstances particularly when the laws of the state are tyrannical and the state fails to promote the common good, the individual has the right of resistance. According to Green, resistance under these circumstance is not merely a right but it becomes a duty. He further recognises that the various permanent groups with society have their own inner system of rights and that the right of the state over them is one of adjustment. As Prof. Ernest Barker has observed, the state adjusts for each group its system of rights internally and it adjusts each system of rights to the state externally.

The authority of the state is limited from without in the sense that it has to show its respect to the existence of international law. Like Kant, Green is a believer in international law and international organizations.
WILL NOT FORCE IS THE BASIS OF THE STATE.

Green agrees that the existence of a supreme coercive power is necessary for society and this power is state. According to Green, the essence of state is not the supreme coercive power but the exercise of such coercive power in accordance with law and for maintenance of rights. The sovereign may be a creator of laws but he is also bound by them. The real sustaining power behind the state is general will. The essence of sovereignty and state is not force but that they represent the general will of the community. The true basis of the state, therefore, is the will of the community. Men habitually obey only those institutions which they feel represent general will.

NEGATIVE ROLE OF THE STATE

Green was in favour of granting only negative function to the state. The negative role which Green assigns to the state as the remover of obstacles is nevertheless significant. The state can do everything which will help but it must do nothing which will hinder the free development of moral personality. The basic function of the state, according to Green, is to remove obstacles to freedom. The three greatest obstacles to freedom were ignorance, drunkenness and poverty. Classical liberalism, he thinks, went wrong in regarding freedom simply in negative terms. Thus Green laid the foundations for the modern social welfare state which guarantees old age pension, unemployment insurance, health insurance and all the other legislative schemes designed to promote self-security.

Although Green held that will, not force, was the true basis of the state, he was fully conscious that there were states in which force was predominant. For such status he had no liking as they could not fulfil their ideal function. While Green reflected Rousseau’s view that the general will was entirely in abeyance in all existing states, he also rejected Hegel’s view that the laws in all existing state were synonymous with the General will. Thus Green, unlike Hegel, tried to safeguard the individual against the absolute power of the state.

FREEDOM

TH Green is indebted to Immanuel Kant for his Theory of Freedom. According to Kant, a ‘person who is really free is one who is morally free’. Kant was a believer in moral freedom and freedom, according to him, consist in the realisation of the free moral will. It is from this moral will TH Green has taken his start. According to Prof. Ernest Barker, Green begins from, always clings to and finally ends in the Kantinian doctrine of the free moral will in virtue of which man always wills himself as an end. The most valuable thing, therefore, this moral will the realisation of which should be considered as the supreme object of a man’s endeavour. When this moral will is realised individual which ceases to be selfish and starts doing those things which aims at promoting the common good. In this connection there is one thing which the state should not do and there is another which it should do. Firstly, it should not check its self determination. It means that morality is something which is self imposed and it is not something which can be imposed from outside. Secondly, it is the duty of the state to remove all hindrances that prove to be destructive in the realization of moral will. Since the aim of the state is to establish ideal conditions for the performance of moral acts, such functions may be rightly termed as moral negative functions. In this connection Green has rightly observed. The state has no business of making its members better but it has those moral negative functions. In this connection Green has rightly observed,’ The state has no business of making its members better, but it has those moral
negative functions which present them from making themselves better. ‘Freedom is, therefore, ‘no absence of restraint any more than beauty is the absence of ugliness’

According to Green, freedom does not mean mere absence of restraints, but the “positive power of doing and enjoying something worth doing and worth enjoying”. The true personality of the individual is his will. The will is not only good and moral; it is also free because the moral restraints on it are self-imposed. Such a free moral will seeks its good in the context of social good and enjoys freedom to do the right thing which Green calls ‘positive freedom’. Positive freedom represents an approximation between will and reason and morality and law. T.H. Green in his major work wrote the meaning of freedom thus: ‘We do not merely mean freedom from restraint or compulsion. We do not mean merely freedom to do as we like irrespective of what it is that we like. We do not mean a freedom that can be enjoyed by one man or one set of men at the cost of the loss of freedom to others. When we speak of freedom as something to be so highly prized, we mean a positive power or capacity of doing or enjoying something worth doing or enjoying and that too something that we do or enjoy in common with other.”

According to Prof. G.H. Sabine, Green’s contrast between positive and negative freedom reproduced a line of thought which came to him both from Rousseau and Hegel. In his concept of freedom, Green was influenced by Aristotle’s idea of common life. In fact he owed more to Aristotle than he did to Hegel. The Self realization whose conditions a community ought to secure for its members was in the main Aristotle’s realization of Greek citizenship but with its aristocratic implications omitted.

Green believes that freedom was possible only in the state. His doctrine of freedom is based on some important aspects. It is a positive freedom to do something worth doing and worth enjoying. Further, his concept of freedom is determinate. It has an individual and social aspects. He tries to reconcile the claims of the individuals with the authoring of the state.

**HIS THEORY OF RIGHTS**

According to Green, human consciousness postulates liberty; liberty involves rights and rights demand the state. Rights are the outer conditions necessary for a man’s inner development of personality. Rights are inherent in individuals, but they can be internal in individuals only as members of a society which gives its recognition, and in virtue of the community of ideal objects which causes that recognition. The rights with which he concerned are not legal rights but ideal rights: they are the rights which society properly organized on the basis of the good will should ideally recognize, if it is true to its basic principles. Such rights are termed as natural rights. They are natural rights not in the sense that they are pre-social but they are natural in the sense that they are inherent and innate in the moral nature of associated mean who are living in some form of society.

The rights of which Green speaks are relative to morality rather than law; and recognition of which he speaks is recognition by a common moral consciousness rather than by a legislature. The rights are relative to morality in the sense that they are the conditions of the attainment of the moral end. And the recognition is given by the moral consciousness, because it knows that they are the necessary conditions of its own satisfaction.

Green’s concept of rights is quite different from that of John Locke in the sense that rights are concessions granted by the society or state rather than as rights belonging to individuals by
virtue of their humanity. The state does not create rights but rights are derived from the state. People have no right to resist the state except in the interest of the state, ie, to compel the state to make its laws conform to the general will and general welfare. Green is against the utilitarian view of rights as the gift of the state. Green wrote that ‘Natural rights are rights which should be enjoyed by a normally rational and moral being in a rationally constituted society’.

**AN ASSESSMENT**

T.H. Green gave to idealism a new lease of life. He rejected the mechanistic theory of the state on the ground that it had made the state as an artificial institution and ignored the various factors which had contributed to state building. He rejected the force theory of the origin of the state and was convinced that will not force was the basis of state.

Green is an idealist but he can also be hailed as an individualist. He gave the individual a far more effective protection against the undue exercise of the state’s power than anything with which utilitarianism could provide him. Green revitalized the principle of liberty and instead of giving it a negative gave it a positive social meaning. To conclude, Green, with his practical knowledge of the problems of the state and his faith in political liberalism, tried to make individualism moral and social and idealism civilized and safe. If he paved the way for speculative thinking in the field of metaphysics, he attempted to liberalize the politics and safeguard the dignity of the self-conscious individual against the restraining character of the state.
MODULE IV

SOCIALISTS

KARL MARX (1818-1883)

BASIC PRINCIPLES OF MARXISM: A CRITICAL APPRAISAL

In the entire history of political thought both on influence in criticism, few political theorists can match Karl Marx. He was truly the last of the great critics in the western intellectual tradition. His ideas exerted a decisive influence on all aspects of human endeavour and transformed the study of history and society. He was the first thinker to bring together the various strands of socialist thought into both a coherent world view and an impassioned doctrine of struggle. Along with Friedrich Engels (1820-1895), with whom he shared an unparalleled partnership, Marx dissected 19th century capitalism as scientific socialism or communism. Marxism is not only a critical appraisal of capitalism but also a viable or credible alternative to it. Marxism is at once an orientation, programme of action and a working class movement.

Marx’s principal doctrines were not new; but he greatly amplified and systematized older ideas, putting them into new and effective combinations. He attempted to show that a socialist programme must be based upon a systematic interpretation of social evaluations and a critical analysis of the existing system of production and exchange. His design was to show how a socialist community is to be built upon capitalist foundations. Marx described his socialism as scientific.

Marx inherited and integrated three legacies, German philosophy, French political thought and English economics in his theoretical foundation. From the German intellectual tradition, he borrowed the Hegelian method of dialectics and applied it to the material world. From the French revolutionary tradition he accepted the idea that change motivated by a messianic idea was not only desirable, but also feasible. He applied his method with a view to bringing about large-scale change within the industrialized capitalist economy of which England was the classical model in the 19th century. He used the English classical economists to understand the dynamics of capitalism and the Industrial Revolution.

Marx was born on March 5, 1818 in the predominantly Catholic city of Trier in the Rhineland in a Jewish family. He embraced Christianity during his childhood. Marx studied law at the university of Born 1835, and at the university of Berlin 1836. He changed his course to philosophy under the influence of the young Hegelians. He completed his doctorate in philosophy in 1841. Marx married his childhood friend Jenny, six years older than Marx.

Marx has written so extremely on various issues of Philosophy, Economics, Politics and society. During his student days Marx was attached to Hegelian Idealism but he soon shifted his interest to humanism and ultimately to scientific socialism. The books, articles, pamphlets of Marx were written during three decades from the early forties to the early seventies. The important works of Marx include Critique of Political Economy, The Communist Manifesto, Das Capital. The basic principles of Marxism can be summarized as follows:
1. Dialectical Materialism
2. Historical Materialism
3. Theory of Alienation
4. Theory of surplus value
5. Class struggle
6. Dictatorship of the proletariat
7. Vision of a communist society

**DIALECTICAL MATERIALISM**

Karl Marx is indebted to both Hegel and Hobbes for his theory of Dialectical materialism. Marx borrowed is dialectical method from Hegel but modified it in a fundamental way. While Hegel applied the dialectics to explain the material conditions of life, Marx applied the dialectics to explain the material conditions of life. In the process of doing so he denounced the Hegelian philosophy of dialectical idealism on the on hand and the theory of mechanistic materialism on the other ‘ May dialectic method ‘ wrote Marx, ‘ is not only different from the Hegelian but is its direct opposite. To Hegel, the life process of the human brain, ie. process of thinking which under the name of ‘ the idea’ he even transforms into an independent subject is the demiurges 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’ Thus Marx contrasted his materialistic to Hegel’s idealistic interpretation of history.

In the dialectical materialism of Marx, evolution is the development of matter from within environment helping or hindering but neither originating the evolutionary process nor capable of preventing it from reaching its inevitable goal. Matter is active and not passive, and moves by an inner necessity of its nature. In other words, Dialectical Materialism of Marx is more interested in motion than matter, in the vital energy within matter inevitably driving it towards perfect human society. As Engels has rightly pointed out, the dialectical method grasps things and their images, ideas essentially in their sequence, their movement, their birth and death. “This motion that dialectical materialism entails is possible by the conflict of the opposites. According to Marx, every state of history which falls short of perfection carries within itself the seeds of its own destruction. Each stage reached in the march to the classless society, the thesis, calls into being its opposite or anti-thesis and from the clash between the two, a new synthesis emerges in which what was true in both thesis and antithesis is preserved which serves as a starting point for the whole process again until the class less society has been achieved.

Marxian Dialectical Materialism developed by Engels has three dimensions.

1. The law of transformation of quantity into quality. It means that qualitative changes lead to qualitative revolutionary situation.
2. The law of unity of opposites and
3. The law of negation of negation
HISTORICAL MATERIALISM

Historical materialism is the application of the principles of dialectical materialism to the development of society. Marx applied dialectical materialism to the social world consisting of economic production and exchange. In his Socialism: Utopian and Scientific, Engels has defined historical materialism as a theory which holds that the ultimate cause which determines the whole course of human history is the economic development of society. The whole course of human history in explained in terms of changes occurring in the mode of production and exchange. Starting from primitive communism, the mode of production has passed through three stages. Slavery, feudalism and capitalism and the consequent division of society into three distinct classes (Slave- master, self-baron and proletariat-capitalist) and the struggle of these classes against one another. The most profound statement of Marx’s theory of historic materialism is contained in his preface to a contribution to the Critique of Political Economy. In this work, Marx wrote thus:

The economic structure of society, constituted by its relations of production is the real foundation of society. It is the basis on which rises a legal and political super structure and to which correspond definite forms of social consciousness. Along with it, the society’s relations of production themselves corresponds to a definite state of development of its material productive forces. Thus the mode of production of material life determines the social, political and intellectual life process in general....”

According to Marx the general relations as well as form of state are to be grasped from the material conditions of life. As the society’s productive forces develop they clash with the existing relations of production. This contradiction between forces of production and relations of production divides the society into different classes. As people become conscious of this conflict they fight it out. The conflict is resolved in favour of the productive forces and higher relations of production.

Like his dialectical materialism, Marx constructed his materialistic conception of history out of the Hegelian system itself which had sought to bridge the gap between the rational and actual ‘Marx, in fact, borrowed such concepts as civil society and property from the Hegelian system and set them in a revolutionary relationship to the concept of the state. Hegel confronts civil society as a sphere of materialism and counterposes it to the state as sphere of idealism. In sharp contrast to this, Marx holds that relations as well as forms of state are to be grasped neither from themselves, nor from the general development of human mind but rather they have their roots in the material conditions of life. Thus, for Hegel, the real world is only the external phenomenal form of the idea, while for Marx the ideal is nothing else than the material world reflected by human mind and translated into forms of thought. To put it differently while in the Hegelian scheme, human consciousness determines social existence in the Marxian scheme; it is the social existence that determines their consciousness.

THEORY OF SURPLUS VALUE

The theory of surplus value is discussed by Marx in detail in his well known work ‘Das Capital’ which was considered as the Gospel or Bible of socialism. The doctrine of surplus value is the most important theoretical contribution of Karl Marx. The theory of surplus value is rooted in the labour theory of value holds that labour spent by the labourer in the production of the commodity is the sole criterion for determining its value. Marx admits that human labour cannot create value by itself alone. It uses instruments of production which are owned by the capitalists. The capitalist buys the labour power of the labourer and applies it to the raw material to produce
commodities which have an exchange value of the commodity and the wages paid to the worker by the capitalist in producing that commodity is surplus value.

Marx explains the whole process of exploitation with the help of his theory of surplus value. It is a distinct feature of capitalist mode of production. Surplus value accrues because the commodity produced by the worker is sold by the capitalist for more than what the worker receives as wages. In his Das Capital, Marx elaborated it in a simple technical manner. He argued that the worker produces a commodity which belongs to the capitalist and whose value is realized by the capitalist in the form of price. This capital has two parts-constant capital and variable capital. Constant capital relates to means of production like raw material, machinery toolset used for commodity production. The variable capital refers to the wages paid to the worker. Surplus value is thus the differences between the value produce by the worker and what he actually gets in exchange for this value of his labour. In other words, surplus value is unpaid labour of the labour. It can be variously measured in terms of time as well as in terms of money.

Marx’s theory of surplus value is merely the introduction to something that interested him for more, an examination not of capitalism as it is but of capitalism as it was becoming. According to Marx, capitalism constantly generates the seed of its own destruction. The instruments which the owners use to enlarge their profits and rents are the instruments, fall inevitably into the hands of workers to be used by them to demolish the whole capitalist system. Thus Professor Francis W. Coker has summarized this process in the following manner. First place, the tendency under capitalist production is towards large production and monopoly. Secondly the tendency towards local concentration, large-scale production necessitates the bringing together of thousands of workers into small areas; and by these contacts they become more fully conscious of their common hardship and needs. In the third place, the tendency of capitalist production is towards the attainment of ever wider fields for markets. This requires a large development of the means of communication among different parts of the industrial world and this, in turn, facilitates intercommunication among the workers distribute throughout the industrial world. Fourthly, the capitalist system produces recurring economic crises: Finally, the tendency under capitalism is towards a steady increase in the misery, ignorance and dependency of the workers and this aggravates their hostility and discontent.

CLASS STRUGGLE

The doctrine of class struggle is central to the understanding of Marxian political philosophy. The sole criterion on the basis of which the class of a person is determined is this ownership (or control) of means of production constitute the bourgeoisie (exploiters) and those who own labour power constitute the proletariat (exploited). It is clear that Max defined classes on the basis of twin criteria of a person’s place with mode of production and his consequent position in terms of relations of production.

According to Marx class conflict is the real driving force of human history. In Communist Manifesto (1848), Marx and Engels wrote thus; ‘The history of all hitherto existing society is the history of class struggles. In the capitalist societies class differentiation is most clear, class consciousness is more developed and class conflict is more acute. Thus capitalism is the culminating point in the historical feature of bourgeois epoch is that society as a whole is more and more splitting up into two great hostile camps, into two great classes directly falling each other - bourgeoisie and proletariat.'
Marx made a distinction between the objective fact of existence of a class and its subjective awareness about its being a class – class consciousness. Division of labor is the main source of historical emergence of classes and class antagonisms. Through a detailed historical analysis, Marx showed that no major antagonism disappears unless there emerges a new antagonism. General antagonism between rich and poor is there but in capitalism it has been sharply polarised into antagonism between the capitalist and the proletariat. Thus in capitalism the emergence of proletariat has a special significance. It is not a historical phenomenon because its suffering, its exploitation and determination is a paradigm for the human conduct at large. The proletariat can abolish all classes and all class antagonisms by abolishing itself as a separate classes. In the class struggle the majority proletariat will come out successful. Marx and Engels wrote thus: “The workers of the world unite. The workers have nothing to lose but their chains. They have a world to win”. In the final analysis Marx visualized the emergence of a classless society, free from exploitation and suppression. Such class-less society will also be a state less society because with the disappearance of classes the very rationale for the existence of state will disappear.

**DICTATORSHIPS OF THE PROLETARIAT**

The concept of the dictatorship of the proletariat held the key to the understanding of Marx’s theory of the communist society and the role of the proletarian state. Marx did not write very clearly and systematically about the dictatorship of the proletariat and about the exact nature and form of post revolutionary communist society. The dictatorship of the proletariat is an intermediate point or transition phase on the path form capitalism to socialism and communism. In the critique of the Gotha programme, he further clarified that between capitalism and communist society lies a period of revolutionary transformation from capitalism to socialism. In political sphere this transformation will take the form of dictatorship of the proletarians. It is the first step in the revolution of the working class which will raise the proletariat to the position of a ruling class. In Marx’s view, during the dictatorship of the proletariat there will be a regime in which the proletariat will control the state power.

Such a transitional phase of dictatorship of the proletariat is necessary because the destruction of whole capitalist social and political order cannot be fully achieved without capturing the state power and without using it as an instrument of to create condition for the ushering in of a communist social order.

Marx and Engels were convinced that existing states whether as instrument of class domination and oppression, or rule by bureaucratic parasites on the whole of society, would grow inherently strong and remain minority states representing in the interests of the small dominant and powerful possessing class. It was only when the proletarian majority seized the state structure that the sate became truly democratic and majoritarian. Whatever might be the form the state assumed, it was a powerful machinery which the proletariat had to contend with while making its revolution. In the later part of his life, Marx was convinced of the imperative need to destroy the state and to establish the dictatorship of the proletariat. In the initial states, bearing in mind the example of the French Revolution of 1789 he anticipated a seizure of the existing state machine by the revolutionary proletariat, for he believed that political centralization would assist the revolutionary process. In a book review written around 1848-1849, Marx observed that the destruction of the state had one implication for the communists, namely the cessation of an organised power of one class for the suppression of another class.
In March 1850, the phrase dictatorship of the proletariat replaced rule of the proletariat. Marx and Engels stressed the notion of extraordinary power during an emergency for a limited period of time. It was “a social description, a statement of the class character of the political power. It did not indicate a statement about the forms of government authority”. It is in fact the nature of political power which it describes which guarantees its class character. According to Marx and Engels, the dictatorship of the proletariat was by the entire class, for the revolution would be made by the masses themselves. In a series of articles entitled the class struggles in France, Marx contended that the declaration of the permanence of the revolution, the class dictatorship of the proletariat as the necessary transit point to the abolition of class distinctions generally to the abolition of all social relations that correspond to these relations of production, to the revolutionizing of all the ideas that result from these social relations.”

There is a difference of opinion regarding the nature and character of the dictatorship of the proletariat. Marx wrote that the first step in the working class revolution is the raising of the proletariat to the position of the ruling class, the victory of democracy……………… the proletarian movement is the conscious movement of the immense majority in the interest of the immense majority. The communists hold the view that this dictatorship means the despotic rule of the communist minority within the proletariat but the socialists hold that this means a socialist government by a proletarian majority. The dictatorship of the proletariat would be established by violent methods but would not be maintained violence and repression.

VISION OF A COMMUNIST SOCIETY.

During the period of dictatorship of the proletariat the state continues to be the repressive organ of the class controlling the means of production, but instead of the minority oppressing the majority, the minority will oppress the small group of former exploiters. Under the loving care of the dictatorship of the proletariat, socialism will blossom into communism. Communism is explained by Marx as a form of society which the proletariat will bring into existence through its revolutionary struggle. In Communist Manifesto, Marx and Engles argued that the communists have no interests separate and apart from the interests of the proletariat as a whole. In his Economic and Philosophical Manuscripts, Marx defined communism as the positive abolition of private property. It also entailed the abolition of classes and abolition of division of labour. In economic terms, the communist society will be a society of associated producers’. In political terms communism will be the first state in the history of mankind to political power for universal interests instead of partisan interests. Thus, it will be different from the state in capitalism which is no more than the managing committee of the bourgeoisie. For Marx the state in capitalism is serving the long-term interests of the bourgeoisie as a whole.

Marx talked of two stages of communist society. In the first stage communism will bring about the socialization of means of production. It means that the means of production will not be in the hands of any one class but in the hands of society as a whole. At this stage labour will continue to exist and the organizing principle of the economy will be: “from each according to his capacity to each according to his work”. It means that every one will work according to one’s ability and get according to the amount of work done. At the second and final stage the communist society will ensure the end of man’s domination by objective forces. According to Marx, communism is not only the abolition of private property but also the abolition of state and abolition of classes. It will be a classless and stateless society in which government of men will be replaced by administration of things. Communism is viewed by Marx as the true final solution of the conflict between existence and essence, freedom and necessity, individual and the species.
Marx claimed that communism is the final solution to the problem of exploitation and oppression. Since communism will ensure the disappearance of social division of labour, it will become possible for man to do one thing to day another tomorrow. Moreover, it will be a state of plenty where every one will work according to ability and get according to need. The creation of new needs will also ensure the creation of means for their satisfaction. History will not come to an end, it will continue in terms of creation of new needs and creation of methods of their fulfillment.

According to William Ebenstein, Marx had no clear cut theory as to how the political reformation from capitalist to proletarian rule could come about. Though in the Communist Manifesto he visualized in the need for revolution he was less dogmatic later, speaking in 1872 at a public meeting in Amsterdam following the Congress of International, Marx declared that the means of attaining power for the working class are not everywhere the same. He wrote thus: “We know that we must take into consideration the institutions, the habits and customs of different regions, and we do not deny that there are countries like America, England and….. where the workers can attain their objectives by peaceful means. But such is not the case in all other countries”.

CRITICISMS

Karlo Marx is undoubtedly one of the most influential philosophers of modern times. His ideas and doctrines have acquired the status of a powerful ideology and a programme of action. His ideas on Dialectical Materialism, Historical Materialism, Surplus Value, Class Struggle, Dictatorship of the Proletariat, Alienation, communism etc have been extensively discussed, debated, modified and sometimes even rejected and criticized by his followers and adversaries.

Marxism has been subjected to severe criticisms from various corners. Along with Plato and Hegel, Marx was seen as an enemy of the open society. Marxism claimed to have studied the laws of history on the basis of which it advocated total sweeping and radical changes. Not only was it impossible to have firsthand knowledge based on some set of laws that governed society and human individuals, but Karl Popper also rejected Marx’s social engineering as dangerous for it treated individuals as subservient to the interests of the whole. Popper rejected the historicism, holism and utopian social engineering of Marxism. In contrast, he advocated piecemeal social engineering, where change would be gradual and modest, allowing rectification of lapses and errors for it was not possible to conceive of everything.

Popper claimed that Marx’s scientific socialism was wrong not only about society but also about science. He claimed that the capitalism that Marx described never existed. He wrote thus: Marx misled crores of intelligent people by saying that the historic method is the scientific way of approaching social problems” Further Marx made the economy all important, ignoring factors like nationality, friendship, religion, sex etc. Society was far more complex that what Marx described. As Popper has rightly mentioned “Marx brought into the social science and historical science the very important idea that economic conditions are of great importance in the life of society …….. There was nothing like serious economic history before Marx”.

Marx did not foresee the rise of Fascism, totalitarianism and the welfare state. His analysis of capitalism was, at best, applicable to early 19th century capitalism, though his criticisms of capitalism as being wasteful unequal and exploitative was true. However, his alternative to genuine democracy and communism seemed more official to realize in practice, for they did not accommodate a world which was becoming increasingly differentiated, stratified and functionally
specialized. Popper’s critique of Marxism on the basis of falsification was equally true and
difficult to refute, for Marxism constantly adjusted theory in the light of reality.

Marx’s vision of a new social order in which there will be neither alienation nor exploitation
no classes, no class antagonism, no state is highly fascinating and because of this attraction Prof.
Sabine called Marxism a ‘Utopia but a generous and humane one’. Harrington portrayed the
contemporary radical view of Marx as being an excellent critic of capitalism but unable to provide
a detailed alternative to it. A democratic system was totally alien to his temperament in spite of his
plea for democratization of social forces. Marx dismissed liberty as a purely bourgeois ideal and
was openly scornful of democracy as a bourgeois invention designed to deceive the people. As a
prophet of revolution, Marx failed to analyze human nature correctly. Nevertheless it cannot be
denied that the true and the false together in him constitute one of the most tremendously
compelling forces that modern history has seen.

The collapse of communism proved the serious shortcomings of Marxism both in theory
and practice. It, at best, remained a critique rather than providing a serious alternative to liberal
democracy. In spite of Marx’s utopia being truly generous, it displayed a potential for being
tyrannical despotric and arbitrary. Centralization of power and absence of checks and balances on
absolute power were themselves inimical to human freedom and liberation.

Whatever the shortcomings and limitations of Marxian principles, it is beyond dispute
that Marx would be remembered as a critique of 19th century capitalism and politics. He was the
first socialist who stressed the importance and increasing role of the proletariat. Marx was the first
political thinker to offer a systematic exposition of scientific socialism or communism. He made
communism an international movement of immense potentialities.

V I LENIN (1870-1924)

Lenin was not only a revolutionary leader of great sagacity and practical ability, but was
also a writer and thinker of exceptional penetration and power. He made Marxism a practical
political creed in Russia. He was a rare combination of the theorist and a man of action. He had a
keen intellect and displayed considerable interest in the theoretical aspects of Marxian socialism,
but his theoretical interests were directed the end goal of bringing about a successful socialist
revolution in Russia. He was specially concerned with the period of transition from capitalism to
socialism and contributed much in the way of theory on this subject that Marx and Engels had
neglected, or discussed ambiguously. Lenin's life-long passion was to serve the people. He showed
and unceasing care for the people's welfare, a passionate devotion to the cause of the party
and working class and a supreme conviction of the justice of this cause. Besides being one of the
dogmatic disciples of Marx, Lenin is also regarded as one of the greatest political geniuses of
modern history.

Lenin was born on April 10, 1870 in the town of Simbrisk in a middle class family. His
father and mother had been teachers and as such they were persons of progressive views. Their
five surviving children became revolutionaries and their eldest son, Alexander, was hanged at the
age of 19 for complicity in an abortive plot against Czar Alexander III. Elder brother's execution
was a stunning blow to Lenin, and strengthened him in his resolve to dedicate his life to the cause
of revolution. He attended the university of St. Petersburg and was as admitted to the bar in 1892.
Lenin became an active organizer of radical working class groups in the city of St. Petersburg. In
1895 he was arrested in Petersburg and spent 14 months in prison. He guided a revolutionary
organization from his prison cell. He later edited a Labor's work and Iskar (The spark) both
underground journals aimed at fomenting revolution among the urban working classes. From 1903 onwards he fought against moderate socialist element. He missed the revolution of 1905, arriving late from Switzerland where he had been in exile. The revolution was brutally suppressed by the Tsarist government. He spent a lot of his time studying the works of Marx and Engels and contributing himself to the theory of revolution. With the establishment of the dictatorship in November 1917, Lenin became the acknowledged leader of the Bolsheviks.

As a theorist, Lenin is best known for his analysis of revolutionary tactics and for his theory of imperialism. Lenin's most important work is 'What is To Be Done'. In this book Lenin drew a distinction between an organization of workers and an organization of revolutionaries. His most influential political work is 'State and Revolution' written in 1917. Lenin's 'Imperialism: the Highest Stage of Capitalism' was written in 1916. In this work, Lenin expanded on the economic aspects of Marxism.

According to Joseph Stalin, Leninism is Marxism of the era of imperialism and of the proletarian revolution. He brought Marxism up to date in the latest stage of capitalism and by making use of his theory of imperialism. His greatest contribution lies not in the field of theory but in adapting with great skill the most consistent social theory to pressing practical needs. He made Marxism successful in a country less industrially advanced, quite contrasting to Marx had predicted earlier. Lenin's method for ending the system of capitalism was revolutionary.

**HIS THEORY OF IMPERIALISM**

Lenin's views on imperialism are contained in his well known work Imperialism: The Highest Stage of Capitalism. He completed this work in the summer of 1916 which is regarded by the Marxists as an outstanding contribution to the treasure store of creative Marxism. In this book, Lenin made a comprehensive and detailed investigation of imperialism. He traces the development of world capitalism over the course of half a century after the publication of Marx's Das Capital. The outbreak of the first world war turned Lenin's attention more definitely towards international affairs and led to the formulation of his theory of imperialist war and of communism in the imperialist stage of capitalism. Basing himself on the laws of the emergence, development and decline of capitalism, Lenin was the first to give a profound and scientific analysis of the economic and political substance of imperialism all the contradictions of capitalist society inevitably become aggravated.

Lenin characterizes imperialism as monopoly imperialism and at the same time as parasitical, decaying and dying capitalism, disclosing the conditions that will bring or its end and demonstrating that capitalism will inevitably and necessarily be superseded by socialism. Lenin gives the following definition of the substance of imperialism: Imperialism is capitalism at that stage of development at which the dominance of monopolies and finance capital is established; in which the export of capital has acquired pronounced importance, in which the division of the world among the international trusts has begun in which the division of all territories of the globe among the biggest capitalist powers has been completed.

According to Lenin, imperialism is the last or final stage of capitalism. As capitalism develops, units of industrial production grow bigger and combine in trusts and cartels to produce monopoly capitalism. The same process takes place in the financial world. Banks combine and become masters of capital that the industrialists use of that monopoly finance capitalism is aggressively expansionist. Its characteristic export is capital, and its consequences are threefold. It results in the exploitation of colonial peoples, whom it subjects to the capitalist law of increasing
misery and whose liberty it destroys. Secondly, it produces international wars between capitalist countries. Finally, it brings about the end of capital and the emergence of the new order. In fact the transition from capitalism to socialism in through imperialism.

According to Lenin, imperialism is moribund capitalism, containing a number of contradictions which ultimately destroys capitalism itself. There is firstly contradiction between capital and labour. Capital exploits labour and brings the exploited workers to revolution. Secondly, there is the contradiction between various imperialist powers and industrial combines for new territories, new markets and sources of raw materials. Finally, there is also the contradiction between the colonial powers and the dependent colonial people which arouses revolutionary outlook and spirit among the later. Imperialism, thus, creates conditions favorable to the destruction of capitalism by promoting class and international conflicts and revolutionary outlook among the proletariat. Lenin's scientific analysis of the contradictions of capitalism at its last stage brought him round to the conclusion that imperialism is the eve of the socialist revolution. The revolutionary transition to socialism has now become a vital necessity.

On the basis of his own study of imperialism, Lenin further developed the Marxist theory of socialist revolution, its content, its motive forces and conditions and forms of development; in the new epoch. He proved that the war had accelerated the growth of the requisites for revolution and that as a whole world capitalist system had matured for the transition to socialism. Lenin's theory of capitalist imperialism thus supplied him an additional justification for the revolutionary tactics which he had always advocated

ROLE OF COMMUNIST PARTY.

Lenin's views on the role of the communist party, its organization etc. are contained in his book entitled 'What is to be done' published in 1902. The organization of the communist party on the basis of democratic centralism was an important contribution of Lenin to Marxism. Lenin described the communist party “as the revolutionary vanguard of the proletariat, an organisation consisting chiefly of persons engaged in revolutionary activities as a profession”. According to him, a political party that intends to carry out a revolution successfully must be thoroughly disciplined, alert and ably led like an army. It was an elite organisation, consisting of outstanding individuals who combined the thorough understanding of the theoretical issues and the general aspects of the situation confronting them, with a relentless will and capacity for decisive action. These individuals formed the core of revolutionary party, combining theory and practice, independence of mind with the strict discipline, freedom of discussion with a firm adherence to party line.'

Lenin's most important theoretical contribution to the theory of Marxism is the doctrine of professional revolutionary. He drew a distinction between an organisation of workers, and an organization of revolutionaries. The former must be essentially trade union in character, as wide as possible, and as public as political conditions will allow. By contrast, the organization of revolutionaries must consist exclusively of professional revolutionaries, must be small and 'as secret as possible'. Whereas Marx had assumed that the working class would inevitably develop its class consciousness in the daily struggle for its economic existence, Lenin had much less confidence in the ability of the workers to develop politically by their own effort and experience. Lenin wrote thus: ‘Class political consciousness can be brought to the workers only from without, that is only outside the economic struggle, outside the sphere of relations between workers and employers’. Lenin did not care whether the professional revolutionaries destined to lead proletariat
of working class origin or not, as long as the professional revolutionary must be no less professionally trained than the police and like the police the organization of professional revolutionaries must be highly centralized and able to supervise and control the open organization of workers that are legally permitted.

Communist party is organized on the principle of democratic centralism. Democratic centralism means on the one hand, that the party is democratically organized from bottom to top. Every office bearer is elected democratically. Each organ of the party, whether the lowest cell or the highest central executive conducts its deliberations and arrives at its decisions, on a democratic basis. Each party member is given freedom of speech and expression in party forums. Normally decisions are taken on the basis of majority. So the party is democratically organized. However, the party is centralized and in the normal course of functioning the decisions of the higher organs and binding on the lower bodies.

In Lenin's philosophy, communist party becomes a staff organization in the struggle for the proletarian class for power. He has made two types of unions:

1) Ideal union through the principles of Marxism and

2) Material Union which was to be achieved through rigid organization and discipline.
   As he wrote in his 'One step forward, Two steps Backward' the proletariat has no weapon in the struggle for power except organization. According to Lenin, the communist party is a part of the working class; its most progressive, most class conscious and therefor, most revolutionary part. The communist party is created by means of selection of the best, most class-conscious, most self sacrificing and foresighted worker.

Lenin differed from Marx in his interpretation and role of the proletariat or workers. According to Marx, the proletariat would become increasingly class conscious and militant as the contradictions in capitalism became more and more apparent and acute. Lenin, on the other hand, made it clear that the proletariat, if left alone, would develop only a 'trade union mentality'. Thus Lenin in his book entitled 'What is to be Done' declared:” the history of all countries shows that the working class, exclusively by its own efforts, is able to develop only trade union consciousness, i.e., it may itself realize the necessity for combining unions to fight against employers and to strive to compel the government to pass necessary labour legislation etc.

ESTIMATE

Lenin was a great leader of practical wisdom. As a great organizer, agitator and revolutionary, Lenin occupies a very important place in the theory and practice of socialism. He made Marxism up to date in the light of certain needs and developments which Marx had not anticipated. It will not be wrong to say that without the services to Marxism it must have died a natural and inevitable death. Lenin's formulas remained the formulas of Marx, the meaning of Leninism departed widely, from the meaning of Marxism.
MODULE V

MODERN INDIAN POLITICAL THOUGHT

GANDHIJI (1869-1948)

Mohandas Karamchand Gandhi was undoubtedly the most authentic celebrated representative of the wisdom and culture of India in our times. He was a political philosopher, social reformer, and economist and a seeker of truth. The contribution of Mahatma Gandhi to the Indian national movement was unparalleled. He made the Indian National Congress a people's congress and the national movement a mass movement. He was a man of action who reacted with vigor to every critical situation of social, political religious or cultural conflict that he was faced with and tried to resolve it by truthful and non-violent means. He had a passion for individual liberty which was closely bound with his understanding of truth and self realization. His philosophy was profound engagement with modernity and its pitfalls. Essentially a man of action, Gandhiji proposed a minimal state, vested coordinative powers, that support decentralization with autonomous individual as its base of support.

Gandhiji was born on October 2, 1869 in the small state of Porbandar where his grandfather, father and elder brother were prime ministers. His father later became Prime Minister of the Kathiawar state of Rajkot. Following the custom of his day, he was betrothed when he was seven years and was married at 13. Being a member of Vaishanava family he was strictly vegetarian.

PHILOSOPHICAL FOUNDATIONS OF GANDHIAN THOUGHT

Gandhiji was basically a religious man. Among the sources which moulded the Gandhian outlook, ‘Gita’ ranks the foremost. Gita had always been his spiritual reference book his daily and never failing guide. As he himself says, 'When doubt stares me, when disappointment stuyagras me in the face, and I see not even one ray of light on the horizon, I turn to Bhagavad-Gita' This religious prospective shaped his politics, his economic ideas and his view on society. However, the religious approach that he imbibed was markedly different from other religious men. He accepts the inner oneness of all existence in the cosmic spirit, and saw and living beings as representatives of the eternal divine reality. Gandhiji believed that man's ultimate goal in life was self-realization. According to him, self –realisation means seeing God face to face i.e, realizing the absolute truth or knowing oneself. He believed that it could not be achieved unless man identified himself with the whole of mankind. Gandhiji further states that truth could not be attained by merely retiring to the Himalayas or being bogged down with rituals but in actively engaging with the world. Man's ultimate aim is the realization of god, and all his activities, social, political and religious have to be guided by the ultimate aim of the vision of God.

Gandhiji believes that it is only through the means of self-purification that self-realization can be attained. The fasts, prayers and works of service that he undertook were all directed towards such an end. In his autobiography, Gandhiji says that self-realization required self-purification as its ethical foundation. Man's moral life flows from such a search inward into his own self and expresses itself in outward activity of fellowship and concern to others. Gandhiji
involved fivefold moral principles for the achievement of moral disciplines to the individuals. They are: a) Truth, b) non-violence, c) non-stealing, d) non-possession and e) celibacy.

According to Gandhiji, religion enables us to pursue truth and righteousness. He distinguished religion in general and religion in a specific sense. One belongs to a specific religion with its beliefs and practices. Gandhiji wrote thus: 'Let me explain what I mean by religion. It is not the Hindu religion which I certainly prize above all other religions, but the religion which transcends Hinduism, which changes one's very nature, which binds one indissolubly to the truth within, and whichever purifies. It is the permanent element in human nature which counts no cost too great in order to find full expression and which leaves the soul utterly restless until it has found itself knows its maker and appreciates the true correspondence between the maker and itself.' Talking about specific religions, he says, religions are different roads converging to the same point. What does it matter that we take different roads, so long as we reach the same goal? In reality, there are as many religion as there are individuals'.

RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN RELIGION AND POLITICS

For Gandhiji politics was but a part of man's life. Political activity of man is closely associated with other activities of man and all these activities influence each other. He formulated the relationship between politics and religion as an intimate one. Religion cannot be divorced from politics. He says that 'politics devoid of religion is meaningless'. Politics creates the conditions for pursuits which members of a polity feel are basis to the making of their selves. He felt, 'For me there is no politics without religion- not the religion of the superstitions and the bind, religion that hates and fights, but the universal religion of toleration'

GANDHIAN DOCTRINE OF SATYAGRAHA

Satyagraha was a formidable weapon in the hands of Gandhiji. It is a natural outcome from the supreme concept of truth. Satyagraha is literally holding on to truth, and it means, therefore, Truth force. Satyagraha means the exercise of the purest soul-force against all injustice, oppression and exploitation. Suffering and trust are attributes of soul-force. Truth is soul or spirit, it is there for known as soul force. It excludes the use of violence because man is not capable of knowing the absolute truth. 'Truth or satya, for Gandhiji, is go himself. He, therefore, changed the statement,' God is truth' later in his life into' Truth is God ' and suggested that it was one of the fundamental discoveries of his life's experiments. The life of man, for Gandhiji, is a march of his pursuit in search of Truth or God.

Satyagraha is not merely the insistence on truth, it is, in fact, holding on to truth through ways which are moral and non-isolent; it is not the imposition of one's will over others, but it is appealing to the reasoning of the opponent, it is not coercion but is persuasion. It means urge for satya or Truth. Gandhi highlights several attributes to satyagraha. It is a moral weapon and does not entertain ill-feeling towards the adversary, it is a non violent device and calls upon its user to love his enemy, it does not weaken the opponent but strengthens him morally; it is a weapon of the brave and is constructive in his approach. For Gandhiji, a satyagrahi is always truthful, morally inbued, non violent and a person without any malice, he is one who is devoted to the service of all.

Gandhiji firmly believed that truth can be attained only through non-violence which was not negative, meaning absence of violence, but was a positive condition of love. Resort to non-violence is recourse to love. In its positive sense, it seeks non-injury to others, both in words as well as deeds.
Gandhiji recommends several techniques of Satyagraha. The techniques of satyagraha may take the form of non-co operation, civil disobedience, Hijrat, fasting and strike. Gandhiji believes that oppression and exploitation were possible only on account of the cooperation of the people. If the people refused to cooperate with the government, the latter could not function properly. Non-cooperation may manifest itself in the form of hartals, picketing etc. Hartal involved the stopping of work as a measure of protest and its objective was to the strike the imagination of the people and the government. According to Gandhiji, hartals in order to be effective were to be voluntarily organized and non-violent method could be used. In the case of picketing also, no force was to be used. Picketing should avoid coercion, intimidation, discourtesy, burning of effigies and hunger strike.

Civil disobedience is another effective method recommended by Gandhiji for the realisation of satyagraha. It was regarded as a ‘complete effective and bloodless substitute of armed revolt’. There can be individual as well as mass civil disobedience. According to Gandhiji, complete civil disobedience implying a refusal to render obedience to every single state made law can be a very powerful movement. It can become ‘more dangerous than an armed rebellion’ because the stupendous power of innocent suffering undergone on a great scale has great potency.

Another form of satyagraha suggested by Gandhiji was Hijrat which implied voluntary exile from the permanent place of residence. This was to be done by those who feel oppressed cannot live without loss of self-respect in a particular place and lack the strength that comes from true non-violence of the capacity to defend themselves violently.

Fasting is another method of satyagraha. This method was considered by Gandhiji as a fiery weapon but it has to be applied only against those who are bound by ties of close personal affection. It required purity of mind, discipline, humility and faith. Gandhiji’s views was that fasting stirred the sluggish conscience and fired the loving hearts to action.

Another method of satyagraha was in the form of strike. Gandhiji’s view of strike was different from that advocated by the socialists and communists. According to Gandhiji, strike was a voluntary, purificatory suffering undertaken to convert the erring opponent. He did not believe in the theory of class war. His view was that industry was a joint enterprise of labour and capital, and both of them were trustees. The strikers were required to put forward their demands in very clear terms.

NON – VIOLENCE

Gandhiji cannot be regarded as the inventor and propounder of this principle. He discovered the principle of non-violence from the pages of history and his greatness lies in the fact that he made it on the basis of his life and adopted to serve the needs of time. He transformed it into social and political technique. He regards it as the supreme concept for the reformation of politics.

According to Gandhiji, Non-violence or Ahimsa is the heart of all religions. Non-violence is truth itself; it’s very soul, and its fruit. Truth and non-violence are two sides of a smooth unstamped metallic disc and are so intertwined that it is very difficult to separate them. Gandhiji put more emphasis on truth than non-violence because he believed that truth existed beyond and unconditioned by space and time, but non-violence existed only on the part of all finite beings.

Non-violence is, in fact, the acceptance of spiritual metaphysics. It is not merely the negative act of refraining from doing offence, injury and harm to others but really it represents the
ancient law of positive self-sacrifice and constructive suffering. Gandhiji interpreted it as signifying utter selflessness and universal love. The ultimate aim of non-violence is even to love the so-called enemies or opponents.

According to Gandhiji, there are three levels of non-violence. The highest form was the enlightened non-violence of resourcefulness or the non-violence of the brave. It was the non-violence of one who adopted it not by painful necessity but by inner conviction based on moral considerations. Non-violence was not merely political but embraces every sphere of life. The second kind of non-violence was adopted as a measure of expediency and sound policy in some spheres of life. That was the non-violence of the weak or the passive non-violence of the helpless. It is weakness rather than moral conviction which rules out the use of violence. It pursed honestly with real courage so long as it is accepted as a policy. It is capable of achieving results to a certain extent. However, it is not as effective as the non-violence of the brave.

The third level of non-violence is the passive violence of the coward. As Gandhiji has rightly pointed out, cowardice and ahimsa(non-violence) do not go together and more than water and fire. The coward seeks to avoid the conflict and flies from the danger. Cowardice is a impotent worse than violence. Gandhiji believes that non-violence cannot be taught to a person who fears to die and has no power of resistance. There is a hope for violent man to be some day non-violent, but there is none for a cowardice. This sound principle is based on the fact that despotism, could never have existed if it did not have fear as its foundation.

Gandhiji believed that self-suffering is an indispensable part of the struggle for the attainment of truth through non-violence. Self-suffering which he regarded as non-violence in its dynamic condition, had to be conscious. Conscious suffering means pitting of one's whole soul against the will of the tyrant. Ahimsa or non-violence, therefore, means infinite love. Gandhiji wrote thus: 'Non-violence is the first article of my faith. It is also the last article of my creed.' It is the imperative duty of 'satyagrahi to make endless endeavors for the realization of truth through non-violence. Gadhiji used this technique of non-violent resistance not only in combating the British occupation in India but also in dealing with India's internal problems.

For Gandhi, ahimsa or Non-violence meant both passive and active love, refraining from casing harm and destruction to living beings as well as positively promoting their well being. Gandhi defined ahimsa in two contrasting ways: On the one hand, in its narrow sense, it simply meant avoidance of acts harming others, While in its positive sense, it denoted promoting their well being, based on infinite love. Jawaharlal Nehru characterized Gadhian principle of Ahimsa as 'a positive and dynamic method of action and it was not meant for those who meekly accept the status quo'. Ahimsa, in its positive connotation, was based on highest moral values, epitomized in the unselfish self'.

Ahimsa was complementary to Gandhi's model of conflict resolution that was certainly the most original and creative model of social change and political action even under most adverse circumstances. This was a theory of politics that gradually became the dominant ideology of a national political movement in which Gandhi reigned supreme.

RAMA RAJYA

Mahatma Gandhi was an ardent believer in the theory and practice of democracy. However, his doctrine of democracy is different from classical democracy of the west. Gandhian model of democracy has two levels evolving from a lower level to a higher level. At one level he
conceived of an idealized polity where there would not be any state or government to regulate the rights and liberties of the individuals. This form of polity was identified by Gandhiji as Rama Rajya or Kingdom of God. The other level of polity was conceived as the sub-ideal level which would have a government that would permit maximum freedom to the individuals.

Rama Rajya relates to Lord Rama’s rule. It is a reference to the ideal conditions that upheld and nurtured the qualities of honesty, truthfulness, trust, respect co-operation, sacrifice and service at the time when Rama ruled his kingdom. This ideal Hindu society was projected sharply by Gandhiji during Indian’s struggle for freedom. According to Gandiji, Rama Rajya was that stage of development where ethical considerations would govern the life of the individuals.

Some scholars tried to compare Gadhian concept of Rama Rajya with the platonic Theory of rule of philosopher king. Those who support this view hold that Gandhian concept of Rama Rajya is interpreted in the traditional Indian sense to signify benevolent monarchy oriented to the realization of the good of all. Gandhian notion of Rama Rajya may also be interpreted as signifying a state of enlightened monarchy that would be characterized by the absence of governmental coercion. If this interpretation is emphasized, then Rama Rajya cannot be compared to the doctrine of the philosopher king.

There are two interpretations of Gandhian concept of Rama Rajya. One is the traditional interpretation as formulated in the Ramayana of Valmiki or in the our puranas or with various Ramayanas in the Indian languages. According to this interpretation, Rama Rajya is a political system based on benevolence, consideration for good, peace and social harmony. The king is there at the top as the father of his subjects. Secondly, the influence of anarchists like Tolstoy may be seen.

For Gandhiji, Rama Rajya means kingdom of god symbolising the victory of forces of good over forces of evil. Gandhiji’s central concern in life was for the individual and not so much for established institution. Gandhian notion of Rama Rajya assures every one will have a proper house to live in, sufficient and balanced food to eat and sufficient Khadi with which to cover himself. It also meant that the cruel inequality that obtains today will be removed by purely non-violent means. Gandhiji considered the state as an organisation of violence and force. Being an apostle of non-violence, Gandhiji was repelled by the coercive character of the state. He postulated that in the ideal state of Rama Rajya there will be sovereignty of the moral authority of the people, and the state as an instrument of violence would be extinct.

AS A CRITIQUE OF MODERN STATE

Gandhiji’s critique of the modern state emanated from its coercive aspect and its anti-human thrust. The mode of operation of the modern state constituted an infringement with his concept of non-violence. He wrote in Young India thus: To me political power is not an end but one of the means of enabling people to better their condition in every department of life. Political power means capacity to regulate national life through national representatives. If national life becomes so perfect as to become self-regulated, no representation becomes necessary. There is then a state of enlightened Anarchy. In such a state everyone is his own ruler. He rules himself in such a manner that he is never a hindrance to his neighbour. In the ideal state, therefore, there is no political power because there is no state. But the ideal is never fully realised in life.’

Gandhiji also criticised the impersonal character of the modern State. The state for Gandhiji represented a co-operative of people sustained by the acts of its citizens. In a write up published in
the Modern Review in the year 1935, Gandhiji has made some limitations of the modern state. He wrote ‘I look upon an increase in the power of the state with the greatest fear, because although while apparently doing good by minimising exploitation, it does greatest harm to mankind by destroying individuality, which lies at the root of all progress. The state represents violence in a concentrated and organised form. The individual has a soul, but as the state is a soulless machine, it owes its very existence. What I disapprove of is an organisation based on force which a state is. Voluntary organisation there must be.’

Gandhian perspective on the theory of the state can be best understood on the basis of a model that he aspired for independent India. This polity is known as Swaraj meaning self-rule or self governance. Swaraj is not transfer of political power to the Indians. The real Swaraj will come not by the acquisition of authority by a few but by the acquisition of the capacity by all to resist authority when abused. According to Gandhiji, the word Swaraj is a sacred word, a Vedic word, meaning self-rule and self-restraint and not freedom all restraint which independence.

Gandhian doctrine of Swaraj had economic, social, political and international connotations. Economic Swaraj stands for social justice, it promotes the good of all equally including the weakest, and is indispensable for descent life. Social Swaraj centres on an equalisation of status. Political Swaraj aims at enabling people to better their condition in every department of life. In the international field, Swaraj emphasised on interdependence.

**ECONOMIC IDEAS**

Gandhian economic thought revolves around the following principles;

a) Economic process must work towards equality and non-exploitation ; b) It must be consistent with full employment. c) it must produce low priced consumer goods which satisfy the needs of the people (d) all those industries with sophisticated economy must be in the public sector and (e) No mass production without equal distribution. For Gandhiji, the cardinal principles in his economic thought are the promotion of equality together with social justice.

Gandhian economics stressed on equality social justice, full employment and harmonious labour-capital relations. Gandhiji opposed both capitalism and communism and suggested an attentive model for overcoming the socio-economic backwardness of the poor. For him the individual, his freedom, dignity and satisfying life were more important than more economic progress, which capitalism and communism promised to deliver. In Gandhian economics, the supreme consideration is the human being. According to him, every man has the right to live and therefore, to find work to meet his basic needs of food, clothing, shelter education, health and self-esteem. He argued that we must utilise all human labour we entertain the idea of employing mechanical power. ‘Real planning’, according to Gandhiji, consists in the best utilisation of whole man-power of India and the distribution of the raw products of India and the distribution of the raw products of India in her numerous villages instead of sending then outside and reburying finished articles at fabulous price.

In Gadhian economics, the supreme consideration is the human being. Every man has the right to live and, therefore, to find work to meet his basic needs of food, clothing, shelter, education, health and self-esteem. He felt; these should be freely available to all as God’s air and water are ought to be. The should not be made a vehicle of traffic for exploitation of others. Their monopolisation by any country, nation or group of persons would be unjust’ He argued
that we must utilize all human labour before we entertain the idea of employing mechanical power.

SARVODAYA: THE RISE OF ALL

Gandhiji was highly critical of the path both capitalist and socialist economies had taken. America harbours massive poverty amidst abundant wealth. As Gandhiji has rightly pointed out, America is the most industrialised country in the world, and yet it has not banished poverty and degradation. That is because it neglects the universal manpower and concentrates power in the hands of the few who amass fortunes at the expense of the many. He felt socialist economies put the cart before the horse. Socialism has only one aim that is material progress. Against capitalism and socialism, Gandhiji proposed the concept of Sarvodaya, which was based on three basic principles.

1) That good of the individual is contained in the good of all.

2) That the life of labour, i.e., the life of the tiller of the soil and the handicraftsman is the life worth living.

3) That the lawyer’s work has the same value as the barber’s in as much as all have the same right of earning their livelihood from their work.

TRUSTEESHIP

One of the most original contributions of Gandhiji in the area of economics is the concept of Trusteeship. It is, in fact, an economic extension of his political philosophy. The main trust is on treating resources as a public trust with man being the trustee, so that the riches of nature and society are equitably used. The theory was intended to combine the advantages of both capitalism and communism, and to socialise property without nationalising it.

Gandhiji had a view that all material property was a social trust. The owner and the rest of the people were to regard themselves as trustees of the property. The Trusteeship provides a means of transforming the present capitalist order or society into an egalitarian one. It does not recognise any right of private ownership of property except so far as it may be permitted by society. For its own welfare. It does not exclude legislative regulation of the ownership and use of wealth. Under the Gandhian economic order, the character of production will be defined by social necessity and not by personal whim or greed.

Gandhiji was against industrialisation on a mass scale because it leads to many insoluble problems such as the exploitations of the villages, urbanisation, environmental pollution etc. He wanted manufacturing to be done in village and by the villages. This would keep the majority of the people of India fully employed; they would be able to meet their basic needs and would remain self-reliant. For Gandhi, India’s economic future lay in charkha (spinning wheel) and khadi (homespun cotton textile.) He wrote thus: ‘If India’s villages are to live and prosper, the charkha must become universal’. Rural civilization is impossible without the Charka and all it implies, i.e, revival of village crafts.

Gandhiji was convinced that industrialisation as it manifested in the west was devastating for India. His alternative revolves around his concern for providing profitable employment to all those who are capable. Not only industrialism undermines the foundation of India’s village
economy, it will also lead to passive or active exploitation of the villagers as the problem of competition and marketing come in. He made it clear that no amount of socialisation can eradicate the evil’s, inherent in industrialism.

M N ROY (1886-1954)

Manvendra Nath Roy, whose original name was Narendra Nath Battacharya was born on 1886 and died on 1954. In his early years M.N Roy was influenced by the writings of Swami Vivekananda, Bakim Chandra, Daynanda Saraswthi, Bipin Chandra Pal, Aurobindo Ghosh and V.D Savarker. In 1910 Roy was sentenced to imprisonment in connection with Howrah conspiracy case. Roy had the unique distinction of working with Lenin, Stalin and Trotsky. He began his political life as a militant nationalist and ended a radical humanist.

M.N Roy paved through at least three phases in his career. In the first phase, he was a national revolutionary, smuggling arms for the terrorists of Bengal. In the second phase, Roy was a Marxist engaged in active communist movement first in Mexico and then in Russia, China and India. In the final phase, Roy emerged as a radical humanist, completing his journey from Nationalism to communism and from communism to Radical Humanism.

In 1922, M.N Roy made a sociological study of contemporary India in his ‘India in Transition in which differed from the proposed solutions of the problems of India in transition. Towards the end of 1922, he has published India’s problem and His solutions. In this work he criticized the medievalism and conservatism of the Gandhi an social theology. In addition to these books, he has written several books and published several articles in reputed journals. By 1936 Roy has further intensified his campaign against Gandhism. He condemned Gandhism as a reactionary social philosophy teaching the impracticable concept of social harmony. In 1937, he founded his weekly Independent India which was later renamed Radical Humanist in 1949. He regarded the Gandhian concept of Non-violence as asubtile intellectual device for concealing the capitalist exploitation of the country.

HUMANISTIC CRITIQUE OF MARXISM

The philosophical writings of Roy indicate a breakaway from his Marxian affiliations. As a person, Marx evokes great praise from Roy. He regards Marx as a merciless critic of social injustice. He conciders Marx as a humanist and a lover of freedom. Hence, Roy wanted to restate the humanist, libertarian, moralist principals of Marxian after freeing it from the dogmas of economic determinism.

According to Roy, the materialism of Marxism is dogmatic and un scientific. Roy is critical of the empirical account of knowledge that Marxism provides thus neglecting the creative role of the human beings. Roy believes that the dialectical materialism of Marx is materialist only in nature. According to Roy, the Marxian interpretation if history is defective because it allows slender role to mental activity in the social process. History cannot be interpreted soley in the reference to materialistic objectivism. The intelligence of human being and their cumulative actions are very powerful social forces. Roy also criticizes the Marxian economic interpretation of history.

Roy also criticises Maxian theory of class struggle. According to Roy, Marx’s theory of class struggle has subordinated individual consciousness. He was also critical of Marx giving too much importance to the working class. Roy believes that polarization of capitalist society into the
exploiting and the working class never takes place. Again, Roy did not regard surplus value as a peculiar feature of capitalism. He believes that the creation of surplus value and accumulation of capital were also in a socialist society

NEW HUMANISM

In the later years of his life (1947-1954) Roy became an exponent of New Humanism. Humanist elements of thought can be traced to several schools and epochs of western philosophy. There were humanist tends in Protagoras, Erasman, Buchanau and Herder. Roy felt that the advance of science was a factor for the liberation of man’s creative energies. Science had enhanced the creatively of man and emancipated him from the dominated of superstitions and fears. Though Roy influenced by the scientific materialism of Hobbes, Ethics of Spinoza and secular politics of Locke, he reconciled all these to propound a rational idea of freedom with the concept of necessarily. The central purpose of Roy’s Radical Humanism is to co ordinate the philosophy of nature with social philosophy and ethics in a monistic system. It is for this reason that Roy claims it an humanist as well as materialist, naturalist as well as rationalist,creativist as well as determinist

Roy theory of New Humanism revolves around Man. Man is the product of physical universes. It is the man who creates society, state and other institutions and values for his own welfare. As a Radical Humanist, his philosophical approach in individualistic. The individual should not be subordinated either to a clan or to a nation. According to Roy, man has two basic traits one reason the other, the urge for freedom. The reason in man echoes the harmony of the universe .He states that every human behavior is rational, though it may appear as irrational. Man tries to find out the laws of nature in order to realize his freedom. This urge for freedom leads him to a search for knowledge. While rationality provides dynamisms to amen, the urge for freedom gives him direction. The interaction of reason and freedom leads to the expression of co operative spirit as manifested in social relationship.

According to Roy, humanity is paning through a period of crisis. The fundamental problem is to ensure individual freedom against the encroachment of the state. Roy is aware of the coercive power of the state. He defines state as the political organization of society. The functions of state are the welfare of people. According to him, the state must exist and discharge its limited functions along with other equally important and autonomous social organizations. Thus, Roy reduces the functions of the state to the minimum. He pleaded for decentralization where maximum possible autonomy should be granted to the local units.

Roy distinguishes his new humanism from the French and German schools of Humanism of the 19th century. New Humanism is based on the researches of physical science, sociology, philosophy and other branches of knowledge. Its philosophical foundation is provided by materialism and its methodology is mechanistic. It professes confidence in the creative power of man. Man derives his sovereignty from his creative achievement in the understanding and partial conquest of nature. New Humanism, according to Roy, claims to reassert the sovereignty of man by emphasizing that history is the record of man’s activities and state or society has no power to impose absolute power of man. New Humanism is based on a mechanistic cosmology and materialistic metaphysics. Man derives rationality from nature through biological evolution. Thus Roy claims that humanism is a philosophy based on a synthesis of the achievement of modern knowledge.

Roy was in favour of abolition of party system in India. He advocates humanist politics. This will lead to purification and rationalization of politics. According to Roy’s party politics has
given rise to power politics”. He lawents about the evils of party politics that exist where innocent and ignorant people are exploited in the elections. Thus he favoured the abolition of party system which will enable politics to operate without the incentive of power

Roy’s New Humanism is cosmopolitan in its outlook. New Humanism is pledged to the idea of a commonwealth and fraternity of freeman. He advocated a world federation. In his well known work, Reason, Romanticism and Revolution, Roy wrote thus: New Humanism is cosmopolitan. A cosmopolitan common wealth of spiritually free men would not be limited by the boundaries of national states- capitalist, fascist, socialist, communist or any other kind which will gradually disappear under the impact of the twentieth century renaissance of Man’

Roy makes a distinction between cosmopolitanism and internationalism. He pleads for a spiritual community or a cosmopolitan humanism. Internationalism postulates the existence of separate nation states. Roy believes that true world government can be built only the decentralization of nation states

M.N Roy has been one of the most important political thinkers of the modern Indian political thought. His work ‘Reason, Romanticism and Revolution’ is a significant contribution to the history of western thought. He began his academic pursuit as a Marxist, but gradually restated all the propositions of Marx. He gave a moral restatement of Marxism.
MODULAR VI

CONTEMPORARY POLITICAL THOUGHT

JOHN RAWLS (1921 – 2002)

John Rawls is the foremost political philosopher of the 20th century. He is regarded as one of the greatest political philosophers of all time. His main work, ‘A Theory of Justice’ has now been translated into more than thirty languages. Rawls devoted his entire career to one general philosophic topic and as a result wrote more on the subject of justice than any other major philosopher. Rawls revived the natural rights theory of the social contract found in Locke, Rousseau, Kant. The guiding purpose of Rawl’s work is to justify the primary institutions of a liberal and democratic society.

John Rawl’s was born in Baltimore, Maryland, 2nd February 1921, to William Lee and Anna Stump Rawls. He was the second of five sons, two of whom died in childhood. He grew up in Baltimore, where his father practiced law. His mother came from an established Baltimore family. Despite his lack of academic training, Rawl’s father was learned, cultivated, and a highly respected lawyer. John Rawl’s attended the Calvert school at Baltimore for six years. He graduated from Princeton university in January 1943. Rawls joined the U.S. Army. Upon completing military service in January 1946, Rawls entered graduate studies in philosophy at Princeton university. He completed and defended his thesis in 1949, and received the Ph.D Degree in June 1950. Rawls went to Oxford on a post doctoral Fulbright Fellowship for the academic year 1952-53. Rawls returned to the USA in 1953 and went to Cornell university in New York as Assistant professor of philosophy and later assumed professorship at Harvard. A Theory of Justice was published in 1971 and was awarded the PhiBeta Kappa Ralph also Emerson prize in 1972. In 1999 Rawls Wald awarded a National Humanities Medal by President Clinton. He was awarded the Rolf Schock prize in Logic and philosophy the same year.

In his later years Rawls was especially interested in history particularly books on world war II and on Abraham Lincoln, whom he especially admired as a statesman who did not compromise with evil. In 1995 Rawls suffered the first of series of strokes. Inspired of declining health, he continued to work formost of the remaining seven years of his life. With the help of his wife and friends he completed the important Second Introduction to Political Liberalism. He died at home on November 24, 2002 three months before the 82nd birth day.

Rawl’s Political philosophy was influenced by the contemporary discussions in moral and political philosophy. In the 1950s and 1960s, moral philosophy was largely focused on meta-ethical questions regarding the meaning of moral terms and the possibility of true moral statement. Rawl’s believed that Christianity and religion generally had the wrong attitude towards morality. A fundamental assumption of Rawl’s moral psychology is that human beings are not naturally corrupt or moved purely by selfish motive but have genuine dispositions to sociability. The writings of Hobbes John Locke, Rousseau, Immanuel Kant, Hegel, Hume, Henry Sidwick, J.S. Mill, Marx etc. influenced the political philosophy of Rawl’s.
HIS THEORY OF JUSTICE

The concept Justice occupies an important place in political theory and practice. The word justice is derived from the Latin words ‘Jungere’ meaning to bind or to tie together and jus meaning a bound or tie. As a bonding or joining idea, justice serves to organize people together into a right or fair order of relationship by distributing to each person his or her due share of rights and duties rewards and punishments.


As a moral political value, justice is interlinked with such other moral-political values as liberty, equality and fraternity. What makes a society or state just in a basic sense its right or fair ordering of human relations by giving to each person her or his basic rights and duties as well as due rewards and punishments. Justice does this by bringing about adjustments between the principles of liberty, equality, co-operation etc.

In discussions of justice, a distinction is drawn between procedural justice and substantive justice. The former refers to justice or fairness or impartiality of the processes and procedures through which a law or policy or decision is arrived at and applied. Substantive justice refers to justice or fairness of the content or outcome of laws, policies, decisions etc. John Rawls claims that his theory of justice is pure procedural justice. By procedural justice, Rawls means that the justice of his distributive principles is founded on justice as fairness.

Rawl’s concept of justice as fairness is a liberal conception in that it protects and gives priority to certain equal basic liberties, which enable individuals to freely exercise their consciences, decide their values and live their chosen way of life. Liberal societies and governments respect individual’s choices and tolerate many different styles as well as religious, philosophical, and moral doctrines. His theory of justice is also liberal in that it endorses free markets in economic relations, respects individual’s free choice of occupations and careers, and provides a social minimum for the least advantaged members of society. Rawl’s conception of justice is democratic in the sense that it provides for equal political rights and seeks to establish equal opportunities in educational and occupational choices. Further, his theory of justice is egalitarian because it seeks to maintain the fair value of the political liberties, establishes fair equality of opportunity and determines the social minimum by aiming to maximum benefit to the least advantaged sections of society. These rights liberates and opportunities are subsumed under Rawl’s two principles of justice.

CRITIQUE OF UTILITARIANISM

Rawl's principle of justice is a corrective to the liberal utilitarian principle of the greatest happiness of the greatest number. Rawls recognizes that utilitarianism marked a progressive, welfare oriented departure from classical liberalism’s preoccupation with individualistic rights. According to Rawls, utilitarianism is a morally flawed theory of justice. Its moral flaw is that it justifies or condones the sacrificing of the good of some individuals for the sake of the happiness of the greatest number. For the utilitarians, the criterion of justice in a society is the aggregate sum of utility or happiness or welfare it produces and not the well being or welfare of each member of the society. In his Critique of Utilitarianism, Rawls derives inspiration from Immanuel Kant’s
moral idea of the freedom and equality of every human being. According to Kant, every human being is to be treated as an end in himself or herself and not as means to the ends of others. It is this liberal-egalitarian moral principle, which is isolated by utilitarianism and which Rawl’s reinstates in his theory of justice. Here Rawls tries to give centrality to the moral principle of the freedom and equality of every person.

LIBERAL EGALITARIAN PRINCIPLE OF JUSTICE.

According to John Rawls, a stable and well-off society is a co-operative venture for mutual advantage.’ Along with co-operation there is also conflict among its members regarding their share of the burdens and benefits of social living. The purpose of principles of justice is to ensure that the distribution of the benefits and burdens of society is just or fair to all its members. The basic institutions of society including the state should be so constructed as to ensure the continuous distribution of social primary goods to all the members of society in a fair or just manner. Social primary goods include rights and liberties, powers and opportunities, and income and wealth. Rawls believes that the distribution of these social primary goods among the members of a society is just, if that distribution is made in accordance with the following principles of justice.

1. The first principle of Justice : The Basic liberties.

2. Fair equality of opportunity and difference principle.

According to Rawl’s, “each person has an equal claim to a fully adequate scheme of equal basic rights and liberties, which scheme is compatible with the same scheme for all’. The main idea of the first principle is that there are certain basic rights and freedoms of the person that are more important than others and that are needed to characterize the moral ideal of free and equal persons. With the first principle Rawls aims first to define a democratic ideal of free citizens who have equal civil status with powers to fairly and effectively influence legislation and taken part in public life. Here he works within a Rousseauian conception of democracy as equal citizen’s deliberation on justice and the common good. Second, the first principle in theory is part of Rawl's liberal ideal of free self-governing persons who develop their human capacities, and shape and pursue ways of life that are intrinsically rewarding. This is the ideal of the person that underlies the liberalisms of freedom of the high liberal tradition.

Rawl's first principle refers not to liberty but to “basic liberties” He appeals to the commonly accepted idea that certain rights and liberties are more important or basic than others. Rawls regards five sets of basic liberties: They are;

1) Liberty of conscience and freedom of thought;
2) Freedom of association,
3) Equal political liberties,
4) The rights and liberties that protect the integrity and freedom of the person,
5) The rights and liberties covered by the rule of law.

According to Rawl’s, these basic rights and liberties enable us to exercise and realize our “two highest-order moral powers” namely,

(i) the capacity to understand, apply and act according to the principles of justice and
(ii) capacity to form, revise and pursue conceptions of the good. In Rawl’s view every member of a just society must be viewed as having these two moral capacities. These make them free and equal citizens.
The main purpose of his second principle of justice is to keep inequalities within the bounds of justice as and unjust or unfair inequalities is of crucial importance in Rawl’s theory of social justice. Rawl’s thinks that excessive equality in income and wealth would destroy the economic incentives required for greater creativity and productivity. This would be harmful to both the rich and the poor.

Rawl's principle of fair equality of opportunity stipulates that the state should ensure fair equality of opportunity in the educational, cultural and economic spheres as well as provide unemployment and sickness benefits. The principles of justice have been described by Rawls as special formulations of a general conception of justice. This general conception is stated as: all Social primary goods - liberty and opportunity, income and wealth and the bases of self respect-are to be distributed equally unless an unequal distribution of any or all of these goods is to the advantage of the least favoured. By general conception of justice Rawls means that only those inequalities unjust which put some members or the society at a disadvantage. This general conception of justice, however, does not differentiate between the different social primary goods.

CRITICISMS

It is beyond dispute that Rawl's liberal theory of justice occupies a central position within contemporary political philosophy. However, his theory has been subjected to severe criticisms from various angles. Many political philosophers have criticized it and have advanced alternative conceptions of Justice.

Robert Nozick in his well known work, ‘Anarchy, State and Utopia’ draws a distinction between 'end state' and patterning conceptions of justice on the one hand and historical and entitlement based conceptions of justice on other The former types of justice call for social reconstruction or patterning by the state in the name of some end stage goal. According to Nozik, Rawl's concept of justice is such an end state and patterning conception, which by undermining the liberty rights of the individuals is unfair or unjust to them. Instead of prescribing any end-state or patterning principles of distribution, Nozick looks for justice or injustice in the history of the acquisition of the titles to our property holding.

Many Marxists criticize Rawl's theory of justice for its pre occupation with just or fair distributions with the capitalist system and its failure to address its underlying inequalities between the capitalists and workers. The ideal communist society, which Marxism seeks to bring about through the destruction of the system of private ownership of the means of production, is envisaged as a society in which there will be no scarcity, no limits to human benevolence and no state.

The communitarian theorists criticize Rawl's liberal equalitarian conception of justice for its emphasis on individual rights at the expense of the good of the community. In his book entitled, Liberalism and the Limits of Justice’ Michael sandal criticizes Rawl's notion of disembodied self or subject, who is invariably a member of a community. While for Rawls the right is prior to the good and justice is the first virtue of a society. ‘For Sandal’, justice is only a remedial virtue that is needed in an individualistic society, for sandal, the common good of the community is prior to the lights of the individuals. Charles Taylor, a communitarian political thinker, criticizes Rawls notion of justice as atomistic’ conception of the self. According to Charles Taylor, the well-being of the individual depends on the good of his community and therefore, the recognition and protection of the group or cultural rights of the community is not less than important than the just distribution of freedom and equality rights to the individuals.
POLITICAL LIBERALISM:

In political liberalism Rawls modified the Universalist presumptions of his early work. There are two ways to understand Political liberalism. It might be seen as a remedy to the problem that Rawl’s encounters with the argument for the stability of a well-ordered society of justice as fairness. Political liberalism also can be understood independently of theory and as responding to deferent problems. Taken on its own terms, political liberalism responds to two main questions, one regarding the practical possibility of a well-ordered liberal society and the other the conditions of legitimacy of the exercise of political power in a liberal society. Legitimacy is not a concept that Rawls uses in 'A theory of Justice'. It is a different concept than justice, and it becomes especially important under non-ideal conditions in societies where justice as fairness is not uniformly applied.

Political liberalism has a different focus than theory. It does not ask what conception of justice is true or most reasonable and best fits with our considered convictions of justice. Rather, it presupposes the justice of a liberal and democratic society where people regard themselves as free and equal citizens. Political liberalism starts out with the assumption that a liberal democratic society is more just than the alternatives, and address itself to people who accept the fundamental political importance of freedom and equality. As Prof. Rawls has rightly pointed out, if people do not regard themselves as free and equal citizens nor believe that freedom and equality are fundamental political values, then political liberalism may not be of much importance to them.

Political liberalism addresses a problem within democratic and liberal theory; namely, how is it possible that there exists stable and enduring liberal and democratic society that tolerates different views and ways of life when reasonable citizens disagree about fundamental moral and religious values?

THE POLITICAL CONCEPTION OF A PERSON

Rawls says that it is a part of democratic culture that citizens are regarded as free and as equal. This is a social and institutional fact. Of course, people disagree about the ways in which citizens should be free and treated as equals but these fundamental political values are generally held by reasonable persons in a democratic society.

In political liberalism, Rawls resourcefully converts the Kantian conceptions of the person and the nature of agency into what he regards as non-controversial claims about how citizens in fact conceive of themselves in a democratic society and the natural capacities they need to effectively participate in society. This is party what Rawls means by a political conception of the person. It is not a metaphysical conception of the self, or a controversial normative conception of the person of the kind presupposed by comprehensive moral doctrines. Rather, it is a conception of the person that is based in empirical facts about social co-operation and how we actually conceive of ourselves in one important area of our lives, in our capacity as citizens.

THE FREEDOM OF CITIZENS

One of Rawl’s aims in political liberalism is to reconcile the Lockean and Rousseauian understandings of the fundamental democratic values of freedom and equality. There are three types of freedoms that Rawl’s associates with the idea of free and equal citizens. First, citizens are free in that they have a conception of the good; if they have not freely formed it for themselves, they nonetheless have the capacity to revise and reform it as they pursue their good. Second,
citizens see themselves as they ' self-authenticating sources of valid claims' Third, citizens are free in that they see themselves as responsible for their ends and capable of adjusting their wants to what they can legitimately expect as a result of social cooperation. The first and third of these kinds of freedom are positive freedoms; they concern capacities or powers that people have. The second appears to be freedom as a kind of status that stems from others recognition of the legitimacy of one's claims on them, independent of their and society's own purposes. Rawls contracts freedom of the second kind with its opposite, the status of slaves and their inability to make recognizable claims on society and others.

Rawls cannot mean in political liberalism that these three kinds of freedom are for valuable for their own sake, or that they stem from a more general conception of freedom as full autonomy that is instrically good. No such appeal to comprehensive values can be made within political liberalism. For many, the freedoms they enjoy as citizens might be nothing more than a means to other ends.

THE LIBERAL PRINCIPLE OF LEGITIMACY

Rawl's initially introduces the idea of public reason as part of justice as fairness. He distinguishes two kinds of liberal political values. First, 'the values of political justice-fall under the principles of justice for the basic structure; and second the values of public reason fall under the guidelines for public inquiry, which make that inquiry free and public. The values of public reason initially described rather narrowly, as among the guidelines for applying the principles of justice that presumably all reasonable persons accept in a well ordered society. Assuming that there are different comprehensive conceptions in a well ordered society then even though everyone accepts the same principles of justice (justice as fairness) they will apply these principles differently.

Rawl's has an alternative route to the idea of public reason, one not tied specifically to justice as fairness, and which leads to a broader characterization of public reason. Here Rawls introduces the idea of public reason by way of a requirement of political legitimacy. The liberal principle of legitimacy applies in any liberal society, not just one regulated by justice as fairness. Rawls says that liberal legitimacy imposes a moral duty of civility or citizens: a duty to be able to explain to one another on those fundamental question how the principles and policies they advocate and vote for can be supported by the political values of public reason.

PUBLIC REASON

The idea of public reason was introduced in chapter 2. Public reasons are the kinds of considerations that should be invoked to decide the nature and limits of constitutional liberties. In a constitutional democracy, citizens and officials normally have a sense of the kinds of reasons that are appropriately invoked in legislative and judicial forums.

The idea of public reason is easily misunderstood. If all that is meant by public reason is the reasons that people in a society share in common, then any society has a conception of public reason. According to Rawls, public reason is a characteristic of a democratic people, it is the reason of the citizens, of sharing the status of equal citizenship. This implies that simply because people in a society commonly accept and reason in terms of a common religion does not make that doctrine part of public reason. Differences among comprehensive views supply the background for Rawls idea of public reason.
CONCLUSION

John Rawls was one of the most significant moral and political philosophers of the 20th century. The 20th century was not a century marked by great moral political philosophers. Rawls is a formidable philosopher and must be reckoned with by anyone who addresses philosophical issues of justice in the indefinite future. His theory of ‘justice as fairness’ not only condemns racial sexual and religious discrimination, but also rejects many forms of social and economic inequality. Rawl's egalitarian forms of liberalism has had a profound effect upon political philosophy generally, and has made a significant contribution to both the modern liberal and social democratic political traditions.

ANTONIO GRAMSCI (1891-1937)

Antonio Gramsci was an eminent Italian Marxist and social theorist. He was born in a poor family in Sardinia which was the poorest region of Italy. His father was arrested when Gramsci was a small child and sentenced to five years imprisonment. In his absence, the family lived in utter poverty because of which Gramsci suffered physical deformity. After some elementary education, Gramsci started working in an office. In 1911 he won a scholarship and joined Turin university. At Turin he noticed that there was a lot of differences in the standard of living in the rural areas of Italy and its cities. While at the university, he got associated with the Italian socialist party. He was attracted by the ideas of Karl Marx. In 1914-15 he attended a series of lectures on Marx which made him particularly interested in the problem of relation between the base and the superstructure. When the Italian communist party was founded in 1921, Gramsci became one of its founding members. Soon he became its General Secretary and was also elected to the Italian Parliament. He was imprisoned by Mussolini in 1926 and remained there till his death. During his prison life he wrote on several topics. In Prison Notebooks written between 1929 and 1935, Gramsci sought to redress the emphasis within orthodox Marxism on economic or material factors. Rejecting any form of scientific determinism, Gramsci stressed the importance of political and intellectual struggles. His other major work is Modern Prince and other writings.

THEORY OF HEGEMONY

Gramsci’s Prison Notebooks and Modern Prince and other Writings deal with diverse issues of history, culture, politics, philosophy etc. The notion of Hegemony is considered as the most significant and original contribution of Gramsci to the theory and practice of Marxism.

The term ‘ Hegemony’ is derived from the Greek word ‘ Hegemonia’ meaning leader. In its simplest sense, the concept of Hegemony means the leadership or domination of one element of a system over other. Gramsci used this term to refer to the ideological leadership of the bourgeoisie over subordinate classes.

According to Marxian thinkers, in all societies there are two classes: the class which owns the means of production and the class which owns only labour power. The class which owns the means of production establishes its rule over the class which owns labour power and exploits it. Thus, in the Marxian theory, the capitalist state is the managing committee of the bourgeoisie, which facilitates and legitimizes the exploitative processes in the society. It is the economic power that enables the ruling class to remain in power. Gramsci, however, rejected the above Marxian principles. He argued that the ruling class maintains its dominating in diverse ways including the use of force, use of its economic power and the consent of the ruled.
Gramsci in his ‘Prison Notebooks’ maintains that the bourgeois class maintains its domination not merely by force, but in several non-coercive ways. Two such non-coercive ways come out in his writings. One of them is ability of the ruling class to impose its own values and belief systems on the masses. Gramsci argued that the ruling class uses various processes of socialization to impose its own values and belief systems on the masses. Gramsci argued that the ruling class uses various processes of socialization to impose its own culture on the ruled. The ruling class attempts to control the minds of men by imposing its own culture of them in several ways. Cultural hegemony, of the ruling class is the basis of its ruling power. Secondly, the ruling class does not always work for its narrow class interest. According to Gramsci, in order to maintain its ruling position, the ruling class enters into alliances and understanding with other groups in societies and creates a historic bloc. It is this strategy of creating a social bloc which enables the ruling class to get the consent of the ruled.

Gramscian argument of the role of ideas and culture is a deviation from orthodox Marxism which recognizes the importance of economic factor alone instead of non-economic factors. Secondly, Gramsci’s explanation of hegemony or dominance of the ruling class in terms of its compromises and alliances with other allies underplays the orthodox Marxian position in which the state is viewed merely as the managing committee of the bourgeoisie. Gramsci insisted that bourgeoisie hegemony could only be challenged at the political and intellectual level, through a counter hegemonic struggle, carried out in the interests of the proletariat and on the basis of socialist principles, values and theories.

ROLE OF INTELLECTUALS

Gramsci believes that intellectuals could play an important role in the revolutionary transformation of society. He argued that intellectuals provide a philosophy as well as advice for the masses so that they do not question the ruling position of the bourgeoisie. Gramsci talks about two types of intellectuals—traditional intellectuals and organic intellectuals. Traditional intellectuals refer to those who think they are not linked to any class. Organic intellectuals on the other hand are those who are actively and closely associated either with the ruling class or with the masses. Those who are associated with the ruling class chalk out ideas, which helps in legitimizing the rule of one class over the other. Those who are associated with the masses work for and provide leadership to bring about revolutionary change in society. Such intellectuals normally emerge from within the working class.