



NIILM
University



Political Theory

CONTENTS

- Chapter 1 : Concept and Approaches to the study of Political Science
- Chapter 2 : Behavioural & Post-Behavioural approach
- Chapter 3 : Power, Authority and Legitimacy
- Chapter 4 :Major Concepts in Political Theory
- Chapter 5 : State: Concept & Perspectives on State
- Chapter 6 : Ideology: Concept of Ideology
- Chapter 7 : Democracy: Meaning & Theories
- Chapter 8 : Democracy: Meaning & Theories-II
- Chapter 9 : Development : Meaning& Views on Development
- Chapter 10 : Gandhian view on Development
- Chapter 11 : Moral Values in Politics
- Chapter 12 : Legitimacy and its different forms

Chapter 1

Concept and Approaches to the study of Political Science

Politics & Political Science

Political science

Political science is a social science discipline concerned with the study of the state, nation, government, and politics and policies of government. Aristotle defined it as the study of the state. It deals extensively with the theory and practice of politics, and the analysis of political systems, political behavior, and political culture. Political scientists "see themselves engaged in revealing the relationships underlying political events and conditions, and from these revelations they attempt to construct general principles about the way the world of politics works." Political science intersects with other fields; including economics, law, sociology, history, anthropology, public administration, public policy, national politics, international relations, comparative politics, psychology, political organization, and political theory. Although it was codified in the 19th century, when all the social sciences were established, political science has ancient roots; indeed, it originated almost 2,500 years ago with the works of Plato and Aristotle.

Political science is commonly divided into distinct sub-disciplines which together constitute the field:

- political theory
- comparative politics
- public administration
- international relations
- public law
- political methodology

Political theory is more concerned with contributions of various classical thinkers such as Aristotle, Niccolò Machiavelli, Cicero, Plato and many others. Comparative politics is the

science of comparison and teaching of different types of constitutions, political actors, legislature and associated fields, all of them from an intrastate perspective. International relations deals with the interaction between nation-states as well as intergovernmental and transnational organizations.

Political science is methodologically diverse and appropriates many methods originating in social research. Approaches include positivism, interpretivism, rational choice theory, behavioralism, structuralism, post-structuralism, realism, institutionalism, and pluralism. Political science, as one of the social sciences, uses methods and techniques that relate to the kinds of inquiries sought: primary sources such as historical documents and official records, secondary sources such as scholarly journal articles, survey research, statistical analysis, case studies, experimental research and model building.

Overview

Political scientists study matters concerning the allocation and transfer of power in decision making, the roles and systems of governance including governments and international organizations, political behavior and public policies. They measure the success of governance and specific policies by examining many factors, including stability, justice, material wealth, and peace. Some political scientists seek to advance positive (attempt to describe how things are, as opposed to how they should be) theses by analyzing politics. Others advance normative theses, by making specific policy recommendations.

Political scientists provide the frameworks from which journalists, special interest groups, politicians, and the electorate analyze issues. According to Chaturvedy, "...Political scientists may serve as advisers to specific politicians, or even run for office as politicians themselves. Political scientists can be found working in governments, in political parties or as civil servants. They may be involved with non-governmental organizations (NGOs) or political movements. In a variety of capacities, people educated and trained in political science can add value and expertise to corporations Private enterprises such as think tanks, research institutes, polling and public relations firms often employ political scientists In the United States, political scientists known as "Americanists"¹ look at a variety of data including constitutional

development, elections, public opinion and public policy such as Social Security reform, foreign policy, US Congressional committees, and the US Supreme Court — to name only a few issues.

"As a discipline" political science, possibly like the social sciences as a whole, "lives on the fault line between the 'two cultures' in the academy, the sciences and the humanities." Thus, in some American colleges where there is no separate School or College of Arts and Sciences per se, political science may be a separate department housed as part of a division or school of Humanities or Liberal Arts. Whereas classical political philosophy is primarily defined by a concern for Hellenic and Enlightenment thought, political scientists are also marked by a great concern for "modernity" and the contemporary nation state, along with the study of classical thought, and as such share a greater deal of terminology with sociologists (e.g. structure and agency).

Most United States colleges and universities offer B.A. programs in political science. M.A. or M.A.T. and Ph.D. or Ed.D. programs are common at larger universities. The term *political science* is more popular in North America than elsewhere; other institutions, especially those outside the United States, see political science as part of a broader discipline of *political studies, politics, or government*. While *political science* implies use of the scientific method, *political studies* implies a broader approach, although the naming of degree courses does not necessarily reflect their content.^[6] Separate degree granting programs in international relations and public policy are not uncommon at both the undergraduate and graduate levels. Master's level programs in political science are common when political scientists engage in public administration.

The national honor society for college and university students of government and politics in the United States is Pi Sigma Alpha.

Modern political science

Because political science is essentially a study of human behavior, in all aspects of politics, observations in controlled environments are often challenging to reproduce or duplicate, though experimental methods are increasingly common (see experimental political science). Citing this difficulty, former American Political Science Association President Lawrence Lowell once said "We are limited by the impossibility of experiment. Politics is an observational, not an experimental science." Because of this, political

scientists have historically observed political elites, institutions, and individual or group behavior in order to identify patterns, draw generalizations, and build theories of politics.

Like all social sciences, political science faces the difficulty of observing human actors that can only be partially observed and who have the capacity for making conscious choices unlike other subjects such as non-human organisms in biology or inanimate objects as in physics. Despite the complexities, contemporary political science has progressed by adopting a variety of methods and theoretical approaches to understanding politics and methodological pluralism is a defining feature of contemporary political science. Often in contrast with national media, political science scholars seek to compile long-term data and research on the impact of political issues, producing in-depth articles breaking down the issues

The advent of political science as a university discipline was marked by the creation of university departments and chairs with the title of political science arising in the late 19th century. In fact, the designation "political scientist" is typically for those with a doctorate in the field. Integrating political studies of the past into a unified discipline is ongoing, and the history of political science has provided a rich field for the growth of both normative and positive political science, with each part of the discipline sharing some historical predecessors. The American Political Science Association was founded in 1903 and the American Political Science Review was founded in 1906 in an effort to distinguish the study of politics from economics and other social phenomena.

Behavioral revolution and new institutionalism

In the 1950s and the 1960s, a behavioral revolution stressing the systematic and rigorously scientific study of individual and group behavior swept the discipline. A focus on studying political behavior, rather than institutions or interpretation of legal texts, characterized early behavioral political science, including work by Robert Dahl, Philip Converse, and in the collaboration between sociologist Paul Lazarsfeld and public opinion scholar Bernard Berelson.

The late 1960s and early 1970s witnessed a take off in the use of deductive, game theoretic formal modeling techniques aimed at generating a more analytical corpus of knowledge in the discipline. This period saw a surge of research that borrowed theory and methods from economics to study political institutions, such as the United States Congress, as well as political

behavior, such as voting. William H. Riker and his colleagues and students at the University of Rochester were the main proponents of this shift.

Political science in the Soviet Union

In the Soviet Union, political studies were carried out under the guise of some other disciplines like theory of state and law, area studies, international relations, studies of labor movement, "critique of bourgeois theories" etc. Soviet scholars were represented at the International Political Science Association since 1955 (since 1960 by the Soviet Association of Political and State Studies). In 1979 11th World Congress of IPSA took place in Moscow. Until the late years of the Soviet Union, political science as a field was subjected to tight control of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union and was thus subjected to distrust. Anti-communists accused political scientists of being "false" scientists and of having served the old regime. After the fall of the Soviet Union, two of the major institutions dealing with political science - the Institute of Contemporary Social Theories and the Institute of International Affairs - were disbanded, and most of their members were left without jobs. These institutes were victims of the first wave of anti-communist euphoria and of in many ways unfounded ideological attacks, despite many of the people working in these institutes being competent scientists with a proficient knowledge of political science, and some of them having played an important role in reforming the Communist Party. Today the Russian Political Science Association unites professionals-political scientists from in Russia.

Recent developments

In 2000, the Perestroika Movement in political science was introduced as a reaction against what supporters of the movement called the mathematicization of political science. Those who identified with the movement argued for a plurality of methodologies and approaches in political science and for more relevance of the discipline to those outside of it. Evolutionary psychology theories argue that humans have evolved a highly developed set of psychological mechanisms for dealing with politics. However, these mechanisms evolved for dealing with the small group politics that characterized the ancestral environment and not the much larger political structures in today's world. This is argued to explain many important features and systematic cognitive biases of current politics.

Philosophical approach

Philosophical method (or philosophical methodology) is the study of how to do philosophy. A common view among philosophers is that philosophy is distinguished by the ways that philosophers follow in addressing philosophical questions. There is not just one method that philosophers use to answer philosophical questions.

Methodology process

Systematic philosophy is a generic term that applies to philosophical methods and approaches that attempt to provide a framework in reason that can explain all questions and problems related to human life. Examples of systematic philosophers include Plato, Aristotle, Descartes, Spinoza, and Hegel. In a meaningful sense, all of western philosophy from Plato to the modern schools of theoretical metaphysics. In many ways, any attempts to formulate a philosophical method that provides the ultimate constituents of reality, a metaphysics, can be considered systematic philosophy. In modern philosophy the reaction to systematic philosophy began with Kierkegaard and continued in various forms through analytic philosophy, existentialism, hermeneutics, and deconstructionism.

Some common features of the methods that philosophers follow (and discuss when discussing philosophical method) include:

- Methodic Doubt - a systematic process of being skeptical about (or doubting) the truth of one's beliefs.
- Argument - provide an argument or several arguments supporting the solution.
- Dialectic - present the solution and arguments for criticism by other philosophers, and help them judge their own.

Doubt and the sense of wonder

Plato said that "philosophy begins in wonder", a view which is echoed by Aristotle: "It was their wonder, astonishment, that first led men to philosophize and still leads them." Philosophizing may begin with some simple doubts about accepted beliefs. The initial impulse to philosophize may arise from suspicion, for example that we do not fully understand, and have not fully justified, even our most basic beliefs about the world.

Formulate questions and problems

Another element of philosophical method is to formulate questions to be answered or problems to be solved. The working assumption is that the more clearly the question or problem is stated, the easier it is to identify critical issues.

A relatively small number of major philosophers prefer not to be quick, but to spend more time trying to get extremely clear on what the problem is all about.

Enunciate a solution

Another approach is to enunciate a theory, or to offer a definition or analysis, which constitutes an attempt to solve a philosophical problem. Sometimes a philosophical theory by itself can be stated quite briefly. All the supporting philosophical text is offered by way of hedging, explanation, and argument.

Not all proposed solutions to philosophical problems consist of definitions or generalizations. Sometimes what is called for is a certain sort of explanation — not a causal explanation, but an explanation for example of how two different views, which seem to be contrary to one another, can be held at the same time, consistently. One can call this a philosophical explanation.

Justify the solution

An argument is a set of statements, one of which (the conclusion), it is said or implied, follows from the others (the premises). One might think of arguments as bundles of reasons — often not just a list, but logically interconnected statements — followed by the claim they are reasons for. The reasons are the premises, the claim they support is the conclusion; together they make an argument.

Philosophical arguments and justifications are another important part of philosophical method. It is rare to find a philosopher, particularly in the Western philosophical tradition, who lacks many arguments. Philosophers are, or at least are expected to be, very good at giving arguments. They constantly demand and offer arguments for different claims they make. This therefore indicates that philosophy is a quest for arguments.

A good argument — a clear, organized, and sound statement of reasons — may ultimately cure the original doubts that motivated us to take up philosophy. If one is willing to be satisfied

without any good supporting reasons, then a Western philosophical approach may not be what one actually requires.

Philosophical criticism

In philosophy, which concerns the most fundamental aspects of the universe, the experts all disagree. It follows that another element of philosophical method, common in the work of nearly all philosophers, is philosophical criticism. It is this that makes much philosophizing a social endeavor.

Philosophers offer definitions and explanations in solution to problems; they argue for those solutions; and then other philosophers provide counter arguments, expecting to eventually come up with better solutions. This exchange and resulting revision of views is called dialectic. Dialectic (in one sense of this history-laden word) is simply philosophical conversation amongst people who do not always agree with each other about everything.

One can do this sort of harsh criticism on one's own, but others can help greatly, if important assumptions are shared with the person offering the criticisms. Others are able to think of criticisms from another perspective.

Some philosophers and ordinary people dive right in and start trying to solve the problem. They immediately start giving arguments, pro and con, on different sides of the issue. Doing philosophy is different from this. It is about questioning assumptions, digging for deeper understanding. Doing philosophy is about the journey, the process, as much as it is about the destination, the conclusion. Its method differs from other disciplines, in which the experts can agree about most of the fundamentals.

Motivation

Method in philosophy is in some sense rooted in motivation, only by understanding why people take up philosophy can one properly understand what philosophy is. People often find themselves believing things that they do not understand. For example, about God, themselves, the natural world, human society, morality and human productions. Often, people fail to understand what it is they believe, and fail to understand the reasons they believe in what they do. Some people have questions about the meaning of their beliefs and questions about the

justification (or rationality) of their beliefs. A lack of these things shows a lack of understanding, and some dislike not having this understanding.

These questions about are only the tip of the philosophical iceberg. There are many other things about this universe about which people are also fundamentally ignorant. Philosophers are in the business of investigating all sorts of those areas of ignorance.

A bewilderingly huge number of basic concepts are poorly understood. For example:

- What does it mean to say that one thing causes another?
- What is rationality? What are space and time?
- What is beauty, and if it is in the eye of the beholder, then what is it that is being said to be in the eye of the beholder?

One might also consider some of the many questions about justification. Human lives are deeply informed with many basic assumptions. Different assumptions, would lead to different ways of living.

Legal-Institutional approach

Behavioural & Post-Behavioural approach

each refines the Behavioural Approach and tries to make it acceptable.

Chapter 2

Behavioral and Post Behavioral Approach to Political Science

Meaning and definition of Behavioural Approach:

The behavioural approach to political science mainly emphasizes on scientific, objective and value free study of political phenomenon. This approach stresses upon the use of empirical as well as scientific methods of study political behavior. This approach shifts its emphasis from the study of the state and government to the day-today problems, activities and behaviour of individuals and groups. Behavioural approach has portraits individuals as center of attention and examines their behaviour, actions and tries to comprehend them through a scientific outlook. To Leslie Lipson, “The behavioural method records the details of what men do, seeking to explain why they do...” David Easton, one of the prominent scholars of this school said about it as, “the behavioural researcher wishes to look at the participants in the political system as individuals who have the emotions, prejudices and pre-dispositions of human beings as we know them in our daily lives.” Thus, behavioural approach studies the political behaviour of individuals through an empirical viewpoint. It studies the legislatures, voters, decision makers, policy makers etc. in a scientific way and by correlating their activities and practices, tries to conceptualize and give answer to political outcomes.

Characteristics of behaviouralism:

Behavioural approach is based on some fundamental assumptions. Scholars like David Easton, Kirkpatrick, Heinz Eulou etc have highlighted some basic characteristics of behaviouralism. David Easton has laid down eight basic characteristics. These are Regularities, Verification, Techniques, Quantification, Value free, Systematization, Pure Science and Integration. According to Eulan and Eldersveld, Study of Human political Behavior, Empirical Methods, Interdisciplinary Focus, Scientific Theory of Politics etc. are the main features of the approach. From these we can draw a few common features of Behavioral Approach. These are –importance of study political behavior, practice of theory and empirical research, use of scientific methods, importance on inter-disciplinary studies, application of new techniques and exercise of value neutral observation etc. In practice, behavioural approach studies political science through the

perspective of defining individuals and group behaviours empirically by using scientific, value-neutral observations.

The behavioral approach brings to the fore, certain positive signs and makes the study of political science more authentic. By using scientific methods of study political phenomenon, exercise of value-neutrality in exploring human behaviour, the approach attempts to reach out a new height of analysis the political aspects of society theoretically. Despite having these advantages, behavioural approach to political science has been facing some criticisms on the following grounds.

Behavioural Approach advocates empirical study of individual behaviours. But all aspects of individual behaviour can't be observed and stated through empirical generalizations. Thus, the approach loses the focal assumption, it has taken up.

This approach is based on value-neutrality, is also not practical. Because, in political science, we study human-behaviour and it cannot be make a value-neutral discipline at any cost. Again critics pointed out that, in developing countries a value-free study of political science will not be fruitful due to overlapping in political structures, relations and activities.

This approach gives more importance to individuals than institutions. But critics say that without looking at institutions we can't draw proper conclusion as institutions hold prime importance in the subject matter of political science.

Again one can criticize the approach due to the large diversity and differences among the political scientist of behavioural school itself. Here, we can derive the answer that though theoretically behavioralism is a much applicable approach but that laves fruitful application in practice.

Post-Behavioural Approach

After discussing the Behavioural Approach, we put light on the Post- Behavioural Approach to develop a greater understanding of the prospects of Political Science. The Post-Behavioural Approach is such an approach which developed after witnessing the loopholes of Behavioral Approach. Considering the popularity in 1940's, Behavioural Approach has been one of the most important approaches to Political Science. But in 1970's, there was general dissatisfaction with

the achievements of behaviouralist as it failed to solve practical problems of the society and it led to the emergence of the post-Behavioural Approach. The failure of the Behavioural Approach to make any real progress towards the objective of building a scientific political theory compelled the behaviouralists to admit reforms in Behavioural Approach and that result in Post-Behavioural Approach. David Easton, who at one time was a Behaviouralist, criticized it for its limitations in later course. Thus, the Post- Behavioural Approach complains that the Behavioural Approach had not taken into account serious social matters.

Post- Behavioural Approach is both a movement and academic tendency. It opposed the efforts of the Behavioural Approach to make Political science a value free science. The Post-Behavioural Approach is a future oriented approach which wants to solve problems of both present and future. To this approach, the study of Political Science should put importance on social change. To it political science must have some relevance to society. Along with relevance, this approach believes that action is the core of study political science. It accepts that political science needs to study all realities of politics, social change, values etc.

There are some basic characteristics of Post- Behavioural Approach. Importance on action and relevance, human problem oriented, qualitative and quantitative, concerned with regularities and irregularities are the basic features of Post-Behavioural Approach. David Easton has mentioned about seven key features of Post- Behavioural Approach to political science. Considering this seven features, he opined that substance must have precedence over technique, political science should put emphasis on social change, research in social science must not lose touch with reality, study should accord value also, study should also be future oriented etc. To him mad craze for scientism should be discarded as social science can't be pure science at any cost. Therefore, we can say that Post- Behavioural Approach lays emphasis on substance than technique. It is an attempt to develop a practical, social change oriented approach to political science. Actually, the Post- Behavioural

Behavioralism

Behavioralism (or behaviouralism outside the United States) is an approach in political science, which emerged in the 1930s in the United States. It represents a sharp break from previous political science. This is because it emphasized an objective, quantified approach to explain and

predict political behavior. It is associated with the rise of the behavioral sciences, modeled after the natural sciences. This means that behavioralism claims it can explain political behavior from an unbiased, neutral point of view.

Behavioralism seeks to examine the behavior, actions, and acts of individuals – rather than the characteristics of institutions such as legislatures, executives, and judiciaries – and groups in different social settings and explain this behavior as it relates to the political system.

Origins

From the 1940s through the 1960s, behavioralism gained support. It was the site of discussion between traditionalist and new emerging approaches to political science. The origins of behavioralism is often attributed to the work of University of Chicago professor Charles Merriam who in the 1920s and 1930s, emphasized the importance of examining political behavior of individuals and groups rather than only considering how they abide by legal or formal rules.

Behavioralism as a political approach

Prior to the "behavioralist revolution", political science being a science at all was disputed. Critics saw the study of politics as being primarily qualitative and normative, and claimed that it lacked a scientific method necessary to be deemed a science.

Behavioralists used strict methodology and empirical research to validate their study as a social science. The behaviorist approach was innovative because it changed the attitude of the purpose of inquiry. It moved toward research that was supported by verifiable facts. During its rise in popularity in the 1960s and 70s, behavioralism challenged the realist and liberal approaches, which the behavioralists called "traditionalism", and other studies of political behavior that was not based on fact.

To understand political behavior, behavioralism uses the following methods: sampling, interviewing, scoring and scaling and statistical analysis.

Behavioralism studies how individuals behave in group positions realistically rather than how they should behave. For example, a study of the United States Congress might include a consideration of how members of Congress behave in their positions. The subject of interest is

how Congress becomes an 'arena of actions' and the surrounding formal and informal spheres of power.

Meaning of behavioralism

David Easton was the first to differentiate behavioralism from behaviorism in the 1950s. In the early 1940s, behaviorism itself was referred to as a behavioral science and later referred to as behaviorism. However, Easton sought to differentiate between the two disciplines:

Behavioralism was not a clearly defined movement for those who were thought to be behavioralists. It was more clearly definable by those who were opposed to it, because they were describing it in terms of the things within the newer trends that they found objectionable. So some would define behavioralism as an attempt to apply the methods of natural sciences to human behavior. Others would define it as an excessive emphasis upon quantification. Others as individualistic reductionism. From the inside, the practitioners were of different minds as what it was that constituted behavioralism. And few of us were in agreement. With this in mind, behavioralism resisted a single definition. Dwight Waldo emphasized that behavioralism itself is unclear, calling it "complicated" and "obscure." Easton agreed, stating, "every man puts his own emphasis and thereby becomes his own behavioralist" and attempts to completely define behavioralism are fruitless. From the beginning, behavioralism was a political, not a scientific concept. Moreover, since behavioralism is not a research tradition, but a political movement, definitions of behavioralism follow what behavioralists wanted. Therefore, most introductions to the subject emphasize value-free research. This is evidenced by Easton's eight "intellectual foundation stones" of behavioralism: Regularities - The generalization and explanation of regularities.

1. Commitment to Verification - The ability to verify ones generalizations.
2. Techniques - An experimental attitude toward techniques.
3. Quantification - Express results as numbers where possible or meaningful.
4. Values - Keeping ethical assessment and empirical explanations distinct.
5. Systemization - Considering the importance of theory in research.
6. Pure Science - Deferring to pure science rather than applied science.
7. Integration - Integrating social sciences and value.

Subsequently, much of the behaviorist approach has been challenged by the emergence of postpositivism in political (particularly international relations) theory.

Post-behavioralism

Post-behavioralism (or post-behaviouralism) also known as neo-behavioralism (or neo-behaviouralism) was a reaction against the dominance of behaviorist methods in the study of politics. One of the key figures in post-behaviouralist thinking was David Easton who was originally one of the leading advocates of the "behavioral revolution". Post-behavioralists claimed that despite the alleged value-neutrality of behaviorist research it was biased towards the status quo and social preservation rather than social change.

Key tenets Post-behavioralism challenged the idea that academic research had to be value neutral and argued that values should not be neglected.

- Post-behavioralism claimed that behaviorism's bias towards observable and measurable phenomena meant that too much emphasis was being placed on easily studied trivial issues at the expense of more important topics.
- Research should be more relevant to society^[5] and intellectuals have a positive role to play in society.

Chapter 3

Power, Authority and Legitimacy

Power and its various forms

Power (social and political)

In social science and politics, power is the ability to influence the behavior of people. The term authority is often used for power perceived as legitimate by the social structure. Power can be seen as evil or unjust, but the exercise of power is accepted as endemic to humans as social beings. In the corporate environment, power is often expressed as upward or downward. With downward power, a company's superior influences subordinates. When a company exerts upward power, it is the subordinates who influence the decisions of the leader (Greiner & Schein, 1988).

The use of power need not involve coercion (force or the threat of force). At one extreme, it more closely resembles what everyday English-speakers call influence, although some authors make a distinction between power and influence – the means by which power is used (Handy, C. 1993 Understanding Organisations).

Much of the recent sociological debate on power revolves around the issue of the enabling nature of power. A comprehensive account of power can be found in Steven Lukes Power: A Radical View where he discusses the three dimensions of power. Thus, power can be seen as various forms of constraint on human action, but also as that which makes action possible. French philosopher Michel Foucault (1926–1984) saw power as "a complex strategic situation in a given society social setting". Being deeply structural, his concept involves both constraint and enablement. For a purely enabling (and voluntaristic) concept of power see the works of Anthony Giddens.

Tactics

People use power more than rewards, threats, and information to influence people. In everyday situations people use a variety of power tactics to push or prompt people into particular action. There are plenty of examples of power tactics that are quite common and employed every day. Some of these tactics include bullying, collaboration, complaining, criticizing, demanding, disengaging, evading, humor, inspiring, manipulating, negotiating, socializing, and supplicating.

These power tactics can be classified along three different dimensions: softness, rationality, and laterality.

Soft and hard

Main articles: Hard power and Soft power

Soft tactics take advantage of the relationship between person and the target. They are more indirect and interpersonal (e.g., collaboration, socializing). Conversely, hard tactics are harsh, forceful, direct, and rely on concrete outcomes. However, they are not more powerful than soft tactics. In many circumstances, fear of social exclusion can be a much stronger motivator than some kind of physical punishment.

Rational and nonrational

Rational tactics of influence make use of reasoning, logic, and sound judgment, whereas nonrational tactics rely on emotionality and misinformation. Examples of each include bargaining and persuasion, and evasion and put downs, respectively.

Unilateral and bilateral

Bilateral tactics, such as collaboration and negotiation, involve reciprocity on the part of both the person influencing and their target. Unilateral tactics, on the other hand, are enacted without any participation on the part of the target. These tactics include disengagement and fait accompli.

People tend to vary in their use of power tactics, with different types of people opting for different tactics. For instance, interpersonally oriented people tend to use soft and rational tactics. Machiavellians, however, tend to use nonrational tactics. Moreover, extraverts use a greater variety of power tactics than do introverts. Further, men tend to use bilateral and direct tactics, whereas women tend to use unilateral and indirect tactics. People will also choose different tactics based on the group situation, and based on who they are trying to influence. People also tend to shift from soft to hard tactics when they face resistance.

Balance of power

Because power operates both relationally and reciprocally, sociologists speak of the balance of power between parties to a relationship: all parties to all relationships have some power: the sociological examination of power concerns

itself with discovering and describing the relative strengths: equal or unequal, stable or subject to periodic change. Sociologists usually analyse relationships in which the parties have relatively equal or nearly equal power in terms of constraint rather than of power. Thus 'power' has a connotation of unilateralism. If this were not so, then all relationships could be described in terms of 'power', and its meaning would be lost. Given that power is not innate and can be granted to others, to acquire power you must possess or control a form of power currency.

Psychological research

Recent experimental psychology suggests that the more power one has, the less one takes on the perspective of others, implying that the powerful have less empathy. Adam Galinsky, along with several coauthors, found that when those who are reminded of their powerlessness are instructed to draw Es on their forehead, they are 3 times more likely to draw them such that they are legible to others than those who are reminded of their power. Powerful people are also more likely to take action. In one example, powerful people turned off an irritatingly close fan twice as much as less powerful people. Researchers have documented the bystander effect: they found that powerful people are three times as likely to first offer help to a "stranger in distress".

A study involving over 50 college students suggested that those primed to feel powerful through stating 'power words' were less susceptible to external pressure, more willing to give honest feedback, and more creative.

Empathy gap

"Power is defined as a possibility to influence others."

The use of power has evolved from centuries. Gaining prestige, honor and reputation is one of the central motives of gaining power in human nature. Power also relates with empathy gap because it limits the interpersonal relationship and compares the power differences. Having power and not having power can affect a number of psychological consequences. It leads to strategic versus social

responsibilities. Research experiments were done in past, as early as 1968, to explore power conflict.

Past research

Earlier, research proposed that increased power is related to increased rewards and leads one to approach things more frequently. In contrast, decreased power is related more constraint, threat and punishment which leads one to inhibitions. It was concluded that being powerful leads one to successful outcome, develop negotiation strategies and make more self-serving offers.

Later, research proposed that differences in power lead to strategic considerations. Being strategic can also mean to defend when one is opposed or to hurt the decision maker. It was concluded that facing one with more power leads to strategic consideration whereas facing one with less power leads to a social responsibility.

Bargaining games

Bargaining games were explored in year 2003 and year 2004. These studies compared behavior done in different power given situation.

Ultimatum game

In an ultimatum game, the person in given power offers an ultimatum and the recipient would have to accept that offer or else both the proposer and the recipient will receive no reward.

Dictator game

In a dictator game, the person in given power offers a proposal and the recipient would have to accept that offer. The recipient has no choice of rejecting the offer.

Bargaining games, conclusion

The dictator game gives no power to the recipient whereas the ultimatum game gives some power to the recipient. The behavior observed was that the person offering the proposal would act less strategically than would the one offering in

the ultimatum game. Self-serving also occurred and a lot of pro-social behavior was observed. When the counterpart recipient is completely powerless, lack of strategy, social responsibility and moral consideration is often observed from the behavior of the proposal given (the one with the power).

Power and control in abusive relationships

In abusive relationships, violence is posited to arise out of a need for power and control of one partner over the other. An abuser will use various tactics of abuse (e.g., physical, verbal, emotional, sexual or financial) in order to establish and maintain control over the partner.

Theories

Five bases of power

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

According to French and Raven, power must be distinguished from influence in the following way: power is that state of affairs which holds in a given relationship, A-B, such that a given influence attempt by A over B makes A's desired change in B more likely. Conceived this way, power is fundamentally relative – it depends on the specific understandings A and B each apply to their relationship, and, interestingly, requires B's recognition of a quality in A which would motivate B to change in the way A intends. A must draw on the 'base' or combination of bases of power appropriate to the relationship, to effect the desired outcome. Drawing on the wrong power base can have unintended effects, including a reduction in A's own power.

French and Raven argue that there are five significant categories of such qualities, while not excluding other minor categories. Further bases have since been adduced – in particular by Morgan (1986: ch.6), who identifies 14, while others have suggested a simpler model for practical purposes – for example, Handy (1976), who recommends three.

Legitimate power

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

Referent power

Referent power is the power or ability of individuals to attract others and build loyalty. It's based on the charisma and interpersonal skills of the power holder. A person may be admired because of specific personal trait, and this admiration creates the opportunity for interpersonal influence. Here the person under power desires to identify with these personal qualities, and gains satisfaction from being an accepted follower. Nationalism and patriotism count towards an intangible sort of referent power. For example, soldiers fight in wars to defend the honor of the country. This is the second least obvious power, but the most effective. Advertisers have long used the referent power of sports figures for products endorsements, for example. The charismatic appeal of the sports star supposedly leads to an acceptance of the endorsement, although the individual may have little real credibility outside the sports arena. Abuse is possible when someone that is likable, yet lacks integrity and honesty, rises to power, placing them in a situation to gain personal advantage at the cost of the group's position. Referent power is unstable alone, and is not enough for a leader who wants longevity and respect. When combined with other sources of power, however, it can help you achieve great success.

Expert power

Expert power is an individual's power deriving from the skills or expertise of the person and the organization's needs for those skills and expertise. Unlike the others, this type of power is usually highly specific and limited to the particular area in which the expert is trained and qualified. When you have knowledge and skills that enable you to understand a situation, suggest solutions, use solid

judgment, and generally outperform others, people will have reason to listen to you. When you demonstrate expertise, people tend to trust you and respect what you say. As a subject matter expert, your ideas will have more value, and others will look to you for leadership in that area.

Reward power

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

Coercive power

Coercive power is the application of negative influences. It includes the ability to demote or to withhold other rewards. The desire for valued rewards or the fear of having them withheld that ensures the obedience of those under power. Coercive power tends to be the most obvious but least effective form of power as it builds resentment and resistance from the people who experience it. Threats and punishment are common tools of coercion. Implying or threatening that someone will be fired, demoted, denied privileges, or given undesirable assignments –

these are examples of using coercive power. Extensive use of coercive power is rarely appropriate in an organizational setting, and relying on these forms of power alone will result in a very cold, impoverished style of leadership.

Rational choice framework

Game theory, with its foundations in the Walrasian theory of rational choice, is increasingly used in various disciplines to help analyze power relationships. One rational choice definition of power is given by Keith Dowding in his book *Power*.

In rational choice theory, human individuals or groups can be modelled as 'actors' who choose from a 'choice set' of possible actions in order to try to achieve desired outcomes. An actor's 'incentive structure' comprises (its beliefs about) the costs associated with different actions in the choice set, and the likelihoods that different actions will lead to desired outcomes.

In this setting we can differentiate between:

1. outcome power – the ability of an actor to bring about or help bring about outcomes;
2. social power – the ability of an actor to change the incentive structures of other actors in order to bring about outcomes.

This framework can be used to model a wide range of social interactions where actors have the ability to exert power over others. For example a 'powerful' actor can take options away from another's choice set; can change the relative costs of actions; can change the likelihood that a given action will lead to a given outcome; or might simply change the other's beliefs about its incentive structure.

As with other models of power, this framework is neutral as to the use of 'coercion'. For example: a threat of violence can change the likely costs and benefits of different actions; so can a financial penalty in a 'voluntarily agreed' contract, or indeed a friendly offer.

Marxism

In the Marxist tradition, the Italian writer Antonio Gramsci elaborated the role of ideology in creating a cultural hegemony, which becomes a means of bolstering the power of capitalism and of the nation-state. Drawing on Niccolò Machiavelli in *The Prince*, and trying to understand why there had been no Communist revolution in Western Europe, whilst there had been in Russia, Gramsci conceptualised this hegemony as a centaur, consisting of two halves. The back end, the beast, represented the more classic, material image of power, power through coercion, through brute force, be it physical or economic. But the capitalist hegemony, he argued, depended even more strongly on the front end, the human face, which projected power through 'consent'. In Russia, this power was lacking, allowing for a revolution. However, in Western Europe, specifically in Italy, capitalism had succeeded in exercising consensual power, convincing the working classes that their interests were the same as those of capitalists. In this way revolution had been avoided.

While Gramsci stresses the significance of ideology in power structures, Marxist-feminist writers such as Michele Barrett stress the role of ideologies in extolling the virtues of family life. The classic argument to illustrate this point of view is the use of women as a 'reserve army of labour'. In wartime it is accepted that women perform masculine tasks, while after the war the roles are easily reversed. Therefore, according to Barrett, the destruction of capitalist economic relations is necessary but not sufficient for the liberation of women.

Tarnow

Tarnow considers what power hijackers have over air plane passengers and draws similarities with power in the military. He shows that power over an individual can be amplified by the presence of a group. If the group conforms to the leader's commands, the leader's power over an individual is greatly enhanced while if the group does not conform the leader's power over an individual is nil.

Authority and its forms

The word authority is derived from the Latin word *auctoritas*, meaning invention, advice, opinion, influence, or command. In English, the word authority can be used to mean power given by the state (in the form of Members of Parliament, judges, police officers, etc.) or by academic knowledge of an area (someone can be an authority on a subject). The word Authority with capital A refers to the governing body upon which such authority (with lower case a) is vested; for example, the Puerto Rico Electric Power Authority or the Massachusetts Bay Transportation Authority

Government

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

Political philosophy

In political philosophy, the jurisdiction of political authority, the location of sovereignty, the balancing of freedom and authority (cf. Cristi 2005), and the requirements of political obligations have been core questions from Plato and Aristotle to the present. Many democratic societies engage in ongoing discussion regarding the legitimate extent of the exercise of governmental authority. In the United States, for instance, there is a widespread belief that the political system as instituted by the Founding Fathers should accord the populace as much freedom as reasonable, and that government should limit its authority accordingly.

Other social sciences

Since the emergence of social sciences, authority has become a subject of research in a variety of empirical settings: the family (parental authority), small groups (informal authority of leadership), intermediate organizations such as schools, churches, armies, industries and bureaucracies (organizational and bureaucratic authorities), and society-wide or inclusive

organizations, ranging from the most primitive tribal society to the modern nation-state and intermediate organization (political authority).

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

Howard Bloom hints at a parallel between authority and respect/reverence for ancestors.

Chapter 4

Major Concepts in Political Theory

Rights

Rights are legal, social, or ethical principles of freedom or entitlement; that is, rights are the fundamental normative rules about what is allowed of people or owed to people, according to some legal system, social convention, or ethical theory. Rights are of essential importance in such disciplines as law and ethics, especially theories of justice and deontology.

Rights are often considered fundamental to civilization, being regarded as established pillars of society and culture, and the history of social conflicts can be found in the history of each right and its development. According to the Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy, "rights structure the form of governments, the content of laws, and the shape of morality as it is currently perceived."

Definitional issues

Natural rights versus legal rights

- Natural rights are rights which are "natural" in the sense of "not artificial, not man-made", as in rights deriving from deontic logic, from human nature, or from the edicts of a god. They are universal; that is, they apply to all people, and do not derive from the laws of any specific society. They exist necessarily, inhere in every individual, and can't be taken away. For example, it has been argued that humans have a natural right to life. They're sometimes called moral rights or inalienable rights.
- Legal rights, in contrast, are based on a society's customs, laws, statutes or actions by legislatures. An example of a legal right is the right to vote of citizens. Citizenship, itself, is often considered as the basis for having legal rights, and has been defined as the "right to have rights". Legal rights are sometimes called civil rights or statutory rights and are culturally and politically relative since they depend on a specific societal context to have meaning.

Some thinkers see rights in only one sense while others accept that both senses have a measure of validity. There has been considerable philosophical debate about these senses throughout

history. For example, Jeremy Bentham believed that legal rights were the essence of rights, and he denied the existence of natural rights; whereas Thomas Aquinas held that rights purported by positive law but not grounded in natural law were not properly rights at all, but only a facade or pretense of rights.

Claim rights versus liberty rights

- A claim right is a right which entails that another person has a duty to the right-holder. Somebody else must do or refrain from doing something to or for the claim holder, such as perform a service or supply a product for him or her; that is, he or she has a claim to that service or product (another term is thing in action). In logic, this idea can be expressed as: "Person A has a claim that person B do something if and only if B has a duty to A to do that something." Every claim-right entails that some other duty-bearer must do some duty for the claim to be satisfied. This duty can be to act or to refrain from acting. For example, many jurisdictions recognize broad claim rights to things like "life, liberty, and property"; these rights impose an obligation upon others not to assault or restrain a person, or use their property, without the claim-holder's permission. Likewise, in jurisdictions where social welfare services are provided, citizens have legal claim rights to be provided with those services.¹
- A liberty right or privilege, in contrast, is simply a freedom or permission for the right-holder to do something, and there are no obligations on other parties to do or not do anything. This can be expressed in logic as: "Person A has a privilege to do something if and only if A has no duty not to do that something." For example, if a person has a legal liberty right to free speech, that merely means that it is not legally forbidden for them to speak freely: it does not mean that anyone has to help enable their speech, or to listen to their speech; or even, per se, refrain from stopping them from speaking, though other rights, such as the claim right to be free from assault, may severely limit what others can do to stop them.

Liberty rights and claim rights are the inverse of one another: a person has a liberty right permitting him to do something only if there is no other person who has a claim right forbidding him from doing so. Likewise, if a person has a claim right against someone else, then that other person's liberty is limited. For example, a person has a liberty right to walk down a sidewalk and can decide freely whether or not to do so, since there is no obligation either to do so or to refrain

from doing so. But pedestrians may have an obligation not to walk on certain lands, such as other people's private property, to which those other people have a claim right. So a person's liberty right of walking extends precisely to the point where another's claim right limits his or her freedom.

Positive rights versus negative rights

In one sense, a right is a permission to do something or an entitlement to a specific service or treatment, and these rights have been called positive rights. However, in another sense, rights may allow or require inaction, and these are called negative rights; they permit or require doing nothing. For example, in some democracies e.g. the US, citizens have the positive right to vote and they have the negative right not to vote; people can choose not to vote in a given election. In other democracies e.g. Australia, however, citizens have a positive right to vote but they don't have a negative right to not vote, since non-voting citizens can be fined. Accordingly:

- Positive rights are permissions to do things, or entitlements to be done unto. One example of a positive right is the purported "right to welfare."
- Negative rights are permissions not to do things, or entitlements to be left alone. Often the distinction is invoked by libertarians who think of a negative right as an entitlement to "non-interference" such as a right against being assaulted.

Though similarly named, positive and negative rights should not be confused with active rights(which encompass "privileges" and "powers") and passive rights (which encompass "claims" and "immunities").

Citizenship

Citizenship denotes the link between a person and a state or an association of states. Possession of citizenship is normally associated with the right to work and live in a country. A person with citizenship in a state is called a citizen of it, "of" being the context; one who does not have citizenship in any state is said to be stateless.

Nationality is often used as a synonym for citizenship in English – notably in international law – although the term is sometimes understood as denoting a person's membership of a nation In

some countries, e.g. the United States, Philippines and the United Kingdom, "nationality" and "citizenship" have different meanings.

Factors determining citizenship

A person can be a citizen for several reasons. Usually citizenship of the place of birth is automatic; in other cases an application may be required.

- Parents are citizens. If one or both of a person's parents are citizens of a given state, then the person may have the right to be a citizen of that state as well. Formerly this might only have applied through the paternal line, but sex equality became common since the late twentieth century. Citizenship so obtained is said to be by *jus sanguinis* (Latin for "right of blood"), and means that citizenship is granted based on ancestry or ethnicity, and is related to the concept of a nation state common in Europe. Where *jus sanguinis* holds, a person born outside a country, one or both of whose parents are citizens of the country, is also a citizen. States normally limit the right to citizenship by descent to a certain number of generations born outside the state. This form of citizenship is common in civil law countries.
- Born within a country. Most people are automatically citizens of the state in which they are born. Citizenship so obtained is said to be by *jus soli* (Latin for "right of soil"). This form of citizenship is common in common law countries and originated in England, where those who were born within the realm were subjects of the monarch (a concept pre-dating citizenship).

In many cases both *jus solis* and *jus sanguinis* hold; citizenship either by place or parentage (or of course both).

- Marriage to a citizen. Citizenship may in many cases be obtained by marrying a citizen, which is termed *jure matrimonii*. Countries which are destinations for immigration often have regulations to try to restrict sham marriages, where a citizen marries a non-citizen typically for payment, without them having the intention of living as man and wife
- Naturalization. States normally grant citizenship to people who have entered the country legally and been granted leave to stay, or been granted political asylum, and also resided there for a specified period. In some countries naturalization is subject to conditions which may include passing a test demonstrating reasonable knowledge of the language or way of

life of the host country, good conduct (no serious criminal record), swearing allegiance to their new state or its ruler, and renouncing their prior citizenship. Some states allow dual citizenship and do not require naturalized citizens to renounce any other citizenship.

- Excluded categories. In the past there have been exclusions on entitlement to citizenship on grounds such as skin color, ethnicity, sex, and free status (not being a slave). Most of these exclusions no longer apply in most places.

Justice

Justice is a concept of moral rightness based on ethics, rationality, law, natural law, religion, equity and fairness, as well as the administration of the law, taking into account the inalienable and inborn rights of all human beings and citizens, the right of all people and individuals to equal protection before the law of their civil rights, without discrimination on the basis of race, gender, sexual orientation, gender identity, national origin, color, ethnicity, religion, disability, age, wealth, or other characteristics, and is further regarded as being inclusive of social justice

Concept

It has been argued that 'systematic' or 'programmatic' political and moral philosophy in the West begins, in Plato's Republic, with the question, 'What is Justice? According to most contemporary theories of justice, justice is overwhelmingly important: John Rawls claims that "Justice is the first virtue of social institutions, as truth is of systems of thought." In classical approaches, evident from Plato through to Rawls, the concept of 'justice' is always construed in logical or 'etymological' opposition to the concept of injustice. Such approaches cite various examples of injustice, as problems which a theory of justice must overcome. A number of post-World War II approaches do, however, challenge that seemingly obvious dualism between those two concepts. Justice can be thought of as distinct from benevolence, charity, prudence, mercy, generosity, or compassion, although these dimensions are regularly understood to also be interlinked. Justice is the concept of cardinal virtues, of which it is one. Justice has traditionally been associated with concepts of fate, reincarnation or Divine Providence, i.e. with a life in accordance with the cosmic plan. The association of justice with fairness has thus been historically and culturally rare and is

perhaps chiefly a modern innovation [in western societies]. Studies at UCLA in 2008 have indicated that reactions to fairness are "wired" into the brain and that, "Fairness is activating the same part of the brain that responds to food in rats... This is consistent with the notion that being treated fairly satisfies a basic need". Research conducted in 2003 at Emory University involving capuchin monkeys demonstrated that other cooperative animals also possess such a sense and that "inequity aversion may not be uniquely human" indicating that ideas of fairness and justice may be instinctual in nature.

Understandings

Understandings of justice differ in every culture, as cultures are usually dependent upon a shared history, mythology and/or religion. Each culture's ethics create values which influence the notion of justice. Although there can be found some justice principles that are one and the same in all or most of the cultures, these are insufficient to create a unitary justice apprehension.

Harmony

In his dialogue Republic, Plato uses Socrates to argue for justice that covers both the just person and the just City State. Justice is a proper, harmonious relationship between the warring parts of the person or city. Hence Plato's definition of justice is that justice is the having and doing of what is one's own. A just man is a man in just the right place, doing his best and giving the precise equivalent of what he has received. This applies both at the individual level and at the universal level. A person's soul has three parts – reason, spirit and desire. Similarly, a city has three parts – Socrates uses the parable of the chariot to illustrate his point: a chariot works as a whole because the two horses' power is directed by the charioteer. Lovers of wisdom – philosophers, in one sense of the term – should rule because only they understand what is good. If one is ill, one goes to a doctor rather than a psychologist, because the doctor is expert in the subject of health. Similarly, one should trust one's city to an expert in the subject of the good, not to a mere politician who tries to gain power by giving people what they want, rather than what's good for them. Socrates uses the parable of the ship to illustrate this point: the unjust city is like a ship in open ocean, crewed by a powerful but drunken captain (the common people), a group of untrustworthy advisors who try to manipulate the captain into giving them power over the ship's course (the politicians), and an navigator (the philosopher) who is the only one who knows how to

get the ship to port. For Socrates, the only way the ship will reach its destination – the good – is if the navigator takes charge.

Divine command

Advocates of divine command theory argue that justice, and indeed the whole of morality, is the authoritative command of God. Murder is wrong and must be punished, for instance, because, and only because, God commands that it be so.

Divine command theory was famously questioned by Plato in his dialogue, Euthyphro. Called the Euthyphro dilemma, it goes as follows: "Is what is morally good commanded by God because it is morally good, or is it morally good because it is commanded by God?" The implication is that if the latter is true, then justice is arbitrary; if the former is true, then morality exists on a higher order than God, who becomes little more than a passer-on of moral knowledge.

Many apologists have addressed the issue, typically by arguing that it is a false dilemma. For example, some Christian apologists argue that goodness is the very nature of God, and there is necessarily reflected in His commands. Another response, popularized in two contexts by Immanuel Kant and C. S. Lewis, is that it is deductively valid to argue that the existence of an objective morality implies the existence of God and vice versa.

Natural law

For advocates of the theory that justice is part of natural law (e.g., John Locke), it involves the system of consequences that naturally derives from any action or choice. In this, it is similar to the laws of physics: in the same way as the Third of Newton's laws of Motion requires that for every action there must be an equal and opposite reaction, justice requires according individuals or groups what they actually deserve, merit, or are entitled to. Justice, on this account, is a universal and absolute concept: laws, principles, religions, etc., are merely attempts to codify that concept, sometimes with results that entirely contradict the true nature of justice.

Human creation

In contrast to the understandings canvassed so far, justice may be understood as a human creation, rather than a discovery of harmony, divine command, or natural law. This claim can be understood in a number of ways, with the fundamental division being between those who

argue that justice is the creation of some humans, and those who argue that it is the creation of all humans.

Trickery

In Republic by Plato, the character Thrasymachus argues that justice is the interest of the strong—merely a name for what the powerful or cunning ruler has imposed on the people.

Further information: The Republic (Plato)

Mutual agreement

According to thinkers in the social contract tradition, justice is derived from the mutual agreement of everyone concerned; or, in many versions, from what they would agree to under hypothetical conditions including equality and absence of bias. This account is considered further below, under 'Justice as fairness'. The absence of bias refers to an equal ground for all people concerned in a disagreement (or trial in some cases).

Subordinate value

According to utilitarian thinkers including John Stuart Mill, justice is not as fundamental as we often think. Rather, it is derived from the more basic standard of rightness, consequentialism: what is right is what has the best consequences (usually measured by the total or average welfare caused). So, the proper principles of justice are those that tend to have the best consequences. These rules may turn out to be familiar ones such as keeping contracts; but equally, they may not, depending on the facts about real consequences. Either way, what is important is those consequences, and justice is important, if at all, only as derived from that fundamental standard. Mill tries to explain our mistaken belief that justice is overwhelmingly important by arguing that it derives from two natural human tendencies: our desire to retaliate against those who hurt us, and our ability to put ourselves imaginatively in another's place. So, when we see someone harmed, we project ourselves into her situation and feel a desire to retaliate on her behalf. If this process is the source of our feelings about justice, that ought to undermine our confidence in them.

Liberty

Liberty is the quality individuals have to control their own actions. Different concepts of liberty articulate the relationship of individuals to society in different ways. Some concepts relate to life under a social contract, existence in an imagined state of nature, and therefore define the active exercise of freedom and rights essential to liberty in corresponding ways. Understanding liberty involves how we imagine, and structure, individual's roles and responsibilities in society in terms of free will and determinism, which involves the larger domain of metaphysics.

Classical liberal concepts of liberty typically consist of freedoms of individuals from outside compulsion or coercion, also known as negative liberty. This conception of liberty, which coincides with the libertarian point-of-view, suggests that people should, must, and ought to behave according to their own free will, and take responsibility for their actions. In contrast, social liberal conceptions of liberty (positive liberty) place an emphasis upon social structure and agency and is therefore directed toward ensuring egalitarianism. In feudal societies, a "liberty" was an area of allodial land where the rights of the ruler or monarch were waived.

Liberty is a historically controversial philosophy. One understanding of liberty asserts that freedom is found in a person's ability to exercise agency, particularly in the sense of one having the freedom to choose what authorities one will submit to agency with in exchange for rights derived from that authority to develop resources to carry out their own will, without being inhibited; Social Contract. According to Thomas Hobbes, for example, "a free man is he that... is not hindered to do what he hath the will to do."

However, John Locke rejected that definition of liberty. While not specifically mentioning Hobbes, he attacks Sir Robert Filmer who had the same definition. According to Locke:

“In the state of nature, liberty consists of being free from any superior power on Earth. People are not under the will or lawmaking authority of others but have only the law of nature for their rule. In political society, liberty consists of being under no other lawmaking power except that established by consent in the commonwealth. People are free from the dominion of any will or legal restraint apart from that enacted by their own constituted lawmaking power according to the trust put in it. Thus, freedom is not as Sir

Robert Filmer defines it: 'A liberty for everyone to do what he likes, to live as he pleases, and not to be tied by any laws.' Freedom is constrained by laws in both the state of nature and political society. Freedom of nature is to be under no other restraint but the law of nature. Freedom of people under government is to be under no restraint apart from standing rules to live by that are common to everyone in the society and made by the lawmaking power established in it. Persons have a right or liberty to (1) follow their own will in all things that the law has not prohibited and (2) not be subject to the inconstant, uncertain, unknown, and arbitrary wills of others.

Chapter 5

Concept & Perspectives on State

Liberal

Politics

Liberalism, a political ideology

- Classical liberalism, a political or social philosophy advocating the freedom of the individual, parliamentary systems of government, nonviolent modification of political, social, or economic institutions to assure unrestricted development in all spheres of human endeavor, and governmental guarantees of individual rights and civil liberties.
- Conservative liberalism, a variant of liberalism, combining liberal values and policies with conservative stances, or, more simply, representing the right-wing of the liberal movement
- Economic liberalism, the ideological belief in organizing the economy on individualist lines, such that the greatest possible number of economic decisions are made by private individuals and not by collective institutions.
- Social liberalism, the belief that liberalism should include social justice and that the legitimate role of the state includes addressing issues such as unemployment, health care, education, and the expansion of civil rights

Liberal religion

Liberal religion is a religious tradition which embraces the theological progress of a congregation rather than a single creed, authority, or writing. Because it may draw resources from many traditions, it cannot normally be characterized as Christian, Jewish, or any particular religious faith.

Progressive religion in principle

Theologian James Luther Adams defined the "five smooth stones of liberal theology" as:

1. Revelation and truth are not closed, but constantly revealed.

2. All relations between persons ought ideally to rest on mutual, free consent and not coercion.
3. Affirmation of the moral obligation to direct one's effort toward the establishment of a just and loving community.
4. Denial of the immaculate conception of virtue and affirmation of the necessity of social incarnation. Good must be consciously given form and power within history.
5. The resources (divine and human) that are available for achievement of meaningful change justify an attitude of ultimate (but not necessarily immediate) optimism. There is hope in the ultimate abundance of the Universe.

Unitarian Universalist minister Kimi Riegel defines the religious liberal as such:

"To be a liberal according to my favorite scripture, Merriam-Webster, is to be open minded, is to be free from the constraints of dogmatism and authority, is to be generous and to believe in the basic goodness of humankind. Religion is defined as that which binds us back or reconnects us to that which is ultimately important. Thus religious liberals are those that are connected, through generosity and openness, to the most important aspects of life. And therein lies the challenge. If we are open minded and not bound by authority, who or what decides those matters of ultimate importance?"

Seven Principles and Purposes

Deliberately without an official creed or dogma (per the principle of freedom of thought), Unitarian Universalists instead typically agree with the principles and purposes suggested by the Unitarian Universalist Association. As with most actions in Unitarian Universalism, these were created in committee, and affirmed democratically by a vote of member congregations, proportional to their membership, taken at an annual General Assembly (a meeting of delegates from member congregations). Adopted in 1960, the full Principles and Purposes are as follows:

"We, the member congregations of the Unitarian Universalist Association, covenant to affirm and promote

- The inherent worth and dignity of every person;
- Justice, equity and compassion in human relations;

- Acceptance of one another and encouragement to spiritual growth in our congregations;
- A free and responsible search for truth and meaning;
- The right of conscience and the use of the democratic process within our congregations and in society at large;
- The goal of world community with peace, liberty and justice for all;
- Respect for the interdependent web of all existence of which we are a part."

—The Principles of the Unitarian Universalist Association

Six Sources

Unitarian Universalists place emphasis on spiritual growth and development. Unitarian Universalism is a creedless religion. The Unitarian Universalist Association affirms seven principles: The official statement of Unitarian Universalist principles describes the "sources" upon which current practice is based:

- Direct experience of that transcending mystery and wonder, affirmed in all cultures, which moves us to a renewal of the spirit and an openness to the forces which create and uphold life;
- Words and deeds of prophetic women and men which challenge us to confront powers and structures of evil with justice, compassion, and the transforming power of love;
- Wisdom from the world's religions which inspires us in our ethical and spiritual life;
- Jewish and Christian teachings which call us to respond to God's love by loving our neighbors as ourselves;
- Humanist teachings which counsel us to heed the guidance of reason and the results of science, and warn us against idolatries of the mind and spirit.
- Spiritual teachings of earth-centered traditions which celebrate the sacred circle of life and instruct us to live in harmony with the rhythms of nature.

Liberalism

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

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

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

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

Today, liberal political parties remain a political force with varying degrees of power and influence on many countries

Etymology and definition

Words such as liberal, liberty, libertarian, and libertine all trace their history to the Latin liber, which means "free". One of the first recorded instances of the word liberal occurs in 1375, when it was used to describe the liberal arts in the context of an education desirable for a free-born

man. The word's early connection with the classical education of a medieval university soon gave way to a proliferation of different denotations and connotations. Liberal could refer to "free in bestowing" as early as 1387, "made without stint" in 1433, "freely permitted" in 1530, and "free from restraint"—often as a pejorative remark—in the 16th and the 17th centuries.

In 16th century England, liberal could have positive or negative attributes in referring to someone's generosity or indiscretion. In *Much Ado About Nothing*, Shakespeare wrote of "a liberal villaine" who "hath...confest his vile encounters". With the rise of the Enlightenment, the word acquired decisively more positive undertones, being defined as "free from narrow prejudice" in 1781 and "free from bigotry" in 1823. In 1815, the first use of the word liberalism appeared in English. By the middle of the 19th century, liberal started to be used as a politicised term for parties and movements all over the world.

Marxist

Marxism is a method of socio-economic analysis and worldview based on a materialist interpretation of historical development, a dialectical view of social transformation, and an analysis of class-relations and conflict within society. Marxist methodology informs an economic and sociopolitical enquiry applying to the analysis and critique of the development of capitalism and the role of class struggle in systemic economic change.

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

There is no single definitive Marxist theory; Marxist analysis has been applied to diverse subjects and has been misconceived and modified during the course of its development, resulting in numerous and sometimes contradictory theories that fall under the rubric of Marxism or Marxian analysis. Marxism builds on a materialist understanding of societal development, taking as its starting point the necessary economic activities required by human society to provide for its material needs. The form of economic organization or mode of production is understood to be the basis from which the majority of other social phenomena – including social relations,

political and legal systems, morality and ideology – arise (or at the least by which they are directly influenced). These social relations form the superstructure, for which the economic system forms the base. As the forces of production (most notably technology) improve, existing forms of social organization become inefficient and stifle further progress. These inefficiencies manifest themselves as social contradictions in the form of class struggle.

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

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

These theoretical differences have led various socialist and communist parties and political movements to embrace different political strategies for attaining socialism and advocate different programs and policies from each other. One example of this is the division between revolutionary socialists and reformists that emerged in the German Social Democratic Party (SPD) during the early 20th century.

Marxist understandings of history and of society have been adopted by academics in the disciplines of archaeology and anthropology, media studies, political science, theater, history, sociological theory, art history and art theory, cultural studies, education, economics, geography, literary criticism, aesthetics, critical psychology, and philosophy.

Overview

The Marxian analysis begins with an analysis of material conditions, taking at its starting point the necessary economic activities required by human society to provide for its material needs. The form of economic organization, or mode of production, is understood to be the basis from which the majority of other social phenomena – including social relations, political and legal systems, morality and ideology – arise (or at the least by which they are directly influenced). These social relations base the economic system and the economic system forms the superstructure. As the forces of production, most notably technology, improve, existing forms of social organization become inefficient and stifle further progress. As Karl Marx observed: "At a certain stage of development, the material productive forces of society come into conflict with the existing relations of production or_ this merely expresses the same thing in legal terms_ with the property relations within the framework of which they have operated hitherto. From forms of development of the productive forces these relations turn into their fetters. Then begins an era of social revolution."

These inefficiencies manifest themselves as social contradictions in society in the form of class struggle. Under the capitalist mode of production, this struggle materializes between the minority (the bourgeoisie) who own the means of production, and the vast majority of the population (the proletariat) who produce goods and services. Taking the idea that social change occurs because of the struggle between different classes within society who are under contradiction

against each other, leads the Marxist analysis to the conclusion that capitalism exploits and oppresses the proletariat, which leads to a proletarian revolution.

Capitalism (according to Marxist theory) can no longer sustain the living standards of the population due to its need to compensate for falling rates of profit by driving down wages, cutting social benefits and pursuing military aggression. The socialist system would succeed capitalism as humanity's mode of production through workers' revolution. According to Marxism, especially arising from Crisis theory, Socialism is a historical necessity (but not an inevitability). In a socialist society private property in the means of production would be superseded by co-operative ownership. A socialist economy would not base production on the creation of private profits, but would instead base production and economic activity on the criteria of satisfying human needs – that is, production would be carried out directly for use. As Engels observed: "Then the capitalist mode of appropriation in which the product enslaves first the producer, and then appropriator, is replaced by the mode of appropriation of the product that is based upon the nature of the modern means of production; upon the one hand, direct social appropriation, as means to the maintenance and extension of production_ on the other, direct individual appropriation, as means of subsistence and of enjoyment."

The historical materialist theory of history dialectically analyses the underlying causes of societal development and change in the collective ways humans make their living. All constituent features of a society (social classes, political pyramid, ideologies) stem from economic activity, an idea often conveyed with the metaphor of the base and superstructure.

The base and superstructure metaphor explains that the totality of social relations in and by which humans produce and re-produce their social existence, forms a society's economic base. From this base rises a superstructure of political and legal institutions, i.e., ruling class. The base corresponds to the social consciousness (politics, religion, philosophy, etc.), and it conditions the superstructure and the dominant ideology. A conflict between the development of material productive forces and the relations of production provokes social revolutions, thus, the resultant changes to the economic base will lead to the transformation of the superstructure. This relationship is reflexive; At first the base gives rise to the superstructure and remains the foundation of a form of social organization. Hence, that formed

Chapter 6

Ideology: Concept of Ideology

An ideology is a set of conscious and unconscious ideas that constitute one's goals, expectations, and actions. An ideology is a comprehensive vision, a way of looking at things (compare worldview) as in several philosophical tendencies (see political ideologies), or a set of ideas proposed by the dominant class of a society to all members of this society (a "received consciousness" or product of socialization).

Ideologies are systems of abstract thought applied to public matters and thus make this concept central to politics. Implicitly every political or economic tendency entails an ideology whether or not it is propounded as an explicit system of thought.

History

The term "ideology" was born in the highly controversial philosophical and political debates and fights of the French Revolution and acquired several other meanings from the early days of the First French Empire to the present. The word was coined by Destutt de Tracy in 1796, assembling the parts *idea* (near to the Lockean sense) and *-logy*. He used it to refer to one aspect of his "science of ideas" (to the study itself, not the subject of the study). He separated three aspects, namely: ideology, general grammar, and logic, considering respectively the subject, the means, and the reason of this science. He argues that among these aspects ideology is the most generic term, because the science of ideas also contains the study of their expression and deduction.

According to Karl Mannheim's historical reconstruction of the shifts in the meaning of ideology, the modern meaning of the word was born when Napoleon Bonaparte (as a politician) used it in an abusive way against "the ideologues" (a group which included Cabanis, Condorcet, Constant, Daunou, Say, Madame de Staël, and Tracy), to express the pettiness of his (liberal republican) political opponents.

Perhaps the most accessible source for the near-original meaning of ideology is Hippolyte Taine's work on the Ancien Regime (the first volume of "Origins of Contemporary France"). He describes ideology as rather like teaching philosophy by the Socratic method, but without

extending the vocabulary beyond what the general reader already possessed, and without the examples from observation that practical science would require. Taine identifies it not just with Destutt De Tracy, but also with his milieu, and includes Condillac as one of its precursors. (Tracy read the works of Locke and Condillac while he was imprisoned during the Reign of Terror.)

The word "ideology" was coined long before the Russians coined "intelligentsia", or before the adjective "intellectual" referred to a sort of person (see substantive), i.e. an intellectual. Thus these words were not around when Napoleon Bonaparte took the word "ideologues" to ridicule his intellectual opponents. Gradually, however, the term "ideology" has dropped some of its pejorative sting, and has become a neutral term in the analysis of differing political opinions and views of social groups. While Karl Marx situated the term within class struggle and domination, others believed it was a necessary part of institutional functioning and social integration

Analysis

Meta-ideology is the study of the structure, form, and manifestation of ideologies. Meta-ideology posits that ideology is a coherent system of ideas, relying upon a few basic assumptions about reality that may or may not have any factual basis, but are subjective choices that serve as the seed around which further thought grows. According to this perspective, ideologies are neither right nor wrong, but only a relativistic intellectual strategy for categorizing the world. The pluses and minuses of ideology range from the vigor and fervor of true believers to ideological infallibility. Excessive need for certitude lurks at fundamentalist levels in politics and religions.

The works of George Walford and Harold Walsby, done under the heading of systematic ideology, are attempts to explore the relationships between ideology and social systems. Charles Blattberghas offered an account which distinguishes political ideologies from political philosophies.

Political ideologies

Many political parties base their political action and program on an ideology. In social studies, a political ideology is a certain ethical set of ideals, principles, doctrines, myths, or symbols of a social movement, institution, class, or large group that explains how society should work, and

offers some political and cultural blueprint for a certain social order. A political ideology largely concerns itself with how to allocate power and to what ends it should be used. Some parties follow a certain ideology very closely, while others may take broad inspiration from a group of related ideologies without specifically embracing any one of them.

Political ideologies have two dimensions:

1. Goals: how society should work
2. Methods: the most appropriate ways to achieve the ideal arrangement

An ideology is a collection of ideas. Typically, each ideology contains certain ideas on what it considers to be the best form of government (e.g. democracy, theocracy, caliphate etc.), and the best economic system (e.g. capitalism, socialism, etc.). Sometimes the same word is used to identify both an ideology and one of its main ideas. For instance, "socialism" may refer to an economic system, or it may refer to an ideology which supports that economic system.

Ideologies also identify themselves by their position on the political spectrum (such as the left, the center or the right), though this is very often controversial. Finally, ideologies can be distinguished from political strategies (e.g. populism) and from single issues that a party may be built around (e.g. legalization of marijuana). Philosopher Michael Oakeshott provides a good definition of ideology as "the formalized abridgment of the supposed sub-stratum of the rational truth contained in the tradition".

Studies of the concept of ideology itself (rather than specific ideologies) have been carried out under the name of systematic ideology.

Political ideologies are concerned with many different aspects of a society, some of which are: the economy, education, health care, labor law, criminal law, the justice system, the provision of social security and social welfare, trade, the environment, minors, immigration, race, use of the military, patriotism, and established religion.

There are many proposed methods for the classification of political ideologies, each of these different methods generate a specific political spectrum.

Today, many commentators claim that we are living in a post-ideological age, in which redemptive, all-encompassing ideologies have failed, and this is often associated with Francis Fukuyama's writings on "the end of history".

Government ideology

When a political ideology becomes a dominantly pervasive component within a government, it can be considered an ideocracy. Different forms of government utilize ideology in various ways, not always restricted to politics and society. Certain ideas and schools of thought become favored, or rejected, over others, depending on their compatibility with or use for the reigning social order.

Epistemological ideologies

Even when the challenging of existing beliefs is encouraged, as in scientific theories, the dominant paradigm or mindset can prevent certain challenges, theories, or experiments from being advanced.

A special case of science adopted as ideology is that of ecology, which studies the relationships among living things on Earth. Perceptual psychologist James J. Gibson believed that human perception of ecological relationships was the basis of self-awareness and cognition itself. Linguist George Lakoff has proposed a cognitive science of mathematics wherein even the most fundamental ideas of arithmetic would be seen as consequences or products of human perception—which is itself necessarily evolved within an ecology.

Deep ecology and the modern ecology movement (and, to a lesser degree, Green parties) appear to have adopted ecological sciences as a positive ideology.

Some accuse ecological economics of likewise turning scientific theory into political economy, although theses in that science can often be tested. The modern practice of green economics fuses both approaches and seems to be part science, part ideology.

This is far from the only theory of economics to be raised to ideology status—some notable economically based ideologies include neoliberalism, monetarism, mercantilism, mixed economy, social Darwinism, communism, laissez-faire economics, and free trade. There are also current theories of safe trade and fair trade which can be seen as ideologies.

Psychological research

Psychological research increasingly suggests that ideologies reflect (unconscious) motivational processes, as opposed to the view that political convictions always reflect independent and unbiased thinking. Research in 2008 proposed that ideologies may function as prepackaged units of interpretation that spread because of basic human motives to understand the world, avoid existential threat, and maintain valued interpersonal relationships. The authors conclude that such motives may lead disproportionately to the adoption of system-justifying worldviews. Psychologists have generally found that personality traits, individual difference variables, needs, and ideological beliefs seem to have a common thread

Ideology and semiotic theory

According to the semiotician Bob Hodge, ideology "identifies a unitary object that incorporates complex sets of meanings with the social agents and processes that produced them. No other term captures this object as well as 'ideology'. Foucault's 'episteme' is too narrow and abstract, not social enough. His 'discourse', popular because it covers some of ideology's terrain with less baggage, is too confined to verbal systems. 'Worldview' is too metaphysical, 'propaganda' too loaded. Despite or because of its contradictions, 'ideology' still plays a key role in semiotics oriented to social, political life." Authors such as Michael Freeden have also recently incorporated a semantic analysis to the study of ideologies.

This is a list of political ideologies. Many political parties base their political action and election program on an ideology. In social studies, a political ideology is a certain ethical set of ideals, principles, doctrines, myths or symbols of a social movement, institution, class, and or large group that explains how society should work, and offers some political and cultural blueprint for a certain social order. A political ideology largely concerns itself with how to allocate power and to what ends it should be used. Some parties follow a certain ideology very closely, while others may take broad inspiration from a group of related ideologies without specifically embracing any one of them. The popularity of an ideology is in part due to the influence of moral entrepreneurs, who sometimes act in their own interests. Political ideology and political action committee are in a form related.

Political ideologies have two dimensions:

1. Goals: How society should be organized.
2. Methods: The most appropriate way to achieve this goal.

An ideology is a collection of ideas. Typically, each ideology contains certain ideas on what it considers to be the best form of government (e.g. democracy, autocracy, etc.), and the best economic system (e.g. capitalism, socialism, etc.). Sometimes the same word is used to identify both an ideology and one of its main ideas. For instance, "socialism" may refer to an economic system, or it may refer to an ideology which supports that economic system.

Ideologies also identify themselves by their position on the political spectrum (such as the left, the centre or the right), though this is very often controversial. Finally, ideologies can be distinguished from political strategies (e.g. populism) and from single issues that a party may be built around (e.g. opposition to European integration or the legalization of marijuana).

The following list attempts to divide the ideologies found in practical political life into a number of groups; each group contains ideologies that are related to each other. The headers refer to names of the best-known ideologies in each group. The names of the headers do not necessarily imply some hierarchical order or that one ideology evolved out of the other. They are merely noting the fact that the ideologies in question are practically, historically and ideologically related to each other. Note that one ideology can belong to several groups, and there is sometimes considerable overlap between related ideologies. Also, keep in mind that the meaning of a political label can differ between countries and that parties often subscribe to a combination of ideologies.

The list is strictly alphabetical. Thus, placing one ideology before another does not imply that the first is more important or popular than the second.

Systematic ideology

Systematic ideology is a study of ideologies founded in the late 1930s in and around London, England by Harold Walsby, George Walford and others. It seeks to understand the origin and development of ideologies, how ideologies and ideological groups work together, and the possibilities of guiding the development of ideologies on a global scale. The basic premise of systematic ideology is that ideology is the central motivator in human affairs; that the

characteristics that make up the major ideologies come in sets; that those sets of characteristics form a series; and that the ideological series forms a system.

History

The group that formed around Harold Walsby and his ideas was a breakaway from the Socialist Party of Great Britain. During the Second World War this group developed a fascination with perceived impediments to mass socialist consciousness among the working class. The theory they developed was expressed by Walsby himself in his 1947 book *The Domain of Ideologies* and those involved in the group set up an organisation to propagate their views called the Social Science Association, which existed from 1944 until 1956, attracting a number of new recruits during the 'Turner Controversy'. It was later succeeded by the Walsby Society and the journal which emerged from it called *Ideological Commentary*.

From the 1980s onwards, George Walford, editor of *Ideological Commentary* and former secretary of the SSA, watered down some of the theory's more obviously elitist elements and even left the SPGB money at the time of his death. He did this on the grounds that although in his view the Party would never help achieve socialism it did perform a valuable function by demonstrating through its application of critical analysis, logical thought and theory the limitations of other political groups that valued these less highly (a perspective which had informed Harold Walsby's decision in 1950 to surreptitiously rejoin the Party through its postal branch and write articles for the *Socialist Standard* under the pseudonym "H.W.S.Bee").

Ideological Commentary survived until the death of Walford in 1994. As of 2007, barely a handful of systematic ideology's exponents remain.

Walsby, Walford and their group produced a large number of leaflets, pamphlets and other literature over time, a fair chunk of it dealing with the SPGB. The most readable expressions of systematic ideology are Walford's book *Beyond Politics*, published in 1990, and the pamphlet *Socialist Understanding*, published ten years earlier.

Dominant ideology

The dominant ideology denotes the values, beliefs, and mores shared by the majority of the people in a given society; the dominant ideology frames how the majority of the population think about the nature of their society.

According to Marxist theory, the dominant ideology is used to serve the interests of the ruling class. Hence the slogan: The dominant ideology is the ideology of the dominant class summarises its function as a revolutionary basis. In a capitalist, bourgeois society, Marxist revolutionary praxis seeks to achieve the social and political circumstances that will render the ruling class as politically illegitimate, as such, it is requisite for the successful deposition of the capitalist system of production. Then, the ideology of the working class will achieve and establish social, political, and economic dominance, so that the proletariat (the urban working class and the peasantry) can assume power (political and economic) as the dominant class of the society. In non-Marxist theory, the dominant ideology means the values, beliefs, and morals shared by the social majority, which frames how most of the populace think about their society, and so, to the extent that it does, it may serve the interests of the ruling class; therefore, the extent to which a dominant ideology effectively dominates collective societal thought has declined during the modern era.

Chapter 7

Democracy: Meaning & Theories

Democracy is a form of government in which all eligible citizens participate equally—either directly or through elected representatives—in the proposal, development, and creation of laws. It encompasses social, economic and cultural conditions that enable the free and equal practice of political self-determination.

The term originates from the Greek δημοκρατία(dēmokratía) "rule of the people", which was coined from δῆμος (dêmos) "people" and κράτος (kratos) "power" or "rule" in the 5th century BCE to denote the political systems then existing in Greek city-states, notably Athens; the term is an antonym to ἀριστοκρατία(aristokratia) "rule of an elite". While theoretically these definitions are in opposition, in practice the distinction has been blurred historically. The political system of Classical Athens, for example, granted democratic citizenship to an elite class of free men and excluded slaves and women from political participation. In virtually all democratic governments throughout ancient and modern history, democratic citizenship consisted of an elite class until full enfranchisement was won for all adult citizens in most modern democracies through the suffrage movements of the 19th and 20th centuries. The English word dates to the 16th century, from the older Middle French and Middle Latin equivalents.

Democracy contrasts with forms of government where power is either held by one person, as in a monarchy, or where power is held by a small number of individuals, as in an oligarchy. Nevertheless, these oppositions, inherited from Greek philosophy, are now ambiguous because contemporary governments have mixed democratic, oligarchic, and monarchic elements. Karl Popper defined democracy in contrast to dictatorship or tyranny, thus focusing on opportunities for the people to control their leaders and to oust them without the need for a revolution.

Several variants of democracy exist, but there are two basic forms, both of which concern how the whole body of all eligible citizens executes its will. One form of democracy is direct democracy, in which all eligible citizens have direct and active participation in the decision making of the government. In most modern democracies, the whole body of all eligible citizens remain the sovereign power but political power is exercised indirectly through elected representatives; this is called representative democracy. The concept of representative democracy

arose largely from ideas and institutions that developed during the European Middle Ages, the Reformation, the Age of Enlightenment, and the American and French Revolutions.

Characteristics

No consensus exists on how to define democracy, but equality, freedom and rule of law have been identified as important characteristics since ancient times. These principles are reflected in all eligible citizens being equal before the law and having equal access to legislative processes. For example, in a representative democracy, every vote has equal weight, no unreasonable restrictions can apply to anyone seeking to become a representative, and the freedom of its eligible citizens is secured by legitimised rights and liberties which are typically protected by a constitution.

One theory holds that democracy requires three fundamental principles: 1) upward control, i.e. sovereignty residing at the lowest levels of authority, 2) political equality, and 3) social norms by which individuals and institutions only consider acceptable acts that reflect the first two principles of upward control and political equality. The term "democracy" is sometimes used as shorthand for liberal democracy, which is a variant of representative democracy that may include elements such as political pluralism; equality before the law; the right to petition elected officials for redress of grievances; due process; civil liberties; human rights; and elements of civil society outside the government. Roger Scruton argues that democracy alone can't provide personal and political freedom unless the institutions of civil society are also present.

In many countries, notably the United Kingdom which originated the Westminster system, the dominant principle is that of parliamentary sovereignty, while maintaining judicial independence. In the United States, separation of powers is often cited as a central attribute. In India, the world's largest democracy, parliamentary supremacy is subject to a constitution which includes judicial review. Other uses of "democracy" include that of direct democracy. Though the term "democracy" is typically used in the context of a political state, the principles also are applicable to private organisations.

Majority rule is often listed as a characteristic of democracy. Hence, democracy allows for political minorities to be oppressed by the "tyranny of the majority" in the absence of legal protections of individual or group rights. An essential part of an "ideal" representative democracy is competitive elections that are fair both substantively and

procedurally. Furthermore, freedom of political expression, freedom of speech, and freedom of the press are considered to be essential rights that allow eligible citizens to be adequately informed and able to vote according to their own interests. It has also been suggested that a basic feature of democracy is the capacity of all voters to participate freely and fully in the life of their society. With its emphasis on notions of social contract and the collective will of the all voters, democracy can also be characterised as a form of political collectivism because it is defined as a form of government in which all eligible citizens have an equal say in the decisions that affect their lives.

While democracy is often equated with the republican form of government, the term "republic" classically has encompassed both democracies and aristocracies. Some democracies are constitutional monarchies, such as the United Kingdom and Japan.

Types of democracy

Types of democracy refers to kinds of governments or social structures which allow people to participate equally, either directly or indirectly. Democracies can be classified in different ways.

Direct democracies

A direct democracy or pure democracy is a type of democracy where the people govern directly. Athenian democracy or classical democracy refers to a direct democracy developed in ancient times in the Greek city-state of Athens. A popular democracy is a type of direct democracy based on referendums and other devices of empowerment and concretization of popular will.

An industrial democracy is an arrangement which involves workers making decisions, sharing responsibility and authority in the workplace (see also workplace democracy).

Intra-party democracy refers to the democratic process within a single-party state government. Scholars debate if the Chinese Communist Party resembles this process during leadership transitions.

Representative democracies

A representative democracy is an indirect democracy where sovereignty is held by the people's representatives.

A liberal democracy is a representative democracy with protection for individual liberty and property by rule of law. An illiberal democracy has weak or no limits on the power of the elected representatives to rule as they please.

Types of representative democracy include:

-
- Electoral democracy – type of representative democracy based on election, on electoral vote, as modern occidental or liberal democracies.
- Dominant-party system – democratic party system where only one political party can realistically become the government, by itself or in a coalition government.
- Parliamentary democracy – democratic system of government where the executive branch of a parliamentary government is typically a cabinet, and headed by a prime minister who is considered the head of government.
 - Westminster democracy – parliamentary system of government modeled after that of the United Kingdom system.
 - Jacksonian democracy – form of democracy popularized by President Andrew Jackson promoted the strength of the executive branch and the Presidency at the expense of Congressional power.
- Soviet democracy or Council democracy – form of democracy where the workers of a locality elect recallable representatives into organs of power called soviets (councils.) The local soviets elect the members of regional soviets who go on to elect higher soviets.
- Totalitarian democracy – system of government in which lawfully elected representatives maintain the integrity of a nation state whose citizens, while granted the right to vote, have little or no participation in the decision-making process of the government.

A demarchy has people randomly selected from the citizenry through sortition to either act as general governmental representatives or to make decisions in specific areas of governance (defense, environment, etc.).

A non-partisan democracy is system of representative government or organization such that universal and periodic elections (by secret ballot) take place without reference to political parties.

An organic democracy is a democracy where the ruler holds a considerable amount of power, but their rule benefits the people. The term was first used by supporters of Bonapartism.

Types based on communication

An e-democracy uses electronic communications technologies, such as the Internet, in enhancing democratic processes within a democratic republic or representative democracy.

An emergent democracy is social system in which blogging undermines mainstream media.

Types based on location

A bioregional democracy matches geopolitical divisions to natural ecological regions.

A cellular democracy, developed by economist Fred E. Foldvary, uses a multi-level bottom-up structure based on either small neighborhood governmental districts or contractual communities.

A workplace democracy refers to the application of democracy to the workplace (see also industrial democracy).

Types based on level of freedom

A liberal democracy is a representative democracy with protection for individual liberty and property by rule of law. In contrast, a defensive democracy limits some rights and freedoms in order to protect the institutions of the democracy.

Religious democracies

A religious democracy is a form of government where the values of a particular religion have an effect on the laws and rules, often when most of the population is a member of the religion, such as:

-
- Theodemocracy –
- Christian democracy –
- Islamic democracy –

Other types of democracy

Types of democracy include:

- Anticipatory democracy – relies on some degree of disciplined and usually market-informed anticipation of the future, to guide major decisions.
- Consensus democracy – rule based on consensus rather than traditional majority rule.
- Constitutional democracy – governed by a constitution.
- Delegative democracy – a form of democratic control whereby voting power is vested in self-selected delegates, rather than elected representatives.
- Deliberative democracy – in which authentic deliberation, not only voting, is central to legitimate decision making. It adopts elements of both consensus decision-making and majority rule.
- Democratic centralism – organizational method where members of a political party discuss and debate matters of policy and direction and after the decision is made by majority vote, all members are expected to follow that decision in public.
- Democratic dictatorship (also known as democratur) –
- Democratic republic – republic which has democracy through elected representatives
- Economic democracy – theory of democracy involving people having access to subsistence, or equity in living standards.
- Grassroots democracy – emphasizes trust in small decentralized units at the municipal government level, possibly using urban secession to establish the formal legal authority to make decisions made at this local level binding.
- Interactive democracy – proposed form of democracy utilising information technology to allow citizens to propose new policies, "second" proposals and vote on the resulting laws (that are refined by Parliament) in a referendum.
- Jeffersonian democracy – named after American statesman Thomas Jefferson, who believed in equality of political opportunity (for male citizens), and opposed to privilege, aristocracy and corruption.
- Market democracy – another name for democratic capitalism, an economic ideology based on a tripartite arrangement of a market-based economy based predominantly on economic incentives through free markets, a democratic polity and a liberal moral-cultural system which encourages pluralism.

- Multiparty democracy – two-party system requires voters to align themselves in large blocs, sometimes so large that they cannot agree on any overarching principles.
- New Democracy – Maoist concept based on Mao Zedong's "Bloc of Four Classes" theory in post-revolutionary China.
- Participatory democracy – involves more lay citizen participation decision making and offers greater political representation than traditional representative democracy, e.g., wider control of proxies others trust them with, to those who get directly involved and actually participate.
- Radical democracy – type of democracy that focuses on the importance of nurturing and tolerating difference and dissent in decision-making processes.
- Sociocracy – democratic system of governance based on consent decision making, circle organization, and double-linked representation.

Liberal

Politics

Liberalism, a political ideology

- Classical liberalism, a political or social philosophy advocating the freedom of the individual, parliamentary systems of government, nonviolent modification of political, social, or economic institutions to assure unrestricted development in all spheres of human endeavor, and governmental guarantees of individual rights and civil liberties.
- Conservative liberalism, a variant of liberalism, combining liberal values and policies with conservative stances, or, more simply, representing the right-wing of the liberal movement
- Economic liberalism, the ideological belief in organizing the economy on individualist lines, such that the greatest possible number of economic decisions are made by private individuals and not by collective institutions.
- Social liberalism, the belief that liberalism should include social justice and that the legitimate role of the state includes addressing issues such as unemployment, health care, education, and the expansion of civil rights
- An adherent of a Liberal party

- Liberal democracy, a form of government based on limited majority rule
- Liberal Democratic Party, a common name for political parties around the world
- Liberalism (international relations), a theory of international relations
- European liberalism
- In the US, "liberalism" can refer to either or both of the following:
 - Modern liberalism, the current American manifestation of the ideology
 - Progressivism
- See also Liberalism by country

Economics

Laissez-faire, an economic environment in which the government limits itself to enforcing private property rights and transactions between private parties are free from tariffs, government subsidies, and enforced monopolies

- Neoliberalism, a contemporary free-market political-economic philosophy
- Ordoliberalism, a German variant of neoliberalism that emphasises the need for the state to ensure that the free market produces results close to its theoretical potential

Chapter 8

Democracy: Meaning & Theories-II

Pluralist

Pluralism is used in different ways across a wide range of topics. It denotes a diversity of views and stands rather than a single approach or method of interpretation:

- Benefice Pluralism, a situation in the sense of holding multiple ecclesiastical offices
- Cosmic pluralism, the belief in numerous other worlds beyond the Earth, which may possess the conditions suitable for life
- Cultural pluralism, when small groups within a larger society maintain their unique cultural identities (see Multiculturalism)
- Legal pluralism, acknowledges the existence of differing legal systems in the world
 - Journal of Legal Pluralism, a peer-reviewed academic journal that focuses on legal pluralism
- Methodological pluralism, the view that some phenomena observed in science and social science require multiple methods to account for their nature
- Pluralism (industrial relations), recognition of a multiplicity of legitimate interests and stakeholders in the employment relationship
- Pluralism (political philosophy), the acknowledgment of a diversity of political systems
- Pluralism (political theory), belief that there should be diverse and competing centres of power in society, so that there is a marketplace for ideas
- Religious pluralism, the acceptance of all religious paths as equally valid, promoting coexistence
- Scientific pluralism, the view that some phenomena observed in science require multiple explanations to account for their nature
- Structural pluralism, a concept used to examine the way in which societies are structured

In philosophy Epistemological pluralism, methodologies for determining what we know – a set of untold truths about the world

- Pluralism (philosophy), a doctrine according to which many rather than one (monism) or two(dualism) basic substances make up reality
- Pluralist school, a Greek school of pre-Socratic philosophers
- Value pluralism, the idea that there are several values that may be equally correct, even fundamental, and yet in conflict with each other
- Pluralism as a political philosophy is the belief that many of our deepest moral values (liberty,equality, the minimization of pain or cruelty, dignity, etc.) are incommensurate, and balancing them as best as possible should therefore govern one's political philosophy. Political pluralists are not inherently liberals (who place liberty and/or equality as their guiding principles) or conservatives(who place order and/or tradition as their guiding principles) but advocate a form of politicalmoderation. Nor are political pluralists necessarily advocates of a democratic plurality, but generally agree that this form of government is often best at moderating discrete values.
- As put by arch-pluralist Isaiah Berlin, "et us have the courage of our admitted ignorance, of our doubts and uncertainties. At least we can try to discover what others [...] require, by [...] making it possible for ourselves to know men as they truly are, by listening to them carefully and sympathetically, and understanding them and their lives and their needs...." Pluralism thus tries to encourage members of society to accommodate their differences by avoiding extremism(adhering solely to one value, or at the very least refusing to recognize others as legitimate) and engaging in good faith dialogue. Pluralists also seek the construction or reform of social institutions in order to reflect and balance competing principles. One of the more famous arguments for institutional pluralism came from James Madison in paper to questioning how best to avoid such an occurrence. He posits that to avoid factionalism, it is best to allow many competing factions (advocating different primary principles) to prevent any one from dominating the political system. This relies, to a degree, on a series of disturbances changing the influences of groups so as to avoid institutional dominance and ensure competition. Like Edmund Burke, this view concerns itself with balance, and subordinating any single abstract principle to a plurality or realistic harmony of interests.

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

Pluralism and the common good

Pluralism is connected with the hope that this process of conflict and dialogue will result in a quasi-common good. This common good is not an abstract value or set in stone, however, but an attempt at balancing competing social interests, and will thus constantly shift given present social conditions. Proponents in contemporary political philosophy of such a view include (the aforementioned) Isaiah Berlin, Stuart Hampshire and Bernard Williams. An earlier version of political pluralism was a strong current in the formation of modern social democracy (to balance socialist and capitalist ideals), with theorists such as the early Harold Laski and G. D. H. Cole, as well as other leading members of the British Fabian Society. In the United States, President Eisenhower's "middle way" was arguably motivated by a belief in political pluralism. While advocated by many pluralists, pluralism need not embrace social democracy given it does not a priori assume a desirable political system. Rather, pluralists advocate one based on the preexisting traditions and cognizable interests of a given society, and the political structure most likely to harmonize these factors. Thus, pluralists have also included Michael Oakeshott and John Kekes, proponents of something close to liberal conservatism. What pluralists certainly do have in common is the notion that a single vision or ideological schema, whether Marxism or unbridled neoliberalism, is likely too simplistic and rigid to advocate human beings' natural plurality of values. Pluralists likewise reject historicism and utopian thinking. While some, like John N. Gray, repudiate historical progress altogether, others, like Edmund Burke, indicate a form of human progress may be possible by improved social harmony.

The Fourth Way

The Fourth Way is an attempt, although certainly not shared by all (or even most) pluralists, to conceptualize a pluralist political schema.

Coined by Pluralist Party leader Jonathan Bishop, the Fourth Way is meant to represent a particular approach to pluralist integrated bargaining where one finds two opposing view points, the third way compromise between them, and then a fourth way which takes the best parts of the

first and second ways which dismisses all the conclusions of the third way. For instance, in political systems; the first way might be for a government to make public services based on the involvement of private sector firms, the second way using public sector organisations, and the third way to use aPublic-private partnership. The fourth way would be to allow the public to chose the service provider best for them based on their principles and values and not the ideological biases of government or civic officials. Likely, this fourth way will eventually manage to establish its own view as the generally accepted view, and then over time become the first way as science and society develop. This can only occur as the result of the negotiation process within the pluralistic framework, which implies the "operator" as a general rule of a truly pluralistic framework, i.e. the state in a pluralistic society, must not be biased.

Many pluralists (like Isaiah Berlin or Michael Oakeshott), while perhaps sympathetic to the Fourth Way's premises, would entirely reject any such formalized system. To Oakeshott, for example, laying out any single system of rules problematically reduces politics to an abstraction, which is better (and more honestly) based on a pluralist temperament in a given political climate than any systematic schema.

Conditions for pluralism

For pluralism to function and to be successful in defining the common good, all groups have to agree to a minimal consensus that shared values are at least worth pursuing. The most important baseline value is thus that of mutual respect or tolerance. If no such dialogue is possible,extremism (the subordination of many values to a single system) and physical coercion are likely inevitable.

Marxist

Marxism is a method of socio-economic analysis and worldview based on a materialist interpretation of historical development, a dialectical view of social transformation, and an analysis of class-relations and conflict within society. Marxist methodology informs an economic and sociopolitical enquiry applying to the analysis and critique of the development ofcapitalism and the role of class struggle in systemic economic change.

In the mid-to-late 19th century, the intellectual tenets of Marxism were inspired by two German philosophers: Karl Marx and Friedrich Engels. Marxist analyses and methodologies have

influenced multiple political ideologies and social movements throughout history. Marxism encompasses an economic theory, a sociological theory, a philosophical method, and a revolutionary view of social change.

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

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

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

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

These theoretical differences have led various socialist and communist parties and political movements to embrace different political strategies for attaining socialism and advocate different programs and policies from each other. One example of this is the division between revolutionary socialists and reformists that emerged in the German Social Democratic Party (SPD) during the early 20th century.

Marxist understandings of history and of society have been adopted by academics in the disciplines of archaeology and anthropology, media studies, political science, theater, history, sociological theory, art history and art theory, cultural studies, education, economics, geography, literary criticism, aesthetics, critical psychology, and philosophy

Communist Party of India (Marxist)

History

Formation of CPI

CPI(M) emerged from a division within the Communist Party of India (CPI). The undivided CPI had experienced a period of upsurge during the years following the Second World War. The CPI led armed rebellions in Telangana, Tripura and Kerala. However, it soon abandoned the strategy of armed revolution in favour of working within the parliamentary framework. In 1950 B.T. Ranadive, the CPI general secretary and a prominent representative of the radical sector inside the party, was demoted on grounds of left-adventurism.

Under the government of the Indian National Congress party of Jawaharlal Nehru, independent India developed close relations and a strategic partnership with the Soviet Union. The Soviet government consequently wished that the Indian communists moderate their criticism towards the Indian state and assume a supportive role towards the Congress governments. However, large sections of the CPI claimed that India remained a semi-feudal country, and that class struggle could not be put on the back-burner for the sake of guarding the interests of Soviet trade and foreign policy. Moreover, the Indian National Congress appeared to be generally hostile towards political competition. In 1959 the central government intervened to impose President's Rule in Kerala, toppling the E.M.S. Namboodiripad cabinet (the sole non-Congress state government in the country).

Simultaneously, the relations between the Communist Party of the Soviet Union and the Communist Party of China soured. In the early 1960s the Communist Party of China began criticising the CPSU of turning revisionist and of deviating from the path of Marxism-Leninism. Sino-Indian relations also deteriorated, as border disputes between the two countries erupted into the Sino-Indian war of 1962.

Chapter 10

Development : Meaning& Views on Development:-I

Development may refer to:

Science and technology

Artificial development, an area of computer science and engineering

- Development (differential geometry), the process of rolling one surface over another
- Development (journal), an academic journal in developmental biology
- Development (topology), a countable collection of open coverings
- Developmental biology, the study of the process by which organisms grow and develop
- Drug development, the entire process of bringing a new drug or device to the market
- Embryogenesis, or development, the process by which the embryo is formed
- Energy development, the effort to provide sufficient primary energy sources
- Human development (biology), the process of growing to maturity
 - Prenatal development, the process in which a human embryo or fetus gestates during pregnancy
 - Child development, the biological, psychological, and emotional changes that occur in human beings between birth and the end of adolescence
 - Youth development, the process through which adolescents acquire the cognitive, social, and emotional skills and abilities required to navigate life
- Neural development, the processes that generate, shape, and reshape the nervous system
- Photographic development, chemical means by which exposed photographic film or paper is processed to produce a visible image
- New product development, the complete process of bringing a new product to market
- Research and development, work aiming to increase knowledge
- Software development, the development of a software product
- Tooth development or odontogenesis
- Web development, work involved in developing a web site

Social science

Development studies, social science which addresses issues of concern to developing countries

- Development geography, geography with reference to the standard of living and quality of life of human inhabitants
- Developmental psychology, the scientific study of systematic psychological, emotional, and perception changes over life spans
- Community development, the practices and academic disciplines to improve various aspects of local communities
- Sociocultural evolution, how cultures and societies have changed over time
- Economic development, the economic aspect of social change
- Human development (humanity), an international and economic development paradigm
- Human development theory, a theory that merges older ideas from ecological economics, sustainable development, welfare economics, and feminist economics
- Rural development, actions and initiatives taken to improve the standard of living in non-Urban neighborhoods, countryside, and remote villages
- Social development, processes of change in societies
- Sustainable development, a pattern of resources use, that aims to meet human needs while preserving the environment

International and regional

Regional development, the provision of aid and other assistance to regions which are less economically developed

- Multilateral development bank
- European Development Fund, an instrument for European Community aid
- Development aid, the provision of assistance to developing countries
- Economic development, the sustained, concerted effort of policymakers and community to promote the standard of living and economic health in a specific area
- Human Development Index, used to rank countries by level of "human development"
- International development, the development of greater quality of life for humans

Business and professional Business development, a process of growing a business

- Career development, which has several meanings
- Corporate development, a position in a business
- Development & Commerce Bank (now called RHB Bank)
- Fundraising, soliciting voluntary contributions to an organization or prospective organization
- Training and development, organizational activity aimed at bettering the performance of individuals and groups in organizational settings
- Leadership development, activities that enhances the quality of leadership within an individual or organization
- New product development, the complete process of bringing a new product to market
- Organization development, a conceptual, organization-wide effort to increase an organization's effectiveness and viability
- Personal development or self-help
- Professional development, skills and knowledge attained for both personal development and career advancement

Sustainable Development

Sustainable development is an organizing principle for human life on a finite planet. It posits a desirable future state for human societies in which living conditions and resource-use meet human needs without undermining the sustainability of natural systems and the environment, so that future generations may also have their needs met.

Sustainable development ties together concern for the carrying capacity of natural systems with the social and economic challenges faced by humanity. As early as the 1970s, 'sustainability' was employed to describe an economy "in equilibrium with basic ecological support systems." Scientists in many fields have highlighted The Limits to Growth and economists have presented alternatives, for example a 'steady state economy', to address concerns over the impacts of expanding human development on the planet.

The term 'sustainable development' rose to significance after it was used by the Brundtland Commission in its 1987 report *Our Common Future*. In the report, the commission coined what has become the most often-quoted definition of sustainable development: "development that meets the needs of the present without compromising the ability of future generations to meet their own needs." The concept of sustainable development has in the past most often been broken out into three constituent domains: environmental sustainability, economic sustainability and social sustainability. However, many other possible ways to delineate the concept have been suggested. For example, the Circles of Sustainability approach distinguishes the four domains of economic, ecological, political and cultural sustainability. This accords with the United Cities and local governments specifying of culture as the fourth domain of sustainability. Other important sources refer to the fourth domain as 'institutional' or as 'good governance'.

Definitions

In 1987, the United Nations World Commission on Environment and Development released the report *Our Common Future*, now commonly named the 'Brundtland Report' after the commission's chairperson, the then Prime Minister of Norway Gro Harlem Brundtland. The report included what is now one of the most widely recognised definitions: "Sustainable development is development that meets the needs of the present without compromising the ability of future generations to meet their own needs." The Brundtland Report goes on to say that sustainable development also contains within it two key concepts:

- The concept of 'needs', in particular the essential needs of the world's poor, to which overriding priority should be given
- The idea of limitations imposed by the state of technology and social organization on the environment's ability to meet present and future needs.

The United Nations 2005 World Summit Outcome Document refers to the "interdependent and mutually reinforcing pillars" of sustainable development as economic development, social development, and environmental protection. Based on this 'triple bottom line', numerous sustainability standards and certification systems have been established in recent years, in particular in the food industry. Well-known standards include organic, Rainforest Alliance, fair trade, UTZ Certified, Bird Friendly, and The Common Code for the Coffee Community.

Indigenous people have argued, through various international forums such as the United Nations Permanent Forum on Indigenous Issues and the Convention on Biological Diversity, that there are four pillars of sustainable development, the fourth being cultural. The Universal Declaration on Cultural Diversity (UNESCO, 2001) further elaborates the concept by stating that "... cultural diversity is as necessary for humankind as biodiversity is for nature"; it becomes "one of the roots of development understood not simply in terms of economic growth, but also as a means to achieve a more satisfactory intellectual, emotional, moral and spiritual existence". In this vision, cultural diversity is the fourth policy area of sustainable development.

A useful articulation of the values and principles of sustainability can be found in the Earth Charter. It offers an integrated vision and definition of strong sustainability. The document, an ethical framework for a sustainable world, was developed over several years after the Rio Earth Summit in 1992 and launched officially in 2000. The Charter derives its legitimacy from the participatory process in which it was drafted, which included contributions from hundreds of organizations and thousands of individuals, and from its use since 2000 by thousands of organizations and individuals that have been using the Earth Charter as an educational instrument and a policy tool.

Economic Sustainability: Agenda 21 clearly identified information, integration, and participation as key building blocks to help countries achieve development that recognises these interdependent pillars. It emphasises that in sustainable development everyone is a user and provider of information. It stresses the need to change from old sector-centered ways of doing business to new approaches that involve cross-sectoral co-ordination and the integration of environmental and social concerns into all development processes. Furthermore, Agenda 21 emphasises that broad public participation in decision making is a fundamental prerequisite for achieving sustainable development.

According to Hasna Vancock, sustainability is a process which tells of a development of all aspects of human life affecting sustenance. It means resolving the conflict between the various competing goals, and involves the simultaneous pursuit of economic prosperity, environmental quality and social equity famously known as three dimensions (triple bottom line) with the resultant vector being technology, hence it is a continually evolving process; the 'journey' (the process of achieving sustainability) is of course vitally important, but only as a means of getting

to the destination (the desired future state). However, the 'destination' of sustainability is not a fixed place in the normal sense that we understand destination. Instead, it is a set of wishful characteristics of a future system.

Important related concepts are 'strong' and 'weak' sustainability, deep ecology, and just sustainability. "Just sustainability" offers a socially just conception of sustainability. Just sustainability effectively addresses what has been called the 'equity deficit' of environmental sustainability (Agyeman, 2005:44). It is "the egalitarian conception of sustainable development" (Jacobs, 1999:32). It generates a more nuanced definition of sustainable development: "the need to ensure a better quality of life for all, now and into the future, in a just and equitable manner, whilst living within the limits of supporting ecosystems" (Agyeman, et al., 2003:5). This conception of sustainable development focuses equally on four conditions: improving our quality of life and well-being; on meeting the needs of both present and future generations (intra- and intergenerational equity); on justice and equity in terms of recognition (Schlosberg, 1999), process, procedure and outcome and on the need for us to live within ecosystem limits (also called one planet living) (Agyeman, 2005:92). Open-source appropriate technology has been proposed as an approach for reaching just sustainable development.

Green development is generally differentiated from sustainable development in that Green development prioritizes what its proponents consider to be environmental sustainability over economic and cultural considerations. Proponents of Sustainable Development argue that it provides a context in which to improve overall sustainability where cutting edge Green Development is unattainable. For example, a cutting edge treatment plant with extremely high maintenance costs may not be sustainable in regions of the world with fewer financial resources. An environmentally ideal plant that is shut down due to bankruptcy is obviously less sustainable than one that is maintainable by the community, even if it is somewhat less effective from an environmental standpoint. However, this view depends on whether one determines that it is the development (the plant) which needs to be sustainable, or whether it is the human-nature ecology (the environmental conditions) in which the plant exists which should be sustainable. It follows, then, that an operational but heavily polluting plant may be judged as actually 'less sustainable' than having no plant at all.

Sustainability educator Michael Thomas Needham referred to 'Sustainable Development' "as the ability to meet the needs of the present while contributing to the future generations' needs." There is an additional focus on the present generations' responsibility to improve the future generations' life by restoring the previous ecosystem damage and resisting to contribute to further ecosystem damage.

Chapter 11

Gandhian view on Development

Development : Meaning& Views on Development:-II

Human Development

Human development is a well-being concept within a field of international development. It involves studies of the human condition with its core being the capability approach.

Introduction

Concept of a broader human development was first laid out by Amartya Sen, a 1998 Nobel laureate, and expanded upon by Martha Nussbaum, Sabina Alkire, Ingrid Robeyns, and others. Human development encompasses more than just the rise or fall of national incomes. Development is thus about expanding the choices people have, to lead lives that they value, and improving the human condition so that people have the chance to lead full lives. Thus, human development is about much more than economic growth, which is only a means of enlarging people's choices. Fundamental to enlarging these choices is building human capabilities—the range of things that people can do or be in life. Capabilities are "the substantive freedoms [a person] enjoys to lead the kind of life [they have] reason to value." Human development disperses the concentration of the distribution of goods and services that underprivileged people need and center its ideas on human decisions. By investing in people, we enable growth and empower people to pursue many different life paths, thus developing human capabilities. The most basic capabilities for human development are: to lead long and healthy lives, to be knowledgeable (e.g., to be educated), to have access to the resources and social services needed for a decent standard of living, and to be able to participate in the life of the community. Without these, many choices are simply not available, and many opportunities in life remain inaccessible.

An abstract illustration of human capability is a bicycle. A bicycle itself is a resource- a mode of transportation. If the person who owns the bicycle is unable to ride it (due to a lack of balance or knowledge), the bicycle is useless to that person as transportation and loses its functioning. If, however, a person both owns a bicycle and has the ability to ride a bicycle, they now have the capability of riding to a friend's house, a local store, or a great number of other places. This

capability would (presumably) increase their value of life and expand their choices. A person, therefore, needs both the resources and the ability to use them in order to pursue their capabilities. This is one example of how different resources and/or skills can contribute to human capability. This way of looking at development, often forgotten in the immediate concern with accumulating commodities and financial wealth, is not new. Philosophers, economists and political leaders have long emphasized human well being as the purpose, or the end, of development. As Aristotle said in ancient Greece, "Wealth is evidently not the good we are seeking, for it is merely useful for the sake of something else."

Measurement of human development

One measure of human development is the Human Development Index (HDI), formulated by the United Nations Development Programme. The index encompasses statistics such as life expectancy at birth, an education index (calculated using mean years of schooling and expected years of schooling), and gross national income per capita. Though this index does not capture every aspect that contributes to human capability, it is a standardized way of quantifying human capability across nations and communities. Aspects that could be left out of the calculations include incomes that are unable to be quantified, such as staying home to raise children or bartering goods/services, as well as individuals' perceptions of their own well being. Other measures of human development include the Human Poverty Index (HPI) and the Global Empowerment Measure.

Pillars of human development

There are six basic pillars of human development: equity, sustainability, productivity, empowerment, cooperation and security.

- Equity is the idea of fairness for every person, between men and women; we each have the right to an education and health care.
- Sustainability is the view that we all have the right to earn a living that can sustain our lives and have access to a more even distribution of goods.
- Productivity states the full participation of people in the process of income generation. This also means that the government needs more efficient social programs for its people.

- Empowerment is the freedom of the people to influence development and decisions that affect their lives.
- Cooperation stipulates participation and belonging to communities and groups as a means of mutual enrichment and a source of social meaning.
- Security offers people development opportunities freely and safely with confidence that they will not disappear suddenly in the future.
- Human rights and human development

In seeking that something else, human development shares a common vision with human rights. The goal is human freedom. Therefore, human development is interconnected with human rights and human freedom because in well-managed prisons life expectancy and literacy as measured by the Human Development Index could be quite high. And in pursuing capabilities and realizing rights, this freedom is vital. People must be free to exercise their choices and to participate in decision-making that affects their lives. Human development and human rights are mutually reinforcing, helping to secure the well-being and dignity of all people, building self-respect and the respect of others. In the days of fast globalization, human rights issues surface in relation to multilateral corporations and poverty issues. The idea of human development stipulates the need for education, better conditions for work and more choices for individuals. The idea goes with what human rights. The two concept is simultaneously promoted first by well governance, implementation of human rights policy and a formation of participation of community in decision making processes, second by the promotion of civil and political rights and economic and social rights, which are components of the level of development. For instance, the right for education relates to intellectual development, and political rights relates to the level of the political development of that society.

Health and human development

The axis of Development is that it may harm or benefit human health, and eventually human development, as it proceeds. In concern of health, we divided it into disease and poverty issues. On 16 June 2006 the World Health Organization (WHO) presented the report Preventing disease through healthy environments. No one in the world is without the environmental health issues and wealth problems. Development had been first approached as the future for more cure and hope. However, the criticism argues of the side effects such as environmental pollution and the

gap between increasing wealth and poor. The Ineffectiveness of many public health policies in terms of health inequality issues and social problems should be held by global community. Therefore, the ultimate goal is to achieve environmental sustainability. Some critics say development is undermined by health concerns as it both directly and indirectly influences growth to be lower. HIV/AIDS, in addition to malaria, has negatively influenced development and increased poverty in many places, especially in Africa. Achieving adequate health standards is important for the success of development and the abolition of poverty.

Human Development Report

The Human Development Report (HDR) is released by the United Nations and contains the Human Development Index. There is not only a global Human Development Report but there are regional and national reports as well that specifically show certain areas. Within global HDR there are four main indexes: Human Development Index, Gender-related Development Index, Gender Empowerment Measure and the Human Poverty Index. The Regional, National and subnational (for portions of countries) HDRs take various approaches, according to the strategic thinking of the individual authorship groups which craft the individual reports.

The Human Development Index is a way for people and nations to see the policy flaws of regions and countries. Although the releasing of this information is believed to encourage countries to alter their policies, there is no evidence demonstrating changes nor is there any motivation for countries to do so.

Gandhian view on Development

I would say that if the village perishes India will perish too. India will be no more India. Her own mission in the world will get lost. The revival of the village is possible only when it is no more exploited. Industrialization on a mass scale will necessarily lead to passive or active exploitation of the villagers as the problems of competition and marketing come in. Therefore we have to concentrate on the village being self-contained, manufacturing mainly for use. Provided this character of the village industry is maintained, there would be no objection to villagers using even the modern machines and tools that they can make and can afford to use. Only they should not be used as a means of exploitation of others.

Gandhi and Rural Development

Gandhi's idea to develop the Indian society was based on his understanding of the society and hence based on the village system. Talking about the importance of village, he wrote in 1936, "I would say if the village perishes, India will perish too. It will be no more India. His one mission in the world will get lost." Harijan. 29.08.36.

He was aware of the realities of the village life and knew the plight of half starved masses of India. He often acknowledged the same in his vivid descriptions of Indian villages. He wrote, "instead of having graceful hamlets dotting the lands, we have dung-heaps. The approach to many villages is not a refreshing experience. Often one would like to shut one's eyes and stuff one's nose, such is the surrounding dirt and offending smell". (Gandhi: Constructive programmes – its meaning and place). His understanding of the plight of the people has been extremely well brought out in his writings, identifying his emphasis on removal of poverty over aesthetics.

Concept of Rural Reconstruction :

His concept of rural reconstruction is a comprehensive one, emphasizing on the economic, political, social, educational, ecological and spiritual dimensions. He ceaselessly insisted on a pattern of village life, which will be man-centered and non-exploiting. The decentralized village economy should provide full employment to all on the basis of voluntary cooperation and work for achieving self-sufficiency in its basic requirement of food, clothing and shelter. In short, it can be said that rural reconstruction, according to Gandhi should not be merely concerned with raising the standard of living of village folk, though that was important. Talking specifically about an ideal village, where in he outlined the objectives of rural reconstruction: - he said,

My idea of an ideal village is that of complete republic independence of its neighbor for its own vital wants, and yet dependent for many others in which dependence is necessity. Such village will contain intelligent people. First concern of the village should be to grow its own food. Then only all communities will live together in harmony.

The curse of untouchability, intoxicating drinks and drugs will not exist. Women will enjoy the same right as the men. People in villages will not live in dirt and darkness as animal. No one will wallow in luxury. The village community should take up the responsibility for providing work to all able bodied people and every one will have to contribute his quota of manual labour.

Non-violence with its techniques of Satyagraha and non-cooperation will have the sanction of village community. The government of the village will be conducted by the panchayat of five persons annually elected by the villagers. (Harijan 26.07.42). Such an ideal society, he stated is “necessarily highly cultured because every man and women in that society knows what he or she wants and also no one should want anything that others could not have. Such a society will be an “Oceanic Circle” where the centre will be the individual who will always be ready to perish for the village, later ready to perish for the circle of villagers, till at last the whole becomes a life comprised of individuals”.

Affluence of people was, not in Gandhi’s mind. He believed that there was sufficient to meet the needs of all people, but not their greed. He considered, that the type of development, Europe had achieved was the result of a systematic colonization and exploitation of both people and nature. In addition, it had contributed to imbalance in the levels of development of different areas, monopolization of benefits by a few families, and increase of poverty and violence. He, therefore rejected not only supportive mechanism of development seen as bureaucracy, technology, elitist education, but also the whole idea of development as conceived by the builders of the western industrial society.

Truth, non-violence, freedom, equality, full employment, bread labour, trusteeship, decentralization, swadesh and cooperation were perceived as cardinal principles for rural reconstruction.

VALUES : The first four principles are the universal or core values, i.e. Truth, Non-violence, Freedom, Equality; the remaining, flowing mostly from them and are linked with his economic ideas. They were formulated by Gandhi to regulate initially the conducts of inmates of Satyagraha Ashram in 1930 and latter extended to the work for rural reconstruction. These were not intended to be mechanical formulae, but as practical aids to moral and spiritual growth. A brief elaboration of some of these principles like truth, no-violence, freedom and equality will be

useful to understand them and their importance in the context of initiating action for rural reconstruction.

Truth : He regarded truth as the source of Dharma. Hence there should be truth in thought, speech and action. The man who has realized truth completely has nothing else to know, because all knowledge is necessarily included in it. And that is why truth is perhaps the most important name of God. In fact it is better to say that truth is God, than to say God is truth.

His concept of truth involves complete tolerance to those who differ. According to him the aim of human life is to attain truth and non-violence. Truth is of two types, Ultimate and Relative. It is comparatively easy to achieve relative truth. However the endeavor should be to know the ultimate truth, because this results in realization of God.

Non-violence : Gandhi considered non-violence, besides truth synonymous with God. He believed that non-violence has its own relevance in resolving conflict and is also related to reconstruction of society. Non-violent resolution of conflict is in accordance with the dignity of man's spirit. He can save his spirit by observing non-violence, which is in tune with his spirituality. Another aspect of non-violence is progress. It binds people together, promoting cooperation, harmony and unity and preventing destruction, contributes to development. Practice of absolute non-violence is not possible so long one exists physically. It is not the same as non-killing, nor it is non-resistance borne out of cowardice. It implies absence of hatred or ill will, love for wrong doer, courage in the face of violence, bread labour, truthfulness and freedom from possession.

Freedom : Closely linked with truth and non-violence is freedom; without the freedom of body, mind and soul, the individual can not attain perfection. It is used to indicate freedom to make a choice and to take a decision without which development of individual is not possible. This perfection can be achieved by acquisition of the capacity by all to resist authority, when it is misused. It makes people tolerant to other ideas.

Equality : It flows logically from the concept of non-violence, since non-violence and non-exploitation is impossible without equality.

Moral Values in Politics

Moral Politics

Moral Politics: How Liberals and Conservatives Think is a 1996 book by cognitive linguist George Lakoff. It argues that conservatives and liberals hold two different conceptual models of morality. Conservatives have a Strict Father morality in which people are made good through self-discipline and hard work, everyone is taken care of by taking care of themselves. Liberals have a Nurturant Parent morality in which everyone is taken care of by helping each other.

The central problems

The major observations/assumptions and questions on which the book is founded include these:

1. There is one cluster of beliefs that most conservatives share (including some kind of condemnation of abortion, a positive emphasis on military spending, and a fixed-percentage income tax) and another cluster that most liberals share (including some kind of support for abortion, a negative emphasis on military spending, and a progressive income tax). What is the explanation for this clustering? What "unifies each of the lists of moral priorities?" "Mix and match" views seem comparatively rare. how come?
2. Liberals and conservatives usually not only disagree with one another but view the "other side" as largely incoherent. Many liberals, for example, see building more prisons a completely ineffective and illogical solution to crime, while many conservatives view it as the obvious solution. Why can't the one side even begin to understand the other?
3. Why do liberals and conservatives tend to use the same words to mean different things? For example, a liberal might use the term "big government" to condemn the military, but, to a conservative, the term "big government" has nothing to do with the military, even though the military is a significant government institution.
4. Why do liberals and conservatives make different issues the focus of campaigns? For example, why did the Republican leaders emphasize "family values" so much in their

1994 campaign, and why was similar emphasis not made by Democrats? Don't liberals also have families and a moral framework for reasoning about families?

The proposed solution: a metaphorical model

Lakoff tries to resolve these difficulties through a model in which liberals and conservatives are shown to have different and contradictory worldviews. These worldviews are thought to conflict in a number of ways relevant to the understanding of politics. Nonetheless, Lakoff claims that all of these differences center around the two sides' respective understandings of a single concept - the ideal nuclear family.

The family is central to Lakoff because he views the family as Americans most common model for understanding the country; that is Americans often metaphorically understand their country as a family, with the government corresponding to the parent(s) of the family and the individual citizens corresponding to the children. Thus, one's understanding of how a family is best organized will have direct implications for how the country should be governed.

Liberals' ideal conceptualization follows the model of the "nurturant parent" family, while Conservatives' follow the model of the "strict father" family. Given the importance of these concepts in Moral Politics, it is important to consider their meaning along with how each view suggests and is justified by a corresponding view of the nature of child rearing, morality, and justice.

A "nurturant parent" family is one that revolves around every family member caring for and being cared for by every other family member, with open communication between all parties, and with each family member pursuing their own vision of happiness. The nurturant parent model is also correlated with the following views:

- **Morality:** The basis of morality is in understanding, respecting, and helping other people, and in seeking the happiness of one's self and of others. The primary vices are selfishness and anti-social behavior.
- **Child development:** Children develop morality primarily through interacting with and observing good people, especially good parents. Punishment is necessary in some cases, but also has the potential to backfire, causing children to adopt more violent or more anti-social ways. Though children should, in general, obey their parents, they will develop best if

allowed to question their parents' decisions, to hear justifications for their parents' rules, and so on. Moral development is a lifelong process, and almost no one is so perfect as not to need improvement.

- Justice: The world is not without justice, but it is far from the ideal of justice. Many people, for example, do not seem properly rewarded for their hard work and dedication. We must work hard to improve everyone's condition.

In contrast, the "strict father" family revolves around the idea that parents teach their children how to be self-reliant and self-disciplined through "tough love". This is correlated with the following views:

- Morality: Evil is all around us, constantly tempting us. Thus, the basis of morality is strong moral character, which requires self-reliance and self-discipline. The primary vices are those that dissolve self-discipline, such as laziness, gluttony, and indulgent sexuality.
- Child development: Children develop self-discipline, self-reliance, and other virtues primarily through rewards and punishment, a system of "tough love". Since parents know the difference between right and wrong and children still do not, obedience to the parents is very important. Moral development basically lasts only as long as childhood; it's important to get it right the first time, because there is no "second chance".
- Justice: The world may be a difficult place to live, but it is basically just; people usually get what they deserve. The difficulties in one's life serve as a test to sort the deserving from the undeserving.

Lakoff uses this model to answer the central questions framed above - why is there such clear grouping on issues that separate liberals and conservatives, and, conversely, why don't we find more issue-by-issue voters? Lakoff claims that one's take on any given political issue is largely determined by which model one adopts. Thus, in Part IV, "The Hard Issues", he tries to demonstrate how the liberal and conservative worldviews outlined above lead to typical liberal and conservative positions on a wide range of issues, including taxes, the death penalty, environmental regulations, affirmative action, education, and abortion.

As to why liberals and conservatives view each other as incomprehensible on an issue-by-issue basis, Lakoff claims that this is due to each side failing to grasp the other side's worldview as

well as not appreciating how different the other worldview is from its own. Failure to see or appreciate this gap results in both sides thinking the other is hopelessly irrational and immoral.

Lakoff also uses this model to show how and why liberals and conservatives use different semantics, often even using the same words in very different ways. Liberals and conservatives have different worldviews and semantics are very much influenced by the worldview of the speaker. As Lakoff puts it,

Words don't have meanings in isolation. Words are defined relative to a conceptual system. If liberals are to understand how conservatives use their words, they will have to understand the conservative conceptual system. (From chapter 2, "The Worldview Problem")

Here, Lakoff is specifically referring to liberals' challenges in understanding conservatives. However, he obviously views the reverse situation as equally problematic.

In addressing why conservatives and liberals choose different issues as the focus of their campaigns, Lakoff claims that this too finds explanation in the context of his model. In the 1994 elections, the Republican focus on "family values", while the Democrats largely ignored this framing, is key to Lakoff. He views this discrepancy as a sign that conservatives understand the Country is a Family metaphor that lies behind people's views of politics much better than liberals do. And, by extension, this has been key to the success of the Republican Party.

Clarifications of the model

There are several things Lakoff does not intend to mean with his model. Perhaps most importantly, Lakoff does not believe that all conservatives are the same or that all liberals are the same. Chapter 17, "Varieties of Liberals and Conservatives", is entirely devoted to showing a number of dimensions along which one can slide and still be a member of either camp. Among other things, he says that one might have one way to conceptualize a real nuclear family and a separate, even opposite way of conceptualizing a metaphorical country-family. Lakoff is certainly not trying to establish necessary and sufficient conditions for being liberal or conservative. In the terminology of cognitive linguistics, Lakoff views both liberal and conservative as "radial category" labels.

Another thing Lakoff does not mean is that people consciously believe in the family concepts that he has described. As a cognitive scientist, Lakoff believes he is describing mental structures that may well be mostly below the level of conscious thought. This does not mean, however, that they have little or no effect on one's opinions and consequent actions.

Morality and politics

If morality is the answer to the question 'how ought we to live' at the individual level, politics can be seen as addressing the same question at the social level, though the political sphere raises additional problems and challenges. It is therefore unsurprising that evidence has been found of a relationship between attitudes in morality and politics. Jonathan Haidt and Jesse Graham have studied the differences between liberals and conservatives, in this regard. Haidt found that Americans who identified as liberals tended to value care and fairness higher than loyalty, respect and purity. Self-identified conservative Americans valued care and fairness less and the remaining three values more. Both groups gave care the highest over-all weighting, but conservatives valued fairness the lowest, whereas liberals valued purity the lowest. Haidt also hypothesizes that the origin of this division in the United States can be traced to geohistorical factors, with conservatism strongest in closely knit, ethnically homogenous communities, in contrast to port-cities, where the cultural mix is greater, thus requiring more liberalism.

Group morality develops from shared concepts and beliefs and is often codified to regulate behavior within a culture or community. Various defined actions come to be called moral or immoral. Individuals who choose moral action are popularly held to possess "moral fiber", whereas those who indulge in immoral behavior may be labeled as socially degenerate. The continued existence of a group may depend on widespread conformity to codes of morality; an inability to adjust moral codes in response to new challenges is sometimes credited with the demise of a community (a positive example would be the function of Cistercian reform in reviving monasticism; a negative example would be the role of the Dowager Empress in the subjugation of China to European interests). Within nationalist movements, there has been some tendency to feel that a nation will not survive or prosper without acknowledging one common morality, regardless of its content. Political Morality is also relevant to the behaviour internationally of national governments, and to the support they receive from their host population. Noam Chomsky states that

“ ... if we adopt the principle of universality : if an action is right (or wrong) for others, it is right (or wrong) for us. Those who do not rise to the minimal moral level of applying to themselves the standards they apply to others—more stringent ones, in fact—plainly cannot be taken seriously when they speak of appropriateness of response; or of right and wrong, good and evil. ”

“ In fact, one of the, maybe the most, elementary of moral principles is that of universality, that is, If something's right for me, it's right for you; if it's wrong for you, it's wrong for me. Any moral code that is even worth looking at has that at its core somehow. ”

Morality and religion

Religion and morality are not synonymous. Morality does not depend upon religion although this is "an almost automatic assumption." According to The Westminster Dictionary of Christian Ethics, religion and morality "are to be defined differently and have no definitional connections with each other. Conceptually and in principle, morality and a religious value system are two distinct kinds of value systems or action guides."

Positions

Within the wide range of moral traditions, religious value systems co-exist with contemporary secular frameworks such as consequentialism, freethought, humanism, utilitarianism, and others. There are many types of religious value systems. Modern monotheistic religions, such as Islam, Judaism, Christianity, and to a certain degree others such as Sikhism and Zoroastrianism, define right and wrong by the laws and rules set forth by their respective scriptures and as interpreted by religious leaders within the respective faith. Polytheistic religious traditions tend to be less absolute. For example, within Buddhism, the intention of the individual and the circumstances should be accounted for to determine if an action is right or wrong. A further disparity between the values of religious traditions is pointed out by Barbara Stoler Miller, who states that, in Hinduism, "practically, right and wrong are decided according to the categories of social rank, kinship, and stages of life. For modern Westerners, who have been raised on ideals of universality and egalitarianism, this relativity of values and obligations is the aspect of Hinduism most difficult to understand".

Religions provide different ways of dealing with moral dilemmas. For example, there is no absolute prohibition on killing in Hinduism, which recognizes that it "may be inevitable and indeed necessary" in certain circumstances. In monotheistic traditions, certain acts are viewed in more absolute terms, such as abortion or divorce. Religion is not always positively associated with morality. Philosopher David Hume stated that, "the greatest crimes have been found, in many instances, to be compatible with a superstitious piety and devotion; Hence it is justly regarded as unsafe to draw any inference in favor of a man's morals, from the fervor or strictness of his religious exercises, even though he himself believe them sincere."

Religious value systems can diverge from commonly-held contemporary moral positions, such as those on murder, mass atrocities, and slavery. For example, Simon Blackburn states that "apologists for Hinduism defend or explain away its involvement with the caste system, and apologists for Islam defend or explain away its harsh penal code or its attitude to women and infidels" In regard to Christianity, he states that the "Bible can be read as giving us a carte blanche for harsh attitudes to children, the mentally handicapped, animals, the environment, the divorced, unbelievers, people with various sexual habits, and elderly women", and notes morally suspect themes in the Bible's New Testament as well. Christian apologists address Blackburn's viewpoints and construe that Jewish laws in the Jewish Bible showed the evolution of moral standards towards protecting the vulnerable, imposing a death penalty on those pursuing slavery and treating slaves as persons and not property. Elizabeth Anderson, a Professor of Philosophy and Women's Studies at the University of Michigan, Ann Arbor, holds that "the Bible contains both good and evil teachings", and it is "morally inconsistent". Humanists like Paul Kurtz believe that we can identify moral values across cultures, even if we do not appeal to a supernatural or universalist understanding of principles - values including integrity, trustworthiness, benevolence, and fairness. These values can be resources for finding common ground between believers and nonbelievers.

Non-Violence

Nonviolence is the personal practice of being harmless to self and others under every condition. It comes from the belief that hurting people, animals or the environment is unnecessary to achieve an outcome and refers to a general philosophy of abstention from violence based on moral, religious or spiritual principles.

For some, the philosophy of nonviolence is rooted in the simple belief that God is harmless. Mahavira (599 BCE–527 BCE[1]), the twenty-fourth "tirthankara" of Jain religion was the Torch-bearer of "Ahimsa" and introduced the word to world in large and applied in his life. Therefore, to more strongly connect with God, one must likewise be harmless. Nonviolence also has 'active' or 'activist' elements, in that believers accept the need for nonviolence as a means to achieve political and social change. Thus, for example, the Gandhian ahimsa is a philosophy and strategy for social change that rejects the use of violence, but at the same time sees nonviolent action (also called civil resistance) as an alternative to passive acceptance of oppression or armed struggle against it. In general, advocates of an activist philosophy of nonviolence use diverse methods in their campaigns for social change, including critical forms of education and persuasion, mass noncooperation civil disobedience and nonviolent direct action and social, political, cultural and economic forms of intervention.

In modern times, nonviolent methods of action have been a powerful tool for social protest and revolutionary social and political change. There are many examples of their use. Fuller surveys may be found in the entries on civil resistance, nonviolent resistance and nonviolent revolution. Here certain movements particularly influenced by a philosophy of nonviolence should be mentioned, including Mahatma Gandhi leading a decades-long nonviolent struggle against British rule in India, which eventually helped India win its independence in 1947, Martin Luther King's and James Bevel's adoption of Gandhi's nonviolent methods in their campaigns to win civil rights for African Americans, and César Chávez's campaigns of nonviolence in the 1960s to protest the treatment of farm workers in California. The 1989 "Velvet Revolution" in Czechoslovakia that saw the overthrow of the Communist government is considered one of the most important of the largely nonviolent Revolutions of 1989. Most recently the nonviolent campaigns of Leymah Gbowee and the women of Liberia were able to achieve peace after a 14-year civil war. This story is captured in a 2008 documentary film *Pray the Devil Back to Hell*. In an essay, "To Abolish War," evolutionary biologist Judith Hand advocated the use of nonviolent direct action to dismantle the global war machine.

The term "nonviolence" is often linked with or even used as a synonym for peace, and despite being frequently equated with passivity and pacifism, this is rejected by non-violent advocates and activists. Non-violence (with a hyphen) refers more specifically to the absence of violence and is always the choice to do no harm or the least harm, and passivity is the choice to do

nothing. Sometimes non-violence is the same as being passive, and other times it isn't. So for example, if a house is burning down, the most harmless appropriate action is to put the fire out, not to sit by and passively let the fire burn. There is considerable confusion and contradiction written about non-violence, harmlessness and passivity. A person may advocate nonviolence in a specific context while advocating violence in other contexts. For example, someone who passionately opposes abortion as a life-saving practice may concurrently advocate violence to kill an abortionist

Swarajs

Swaraj (Hindi: swa- "self", raj "rule") can mean generally self-governance or "self-rule", and was used synonymous with "home-rule" by Mahatma Gandhi but the word usually refers to Gandhi's concept for Indian independence from foreign domination. Swaraj lays stress on governance not by a hierarchical government, but self governance through individuals and community building. The focus is on political decentralization. Since this is against the political and social systems followed by Britain, Gandhi's concept of Swaraj laid stress on India discarding British political, economic, bureaucratic, legal, military, and educational institutions.

Although Gandhi's aim of totally implementing the concepts of Swaraj in India was not achieved, the voluntary work organizations which he founded for this purpose did serve as precursors and role models for peoples movements, voluntary organisations and some of the non-governmental organisations that were subsequently launched in various parts of India. The Bhoodan movement which presaged land reform legislation activity throughout India, ultimately leading to India discarding the Zamindari system, was also inspired by the ideas of Swaraj.

Swaraj warrants a stateless society; according to Gandhi, the overall impact of the state on the people is harmful. He called the state a "soulless machine" which, ultimately, does the greatest harm to mankind. The *raison d'être* of the state is that it is an instrument of serving the people. But Gandhi feared that in the name of moulding the state into a suitable instrument of serving people, the state would abrogate the rights of the citizens and arrogate to itself the role of grand protector and demand abject acquiescence from them. This would create a paradoxical situation where the citizens would be alienated from the state and at the same time enslaved to it which according to Gandhi was demoralizing and dangerous. If Gandhi's close acquaintance with the

working of the state apparatus in South Africa and in India strengthened his suspicion of a centralized, monolithic state, his intimate association with the Congress and its leaders confirmed his fears about the corrupting influence of political power and his skepticism about the efficacy of the party systems of power politics (due to which he resigned from the Congress on more than one occasion only to be persuaded back each time) and his study of the British parliamentary systems convinced him that representative democracy was incapable of meting out justice to people. So he thought it necessary to evolve a mechanism to achieve the twin objectives of empowering the people and 'empowering' the state. It was for this that he developed the two pronged strategy of resistance (to the state) and reconstruction (through voluntary and participatory social action).

Although the word "Swaraj" means self-rule, Gandhi gave it the content of an integral revolution that encompasses all spheres of life. "At the individual level Swaraj is vitally connected with the capacity for dispassionate self-assessment, ceaseless self-purification and growing self-reliance". Politically swaraj is self-government and not good government (for Gandhi, good government is no substitute for self-government) and it means a continuous effort to be independent of government control, whether it is foreign government or whether it is national. In other words, it is sovereignty of the people based on pure moral authority. Economically, Swaraj means full economic freedom for the toiling millions. And in its fullest sense, Swaraj is much more than freedom from all restraints, it is self-rule, self-restraint and could be equated with moksha or salvation.

Adopting Swaraj means implementing a system whereby the state machinery is virtually nil, and the real power directly resides in the hands of people. Gandhi said, "Power resides in the people, they can use it at any time." This philosophy rests inside an individual who has to learn to be master of his own self and spreads upwards to the level of his community which must be dependent only on itself. Gandhi said, "In such a state (where swaraj is achieved) everyone is his own ruler. He rules himself in such a manner that he is never a hindrance to his neighbour"; and also "It is Swaraj when we learn to rule ourselves."

Chapter 12

Legitimacy and its different forms

The Three Types of Legitimate Rule

The Three Types of Legitimate Rule (Die drei reinen Typen der legitimen Herrschaft) is an essay written by Max Weber, a German economist and sociologist. Originally published in the journal *Preussische Jahrbücher* 187, 1-2, 1922, an English translation, translated by Hans Gerth, was published in the journal *Berkeley Publications in Society and Institutions* 4(1): 1-11, 1958. Weber's ideas about legitimate rule also appear in his *Basic Concepts in Sociology and The Theory of Social and Economic Organization*. The word Rule was employed in the 1958 essay translation by translator Hans Gerth, a native speaking German who lived in Germany until he was 30 (fleeing just prior to World War II) and is a direct translation of *Herrschaft* from the original essay title; whereas, the English translators of the book *The Theory of Social and Economic Organization*, Alexander M. Henderson and Talcott Parsons, substituted the word rule for authority.

According to Weber, beliefs in a legitimacy of a political system go beyond philosophy and they directly contribute to the state system stability and authority. All rulers have an explanation for their superiority, an explanation that is commonly accepted during a crisis can be questioned. Weber sees only three categories of legitimation strategies (which he calls "pure types") used to justify the right of rulers to rule:

- Legal authority is based on a system of rules that is applied administratively and judicially in accordance with known principles. The persons who administer those rules are appointed or elected by legal procedures. Superiors are also subject to rules that limit their powers, separate their private lives from official duties and require written documentation.
- Traditional authority is based on a system in which authority is legitimate because it "has always existed". People in power usually enjoy it because they have inherited it. Officials consist either of personal retainers (in a patrimonial regime) or of personal loyal allies, such as vassals or tributary lords (in a feudal regime). Their prerogatives are usually similar to those of the ruler above them, just reduced in scale, and they too are often selected based on inheritance.

- Charismatic authority is based on the charisma of the leader, who shows that he possesses the right to lead by virtue of magical powers, prophecies, heroism, etc. His followers respect his right to lead because of his unique qualities (his charisma), not because of any tradition or legal rules. Officials consist of those who have shown personal devotion to the ruler, and of those who possess their own charisma.

The types of authority change over time, when the ruled are no longer satisfied with the system. For example, after the death of a charismatic leader his followers, if they lack the charisma of their predecessor, will try to institute a system based on tradition or law. On the other hand, these systems can be challenged by the appearance of a new charismatic leader, especially during economic or military crises.

These 'pure types' are almost always found in combination with other 'pure types' — for example, familial charisma (important in kingship and the Indian caste system) is a combination of charismatic and traditional elements, while institutional charisma (existing in all church organizations, but absent from a priesthood that fails to develop such an organization) is a mixture of charismatic and legal elements.

Legitimacy (political)

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

In moral philosophy, the term “legitimacy” often is positively interpreted as the normative status conferred by a governed people upon their governors’ institutions, offices, and actions, based upon the belief that their government's actions are appropriate uses of power by a legally

constituted government. In law, “legitimacy” is distinguished from “legality” (see colour of law), to establish that a government action can be legal whilst not being legitimate, e.g. the Southeast Asia Resolution, Public Law 88-408 (The Gulf of Tonkin Resolution), which allowed the U.S. to war against Vietnam, without a formal declaration of war; a government action can be legitimate without being legal, e.g. a pre-emptive war, a military junta. An example of such matters arises when legitimate institutions clash in a constitutional crisis.

The Enlightenment-era British social theoretician John Locke (1632–1704) said that political legitimacy derives from popular explicit and implicit consent of the governed: “The argument of the [Second] Treatise is that the government is not legitimate unless it is carried on with the consent of the governed.” The German political philosopher Dolf Sternberger said, “Legitimacy is the foundation of such governmental power as is exercised, both with a consciousness on the government’s part that it has a right to govern, and with some recognition by the governed of that right.” The American political sociologist Seymour Martin Lipset said that legitimacy also “involves the capacity of a political system to engender and maintain the belief that existing political institutions are the most appropriate and proper ones for the society.” The American political theorist Robert A. Dahl explained legitimacy as a reservoir; so long as the water is at a given level, political stability is maintained, if it falls below the required level, political legitimacy is endangered.

Types of legitimacy

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

I. Traditional legitimacy derives from societal custom and habit that emphasize the history of the authority of tradition. Traditionalists understand this form of rule as historically accepted, hence its continuity, because it is the way society has always been. Therefore, the institutions of traditional government usually are historically continuous, as in monarchy and tribalism.

II. Charismatic legitimacy derives from the ideas and personal charisma of the leader, a man or woman whose authoritative persona charms and psychologically dominates the people of the society to agreement with the government's régime and rule. A charismatic government usually features weak political and administrative institutions, because they derive authority from the persona of The Leader, and usually disappear without him or her in power. Yet, a government derived from charismatic legitimacy might continue if the charismatic leader has a successor.

III. Rational-legal legitimacy derives from a system of institutional procedure, wherein government institutions establish and enforce law and order in the public interest. Therefore, it is through public trust that the government will abide the law that confers rational-legal legitimacy.^[6]

Forms of legitimacy

Numinous legitimacy

In a theocracy, government legitimacy derives from the spiritual authority of a god or a goddess.

- In Ancient Egypt (ca. 3150 BC) the legitimacy of the dominion of a Pharaoh (god-king) was theologically established by doctrine that posited the pharaoh as the Egyptian patron god Horus, son of Osiris.
- In the Roman Catholic Church, the priesthood derives its legitimacy from a divine source; the Church doctrines establish that the papacy based upon Jesus Christ's designation of St. Peter as head of the earthly church, thus the sanctity and legitimacy of each pope.

Civil legitimacy

The political legitimacy of a civil government derives from agreement among the autonomous constituent institutions —legislative, judicial, executive — combined for the national common good; legitimate government office as a public trust, is expressed by means of public elections.

Sources of legitimacy

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

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

Forms of legitimate government

In determining the political legitimacy of a system of rule and government, the term proper — political legitimacy — is philosophically an essentially contested concept that facilitates understanding the different applications and interpretations of abstract, qualitative, and evaluative concepts such as “Art”, “social justice”, et cetera, as applied in aesthetics, political philosophy, the philosophy of history, and the philosophy of religion. Therefore, in defining the political legitimacy of a system of government and rule, the term “essentially contested concept” indicates that a key term (communism, democracy, constitutionalism, etc.) has different meanings within a given political argument. Hence, the intellectually restrictive politics of dogmatism (“My answer is right, and all others are wrong”), scepticism (“All answers are equally true or [false]; everyone

has a right to his own truth”), and eclecticism (“Each meaning gives a partial view, so the more meanings the better”) are inappropriate philosophic stances for managing a political term that has more than one meaning. (see: (Walter Bryce Gallie)

- Communism — The legitimacy of a Communist state derives from having won a civil war, a revolution, or from having won an election, such as the Presidency of Salvador Allende (1970–73) in Chile; thus, the actions of the Communist government are legitimate, authorised by the people. In the early twentieth century, Communist parties based the arguments supporting the legitimacy of their rule and government upon the scientific nature of Marxism. (see: dialectical materialism)
- Constitutionalism — The modern political concept of constitutionalism establishes the law as supreme over the private will, by integrating nationalism, democracy, and limited government. The political legitimacy of constitutionalism derives from popular belief and acceptance that the actions of the government are legitimate because they abide the law codified in the political constitution. The political scientist Carl Joachim Friedrich (1901–84) said that in dividing political power among the organs of government, constitutional law effectively restrains the actions of the government. (see checks and balances)
- Democracy — In a democracy, government legitimacy derives from the popular perception that the elected government abides democratic principles in governing, and thus is legally accountable to its people.^[11]
- Fascism — In the 1920s and the 1930s, Fascism based its political legitimacy upon the arguments of traditional authority; respectively, the German National Socialists and the Italian Fascists claimed that the political legitimacy of their right to rule derived from philosophically denying the (popular) political legitimacy of elected liberal democratic governments. During the Weimar Republic (1918–33), the political philosopher Carl Schmitt (1888–1985), whose legal work as the “Crown Jurist of the Third Reich” promoted fascism and deconstructed liberal democracy, addressed the matter in *Legalität und Legitimität* (Legality and Legitimacy, 1932) an anti-democratic polemic treatise that asked: How can parliamentary government make for law

and legality, when a 49 per cent minority accepts as politically legitimate the political will of a 51 per cent majority?

- Monarchy — In a monarchy, the divine right of kings establishes the political legitimacy of the rule of the Monarch (King or Queen); legitimacy also derives from the popular perception (tradition and custom) and acceptance of him or her as the rightful ruler of nation and country. Contemporarily, such divine-right legitimacy is manifest in the absolute monarchy of the House of Saud (est. 1744), a royal family who have ruled and governed Saudi Arabia since the 18th century. Moreover, constitutional monarchy is a variant form, of monarchic political legitimacy, which combines traditional authority and legal-rational authority, by which means the monarch maintains nationalist unity (one people) and democratic administration (a political constitution).

“The lesson content has been compiled from various sources in public domain including but not limited to the internet for the convenience of the users. The university has no proprietary right on the same.”



9, Km Milestone, NH-65, Kaithal - 136027, Haryana
Website: www.niilmuniversity.in