

# CONTEMPORARY DEBATES IN POLITICAL THEORY



ଦୂରନିରନ୍ତର ଶିକ୍ଷା ନିର୍ଦ୍ଦେଶାଳୟ, ଉତ୍କଳ ବିଶ୍ୱବିଦ୍ୟାଳୟ

DIRECTORATE OF DISTANCE & CONTINUING EDUCATION

Utkal University, Bhubaneswar-7, Odisha

Email: [helpline@ddceutkal.ac.in](mailto:helpline@ddceutkal.ac.in)

Website: [www.ddceutkal.ac.in](http://www.ddceutkal.ac.in)



# CONTEMPORARY DEBATES IN POLITICAL THEORY



UTKAL UNIVERSITY

NAAC ACCREDITED A+

DDCE

Education for all

ଦୂରନିରନ୍ତର ଶିକ୍ଷା ନିର୍ଦ୍ଦେଶାଳୟ, ଉତ୍କଳ ବିଶ୍ୱବିଦ୍ୟାଳୟ

DIRECTORATE OF DISTANCE & CONTINUING EDUCATION

Utkal University, Bhubaneswar-7, Odisha

Email: [helpline@ddceutkal.ac.in](mailto:helpline@ddceutkal.ac.in)

Website: [www.ddceutkal.ac.in](http://www.ddceutkal.ac.in)



© Directorate of Distance & Continuing Education, Utkal University, Vanl Vihar, Bhubaneswar-751007  
The study material is developed exclusively for the use of the students admitted under DDCE, Utkal University.

Name of the Study Material: Contemporary Debates in Political Theory

ISBN : 978-93-5338-042-7

**Authors:**

Biswaranjan Mohanty: Units (1.4.1, Unit 3, 4.2-4.4)

Firdous Azmat Siddiqui: Unit (2.2)

Vikas Publishing House: Units (1.0-1.4, 1.5-1.9, 2.0-2.1, 2.3-2.8, 4.0-4.1, 4.5-4.11)

Year of Print: 2020

No. of Copies: 320

**Printed and Published by:**

VIKAS® PUBLISHING HOUSE PVT LTD

E-28, Sector-8, Noida - 201301 (UP)

Phone: 0120-4078900 • Fax: 0120-4078999

Regd. Office: A-27, 2nd Floor, Mohan Co-operative Industrial Estate, New Delhi 1100 44

Website: [www.vikaspublishing.com](http://www.vikaspublishing.com) • Email: [helpline@vikaspublishing.com](mailto:helpline@vikaspublishing.com)

For:

**Directorate of Distance & Continuing Education**

Utkal University, Bhubaneswar - 751007

[www.ddceutkal.ac.in](http://www.ddceutkal.ac.in)





**D.D.C.E.**

Education for All

### ABOUT THE UNIVERSITY

Founded in 1943, Utkal University is the 17th University of the country and the first of Orissa. It is the result of the efforts of Pandit Nilakantha Dash, Maharaja Krushna Chandra Gajapati, Pandit Godavarish Mishra and many others who envisioned a progressive education system for modern Orissa.

The University started functioning on 27 November 1943, at Ravenshaw College, Cuttack. It originated as an affiliating and examining body but shifted to its present campus spread over 400 acres of land at Vanivihar in Bhubaneswar, in 1962.

A number of Postgraduate Departments and other centres were established in the University campus. There are presently more than two hundred general affiliated colleges under the University. It has eleven autonomous colleges under its jurisdiction, twenty-eight constituent postgraduate departments, 2 constituent law colleges and a Directorate of Distance & Continuing Education. It boasts of a centre for Population Studies, a School of Women's Studies, an Academic Staff College, a pre-school and a high school. The University also offers a number of self-financing courses.

NAAC accredited since 2003, with B++ status and a score little over 80%, Utkal University is recognized by the UGC. It is a member of the Indian Association of Universities and the Commonwealth Association of Universities.



**DIRECTORATE OF DISTANCE & CONTINUING EDUCATION**  
**UTKAL UNIVERSITY : VANI VIHAR**  
**BHUBANESWAR:-751007.**

**From the Director's Desk**

The Directorate of Distance & Continuing Education, originally established as the University Evening College way back in 1962 has travelled a long way in the last 52 years. **'EDUCATION FOR ALL'** is our motto. Increasingly the Open and Distance Learning institutions are aspiring to provide education for anyone, anytime and anywhere. DDCE, Utkal University has been constantly striving to rise up to the challenges of Open Distance Learning system. Nearly one lakh students have passed through the portals of this great temple of learning. We may not have numerous great tales of outstanding academic achievements but we have great tales of success in life, of recovering lost opportunities, tremendous satisfaction in life, turning points in career and those who feel that without us they would not be where they are today. There are also flashes when our students figure in best ten in their honours subjects. Our students must be free from despair and negative attitude. They must be enthusiastic, full of energy and confident of their future. To meet the needs of quality enhancement and to address the quality concerns of our stake holders over the years, we are switching over to self instructional material printed courseware. We are sure that students would go beyond the course ware provided by us. We are aware that most of you are working and have also family responsibility. Please remember that only a busy person has time for everything and a lazy person has none. We are sure, that you will be able to chalk out a well planned programme to study the courseware. By choosing to pursue a course in distance mode, you have made a commitment for self improvement and acquiring higher educational qualification. You should rise up to your commitment. Every student must go beyond the standard books and self instructional course material. You should read number of books and use ICT learning resources like the internet, television and radio programmes etc. As only limited number of classes will be held, a student should come to the personal contact programme well prepared. The PCP should be used for clarification of doubt and counseling. This can only happen if you read the course material before PCP. You can always mail your feedback on the course ware to us. It is very important that one should discuss the contents of the course materials with other fellow learners.

We wish you happy reading.

**DIRECTOR**



---

# SYLLABI-BOOK MAPPING TABLE

## Contemporary Debates in Political Theory

---

Syllabi	Mapping in Book
<b>Unit I</b> Theories of the 20th Century	<b>Unit-1:</b> Theories of the 20th Century
<b>Unit II</b> Feminism; Environmentalism	<b>Unit-2:</b> Feminism and Environmentalism
<b>Unit III</b> Role of Ideology; End of Ideology	<b>Unit-3:</b> The Concept of Ideology and End of Ideology Debate
<b>Unit IV</b> Theories of Change: Lenin, Mao and Gandhi, Communitarianism, Multiculturalism	<b>Unit-4:</b> Theories of Transformation

---



---

# CONTENTS

---

## INTRODUCTION

1

## UNIT 1 THEORIES OF THE 20TH CENTURY

3-26

- 1.0 Introduction
- 1.1 Unit Objectives
- 1.2 Fascism
  - 1.2.1 Italy towards a Totalitarian State
  - 1.2.2 Nazism
- 1.3 Neo-Marxism
  - 1.3.1 Dependency Theories
  - 1.3.2 World Systems Theory
- 1.4 Modernism and Postmodernism
  - 1.4.1 Impact of Postmodernism on Political Theory
- 1.5 Summary
- 1.6 Key Terms
- 1.7 Answers to 'Check Your Progress'
- 1.8 Questions and Exercises
- 1.9 Further Reading

## UNIT 2 FEMINISM AND ENVIRONMENTALISM

27-48

- 2.0 Introduction
- 2.1 Unit Objectives
- 2.2 Feminism
  - 2.2.1 Theories of Feminism
- 2.3 Environmentalism
  - 2.3.1 Why are Environmental Issues a Global Concern?
  - 2.3.2 Major Environmental Problems
  - 2.3.3 Responses to Environmental Problems
- 2.4 Summary
- 2.5 Key Terms
- 2.6 Answers to 'Check Your Progress'
- 2.7 Questions and Exercises
- 2.8 Further Reading

## UNIT 3 THE CONCEPT OF IDEOLOGY AND END OF IDEOLOGY DEBATE

49-56

- 3.0 Introduction
- 3.1 Unit Objectives
- 3.2 Concept of Ideology
- 3.3 Debate on the End of Ideology Theory
- 3.4 Summary
- 3.5 Key Terms
- 3.6 Answers to 'Check Your Progress'
- 3.7 Questions and Exercises
- 3.8 Further Reading

## UNIT 4 THEORIES OF TRANSFORMATION

57-97

- 4.0 Introduction
- 4.1 Unit Objectives
- 4.2 Lenin
  - 4.2.1 Conditions for Successful Working of Socialism

- 4.3 Mao
  - 4.3.1 Background of History: Struggle for Socialism
  - 4.3.2 Essence of New Democracy or Socialism
  - 4.3.3 Economy of New Democracy or New Socialism
  - 4.3.4 Contradicting the Die Hards
  - 4.3.5 Mao's Hundred Flowers Policy
  - 4.3.6 Culture of New Socialism or Democracy
- 4.4 Gandhian Thoughts on State Policy
  - 4.4.1 Welfare Concept of the State
  - 4.4.2 Gandhi on Democracy
- 4.5 Communitarianism
- 4.6 Multiculturalism
- 4.7 Summary
- 4.8 Key Terms
- 4.9 Answers to 'Check Your Progress'
- 4.10 Question and Exercise
- 4.11 Further Reading



---

## INTRODUCTION

---

Introduction

### NOTES

Politics is about government, its control and its work. Political theory has aimed at settling the issues of government, the rights of the people and the powers of the elite. Since the days of Plato and Aristotle several issues have been debated in political theory. In the recent period, since the 19th century, humanity has come to the centre of the debate. More than abstract principles, concrete issues of human society are being discussed by political thinkers of different countries.

This book, *Contemporary Debates in Political Theory*, evaluates the theories forwarded by a new brand of followers of Marx, called the neo-Marxist and goes on till Mao in China and Gandhi in India. The book also studies the contemporary ideologies of feminism, multiculturalism and environmentalism. The book also looks into the Nazi and fascist ideologies.

This book is written for you, the distance learning students. It is presented in a user-friendly format with clear, lucid language. Each Unit contains an *Introduction* and a list of *Unit Objectives* to prepare the student for what to expect in the text. At the end of each unit is a list of *Key Terms* and a *Summary*, to help you recollect what has been described in the unit. All units contain *Questions and Exercises*, and strategically placed '*Check Your Progress*' questions so the student can keep track of what has been learned.

## UNIT-1 THEORIES OF THE 20TH CENTURY

Theories of the 20th Century

### Structure

- 1.0 Introduction
- 1.1 Unit Objectives
- 1.2 Fascism
  - 1.2.1 Italy towards a Totalitarian State
  - 1.2.2 Nazism
- 1.3 Neo-Marxism
  - 1.3.1 Dependency Theories
  - 1.3.2 World Systems Theory
- 1.4 Modernism and Postmodernism
  - 1.4.1 Impact of Postmodernism on Political Theory
- 1.5 Summary
- 1.6 Key Terms
- 1.7 Answers to 'Check Your Progress'
- 1.8 Questions and Exercises
- 1.9 Further Reading

### NOTES

### 1.0 INTRODUCTION

In this unit, you will learn about the emergence of Italy as a totalitarian state post-First World War during the reign of Fascist leader Mussolini. You will also study the rise of the Nazi party in Germany and policies of Adolf Hitler. After World War I, new perceptions of Marxism appeared in the field of social theory. This new perception is generally called neo-Marxism. The neo-Marxist ideas will be discussed in detail. Further, the theories of modernism and postmodernism will be discussed in detail.

### 1.1 UNIT OBJECTIVES

After going through this unit, you will be able to:

- Understand the meaning of fascism and how it led to a totalitarian rule in Italy
- Evaluate the ideologies of the neo-Marxists
- Explain the dependency theories and the world system theory
- Discuss modernism and postmodernism

### 1.2 FASCISM

The word 'fascism' was derived from the Latin word *fascio* meaning club. The word also has its roots in the Roman ancient *fascies* meaning a bundle of sticks with an axe protecting them. This emblem was used as a symbol of authority. Some basic characteristics of fascism are as follows:

- Fascism is extremely nationalist in nature
- Fascism has no coherent ideology
- Fascism is against liberalism, democracy, socialism and communism
- For the fascists, state was the almighty based on military strength and controlled by one party and one leader
- Fascism laid emphasis on absolute obedience to the authority
- Fascism did not permit any opposition party to function
- The fascists proclaim the right to regulate all economic, political, social and cultural activities



## NOTES

- They followed a state capitalist economic policy and assured protection of private property rights of industrialists
- Their leader was called the 'Il Duce' (the leader) who would have no opposition to its party to its flag and to itself
- The fascist considered it an important task of their government to form public opinion by propaganda
- They formed an association named ADITI of young volunteers drawn mostly from the middle class and universities. The members of ADITI were trained commandos who were used to break up meetings of the socialists

Later, the responsibility of the ADITI volunteers were entrusted upon black shirted commandos called *Squadristi*.

Mussolini was an Italian politician and leader of the National Fascist Party, ruling the country as Prime Minister from 1922 until his ousting in 1943. Initially, Mussolini joined the Socialist Party, but left the party when the First World War broke out and became an ardent nationalist. After the War, he tried to regain entry into the Socialist Party, but since a majority of Italian socialists were against him, Mussolini's could not re-join the party.

Dejected, Mussolini became an anti-socialist and in 1919 formed a group called 'Fasico de Combatimento' i.e., combatant group. He enlisted the support of a growing number of army officers, soldiers, nationalists, property owners and youthful intellectuals for his movement which came to be known as Fascism. Within a year, Mussolini's fascist group became very powerful and influential within the Italian political circle.

Soon after the First World War, Italy witnesses a rise in Marxist influence inspired by the Russian Revolution. In the election of 1921, the Socialist could win only 122 seats as against 156 held by them. The Communists, in their maiden attempt, won 16 seats, but it was the fascists who obtained 35 seats. The liberals were reduced to a minority in the Italian parliament and their prime minister resigned. This gave more strength to the fascist power which seemed to be rising slowly. These paved the way for the growth of fascism in Italy.

The fascist adopted an anti-socialist attitude and ridiculed the liberals, and also opposed the business class. The political turmoil in the country gave Mussolini the opportunity he was waiting for as the ruling liberals ceased to be a prominent force in Italy. However, the results of the election of 1921 emboldened Mussolini and his *Squadristi* the dream of ruling the country.

By 1922, fascist clubs were set up all over the country which recruited unemployed soldiers and youth. It was financially supported by industrialists, landowners, merchant community and all section of the Italian public whose life and property were endangered. By then, the fascist activity against the people who opposed them had intensified. When the socialists called for a strike in 1922, the fascist supporters ensured its failure. Mussolini's *Squadristi* and ADITI broke the socialist rallies and led to a labour unrest. There was very little that the government could do to prevent the civil war situation that had been created due to the tussle between the socialists and the fascists. Taking full advantage of the prevailing discontent in the country, Mussolini organized a march to Rome, where the King, Victor Emmanuel III, terrified by this action, dismissed his Prime Minister, Luigi Facta, and invited Benito Mussolini to form the government. On 30 October 1922, Mussolini came to power in a constitutional manner. Having won

## NOTES

over the industrialists, Mussolini began to make conciliatory speeches about the Roman Catholic Church which he had earlier criticized. Seeing him as a good anti-communist weapon, even Pope Pius XI swung the Church into line behind Mussolini. When Mussolini announced that he had dropped the Republican part of his programme in 1922, even the King began to look more favourably towards the fascists. The anti-fascist forces, on the other hand, failed to cooperate with each other and made no determined effort to drive the Fascists out from Italy.

### 1.2.1 Italy towards a Totalitarian State

The initial actions and working of Mussolini's government paved the way towards a totalitarian state in Italy. He tried to construct a strong nation but through rigorous totalitarian policies. Mussolini's government conducted elections in 1924 to the Chamber of Deputy and managed to get a massive majority of two-third seats. This marked the end of Constitutionalism and beginning of fascism in Italy. Soon after its victory, the Fascist Party let loose a reign of terror on the opposition. The opposition leaders were kidnapped and murdered. By a series of law in 1925, the parliamentary government was scrapped in Italy and Mussolini was given dictatorial powers. The political structure of Italy was that of a totalitarian state.

The characteristics of Italy as a totalitarian state were as follows:

- Absolute power was vested in one person—the 'leader' i.e., the *Duce of Fascism*.
- The *Duce* emerged as the dominant figure in the totalitarian regime. He presided over the Fascist Grand Council which had the power and responsibility of choosing and appointing members of the legislatures and determining the scope of the legislative body.
- All recognized associations were placed under supervision of the Fascist Party, and the network of spies facilitated a curb on the freedom of expression.
- The democratic elections of the Chamber of the Deputies was discontinued, also the jury system was abolished in the court of law.
- The system of education was changed to suit the needs of Fascism. All textbooks were based on the principles and aims of Fascism—an attempt to instill these principles in the minds of the generations to come.
- Between 1925 and 1928, Mussolini's government enacted several laws that destroyed the political democracy as previously practiced in the country.
- The administration was centralized and Mussolini became the supreme head of the state—put above the law and parliament.

Though the Second World War started in September 1939, Italy remained neutral in the initial phase. Its plan was to attack when the Allies were almost exhausted, because that would save Italy from the destruction of the War and would entitle it to share in the spoils of victory. In 1940, when France was on the verge of collapse, Italy declared war against Britain and France. It formally joined the Triple Alliance with Germany and Japan on 27 September 1940. Italy declared war against Russia in June 1941 and against USA in December 1941. However, after 1942, the course of war changed and the defeat of Italy became imminent, due to continuous defeats and internal economic crisis. In 1943, Mussolini was arrested but later the German army freed Mussolini and put him back into power. But, when the Allies attacked North Italy in 1945, Italy unconditionally surrendered to the Allies. This marked the fall of Fascist Italy.



### 1.2.2 Nazism

#### NOTES

The First World War ended disastrously for Germany. The collapse of Germany led to political turmoil in the country. Kaiser Wilhelm II, the last German Emperor, was held responsible for the debacle of the German army and the miseries of the people. A countrywide anti-monarchist revolution compelled Kaiser to abdicate his throne. To take shelter, he fled with his family to Holland. With his abdication, a Provisional Democratic Government was established under the socialist leadership of Elbert and Schidemann to manage the affairs of the state simultaneously. The Provisional Democratic Government conducted elections on the basis of adult franchise to elect members to the Democratic National Assembly. The Assembly was entrusted with the responsibility of drafting a Democratic Constitution for the German Republic. The Constituent Assembly met at Weimer on 6 February 1919 because Berlin was still torn by political unrest and drafted a new Constitution. This Constitution came into effect on 11 August 1919 and was known as the 'Weimer Constitution'.

The Weimer Republic, which bridged the years between the Hohenzollerns and the Nazis, had a number of outstanding achievements to its credit. Due to the introduction of the Dawes Plan in 1924, Germany witnessed unprecedented prosperity in all sectors. Industrial production recorded an enormous increase. Huge foreign contribution and aid enabled Germany to re-establish the currency and rationalization of its industrial and business life. The establishment of branches of the foreign firms in Germany not only led to the utilization of the German raw materials but also provided employment to the massive unemployed German labourers.

In the sphere of foreign policy, Germany, during this period pursued three aims: (i) to induce the Allies to evacuate areas of Germany, which they had occupied; (ii) to restore the sovereignty of the Reich, and recovery of Danzig and the frontier in Upper Silesia; and (iii) settlement of the reparation problems to strengthen Germany's capacity. Through these aims, Germany wanted to make her own decisions. For the achievement of the above mentioned objectives, Germany signed the Locarno Treaties, by which her frontiers with France were settled. Germany concluded the Treaty of Rapallo with Soviet Union in 1922, by which both the states renounced their respective demand against each other and agreed to cooperate in the commercial sphere. In 1926, Germany was admitted to the League of Nations council with a semi-permanent seat.

She succeeded in getting a promise of withdrawal of foreign troops from the Ruhr in 1924 and the valley was freed in 1930. Germany convinced Great Britain, France and Belgium to withdraw their troops from the Rhineland region. The problem of reparation was also largely settled by the Young Plan. In 1932, the Lausanne Conference further cut down Germany's obligations of reparation to \$750 million. During the Weimer rule, Germany again began to rearm itself after the economic and diplomatic revival.

Till the first part of 1930 the economic revival of Germany continued and in 1931, when Economic Depression was at its worst, Germany was spending \$700 million on arms. Despite all these achievements, the Germans, especially the younger generation, was not happy with the Republican government and continued to nourish ambitions for a powerful Germany. The attempt on the part of officials to denigrate the ideals and heroes of imperial Germany also greatly irritated young students, above all, people were not happy with the way the democratic parliamentary system was functioning in the country. The people still remembered the days when order and discipline prevailed in the Reichstag which was in sharp contrast to the bickering and quarrel going on in

the lower house of the Reichstag, and they felt that only a strong man could restore prosperity and prestige to Germany.

### ***Formation of the Nazi Party***

Hitler and his associates formed the Nazi Party in 1920 after the end of the First World War. In the same year, the party announced the Twenty-five Point Programme, which emphasized the need of scraping the Treaty of Versailles which had been imposed on Germany, establishment of vast German empire after bringing back the lost colonies of Germany, increase in the military power of the country, non-recognition of Jews as German citizens and their removal from all important positions, ban on the entry of foreigners into Germany, imposition of ban on parties which propagated against nationalism, opposition to communism and opposition to the Parliamentary system of government which was detrimental to the interest of the country.

In the economic sphere, the party stood for increasing incomes, limitation of profits from wholesale enterprise, land reforms, nationalization of all trusts, departmental stores and ban on land speculation. Similarly, in the social sphere, the party favoured old age and maternity benefits, reorganization of higher education and government control of press. It may be noted, that apart from the so-called Twenty-five Point Programme, the Nazis did not possess any positive philosophy. However, by demagogic appeals to latent emotions, fear of communism and resentment against the Treaty of Versailles, the party soon gained considerable recognition among the lower-middle classes who as a result of widespread unemployment and extreme frustration sympathized with the Nazis.

The Nazi party was to have its own army. The army constituted two types of members; one who wore the brown shirt and the other wore the black shirt. The members of the army were recruited from ex-soldiers, veterans and hoodlums, and took part in all types of demonstrations. They were expected to disturb the meetings of other parties and ensure that their party meetings were not disturbed. The Nazi party also started its own paper entitled *Radical Observer*, which awakened the emotions of common people against Communism and the Treaty of Versailles. The extreme nationalists, who could never reconcile themselves to Germany's defeat, firmly supported the ideology of the Nazi Party.

### ***Rise of Adolf Hitler***

The leader of the Nazi Party and the Nazi movement in Germany, Adolf Hitler, was an Austrian citizen. He began his career as a political agitator after the First World War. Before embarking on a political career in September 1919 at the age of 30, Adolf Hitler had been an insignificant person in Germany. Hitler had no formal qualifications, and he was an aimless drifter and a failed artist before joining the army on the outbreak of war in August 1914. In the army he was not considered worthy of promotion as there was 'a lack of leadership qualities', although his award of the Iron Cross First Class proved that he was very courageous. He succeeded in gaining and exercising supreme power in Germany during the next 26 years and, in the process, arguably left more impact on world's history in the twentieth century than any other political figure. 'The explanation for this remarkable transformation rested partly on Hitler himself, in his particular personal qualities and gifts, and partly in the situation in which he found himself, with a nation in deep crisis'.

In 1920, Hitler joined the German workers party, the National Socialist German Worker's Party, popularly known as the Nazi Party. Hitler's skills for publicity and as

### **NOTES**



## NOTES

a speaker gradually popularized the Nazi Party. Soon Hitler succeeded in ousting the leader of the party, Drexler, and assumed supreme power over the party. In 1923, he attempted to overthrow the Bavarian government at a coup but this attempt was unsuccessful. During his trial he made the remark, 'There is no such thing as high treason against the traitors of 1918', which attracted much attention. He was sentenced to five years imprisonment, but was actually released after nine months in prison. During his imprisonment, Hitler wrote his autobiography, *Mein Kampf* for 'My Struggle' in which he repudiated the parliamentary practice of majority rule and foreshadowed the future programme of Germany's territorial ambitions. According to Hitler, there were easy solutions to the complex problems which the people of Germany faced in the 1920s. He blamed Germany's weak government and stated that Germany lost the war because of 'a stab in the back'. He further argued that if pure Germans who were also known as Aryans controlled Germany's destiny, it would return to greatness. Hitler blamed the Jews for many of Germany's problems.

The Nazi party participated in the elections of 1924, but the number of its supporters fell considerably. In 1925, Hitler rebuilt the Nazi Party, and decided that he had to obtain power by democratic means rather than by force. The Great Economic Depression of 1929 hit Germany hard. Hitler used this situation and blamed the Jews and Communists, using them as scapegoats to gain support for himself. Hitler spoke in a charismatic style that impressed the people of Germany. He blamed outsiders for causing troubles within the nation. Due to his charisma, the popularity of the Nazi party started increasing. In the election of 1932, the Nazi Party captured 230 of 608 seats in the Reichstag. However, Hitler was restless to capture power. In 1932, he contested the presidential elections but lost to Hindenburg by a narrow margin. During the primary part of the 1930s, the Nazi movement had grown quite powerful in Germany.

In early 1933, Hindenburg dismissed his Chancellor Schleicher and he was succeeded by Hitler as the chancellor by forming a coalition with the Nationalists and others. Hitler dissolved the Reichstag and ordered for a fresh election on 5 March 1933. The Nazis, now in power, were able to use all the apparatus/devices of the state, including the press and radio to try to whip up a majority. Senior police officials were replaced with reliable Nazis and the second private army got instructions to show no mercy to the Communists and other enemies of the state. Six days before the ballot, the Reichstag building was burnt, Hitler accused the Communists of arson and bloody revolution.

He ordered the arrest of thousands of Communists and Social Democrats and suppressed the campaign activities of the anti-Nazi parties. The Nazi party was able to secure 44 per cent of the votes polled. The Nazis won 288 out of the 647 seats, 36 short of the magic figure for majority. The Nationalists again won 52 seats. This turned out to be the best performance of the Nazis in a free election, though they never won an overall majority.<sup>2</sup> However, Hitler managed a majority in Reichstag by putting all Communist deputies in prison. Within hundred days, all opposition was suppressed. In August 1934, Hindenburg died and Hitler became the president of Germany and by the Enabling Act of 1933, he attained dictatorial powers.

For millions of Germans, the feeling of insecurity and instability of Weimar was replaced by a sense of normality and strong leadership, and for rest of the world, this was the violence and injustice of the Nazi regime or period. The rise of Nazi Germany and the aggressive policies pursued by it encouraged the growth of revisionist sentiments that strengthened the status quo. This led to a division of the world in two hostile camps, which ultimately culminated in the Second World War.

**CHECK YOUR PROGRESS**

1. State the origin of the word fascism.
2. What is ADITI?
3. When did Mussolini set up Fascio de Combattimento?
4. In which year did the Weimar Constitution come into effect?
5. When was Germany admitted to the League of Nations?
6. Name the autobiography of Hitler.

**NOTES****1.3 NEO-MARXISM**

The development of neo-Marxism came forth through several political and social problems which traditional Marxist thought was unable to answer. Examples to this were: Why socialist and social-democratic political parties did not band together against World War I, but instead supported their own nations' entrance into the great war? Why, although the timing seemed to be right for a workers revolution in the West, no large scale revolutions occurred? Also how at this time the rise of Fascism could occur in Europe. All these questions led to internal problems within Marxist theory which caused renewed study and reanalysis of Marx's works to begin. There is no formal neo-Marxist organization and seldom do people call themselves neo-Marxists, so it is difficult to describe who belongs to this movement. Also there is no set definition as to what a neo-Marxist is, which makes grouping and categorizing this idea even more difficult.

One idea that many 'branches' of neo-Marxism share is the desire to move away from the idea of a bloody revolution to one of a more peaceful nature, moving away from the violence of the red revolutions of the past while keeping the revolutionary message. Neo-Marxist concepts can also follow an economic theory that attempts to move away from the traditional accusations of class warfare and create new economic theory models, such as Hans Jurgen Krahel did.

Several important advances to neo-Marxism came after World War I from Georg Lukács, Karl Korsch and Antonio Gramsci. From the Institute of Social Research founded in 1923 at the University of Frankfurt am Main, grew one of the most important schools of neo-Marxist interdisciplinary social theory, the Frankfurt School. Its founders, Max Horkheimer and Theodor W. Adorno, whose critical theories had great influence on Marxist theory, especially after their exile to New York, after the rise of National Socialism in 1933.

Other ambitious attempts to provide a holistic overview of political economy include Perry Anderson's *Passages from Antiquity to Feudalism* and *Lineages of the Absolute State*; in them Anderson delved into questions relevant to feudalism and capitalism as Europe emerged from the Middle Ages. Immanuel Wallerstein in *The Modern World-System* dated the modern world system from the sixteenth century but saw four periods in its evolution: origins (1450-1640), Mercantile consolidation (1640-1815), industrial expansion (1815-1917), and the contemporary capitalist world (1917-present). Wallerstein elaborated and refined Andre Gunder Frank's theory of capitalist development of underdevelopment and emphasized market relations. Robert Brenner took both thinkers to task for locating their analysis of the origins of capitalism in market processes identified in the work of Adam Smith.



## NOTES

Contemporary Marxist thought, better known as neo-Marxism, has developed in two directions: *humanist* and *scientific*. The humanist strain of neo-Marxism draws particularly on the work of the young Marx and constitutes the main stream of critical theory. Its dominant themes are the problems of alienation and wage to human emancipation. Herbert Marcuss has brilliantly portrayed the conditions of alienation in bourgeois societies which have reduced the human being to 'one-dimensional man'. He has stated that capitalism has cunningly anaesthetized the discontent of the oppressed by manipulating the means of communication so as to stimulate trivial material desires which are easily satisfied. Marcus has argued that human beings should first be made aware of their condition of on freedom, where after they will easily find their way to freedom. On the other hand, the scientific strain of neo-Marxism is primarily concerned with its scientific and explanatory character. It was particularly interested in structures as well as relative importance of cultural, ideological and social factors. Thus, Louis Althusser, a French communist and philosopher, challenged the humanist themes of Marxist thinking in the early 1960s and asserted the importance of analysing the deep structure of human societies – especially their mode of production.

Neo-Marxists have given their own view on development. When it comes to deciding appropriate path of development for the present day developing countries,

Marxist and New-Marxist writers have argued that capitalist path will not suit them. The situation prevailing in these countries is basically different from that where the Western countries started their development. Thus, Paul Baran (*The Political Economy of Growth*; 1957) observed that the advanced capitalist countries of today had managed accumulation of capital by exploiting their colonial territories. The present day developing countries have no access to such resources. Capitalists of the developing countries are incapable of developing the forces of production. Hence, capitalist path would hardly promote their progress.

Four thinkers—Mandel, Amin, Anderson, and Wallerstein – among others have rekindled an interest in the history of political economy. However imperfect their work may be, it orients us toward old and new questions neglected by some of the contemporary work in economics and political science. All four drew heavily on foundation of Marxist thought. Their work also helps to transcend some of the problems found in many theories of development and underdevelopment.

### 1.3.1 Dependency Theories

There are various types of approaches for the theories of dependency. They are broadly divided into two categories: non-Marxist and Marxist approaches. Marxists are seeking to influence radical bourgeois reformers and have frequently utilized the bourgeois social science concept. Marxists who have opposed such an approach have associated that *dependentistas* were Marxist because of a common opposition to foreign penetration.

Dependency theory developed in the late 1950s. The theory is concerned with how developing countries are dependent on developed countries.

Dependency theories became quite popular during the 1970s and 1980s. Unlike the realist and liberal theories which are largely America and Europe centred, the dependency theories largely came from the Latin American scholars. The dependency theories provided a strong critical stream to the largely dominating liberal or realist paradigms in the discipline.



## NOTES

The theories of dependency reveal the contrasting forms of dominance and dependence among the nations of the capitalist world. Capitalism can be a progressive or regressive force. According to Dos Santos, the Brazilian social scientist: 'By dependence we mean a situation in which the economy of certain countries is cautioned by the development and expansion of an economy to which the former is subjected. The relation of inter-dependence between two or more economies, and between these and world trade, assumes the form of dependence when some countries (the dominant ones) can do this only as a reflection of that expansion, which can have either a positive or a negative effect on their immediate development.' (Dos Santos 1970: 231).

In the analysis of development and underdevelopment the dependency theory focuses on the problem of foreign penetration into the political economies of the Third World. Outside economic and political affect local development and reinforce after local development and reinforce ruling classes at the expense of the marginal classes. According to Osvaldo Sunkel: 'Foreign factors are seen not as external but as intrinsic to the system, with manifold and sometimes hidden or subtle political, financial, economic, technical and cultural effects inside the underdeveloped country.... Thus the concept of 'dependencia' links the postwar evolution of capitalism internationally to the discriminatory nature of the local process of development, as we know it. Access to the means and benefits of development are selective; rather than spreading them, the process tends to ensure a self-reinforcing accumulation of privilege for special groups for special groups as well as the continued existence of a marginal class.' (Sunkel 1972: 510)

Despite these definitions of dependency there is no consensus on the theory, i.e., what brings dependency amongst the states. There are various theories of dependency given by Fernando Hnerique Cardoso, Clair Savit Bacha, Philip J. O'Brien, and Ronald H Chilcote.

According to Cardoso, three tendencies can be identified in dependency theories. First was the notion of autonomous national development. This became very popular in Brazil in response to the prevailing belief that development would occur through the growing volume of export of various goods or through foreign investment. Within this there were three broad alternatives: dependency, autonomy and revolution.

According to him, in order to eliminate dependency, autonomy and revolution can be very useful strategies. The second tendency is an analysis of international capitalism in a monopolistic manner. This aspect was later on highlighted by Paul Baran and Paul Seezy and Harry Magdoff. However, finally there is a dependency literature which focuses on the structural aspect of it. Cardoso himself claimed to be a part of this stream. This stream examined the structural process of dependency in terms of class relations.

Bacha on the other hand identified five concepts of dependency. The first was to distinguish development from under-development by analyzing center and periphery as interdependent parts of a worldwide capitalist system. The second conception dates to Lenin's works on imperialism. It is in this conception that dependentistas find the underpinnings of their theory.

A third wave was of the scholars like Andre Gunder Frank who analyzed the metropolis-satellite structure and the internal contradictions of the capitalist system. A fourth perspective came from Dos Santos who developed what is called *new dependency*. This was also known as technical industrial dependence. In contrast to the colonial dependency based on trade export and financial-industrial dependency, and characterized by the domination of big capital in the hegemonic centers at the end

## NOTES

of the nineteenth century, the new dependency is a new phenomenon, based on multinational corporations, which after the Second World War invested in industries geared to the internal markets of the underdeveloped countries.

### ***Structuralist Approaches to Dependency***

Since colonial times, Latin America has been dependent on exports of raw materials and agricultural commodities in its pursuit of development. But this strategy faced a serious setback after the decline in exports during the depression of the 1930s. Consequently, these countries decided to adopt an inward development strategy. Under this strategy, planning and state control were given dominant positions. The main actors in this exercise were petty bourgeoisie and industrial bourgeoisie. This approach was known as ECLA approach. This approach connected the underdevelopment of Latin America with the international economic systems. Osvaldo Sunkel and Celso Furtado elaborated upon the ECLA approach. He examined the inequalities in Brazil throughout historical periods tracing the shifts of major economic activity and production from the North-east to the center-South region where the capital city is established.

### ***Dependent Capitalist Development***

Fernando Henrique Cardoso contended the idea that capitalism promotes underdevelopment. On the contrary he argued that capitalist development can occur in dependent situations. He believed that dependent capitalist development has become a new form of monopolistic expansion in the Third World. This development benefits all classes associated with international capital, including the local agrarian, commercial, financial and industrial bourgeoisie and even the working class involved in the international sector.

### ***Monopoly Capitalism***

This theory was developed by Lenin in his theory of imperialism. He said in his theory of imperialism that in the monopoly stage of capitalism; in which the bank capital was combined with the capital of monopoly industrialists. Lenin called this as a merger of finance capital under a financial oligarchy. Today such a merger would be represented by the multinational corporations.

Baran and Sweezy also developed this theme further. They credited Lenin with advancing the Marxist theory from an analysis of capitalism based on an autonomous assumption of a competitive economy, generality of small farms, to the promotion that imperialism constitutes a monopoly stage of capitalism composed of large scale industries. They examined the US in the light of this approach. But their work is also a foundation stone for understanding the external impact of monopoly capitalism of the center exerts upon the peripheral nations of the world.

### ***Development, Structuralist, Nationalist, Autonomous Development***

The establishment of international financial institutions helped ensure the hegemony of dominant nations over dependent ones, and the establishment of aid programmes. The United States was to serve as benefactor to rid the backward world of underdevelopment and to diffuse civilization everywhere.

Since colonial times, Latin America has been dependent on exports of raw materials and agricultural commodities in its pursuit of development, but this strategy



## NOTES

of outward development was undermined by a decline in export earnings during the depression of the 1930s. Under the ECLA (Economic Council of Latin America) strategy turned to inward development. The new strategy was premised on the achievement of national autonomy through state control and planning of the political economy under the petty bourgeois intelligentsia and the industrial bourgeoisie. Under the modernizing state the bourgeoisie would become progressive and a supporter of national interests as capitalist development diffused itself into rural areas and as economic and political policies restricted the influence of foreign interests.

The ECLA approach was based on anti-imperialist views in that it linked Latin American underdevelopment to the international economic system. Its preference for autonomous capitalist development was echoed by the democratic leftist of social democratic parties. For example, Haya de la Torre of Peru, Romulo Betancourt of Venezuela and Arturo Frondizi of Argentina.

Oswaldo Sunkel and Celso Furtado elaborated upon the ECLA position. Furtado examined the inequalities in Brazil throughout historical periods tracing the shift of major economic activity and production from the North-east to the Centre-South region where Sao Paulo is situated. Sunkel agreed that this transformation of the existing structure was necessary for autonomous growth; he believed that participation of the masses, including the marginal population was essential.

### **Internal Colonialism**

Sunkel alluded to polarization within countries, reminiscent of the theory of internal colonialism proposed by the Mexican sociologist Pablo Gonzalez Casanova (1970). The same condition of traditional colonialism, he argued are found internally in nations today. These conditions include monopoly and dependence (the metropolis dominates isolated communities, creating a deformation of the native economy and decapitalization, relations of production and social control and culture and living standards (subsistence economies, accentuate poverty, backward techniques, low productivity, lack of services). These are the conditions of marginal people who suffer from low levels of education, unemployment and underemployment and lack of nourishment. Such people experience a sense of resignation and fatalism similar to that of colonized people.

### **Poles of Development**

A derivation of internal colonialism is the theory of poles of development first given by French economist Francois Perroux (1968) and elaborated by Brazilian geographer Manuel Correia de Andrade (1967). Andrade was concerned especially with unequal development, which he believed was evident between nations as well as between regions within a single country. The experience in capitalist nations in areas of natural resources and in socialist nations of planned industrial centres served as the basis for a poles-of-development theory.

This theory believes that underdeveloped economies are characterized by a lack of infrastructure in transportation and communication by a dual economy, with advanced areas existing alongside subsistence ones, and by dependence upon external decisions that pertain to the production of products.

### **Sub-imperialism**

This theory was propounded by Ruy Mauro Marini in the context of Brazilian capitalist development. He characterized Brazilian development as super exploitative, with a

## NOTES

rapid accumulation of capital benefitting the owners of the means of production and an absolute poverty accruing to the masses. With the diminution of the internal consumer market and a related decline in surplus, the Brazilian economy reached an impasse in 1964. At the time the military regime initiated its sub-imperialist scheme on two fronts: first, to further exploit mass consumption and second, to penetrate foreign markets.

### *New Dependency*

Theotonio Dos Santos took exception to Frank's emphasis on surplus extraction as the principle cause of underdevelopment. The process under consideration, rather than being one of satellization as Frank believes, is a case of the formation of a certain type of internal structure conditioned by internal relationships of dependence (P.O'Brien 1975: 71).

Dos Santos outlined several types of dependencies. Colonial dependency characterized relationship between Europeans and the colonies by which a monopoly of trade complemented a monopoly of land, mines, and manpower in the colonized countries.

Financial industrial dependency consolidated itself at the end of the nineteenth century with, on the one hand, a domination of capital by the hegemonic centres and, on the other the investment of capital in the peripheral colonies for raw material and agricultural products, which in turn would be consumed by the centres.

The new dependency which emerged after the Second World War was based on investments by multinational corporations. The theory of the new dependency is elaborated in Dos Santos's writings.

The new dependency theory understands industrial development to be dependent on exports, which generate foreign currency to buy imported capital goods. Exports are usually tied to the traditional sectors of an economy, which are controlled by the landed bourgeoisie and which in turn, are tied to the foreign capital.

The theory of new dependency attempts to demonstrate that the relationship of dependent countries to dominant countries cannot be altered without a change in internal structure and external relations. Further the structure of dependency deepens, leads dependent countries to underdevelopment, and aggravates the problems of the people as those countries conform to international and internal structure strongly influenced by the role of multinational corporations as well as by the international commodity and capital markets.

### CHECK YOUR PROGRESS

7. What do you understand by neo-Marxism?
8. Name some of the neo-Marxists.
9. What are the three tendencies in dependency theories according to Fernando Henrique Cardoso?
10. What is dependent capitalist development?
11. What does the theory of poles of development say?

### 1.3.2 World Systems Theory

A major breakthrough in the Marxist analysis of international relations was the world systems theory propounded by Immanuel Wallerstein. Wallerstein argues that history is marked by the emergence or collapse of various types of world systems. These world systems begin they achieve a middle phase and also collapse gradually. The



modern world system is an outcome of an expansion of capitalism. Wallerstein calls it a 'system of production for sale in a market for profit and appropriation of this profit on the basis of individual or collective ownership.' Even this system is bound to collapse one day.

### *What is a world system?*

According to Wallerstein, a world system is:

'A social system, one that has boundaries, structures, member groups, rules of legitimization, and coherence. Its life is made up of the conflicting forces which hold together by tension and tear it apart as each group seeks eternally to remould it to its advantage. It has the characteristic of an organism, in that it has a life span over which its characteristic change in some respect and remain stable in others. Life within it is largely self-contained, and the dynamic of development are largely internal.' (Wallerstein 2003: 347)

In his first definition he said that a world system is a 'multicultural territorial division of labour in which the production and exchange of basic goods and raw materials is necessarily for the everyday life of its inhabitants.'

This division of labour refers to the forces and relations of production of the world economy as a whole and it leads to the existence of two interdependent regions: core and periphery.

In the dependency theory, along with the notion of core and periphery, Wallerstein also added a new element called semi-periphery. These are the geographical explanations of the modern state system. According to Wallerstein, the semi-periphery zone has an intrinsic role within the world system displaying certain features of core and other characteristics of periphery. Unlike the periphery in the dependency literature which is highly underdeveloped in terms of industrial development, the semi periphery has strong industrial base like core. It is because of this nature that semi-periphery also plays a crucial role in social and economic development of the modern world system. More specifically, semi-periphery provides a source of labour that counter-attacks any upward pressure on wages in the core and also provides a new home for those industries that can no longer function profitably in the core. The semi-periphery also plays a vital role in stabilizing the political structure of the world system.

The current world system is a power hierarchy between core and periphery, in which powerful and wealthy 'core societies' dominate and exploit weak and poor peripheral societies. Technology is a crucial factor in the positioning of a region in the core and periphery. The relationship between these three zones is exploitative in nature. Advanced and developed countries are the core and the less developed are in the periphery.

The differential strength of the multiple states within the system is crucial to maintain the system as a whole, because strong states reinforce and increase the differential flow of surplus to the core zones. This is what Wallerstein called the unequal exchange of the systemic transfer of surplus from semi proletarian sectors in the periphery to the high technology, industrialized core. This leads to a process of capital accumulation at a global scale and necessarily involves the appropriation and transformation of peripheral surplus.

On the political side of the world system a few concepts need highlighting. For Wallerstein, nation states are the variable elements within the system. States are used by class forces to pursue their interest in the case of core countries. Imperialism refers to the domination of weak peripheral regions by strong core states. Hegemony refers to the existence of one core state temporarily outstripping the rest. Hegemonic

### NOTES



## NOTES

powers maintain some balance and enforce free trade as long as it is to their advantage. Finally there is global class struggle. Wealth is drained away from the periphery to the center. Together the core, semi-periphery, and periphery make up the geographic dimension of the world economy.

In order to explain their interaction, Wallerstein has discussed temporal dimensions. These are cyclical rhythms, secular trends, contradictions and crisis. It is these, when combined with the spatial dimensions, which determine the nature of the world system.

In the world system, Wallerstein reserves the term 'crisis' to refer to a specific type of temporal occurrence. Crisis constitutes a unique set of circumstances that can only be manifested once in the lifetime of a world-system. It occurs when the contradictions, secular trends, and cyclical rhythms in such a way to mean that the system cannot continue to reproduce itself.

Wallerstein argues that the end of the cold war, rather than marking a triumph for liberalism, indicates its imminent demise. This has sparked a crisis in the current world-system that will involve its demise and replacement by another system. Much of Wallerstein's recent works has been an attempt to develop a political programme to promote a new world system that is more equitable and just than the current one.

### CHECK YOUR PROGRESS

12. Who gave the world system theory?
13. How does Wallerstein define world system?

## 1.4 MODERNISM AND POSTMODERNISM

Modernism is a philosophical movement along with cultural trends and changes that arose in the late 19th and early 20th centuries due to wide-scale and far-reaching transformations in the Western society. The factors that shaped modernism were industrialization that facilitated the development of modern industrial societies, rapid growth of cities, followed by the horrors of World War I. Modernism rejected the certainty of Enlightenment thinking. In general, modernism includes the activities and creations of those who felt that the traditional forms of literature, art, architecture, philosophy, religious faith, and activities of daily life were becoming outdated in the new social, economic, and political environment of an emerging industrialized world.

A notable characteristic of modernism is self-consciousness, which often led to experiments with form, along with the use of techniques that drew attention to the processes and materials used in architecture, paintings, and poems. Modernism explicitly rejected the ideology of realism and made use of the works of the past by employing reprise, incorporation, recapitulation, and parody in new forms.

In the West, many see modernism as a socially progressive trend of thought that asserts the power of human beings to create, improve and reshape their environment with the help of scientific knowledge, technology and practical experimentations. In this respect, Modernism encouraged the re-examination of every aspect of existence from philosophy to commerce. Modernism has also been viewed as an aesthetic introspection. This facilitates consideration of specific reactions to the use of technology in the First World War, and anti-technological and nihilistic aspects of the works of diverse thinkers and artists from Friedrich Nietzsche (1844–1900) to Samuel Beckett (1906–1989).



## NOTES

With the continuing technological advances from 1870 onwards, the idea that history and civilization were inherently progressive, and that progress was always good, increasingly came under attack from theorists and thinkers. It was argued that the values of the artist and the society were not very different, but that society was antithetical to progress, and its present form prevented it from moving forward. Arthur Schopenhauer (1788–1860), German philosopher, argued that people continuously seek satisfaction and live in a dissatisfied world. He questioned the 19<sup>th</sup> century optimism and believed the universe to be inherently irrational. His ideas had an important influence on thinkers such as Friedrich Nietzsche, Albert Einstein, Sigmund Freud, and Leo Tolstoy among others. Two of the most significant thinkers of the 19<sup>th</sup> century were political scientist Karl Marx, author of *Das Kapital* (1867), and biologist Charles Darwin, author of *On the Origin of Species by Means of Natural Selection* (1859). Karl Marx argued that there were fundamental contradictions within the capitalist system and that the workers were anything but free. Darwin's theory of evolution by natural selection undermined religious certainty and the idea of human uniqueness. The theories of Marx and Darwin inspired many modernists who viewed capitalism as degrading to mankind and cited the theories of Darwin as the true natural order.

### *Beginning of Modernism in France*

The beginning of modernism is debated among historians and writers across various disciplines. Historian, William Everdell, has argued that modernism began in the 1870s, when metaphorical (or ontological) continuity began to yield to the discrete with mathematician Richard Dedekind's (1831–1916) Dedekind cut, and Ludwig Boltzmann's (1844–1906) statistical thermodynamics. Visual art critic, Clement Greenberg, called Immanuel Kant 'the first real modernist'.

The theories of Sigmund Freud were influential to modernist writers. Central to Freud's thinking is the idea 'of the primacy of the unconscious mind in mental life', such that all subjective reality is based on basic drives and instincts, on the basis of which the outside world is perceived. Freud's description of subjective states involved an unconscious mind full of primal impulses and counter-balancing self-imposed restrictions derived from social values.

Friedrich Nietzsche was another major forefather of modernism who believed in the philosophy that psychological drives, specifically the 'will to power' was of central importance. Modernists' questioning of philosophical rationalism found support in the writings of Friedrich Nietzsche, whose existentialist philosophy held that reality originated and ended in individual experience. Henri Bergson, a French philosopher, emphasized the difference between scientific, clock time and the direct, subjective, human experience of time. His work on time and consciousness greatly influenced the twentieth-century novelists especially those who used the stream of consciousness technique, such as Virginia Woolf, Dorothy Richardson and James Joyce.

Another modernist movement is 'futurism'. The First World War and the Russian Revolution of 1917 changed the world order and eroded the beliefs in the institutions of the past. The birth of a machine age which brought about major changes in the daily life in the 19th century radically changed the nature of warfare. The horrors of the First World War altered the basic assumptions, and the realistic depiction of life in arts seemed inadequate when faced with the surreal nature of trench warfare. The perception that mankind was steadily making moral progress seemed ridiculous in the face of slaughter, that was described in the works of Erich Maria Remarque's novel, *All*



## NOTES

*Quiet on the Western Front* (1929). Hence, modernism's view of reality came to be more accepted in the 1920s after the War.

Some modernists believed that they were a part of a revolutionary culture that included political revolution. In Russia, after the revolution of 1917, initially there was a burgeoning avant garde cultural activities that included Russian futurism. However, some modernists rejected conventional politics as well as artistic conventions arguing that a revolution of political consciousness had greater importance than a change in political structures. Many modernists also considered themselves to be apolitical. T. S. Eliot, an essayist, playwright, literary and social critic, rejected the popular mass culture. Some modernist writers argue that modernism in art and literature sustained an elite culture that excluded majority of the population. By 1930, modernism had cemented a place in the political and artistic establishments, although modernism itself by this time had changed. Modernism continued to evolve during the 1930s.

After Joseph Stalin came to power, the Soviet government rejected modernism on the grounds of elitism, although previously it had endorsed futurism and constructivism. In Germany, the Nazi government was critical of modernism and deemed it narcissistic and nonsensical, as well as 'Jewish' (anti-semitism) and 'Negro'. For this reason, many modernists of the post-war generation felt that they were the most important bulwark against totalitarianism, whose repression by a government or other groups with supposed authority represented a warning that individual liberties were being threatened.

Modernism flourished mainly in the consumer/capitalist societies, in spite of the fact that the proponents of modernism often rejected consumerism. However, during the 1960s, 'high modernism' began to merge with consumer culture after World War II. In Britain, a youth sub-culture calling itself 'modernist' (usually shortened to 'mod') emerged following music groups such as 'the who' and 'the kinks'. The likes of Bob Dylan and the Rolling Stones combined popular musical traditions with modernist verse, adopted literary devices derived from James Thurber, James Joyce, T. S. Eliot, Samuel Beckett and others. Even the Beatles developed along similar lines, creating various modernist musical effects on several albums. Modernist devices also began to appear in popular cinema and later on in music videos. Modernist designs also entered the mainstream popular culture, when simplified and stylized forms became popular, often associated with dreams of a space age high-tech future.

The merging of consumer and high versions of modernist culture radically transformed the meaning of modernism. It has been argued that modernism had become so institutionalized that it had reached the 'post avant-garde' stage, indicating that it had lost its power as a revolutionary movement. Many have interpreted this transformation as the beginning of the phase that came to be known as postmodernism. Art critic, Robert Hughes, has argued that postmodernism is an extension of modernism.

There are many reasons for the disillusionment with modernity. The experience of war, violence and totalitarianism in the twentieth century, growing assertion of the colonized people, resultant decline in the legitimacy of the western power, arousal of subaltern voices, proliferation of new technologies of communication and the rising consumer culture making a distinction between 'high' and 'low'—all these factors, led many thinkers in the West to rethink and question the very foundations of modernity.

### **Postmodernism**

Postmodernism is a late 20<sup>th</sup> century movement that is seen as a departure from modernism. It is often associated with poststructuralism and deconstruction because



## NOTES

the term gained popularity at the same time as the poststructural thought of the twentieth-century. Postmodernism includes skeptical interpretations of philosophy, history, culture, literature, art, architecture, fiction, and literary criticism. Postmodernism is reaction against tendencies in modernism marked by revival of historical techniques and elements. Though the idea of postmodernity had been prevailing since the 1940s, the postmodern philosophy primarily originated in France during the mid 20th century. Hence, it is considered to be a part of contemporary history.

Postmodern philosophy is critical of the assumptions and universalizing tendency of the Western philosophy. It emphasizes the importance of personalization and discourse, power relationships, in the construction of truth and world views. Postmodernists do not agree with the Enlightenment faith in science and technology as instruments of human progress. In fact, many postmodernists are of the opinion that the misguided (or unguided) pursuit of scientific and technological knowledge led to the development of technologies for killing on a massive scale in World War II. Postmodernists reject objective natural reality. According to postmodernists, reality, reason and logic are conceptual constructs. They claim that there is no such thing as 'universal truth'. Postmodernists dismiss Enlightenment discourses to adopt 'totalizing' systems of thought or grand metanarratives of human historical, biological, and social development. According to postmodernists, these theories are hurtful and damaging not only because they are false but because they effectively impose conformity on other perspectives or discourses, thereby, marginalizing, oppressing or silencing them. Jacques Derrida, a French philosopher, equated the theoretical tendency of totality with totalitarianism. Agreeing with Michel Foucault, a French philosopher, social theorist, philologist and literary critic, postmodernists defend the comparatively nuanced view that in complex and subtle ways, what counts as knowledge in a given era is always influenced by considerations of power. Postmodernists talk about a disciplinary society characterized by a widespread network of surveillance machinery.

Postmodern has been used to express dissatisfaction with modern architecture that led to the postmodern architectural movement. It also developed as a response to the modernist architectural movement known as the International Style. Postmodernism in architecture is marked by the re-emergence of surface ornament, historical reference in decorative forms (eclecticism), and non-orthogonal angles.

The postmodern philosophy is greatly influenced by the writings of Friedrich Nietzsche and Søren Kierkegaard in the 19th century and philosophers in the early-to-mid 20th-century including psychoanalyst Jacques Lacan, phenomenologists Martin Heidegger and Edmund Husserl, structuralist Roland Barthes, and language/logic philosopher, Ludwig Wittgenstein. The postmodern philosophy is also influenced from the world of the arts and architecture, particularly John Cage and Marcel Duchamp, artists who practiced collage, and the architecture of Las Vegas and the Pompidou Centre. The most influential early postmodern philosophers are Jean-François Lyotard, Jean Baudrillard, Michel Foucault and Jacques Derrida.

### Deconstruction

Deconstruction is a form of philosophical, literary criticism, and textual analysis developed by Jacques Derrida. A deconstructive approach implies an analysis that questions the already evident understanding of a text in terms of hierarchical values, frames of reference, ideological underpinnings, and presuppositions. Derrida has opined that the world follows the grammar of a text undergoing its own deconstruction. The method employed by Derrida frequently involves recognizing and spelling out the



## NOTES

different, yet similar interpretations of the meaning of a given text and the problematic implications of binary oppositions within the meaning of the text. The deconstruction philosophy of Derrida influenced a postmodern movement called deconstructivism among architects. This movement was characterized by distortion, intentional fragmentation, and dislocation of architectural elements in designing a building. Derrida ceased to be involved with the movement after the publication of his project with architect Peter Eisenmann in *Chora L Works: Jacques Derrida and Peter Eisenmann*. Some of the influential postmodernist philosophers are discussed below:

1. **Jacques Derrida:** Derrida is regarded as the father of deconstruction. He practiced the philosophy as a form of textual criticism. He was critical of Western philosophy for it privileged the concept of presence and logos and as opposed to absence, markings or writings. Derrida used references to Greek philosophical notions associated with Skeptics and Presocratics, such as Epoché and Aporia to articulate his notion of implicit circularity between premises and conclusions, origins and manifestations, but in a radical manner reinterpreted philosopher figures such as Plato, Aristotle and Descartes.
2. **Michel Foucault:** Foucault introduced concepts such as 'discursive regime' and re-invoked older philosophies like 'episteme' and 'genealogy' in order to explain the relationship between meaning, power, and social behaviour within social orders. Foucault asserted that rational judgment, social practice are not only inseparable but co-determinant and are in direct contradiction to modernist perspectives on epistemology. Foucault argued that knowledge is produced through the operations of power and changes fundamentally in different historical epochs. He rejected the Enlightenment concepts of liberation, freedom, and self-determination. Instead, he laid emphasis on the ways through which such constructs can foster violence, cultural hegemony, and exclusion. He considered Freud's concept of repression central to psychoanalysis (which was still very influential in France during the 1960s and 70s), to be both harmful and misplaced. Foucault argued that language functions in a way that renders false or silences tendencies that might otherwise threaten or undermine the distributions of power backing the conventions of a society, even though such distributions claim to celebrate liberation and expression or value minority groups and their perspectives. His writings greatly influenced the larger body of Postmodern academic literature.
3. **Jean-François Lyotard:** The writings of Lyotard are largely concerned with the role of narratives in human culture, and particularly how the role has changed as we left modernity and entered a postmodern condition. He was of the opinion that modern philosophies legitimized their claims of truth not (as they themselves claimed) on logical or empirical grounds, but on the grounds of accepted stories or metanarratives about knowledge and the world. He argued that in a postmodern condition, the metanarratives no longer function to legitimize the truth-claims. He was of the opinion that in a postmodern situation, there is no absolute truth; rather there exists a world of ever-changing relationships among people and between people and the world.

### Criticisms

There are intellectually diverse criticisms of postmodernism including the assertion that postmodernism is meaningless and promotes obscurantism and uses relativism.



**NOTES**

culture, knowledge and morality) to the extent that it cripples judgements. Noam Chomsky, an American linguist, philosopher has argued that postmodernism is meaningless as it adds nothing to empirical or analytical knowledge. William Lane Craig, an American analytical philosopher, Christian apologist and theologian, has argued that the notion that we live in a postmodern culture is a myth. According to Craig, a postmodern culture is impossible. People are not relativistic in matters of engineering, science, and technology; rather, they are relativistic and pluralistic in matters of ethics and religion.

Félix Guattari, an institutional psychotherapist and philosopher, often considered to be a postmodernist, rejected its theoretical assumptions by arguing that Postmodernist and structuralist theories are not flexible enough to provide explanations in social, environmental and psychological domains at the same time.

American literary critic and Marxist political theorist, Fredric Jameson, critiqued postmodernism (or poststructuralism), and labeled it as 'the cultural logic of late capitalism'. He was critical of postmodernism for it did not critically engage with the metanarratives of capitalization and globalization. This makes postmodernist philosophy complicit with the prevailing relations of domination and exploitation.

Many philosophical movements have rejected both modernity and postmodernity. Some of these philosophical movements believe in cultural and religious conservatism and do not conform to the notion of postmodernism that rejects natural or spiritual truths and emphasizes on material and physical pleasure. Many of these critiques attack the tendency of postmodernism to abandon the 'objective truth' and consider it to be an unacceptable feature of postmodernism and offer a metanarrative that provides this truth.

Postmodernists or intellectuals who support postmodernism, such as British historian Perry Anderson, defend the existence of the varied meanings assigned to the term postmodernism. He is of the opinion that postmodernism contradicts one another on the surface and that a postmodernist analysis can offer insight into the contemporary culture.

#### **1.4.1 Impact of Postmodernism on Political Theory**

The post-modernists challenge liberalism for its abstract categories—categories like the universal rights of all people and emphasize the rights of specific groups—women, tribals, blacks and the colonial people. This has led to the emergence of, 'new social movements', which challenged specific forms of social domination based on gender, caste, colour and race. Identity politics has become the most crucial element in these movements. It also marks a shift from macro abstract political, social and economic issues to culture. The basic argument of identity politics is that individuals define themselves mainly as belonging to a given cultural group which perceives themselves as disadvantaged and oppressed at the hands of groups which are privileged and dominant upper castes, white races and the imperialist countries. The relevant binary categories in identity policies become 'we' and 'they'. It is important to note that in practical terms, this new political theory of identity politics tantamount to rejecting the Marxian category of 'class' as a major tool of analysis. It, equally vehemently, negates liberalism's universal categories like 'universal rights', 'civil liberties' and 'equality'. Instead of the 'class war' of Marxian variety, it emphasizes local struggles'. Instead of advocating power to the working class, it advocates empowerment of the local communities and specific cultural groups.

NOTES

CHECK YOUR PROGRESS

14. State one characteristic of modernism.
15. Who are the authors of *Das Kapital* and *On the Origin of Species by Means of Natural Selection*?
16. Name the thinkers whose ideas and theories inspired modernist writers.
17. Who is regarded as the father of deconstruction?
18. Name some influential postmodernist philosophers.

1.5 SUMMARY

- The word 'fascism' was derived from the Latin word *fascio* meaning club.
- In 1919, Mussolini formed a group called 'Fasico de Combatimentto' i.e., combatant group.
- The political turmoil in the country gave Mussolini the opportunity he was waiting for as the ruling liberals ceased to be a prominent force in Italy.
- By 1922, Fascist clubs were set up all over the country which recruited unemployed soldiers and youth. It was financially supported by industrialists, landowners, merchant community and all section of the Italian public whose life and property were endangered.
- By a series of law in 1925, the parliamentary government was scrapped in Italy and Mussolini was given dictatorial powers. The political structure of Italy was that of a totalitarian state.
- After 1942, the course of war changed and the defeat of Italy became imminent, due to continuous defeats and internal economic crisis.
- When the Allies attacked North Italy in 1945, Italy unconditionally surrendered to Allies. This marked the fall of Fascist Italy.
- Kaiser Wilhem II, the last German Emperor, was held responsible for the debacle of the German army in the First World War. A countrywide anti-monarchist revolution compelled Kaiser to abdicate his throne.
- The Weimer Republic, which bridged the years between the Hohenzollerns and the Nazis, had a number of outstanding achievements to its credit.
- The younger generation of Germany was not happy with the Republican government and continued to nourish ambitions for a powerful Germany.
- Hitler and his associates formed the Nazi Party in 1920 after the end of the First World War. In the same year, the party announced the Twenty-five Point Programme, which emphasized the need of scraping the Treaty of Versailles which had been imposed on Germany, establishment of vast German empire after bringing back the lost colonies of Germany among others.
- Hitler succeeded in gaining and exercising supreme power in Germany and, in the process, arguably left more impact on world's history in the twentieth century than any other political figure.
- In 1920, Hitler joined the German workers party, the National Socialist German Worker's Party, popularly known as the Nazi Party. Hitler's skills for publicity and as a speaker gradually popularized the Nazi Party.
- During the primary part of the 1930s, the Nazi movement had grown quite powerful in Germany.



**NOTES**

- In August 1934, Hindenburg died and Hitler became the president of Germany and by the Enabling Act of 1933, he attained dictatorial powers.
- The rise of Nazi Germany and the aggressive policies pursued by it encouraged the growth of revisionist sentiments that strengthened the status quo. This led to a division of the world in two hostile camps, which ultimately culminated in the Second World War.
- There is no formal neo-Marxist organization and seldom do people call themselves neo-Marxists, so it is difficult to describe who belongs to this movement. Also there is no set definition as to what a neo-Marxist is, which makes grouping and categorizing this idea even more difficult.
- The humanist strain of neo-Marxism draws particularly on the work of the young Marx and constitutes the main stream of critical theory.
- Dependency theories became quite popular during the 1970s and 1980s. Unlike the realist and liberal theories which are largely America and Europe centred, the dependency theories largely came from the Latin American scholars.
- Despite these definitions of dependency there is no consensus on the theory, i.e., what brings dependency amongst the states.
- The new dependency theory understands industrial development to be dependent on exports, which generate foreign currency to buy imported capital goods.
- A major breakthrough in the Marxist analysis of international relations was the world systems theory propounded by Immanuel Wallerstein.
- The current world system is a power hierarchy between core and periphery, in which powerful and wealthy 'core societies' dominate and exploit weak and poor peripheral societies.
- Modernism is a philosophical movement along with cultural trends and changes that arose in the late 19th and early 20th centuries due to wide-scale and far-reaching transformations in the Western society.
- A notable characteristic of Modernism is self-consciousness, which often led to experiments with form, along with the use of techniques that drew attention to the processes and materials used in architecture, paintings, and poems.
- Modernism explicitly rejected the ideology of realism and made use of the works of the past by employment of reprise, incorporation, recapitulation, and parody in new forms.
- The theories of Sigmund Freud were influential to Modernist writers. Friedrich Nietzsche was another major forefather of modernism who believed in the philosophy that psychological drives, specifically the 'will to power' was of central importance.
- Another Modernist movement is Futurism.
- The merging of consumer and high versions of modernist culture radically transformed the meaning of modernism. It has been argued that Modernism had become so institutionalized that it had reached the post avant-garde stage, indicating that it had lost its power as a revolutionary movement.
- Postmodernism is a late 20<sup>th</sup> century movement that is seen as a departure from modernism.
- Postmodern philosophy is critical of the assumptions and universalizing tendency of the Western philosophy. It emphasizes the importance of personalization and discourse, power relationships, in the construction of truth and world views.

## NOTES

- Postmodernists reject objective natural reality. According to postmodernists, reality, reason and logic are conceptual constructs. They claim that there is no such thing as 'universal truth'.
- Deconstruction is a form of philosophical, literary criticism, and textual analysis developed by Jacques Derrida.
- Jacques Derrida, Michel Foucault and Jean-François Lyotard are some of the influential postmodernist philosophers.
- There are intellectually diverse criticisms of postmodernism including the assertions that postmodernism is meaningless and promotes obscurantism and uses relativism (in culture, knowledge and morality) to the extent that it cripples judgements.
- The post-modernists challenge liberalism for its abstract categories—categories like the universal rights of all people and emphasize the rights of specific groups—women, tribals, blacks and the colonial people. This has led to the emergence of New Social Movements which challenge specific forms of social domination based on gender, caste, colour and race.

### 1.6 KEY TERMS

- **Fascism:** The word 'fascism' was derived from the Latin word *fascio* meaning club.
- **Modernism:** Modernism is a philosophical movement along with cultural trends and changes that arose in the late 19th and early 20th centuries due to wide-scale and far-reaching transformations in the Western society.
- **Postmodernism:** Postmodernism is a late 20<sup>th</sup> century movement which evolved as reaction to modernism.
- **World system:** It is a social system, one that has boundaries, structures, member groups, rules of legitimization, and coherence.

### 1.7 ANSWERS TO 'CHECK YOUR PROGRESS'

1. The word 'fascism' was derived from the Latin word *fascio* meaning club.
2. The fascists formed an association named ADITI of young volunteers drawn mostly from the middle class and universities. The members of ADITI were trained commandos who were used to break up meetings of the socialists.
3. In 1919, Mussolini formed a group called Fasico de Combatementto.
4. The Weimar Constitution came into effect on 11 August 1919.
5. In 1926, Germany was admitted to the League of Nations.
6. The autobiography of Hitler is *Mein Kampf* or 'My Struggle'.
7. Neo-Marxism is a term used to refer to the approaches forwarded by contemporary Marxists or new Marxists to the several political and social problems which traditional Marxist thought was unable to answer.
8. Several important advances to neo-Marxism came after World War I from Georg Lukács, Karl Korsch and Antonio Gramsci.
9. According to Fernando Henrique Cardoso, the three tendencies in dependency theories are the following:



## NOTES

- First was the notion of autonomous national development
  - The second tendency is an analysis of international capitalism in a monopolistic manner.
  - Finally, there is a dependency literature which focuses on the structural aspect of it. Cardoso himself claimed to be a part of this stream.
10. Fernando Henrique Cardoso contended the idea that capitalism promotes underdevelopment. To the contrary he argued that capitalist development can occur in dependent situations. He believed that dependent capitalist development has become a new form of monopolistic expansion in the Third World. This development benefits all classes associated with international capital, including the local agrarian, commercial, financial and industrial bourgeoisie and even the working class involved in the international sector.
  11. The theory of poles of development first given by the French economist Francois Perroux (1968) and elaborated by the Brazilian geographer Manuel Correia de Andrade (1967), believes that underdeveloped economies are characterized by a lack of infrastructure in transportation and communication by a dual economy, with advanced areas existing alongside subsistence ones, and by dependence upon external decisions that pertain to the production of products.
  12. The world systems theory was propounded by Immanuel Wallerstein.
  13. A world system, according to Wallerstein, is a multicultural territorial division of labour in which the production and exchange of basic goods and raw materials is necessarily for the everyday life of its inhabitants.
  14. A notable characteristic of modernism is self-consciousness, which often led to experiments with form, along with the use of techniques that drew attention to the processes and materials used in architecture, paintings, and poems.
  15. Karl Marx wrote *Das Kapital* and Charles Darwin is the author of *On the Origin of Species by Means of Natural Selection*.
  16. The theories and ideas of Sigmund Freud and Friedrich Nietzsche inspired modernist writers.
  17. Jacques Derrida is regarded as the father of deconstruction.
  18. Jacques Derrida, Michel Foucault and Jean-François Lyotard are some of the influential postmodernist philosophers.

## 1.8 QUESTIONS AND EXERCISES

## Short-Answer Questions

1. What were the achievements of the Weimar Republic?
2. What does the world system theory state?
3. How were the neo-Marxists different from the Marxists?
4. Write a short note on deconstruction.
5. State the impact of postmodernism on political theory.

## Long-Answer Questions

1. What were the basic characteristics of fascism? Discuss the characteristics of Italy as a totalitarian state.
2. What were the programmes of the Nazi party? Discuss the rise of Adolf Hitler.

NOTES

3. Discuss the birth of neo-Marxism.
4. Were the neo-Marxists really successful in differentiating themselves from Marx? Give your reasons.
5. Discuss the theory of development and underdevelopment in the dependency theory.
6. Describe the various approaches to dependency theory.
7. What is the world system theory of Wallerstein?
8. Explain modernism.
9. Discuss postmodernism. Describe the ideas and viewpoints of some of the influential postmodern philosophers.

**1.9 FURTHER READING**

- Coleman, Janet. 2000. *A History of Political Thought*. New Delhi: Wiley-Blackwell.
- Wolff, Jonathan. 2006. *An Introduction to Political Philosophy*. New Delhi: OUP Oxford.
- Strauss, Leo, Joseph Cropsey. 1987. *A History of Political Philosophy*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Miller, David, Janet Coleman, William Connolly (et.al.) 1991. *The Blackwell Encyclopaedia of Political Thought*. New Delhi: Wiley-Blackwell.
- Grube, G. M. A., C. D. C. Reeve. 1992. *Plato: Republic*. Indianapolis: Hackett Pub Co.
- Grube, G. M. A. 1980. *Plato's Thought*. Cambridge: Hackett Pub Co Inc.
- Balme, D. M. Aristotle. 2002. *Historia Animalium*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

**Endnotes**

1. J Noakes, *The Nazi Party in Lower Saxony 1919-1933*, 1971, pp.1-5.
2. N. Lowe, *Mastering Modern World History*, 1982, Chennai, p.276.



## UNIT-2 FEMINISM AND ENVIRONMENTALISM

*Feminism and  
Environmentalism*

### Structure

### NOTES

- 2.0 Introduction
- 2.1 Unit Objectives
- 2.2 Feminism
  - 2.2.1 Theories of Feminism
- 2.3 Environmentalism
  - 2.3.1 Why are Environmental Issues a Global Concern?
  - 2.3.2 Major Environmental Problems
  - 2.3.3 Responses to Environmental Problems
- 2.4 Summary
- 2.5 Key Terms
- 2.6 Answers to 'Check Your Progress'
- 2.7 Questions and Exercises
- 2.8 Further Reading

### 2.0 INTRODUCTION

For two hundred years political and economic ideas have focused on development and contradictions within the society. The power structure of the state and the economic strength of the propertied class have drawn almost the entire attention of social scientists. But as early as the late 19th century a new claimant to attention emerged. It was the gender question. Still later, at the beginning of the second half of the 20<sup>th</sup> century awareness developed about environmental decay in the form of depletion of forest, global warming, draughts and floods and other natural calamities. The first concern was expressed in feminism and the second concern was expressed in environmentalism.

This unit will discuss the various types of feminism and their relevance today. It will also assess the environmental concern of today.

### 2.1 UNIT OBJECTIVES

After going through this unit, you will be able to:

- Identify the role and importance of feminism in the changing socio-political scenario
- Summarize and evaluate the different theories of feminism
- Discuss the issues related to ecology and environment

### 2.2 FEMINISM

The word feminist has been derived from the French term *féministe*. After the First International Women's Conference in Paris in 1892 the term feminism was used regularly in English for the advocacy of equal rights for women based on the idea of the equality of the sexes. Feminism refers to the principle of equality and equal rights to both men and women. The wave of feminism arose in Europe and America in response to the exclusion of women from mainstream politics and decision making bodies. Women's exclusion was argued and justified on the ground of biological difference imbibed among the sexes.

Most feminists concentrated on criticizing the patriarchal system. Men had an advantage over women because they had better access to the resources that society had to offer. Thus, men were able to exercise power over women, both at a large scale and at a personal level. Intimate relationships between the sexes were, therefore, always power relationships (Millett, 1972/1970). Individual men making changes would

**NOTES**

help, but this would not bring liberation for women unless the way society operated changed. At the beginning of the feminist movement in the late 1960s and early 1970s, some feminist groups or events included men (Whelehan, 1995), but feminists became frustrated by the tendency of men to monopolize meetings or groups and found that more could be achieved without them (Phillips 1991: 98). Some men continued to provide support for the feminist movement, but did so by forming their own groups to examine how they might relate to women in better ways (Messner, 1997) and/or providing background support such as childcare at feminist conferences.

In essence, feminism questions the patriarchal ideologies used to justify subordination of women. It analyses women's status in the past and the present and challenges the age-old notion that it was natural and universally accepted that women should remain subordinated to men.

Feminism begins from the very fact that women are always oppressed and for many, this oppression is primary. It raises the fact that women's freedom and power is limited by the supremacy of their male counterpart, who generally have more economic power and social authority. This is not to overlook that fact that women are different from men and these differences themselves involve subordination and exploitation. Hence, what is required is to view the world from the women's point of view that has so far been excluded from the production of knowledge. Such a view will break the long held notion of male supremacy and explain the existence of this fact, which has not been accepted.

It is worthy to note that studies in sociology, economy and public administration to look for the source of oppression have ignored the very source of subordination within family (private institutes) and relationships in public and private spheres.

The first-wave of feminism, which started in the 19th century and extended to the 20th century and especially in the UK, the Netherlands, Canada and the US, witnessed tremendous activities wherein the focus was on political issues, primarily on women suffrage. It also took up issues such as right to property, equal contract, marriage, reproduction and so on. Since 1970s onward feminists from all over the world has debated on the definition, issues, and problems pertaining to 'feminism'. One most burning debate around the issue was whether women are similar to men or requires special recognition and response. Another source of controversy that derives from western perception that women as both subject and object of feminism share common nature, common needs, common wants, common desires and thus suffers common oppression. Women from multiethnic groups both from Britain and America and other parts of the world asserts their views on the issue of difference on the basis of race, sex, class, nationality, culture, religion, age and ethnicity and emphasize on inclusion of these issues with femininity. Hence, in the west since the 18th century those different categories included concepts such as nature, class, reason and humanity that changes with passing of time. In an effort to suggest a schematic account of feminism, Susan James characterizes feminism as follows:

'Feminism is grounded on the belief that women are oppressed or disadvantaged by comparison with men, and that their oppression is in some way illegitimate or unjustified. Under the umbrella of this general characterization there are, however, many interpretations of women and their oppression, so that it is a mistake to think of feminism as a single philosophical doctrine, or as implying an agreed political program' (James 1998, 576).



## 2.2.1 Theories of Feminism

### *Socialist Feminism*

Women have been invisible from historical discourse. But what is even more invisible is the history of their rebellion against exploitation and subordination. The demand of women's emancipation first rose during the French Revolution. Indeed first half of the 19th century was the time when capitalism as a new mode of production changed from mercantile capitalism to industrial capitalism and transformed the lives of millions of people. It was time of ruthless 'Manchesterdom' when the bourgeoisie accumulated wealth by the most brutal exploitation of workers. The whole period is characterized by social unrest, revolts and strikes of workers including women.

It was also the period of experimenting with new concepts of society and human relationship. Early socialist were Robert Owen, Charles Fourier, Saint Simon, etc., who developed a concept of society where all could be free, happy, live in fraternal equality, where love was the law between people and not greed and exploitation. These ideas were developed in contradiction to misery and slavery.

People who propagated these ideas were known as 'socialist' or 'communists' and most of them saw themselves as the heirs of French Revolution and the Age of Enlightenment. What was more important was the concept of women's emancipation formed an important part of their thinking. Socialists saw bourgeois marriage system as hypocrisy and a means to use women for accumulation of more wealth.

Earlier, socialist Robert Owen (1771-1858) believed that production for profit was the main reason behind the misery and impoverishment of industrial workers. He took economic crisis of 1815 as the outcome of under consumption of workers and overproduction due to industrialization. Therefore, he thought that overproduction would create disproportion between production and consumption that would lead to poverty. Hence, Owen was not in favour of industry. Instead he favoured agricultural and craft-based production where people can get more work. He rejected private property concept and opined all property should be public and should be shared by all. He argued that by doing so people can groom their physical and intellectual capacity. He was completely against institution of marriage and monogamous marriage and also protested against church and religion. He saw organized religion and monogamous marriage as main evils which strengthened the idea of private property. In his book '*The Book of new Moral World*' he claims that existing marriage system is against nature and based on property consideration, where women is considered as a commodity for men folk, thus she is like a slave and furthermore this slavery is strengthened by religious obligation of relationship.

Owen emphasized on education. He propagated the idea of mother child separation at the age of two. He believed a two year child should be separated from the parents and should be brought up by trained teachers of crèche. He emphasized that education should not be imparted on the basis of gender and both gender should learn manual work when they are young. By attacking on private property he made many enemies particularly from ruling class British. Therefore, he left for America to experiment his ideas on communal living. This experiment of New Harmony too failed.

Another prominent advocate of socialist feminism was Charles Fourier (1772-1837). His idea of feminism was much more radical and far reaching than Owens. Though he considered civilization more harmful for human beings but accepted that it bore the germs of new stage. He believed that it was barbarism that invented patriarchy and enslaved women and this degradation of women found its deepest root in civilization.

### NOTES



**NOTES**

He believed that civilization had enforced monogamy on women but not on men. French philosopher and an advocate of women's rights, Charles Fourier is said to have coined the term feminism in 1837. He was the one to point out that development of any civilization could be determined by measuring the extent of freedom its women exercised. The position of women in 19<sup>th</sup> century Europe and before was nothing less than a slave. Highlighting this fact, he said a society could progress only if women were given equal treatment and the society learnt to respect them.

He, however, refrained from calling for equality of sexes since he acknowledged the inherent difference between them. But Fourier was against patriarchy and blamed the existing social structure for the oppression of women. He, thus, developed an innovative model for family life in his phalanxes.

Fourier laments on debased status of European women, even to this extent that they did not know what are their dues. For this he developed his idea of New Harmony by attacking civilization. He dreamt of no permanent marriage and no individual family. He believed that all should work and live together in big communities.

Saint Simon (1760-1825), in 1819 wrote in a pamphlet and raised a question as to what would happen to France if all of a sudden 30,000 landlords, princesses, aristocrats and bureaucrats would die. The answer was nothing. He termed them as parasites because at that time France needed intellectuals as well as workers who were politically suppressed since long. He dreamt of a society where the industrialists, capitalists, intellectuals and scientists would have the power. He was in favour of religious reform in Christianity. He was under the impression that new Christianity would change the life of the poorest class. Since he was not against religion, his ideas were welcomed by many people. This encouraged him in making a new church of Saint-Simonianism. His followers developed the idea of perfect couple where male had all characteristics of reasons and females had characteristics of love, emotions and heart. They propagated socio-religious and political emancipation of women without attacking the existing marriage system and monogamy. They only wanted to bring women to the same level of as that men. They saw bourgeoisie marriage system based on money as legalized prostitution. They preached equal rights for all without any gender discrimination and demanded work for all and the rule of intellectuals. The first authentic feminist movement in France was around Saint Simonians. They had great influence on the development of socialist feminism in France and Europe.

Suzanne Voilquin was the daughter of a proletarian French revolutionary and received some education. Her father had inspired her with his ideas a lot. During her matrimonial disturbance she met Saint Simonians. Their gender theory appealed her and she joined them. She had extensively written for a women journal and later on she became chief editor of a journal called 'La femme libre' (the free woman). After a few years its title was changed to 'La Tribune des Femmes' (The Tribune of Women). She was in favour of changing the production system because she believed this change would provide work to women. She had rejected men's plan of women's liberation. In a speech she emphasized:

'We do not need you as the guardian of our happiness and we deny you the right to touch anything which is our concern. The full emancipation of women is the deepest reason to work for the realization of a new world'. (in Mies and Jayavardane, p.50).

She accused men for the prevailing anarchy in society and rejected the idea of men's law. She did not fight only for working class women but she strongly believed in concept of sisterhood.



## **Liberal Feminism**

Liberal philosophy emerged with the growth of capitalism. Liberal feminists seek equal rights with men. They believe that individuals should be treated on the basis of their talents and effort as opposed to the characteristics of their sex. They campaign to remove any obstacle, be it political, social, legal or economical, that gets in the way of women getting the same opportunities as their male counterparts.

Liberal feminism has always been a voice which has often gone unheard. At initial stage of liberal feminism they argued that gender equality is their natural rights but with passage of time they developed the liberal theory of welfare state and demanded that the state should ensure equal opportunities for women as they provided to men.

The position of women in earlier time is depicted in explicitly hierarchal terms, with women being seen as more sinful than men, inferior to men and not appropriate to take part in political process. A woman is never considered an independent personality but like an object belonging to her father, husband and son.

Mary Wollstonecraft is regarded as the first feminist. In her famous book '*Vindication of the rights of Women*' published in 1792, she argued for economic independence and legal equality for women. She focuses her argument around middle class women as she believed that this class of women is neither dissipated by inherited wealth nor brutalized by poverty. She attacked Rousseau's thought of women being inferior, seeing this as a betrayal of the liberal assumptions of his political theory. In her view, women need to be represented in government and have a civil existence in the state and that they should not be excluded from civil and political employment. The enlightened women must be an active citizen who intends to manage her family, educate her children and assist her neighbours (Hofman John, 327).

John Stuart Mill influenced by his partner Harriet Taylor, wrote a book '*Subjugation of Women*' in 1869. In his book he supported women's right on property as well as their political rights of voting. It is interesting to note that in some of the developed countries women did not have the right to vote and they had to struggle for decades to get it. He wrote that in many parts of globe women are just like slaves and are not considered equal to men. It cannot be said that women are housewife and mother just because of nature's rule instead he claimed they are mothers because it is the most suitable role for her. He argues that family must become a school for learning the values of freedom and independence.

## **Cultural Feminism**

Cultural feminism upheld the essence of womenhood, i.e., the attributes of women's biological distinctive and superior virtues. The focus was on emphasizing the qualities of women, which were generally taken for granted and appreciating her 'natural occupation' such as narturing and caring, natural kindness and focusing on relationship. This was in sharp contrast from the notion held that women are physically week and unable to do things alone. While the theory commends the essential differences between a man and a woman, it opposes an emphasis on equality and instead argues for increased value placed on culturally designated 'women's work'.

Although cultural feminism does not form a separate branch on its own, the debate around the 'degree of gender difference or similarity' has allowed cultural feminism to become incorporated in all the feminist branches at some level. Liberal feminists, however, are more likely to subscribe to these principles than women in other branches.

## **NOTES**



NOTES

### Marxist Feminism

This strand of feminism follows the Marxist line of class struggle while incorporating the social protests by the feminists. This socialistic characteristic also gives this theory the name of socialist feminism. This theory blamed the inferior position of women to the class-based society of capitalism and the patriarchal social structure. Marxist feminism argues that sexism and capitalism are mutually supportive. Marxist feminism brings together Marxian class struggle and feminist social protest. Marx's focus was on capitalism, and he believed that women would gain a measure of equality as they increasingly entered the paid workforce.

This was based on a thorough examination of women's subordinate social position as firmly tied to the way the privatized family emerged within a capitalist society. Marx himself made notes on this, but it was his friend and co-writer Engels (1859/1884) who put together the final analysis of *The Origin of the Family, Private Property and the State*. The argument is that the form of family life in which women are dependent on men has come about as a consequence of capitalism. Put simply, as society has become more settled, initially around agriculture, surplus wealth has emerged. Within capitalism, wealth has become concentrated in the hands of individual men (capitalists who own the new factories and businesses). Those men have become concerned about handing over their wealth to their children. In order to be sure that it is their children to whom they are leaving their inheritance, men begin to control women even more, especially by keeping them dependent within the family. Based on this logic, it is clear as to why Marx and Engels suggest that women require economic independence attained to gain equality. Although Marx believed that women's equality was crucial to socialism, it was thought to be something that was of secondary importance to class struggle.

The patriarchal capitalist society only benefitted from the unpaid labour of the women at home and as a paid labour of a reserved labour force outside home. Most socialist feminist believed emotional and economic dependence were two sides of the same coin and could not be separated. A man exercised more force on his women due to the fear of loss of economic security. In the case of husband and wife the force was absolute. Hence, the Marxists believed that capitalism had to end and socialist principles have to be enforced both at home and at work place. Ironically, it was the former Soviet Union where this arrangement was most vivid.

Sexism and economic oppression are mutually reinforcing, so a socialist revolutionary agenda is needed to change both. Socialist feminism, hence, stood essentially for the working-class women and those who felt disenfranchised from the economic opportunities brought in by capitalism. This movement made tremendous impact in Latin America and proved to be a rallying for women in developing countries.

A closer look at socialist feminism would reveal significant differences between it and the Marxist ideology. The latter aims its struggle towards the propertied class, essentially their property, and economic condition of the people. Socialist feminism on the other hand is a fight of sexuality and gender. A humane socialist approach to feminism requires consensus on what the new society should be and would require men to renounce their privileges as men.

### Radical Feminism

Radical feminism emerged as a reaction to liberal feminism, which failed to challenge the different aspects of women oppression, and the narrow framework of Marxist ideology towards the feminist question. Radical feminism neither agrees to the theoretical



NOTES

framework and political practice of liberalism nor to the Marxists orthodoxy. Against the liberal feminists, the radicals held that theoretical framework cannot be the route to achieve women's liberation. Against the Marxist they argued that women's oppression cannot be equated with class oppression or capitalist socio-economic structure. The radicals regarded oppression has the primary and must fundamental kind of oppression.

Some radicalists viewed patriarchy as a transhistorical phenomenon. They hold that women of all class, culture and history are oppressed and family or the husband is the key oppressor, which can be in the form of sexual slavery or forced motherhood. The radicals do not negate the differences male and female have, biologically, but question there interpretation. While male aggression is manifested in sexual urge or supremacy, which gets manifested as rape, women's oppression is viewed from their ability to give birth.

The basic premise of radical feminism, which is also regarded as the second-wave of feminism, is that gender inequalities was a product of the autonomous patriarchal structure that had dominated the world for centuries and was the primary form of social inequality. The radicals argued that division of labour, both at home and outside, was based on sexuality underpinning and reinforcing a system of male domination.

Primarily revolutionary in character, the radical feminist movement sought women's emancipation. The radicals pointed out that male domination could be found in every sphere of life and so those aspects of women's life that are generally considered 'natural' should be questioned, and alternatives should be looked for. They argued that theory was part of the practical life of a women and not an activity carried out by the elite. They further argued that this feminist practice could be measured against experience and reformulated. They believed a revolution could be brought in by women when they take the right actions towards a positive life and eliminate oppression. However, radical and revolutionary feminism is not a unified area. There are three major areas of concern and they are the following:

- The link between feminist politics and personal sexual conduct; an important question being can women live with men or separation was essential
- Whether sex differences are biologically or socially constructed
- The political strategy that should be adopted—withdrawal or revolution

Their whole thesis is based on the argument that men are aggressive in nature and they use this aggression to control women (in most cases overpowering them in their sexual act, in other words, rape). Radicals reject the view that women's subordination is basically due to their biological inferiority. They oppose the argument that women are the victim and hold they are to be blamed for their inferior position.

*Gyn/Ecology: The Metaethics of Radical Feminism*, by Mary Daly is an influential example that celebrates women power and rejects the necrophilia of patriarchy. The book brings out the relationship between women's oppression in different historical period. It studies how men have over the years used their physical power to dominate women. She cites the practice of Sati in India, foot binding among women in China, genital mutilation in African women, European witch hunts, and American gynaecology. Some of these practices are still continued.

Challenging the patriarchal notions, radical feminists inspire women to find a new identity for themselves, which would essentially highlight their feminine strengths and encourage to celebrate a new female creativity based on sisterhood and self-



**NOTES**

identification. They, however, are not in favour of androgyny as they argue that women should celebrate their innate qualities and womanhood. They further argued that men oppress women in the most intimate relationship, hence women should live separate. The key idea is to free themselves from the patriarchal stronghold, which divides and mutilates them.

Daly insists on cultural relativism and counters views that do not express women's shared oppression. She points out that these practices are done to repress women universally. Like other radical feminists writers, Daly does not give attention beyond what is necessary towards the causes of women oppression. The thrust of her arguments lies on the fact that men oppress women not because of their 'ownership of means of production' but due to their physical superiority and domination over women's body and mind, particular their sexuality and their reproductive powers. In cases where women succeed in eluding such situation they are destroyed, for example women were forced to practice sati if they outlive the life of their husbands or burnt as witches. Men, on the other hand, spend a lot of energy preventing women from becoming a threat and patriarchal education plays a key role here.

For radical feminists, the main battle is against women's subordination and their theories seek to uncover them. Men have been systematically dominating women in all aspects of life and the power-sharing relationships between them and women have become institutionalized. This creates an apt subject for political analysis. Radical feminists, hence seek to expose how men exercise their power, including in personal sphere such as marriage, child-rearing, household chores and in all kinds of sexual practices including rape, prostitution, sexual harassment, and sexual intercourse.

As we have mentioned earlier, women are dominated universally and not much changed over time. It is clear from the discussion so far that men have taken advantage of these practices and enjoyed dominating women. The relationship between sexes can thus be called political. Any change in this relationship will bring a transformation in the sexual relationship of the sexes, i.e., elimination of domination of women by the male.

What has for long been accepted as truth and respected are theories defined by men. Male science has been used to legitimize the views that define women as inferior and their roles to be confined to domestic work, which is nothing less than a slave. Sociology is regarded as a part of this male-dominating culture which belittles the role of the female.

In this regard, radical feminism resists from being a participant of sociology. It instead seeks to transform the way knowledge is produced so that women's subjective understandings are revalued. A number of radical feminist work has concentrated on analyzing the violence of man towards the woman and the methods used to cover them up, marginalized or put the blame on the woman. Radical feminism have struggled to uncover the story of the women, recover her history and cultural heritage and interpret how women's knowledge has been devalued over the ages and by all kinds of societies. They have also documented the universality of patriarchal relationships and unraveled how the most intimate relationships have become political and a kind of powerplay.

The radicals were, however, not entirely successful in their attempts to unravel the ways women are subordinated and exploited. Their failure also lies in their disability to define the various patriarchal relationships in different societies.

Their biological explanations, although very different from the male theorists, are equally reductionist and fail to take account of ideology and culture. Their theories



**NOTES**

have left enough opportunities for socio-biological theorists to be develop new arguments, countering the feminists ones—ones that argue that women's role presently constituted is naturally determined. However, not all radical feminists accept biological theories, arguing that they are developed to justify the subordination of women and that it is necessary to challenge the argument with regard to the existence of two biologically determined sexes.

***Postmodern Feminism***

Postmodern Feminists accept the male/female binary as a main categorizing force in the society. Postmodern Feminists criticize the structure of society and the dominant order, especially in its patriarchal aspects. The term postmodernism was first used in the 1950s by critics to describe what they perceived to be new kind of literary experiments arising out of cultural modernism.

***Multicultural, Global and Ecofeminism***

Multicultural and global feminisms are two related modes of feminist thinking that emphasize women's differences, disagreements, and situated identities, even as they strive to identify both commonalities in women's experiences and opportunities for women to work together to achieve shared goals. Although the terms multicultural feminism and global feminism are often used interchangeably, strictly speaking, multicultural feminism focuses on the different kinds of women living within a nation-state, whereas global feminism highlights the intricate relationships between women in one nation-state and women in other nation-states. Common to both multicultural feminism and global feminism, however, is resistance to two key ideologies that feminists have identified and subsequently rejected: so-called female essentialism and so-called female chauvinism. Female essentialism is the view that there exists some sort of platonic form, 'Woman,' which each woman in the world either embodies or should strive to embody in precisely the same way. Female chauvinism is the tendency for relatively privileged women—most often, White, Western/Northern, middle-class, heterosexual, and well-educated women—to assume, incorrectly, that their way of seeing the world is the way all women see it.

***Multicultural feminism***

Although some of the world's nation-states have fairly homogeneous populations, very few of them have populations that are as homogeneous as the population of Iceland. Most nation-states are very multicultural. Within their historically constructed boundaries are a wide variety of people who, as a result of migration, immigration, forced resettlement, territory seizure, or enslavement are now located in one or other parts of the world. Among these multicultural nation-states is the United States where, in large measure, the concept of multicultural feminism first arose in self-conscious form.

In order to appreciate the significance of the US multicultural feminism, it is necessary to understand the reasons for its emergence and rapid ascendancy. Throughout the 1960s, 1970s and 1980s, the US feminists focused mainly on the gender differences between men and women. They stressed the degree to which, in the West, qualities such as self assertion, rationality, a sense of justice, physical strength, and emotional restraint were associated with masculinity, whereas qualities such as connectedness to others, emotionality, physical weakness and caring were associated with femininity. They also debated the extent to which these traits were biological givens or social and whether masculine traits were better than feminine traits or vice versa.

**NOTES**

Some feminists tried to prove that women had the same intellectual, physical, and moral capacities as men and that, if women were given the same educational and occupational opportunities men had, women could be equal to men. Like men, women could be chief executive officers of large corporations, army generals, neurosurgeons, and football players. Other feminists countered that it was a mistake for women to try to be like men because women's ways of knowing, doing, and being were just as good as, if not better, than that of men. They argued that equal treatment of men and women requires equal recognition of men and women's different needs, interests, and values. Women should not strive to become like men. On the contrary, they should celebrate their difference from men.

Both sameness feminists and difference feminists had crucial points to make about the relationship between men, maleness, and masculinity, on the one hand, and women, femaleness, and femininity on the other. For sameness feminists, the primary enemy of women was sexism—the perspective that views that women are not able to do what men do and are appropriately relegated to the domestic sphere. In contrast, for difference feminists, the primary enemy of women was androcentrism—the view that men are the norm for all human beings and that of women should become like men (Fraser, 1997).

Importantly the debate between sameness and difference feminists was never resolved because by the mid-1980s, feminists' exclusive focus on the category of gender came into question. Lesbians, women of colour, and other marginalized women pointed out that official feminism—the kind of feminism that held sway in the academy and determined which issues counted as feminist—was not a feminism for all women but a feminism for a certain kind of woman, namely, White, heterosexual, middle class, and well-educated women.

Gender is neither the only nor necessarily the main cause of many women's oppression. Depending on her race, ethnicity, class, religion, sexual orientation, age, health status, or level of education, one woman's oppression, they claimed, may be another woman's liberation.

Just because college-educated housewives in suburbia seek release from the domestic duties so they can get jobs in corporate America does not mean that female assembly-line workers do not yearn to be stay-at-home wives and mothers. Moreover, just because some women find that matters related to their sexuality and reproductive capacities and responsibilities play the greatest role in their oppression does not mean that all women find this to be the case. For some women, not sexism but racism, ethnocentrism, classism, heterosexism, ableism, and/or ageism are the major contributors to their low status.

Repentant about its relative neglect of women's differences and its failure to push marginalized women's concerns to the forefront of its agenda, U.S. academic feminism determined to reorder its priorities. Discussions on sexism and androcentrism were replaced by discussions on interlocking systems of oppression (gender, race, age, class) and the multiple jeopardies of women of colour and other marginalized women. Although a privileged White woman may hit her head against a glass ceiling or two in her lifetime, she will not have to face the kind of obstacles a Native American woman with few or no job skills, clinical depression, and an alcoholic husband has to face.

As multicultural feminists see it, sexism, racism, classism, ableism, elitism—indeed all the 'isms' that divide people—interlock and choke whomever they catch in their grip. Oppression is a many-headed beast capable of rearing any one of its heads depending on the situation. The whole body of the beast is the appropriate target



multicultural feminists who wish to end its reign of terror, and, depending on her situation, each woman must pick and choose her battles.

In an attempt to give voice to women whose voices have been previously silenced, multicultural feminists have urged disadvantaged women to educate advantaged women about their concerns. But women of colour and otherwise marginalized women have not always appreciated these gestures of welcome. They claim that it should not be their responsibility to explain themselves to privileged women in terms that privileged women can understand; thereby ironically contributing to the reigning state of affairs in which relatively privileged women are 'us' and underprivileged women are 'them'. On a related issue, many disadvantaged women point out that they do not want to join feminist groups that are populated by mainly advantaged women. They prefer starting their own organizations and working on behalf of women whose condition and experiences are most likely their own. Finally, many women of colour and other previously marginalized women eschew the label feminist either because of popular misconceptions about it or because they prefer to identify themselves as womanists rather than feminists. Conceived by Alice Walker, the term 'womanist' refers to a certain kind of feminist, one who is committed to helping people, men as well as women (Walker, 1983).

For all its virtues, there are some problems with multicultural feminism. First, it is not clear precisely what is meant by the term culture. Sometimes the term denotes a group of women who, on account of their race or ethnicity, share a tradition or history that distinguishes them from other groups of women. But at other times, the term 'culture' is used more expansively to include groups of women who feel that something about them—for example, their sexual orientation to women or their disabled physical condition—is the glue that holds them together and makes them a 'we'.

Second, the differences among women within a culture may be just as great or even greater than the differences between some of them and the women in another culture. For example, a well-educated Asian American woman, whose millionaire great grandparents immigrated to San Francisco from Hong Kong, may have far more in common with an Anglo American woman, whose millionaire great-grandparents made a fortune on Wall Street, than with an Asian American woman, newly immigrated to the United States, who spent her childhood in a struggling Laotian village tending to her large extended family's scrawny chickens.

Third, and related to the second point, it is not clear as to which characteristics make a woman a true or authentic representative of her culture. Must she be an average or typical woman in her culture? Or must she, instead, be a disadvantaged as opposed to an advantaged woman in her culture? These questions are perceptively addressed by Uma Narayan, an Indian woman, who immigrated to the United States and now teaches at a prestigious U.S. university. She claims that her opposition to women-harming Indian cultural practices are often dismissed as the views of a Westernized woman who has betrayed her culture when, in fact, they are the views of many women (and men) who live in India and want to reform their native culture (Narayan, 1997).

Fourth, to the extent that culture is linked with race and/or ethnicity, an increasing number of people in the United States (and, of course, elsewhere) are members of more than one culture. In the 2000 U.S. Census, about 7 million people identified themselves as belonging to more than one race or some other race than the racial categories used in the Census. Increasingly, people wear their multiracial and multiethnic backgrounds proudly. Race and ethnicity take a backseat to the kind of music, clothes, foods, and lifestyles a person prefers.

## NOTES



NOTES

Fifth, and somewhat by way of a summary of the points raised above, if it is to be fully successful, multicultural feminism needs to examine more carefully the concept of whiteness. If by 'white' is meant a living, breathing, organic tradition that weaves together customs, religious beliefs, musical, artistic, and literary works, family stories, and so forth, then there is no unitary white culture. People with white skins do not belong to one White culture. Rather, they participate in, or at least have their roots in, many cultures, for example, Italian American, Irish American, Czech American, Hispanic American, and so on. Much the same can be said about people with black skin or yellow skin. Depending on whether a Black person's family has recently immigrated to the United States from Haiti or has been here since the first of the slave days, that person will identify their culture as Caribbean rather than African American or vice versa. In contrast, if by 'white' is meant not a nonexistent white culture but a hegemonic power structure that will do whatever it has to do to retain and increase its privilege, then multicultural feminists still need to rethink this use of the term 'white'. In the United States, 'white,' as a hegemonic power structure, is the result of the intersection of two facts: namely, which kind of people were most populous in the United States for nearly two centuries (they happened to have white skin) and which kind of people initially gained control of U.S. society's economic, political, and cultural institutions (they also happened to have white skin). But today (as in the past, though to a lesser degree) having white skin is neither a sufficient nor a necessary condition for membership in the US power elite.

Whatever conceptual problems multicultural feminism may have, it has enriched U.S. feminism. Courses and texts on women no longer present gender issues in abstraction from race and class issues. Thematic courses on women as workers may include articles on White teen-aged girls from Minnesota who have run away from their homes and now must eke out a living in Atlanta's seamy sex industry; upper-middle-class African American women working in Fortune 500 companies; and undocumented Mexican American women working as nannies or maids for Texas legislators. Gender issues will be discussed in each of these articles but in ways that show how a woman's age, race, and/or class shape them. Similarly, discussions about reproduction-controlling technologies (contraception, sterilization, and abortion) and reproduction-aiding technologies (donor insemination, in vitro fertilization, and cloning) stress that whether one or more of these technologies is or is not oppressing depends largely on a particular woman's race, class, age, sexual preference, religion, marital status, and so forth. For some women, the right not to reproduce is most important to them. They either do not want children or they want to control the number and spacing of their children. For other women, however, the right to reproduce is their major concern. Pressured to be sterilized or to use long-term contraceptives by policy makers and/or health care professionals who view them as unfit to be mothers, poor women who want large families may feel aggrieved. Moreover, poor women with infertility problems may wish that they, as well as rich women with infertility problems, could afford steep, out-of-pocket in vitro fertilization costs. As they see it, their desire to have children is no less intense than that of rich women. Convinced that women (and men) must understand the ways in which their own and others' race, class, and gender empower or, alternatively, disempower them, multicultural feminists have sought to transform the curricula of women's studies, feminist studies, and gender studies programmes to achieve this educational goal. Increasingly, the materials and texts used in these curricula are thoroughly hyphenated to reflect the fact that, after 2030, people with white skin will no longer constitute the majority of the U.S. population.

At least with respect to sheer numbers, the 'them'—the people of colour—will have become the 'us.' Multicultural feminists live in happy anticipation of this major



NOTES

Fifth, and somewhat by way of a summary of the points raised above, if it is to be fully successful, multicultural feminism needs to examine more carefully the concept of whiteness. If by 'white' is meant a living, breathing, organic tradition that weaves together customs, religious beliefs, musical, artistic, and literary works, family stories and so forth, then there is no unitary white culture. People with white skins do not belong to one White culture. Rather, they participate in, or at least have their roots in, for example, Italian American, Irish American, Czech American, Hispanic American communities. Much the same can be said about people with black skin or yellow skin. Depending on whether a Black person's family has recently immigrated to the United States from Haiti or has been here since the first of the slave days, that person will identify their culture as Caribbean rather than African American or vice versa. In contrast, if by 'white' is meant not a nonexistent white culture but a hegemonic power structure that will do whatever it has to do to retain and increase its privilege, then multicultural feminists still need to rethink this use of the term 'white'. In the United States, 'white,' as a hegemonic power structure, is the result of the intersection of two facts: namely, which kind of people were most populous in the United States for nearly two centuries (they happened to have white skin) and which kind of people initially gained control of U.S. society's economic, political, and cultural institutions (they also happened to have white skin). But today (as in the past, though to a far lesser degree) having white skin is neither a sufficient nor a necessary condition for membership in the US power elite.

Whatever conceptual problems multicultural feminism may have, it has enriched U.S. feminism. Courses and texts on women no longer present gender issues in abstraction from race and class issues. Thematic courses on women as workers may include articles on White teen-aged girls from Minnesota who have run away from their homes and now must eke out a living in Atlanta's seamy sex industry; upper-middle-class African American women working in Fortune 500 companies; and undocumented Mexican American women working as nannies or maids for Texas legislators. Gender issues will be discussed in each of these articles but in ways that show how a woman's age, race, and/or class shape them. Similarly, discussions about reproduction-controlling technologies (contraception, sterilization, and abortion) and reproduction-aiding technologies (donor insemination, in vitro fertilization, and cloning) stress that whether one or more of these technologies is or is not oppressing depends largely on a particular woman's race, class, age, sexual preference, religion, marital status, and so forth. For some women, the right not to reproduce is most important to them. They either do not want children or they want to control the number and spacing of their children. For other women, however, the right to reproduce is their major concern. Pressured to be sterilized or to use long-term contraceptives by policy makers and/or health care professionals who view them as unfit to be mothers, poor women who want large families may feel aggrieved. Moreover, poor women with infertility problems may wish that they, as well as rich women with infertility problems, could afford steep, out-of-pocket in vitro fertilization costs. As they see it, their desire to have children is no less intense than that of rich women. Convinced that women (and men) must understand the ways in which their own and others' race, class, and gender empower or, alternatively, disempower them, multicultural feminists have sought to transform the curricula of women's studies, feminist studies, and gender studies programmes to achieve this educational goal. Increasingly, the materials and texts used in these curricula are thoroughly hyphenated to reflect the fact that, after 2030, people with white skin will no longer constitute the majority of the U.S. population.

At least with respect to sheer numbers, the 'them'—the people of colour—who have become the 'us.' Multicultural feminists live in happy anticipation of this major



social shift, seeing in it opportunities for women to break out of all the bipolar patterns of human domination and subordination that have restricted their thought and action.

### ***Global feminism***

Global feminism is a movement of people working for change across national boundaries. The world is increasingly interdependent. Global feminism contends that no woman is free until the conditions that oppress women worldwide are eliminated (Bunch, 1993).

Global feminism differs from multicultural feminism because it focuses not on women in any one nation-state but on how the condition of women anywhere in the world affects the condition of women everywhere else in the world. Agreeing with multicultural feminists that feminism cannot ignore women's cultural differences, global feminists nonetheless strive to create alliances among women worldwide. They share two goals in common.

The first is to convince all nations to honour women's rights to make free choices about matters related to their reproductive and sexual capacities and responsibilities. Without the ability to control their own bodies and the course of their destiny, women cannot feel like full human persons. The second, coequal goal of global feminists is to bring women (and men) together to create a more just social and economic order at the global as well as national level. Global feminists are activists as well as theorists; they are bent on creating a new world order in which all people, no matter where they live, have enough food, shelter, clothing, health care, and education to live full human lives (Bunch, 1984).

Global feminists realize that women must forge strong global networks in order to eliminate the disparities that exist between the world's wealthy people and the world's poor people. For them, universal sisterhood is not a natural state of affairs but an ideal to achieve. Before women can embrace each other and work together as a team, they must do the hard work of confronting each other. Among the biggest walls to tear down is the wall between women in the so-called First World and women in the so-called Third World.

The First-World/Third-World opposition, which has increasingly been replaced by either the developed nations/developing nations contrast or the North/South contrast, bears the stamp of the world's colonial past. Because of their power, people in developed nations view themselves as the Self—progressive, literate, and enlightened—and people in the developing nations as the Other—backward, illiterate, and ignorant. Having given up their aspirations to control the world's developing nations militarily and politically, the world's developed nations seem bent on controlling them economically and culturally.

One of the ways the developed nations control developing nations economically is related to what is now referred to as the Southern debt. About 30 years ago, when interest rates were relatively low, many developing nations borrowed large amounts of money from developed nations. Unfortunately, interest rates rose steeply, and the developing nations were unable to pay the interest on their loans. In order to prevent the world economic system from crashing, the International Monetary Fund and the World Bank rescheduled the debts of many developing nations. As part of this bailout scheme, they required the affected developing nations to adjust the structure of their economies to facilitate their integration into the global economic system. In order to earn enough foreign currency to finance their rescheduled external debts, however, developing nations have had to export as many inexpensive goods as possible and/or work for large transnational companies located in their boundaries. As a result of this state of affairs, most developing nations have not been able to produce their own



**NOTES**

consumer goods and are forced to import them from developed nations (Jaggar, 2002). Not only are these goods costly, but they also bear the cultural imprint of the world's developed nations.

Global feminists think that women, even more than men, are used to service the Southern debt, thereby participating in their nations' continuing plight. Nevertheless, many women in developing nations decide to work for relatively low wages in the multinational companies located in their homelands. They do so to help support their struggling families and/or to avoid having to work in the sex tourism industry, which caters to men from developed nations. These men pay for the sexual services of women in the developing countries that they visit.

Because of their nations' condition, women in developing nations are often much more focused on economic, social, and political issues than on the sexual and reproductive issues that have tended to preoccupy the interest of women in developed nations. As a result of women's different priorities, women's conversations at international conferences have sometimes degenerated into shouting matches. In fact, at each of the three international women's conferences the United Nations sponsored during the International Decade for Women (1975–1985)—in Mexico City (1975), Copenhagen (1980), and Nairobi (1985)—as well as at Forum 85, a loosely confederated group of 157 non-governmental organizations, problems emerged among women who were variously labelled as First-World, Western, Northern, or from developed nations, on the one hand, and women who were variously labelled as Third World, Eastern, Southern, or from developing nations on the other. Fortunately, by the 1995 women's conference held in Beijing, global feminists had helped women to resolve some of their cross-cultural differences and to appreciate some of their commonalities. Typical of the kinds of educational tools global feminists use to draw women together are studies such as one done on low-income urban women in Brazil, Egypt, Malaysia, Mexico, Nigeria, Philippines, and the United States. Despite their differences, all the women who were studied used their status as mothers to justify their sense of reproductive entitlement. They reasoned that because they, and not the men in their lives, bear the greatest burdens and responsibilities of pregnancy, childbearing, and child rearing, they have earned the right to make the crucial decisions in these areas (Petchesky & Judd, 1998).

Although global feminists consider it vital to acknowledge that political, religious, and cultural contexts make the situations of women different around the world, they also think it is vital to acknowledge that the biological characteristics of females make some situations of women similar around the world. Global feminists urge women to read books about and by each other, to watch films and documentaries that reveal each other's everyday lives, and, if possible, to travel to each other's nations to meet each other face-to-face. In recognizing each other's shared frailty and mortality, global feminists think women will be inspired to care enough about each other to globally produce just policies aimed at eliminating the patterns of domination and subordination, arrogance and cruelty that have characterized human relationships for too long.

***Ecofeminism***

A number of women have moved towards the feminists' fight as they expand their outlook from environmental activism. This has given birth to a new branch of feminism—ecofeminism. This branch draws a similarity between degradation of the environment with that of degradation of women's position. Drawing on earth-based spiritual imagery, ecofeminism suggests that the world's religions have an ethical responsibility to challenge a patriarchal system of corporate globalization that is deepening the impoverishment of the earth and its people. They hold that ecological

**NOTES**

harmony can be restored on the planet and it can also be healed through political action and enforcing the law of equality of all species.

The holistic overview of ecofeminism and its dependence of all forms of studies makes it compatible with global feminism. All branches of feminism link itself with the gender issue and other relevant social categories. Members of each branch and the groups they work with negotiate with regard to how gender is constructed according to their own needs and priorities. Different kinds of feminism result from these constructions.

Post modernists believe that feminists should get rid of dual characteristics of traditional theory. They say that a person should have only one path, either to accept critical attitude and want to change it or should be conservative and keep things as they are. In their opinion they need to be both subjective and objective.

**CHECK YOUR PROGRESS**

1. What is the difference between patriarchy and matriarchy?
2. What is feminism?
3. Name the different theories of feminism.
4. What is radical feminism?
5. Who is regarded as the first feminist?
6. What is the key difference between socialist feminist theory and Marxist theory?

## **2.3 ENVIRONMENTALISM**

Today, the environment is a global concern and this holds special significance in the international sphere. Issues related to the environment need to be addressed through a combined international effort.

### **2.3.1 Why are Environmental Issues a Global Concern?**

It is widely accepted that the challenges posed by environmental degradation, pollution, resource scarcity and population boom cannot be tackled by any one individual country or by a group of countries. It will take a combined effort of all the individuals on the earth as well as effective regulations by all the countries in order to address the problem causes, effects and impacts of environmental problems. Certain important reasons that make environmental issues a global concern are as follows:

- Ozone depletion caused by chlorofluorocarbons (CFC) affect the whole earth.
- Many resources in this world are shared by nations as they fall in the sovereign boundaries of states. However, there are some common resources that do not fall in any national boundary.
- The effects of local or national over-exploitation of resources and environment degradation can be felt worldwide. For example, soil degradation, deforestation or air/water pollution in one locality exhibits global effects.

### **2.3.2 Major Environmental Problems**

Major environmental issues the world has been facing are as follows:

- Global warming
- Ozone depletion
- Threats to biodiversity
- Hazardous waste



NOTES

• **Global warming:** It refers to the increase in earth's average temperature. According to 2007 Fourth Assessment Report by the intergovernmental panel on climate change (IPCC), global surface temperature increased to  $0.74 \pm 0.18^\circ \text{C}$  ( $1.33 \pm 0.32^\circ \text{F}$ ) during the 20th century. In last four decades, the pace of temperature increase has accelerated. Scientists believe that human actions are responsible for this abnormal increase in earth's temperature. The principal cause of global warming is the emission of greenhouse gases (GHGs) into the atmosphere. GHGs trap heat within the earth's environment as it allows sunlight in but stops some of the ensuring heat from radiating back to space. Carbon dioxide is one such GHG which largely comes from the burning of fossil fuel especially from the power plants. Apart from this, the burning of petrol and diesel in vehicles also produce carbon dioxide. Methane is twenty times more deadly in trapping heat. Concentrations of  $\text{CO}_2$  and methane have increased by 36 per cent respectively since 1750.

The GHG-led rapid climatic change is major concern as global warming is increasingly affecting the global atmosphere, especially the ice sheets on earth (Greenland and Antarctica), which are melting and are increasing the sea levels significantly. In addition to the sea level rising, weather patterns can become extreme and unpredictable.

• **Ozone depletion:** Ozone is a layer of gas that acts as a protective cover for the earth. In the latter half of 1970s, many research studies found out a gradual depletion of ozone layer. The reason for ozone depletion is the increase in the level of free radicals (e.g., hydroxyl radicals, nitric oxide radicals and atomic chlorine and bromine). The most important compound which accounts for almost 80 per cent of the depletion of ozone in the stratosphere is chlorofluorocarbons (CFCs). The dangerous effect of ozone layer depletion is related to ultraviolet rays. Ozone layers absorb ultraviolet rays and prevent them from passing through the atmosphere of earth. It is estimated that a 1 per cent depletion of ozone layer leads to 2 per cent more UV-B reaching the surface of earth. The ultraviolet rays are also responsible for several types of diseases related to skin (cancer) and eye (cataracts).

• **Threats to biodiversity:** The global convention on biological diversity, signed in 1992 at the Earth Summit describes biodiversity as the 'variability among all living organisms from all sources, including terrestrial, marine and other aquatic ecosystem and ecological complexes of which they are a part, this includes diversity within species between species of ecosystems'.

In simple terms, biodiversity means the variety of all forms of life, from genes to species. The term biodiversity is a short form of biological diversity. According to the scientists all species and organism, small or big, have an importance in the health of ecosystem. Even the existing diversity in the ecosystem provides economic benefits to human society in forms of food, clothing, shelter, fuel and medicines. Further, greater diversity is essential for sustainability of life forms and for health of the ecosystem.

It has been observed that certain human activities are destroying the ecosystem. Many plants and animal species have also become extinct or are on the verge of extinction. The diversity that evolved on earth in two billion years is threatened by human existence especially in the last four decades. Many species of animals and plants are extinct due to over-hunting, over-fishing, over timbering.

• **Hazardous waste:** Humans produce waste in all forms. With industrialization, the quantity and quality of waste has increased tremendously. These are toxic, non-toxic, nuclear, e-waste and many other types. Generally, these wastes are dumped in seas or are left untreated. This affects the health of humans and also environment at large.

The major effects of wastes include the production of GHGs, pollution of ground and surface water, soil contamination, and other health impacts for humans. In modern societies, wastes are produced from households to industries and offices and improper dumping of wastes creates many environmental hazards.

### **2.3.3 Responses to Environmental Problems**

The responses to environment can be categorized into:

- Governmental responses
- NGOs' responses

The growing concern for environment and related issues produced responses from every section of global society. The primary actors in global politics are the nations. The nations engaged in dialogues and tried to bring out laws, rules, and regulations to stop or reduce the damage to environment. Their efforts led to the establishment of the International Environmental Agreement (IEA). At the same time, the society at large responded by showing greater consciousness and awareness about the environmental issues. People were worried about governmental inaction or ineffectiveness in this direction. Many international non-governmental organizations (INGOs) are established to champion environmental issues.

These responses have been discussed in detail here.

#### **• Governmental Responses**

The governmental responses led to various conventions and agreements to tackle environmental issues. A few are mentioned here in detail.

#### ***Stockholm conference***

The UN Conference on the Human Environment (June 5–16, 1972) was the first organized, worldwide common effort to derive a common outlook on environmental issues. The conference was attended by the representatives of 113 countries, 19 inter-governmental agencies and more than 400 inter-governmental and non-governmental organizations. There are some enduring contributions of Stockholm Conference:

- The Stockholm conference in many ways marks the establishment of environmental issues as an important agenda in international politics. It also set up wider frameworks for future environmental politics.
- The conference made the platform for future international agreements for cooperation on environmental issues and stipulated national responsibility towards environmental damage. It called for an effective management of the natural resources for common benefit by showing responsible behaviour.
- Networks of monitoring centres, at regional and global level, were established to monitor environmental problems. These networks monitor ozone depletion, marine pollution and other environmentally dangerous activities.
- The UN Environmental Programme was created to coordinate and integrate the environment-related activities of various UN agencies.

The Earth Summit: The 1992 Rio Conference: United Nations Conference on Environment and Development (UNCED).

In 1989, the UN General Assembly decided to convene a summit to promote sustainable development which was convened in 1992, in Rio De Janeiro, Brazil. An important agenda in this summit was made by the World Commission on Environment and Development (WEED) and its 1987 report entitled 'Our Common Future' (also



NOTES

known as the Brundtland Report). This report tried to create goals for environmental preservation and economic development and proposed the concept of 'sustainable development'. The report defined sustainable development as 'development that meets the needs of the present without compromising the ability of future generations to meet their own needs'.

The major outcomes of the Rio Conference were as follows:

- **The adoption of the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change (UNFCCC):** This agreement between 153 nations is a framework establishing principles, aims, institutions and procedures for further negotiations and development of agreements. The UNFCCC came into force on 21 March 1994 with the primary objective of 'achieving stabilization of greenhouse gas concentrations in the atmosphere at a level that would present dangerous anthropogenic interference with the climate system. A time frame sufficient to allow ecosystems to adapt naturally to climate change, to ensure that food production is not threatened and enable economic development to proceed in a sustainable manner'.
- **Convention on Biological Diversity (CBD):** This convention was signed by 155 states, and came into force on 29 September 1993. The framework of this convention aimed at:
  - o Preserving the biological diversity of the earth for its intrinsic value
  - o Providing for the sustainable use of its components
  - o Protecting species, ecosystems and habitats and establishing the terms for using genetic resources and biotechnology
  - o Providing for fair and equitable sharing of the benefits arising from the utilization of genetic resources
- **Rio Declaration:** The Rio Declaration proclaimed 27 general principles to guide action on environment and development. Like Stockholm, many of the Rio Declaration influenced the further development of national and international environmental policies. Some of the important points of this declaration are as follows:
  - o Common but differentiated responsibilities
  - o Public information and participation
  - o Precaution
  - o Polluters pays the cost
  - o Environmental impact assessment
  - o States to cooperate in further development of international law in the field of sustainable development
- **Agenda 21:** This is an action plan for governments. This 400 page, 40 chapters document was adopted by consensus by about 180 countries. The chapters include issues like promoting sustainable development combating deforestation, biotechnology management, managing fragile mountain ecosystems and hazardous waste management.

**Kyoto (Japan) Protocol** is an international agreement to address global warming and delay climate change. Some of the important provisions of the protocol are as follows:

- **Legally binding targets and timetables:** The EU, USA and Japan respectively committed themselves to reduce their annual greenhouse gas

**NOTES**

emission by 2008–12 to 8 per cent, 7 per cent and 6 per cent less than 1990 levels. Overall, it aims to reduce the total greenhouse gas emissions of the developed countries (and countries with economies in transition) to 5 per cent below the 1990 level. The protocol came into force on 16 February 2005. However, till now the largest emitter US, has not ratified the treaty.

- **Flexibility mechanisms:** The parties can also take the benefit of flexibility mechanisms instead of their domestic policies and measures to reduce their share of emission. The flexibility mechanisms are as follows:
  - o International emission trading (industrialized states can exchange agreed part of their emission allowances)
  - o Joint implementation (sharing of emission reduction)
  - o Clean development mechanism (developed countries can purchase emission credit [carbon trading] by supporting climate-friendly projects in developing countries)

The flexibility mechanisms allow a country to comply with its target even though its domestic emission may exceed the assigned amount.

**Montreal protocol:** The Montreal Protocol on substance that depletes the ozone layer was agreed upon by twenty-four industrialized states in 1987. This protocol is a corollary of the Vienna Convention for the Protection of Ozone Layer, 1985. The Montreal Protocol originally required the parties to reduce chlorofluorocarbon (CFCs) use to 50 per cent below 1986 levels till 1998. It also required freezing halon consumption at 1986 levels from 1992. With mounting evidences about ozone depletion, the reduction targets for CFCs were accelerated twice, first in 1990 and then in 1992. In 1990, even the number of parties increased to 81 states and, in 1992, major industrialized states promised to phase out CFCs by 1995. To help third world countries meet the requirements of reduction, a fund was promised. Montreal protocol was the first International Environmental Agreement (IEA) to recognize the need for phased commitments for developing countries. For the first time, it proposed binding time schedule for freezing and reducing the ozone depleting substances (ODS). Today, Montreal protocol has become truly global with over 197 state parties.

**Non-government actors**

The 1992 Earth Summit recognized the role of other actors (other than governments) in environmental protection and conservation. It has been observed that a growing number of non-governmental organizations have played a very important role in championing environmental issues. They try to spread awareness about these issues and use different means to pressurize governments to make environment-friendly policies and take stand for environment protection. Certain major environmental NGOs have been described here:

- **Greenpeace:** It was founded in Vancouver, British Columbia, Canada in 1971. Its present headquarters are at Amsterdam, Netherlands. According to Greenpeace website information, it is 'an independent campaigning organization which uses non-violent, creative confrontation to expose global environmental problems and to force the solutions which are essential to a green and peaceful future'. Its goal is to ensure the ability of the earth to nurture life in all its diversity. There are around more than three million members of Greenpeace. Greenpeace currently has a presence in 41 countries and runs for or against policies of governments, actions of companies or groups, climate change, forests defending our ocean, sustainable agriculture, eliminating toxic chemicals, opposing nuclear weapons and peace and disarmaments.



## NOTES

- **Friends of the Earth International:** Friends of the Earth International (FoEI) is an international network of environmental organization in 76 countries. It is a grassroots' environmental network with over 2 million members and supporters around the world. The FoEI challenges 'the current model of economic and corporate globalization, and promote solutions that will help to create environmentally and socially just societies.' The FoEI secretariat is in Amsterdam. It is important to emphasize here that FoEI considers environmental issues in their social, political and human rights contexts. FoEI has different campaign issues related to climate justice and energy, food sovereignty, forests and biodiversity, resisting mining oil and gas and water related issues.
- **Sierra club:** This is one of the oldest environmental NGO. It was founded in 1892 in California, USA by John Muir. It is mainly famous in the USA and Canada. It has more than one million members. The sierra club's mission is 'to explore, enjoy and protect wide places of the earth; to practice and promote the responsible use of earth's ecosystem and resources; to educate and enlist humanity to protect and restore the quality of the natural and human environment and to all lawful means to carry out these objectives'.

### CHECK YOUR PROGRESS

7. Fill in the blanks.
  - (a) Ozone depletion is caused by \_\_\_\_\_.
  - (b) The principal cause of global warming is the emission of \_\_\_\_\_.
8. State whether the following are true or false:
  - (a) The Kyoto (Japan) Protocol is an international agreement to address global warming and delay climate change.
  - (b) The Montreal Protocol is a corollary of the Vienna Convention for the Protection of Ozone Layer, 1985.

## 2.4 SUMMARY

- The word feminist has derived from the French term *féministe*.
- The wave of feminism arose in Europe and America in response to the exclusion of women from mainstream politics and decision making bodies.
- Since 1970s onward feminists from all over the world has debated on the definition, issues, and problems pertaining to 'feminism'. One most burning debate around the issue was whether women are similar to men or requires special recognition and response.
- Liberal Feminists seek equal rights with men. They believe that individuals should be treated on the basis of their talents and effort as opposed to the characteristics of their sex.
- Radical feminism is a philosophy emphasizing social dominance of women by men. It views patriarchy as dividing rights, privileges and power based on gender which invariably results in oppressing women and privileging men.
- Environment is a global concern. According to the 2007 Fourth Assessment Report by the intergovernmental panel on climate change (IPCC), global surface temperature increased to  $0.74 \pm 0.18^{\circ}\text{C}$  ( $1.33 \pm 0.32^{\circ}\text{F}$ ) during the 20th century.
- The principal cause of global warming is the emission of greenhouse gases (GHGs) especially  $\text{CO}_2$  and Methane which trap heat within the earth's

**NOTES**

environment as it allows sunlight in but stops some of the ensuring heat from radiating back to space.

- The GHG-led rapid climatic change is major concern as global warming is increasingly affecting the global atmosphere, especially the ice sheets on earth which are melting and are increasing the sea levels.
- Ozone is a layer of gas that acts as a protective cover for the earth which is gradually depleting. The reason for ozone depletion is the increase in the level of free radicals (e.g., hydroxyl radicals, nitric oxide radicals and atomic chlorine and bromine).
- The diversity that evolved on earth in two billion years is threatened by human existence, especially in the last four decades. Many species of animals and plants are extinct due to over-hunting, over-fishing and overtimbering.
- With industrialization, the quantity and quality of waste in the form of toxic, non-toxic, nuclear, e-waste has increased tremendously. Generally, these wastes are dumped in seas or are left untreated which affects the health of humans and also environment at large.

## **2.5 KEY TERMS**

- **First wave feminism:** First wave feminism was the extended period of feminist activity during the nineteenth century in the UK and US.
- **Phalanxes:** Communities are known as Phalanxes.
- **Radical feminism:** It is a revolutionary movement for the emancipation of women.
- **Chlorofluorocarbons:** It is a chemical compound which contains chlorine, fluorine, carbon, hydrogen, and its detrimental to the environment.
- **Ecology:** It is a discipline of study that analyzes the associations and relations between living organisms and their environment.
- **Biodiversity:** Biodiversity is known as the variety or species found in an ecosystem.

## **2.6 ANSWERS TO 'CHECK YOUR PROGRESS'**

1. The word patriarchy literally means the rule of the father or the 'patriarch' and matriarchy means rule of the mother.
2. Feminism refers to the principle of equality and equal rights to both men and women.
3. Socialist feminism, liberal feminism, radical feminism and postmodern feminism are the different theories of feminism.
4. Radical feminism opposes existing political and social organization in general because it is inherently tied to patriarchy.
5. Mary Wollstonecraft is regarded as the first feminist.
6. The key difference between socialist feminist theory and Marxist theory is that Marxist theory focuses on property and economic conditions to build an ideology, whereas, socialist feminism focuses on sexuality and gender.
7. (a) Chlorofluorocarbons; (b) Greenhouse gases
8. (a) True; (b) True



## UNIT-3 THE CONCEPT OF IDEOLOGY AND END OF IDEOLOGY DEBATE

*The Concept of Ideology  
and End of Ideology Debate*

### NOTES

#### Structure

- 3.0 Introduction
- 3.1 Unit Objectives
- 3.2 Concept of Ideology
- 3.3 Debate on the End of Ideology Theory
- 3.4 Summary
- 3.5 Key Terms
- 3.6 Answers to 'Check Your Progress'
- 3.7 Questions and Exercises
- 3.8 Further Reading

### 3.0 INTRODUCTION

Social transformation is the goal of all reformers and philosophers. They offer their sets of ideas for a future world along different streams called ideologies. In the modern world two major ideologies have contested each other to win the hearts of people. One is bourgeoisie capitalism, the other is socialism. Throughout seven decades from 1919 to 1990 the Soviet Union offered the alternative to the bourgeois capitalist system. However, in 1995 criticism of the Soviet state started from within the system and the ideological purity of socialism came to be doubted. It was in this situation that the theory of end of ideologies appeared in the world.

This unit will introduce you to the concepts of ideology and help you understand the debate on end of ideology.

### 3.1 UNIT OBJECTIVES

After going through this unit, you will be able to:

- Understand the definition and meaning of ideology
- Learn the views of different theorists on ideology
- Analyse the difference between political philosophy and political ideology
- Participate in the debate on ideology and end-of-ideology theories

### 3.2 CONCEPT OF IDEOLOGY

The word ideology was given currency by a French theorist Detutt de Tracy. Tracy introduced this term as a newly-conceived science differing from metaphysics. By ideology, Tracy meant the science of ideas. Ideology represented the modern answer to the tradition of political theory in the past. Ideologues like Caboni and Condillac looked towards the formulation of a theory of government and programme of political action. In their hands, ideology could not remain content to keep aloof from the politics of the day.

Ever since Karl Marx denounced ideology as false consciousness or Karl Mannheim equated it with utopia or Daniel Bell spoke of the end of ideology, the world ideology has come to acquire an opprobrium which it has never wholly escaped. Ideology, as it is now understood, signifies a type of political theory which upholds a certain political system in the broadest sense and the values and ideals that sustain it. It is the final approximation of the human mind to an ideal arrangement and, therefore, claiming this finality, seeks to realize it.

## NOTES

Ideology indicates a set of ideas. At its one extreme are those which stand for no chance in the prevailing order. On the other are those crying for revolution in the social order. It may signify the refutation of one or the justification of another. Whether ideology is critically referred to as a utopia or a false consciousness, its role in human society is highly significant.

Ideology is defined as any more or less systematic set of ideas about man's place in nature, in society and in history, i.e., in relation to particular societies. Ideology can elicit the commitment of a significant number of people for (or against) political change. However, it does not exclude a set of ideas essentially concerned with merely a class or a nation, if it relates to the place and needs of that section of community, to the place of man in general. Thus, liberalism, conservatism and various nationalisms are all ideologies.

Ideologies contain, in varying proportions, elements of explanation (of fact and history), justification (of demands) and faith or belief (in the ultimate truth or rightness of their cause). They are informed by, but are less precise and systematic than, political theories or political philosophies. They are necessary to any effective political the triple function of simplifying, demanding and justifying.

Ideology refers to an action-related system of political ideas. It involves a set of ideas concerning the change or a defence of the existing political structure and relationship. In short, ideology connotes commitment and action as part of the political process. Political ideology and political philosophy differ in important respects: Political philosophy evokes reflection and understanding, while political ideology is more likely to imply commitment and action.

A typology of definitions of ideology in terms of origin, structure and functions has been offered by Polish sociologist, Jerzy Wiatr. These may be classified under genetic definitions, structural definitions and functional definitions.

### *Definitions*

Ideology is identified with the spiritual structure of the age. Mannheim's concept of total ideology includes a totality of theories, doctrines and concepts that are typical for an entire historical epoch. Ideology represents the spiritual structure of a particular social group. It is the totality of ideas characteristic of a social class or a group of people. According to Donald Mac Rae, people associate ideology with some aspect of class consciousness or class feeling which has coloured thought or desire.

### *Structural definitions*

Ideology is identified with systems of views which contain value judgments. Walter Metzger defines it as a system of beliefs that presents value judgments as empirical truths. Their aim is to justify a particular socio-economic group's claim to material and prestigious reward. Ideology is a system of views, which contains directives to action. According to D. Gould, ideology is a pattern of beliefs and concepts, both factual and normative, which purports to explain complex social phenomena with a view to directing and simplifying socio-political choices facing individuals and groups.

### *Functional definitions*

Ideology is a social function in relation to the socio-economic status of any group whose views it expresses. Ideology is a social function in relation to the socio-economic status of any groups whose views it expresses. Ideology is a pattern of ideas, values and symbols. Its aim is to maintain the conditions of life of a particular group, to change them partially or completely and to alter these conditions.



## NOTES

Karl Mannheim distinguishes between ideology and utopia. To him ideology is a sum total of ideas. Those ideas are associated with the interests and desires of conservative social groups. They aim at preserving the status quo. Ideology is a concept used to designate the primary values which people possess. It enables them to impose some kind of mental order on the diverse individual and social experiences which they meet. A political ideology, thus, is a set of primary values from which a person derives his attitudes towards political events and problems. It is this which guides man's political conduct.

There is a divergence of opinion on the degree of explicitness, integration and internal consistency which any set of primary values should possess in order to be termed as ideology. But it may be most useful to employ the term in its widest sense, which includes any related values that are not derived from *a priori* values. This, in turn, gives rise to the notion of a ladder of values. It is from these that social decisions are derived in logical, though not necessarily actual progression. They are derived from politics, policies from programmes and programmes from ideologies. Thus for example, a decision to nationalize a particular steel company may be an outcome of a policy of steel nationalization. This, in turn, is a part of the general programme involving nationalization of basic industries, which is ultimately derived from an ideology of socialism. Similarly, an ideology of free enterprise leads to a legislated programme of monopoly regulation. It signifies a policy of prohibition, of certain types of merger and a particular decision to forbid a proposed link between two firms.

It is more difficult to restrict the use of the term ideology only to those value sets which are explicit and internally consistent. For, while several ideologies have been made explicit (e.g., Marxism, Catholicism, Anti-Semitism) they are rarely, if ever, completely internally consistent. In any case, for each individual, they depend upon personal interpretation and application, which itself increases the chances of inconsistencies cropping up.

In the context of a society, an ideology may be congruent with, or opposed to, the pressing values of that society. However, it cannot remain unaffected by experience within the society. Ideologies become modified (though not necessarily nationally) to talk of Marxism that occurred in the decades between the Bolshevik Revolution and the Second World War.

### CHECK YOUR PROGRESS

1. What is ideology?
2. What is the structural definition of ideology?
3. What is the functional definition of ideology?

### 3.3 DEBATE ON THE END OF IDEOLOGY THEORY

Thus, ideology plays a very important part in the life of society and in its progress. Ideology, in turn, evolves together with the society. It develops along with the changes taking place in the material conditions of existence of the classes whose interests and aspirations it expresses. Ideology, in turn, evolves together with the society. It develops along with the changes taking place in the material conditions of existence of the classes whose interests and aspirations it expresses. Ideology employs for its own ends and needs, the attainments of science, literature and the arts, and always affects them. Ideology is an expression in the sphere of ideas of that objective process due to which society has split into opposing classes.

## NOTES

Karl Mannheim distinguishes between ideology and utopia. To him ideology is a sum total of ideas. Those ideas are associated with the interests and desires of conservative social groups. They aim at preserving the status quo. Ideology is a concept used to designate the primary values which people possess. It enables them to impose some kind of mental order on the diverse individual and social experiences which they meet. A political ideology, thus, is a set of primary values from which a person derives his attitudes towards political events and problems. It is this which guides man's political conduct.

There is a divergence of opinion on the degree of explicitness, integration and internal consistency which any set of primary values should possess an order to be termed as ideology. But it may be most useful to employ the term in its widest sense, which includes any related values that are not derived from *a priori* values. This, in turn, gives rise to the notion of a ladder of values. It is from these that social decisions are derived in logical, though not necessarily actual progression. They are derived from politics, policies from programmes and programmes from ideologies. Thus for example, a decision to nationalize a particular steel company may be an outcome of a policy of steel nationalization. This, in turn, is a part of the general programme involving nationalization of basic industries, which is ultimately derived from an ideology of socialism. Similarly, an ideology of free enterprise leads to a legislated programme of monopoly regulation. It signifies a policy of prohibition, of certain types of merger and a particular decision to forbid a proposed link between two firms.

It is more difficult to restrict the use of the term ideology only to those value sets which are explicit and internally consistent. For, while several ideologies have been made explicit (e.g., Marxism, Catholicism, Anti-Semitism) they are rarely, if ever, completely internally consistent. In any case, for each individual, they depend upon personal interpretation and application, which itself increases the chances of inconsistencies cropping up.

In the context of a society, an ideology may be congruent with, or opposed to, the pressing values of that society. However, it cannot remain unaffected by experience within the society. Ideologies become modified (though not necessarily nationally) to talk of Marxism that occurred in the decades between the Bolshevik Revolution and the Second World War.

### CHECK YOUR PROGRESS

1. What is ideology?
2. What is the structural definition of ideology?
3. What is the functional definition of ideology?

### 3.3 DEBATE ON THE END OF IDEOLOGY THEORY

Thus, ideology plays a very important part in the life of society and in its progress. Ideology, in turn, evolves together with the society. It develops along with the changes taking place in the material conditions of existence of the classes whose interests and aspirations it expresses. Ideology, in turn, evolves together with the society. It develops along with the changes taking place in the material conditions of existence of the classes whose interests and aspirations it expresses. Ideology employs for its own ends and needs, the attainments of science, literature and the arts, and always affects them. Ideology is an expression in the sphere of ideas of that objective process due to which society has split into opposing classes.



NOTES

However, the prevailing tendency among the bourgeois writers is to bring ideology down to the level of false consciousness. At this stage, it would be worthwhile to examine how the end-of-ideology theorists deal with the concept of ideology. The abstract formalism, typical as a whole, of the positivist and neo-positivist treatment of ideology, is particularly evident in their writings. It is held that all ideologies possess a certain number of signs which are formal. Some are not always essential, while others are seen lacking to any formal system. One gains the impression that the model of ideology is created in *a priori* fashion speculatively, without any investigation in reality. Thus all manner of adverse and negative features are attributed to the concept of ideology. This renders ideology outmoded and unnecessary.

Most end-of-ideologist theorists subscribe to Mannheim's distribution between ideology and utopia. Daniel Bell, for example, views ideology as a system of ideas. According to him, ideology serves to the needs of the existing social system. As against this, a utopia is oriented on a change in the existing set-up. On the whole he is inclined towards a total treatment of ideology as a universal spiritual structure. He sees ideology as a guide to the behaviour of individuals and whole groups, for attaining certain ends. This universal ideology, as Bell describes it, is a form of secular religion.

It is a curious paradox that despite the enunciation of ideology in the broadest and most universal and total sense, the end-of-ideology theorists narrow down its content. Moreover, the terms universal and total, suggest that ideology provides an all-embracing picture of social reality. It interprets the entire course of history, having necessary consequences, in respect of the future development of mankind.

Arthur Schlesinger presents, perhaps, the clearest definition of ideology. According to him, ideology is a body of systematic and rigid dogma by which people seek to understand the world and to preserve or transform it. An ideology is not a picture of actuality. It is a model derived from actuality. It is these which the model builder, the ideologist as a saving remedies. *Ipsa facto*, is committed to a fatalistic view of history.

Schlesinger elucidates his ideological fatalism by the example of an ideologist's approach to history. An ideologist, he writes, upholds a schematic or absolute theory of social development, a social credo that reveals all the secrets of history. It is the framework which enables the ideologist to see the world as an integral whole. The history of the world is pre-ordained. Its principles are inalienable. Its aims and values emanate from the fundamental and theoretical pre-requisites. The ideological look upon the world as a single entity. The whole of this world may be embraced in a single point of view. Everything may be brought down to a single system of abstract concepts. This has the effect of preventing people from appreciating correctly any specific measure that is necessary and possible at a particular moment. As Schlesinger puts it, ideology, therefore, is a totality. However, one may interpret this description, it remains extremely formal and imprecise. This has the effect of distorting the real social phenomena.

Furthermore, certain notions in the precise social and even natural sciences may also be dogmatic. This does not mean that these sciences, because of the presence of such elements, become ideologies. A formal sign of dogmatism per se does not express the essence of ideology. But it veils the class character of ideological views and opinions. Here Schlesinger's subjectivist treatment of ideology is readily apparent.

Daniel Bell's description of ideology too remains one-sided and at times contradictory. Bell connects the appearance of ideology with a certain period in the history of European society. This period had been marked by intensive development of industrial capitalism. It had been a period of actual ideological struggle in the 19th

**NOTES**

and 19th centuries. Bell points out: Whatever its origins among the French philosophers, Ideology, as a way of translating ideas into action, was given its sharpest phrasing by the Left Hegelians, by Feuerbach and by Marx.

Bell, however, depicts and ideology as something negative and undesirable, although in some circumstances evidently inevitable in social life. It arises, he claims, when countries begin their transition in their efforts to develop industrial societies, that is, when they begin to modernize. This transition is accompanied by a fierce struggle for forms and method of industrialization among various groups and classes, the various social upheavals and revolutions. In the sphere of ideology, this is a struggle often to the death. As society becomes 'industrial', one sees the twilight of the ideologies of communism, liberalism and conservatism. It would seem, therefore, that ideology is somehow a relatively short lived phenomenon in social history.

Bell argues that in many respects, ideologies come to replace the religious system that had earlier prevailed. In his opinion, the power of ideologies lies in their fervour. One might claim that the most latent function of ideology is to tap emotion. In this respect, ideology comes very close to religion. But religious symbols drain away and disperse emotional energy from the personal world on to the litany, liturgy, the sacraments, the arts, etc. Ideology, on the other hand, fuses these energies and channels them into politics. That is how, Bell claims, ideologies rouse the public to political action.

For this purpose, Bell considers the following points as of vital importance:

- To simplify social, political, economic and moral ideas with a view to making them accessible to the public at large;
- To establish which notions and actions are true and correct, and which are false and incorrect;
- To demand from one's ideological followers action in a strictly regulated direction.

According to Bell, ideologies are nothing more than a particular form of secularism. But to describe the teachings of French philosophers by Feurbach and Marx, as secular religion, would be a distortion of historical truth. Bell, however, makes certain concessions. According to him, the philosophers, by identifying inevitability with progress, link up ideology with the positive values of science. The idea of social equality and freedom, in the broadest sense, is a key and attractive proposition to many ordinary people. Despite Bell's concession, the substance of his arguments is that ideologies have perverted ideas and have deformed people's consciousness. In this sense, ideologies are a negative and an outmoded phenomenon. Thus, Bell remains the most vocal champion of ideological subjectivism.

The rise of ideologies in the 18th and 19th centuries corresponded to the upsurge in that class of intellectuals who tried to establish themselves in the society. Intellectuals, as distinguished from scholars, can be the creators as well as the bearers of an ideology. The scholar has a bounded field of knowledge. He is dominated by a tradition and seeks to find his place in it. He adds to the existing tradition, the accumulated and the tested knowledge of the past. He aims to achieve the objective science free from all subjective elements. The intellectual, on the contrary, begins with his experience, his individual perception of the world, his privileges and deprivations and judges the world by these sensibilities. Thus, ideological subjectivism has its roots in the subjectivism of understanding reality by intellectuals. They are not 'objective' scholars, but the makes of the objective science.



## NOTES

The concept of ideology, according to the end-of-ideology theorists, has the following characteristics:

- Dogmatism;
- Utopianism (in sense that its ideals and prescription are unrealizable);
- Heightened emotionalism, bias and subjectism; which are incompatible with natural sciences;
- Rhetoric and sumptuousness of language and formulations.

Ideology is portrayed as a means or instrument of spiritual control of the public (which believes in it), in the interest of the power elite or those who are the creators of ideology. Ideology, in this connotation, inevitably bears the imprint of subjectivism. Apart from these characteristics mentioned above, ideologies may have altogether different features.

There are unscientific and scientific ideologies, dogmatic and non-dogmatic, self-interest class-based and universal ideologies and so on. The nature of ideologies, however, depends on the nature of their bearers, that is, social groups and classes, irrespective of whether the classes are progressive or revolutionary, or whether they are reactionary and conservative. Majority of the Western sociologists adopt a one-sided electrical view in matters of investigating the problem of ideology and social process as whole. Therefore, their theory is not an adequate reflection of reality.

In so far as the end-of-ideology theorists look at the ideology theorists look at ideology from an external and superficial point of view, they commit a methodological error. They depict ideology as a psychological accretion of the personality or of social groups in general. They fail to reveal the social and class sources of its origin and functions. In their writings, ideology appears to be only the dream-child of individual intellectuals. Thus, the class characteristic, which is the basic trait in describing any ideology, in fact, is excluded from a definition of the concept of ideology in an attempt to conceptualise it. Without any justification, Bell and other theorists of the end-of-ideology, put political ideology on a level with ideology overall. In this way, they commit an elementary logical mistake. The end-of-ideology theory, therefore, is unsound in its starting basic postulates and especially in its failure to consider the facts of historical development. Consequently, this bourgeois perspective distorts the very essence of ideology as a social phenomenon.

### CHECK YOUR PROGRESS

4. According to Bell, what are the concerns of ideology?
5. Define the concept of ideology according to the end-of-ideology theorists.

## 3.4 SUMMARY

- Ideology, as it is now understood, signifies a type of political theory which upholds a certain political system in the broadest sense and the values and ideals that sustain it. It is the final approximation of the human mind to an ideal arrangement and therefore, claiming this finality, seeks to realize it.
- Structural definition of ideology is identified with systems of views which contain value judgments. Walter Metzger defines it as a system of beliefs that presents value judgments as empirical truths.

## NOTES

- Functional definition of ideology is a social function in relation to the socio-economic status of any group whose views it expresses.
- Bell considers the following objectives and concerns of ideology: (i) To simplify social, political, economic and moral ideas with a view to making them accessible to the public at large; (ii) To establish which notions and actions are true and correct, and which are false and incorrect; and (iii) To demand from one's ideological followers action in a strictly regulated direction.
- The concept of ideology, according to the end-of-ideology theorists, has the following characteristics: (i) Dogmatism; (ii) Utopianism (in sense that its ideals and prescription are unrealizable); (iii) Heightened emotionalism, bias and subjectivism; which are incompatible with natural science; and (iv) Rhetoric and sumptuousness of language and formulations.

### 3.5 KEY TERMS

- **Ideology:** It is more or less systematic set of ideas about man's place in nature, in society and in history, i.e., in relation to particular societies.
- **Dogmatism:** Dogmatism is the tendency to lay down principles as incontrovertibly true, without consideration of evidence or the opinions of others.
- **Fatalism:** Fatalism is the belief that all events are predetermined and, therefore, inevitable.

### 3.6 ANSWERS TO 'CHECK YOUR PROGRESS'

1. Ideology signifies a political theory which upholds a certain political system in the broadest sense and the values and ideals that sustain it. It is the final approximation of the human mind to an ideal arrangement and, therefore, claiming this finality, seeks to realize it.
2. Structural definition of ideology states that it is a system of beliefs that presents value judgements as empirical truths.
3. Functionally, ideology is a social function in relation to the socio-economic status of any group whose views it expresses.
4. According to Bell, the main concerns of ideology are: (i) To simplify social, political, economic and moral ideas with a view to making them accessible to the public at large; (ii) To establish which notions and actions are true and correct and which are false and incorrect; and (iii) To demand from one's ideological followers action in a strictly regulated direction.
5. The concept of ideology, according to the end-of-ideology theorists, has the following characteristics: (i) Dogmatism; (ii) Utopianism (in sense that its ideals and prescription are unrealizable); (iii) Heightened emotionalism, bias and subjectivism; which are incompatible with natural science; and (iv) Rhetoric and sumptuousness of language and formulations.

### 3.7 QUESTIONS AND EXERCISES

#### Short-Answer Questions

1. Define the concept of ideology and give different definitions of this concept.
2. Write a short note on the end-of-ideology theory.
3. Define Daniel Bell's theory and concept of ideology.



## UNIT-4 THEORIES OF TRANSFORMATION

### Structure

- 4.0 Introduction
- 4.1 Unit Objectives
- 4.2 Lenin
  - 4.2.1 Conditions for Successful Working of Socialism
- 4.3 Mao
  - 4.3.1 Background of History: Struggle for Socialism
  - 4.3.2 Essence of New Democracy or Socialism
  - 4.3.3 Economy of New Democracy or New Socialism
  - 4.3.4 Contradicting the Die Hards
  - 4.3.5 Mao's Hundred Flowers Policy
  - 4.3.6 Culture of New Socialism or Democracy
- 4.4 Gandhian Thoughts on State Policy
  - 4.4.1 Welfare Concept of the State
  - 4.4.2 Gandhi on Democracy
- 4.5 Communitarianism
- 4.6 Multiculturalism
- 4.7 Summary
- 4.8 Key Terms
- 4.9 Answers to 'Check Your Progress'
- 4.10 Questions and Exercises
- 4.11 Further Reading

### NOTES

#### 4.0 INTRODUCTION

Transformation has been the dream of great men in history from the beginning. In the ancient period, prophets and reformers took up the cause of social transformation and reconstruction. The modern world, however, has generally lost faith in prophetic charisma. There is a trend towards social organization and movement for such reconstructive activities. In the 19th century, great transformational works were undertaken by Karl Marx and Fredrik Engels. They wrote profusely and worked through the organizations of socialist parties of Europe. Their theoretical position and programme of action have been named Marxism.

Marx and Engels worked through a socialist international organization to which workers parties of Europe were affiliated. Though Marx wanted the workers to revolt and capture state power from the bourgeoisie, it was Vladimir Lenin who first set up a secretive Communist Party and carried on the Bolshevik Revolution. Lenin's contribution towards Marxism in respect of organized action was enormous. He set up a state of Soviet Union which grew into the second most powerful state in the world. However, that state collapsed in 1990.

Following Marx and Lenin along a slightly different channel Mao Zedong in China carried out a peasant revolution and started building a communist state in 1949. However, after the death of Mao, the movement took a turn towards a capitalist economy while its power structure remained monolithic as before.

In India, Mohandas Karamchand Gandhi undertook a unique programme of national liberation through non-violent revolution by changing the hearts of people. He appealed to the morality of the British rulers and the spirit of freedom of the Indian people whom he called upon to sacrifice. He made India free but was assassinated by an Indian within six months of India's Independence. Besides the political programme of liberation, Gandhi's economic and educational programmes were unique too. He insisted upon self-help of the common people and productive education for children (*navitalim*).

## NOTES

Gandhi was the first who offered an alternative to the modernist politics of the state and its economy. He is said to be a philosophical anarchist. One specific problem the modern state faced was the dominance of majorities and suppression of minority cultures. Even federalism could not solve it because in most of the countries minorities are spread out and mixed with the majorities.

This problem is addressed by a new policy of multiculturalism that goes to the 1960s, which acknowledges group rights as well as individual rights.

Modernism has been challenged recently by a new school of thought calling itself 'post-modernist'. They reject the supremacy of the state and draw our attention to the community. They replace the concept of rights by the concept of care. They replace nationalism by what they call mutual trust that constitutes the social capital. This school of thought is also known as 'communitarian'.

### 4.1 UNIT OBJECTIVES

After going through this unit, you will be able to:

- Identify the role of Lenin and Mao in socialism
- Discuss the ideas of Gandhi on decentralization
- Explain the concept of communitarianism
- Describe multiculturalism

### 4.2 LENIN

Lenin was the architect of the first communist state in the world. Along with Marx, he has also become a saint, a god, a philosopher, and a guide for communists all over the world.

He brought Marxism up-to-date and adapted it to Russia. In a way, he rehabilitated true revolutionary Marxism which was placed in cold storage or rather buried by the opportunists and revisionists of the Second International.

In this context, we have to discuss the concept of socialism which has been developed by Lenin at length.

#### (i) *Imperialist capitalism: way to socialism*

Lenin thought that with the concepts of the party and of imperialist capitalism the theory of communism as a logical structure was complete, yet it lacked what proved to be its main driving force as a political system. This was the concept of socialism in one country added by Stalin and his sole venture into theory. In one sense this was a normal capstone to Leninism—at least to the concept of Leninism developed in this way. For Lenin's achievement as it has been described here, was to produce a version of Marxism applicable to an industrially underdeveloped society with an agrarian peasant economy. Socialism in the country, therefore, completed the divergence between Lenin's Marxism and the Marxism of Western Europe, which had been conceived by Marx and Marxists as a theory to transform a highly industrial economy from a capitalist to a socialist society. It is hardly surprising, therefore, that from the standpoint of Marxist theory, all this was commonly understood; Stalin's concept of socialism in one country was logically weak. He tried to meet the arguments that made the concept seem a paradox. In origin it was hardly more than an incident in the scramble for the succession that followed Lenin's death, and Stalin's purpose when he put the theory forward 'was to eliminate Trotsky's relations with Lenin. It included an unfair, even mendacious, representation of the theory of permanent revolution and of Trotsky's relations with Lenin.'



**(ii) Industrial and military power**

In spite of this, socialism in one country became the operative factor in Leninism. Under this slogan communist Russia emerged as a great industrial and military power, as it initiated in 1928, the first of the five-year plans which began a revolution with far greater long-term political and social consequences than Lenin's revolution of 1917. By harnessing communism to the tremendous driving force of Russian nationalism, the five-year plans became the first great experiment with a totally planned economy. And by its success Russian communism became a model likely to be followed by peasant societies with national aspirations the world over.

In 1924 Stalin put forward very abruptly the thesis that Russia 'can and must build up a socialist society'. Only a few months before he had repeated the conventional opinion, current since 1917 and before, that the permanence of socialism in Russia depended on Socialist Revolutions in Western Europe. Stalin argued that the only bar to a complete socialist society in Russia was the risk created by 'capitalist encirclement' (the intrigues), the 'espionage nets,' or the intervention of the capitalist enemies. There was nothing new, of course, in the belief that communist and capitalist states could not permanently coexist.

**(iii) High-level of production**

Lenin held this opinion, but this was not the obstacle, from the standpoint of Marxism, for completing socialism in Russia. Marxists had supposed that socialism required an economy with a high level of production and hence an industrial society, which Russia obviously was not. Stalin did not meet this argument but argued instead that socialism could be built in a country of great extent with large natural resources. In effect he neglected the economic argument normal to Marxism and substituted a political argument. Stalin assumed that, given adequate resources, an adequate labour force, and a government with unlimited power, a socialist economy could be constructed as a political policy. This, of course, is what socialism in one country became, and in theory it is quite different from the supposed dependence of politics on the economy which had been a principle of Marxism. On the other hand, Stalin's assumption fitted rather easily with some elements of Leninism.

It was not at all clear that Lenin was proposing a different policy from that which the party had long been following, for no one in 1924 denied that it ought to move toward socialism as fast and as far as it could. For practical purposes 'this had been settled when Lenin persuaded the party to abandon projects for carrying communism into Western Europe and to accept the German terms at Brest-Litovsk. As was then said, Lenin traded space for time when he acceded to the loss of territory that the Germans demanded. But there was no point in gaining time except on the supposition that communism had a future in Russia. 'From the moment of the victory of socialism in one country,' Lenin had then said, the only important question is 'the best conditions for the development and strengthening the Socialist Revolution that has already started.'

**(iv) Struggle against world imperialism**

As far as tactics were concerned, Lenin was banking on the possibility provided by his theory of imperialism that a significant period of coexistence might be possible. In developing the idea that capitalism develops unevenly, he had said, 'the victory of socialism is possible first in a few or even in one single capitalist country.' He was then thinking of countries already industrialized but less ingenuity than Lenin's would have sufficed to apply the idea to Russia. Finally, in some of his latest writings he seemed to be saying that through its own cultural and industrial development Russia

**NOTES**

NOTES

could go a long way towards socialism. There was perhaps even a suggestion of Russian nationalism when Trotsky told the Communist International: 'The struggle of Soviet Russia has merged with the struggle against world imperialism'. The fact that Stalin's theory was more remarkable because of its dialectical awkwardness because it made any important change in Leninism.

If, then, Lenin was proposing no change of policy, it seemed as if nothing was left of his theory except the academic question whether socialism in Russia could be completed. There were, of course, other important questions, notably of rate of industrialization. Stalin had said nothing about this. Should industrialization be rapid with corresponding rapid changes in agriculture? Or should it be slow with a correspondingly long tolerance of the peasant agriculture permitted in 1917. On these questions there were sharp differences of opinion in 1924, and socialism in one country then seemed to be more acceptable to the gradualists than to their opponents, perhaps because it seemed to acknowledge the magnitude of the task. Stalin performed one of his devious political maneuvers: he sided with the gradualists to eliminate the opposition, and having established his power, he started in his five-year plan a far more rapid rate of industrialization than anyone had ever considered possible. In view of his political methods, one might suppose that the whole proceeding including the studied vagueness of his theory, was an example of deliberate guile, but it is really not possible to say how much of the end Stalin foresaw from the beginning. In view of the feebleness of the theory, it can hardly be supposed that the party's acceptance of socialism in one country was due to logic. The truth seems to be that the party was heartily tired, after seven years of governing against heavy odds, of being told that it held power on the sufferance of a revolution that looked less and less likely to happen. With success its confidence had grown in its ability not only to hold on but to go ahead, and its inherited theory of revolution had become a frustrating socialism in one country seems to be that Stalin told the party what it wanted to hear, a formal political argument more persuasive than dialectic.

(v) *Agricultural production*

Though the party saw little of what it was committing itself to, its acceptance of socialism in the country meant adoption of forced-draft industrialization that Lenin had begun in 1928 and he forced collectivization of agriculture that began the following year. In little more than a decade the party created in Russia a military force able, with Western support, to withstand the German onslaught of World War II. It created an industrial system with a greatly expanded productive capacity and was capable of indefinite or further expansion at an extraordinarily rapid rate of annual increase. It created a 'government stable enough' to remain master of its military force and resourceful enough to initiate and in some fashion to manage the industrial system while the party retained its control over the government. It worked on Russia to bring about the necessary corresponding changes. It created the literacy needed to turn peasants into an industrial working force, and it trained the managers, technicians, engineers and scientists without whom a modern industrial society is impossible. This was a revolution imposed, as Stalin said, 'from above' and by an utterly totalitarian dictatorship. It also imposed on Russia, in little more than a decade, the hardship and barbarism that Marx, in his historical account of the 'primitive accumulation' of capital, had described as spread through more than two centuries of English history. Of this he had said 'Capital comes into the world soiled with mire from top to toe, and oozing blood in every pore.' In Russia, this was literally true.



**(vi) Imperatives of industrialization**

The story of Lenin's revolution belongs to general history. What is relevant here are its implications for the political theory of Russian Marxism. Its effect was to make Lenin's Russia, socialist in name, into the greatest of European national powers. No fiction could make the Russian state appear to be a super-structure on the Russian economy, for the superstructure was visibly creating its economic base. Socialism in the country cut the last tie with the conventional meaning of economic base. Socialism in one country cut the last tie with the conventional meaning of economic determinism, already made tenuous by Trotsky's theory or of imperialism. The motive to which Lenin appealed was Russian patriotism, for there was no more than a verbal difference between building up the socialist homeland and building up the Russian homeland. The regime was socialist only in the sense that the nation owned the means of production, its realities were political absolutism, and the imperatives of industrialization. It claimed indeed to have abolished exploitation, but the claim rested on a semantic argument: the workers 'own' the factories and cannot exploit themselves. It claimed also that it had conquered the class struggle, that relations between the industrial workers and the peasants were 'friendly,' but the accumulation of capital was effected by forced saving which came mostly out of the peasants' standard of living.

**(vii) Advertising socialist 'emulation'**

The party still called itself proletarian, but it tended more and more to consist of the executives that industrialization required, and when in 1931 Lenin enumerated the duties of managers, they differed from the duties of managers' in capitalist industry chiefly in not including advertising Socialist 'emulation' introduced wage differentials between classes' of labor similar to those in capitalist industry, though in deference to its socialist claims the regime provided a considerable range of fringe benefits like socialized medicine and paid rest periods. It is true that industrial expansion opened a wide range of opportunity, especially to able and energetic young people who could benefit from publicly supported education, and this no doubt contributed greatly to the stability of the regime. It is true also that its harshness was gradually 'mitigated' as its goals were realized. The fact remains that the whole process was one of extraordinary hardship even allowing for the terrible hardship caused by World War II. Not the least of the hardship was the chronic insecurity caused by Lenin's habitual use of terrorism and forced labor exercised through the secret police, which fell on the party as well as on the population at large. The determination to create a collective industry and a collective agriculture is a trace of Marxism that chiefly distinguished Lenin's methods from those that might have been used by a tsar bent on building up Russia's national power.

**(viii) Concept of a national state**

The concept, of a national state, which is also socialist, was, from the standpoint of Marxian social philosophy, a logical monstrosity, for Marxism had no positive concept either of, a state or a nation, and it had always conceived socialism to be merely incompatible with either. Nationalism was conceived by Marx and by Marxists generally to be merely a relic of feudalism' and national patriotism to be a vestigial sentiment which like religion, belonged to the false ideological consciousness that laid the working class open to exploitation by the more rational bourgeoisie.

The *Communist manifesto* had laid down the principle that 'the working men have no country,' and it had been regarded as a major strength of Marxism that it emancipated the workers from a, crippling illusion. Marxism had always counted

**NOTES**

NOTES

itself internationalist, but its internationalism had been negative in the sense that expected national distinctions simply to disappear as the working class became enlightened enough to pursue its real class interests. Lacking any positive concept of a nation or any recognition that, nationalism might represent a real cultural value, Marxism lacked also any concept of an international organization of national states. Its internationalism was a relic of early nineteenth century individualism which had been engrossed in abolishing institutions felt to be obsolete and oppressive, and which had therefore assumed that some ideal form of collectivism would be left merely by the removal of obstacles and obstructions. This assumption was responsible for the vein of utopianism that underlay the essentially realistic temper of Marx's thought. The attitude of Marxism toward the state was substantially similar.

The state too, in Marxian mythology was expected, in the phrase that Engels made famous, to 'wither away' after a successful socialist revolution. Marxism, in its own understanding of itself, had always been a class movement and its revolution was conceived as a proletarian revolt against a middle-class dictatorship. The concept of the class struggle, which the *Communist Manifesto* had asserted to describe 'the history of all hitherto existing society, left no room for any concept of a general national or state interest, nor was any considered to be dictatorship of the bourgeoisie, with the negative mandate to repress counter revolution and with a positive mandate to create communism, which for all practical purposes was almost undefined. When the success of socialism in one country turned Stalin's Russia into a very powerful national state, it was a state as nearly as possible without a political philosophy. Or more accurately, it had an elaborate philosophy but one which had no clear cut positive application to what it was doing.

The consequence was that its policies had little perceptible relationship to the theories that it professed, which often seemed a mere façade for conventionally nationalist and imperialist behaviour. The government which Lenin founded and which Stalin inherited, according to its own conception of itself, was an alliance between an urban industrial proletariat and the peasants. Both Lenin and Trotsky, expected that this alliance would be temporary, for neither supposed that the peasants would voluntarily follow the workers in either the collectivism or the internationalism that they supposed would be the policy of a working-class minority either could or would coerce the overwhelming majority of peasants. In this they were mistaken, as Lenin was mistaken in supposing that at some point the alliance with the peasants would be replaced by an alliance with the Western proletariat.

(ix) Problem of peasantry

The problem of the peasantry was solved not in the light of any social philosophy, either socialist or nationalist, but by the savage coercion of Stalin's program of collectivization at the end of the 1920's, which reduced the peasantry to a state of misery that Tsarist Russia never matched. This policy did indeed succeed in the sense that it made possible the rapid development of industry, but it also left a chronic imbalance between industry and agriculture which, by the end of Stalin's life, put the whole regime in jeopardy. Stalin's agricultural policy exemplified the recklessness of an irresponsible despot, covered by the hollow pretense that relations between industrial workers and peasants were 'friendly.' It represented no rational concept of national interest, which the regime's philosophy lacked. In a similar way the regime's concept of itself as a working-class government obstructed its own policy of industrialization. Almost the only positive remnant of the philosophy was Stalin's constant pretense that any opposition to his totalitarian despotism was counter-revolutionary; hence the wild



## NOTES

charges of treason and conspiracy by which he liquidated men with a lifelong record as dedicated revolutionists. Both the party and the government 'discarded any valid claim to represent the working class, which was in fact impossible if the purpose were effectively to construct a large-scale industrial system. 'The regime coerced workers as impartially as it coerced every other group, and if it was in truth the exponent of any social class, its favorite seemed to be the new class of managers and technicians which it was creating, as disappointed Marxists like Milovan Djilas freely predicted. Its industrial policy created another imbalance between the production of capital goods and the production of consumers' goods for which its socialist professions provided no justification, but which might represent a militarism that belied its professed peaceful intentions.

*(x) National ownership of the means of production*

Socialism in the country provided Russia with no cues for its relations to other states different from those of conventional nationalist imperialism. Communism is represented as itself an ideological tie that provides communist countries with a common interest, but there is no perceptible reason why this should be so. The national ownership of the means of production does not affect any advantage that the Russian industrial system might gain from controlling, for example, the output of Silesian steel or make her more charitable in dealing with Poland.

By and large Russian policy toward her ring of satellite states in eastern Europe has been one of using them to enhance her own economic and military power. The only one of these states that retained much independence of action was Yugoslavia, which was also the one not included in Russia's area of occupation at the end of the war. The crucial test of a community of interest between communist states will no doubt be provided by the long-term relations between Russia and China, since neither will be able to treat the other as a satellite. It may well be true, however, that socialism in one country has made an important change in Russia's international orientation. The adoption of Stalin's policy meant in substance abandoning the theory that communism depended on the support of the working class in Western Europe.

There were, in fact, substantial reasons why support from this quarter should not have been forthcoming, though the concept of communism as a working-class movement prevented these reasons from being acknowledged. Except perhaps in a few special cases, there was no reason why the western European worker, with a higher standard of living, his own independent labour unions and generally liberal political institutions should be attracted by communism. The political role of communism in the West has on the whole been one of subversion, effective, only where grievances existed that made subversions a tempting form of political activity.

The state of affairs was different in countries with a social and 'economic structure' closer to that of Russia when Lenin launched his theory. A country with an agrarian economy and a largely peasant population, subject to the pressure of rapidly growing population, is almost under an imperative to industrialize even to keep the low standard of living it has. The problem of industrialization in such a society accumulation of capital, and short inability to borrow on favourable terms, capital can be accumulated only by methods of forced saving similar to those followed by Russia. As a rule, also, countries of this sort lack a political structure able to oppose any obstacle to a dictatorship.

## NOTES

*(xi) International effect of communism*

The attraction exerted by the success of Lenin's rapid industrialization is, therefore, obvious, and in consequence the international effect of communism in one country was to face Russia toward the East. As early as 1923, Lenin foresaw this possibility when he said that his theory of imperialism implied the division of the world into 'two camps.' He attributed this to 'the imperialists' and regarded it as a disadvantage because he assumed that greater power lay on the side of the highly industrialized European bloc. After the temporary alliance of World War II, 'Lenin revived the idea of the two camps but possibly he no longer thought it a disadvantage. In any case, the international effect of communism in one country has been a division between two power blocs, variously described as capitalist-communist, imperialist-peace-loving or simply West-East. The future of each depends, apparently, on its success in attracting the uncommitted nations. The spread of liberal political institutions probably depends on providing an alternative to violent methods of forced saving.

In Russia, the rigours imposed by socialism in one country, were lightened by the prospect held out by the Marxian tradition that they were temporary. Their purpose was first described as the building of socialism, which Lenin proclaimed to have been accomplished about 1936, and second by the transition to communism, the highest stage mentioned by both Marx and Lenin and said by Stalin also to be possible in one country. Beyond this, repression would no longer be required and the state might wither away. This prospect, so deeply rooted in the Marxist tradition, was a kind of promissory note that the regime might sometime have to meet, or it might be a focus for criticism and discontent. Why, it might be asked, since there no longer exploited classes, should the state not begin to wither away? In 1939—Stalin said that this question was indeed 'sometimes asked.' His answer was the usual one given by a Marxist theorist, when his predictions fail. The questioners, he said, have 'conscientiously memorized' the words but 'have failed to understand the essential meaning.' They have overlooked the espionage nets spread by encircling capitalist powers. He concluded that the state would remain in the communist stage, until the capitalist encirclement vanished by the whole world becomes communist.

Lenin approached the question again, rather circuitously, in one of the later writings. In 1950, he wrote several articles on Marxism and language, the purpose of which was to show that neither logic nor language depended on the class struggle since language was a medium of communication between persons of all social classes. This somewhat esoteric question seems an improbable subject of interest, but its purpose apparently was revealed when he reproved those comrades 'who have an infatuation for explosions' as the method for any, kind of important social change. In Soviet society, there are no 'hostile classes' — he gave an instance of the 'revolution from above' that brought about collective agriculture — and hence no need for 'explosions'. In other words, the transition to communism will take place under the direction and control of the party. Khrushchev, too, has occasionally taken pains to strip the transition of its utopian connotations. At the Twenty-first Party Congress (1959), he described his seven-year plan as 'the building of communism and at the same time warned that a communist society would not be 'formless and unorganized'. Yet he also spoke of a possibility that would have horrified Lenin; the growth of 'public organizations or voluntary associations that might take over. Many functions hitherto carried out by state organs' — of course, under the direction of the Party. It seems a fair presumption that what is left of the withering away of the state 'at least as far as concerns the party's intentions, is a regime with the services' usually attached to the concept of a welfare state, a level of 'production, that will permit more consumer



## NOTES

goods without' reducing the production of capital goods below whatever level the party deems necessary, a corresponding increase in living standards with a reduction of the working day, and some lightening or decentralization of administrative regulations.

#### 4.2.1 Conditions for Successful Working of Socialism

In order to make socialism more effective, Lenin has developed different techniques and philosophy in great detail. These are outlined below.

##### (i) Lenin's theory of imperialism

This theory is found in his book *Imperialism, the Highest State of Capitalism*. Lenin regards imperialism, as the highest stage of capitalism. As capitalism develops, units of industrial production grow bigger and combine in trusts and cartels to produce monopoly capitalism. The same process takes place in the financial world. Banks combine and become master of capital that the industrialists use and thus monopoly capitalism becomes finance capitalism. Monopoly finance capitalism is aggressively expansionist. Its characteristic export is capital, and its consequences are three fold. It results in the exploitation of colonial peoples, whom it subjects of the capitalist law of increasing misery and whose liberty it destroys. According to Lenin, 'imperialism is capitalism in that stage of development in which the domination of monopoly and finance capital has taken shape; in which the export of capital has acquired pronounced importance in which the division of the world by international trusts has begun; and in which the portion of all the territory of the earth by the great capitalist countries has been completed.' According to Lenin, imperialism which is moribund capitalism contains a number of contradictions which shall ultimately destroy it and bring socialism. There is, firstly, the contradiction or antagonism between capital and labour. Capital exploits labour and brings the exploited workers to revolution. If it will be materialized, then the spirit of socialism will start.

##### (ii) Theory of party

The greatest contribution of Lenin to socialism is his theory of the party. While Marx laid too much emphasis on the development of class consciousness among the workers, Lenin laid emphasis on the party organization. According to him, 'The proletariat has no other weapon in the struggle for power except organization'.

Constantly pushed out of depths of complete poverty, the proletariat can and will inevitably become the unconquerable. The party is needed not only before the revolution to arouse the revolutionary spirit in the proletariat but also after the revolution to annihilate the capitalist state and to establish the dictatorship of the proletariat. Workers do not become socialists automatically. They become trade unionists. Socialism has to be brought to them from outside and this is done by the party which is in reality the 'vanguard of the proletariat'. It must be able to lead the proletariat to elevate them to the level where they can understand their class interests and purpose with great vigour and determination. The party must act as the General Staff of the Proletariat. On its role, Lenin wrote thus: 'The communist party is a part of the working class, the most advanced, most class conscious and hence the communist party has no other interests other than the interests of the working class as a whole. The communist party is differentiated from the working class in its totality. The communist party is the organizational and political lever which the most advanced sections of the working class use to direct the entire mass of the proletariat and the semi-proletariat along the right road'.

NOTES

**(iii) Dictatorship of the proletariat**

Lenin described dictatorship of the proletariat as the form the state would take during the transitional period revolutionary transformation from capitalism into socialism. Lenin accepted Marx's doctrine of dictatorship of the proletariat in full but he succeeded in converting it to the dictatorships of the communist or socialist ideological party.

**Tactics of Revolution**

According to Sabine 'No principle of Marxian strategy was better settled than the rule that it's impossible to make a revolution by force of conspiracy before the time is ripe, that is before the contradictions in a society have produced a revolutionary situation. It was this principle, which distinguished Marx's scientific socialism from Utopianism or mere adventurism. This view led to the emergence of two views in Russia, one held by the Mensheviks and the other by the Bolsheviks, regarding the tactics socialism. The first view was that of the slow growth of the proletariat into a majority. The other group was led by Lenin, Trotsky and Stalin. According to Trotsky, in a country economically backward, the proletariat can take power earlier than in countries where capitalism is advanced.

Lenin thought in terms of tactics. According to him, insurrection is an art which is something that can be taught and so it is a matter for the artist in revolution who is the professional revolutionary to master. It came to have certain maxims such as (i) Never play at uprising but once it is begun remember firmly that you have to go to the very end. (ii) One must strive to take the enemy by surprise to take advantage of a moment when his troops are scattered'. Lenin was opposed to a large diffused party and he wanted the party to consist of professional revolutionaries and it must be organized as secretly as possible. There is no room for democracy here. According to Lenin, revolution becomes possible only 'when the lower classes do not want the old way and the upper classes cannot continue till the old way promises.

**Strategy of world revolution**

The Third International came to be founded in March, 1919. It was formed to organize world revolution. It was held that without the world revolution, Russian revolution would also collapse. The new organization, according to Lenin, issued a manifesto to the proletarians of the whole world which extolled the Soviet form of government and the dictatorship of the proletariat, emphasized the need to support the non-communist labour movement.

**CHECK YOUR PROGRESS**

1. According to Lenin, what is the highest stage of capitalism?
2. According to Lenin, how can monopoly capitalism become finance capitalism?
3. How did Lenin describe imperialism?
4. When was the 'third international' founded and why?
5. Who was the architect of the first communist state in the world?
6. What became an operative factor in Leninism?
7. Which motive did Lenin appeal to?

**4.3 MAO**

Mao Zedong, the father of modern communist China, was not only an important political leader who molded the destiny of the Chinese people and made China as one of the



most powerful nations of the world, but also an important Marxian philosopher who gave Marxism its Asiatic form.

Mao Zedong was born in 1893 in the Hunan province in the family of a poor peasant. As a child he was required to work hard on the fields and consequently forced to give up his education at the age of 13. As Mao Zedong was keen to become educated, he worked on the fields during the day-time and read books at night. He took special delight in the books dealing with heroes of the world, and was greatly impressed by heroes like George Washington, Rousseau, Gladstone and Napoleon. He also studied the histories of various countries. One thing which really surprised him was that all these books on history dealt with the character and achievements of rulers, feudal lords, and nobility and hardly made any reference to the hardships and sacrifices made by the peasants. The actual sufferings of the peasants also left a deep impact on his mind. He was pained to see that the rulers and nobles maltreated the peasants and even chopped off their heads. To define the concept of socialism which has been developed by Mao Zedong, first we have to discuss the trend of socio-economic problem of China.

#### **4.3.1 Background of History: Struggle for Socialism**

Since the beginning of the war of resistance, a general feeling of liveliness prevailed all over the country. In later times compromise and anti-communism again became dominant, which threw people in to the state of bewilderment once again. This affected the intellectuals and young students first. The question that became pertinent at that time was regarding the fate of China. What was to happen to China? And, therefore it was important to clarify the trends of socialism in the country. But even if the observations are not true, it is impossible for them not to have some truth, and therefore, they might encourage the cultural workers to rise and come forward with their own contribution to the country.

One hopes that they will be part of the discussion to correctly identify the needs of the nation. A scientific approach is needed for the quest of the truth and to tackle the problems faced by the country. A responsible bent of mind is required to lead the country on the road to socialistic liberation. The facts can be measured with the help of the revolutionary practice of millions of people. This is the kind of attitude the Chinese culture had.

#### ***Establishment of Socialism in China***

Since a long time, Mao struggled to bring about a cultural, economic and political revolution. His goal was to create a new society and state by establishing the tenets of socialism for China. His definition of a new society and state were designed to have a new political structure and a new economy, along with a new culture. He wanted China to come out of political oppression and economic exploitation and gain political freedom and economical prosperity. He also wanted that China should come out of the ignorance and backwardness of the old culture, and transform to become enlightened and progressive. The aim of Mao Zedong was to create a novel cultural sphere for China.

#### ***China's Historical Characteristics***

Ideologically, every culture reflects the way the economy and politics of the society functions. But it is true that both politics and economics go hand-in-hand. They both play an important role in the determination of culture. Marx said, 'It is not the consciousness of men that determines their being, but, on the contrary their social

#### **NOTES**

## NOTES

being that determines their consciousness.' He further added, 'The philosophers have only interpreted the world, in various ways, the point, however, is to change it.' In the history of mankind, for the first time, these scientific formulations have proved accurate in resolving the problematic aspects of the relations between the existence and the human consciousness. And these formulations are the fundamental ideas and concepts that underline the dynamic and radical theory of knowledge, as something that reflects the material reality of the world, which so vigorously explained and elaborated by Lenin.

It is important to keep these fundamental concepts in mind while discussing the problems pertaining to China's culture. Thus, it is evident that Mao wanted to remove those elements from the old national politics, which reacted to the tenets of the old national culture. On the other hand, the new national culture which he had in mind was interlinked with the new national politics and economics. The old culture was based on the ideas of old politics and economy of the China. Similarly, the new politics that Mao had in mind was based on the new kind of economic and political models, which was to become the foundation a new culture in China.

### *China's Old Politics, Economics and Culture*

Since the rule of the Chou and Chin, the society of China was feudal, just like its politics, economy and dominant culture. There have been various changes of colonial, semi-colonial and semi-feudal nature in the Chinese society, ever since it was invaded by the foreign capitalism. China in the first half of the twentieth century was both feudal and semi-feudal in the areas which were occupied by Japan. He said that the political and economic characteristics of the Chinese society were prevalently colonial, semi-colonial, and semi-feudal, and also the reverent culture, which was the reflection of political and economic image, was also feudal and colonial in nature. The revolution specifically focuses on the eradication of these prevalent economic, political, and cultural forms.

Mao wanted to create a new kind of politics and economy, which then would give rise to a new kind of culture. According to Mao, in the course of its history, there were two stages through which it was important for the Chinese revolution to go through: the first stage was that of democratic revolution, and the second stage was the socialist revolution. It is important to understand that both the stages are different from each other. In this case, the first category does not include the democracy. It can be said that the new politics, the new economy, and the new culture of China emerged from the new democracy. It is not possible for any political group, party or individual who has no understanding of the theme, to direct the revolution to victory.

### *Chinese Revolution: A Part of the World Revolution*

According to Mao, historically, the Chinese revolution is divided into democracy and socialism. Democracy here does not mean the general democracy, but it refers to the Chinese form of democracy. After studying both the historical development of the world and China, it is evident that the said characteristic was not an abrupt development as the result of the Opium War, rather it was shaped after the WWI and the October Revolution of Russia. Thus, we can divide the Chinese revolution into two stages: the first stage was the transformation of the colonial and feudal aspect of the society into a democratic form of society, and the second stage was the continuation of the revolution for the establishment of socialist form of society. This can be called the trend in the development of the socialism.



## NOTES

The first stage of this revolution began to shape up after the Opium War of 1840, i.e. when feudalism of China began to undergo transformations. It began to change, into a partially colonial and a partially feudal society. This was followed by the various movements of Taiping Heavenly Kingdom, the Sino-French War, the Sino-Japanese War, the Reform movement of 1898, the Revolution of 1911, the May 4th Movement, the Northern Expedition, the War of the Agrarian Revolution and the War of Resistance against Japan. In combination, all these movements consumed an entire century by representing the struggles of the people of China on various occasions and in different degrees against both the imperialist and the feudal forces in order to create a free and democratic state, and thereby completing the first stage of the revolution. Socially, the nature of this first stage of revolution is not that of proletarian-socialist, but bourgeois-democratic. But still, it requires continued efforts, since it is still confronted with strong resistance. When the first president of the Republic of China, Sun Yat-Sen said, 'The revolution is not yet completed, all my comrades must struggle on,' he referred to the bourgeois Democratic Revolution. Changes in the China's democratic revolution began to take place after the outbreak of the WWI, and the establishment of socialism in Russia, as the result of the October Revolution of Russia in 1917. Prior to these happenings, the bourgeois-democratic revolution of China was part of the bourgeois democratic world revolution. This revolution has undergone changes after these happenings. It fell in the new class of bourgeois-democratic revolutions and as far as the alignment of revolutionary forces was concerned, it belonged to the proletarian-socialist world revolution.

In this era, no revolution in a colony or semi-colony directed against imperialism, i.e., against the international bourgeoisie or international capitalism, falls in the old category of the bourgeois-democratic world revolution, but within the new category. This is part of the proletarian-socialist world revolution. Such revolutionary colonies and semi-colonies cannot be regarded as allies of the counter-revolutionary front of world capitalism, they have become allies of the revolutionary front of world socialism. In countries which are colonies and semi-colonies, these types of revolutions are socially and fundamentally bourgeois-democratic in their social character, during the first stage or first step. Though the objective of such a revolution is targeted at developing capitalism, it is not a primitive revolution (with the bourgeoisie leadership, aimed at establishing a capitalist society and a state under bourgeois dictatorship) anymore. This revolution itself is revolutionary, being led by the proletariat. Its main objective is to establish a new democratic society in the first stage and a state which is governed by the combined forces of all the revolutionary classes. Thus, in reality this revolution paves a still wider path for socialism to develop. While in progress, this may further be divided into sub-stages. These sub-stages emerge due to changes on the enemy's side and within the ranks of our allies. However, the basic nature of the revolution does not change. This type of a revolution weakens the base of imperialism. Hence, imperialism opposes it. However, socialism favours it and the land of socialism supports it along with the socialist international proletariat. Hence, it is unavoidable for this type of revolution to become part of the proletarian-socialist world revolution. The correct thesis, 'the Chinese revolution is part of the world revolution' emerged earlier in the period of 1924-27. This was the period of China's First Great Revolution. The Chinese Communists framed it and it was endorsed by everyone who participated in the anti-imperialist and anti-feudal struggle of the time. Nevertheless, the significance of the thesis was not very clear during those days. Thus, a large number of the people misunderstood the crux of the thesis. According to Mao Zedong the thesis made by the Chinese communists is based on Stalin's theory of socialism.

NOTES

The great worldwide consequence of the October Revolution can be said as follows.

- (a) It broadened the scope of the national question and converted it from the activity of combating national oppression in Europe to the general activity of emancipating those who were victims of imperialism's oppression.
- (b) A large number of possibilities have been introduced for implementation. Due to this the cause of the emancipation of the oppressed people of the West and the East and has drawn them together for the victorious struggle against imperialism.
- (c) Hence, it has bridged the socialist West with the enslaved East. This helped in creating a new front of revolutions against world imperialism. It begins from the proletarians of the West through the Russian Revolution and extends to the oppressed people of the East.

#### 4.3.2 Essence of New Democracy or Socialism

The new historical characteristic of the Chinese revolution is its division into two stages, the first being the new Democratic Revolution.

Prior to the movement of 4 May 1919 (that followed the first imperialist world war of 1914 and the Russian October Revolution of 1917), the petty bourgeois and the bourgeoisie (through their intellectuals) led the bourgeois democratic revolution politically. The Chinese proletariat had not yet appeared on the political scene as an awakened and independent class force, but participated in the revolution only as a follower of the petty bourgeoisie and the bourgeoisie. Such was the case with the proletariat at the time of the revolution of 1911. After the movement of 4 May, politically, the leader of China's bourgeois-democratic revolution was no longer the bourgeoisie, but the proletariat. Though the national bourgeoisie went on to participate in the revolution, the Chinese proletariat underwent a rapid transformation to become an awakened and independent political force. This was due to its maturing and the influence of the Russian Revolution. The slogan of the Chinese Revolution was, 'Down with imperialism'. This blended with the thoroughgoing programme for the whole bourgeois democratic revolution. The Chinese Communist Party carried out the Agrarian Revolution on its own.

Being a bourgeoisie in a colonial and semi colonial country under the oppression of imperialism, the Chinese national bourgeoisie retains a certain revolutionary quality at certain periods and to a certain degree. Although in the era of imperialism, opposed to foreign imperialists and domestic governments of bureaucrats and warlords (instances of opposition to the latter can be found in the periods of the Revolution of 1911 and the Northern Expedition), it may be allied with the proletariat and the petty bourgeoisie against opposing forces. On this front, the Chinese bourgeoisie is different from the bourgeoisie of old tsarist Russia: As Tsarist Russia emerged as a military-feudal imperialism that was aggressive towards other nations; the Russian bourgeoisie was entirely devoid of the revolutionary feature. Thus, in this case, the job of the proletariat was to oppose the bourgeoisie and not be supportive towards it.

But China's national bourgeoisie is based on revolution, to a specific extent and at specific times. The reason for this is that China is divided into colonies and semi-colonies which are oppressed. These provide the proletariat with the objective of forming a United Front with the national bourgeoisie. This front is in opposition to imperialism and the bureaucrat and warlord governments. Nevertheless, it does not compromise with its revolutionary quality.



**NOTES**

Simultaneously, nevertheless, being a bourgeois class in a colonial and semi-colonial country and extremely flabby economically and politically, the Chinese national bourgeoisie also has another quality, i.e., it is prone to negotiation with those who are against the revolution. Even after participating in the revolution, it does not cut off its liaisons with imperialism completely and moreover, it has a close association with the exploitation of the rural areas, through land rent. This is the reason for it to adopt neither a favourable, nor an aggressive attitude towards imperialism and much less the feudal forces. So the national bourgeoisie can resolve neither of the problems or tasks of China's bourgeois-democratic revolution. As for China's big bourgeoisie, which is represented by the Kuomintang, all through the long period from 1927 to 1937, it was nurtured by the imperialists and allied with the feudal forces to fight the revolutionaries. During and after 1927, the counter-revolution was also followed by the Chinese national bourgeoisie. During the present anti-Japanese war, the section of the big bourgeoisie represented by Wang Jingwei had capitulated to the enemy, which constituted a fresh betrayal on the part of the big bourgeoisie. On this front, then, the bourgeoisie in China differed from the earlier bourgeoisie of the European and American countries, typically France. During the period of revolution, when the bourgeoisie in those countries, especially in France, was still in its revolutionary era, the bourgeois revolution was comparatively strong. On the other hand, the bourgeoisie in China lacks is not as strong.

The likelihood of participation in the revolution on the one hand and proneness to conciliation with the enemies of the revolution on the other is the twin personality of the Chinese bourgeoisie. Thus, is inclined towards both the planes. Even the bourgeoisie in European and American history has this twin inclination. In circumstances where they are confronted with a strong enemy, they united with the workers and peasants against that enemy. However, at the time of confrontation with workers and peasants awakened, they unite with the enemy against the workers and peasants. As a rule, this generally applies to the bourgeoisie, all over the world, though this is more prominent in the case of the Chinese bourgeoisie. In China, it is amply evident that to win the confidence of the common man, it is important to have a leadership that is capable of overthrowing imperialism. Similarly, in the present scenario, whoever leads the people in driving out Japanese imperialism and bringing about democracy, will be in the position to liberate the people. It has been proven time and again that the Chinese bourgeoisie has not been able to perform this task. Thus, it is inevitable that this task falls on the proletariat.

This is the reason that the proletariat, the peasantry, the intelligentsia, and the other sections of the petty bourgeoisie undoubtedly constitute the basic 'forces' that determine the future of China. These classes, some already awakened and others in the process of awakening, will necessarily become the basic components of the state and governmental structure in the democratic republic of China, with the proletariat as the leading force. The Chinese desired democratic republic should function as a democratic republic under a combined dictatorship of all who are against imperialism and feudalism. This will give rise to a new democratic republic — a republic that is built on the people's principles with great policies. This new-democratic republic will not be the same as the old European-American form of capitalist republic, under bourgeois dictatorship. The old European-American form of capitalist republic is based on the old democratic format and is already outdated. On the other hand, it will also be different from the socialist republic of the Soviet type under the dictatorship of the proletariat, which was flourishing in what was once the Soviet Union. However, in the beginning, for a specific period in history, this form did not suit the revolutions in



NOTES

colonial and semi-colonial countries. The new-democratic republic form of a state was more suitable. This form has the quality of transition and fits a certain historical period. However, this form is necessary and cannot be dispensed with.

Hence, it is possible to reduce the various state systems in the world into three basic categories. The categories are based on the class character of their political power: (i) republics that are led by bourgeois dictatorship (ii) republics that are led by the dictatorship of the proletariat and (iii) republics under the joint dictatorship of several revolutionary classes.

Republics that are led by bourgeois dictatorship comprise of old democratic states. In the period after the second imperialist war, most of the capitalist countries have become democracy. A bloody militarist dictatorship of the bourgeoisie rules them. Countries which are ruled by the combined dictatorship of the landlords and the bourgeoisie fall in this category.

A republic that is led by the dictatorship of the proletariat was existent in the Soviet Union. Capitalist countries exhibit the highest potential for such forms of republic. In the future, it will be the dominant form throughout the world for a certain period.

A republic under the joint dictatorship of several revolutionary classes is a state in transition. It holds the potential to be adopted by the revolutions of the colonial and semi-colonial countries. Every revolution has distinctive features. However, these features will vary marginally from other revolutions. These variations will be generic. As long as the revolution is in colonies or semi-colonies, their state and governmental structure will differ, i.e., a new-democratic state which is led by the joint dictatorship of several anti-imperialist classes. Today in China, the new democratic form of state is represented by the anti-Japanese United Front. It is anti-Japanese and anti-imperialist. Being a United Front, it also combines several revolutionary classes. But unfortunately, despite the fact that the war has been going on for so long, the work of introducing democracy has hardly started in most of the countries, outside the democratic anti-Japanese base areas. The areas referred here are those that are ruled by the Communist Party. They are exploited by the Japanese imperialists to stride into the country.

The topic discussed here is the 'state system'. It was still functional in the last years of the Ching dynasty. This was concerned with the status of the various social classes within the state. The bourgeoisie, as a rule, conceals the problem of class status and carries out its one-class dictatorship under the national banner. Such a system does not favour the revolutionaries. The term 'national' should not include traitors those who are against revolution. The need of the moment is a dictatorship of all the revolutionary classes, over traitors and those who are against revolution.

The so-called democratic system in modern states is usually monopolized by the bourgeoisie and is being used to oppress the common people. On the other hand, the Kuomintang's Principle of Democracy refers to a democratic system that all common people share. No one privately owns it. This was solemnly declared in the Manifesto of the First National Congress of the Kuomintang, held in 1924. This was the period of the Kuomintang-Communist cooperation. The Kuomintang violated this declaration for 16 years, which resulted in a serious national crisis. It is hoped that the Kuomintang will correct in the cleansing flames of the anti-Japanese war and for the system of government, this is a matter of how political power is organized, the form in which one social class or another chooses to arrange its apparatus of political power to oppose its enemies and protect itself. There is no state which does not have an appropriate apparatus of political power to represent it. It is likely for China to adopt a system of people's congresses, from the national people's congress down to the provincial, county



## NOTES

district and township people's congresses, with all levels electing their respective governmental bodies. However, if every revolutionary class is represented on the basis of its status in the state, a proper expression of the people's will, a proper direction for revolutionary struggles and a proper manifestation of the spirit of new democracy, then a system of really universal and equal suffrage, irrespective of sex, creed, property or education, should be introduced. This is the system of democratic centralism. Only government based on democratic centralism can be successful in completely expressing the will of all revolutionary people and fight the enemies of the revolution most in an effective way. Private ownership by a few must be refused in the government and the army. This cannot be achieved without a genuine democratic system of governance and the state system will not have any harmony.

The state system, a joint dictatorship of all the revolutionary classes and the system of government, democratic centralism, all these constitute the politics of new democracy and the republic of the new three people's principles with their three great policies. This is specifically true in the case of the Republic of China. When Mao said that today we have a Republic of China, he meant it only as a label and not in reality. The internal political relations of India with a revolutionary China, a China that is fighting Japanese aggression, should and must establish without fail.

### 3.3 Economy of New Democracy or New Socialism

A new democracy in China should be novel in its approach to both politics and economy. A new democratic policy must control the banking sector along with the industrial and commercial sectors. The enterprises in these sector will include banks, railways, and airlines, both foreign owned and Chinese owned, which either are monopolistic in nature or to be managed privately. The state shall administer and operate these enterprises. Thus, the private capital will not be able to dominate the economy. This is the prime motive for regulating the capital. This was solemnly declared by the Kuomintang's First National Congress's manifesto, which can be seen as the right step towards the economic structure of the new kind of democratic republic. In the new-democratic republic, led by the proletariat, the state enterprises will have socialist characteristics. The whole national economy will be led by them. However, the republic will not seize the privately owned properties in general, and it will also not prohibit the growth and the development of capitalist ventures and productions, for the economy of China was still not very developed.

The republic, however, will take the lands from the landlords and will disperse them amongst the farmers who have meagre or no land. This is in synchronization with Dr. Sun Yat-Sen's slogan of 'land to the tiller'. It promotes abolishment of the relationship feudal in nature and the private ownership of land by the farmers and peasants. It also allows the development of a peasant based economy in the rural areas. This is the policy of 'equalization of land ownership'. The slogan, 'Land to the tiller' suits this policy just right. Generally, socialist agriculture will not be established at this stage, although various types of cooperative enterprises have been developed on the basis of 'land to the tiller'. Mao believed that they would contain the elements of socialism.

#### Regulation of Capital

Mao thought that it would be best if the economy of China follow the path of capital regulation and landownership equalization. It advocated that economy must never be owned by few individuals, and that a few capitalists and landlords should never be allowed to dominate the livelihood of the people. He also called for either the

## NOTES

establishment of a capitalist kind of society similar to that of European and American models, or the permission for the survival of the old semi-feudal society. This economy of new democracy is otherwise known as New Socialism of Mao Zedong, in China. Its politics are concentrated expressions of the economy of New Democracy.'

### *Opposition to Capitalism*

Like Marx, Lenin and Stalin, Mao was also against capitalism. He emphasized on the inability of true peace or accommodation to exist, along with capitalism. This was because the two systems contradicted each other. A dynamic tussle struggle between these two antagonistic systems was unavoidable, though it was likely to be averted for the time being through mutual restraint. However, Mao was flexible in his belief pertaining to the inevitability of conflict between the capitalists and the socialists.

### *Negation of Bourgeois Dictatorship*

More than 90 per cent of the people are in favour of a republic with its new-democratic politics and new-democratic economy. What about the road to a capitalist society under bourgeois dictatorship? The European and American bourgeoisie chose the already explored venue. However, whether one likes it or not, neither the international nor the domestic circumstances permit China to go on the same lines. With reference to the international situation, that road is closed. Basically, the present international environment is one of a struggle between capitalism and socialism. In this situation, capitalism is defensive and socialism is dominant. Indeed, modern China has a history of imperialist aggression and imperialist opposition to China's independence and to the growth of capitalism. Revolutions were not successful in China earlier since they were crushed by imperialism and by the death of many revolutionaries. Today, powerful Japanese imperialism is forcing its way into China with the aim of turning it into a colony. It is not China that is developing Chinese capitalism, but Japan that is developing Japanese capitalism in our country. Similarly, instead of the Chinese bourgeoisie, it is the Japanese bourgeoisie that is dictating the country. Definitely, this is the period of the final struggle of fading imperialism. This is known as 'moribund capitalism'. Since it is facing, it is even more dependent on colonies and semi-colonies to survive. Certainly, it will not allow any colony or semi-colony to establish anything like a capitalist society, under the dictatorship of its own bourgeoisie. As Japanese imperialism is bogged down due to serious economic and political crises, it has invaded China and transformed it into a colony. This is blocking the road to bourgeois dictatorship and national capitalism in China.

Secondly, this cannot be permitted by socialism. All imperialist powers in the world are against socialism. It is not possible for China to achieve independence without socialism and the international proletariat. This means that it will need help from the proletariat of Japan, Britain, the United States, France, Germany, Italy and other countries who have struggled against capitalism. Although, it cannot be proclaimed that for Chinese revolution to succeed, it should wait for revolution to prevail in all some of these countries, but it is not possible to win without the combined strength of their proletariat.

### *People's War*

Another significant characteristic of Mao's belief was his concept of people's war to achieve socialism. Mao wanted the simultaneous execution of two revolutions, one against imperialism and the colonial rule and the other against the feudal landlords. He was sure that it was not possible for the rule of the feudal landlords to end until the



## NOTES

of imperialism was overthrown. On the other hand, it was not possible to form a powerful contingent to overthrow imperialism, unless the farmers were assisted in overthrowing the feudal landlord class. It was emphasized by Mao that these two front wars were to be fought by the masses that were politically structured, rather than by representing the masses. He considered people to be more important than the weapons and wrote that 'Weapons are an important factor in war but not the decisive factor, it is people, not things, that are decisive.' Thus he stressed on the theory of total revolution by the totality of the masses.

### ***Denial of 'Left' Phrase-Mongering***

If it is not possible to follow the capitalist road of bourgeois dictatorship, Mao suggested, then it is possible that one can follow the road that leads to the socialist-proletarian dictatorship. He said that the ongoing relationship is the first step, which soon will pave way for the second stage of the revolution, which will be the arrival of socialism. The people of China can only be happy when they enter the socialist era. However, in the present scenario, it was not right to impose socialism in society. The first important task was to combat the imperialist forces and establish a democratic society. Only after this task is accomplished, socialism can prevail. There can be no Chinese revolution without both, new democracy and socialism. New democracy will take much time and is not an easily achievable task. Mao said that 'we are not utopians and cannot divorce ourselves from the actual conditions confronting us.' There are some propagandists who confuse the two stages of the revolution, which are very different from each other. Such propagandists propose the idea of a single stage revolution so that they prove the applicability of the Three People's Principle to every revolution and that communism, therefore, loses its basic objective. They use this theory to fervently oppose communism and the Communist Party. Their basic motive was to weaken and eradicate every revolution, to oppose a thorough going bourgeois-Democratic Revolution and thorough-going resistance to Japan.

They also direct their efforts to influence public opinion to capitulate to the Japanese aggressors. This is purposely being fostered by Japanese imperialists. Since their occupation of Wuhan, they have realized that only military force cannot subdue China and hence, they have begun to launch political attacks and economic blandishments. Politically, their attacks comprise tempting wavering elements in the anti-Japanese camp, creating divisions in the united front and undermining Kuomintang-Communist cooperation. Their economic blandishments assume the image of the so-called joint industrial enterprises. In central and southern part of China the Japanese aggressors allow Chinese capitalists to invest 51 per cent of the capital in such enterprises, with the Japanese investing the remaining percentage of the capital. On the other hand, in northern China, the Japanese are allowing Chinese capitalists to invest 49 per cent of the capital, with Japanese capital contributing the remaining 51 per cent of it. The Japanese invaders have also promised that they will restore the former assets of the Chinese capitalist to them in the form of capital shares in the investment. One section, represented by Wang Ching-wei, has already capitulated. Another section lurking in the anti-Japanese camp would also like to cross over. But, with the cowardice of thieves they fear that the Communists will block their exit and, what is more, that the common people will brand them as traitors. So, they have combined forces and decided to prepare the ground in cultural circles and through the press. Having determined on their policy, they have lost no time in hiring a few 'metaphysics-mongers'. They have

NOTES

a destructive approach which is detrimental since it confuses the steps to be taken in the revolution and weakens the effort directed towards the current task.

According to the Marxist view of the development of the revolution, the two stages are consecutive without any intervention of the dictatorship of the bourgeois. Mao considered this is a utopian ideal, which the true revolutionary cannot accept.

#### 4.3.4 Contradicting the Die Hards

The bourgeois die-hards in their turn come forward and say: 'you communists have postponed the socialist system to a later stage, The three people's principles is what China needs today, our party is ready to fight for their complete realization. All right then, fold up your communism for the time being.'

Mao said that socialism is at once a complete system of proletarian ideology and a new social system. It is different from any other ideology or social system, and is the most complete, progressive, revolutionary and rational system in human history. The ideology and social character of feudalism is too outdated. Same is the case of the ideology and social character of capitalism. The ideology and social character of communism alone is still in with the times. When scientific communism was introduced in China, it opened new vistas for people and changed the image of the Chinese revolution. Without the guidance of communism, it is not possible for the democratic revolution of China to succeed or even progress to the next stage. This the reason for the demands raised by the bourgeois die-hards to modify communism. However, once communism in China is modified, China will be destroyed. The whole world today is dependent on communism for its recovery and so is China.

It is widely known that the Communist Party has a programme for the near future, as well as for the distant future. It propagates momentum and maximum programmes, pertaining to its social system. At present, the new democracy and in the future, socialism are two parts of an organic whole. They are based on the same communist ideology. Therefore, the Communist party's minimum programme is in basic agreement with the political tenets of the three people's principles. The precise reason for this is the basic agreement between the two. Communists see the three people's principles as the political basis for the anti-Japanese United Front and they acknowledge that China needs it the most. The three people's principles falls in the stage of democratic revolution. This was the kind of a united front, which. Sun Yat-sen had in mind when he said that socialism is the good friend of the three people's principles. Rejection of communism means rejection of the united front. The die-hards put across baseless arguments to reject communism simply since they need a reason to reject the united front and practice their one-party doctrine. Additionally, the 'one doctrine' theory is not logical. As long as classes are prevalent, the number of doctrines will be equal to that of classes. Even different groups in the one class would possibly have different doctrines. For avoiding misunderstanding and for coaching the die-hards, it is important for the three people's principles and communism to coincide. When both of them are compared, the following similarities and differences emerge.

#### *Similarities*

There exist similarities in the basic political programme of both doctrines, in the stage of the bourgeois-democratic revolution in China. There are three political tenets of the revolutionary three people's principles of nationalism, democracy and the people's livelihood. These had been reinterpreted by Sun Yat-sen in 1924 and are fundamentally identical to the communist political programme for the stage of the democratic revolution



in China. These similarities and execution of the three people's principles, brought the united front of the two doctrines and the two parties into existence. This factor cannot be ignored.

### Differences

### NOTES

- (i) The basic difference is evident in the initial section of the programme for the stage of the democratic revolution. The communist programme for the complete course of the democratic revolution is inclusive of fulfilling the rights for the people, the eight-hour working day and a thorough agrarian revolution. On the other hand, the three people's principles does not include the same. If at all, these points are included in the three people's principles and there exists an eagerness to execute them, the two democratic programmes are the same basically, though they differ in other aspects.
- (ii) The second differing factor is that one includes the stage of the socialist revolution and the other does not. Communism envisages the stage of the socialist revolution beyond the stage of the democratic revolution and hence, its maximum programme is beyond its minimum programme, i.e., the programme for achieving socialism and communism. The three people's principles that envisage only the stage of the democratic revolution without envisaging the stage of the socialist revolution, only comprise of a minimum programme and not a maximum programme, i.e., they have no programme for establishing socialism and communism.
- (iii) They have different global viewpoints. Communism holds a dialectical and historically materialistic outlook, whereas the three people's principles provide an explanation of history in terms of the people's livelihood. This actually is a dualist or idealist view. Thus, the two global viewpoints outlooks are opposite to each other.
- (iv) They have different revolutionary thoroughness. In the case of the communists, theory and practice go hand-in-hand, i.e., the thoroughness of communists is revolutionary. The followers of the three people's principles, except for those whose loyalties lie completely with the revolution and truth, theory and practice do not go hand-in-hand and they do not practice what they preach. This means that they do not possess the revolutionary thoroughness.

These differences distinguish communists from followers of the three people's principles. It is important to consider both, the similarities and the differences on the same plane.

### 4.3.5 Mao's Hundred Flowers Policy

This feature of Mao's thought forms the part of the new ideology which Mao advocated during the period of cultural revolution. He asserted that it would be wrong to think that in any society there should be only one ideology or only one state. He held that 'each thinking was a flower and let such hundred schools of thought contend.' Earlier in February, 1957 also Mao had asserted that 'All classes, strata and social groups that approve, support and work for the cause of socialist construction belong to the category of the people.' Through his theory of hundred flowers, he once again asserted that the society shall find out the rotten and out dated ideas and get rid of the same only if all the ideas were permitted free expression. In short, this policy emphasized that coercion shall not be used in ideological matters.

NOTES

**Three People's Principles: Old and New**

Mao held the opinion that the communists must recognize 'the three people's principles' as the political means to begin anti-Japanese National United Front. He acknowledged that 'the three people's principles being what China needs today,' and said that 'our party is ready to fight for their complete realization.' There is no doubt about the basic coordination between the political aspects of three people's principle and the communist minimum programme. But the question that he asked was regarding the nature of the three people's principles. He said that China should adopt the three people's principles which Sun Yat-Sen reinterpreted in his manifesto, which according to Mao was the true interpretation. He declared all the other interpretation of the principles as false interpretations. Mao opined that the manifesto of Sun Yat-Sen highlights two eras in the history of this principle — the Three People's Principles of the old bourgeois Democratic Revolution in a semi-colony, the Three People's Principles of old democracy and the old Three People's Principles. Later, they got aligned in the new category, they became the Three People's Principles of the new bourgeois — Democratic Revolution' in a semi-colony, the Three People's Principles of New Democracy and the new Three People's Principles. Both the revolutionary Three People's Principles of the new period and the new or genuine Three People's Principles embody the three great policies of alliance with Russia, cooperation with the Communist party and the peasants and workers. Without any of these Three Great Policies, the three people's principles would either not hold true, or not be complete in the new period. Primarily, the revolutionary, new or genuine Three People's Principles have to have an alliance with Russia. In the present global scenario, it is amply clear that unless there is the policy of alliance with Russia, there will inevitably be a policy of alliance with imperialism, with the imperialist powers.

Secondly, the revolutionary, new and genuine Three People's Principles should cooperate with the Communist party. Thirdly, the revolutionary, new and genuine Three People's Principles should have a policy of assisting farmers and workers.

**4.3.6 Culture of New Socialism or Democracy**

Culture reflects the ideology of the political and economic state of a given society. China has an imperialist culture which reflects the imperialist or the partial rule, in the political and economic fields. Cultural organizations foster this culture. The imperialists directly run these organizations in China. This category also comprises of the culture of slavery. The culture of China also comprises of semi-feudal characteristics. These characteristics are a reflection of its semi-feudal politics and economy. Its exponents encompass everyone who advocates the beliefs of Confucius, the study, of the Confucian canon, the old ethical code and the old ideas in opposition to the new culture and new ideas. Imperialist culture and semi-feudal culture are interlinked and formed a reactionary cultural alliance against China's new culture. This form of reactionary culture offers its services to the imperialists and the feudal class and should be swept away. Unless this is eradicated, it is not possible to build a new culture of any kind. It is not possible to construct without destruct. The new culture reflects the ideology of the new politics and the new economy, which it sets out to serve.

Mao said that the Chinese society has gradually changed in character since the emergence of a capitalist economy in China; it is no longer an entirely feudal but a semi-feudal society, although the feudal economy still predominates. The capitalist economy is new in comparison to the feudal economy. The political forces of the bourgeoisie, the petty bourgeoisie and the proletariat are the new political forces which



## NOTES

have emerged and grown simultaneously with this new capitalist economy. The new culture is a reflection of the new economic and political forces in the field of ideology and it also serves them. In the absence of the capitalist economy, the bourgeoisie, the petty bourgeoisie and the proletariat and without the political forces of these classes, it would not have been possible for the new ideology or new culture to emerge. These new political, economic and cultural forces are all forces of revolution which oppose the old politics, the old economy and the old culture. The old edition has two parts, one being China's own semi-feudal politics, economy and culture and the other, the politics, economy and culture of imperialism, with the latter heading the alliance. Both are bad and should be eradicated. The struggle between the new and the old in Chinese society, is a struggle between the new forces of the people (different revolutionary classes and the old forces of imperialism) and the feudal class. This struggle lasted a full hundred years since the Opium War and nearly thirty years, if dated since the revolution of 1911. However, revolutions too, can be classified into old and new. Those that are new in one historical period become old in the other.

The century of the Chinese bourgeoisie democratic revolution can be divided into two main stages, the first stage of eight years (belonging to the old category) and the last twenty years. This is because the international and domestic political situation has changed. It falls in the new category. Old democracies are the characteristic of the first eight years. New democracy is a feature of the last twenty years. Mao believed this distinction to hold well in culture as well as in politics.

### *China's Cultural Revolution*

On the basis of cultural ideologies, the two periods that preceded and followed the movement of 4th May formed two distinct historical periods. Prior to the movement of 4th May, the struggle of China's cultural front was the one between the new culture of the bourgeoisie and the old culture of the feudal class. The struggle between the modern school system and the imperial examination system, between the new learning and the old learning and between western learning and Chinese learning, fall in this category. The so-called modern schools or new learning or Western learning of that time, primarily focused (since the pernicious vestiges of Chinese feudalism still remained in parts) on the natural sciences and bourgeois social and political theories. These theories were needed by the representatives of the bourgeoisie.

### *Dissemination of Socialism and Communism*

The communist ideology provides guidance with respect to the orientation of national culture and people should work hard to disseminate socialism and communism throughout the working class and to educate peasants and other sections of the people in socialism and communism step by step. However, Mao said that our national culture as a whole is not yet socialist. Owing to the leadership of the proletariat, the politics, the economy and the culture of new democracy, all contain an element of socialism. They have no mere casual element but one with a decisive role. However, on the whole, the political, economic and cultural situation so far is new-democratic and not socialist. This is because the Chinese revolution at present is not yet socialist enough to overthrow capitalism. In the sphere of national culture, it is wrong to assume that the national culture that exists is, or should be completely socialist in nature. That would amount to confusing the dissemination of communist ideology with the carrying out of an immediate programme of action and to confuse the application of the communist standpoint, method in investigating problems, undertaking research, handling work and training cadres. A national culture with a socialist content will surely reflect socialist politics

## NOTES

and a socialist economy. There are socialist elements in politics and economy and hence these socialist elements reflect in the national culture. However, taking society as one unit, we do not have a socialist politics and a socialist economy yet, so there cannot be a wholly socialist national culture. Since the present Chinese revolution is part of world proletarian socialist revolution, the new culture of China today, is part of the world proletarian-socialist new culture and is its great ally. While this part has essential elements of socialist culture, the national culture as a whole join the stream of the world proletarian-socialist culture. However, it would not entirely feature as a socialist culture, but as the anti-imperialist and anti feudal new-democratic culture of huge masses. Since the Chinese revolution today cannot do without the proletarian leadership, China's new culture cannot do without the leadership of proletarian, culture and ideology, of communist ideology. In the current scenario, this type of a leadership implies leading the public in an anti-imperialist and anti feudal and political. Therefore, on the whole, the content of china's new national culture is still not socialist, but new democratic.

### CHECK YOUR PROGRESS

8. The Chinese revolution can be divided into two stages. State these two stages.
9. What does Mao's hundred flowers policy emphasize on?
10. What did Mao do to gain education?
11. What was the purpose of Mao's struggle?
12. How was the Chinese revolution divided, according to Mao?

## 4.4 GANDHIAN THOUGHTS ON STATE POLICY

Gandhi was not a politician in the ordinary sense of the term. But he exhibited unusual tact and intelligence in choosing the time as well as the methods and techniques to be used in launching his non-violence agitation. This made him the ideal of all the political leaders, who were striving for India's independence. The greatest contribution of Mahatma Gandhi to political theory and politics is the spiritualization of politics. He believed that if politics is to be a blessing for mankind and not a curse then it has to be guided by moral and spiritual principles. The leaders must be guided by a sense of sacrifice and service. Gandhi stressed the importance of means and said that right and just means must be adopted to achieve right and just ends. Only the right means, he believed, could lead to the right ends. Thus, according to him the ends and the means are the same things, looked at from different points of view.

### Philosophical Anarchism

Gandhi believed in the essential goodness of man. Left unto himself, man can develop his spiritual and moral personality. Man alone is capable of achieving wonders in the world. The state should not interfere in the activities of the individual. Gandhi believed that the state is an instrument of exploitation. It exploits and oppresses the poor. The excessive interference of the state kills individual initiative and action. The state originates in an essentially violent society but in a society where the people are non-violent, orderly and disciplined, the state becomes unnecessary. Gandhi believed that all initiative must come from within man. Anything that is imposed by an external agency is evil, because it does not elevate the human soul. It deprives and degrades the human soul and stands as a positive hindrance to the spiritual and moral development of the individual's personality. In his introduction to Thoreau's essay on Civil Disobedience, Mahatma Gandhi (quoted by Prayelal) writes, 'I heartily accepted the



motto, that government is best which governs least ... carried out, it finally amounts to this, which also I believe, that government is best which governs not at all'. Instead of state activity, Gandhi preferred individual activity. The instruments of state, like force and coercion, rob and individual action of its morality. Both Thoreau and Gandhi looked upon the state as a soulless machine. The ideal society envisaged by Gandhi is a stateless democracy. About the state of his imagination, he wrote in his *Young India*: 'In such a state (of enlightened anarchy), everyone is his own ruler. He rules himself in such a manner that he is never a hindrance to his neighbour. In the ideal state, therefore, there is no political power, because there is no state'.

In spite of his distrust for the state, Gandhi did not dogmatize it. He believed that the state is necessary to perform certain functions for the good of the masses. He wanted it to exercise minimum functions, transferring more and more functions to voluntary associations. State action should be judged on its own merit and only that action which promoted the welfare of the masses was to be justified. In performing its functions, the state's object should be to serve the masses and these functions must be performed with minimum use of force. The state must follow persuasive rather than coercive methods.

#### 4.4.1 Welfare Concept of the State

According to Humayum Kabir, who was an Indian philosopher, Gandhi was an inheritor of the liberal tradition, of the tradition of philosophical anarchism and of the tradition of collectivism found socialistic thought that the good thing of life ought to be shared. He would support a welfare state because of his great concern for the masses. Gandhi would have liked the Five Years Plans and other method of planned development if they could have originated of the people. But a plan, which increase government post, favouritism, nepotism and opportunities, corruption and laziness, would have been definitely rejected by him. He was, therefore, not in favour on concentration of heavy industries and the grand multipurpose river valley projects, which did not benefit the people in the proportion of the huge amounts spent on them.

His concern for the misery and exploitation of human beings compelled him to start a vigorous agitation against untouchability in whatever form it might exist. He condemned the practice of untouchability and broke the unhealthy practice of the cast system by such means as a temple entry and continuous propaganda against untouchability. But at the same time, he upheld the Hindu ideal of the varna-ashrama dharma, according to which, every person was to perform his allotted task in the society, in accordance with his training and capacities. Gandhi's ideal of classness was not Marxian. He called himself a weaver and a cultivator by profession and identified himself with those people with regard to food, dress, speech and the like.

#### *Gandhi on Decentralization*

Gandhi's greatest contribution to the social thought of this century is perhaps his insistence on decentralization of the means of production (i.e. say economic power). There are many who are ready to give thoughtful consideration to his theory because it is the only way out of the problem of unemployment in this country. They argue that it is desirable to go in for decentralization because huge capital accumulation is needed to industrialize the country through large-scale industries. They also contend that because large-scale industrialization presupposes the existence of foreign markets which this country cannot have, decentralization is the only cherishable goal. In other words,

#### NOTES

NOTES

large-scale industrialization will be preferable in case the problem of capital formation and foreign market are solved.

Now, this line of reasoning constitutes a danger to the whole theory of decentralization as put forward by Gandhi. It would be wrong to presume that Gandhi propounded his theory only to suit Indian conditions. On the other hand, Gandhi's theory of decentralization was the result of his keen and almost prophetic insight into the numerous political, social and cultural ills which the age of large-scale industrialization has brought in its wake.

This is what Bertrand Russell has to say as regards Gandhi's concept of decentralization: 'In those parts of the world in which industrialism is still young, the possibility of avoiding the horrors we have experienced still exists. India, for example, is traditionally a land of village communities. It would be a tragedy if this traditional way of life with all its evils were to be suddenly and violently exchanged for the greater evils of industrialism and they would apply to people whose standard of living is already pitifully low....'

Therefore, one has only to understand the magnitude of those 'horrors' of which Bertrand Russell speaks, before one can truly appreciate Gandhi's idea of decentralization.

Large-scale industrialism is at the base of the centralization of political power in a few hands. It is in the very nature of large-scale industries to centralize economic power in the hands of a few individuals. Under capitalism, this power comes to be concentrated in the hands of individual capitalists and under socialism it is arrogated by managers, technocrats and bureaucrats.

Thus, the centralization of power in the state negates the very conception of democracy.

This is why Gandhi did not favour the so-called democracy in the West. In his view, Western democracy was only formal. In reality, it was totalitarian insofar as only a few could enjoy the political power in this system.

Apart from the political consequences, there are the evil effects of industrialization on the personality of man. Industrialism starts by snapping the natural chord of man which binds him with soil and sun and all-enveloping shadow of giant machines. As a result, he is reduced to a mere cog in the wheel.

Since industrialization is based on the division of labour, it limits man's self-expression. The famous illustration of Adam Smith that a pin has to pass through ninety hands before it is completely manufactured only reaffirms the above charge. Hence, the work loses its variety, initiative and colour. No doubt such a division increases the productivity. But it obstructs the full fruition of man's natural skill.

Not only this, industrialization does not cater to the biological needs of man. As a biological being requires 'a specific temperature, a specific quality of climate, light, humidity and food'. It is by working in such conditions that man maintains his bodily equilibrium. Industrialization usurps these organic needs of man. Moreover, industrialization tends to gather man in the collective. This inevitably fosters the growth of totalitarian impulse in man. Man becomes oblivious of his own sovereignty and merges his personality in the collective with the result that ultimately he is accustomed to tolerate every form of tyranny and cruelty in the name of the collective well-being of the society.

There are some of the most eloquent ills which result from an unchecked growth of industrialism. As a matter of fact, many thinkers and social reformers, Western and



## NOTES

Fourier and especially Marx tried to go into the causes of these ills. According to them, therefore, the root of the malady lay in the system of ownership; all social, political and cultural ills were due to private ownership of the means of production. Once this private system of ownership was removed and instruments of production socialized, they thought the malady would disappear, rather melt as if into thin air.

However, experience gave a lie to the rosy picture, which these reforms and especially Marx had painted. Even after socialization, the ills tended to appear in diverse other forms. Liberty disappeared and the mad pursuit after power tended to reduce man to the lowest denominator of beast living as George Orwell would like to call on 'Animal Farm'.

Where lay then the root of the disease, the fallacy in the whole approach? Undoubtedly many of the evil originated from the system of ownership. Gandhi accepted Marx in this respect. But he went a step further and delved deeper. According to him, both the system of ownership and the technique of production were the real cause of the malady. Marx attacked the system of ownership in his humanistic zeal. But he left the technique of production altogether untouched. Gandhi focused his attention to the technique also. He suggested that large-scale technique should give way to small-scale technique. This, therefore, forms the core of his decentralization theory.

Does this mean that Gandhi was against the application of science to the instruments of production, i.e. machinery? To this he replied, 'What I object to is the craze for machinery, not machinery as such.....' Indeed he favoured the application of science towards developing the small-scale technique: 'I would welcome every improvement in the cottage machine,' he wrote in *Young India*. Replying to a suggestion whether he was against all machinery he said, 'My answer is emphatically No. but I am against its indiscriminate multiplication. I refuse to be dazzled by the seeming triumph of machinery. But simple tools and implements and such machinery as saves individual labour and lightens the burden of millions of cottages, I should welcome.'

We see, therefore, that Gandhi was not against machinery as such. His whole approach to machinery and the use of science was radically different, deeply revolutionary and humanly conscious. A technique which tends to make man a robot, robs him of his perennial urge to freedom and makes an all-out invasion on his political, economic and social liberties is not acceptable to Gandhi.

'Science in so far as it consists of knowledge, must be regarded as having value, but insofar as it consists of technique, the question whether it is to be praised or blamed depends upon the use that is made of the technique. In itself it is neutral, neither good nor bad and any ultimate views that we may have about what gives value to this or that must come from some other source than science.' This is what Bertrand Russell has to say about the use of scientific technique.

According to Gandhi, the scientific technique, therefore, must be informed by a deep awareness of values which it is out to create. In other words, the advancement of technique and perfection must accord with the general aims. Large-scale technique strikes at the very root of the general aims. Gandhi, therefore, does not show any quarter to it.

#### 4.4.2 Gandhi on Democracy

Mahatma Gandhi felt the importance and necessity of democracy for India, despite its being liable to be greatly abused. That is why he emphasized upon its constant development and maturity. Through this, he wished transformation of his dream of

## NOTES

*Ramarajya* into a reality. In the *Ramarajya* of his imagination, each and everyone, weak or strong— gets equal opportunity to rise and his security and honour, guaranteed. In short, Gandhi's *Ramarajya* is an advanced form of democracy.

Now, the question arises, is there a possibility of transformation of Gandhi's dream of *Ramayana* or an advanced form of democracy into a reality? In this respect Mahatma Gandhi himself was not sure. He knew that a human being always commits mistakes knowingly or unknowingly. He was also aware that one cannot get rid of the evils immediately and completely. Similarly, a man-made institution can also not become free of evils entirely and right away.

Therefore, Gandhi, along with other necessities, particularly stressed upon discipline, equal respect of law by all and priority to social will over the individual will in a democracy. He was of the opinion that indiscipline, disrespect of law and priority to the individual will over the social will are among the main causes behind evils in a democracy. So, it is necessary to minimize them for making the democracy disciplined and enlightened.

For Gandhi, freedom was a mental state rather than political or economic freedom. He laid great emphasis on a healthy public opinion and expressed the need for a responsible representation. The reason being, if public opinion in democracy is not healthy and matured, it can be converted into a mobocracy instead of giving strength to it. On many occasions and at different levels this can be observed in many countries of the world including India.

Similarly, if representatives in a democracy are not responsible, they weaken instead of becoming its defenders. Therefore, Gandhi called upon the people to reduce the possibility of abuse in democracy to the minimum from time-to-time. He, time and again emphasized upon making democratic system of governance firm, healthy, disciplined and responsible. Gandhi's call to save democracy from becoming mobocracy and to make it people-friendly and finally transforming it into a *Swarajya* was, and is, worth giving a thought.

Despite the large number of people coming together mobocracy can never be the reflection of a democracy. Due to lack of discipline and control over the crowd, a mobocracy cannot transmit the will of the people. Hence, a mobocracy sometimes becomes more dangerous than a dictatorship. That is why Gandhi also said: 'Those [who are in a mob] have no mind, no premeditation. They act in frenzy.'

How can a democracy be devoid of mobocracy? How can it be transformed into a real people's rule? How can it become a *Swarajya*? Gandhi was of the opinion that it was possible through the process of constant reforms in democracy and not the avoidance of it and that too in accordance with demand of time and prevailing circumstances. Simultaneously, for the rise of the institution of democracy he rightly called upon the people to carry on their duties and to maintain discipline.

In this process he further spoke about people's awareness: it meant people's consciousness of their duties, rights and responsibilities towards the nation. He first laid the responsibility of people's representatives on the one hand and the government on the other. He opposed the idea of such a democracy in which a handful of representatives, it doesn't matter if they are elected for a fixed period by the people, sit at the centre to work for it. Through that the real aim of democracy can never be achieved; the system cannot become a self-rule. In the words of Gandhi, 'Democracy cannot be worked by twenty men sitting at the centre. For, it has to be worked from below by the people [consciously] from every village.'



## NOTES

Undoubtedly, Gandhi's stress upon an alert democracy is vital and significant. We should see no reason for an institution of democracy becoming unhealthy if its holders are disciplined and responsible. If citizen are conscious enough the democracy will definitely step forward towards a true self-rule. A disciplined, responsible and conscious democracy can become a true government of the people. Such a rule can turn into a *Swarajya* and can pave the way towards the *Ramarajya* of Gandhi's imagination.

Hence, Gandhi's views regarding a democracy cannot be taken slightly. They must be analyzed minutely. An open debate on the vitality and relevance of them in the current perspectives should be organized. If they seem relevant as per the demand of time, they should be examined and adopted.

Today the whole world is looking at *ahimsa*-based ideas of Gandhi. Particularly, institutions of higher learning are making critical analysis of his views on democracy. In such a situation the relevance, significance and utility of his ideas for India can be understood thoroughly.

## CHECK YOUR PROGRESS

13. Fill in the blanks with the appropriate words.

- (a) Gandhi believed that the \_\_\_\_\_ is an instrument of exploitation.
- (b) According to Gandhi, the excessive interference of the state kills \_\_\_\_\_ and \_\_\_\_\_.

14. Who wrote an essay on 'civil disobedience'?

15. State whether the following are true or false.

- (a) Gandhi's decentralization theory was not based on Indian conditions.
- (b) The decentralization of power in the state negates the very conception of democracy.

16. What, according to Gandhi, was the main aspect of freedom?

## 4.5 COMMUNITARIANISM

The terms community stands for a form of society whose members are informed by the 'community spirit' or 'a sense of community'. It denotes a 'network of relationships' which are characterized by intimacy and durability. It may be distinguished from 'association' which is based on impersonal and contractual relations. Liberal theory equates society with 'association', whereas communitarian theory equates society with 'community' to determine the nature and extent of social obligation. Communitarians argue that an individual cannot assure full development of his personality unless he is committed to the spirit of community toward his fellow-beings.

Communitarianism as a socio-political philosophy emphasizing the significance of the community in the operation of the political life, analysing the evaluation of political institutions in its attempt to understand human identity and well-being emerged in the 1980s. It came up as a critique of two established philosophy of school — contemporary liberalism and libertarianism. Contemporary liberalism sought to increase and protect personal autonomy and some individual rights through government activities. Libertarianism, also called classical liberalism, sought to protect two essential rights of individuals, right to property and liberty, by limiting government powers.

Communitarianism believes that society builds a man; that is to say that community structure, ethics and practices give shape to the man or the self. Thus, we are indebted

NOTES

to the community; there are no 'unencumbered selves'. This is in sharp contrast with liberal individualism. Communitarianism, however, has different political forms — leftist, rightist and centralist. Leftist communitarianism believes communities want unrestricted freedom and social equality (the view of anarchism). Centrist communitarianism holds that the community is grounded in an acknowledgement of reciprocal rights and responsibilities while the right-winged upholds that community demands respect for authority and established values.

History has it that John Goodwyn Barnby, a leader of the British Chartist movement, had coined the term communitarian in 1841 to refer to utopian socialist and other who talked of unusual communal life. Communitarian ideas were found in the Old and New Testaments and Catholic theology. More than a century later, the term gained momentum as a number of American philosophers debated on the importance of common good. The very essence of the communitarianism was against the fundamental thought of the contemporary liberals and libertarians. Canadian philosopher Charles Taylor and American political theorist Michael Sandel were among the prominent theorists of this philosophy. Work of several political theorists like Shlomo Avineri, Seyla Benhabib, Avner de-Shalit, Jean Bethke Elshtain, Amitai Etzioni, William A. Galston, Alasdair MacIntyre, Philip Selznick, and Michael Walzer exhibited communitarian thinking. During the same period, researchers working on East Asian society and politics trends spoke of the thinking within authoritarian societies of Singapore, China and Malaysia. These societies extolled social obligations and the importance of the common good and accorded much less weight to autonomy and rights. Further, they viewed individuals as more or less interchangeable cells who find meaning in their contribution to the social whole rather than as free agents.

A third stand in the communitarian idea emerged in the 1990 through A. Etzioni and W. Galston. This branch was called the responsive communitarianism. The main thesis of this branch was there were two sources of normativity — one that was the common good and the other of autonomy and rights. And it upheld that neither should overpower the other.

Nonetheless, communitarians of all strands upheld the importance of the social realm and particularly of the community; they held different views on the extent of attention to be paid to the ideas of liberty and individual rights. Ferdinand Tönnies and Robert Nisbet, some of the early communitarians, highlighted the significance of close-knit social fabric and authority. Communitarians in Asia gave importance to social hierarchy and believed to maintain social harmony political liberties and individual rights had to be curtailed. They criticized the Western idea of liberty and argued that it only led to anarchy. Hence, they gave more power to the state. They further argued that the West uses its idea of legal and political rights to chastise other cultures that have inherent values of their own.

Another important aspect of communitarianism is the attention it pays to the relationship between the self and the community. Theorists consider the self as 'embedded' that is to say, it is restricted by the community. Responsive communitarians feel individuals who are 'well integrated' into the societies are able to act in a responsible manner and isolated individuals. They, however, warned against increased social pressure which would result in undermining the individual self.

Communitarians give a lot of importance to social institutions such as family, schools, social organization and so on. Each of these institutions, say from the birth of an infant, contribute in developing the self. Communitarianism is a contemporary philosophy. It marks a departure from the philosophy of liberalism because it places



## NOTES

the relation between individual and society in a new perspective. Communitarianism repudiates the picture of the 'self-implied in the liberal theory. Liberal theory implied an 'unencumbered detached from pre-existing social form, as exemplified by the concept of 'possessive individualism' which postulates that individual is the sole proprietor of his own person or capacities for he owes nothing to society. Such a view denies his commitment to other individuals, traditions, practices and conception of the good. It holds that self is prior to its ends. It is fully competent to choose its ends as well as its roles and dispositions. In contrast to this 'atomistic' view of individual, communitarianism advances the concept of situated self, as constituted by social role, practices and situations, in other words, communitarianism holds that an agent's identity is constituted by specific commitments to his social situations. While liberalism insists on 'liberty' of individual his interest and rights, communitarianism focuses on his social identity and upholds acceptance of 'authority' because it expresses our common will or reflects our common identity, our shared values and believes. It is significant to note that liberalism had one liberty of the individual but atomistic view of society held by liberalism led to the erosion of the sense of responsibility and the moral standards attached thereto. Communitarianism seeks to restore that sense of responsibility and reconstruct moral standards on that basis.

### *Communitarianism, a Critique of Liberalism*

Communitarianism emerged as a major critique of contemporary liberalism prevalent in Anglo-America. Although the history of communitarian critique is an old one, present day communitarianism or modern communitarianism started as a reaction to John Rawls' book *A Theory of Justice* (1971). Basing their thesis on the ideologies of Aristotle and Hegel, political scientists Alasdair MacIntyre, Michael Sandel, Charles Taylor and Michael Walzer have refuted Rawls' argument that a government's most important task is to provide freedom and liberty uniformly to its citizen allowing them to live freely. These political philosophers, though did not regard themselves as communitarians, but were called so, did not seek to provide any alternative theory to the idea of liberalism. But their core arguments which were meant to highlight difference with liberalism's devaluation of community and for purposes of clarity one can distinguish between claims of three sorts: 'ontological' or 'metaphysical' claims about the social nature of the self, methodological claims about the importance of tradition and social context for moral and political reasoning, and normative claims about the value of community. These strands of debate have evolved from abstract philosophical disputes to more concrete political concerns.

Early critics of liberalism might have rejected the communitarian accounts of the ontology of the self, but today the same is regarded as essential to almost all forms of liberalism. In retrospect, this so-called merger of the communitarian-liberal highlights the fact that key arguments of renowned communitarian philosophers were political in nature, rather than metaphysical. Communitarianism should, in fact, provide a stronger grounding for liberal ideal of equal freedom to individual than what is provided by individual ontologists. The *Politics of Communitarianism and the Emptiness of Liberalism* traces this political mode of philosophizing to the British New Left that shaped Alasdair MacIntyre and Charles Taylor; and to the threat to Rawlsian liberalism represented by Robert Nozick, against whom both Michael Sandel (Taylor's student) and Michael Walzer were arguing. Communitarianism points to the shortcomings of liberalism and attempts to redefine the relation between individual and the community. Liberalism promotes individualism to focus on individual freedom which undermines individual's affinity with the community. Liberals base their theories on notions of

# NOTES

individual rights and personal freedom, but neglect the extent to which individual freedom and wellbeing are only possible within community. Once we recognize the dependence of human beings on society, then our obligations to sustain the common good of society are as weighty as our rights to individual liberty. Hence, communitarians argue, a liberal 'politics of rights' should be abandoned or, or at least supplemented by, a 'politics of the common good'. When every individual turns to seek his own good, no one is emotionally attached to anyone. An individual would manage to have many means of comfort at the expense of his emotional security. In other words, if an individual devotes himself to the pursuit of self-interest, he cannot secure good life in the fullest sense of the term. Communitarians hold that only community is capable of realizing the common good. Individual can derive their respective goods from the source if all the individuals contribute to their efforts for the attainment of the common good from which they would be able to derive their individual goods. This view necessitates individual's first commitment to the community and not to himself. For communitarians, individual's own existence and personality are the product of his social situation, roles and conventions which are embedded in society. While liberals leave the individual to pursue his self-appointed goals, communitarians want him to pursue the community-determined goals. While liberals declare the individual to be the sole proprietor of all his faculties, communitarians focus on his indebtedness to society for these faculties. While liberals insist on individual's rights and liberties, communitarians emphasize his duties and obligations. Communitarianism insists on our common identity and eulogizes those values and beliefs which are dear to all of us.

Broadly speaking, communitarians have attacked the liberal mode of thought on the ground that it is too focused on the importance of individual liberty, and insufficiently appreciative of the way in which human beings require a place in a well-functioning community in order to flourish.

Liberals believe that each person should define and seek his own 'good' within a political structure which defines and enforces what is 'right'. On the other hand, communitarians hold that a political structure has an important role to define what is 'right' as well as 'good' and to help the citizens to seek the good. Liberals define 'common good' as a sum total of the good of all individuals which is exemplified by reconciliation of their conflicting interests. On the contrary, communitarians define 'common good' as a uniform entity where the good of all individuals would converge. They believe that government should strive to create a well-functioning society which would enable all citizens to achieve a good life by participating in its functioning. However, like liberals, communitarians also subscribe to democratic form of government. The ideas of communitarianism can be traced back to the thought of Aristotle, Jacques Rousseau, G. W. F. Hegel and T. H. Green. However, its most ardent advocates of contemporary communitarian theory are Michel Sandel, Alasdair MacIntyre, Michel Walzer, Charles Taylor and Will Kimlicka. These contemporary thinkers were deeply inspired by the thought of Aristotle, Hegel and Rousseau.

Here, it would be pertinent to discuss in brief the contribution of Green to communitarianism. Green is the fore runner of communitarianism. In his celebrated work *Lectures on The Principles of Political Obligation* published in 1982 he argued that human beings, as self-conscious creatures, attain the knowledge of the common good in association with the members of their community. According to him, man knew the common good more intimately than their self-interest or individual good. The common good not only comprehends the good of all members of the community but their conception of the common good is also identical. The state and political institutions are brought into existence for the realisation of the common good. The idea of the common



is the foundation of political obligation. Green asserts that the state is authorised to make only those laws which, promote the common good; and the individual is obliged to abide by only those laws which conform to the common good. If an individual thinks that he can protect the common good more effectively by opposing a particular order of the state, his political obligation does not stop him from going ahead. It is the consciousness of the common good which induces people to accept their duties. They are prepared to forego their personal choice and self-interest for the sake of realizing the common good. They are convinced that they can attain self-realization only by pursuing the common good.

The emphasis on community can be found in Marxism as well, and is of course a defining feature of the communist idea. However, the kind of communitarianism which has recently come to prominence with the writing of Michael Sandel, Michael Walzer, Alasdair MacIntyre, Daniel A. Bell and Charles Taylor is quite different from traditional Marxism. Marxists see community as something that can only be achieved by a revolutionary change in society, by the overthrow of capitalism and the building of a socialist society. The new communitarians, on the other hand, believe that community already exists, in the form of common social practices, cultural traditions, and shared social understandings. Community does not need to be built *de novo*, but rather needs to be respected and protected. To some extent, communitarians see community in the very social practices that Marxists see as exploitative and alienating.

Michael Sandel (1982) uses the communitarian level to criticize liberalism though subsequently he termed himself a republican. He argues that liberalism justifies an individualism radically unembedded in concrete social institutions and in the wrong thus giving priority to the pursuit of abstract equal justice over a communal, moral good. Pointing to Rawls' conception of the individuals in the original positions as a disconnected and disembodied, he concludes that liberal theory fails to understand our 'embeddedness' in a particular time, place and culture. This is a fact that a political theory has to recognize if it is seeking to generate laws, institutions and practices that are truly good for us and constitutive of an ideal and fully just society. Justice must be theorised not only as the basis of individual who are independent and separate desiring to profit from one another but from people with attachments that partially constitute their identities, who come to know and relate to one another. In his book *Liberalism and the Limits of Justice* (1982), Michael Sandel has asserted that a person can only be understood in the context of his 'embeddedness' in a particular time, place and culture. Only with this understanding a political theory can generate laws, institutions and practices that would be genuinely good for us and contribute to a fully just society. This alone will create a 'deeper commonality' which will be informed by 'shared self understanding' as well as affection.

Michael Sandel in his book *Liberalism and the Limits of Justice* (1982) attacked John Rawls's *A Theory of Justice* (1971), for his conception of rational negotiators deliberating as the disconnected and disembodied individuals in the so-called 'original positions' who have come together to find out the principle of justice. It is a typical representation of the liberal attitude which tries to understand human beings independently of all activities; desires, ideas, roles and pursuits that characterize human lives in an actual society. Sandel observes that after subtracting all these characteristics, nothing is left of the person whom we want to understand. Sandel asserts that the person can only be understood in the context of his 'embeddedness' in a particular time, place and culture. Only with this understanding, a political theory can generate laws, institutions and practices that would be genuinely good for us and conducive to a fully just society. This alone will create a 'deeper commonality' which will be informed by 'shared self understanding' as well as affection.

## NOTES



NOTES

Michael Walzer, a left communitarian, argues for what he calls 'complex' as opposed to 'simple equality'; that is, a notion of distributive justice based on different rules of distribution for different social goods, rather than one procrustean rule requiring equal holdings of everything for everyone. Politics, the economy, the family, the workplace, the military are different spheres having different principles of distribution. Justice required that the integrity of its sphere should be maintained as a transgression from the others. In an implicit critique of Rawls, Walzer points out that the various principles of justice in each sphere are local rather than universal and these have to be based only on the common understandings of a particular people with an historical identity. In other words, there is no single principle of distributive justice, which holds true for all societies, in all places and at all times. Philosophical systems could advance such a principle in view of cultural diversity and pluralistic political choices. Walzer believes that questions about justice can only be answered by exploring the 'shared meaning' of a particular society. The problem, however, remains about the objectivity of these shared meanings? Only on this basis it is possible to create a deeper community with shared self understanding and affection.

Michel Walzer (*Spheres of Justice*, 1983) has sought to reconstruct the liberal approach to justice as the problem of determining suitable criteria of distribution by introducing a communitarian approach to this problem. Walzer has argued that criteria of distribution should correspond to the 'spheres' in which distribution is being considered, so that, for instance, economic justice will be different from political justice. According to Walzer, each sphere of justice will have its own right reason (or relevant reason) for distribution of good that it distributes. Thus the sphere of politics, or health, or education, should be uncontaminated by the domination of money, for money properly, rules in the sphere of commodities; the sphere of office should not (beyond a certain limit point) be contaminated by nepotism, which belongs to the sphere of kinship and love; the sphere of kinship should not be contaminated by male domination.

The market properly conceived as the place for the distribution of various social goods on a reasonable basis should be free for all. As the dominance of money (above all) is incompatible with the integrity of politics, merit, kinship etc., so the dominance of money in all these spheres must finally disappear. Walzer's vision of a new social order comprehends the appropriate arrangements of a decentralized democratic socialism: a strong welfare state run, in part at least, by local and amateur officials; a constrained market; an open and demystified civil service; independent public schools; the sharing of hard work and free time; the protection of religious and familial life; a system of public honouring and dishonouring free from all considerations of rank and class; workers' control of companies and factories; a politics and parties, movements, meetings and public debate. In his book *Spheres of Justice* (1983), he has laid down elaborate criteria for the distribution of various social goods according to the proper spheres of their applications, where they would contribute to the smooth functioning of the community.

In his book *After Virtue* (1981), Alasdair MacIntyre has argued that individuals flourish only with in an atmosphere of 'socially established cooperative human activity'. If the state treats individuals as disconnected entities and lets them loose to realize their rights without realizing that duties, the result would be social disintegration and moral disaster. MacIntyre constructs an idea of the narrative self: a notion of personal identity that comes from the wave of social and communal bond. He argues that 'individuality' owes its origin to the framework of an established community; it cannot be the product of an individual's choice. MacIntyre ridicules the liberals' concept of individual as an 'autonomous moral agents', disconnected from the social fabric. He



argues that individual flourish only within an atmosphere of 'socially established cooperative human activity'.

The state must promote and protect this activity and then by encourage the development of human excellence. MacIntyre and other communitarians believe that if the state treats individuals as disconnected beings and let them loose to realize their rights (as liberals seem to wish), the result would be social disintegration and moral disaster. Such disaster has already become visible in modern liberal states as evident in the prevalence of crime and violence, the breakdown of the family, and the rampant drug abuse. Charles Taylor in his book *Philosophical Papers* (1985) echoed MacIntyre's attack on the liberal conception of 'atomistic' individual and conformed the tenants of communitarianism. Taylor argued that if human beings want their genuine development, they must acknowledge first that they are situated in a society. They can realize their good only through cooperation in the pursuit of the common good. According to Taylor liberals claim that the freedom to choose our projects is inherently valuable, something to be pursued for its own sake, a claim that can be rejected as empty. Instead, he says, there has to be some project that is worth pursuing, some task that is worth fulfilling.

In a communitarian society, the common good is conceived of as a substantive conception of the good life which defines the community's way of life. This common good, rather than adjusting itself to the pattern of people's preferences, provides a standard by which those preferences are evaluated. The community's way of life forms the basis for a public ranking of conceptions of the good, and the weight given to an individual preferences depends on how much she conforms or contributes to this common good.

Communitarians talk of two-level relationship with the individual at one level and the state at the other and the intermediate position between the individual and the state is occupied by groups and communities. Communitarian thinkers criticize liberal political theory mainly for its overemphasis on individual. They argued that the liberal conception of the self and the relationship between the individual and the state are inherently flawed, unduly limited as well as the misrepresentative of the true nature of society. They criticized liberal individualism for prioritizing the rights and freedom of individual's and neglecting the importance of community membership to social and political life. Communitarians argue that the guarantee of a free and just state is deeply intertwined with the wellbeing of the community. The main objective of an ideal state is to employ its power and authority to encourage the continuation and health of those cultural traditions and values that serve to determine the common good. In a nutshell, the supporter of communitarianism advocates a state with a positive function of promoting the common good, unlike the liberal individualism who assigned a negative function to the state for ensuring an absence of interference in the domain of individual rights. The advocates of communitarianism focus on particular social value structures and reject the overly abstract individualism of liberalism. Its emphasis is on the importance of particularistic moral traditions by expressing a preference for the collective pursuit of virtue rather than the defence of individual rights as a principle of social order.

### *Rights and Responsibilities: A Synthesis*

Some political theorists see responsive communitarianism as a synthesis of liberal and academic-communitarian concerns. According to Sandel and Taylor, philosophical liberalism tended to overemphasize individual rights and autonomy at the cost of common goods. But such a step only brought out their lack of confidence about

## NOTES

## NOTES

individual rights, especially human rights. The responsive communitarians sought to bridge this gap. In their works they point out that society must take into account the moral high grounds of both the core values — the common good and individual rights and autonomy. They argued that since communities tended to take extreme positions and would side with either core value, it was necessary to pull them back to the centre. Examples of such inequalities were Japan, which was dedicated towards the common good but neglected women rights and rights of ethnic minorities. Similarly, the UK and the US gave undue importance to individual rights.

Responsive communitarians also warned against excessive expansive definition of rights and championed modern communities in which people find both a rich web of social relations and considerable degrees of freedom.

Fearing possibilities of future conflicts between the common goods and individual rights, responsive communitarianism laid out certain principles to formulate policies to cope with them, including in areas such as public health versus individual privacy and national security versus individual liberty. These policy criteria, mentioned below, should be implemented simultaneously.

- No change is justified in governing public policies and norms unless society encounters serious challenges, because these kinds of changes exact considerable societal costs.
- Individual rights may be restricted only if it leads to benefit the common good—what the US courts refer to as a ‘compelling interest’—and if the intrusion is as limited as possible.
- Adverse side effects that result from policy changes must be treated, above all, by introducing stronger mechanisms of accountability and oversight.

### *The Third Sector*

Communitarianism has added another page to the ongoing debate over the role of the government and the market. Communitarians hold that civil societies role should be given due importance. They argue that much of the behaviour as well as the factors that encourage discharging responsibilities are influenced by this third sector, which includes family, schools, different communities and non-profit organizations. They uphold the need and importance of social norms and informal social controls in fostering pro-social conduct and providing moral grounds to run a government as well as the market. American journalist Jonathan Rauch used the words ‘soft communitarianism’ to refer to communitarianism that focuses on the role of civil society and ‘hard communitarianism’ for East Asian communitarianism, which views the state as the primary social agent.

### *Cultural Relativism and the Global Community*

Communitarianism’s advocacy for communal formulations of the good make them vulnerable to the charge of ethical relativism or the claim that there is nothing called absolute good, but the concept of good has different meaning for different societies and culture.

Social scientist Michael Walzer in his book *Spheres of Justice* (1983), took a relativistic position, asserting that the caste system is good for the Indian society according to its standards. Critiques, however, say his theory is untenable. Admitting that every community has its own values, Taylor, as did Rawls, opined that ‘overlapping consensus’ on specific norms and policies is still possible, though different communities may have different reasons for believing that a given norm or policy is right. For



example, in the US, right to abortion and anti-abortion groups have worked together to make adoption easier and improve the functioning of the day-care-centre.

What is to be understood is that the question on scope of morality and scope of community are closely associated. Traditionally, communities adopted the flavour and shape of local beliefs and practices. But with advent of new forces such as technology and economic more-expansive communities became necessary in order to provide effective normative and political guidance to and control of these forces—hence, in the 17 century, national communities came into existence in Europe. By the late 20th century, there was a growing realization that these communities too had limited scope and the several challenges these communities face today, such as nuclear war or environmental degradation, cannot be dealt on a national basis. This has led to the emergence of more encompassing communities. The European Union is an example of forming a supernational community; but so far, it has not developed any kind of social integration and shared values that a strong community requires.

## NOTES

### Criticism

Communitarianism has also its limitations. It is criticized that in spite of its strong ethical base, it has no mechanism to ensure that its principles will be adopted as the general rules of behaviour. Though communitarianism is endowed with strong moral philosophy, it is not founded in equally strong political philosophy. Liberals argue that any 'thicker' conception of community is inconsistent with two basic aspects of modern life: the demand for individual autonomy, and the existence of social pluralism. As Rawls put it the 'fact of pluralism' means that 'the hope of political community must be abandoned, if by such a community we mean a political society united in affirming a general and comprehensive conception of the good. Communitarians object to the neutral state. They believe it should be abandoned for a 'politics of the common good'. According to Stephen Holmes, the contrast between the 'politics of neutrality' and communitarianism's 'politics of the common good' can be misleading. There is a 'common good' present in liberal politics as well, since the policies of a liberal state in at promoting the interests of the members of the community. The political and economic processes by which individual preferences are combined into a social choice function are liberal modes of determining the common good. To affirm state neutrality, therefore, is not to reject the idea of a common good, but rather to provide an interpretation of it.

## 4.6 MULTICULTURALISM

Multiculturalism is a concept first floated by Pierre Trudeau, Prime Minister of Canada, in the 1960s, in the context of peculiar circumstance of Canadian politics.

Canada was a British dominion created by the original British colony of Ontario and an original French colony Quebec acquired by Britain in 1763. They were united in 1867 into one dominion under the British monarch in a federal structure. Bi-lingualism was adopted as the official policy of the country.

Subsequently, Canada acquired new territories and the size of the federation enlarged with the creation of new provinces/states. She settled several fresh immigrants from Europe and Asia and the cultural composition of the population became more and more complex.

The Francophone Quebec was were restless under British rule and always demanded parity with the Anglophone Canadians in all respects. Frequently, they threatened secession. The problem was complicated by the fact that, for historical reasons the Anglophones were Protestants and the Francophones were Catholic. It was to settle this problem that Pierre Trudeau, a French man, floated the concept of

## NOTES

multiculturalism in which the Francophone, the Anglophone, the immigrants and the indigenous people would live happily. The formula was not palatable to the Quebecers who had so far seen themselves as equal partners of the Anglophone Canadians, and now found themselves to be reduced to the status of a minority. However, the system has worked. More importantly it was put up as a model of governance in a country containing different languages and different religions.

### *Implications of multiculturalism*

A modern state today is a mass state. The 'nation states' that came into existence in Europe in the 18th century, contained, besides a dominant majority, several minority cultural groups. Almost every 'nation state' of the world is actually multilingual or multi-religious or both. Multiculturalism recognizes the equality of all these cultural groups, at least in theory. Multiculturalism is a challenge to the idea of cultural nationalism.

This is an innovation over the individualistic principle of nation states where ethnic or cultural groups were not constitutionally recognized. In those states only individuals had rights. Thus, in the USA, the English language is compulsory and official language for the government and the people. So in Britain, France, Germany, Poland etc. Some countries like Switzerland today and Communist Russia earlier had a federal structure of government that granted statehood to individual religious and linguistic groups. Belgium is not a federation in the formal way, but it also recognizes different linguistic groups. Political rights of cultural groups is the foundational principle of multiculturalism.

There is a slow movement in these states towards multiculturalism in that minority cultures are being acknowledged as legitimate. The African Americans in the USA and the European countries have got equal rights. Muslims and other Asians are allowed to have their own languages taught in schools. However, there is still considerable conflict on the question of the cultural specialities of the immigrants like the burqa of the Muslim women or the turban of the Sikhs.

### *Multiculturalism in India*

India is an ancient and vast country. It contains several languages and all the major religious groups of the world. About 80 per cent of her population is Hindu. About 60 per cent of the population do not speak Hindi, the language of the biggest group. The Constitution of India has structured the state federally. Major linguistic groups have their own states. The Constitution grants cultural and educational rights to the minorities.

The states can run their affairs in their own languages although the official language is Hindi or English. All India services examinations are conducted through English, Hindi and other regional languages. Minority educational institutions are entitled to state grants. Multiculturalism, thus cements the mosaic of Indian nation.

### CHECK YOUR PROGRESS

17. Define the term community.
18. Who floated the concept of multiculturalism?

## 4.7 SUMMARY

- Lenin was the architect of the first communist state in the world.
- Lenin was one of the foremost political personalities and revolutionary thinkers of the 20th century.



## NOTES

- He was the mastermind behind the Bolshevik coming to power in Russia during 1917.
- He also designed the architecture and was the first leader of the Soviet Union.
- Mao Zedong was born to a peasant farmer in Chaochan, China, in the year 1893.
- He adopted Marxism at the time when he was employed as a library assistant at the Peking University.
- He was in service of the revolutionary army during Chinese Revolution in the year 1911.
- Although the term Swaraj means self-rule, Gandhi gave it the substance of an integral revolution that included all aspects of life.
- Gandhiji was not the originator of the idea of non-violence and other such means. But he was the first to use them on a mass scale and in the field of politics.
- Gandhiji believed that there is something of God in every man and that the satyagrahi can appeal to this divine element in man through love and conscious self-suffering.
- The greatest contribution of Mahatma Gandhi to political theory and politics is the spiritualization of politics. He believed that if politics is to be a blessing for mankind and not a curse, then it has to be guided by moral and spiritual principles.
- Gandhi's greatest contribution to the social thought of this century is perhaps his insistence on decentralization of the means of production (i.e., say economic power).
- Consistency, positivity, activity, coupled with common good and perpetuity are the main characteristics of Gandhi's non-violence.
- According to Gandhi, democracy is the government of the people. In fact, justice and freedom for every citizen are possible only under this system.
- The greatest merit of Communitarianism insists on co-operation and not competition between individuals and thereby promotes social solidarity.
- It inspires the isolated individual's to establish cordial relations between each other, and shows them the way to obtain emotional security.
- Communitarians insist that each of us, as an individual, develops an identity, talents and pursuits in life only as a member of the community and by sharing in its corporate life.

## 4.8 KEY TERMS

- **Internationalism:** Internationalism is a movement which advocates a greater economic and political cooperation among nations for the theoretical benefit of all.
- **Vanguard:** It is a group of people leading the way in new developments or ideas.
- **Proletariat:** The class of ordinary people who earn money by working.
- **Feudalism:** Feudalism was a way of structuring society around relationships derived from the holding of land in exchange for service or labour.
- **Non-violence:** The policy of using peaceful methods, not force, to bring about political or social change.
- **Communitarianism:** It is a philosophy that emphasizes the connection between the individual and the community.

NOTES

#### 4.9 ANSWERS TO 'CHECK YOUR PROGRESS'

1. According to Lenin, imperialism is the highest stage of capitalism.
2. According to Lenin, monopoly capitalism can become finance capitalism when banks combine and become master of capital that the industrialists use.
3. According to Lenin, Imperialism is capitalism in that stage of development in which the domination of monopoly and finance capital has taken shape; in which the export of capital has acquired pronounced importance in which the division of the world by international trusts has begun; and in which the portion of all the territory of the earth by the great capitalist countries has been completed.
4. The 'third international' came to be founded in March, 1919. It was formed to organize world revolution.
5. Lenin was the architect of the first communist state in the world.
6. Socialism in the country became the operative factor in Leninism.
7. Lenin appealed to Russian patriotism.
8. The Chinese' revolution can be divided into two stages. The first stage is to transform colonial, semi-colonial and semi-feudal form of society into an independent, democratic society. The second stage is to carry the revolution forward and build up a socialistic society.
9. Mao's hundred flowers policy emphasized that coercion shall not be used in ideological matters.
10. As Mao Zedong was keen to have education he worked on the fields during the day and studied at night.
11. Mao struggled for bringing about a cultural, economic and political revolution.
12. According to Mao, historically, the Chinese revolution is divided into democracy and socialism.
13. (a) State; (b) Individual initiative, action
14. Thoreau wrote an essay on 'Civil Disobedience'.
15. (a) False; (b) False
16. For Gandhi, freedom was a mental state rather than political or economic freedom.
17. The term community stands for a form of society whose members are informed by the 'community spirit' or 'a sense of community'.
18. Multiculturalism is a concept first floated by Pierre Trudeau, Prime Minister of Canada, in the 1960s, in the context of peculiar circumstance of Canadian politics.

#### 4.10 QUESTIONS AND EXERCISES

##### Short-Answer Questions

1. How did Lenin define imperialist capitalism?
2. What is the Chinese form of democracy?
3. Specify the main points of Gandhian philosophy of decentralization and democracy.



# Courses Offered Under CBCS at DDCE, Utkal University

## MANAGEMENT PROGRAMME

MBA (2 Yr.)

IMBA /BBA (Distance)

## P.G. DIPLOMA In

Banking & Insurance Management

Financial Management

Marketing Management

Human Resource Management

Tour & Travel Management

Dietetics & Nutrition Management

Production & Operation Management

## COMPUTER SCIENCE & APPLICATION PROGRAMME

MCA (3 Yr.)

MCA (2 Yrs Lateral)

M.Sc. Computer Science & Application

M.Sc. IT

M.Sc. ITM

## UNDER GRADUATE PROGRAMME:

B.A Hons

Educational Hons.

Economics Hons.

History Hons.

Odia Hons.

Pol Sc. Hons.

Sanskrit Hons.

Sociology Hons.

Public Administration Hons.

Hindi Hons.

Urdu Hons.

B.Com Hons.

Accounting Hons.

Management Hons.

## POST GRADUATE (DISTANCE)

M.A. Economics

M.A. Education

M.A. English

M.A. Hindi

M.A. History

M.A. Odia

M.A. Political Science

M.A. Public Administration

M.A. Sanskrit

M.A. Sociology

Master in Social Work (MSW)

Master in Commerce (M.Com)

ISBN 978-93-5338



9 789353 3380