



BACHELOR OF ARTS (HONOURS) IN POLITICAL SCIENCE

SEMESTER-I

CORE-I: UNDERSTANDING POLITICAL THEORY

CREDIT: 6

BLOCK: 1,2,3 & 4

AUTHOR

Dr. Badrinath Das



ଦୂର ଓ ଅନୁଲାଇନ ଶିକ୍ଷା କେନ୍ଦ୍ର, ଉତ୍କଳ ବିଶ୍ୱବିଦ୍ୟାଳୟ
CENTRE FOR DISTANCE AND ONLINE EDUCATION
UTKAL UNIVERSITY

CORE-I

UNDERSTANDING POLITICAL THEORY

BRIEF CONTENTS

Block No.	Block	Unit No.	Unit
1	Introducing Political Theory	1	What is Politics: Theorizing the 'Political'
		2	The tradition of Political Theory–I (Liberal, Marxist)
		3	The tradition of Political Theory–II (Anarchist, Conservative)
		4	Approaches to political theory-I: Normative, Historical
		5	Approaches to political theory-II Behavioral, and Post-behavioral

Block No.	Block	Unit No.	Unit
2	Critical and Contemporary Perspectives in Political Theory	6	Feminism: Origin and Development
		7	Theories of Feminism
		8	Postmodern Feminism
		9	The Feminist Understanding of Politics and Power
		10	Eco-Feminism

Block No.	Block	Unit No.	Unit
3	Political Theory and Practice	11	Democracy: Origin, Meaning and Development
		12	Democracy: Liberal and Marxist
		13	Contemporary Theories of Democracy
		14	Democracy and Citizenship
		15	Procedural Democracy and Its Critique

Block No.	Block	Unit No.	Unit
4	The Grammar of Democracy	16	Deliberative Democracy
		17	The Grammar of Democracy: Political Participation
		18	The Grammar of Democracy: Representation
		19	Pluralist Theory of Democracy:
		20	Elitist Theory of Democracy
		21	Direct and Indirect Democracy

CENTRE FOR DISTANCE AND ONLINE EDUCATION, UTKAL UNIVERSITY,
BHUBANESWAR

Program Name: Bachelor of Arts (Hons.) in Political Science

Program Code: 010116

Course Name: Understanding Political Theory

Course Code: CORE-I Semester: I Credit: 6 Block No. 1 to 4 Unit No. 1 to 21

EXPERT COMMITTEE:

Prof. Brahamananda Satapathy, (Chairman)

Former Head and Professor, Dept. of Political Science, Utkal University, Vani Vihar,
Bhubaneswar

Dr. Smita Nayak, (Member)

HOD, Dept. of Political Science, Utkal University, Vani Vihar, BhubaneswarDr.

Seema Mallick, (Member)

Asst.Professor, Dept. of Political Science, Utkal University, Vani Vihar, BhubaneswarDr.

Swapna S. Prabhu, (Member)

Asst.Professor, Dept. of Political Science, Utkal University, Vani Vihar, Bhubaneswar

COURSE WRITER:

Dr. Badrinath Das, Faculty in Political Science, CDOE, Utkal University

PRINTED AND PUBLISHED BY

UTKAL UNIVERSITY, VANI VIHAR, BHUBANESWAR



C.D.O.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 Odisha.

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 in its 3rd cycle with A+ status in 2023. It is a member of the Indian Association of Universities and the Commonwealth Association of Universities.



CENTRE FOR DISTANCE & ONLINE EDUCATION
UTKAL UNIVERSITY: VANI VIHAR
BHUBANESWAR:-751007

From the Director's Desk

The Centre for Distance and Online 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. CDOE, 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

CORE-I- UNDERSTANDING POLITICAL THEORY

Content

Block/Unit	Page Nos.
<u>BLOCK-1: Introducing Political Theory</u>	1-50
Unit-1: What is Politics: Theorizing the 'Political'	
Unit-2: The tradition of Political Theory–I (Liberal, Marxist)	
Unit-3: The tradition of Political Theory–II (Anarchist, Conservative)	
Unit-4: Approaches to political theory-I: Normative, Historical	
Unit-5: Approaches to political theory-II: Behavioral, and Post-behavioral	
<u>BLOCK-2: Critical and Contemporary Perspectives in Political Theory</u>	51-97
Unit-6: Feminism: Origin and Development	
Unit-7: Theories of Feminism	
Unit-8: Postmodern Feminism	
Unit-9: The Feminist Understanding of Politics and Power	
Unit-10: Eco-Feminism	
<u>BLOCK-3: Political Theory and Practice</u>	98-149
Unit-11: Democracy: Origin, Meaning and Development	
Unit-12: Democracy: Liberal and Marxist	
Unit-13: Contemporary Theories of Democracy	
Unit-14: Democracy and Citizenship	
Unit-15: Procedural Democracy and Its Critique	
<u>BLOCK-4: The Grammar of Democracy</u>	150-202
Unit-16: Deliberative Democracy	
Unit-17: The Grammar of Democracy: Political Participation	
Unit-18: The Grammar of Democracy: Representation	
Unit-19: Pluralist Theory of Democracy	
Unit-20: Elitist Theory of Democracy	
Unit-21: Direct and Indirect Democracy	

BLOCK-1: INTRODUCING POLITICAL THEORY

Unit-1: What is Politics: Theorizing the ‘Political’

Unit-2: The tradition of Political Theory—I (Liberal, Marxist)

Unit-3: The tradition of Political Theory—II

(Anarchist, Conservative)

Unit-4: Approaches to political theory-I: Normative, Historical

Unit-5: Approaches to political theory-II: Behavioral, and
Post-behavioral

UNIT-1: WHAT IS POLITICS: THEORIZING THE ‘POLITICAL’

Structure

- 1.1 Objectives
- 1.2 Introduction
- 1.3 What is Theory?
- 1.4 What is Politics?
- 1.5 Nature of Politics
- 1.6 Evolution of Political Theory
- 1.7 Summary
- 1.8 Key Terms
- 1.9 Self Assessment Questions
- 1.10 References

1.1: OBJECTIVES

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

- The Meaning and Nature of Politics
- What is Political Theory
- Evolution of Political Theory

1.2: INTRODUCTION

Politics is the study and practice of governance and the processes by which groups of people make collective decisions. It involves the analysis of political systems, institutions, behavior, and activities associated with the governance of a country or other political unit.

Politics is the set of activities that are associated with making decisions in groups, or other forms of power relations among individuals, such as the distribution of resources or status. The branch of social science that studies politics and government is referred to as political science.

They may be used positively in the context of a "political solution" which is compromising and non-violent, or descriptively as "the art or science of government", but also often carries a negative connotation. The concept has been defined in various ways, and different approaches have fundamentally differing views on whether it should be used extensively or in a limited way, empirically or normatively, and on whether conflict or co-operation is more essential to it.

A variety of methods are deployed in politics, which include promoting one's own political views among people, negotiation with other political subjects, making laws, and exercising internal and external force, including warfare against adversaries. Politics is exercised on a wide range of social levels, from clans and tribes of traditional societies, through modern local governments, companies and institutions up to sovereign states, to the international level.

In modern nation states, people often form political parties to represent their ideas. Members of a party often agree to take the same position on many issues and agree to support the same changes to law and the same leaders. An election is usually a competition between different parties.

A political system is a framework which defines acceptable political methods within a society. The history of political thought can be traced back to early antiquity, with seminal works such as Plato's *Republic*, Aristotle's *Politics*, Confucius' political manuscripts and Chanakya's *Arthashastra*.

1.3: WHAT IS THEORY?

A theory is a well-substantiated explanation of some aspect of the natural world, based on a body of evidence that has been repeatedly confirmed through observation and experimentation. Theories are formulated to explain, predict, and understand phenomena and to extend existing knowledge within the limits of critical bounding assumptions.

A theory is a rational type of abstract thinking about a phenomenon, or the results of such thinking. The process of contemplative and rational thinking is often associated with such processes as observational study or research. Theories may be scientific, belong to a non-scientific discipline, or no discipline at all. Depending on the context, a theory's assertions might, for example, include generalized explanations of how nature works. The word has its roots in ancient Greek, but in modern use it has taken on several related meanings.

In modern science, the term "theory" refers to scientific theories, a well-confirmed type of explanation of nature, made in a way consistent with the scientific method, and fulfilling the criteria required by modern science. Such theories are described in such a way that scientific tests should be able to provide empirical support for it, or empirical contradiction ("falsify") of it. Scientific theories are the most reliable, rigorous, and comprehensive form of scientific knowledge, in contrast to more common uses of the word "theory" that imply that something is unproven or speculative (which in formal terms is better characterized by the word *hypothesis*).

Scientific theories are distinguished from hypotheses, which are individual empirically testable conjectures, and from scientific laws, which are descriptive accounts of the way nature behaves under certain conditions.

Theories guide the enterprise of finding facts rather than of reaching goals, and are neutral concerning alternatives among values. A theory can be a body of knowledge, which may or may not be associated with particular explanatory models. To theorize is to develop this body of knowledge.

The word theory or "in theory" is sometimes used outside of science to refer to something which the speaker did not experience or test before. In science, this same concept is referred to as a hypothesis, and the word "hypothetically" is used both inside and outside of science. In its usage outside of science, the word "theory" is very often contrasted to "practice" a Greek term for *doing*, which is opposed to theory. A "classical example" of the distinction between "theoretical" and "practical" uses the discipline of medicine: medical theory involves trying to understand the causes and nature of health and sickness, while the practical side of medicine is trying to make people healthy. These two things are related but can be independent, because it is possible to research health and sickness without curing specific patients, and it is possible to cure a patient without knowing how the cure worked.

1.4: WHAT IS POLITICS?

Politics is a continuous, timeless, ever changing and a universal activity. The term 'politics' has got three connotations namely, political activity, political process and political power. Political activity connotes a kind of human activity, "a form of human behavior". It refers to the making or taking a political decision in which the political activation is involved. David Easton treats it as an action or a political interaction for authoritative allocation of the values for the society. "What distinguishes predominantly oriented towards the authoritative allocation of values for a society? Harold Lass well and Robert A. Dahl describe it as "a special case in the exercise of power' and Jean Blundell lays emphasis on "decision making".

Political process in the study of comparative politics includes three questions, namely, how the demands are formulated and for what sort of values, how the government is made aware of them how the machinery of government converts these demands of inputs into policy decisions

applicable to the whole community, and what is the role of agencies who participate in the political process to implement the governmental decisions. Besides, political process refers also to the interaction between governmental and non-governmental agencies as well as between the governmental agencies and the environment.

Power is taken to denote, the whole spectrum of those external influences that, by being brought to bear upon an individual, can make him move in a required direction. Thus, the study of comparative politics is concerned with the obtained, exercised and controlled, the purpose for which it is used, the manner in which the decisions are made, the factors which influences the making of these decisions, and the context in which those decisions take place. Thus, politics is not merely a study of state and government; it is a study of the “exercise of power”. As Curtis Well says, “Politics is organized dispute about power and its use, involving choice among competing values, ideas, persons, interests and demands. The study of politics is concerned with the description and analysis of the manner in which power is obtained, exercised and controlled, the purpose for which it is used, the manner in which decisions are made, the factors which influence the making of those decisions, and the context in which those decisions take place”.

1.5: NATURE OF POLITICS

The nature of politics is complex and multifaceted, encompassing various aspects and dimensions that influence human societies and governance. Here are some key points to consider when discussing the nature of politics:

Power and Authority:

Politics fundamentally revolves around power: who has it, how it is used, and how it is distributed. Authority is the legitimate use of power, often granted by laws, traditions, or social contracts.

Governance and Institutions:

Politics involves the creation and operation of governance structures and institutions that make and enforce rules and policies. These include governments, parliaments, bureaucracies, and judicial systems.

Conflict and Cooperation:

Politics is about managing conflicts and fostering cooperation among different groups with varying interests, values, and goals. It includes negotiation, compromise, and coalition-building.

Public Policy and Decision-Making:

Political processes determine public policies that affect societies. This involves agenda-setting, policy formulation, implementation, and evaluation.

Ideology and Beliefs:

Political ideologies and beliefs shape how individuals and groups perceive and engage in politics. These ideologies include conservatism, liberalism, socialism, and others, each offering different visions for society.

Participation and Representation:

Politics is about participation and representation. It encompasses various forms of civic engagement, from voting and protesting to lobbying and running for office. Representation ensures that diverse voices and interests are considered in decision-making processes.

Legitimacy and Consent:

For political systems to be stable, they require legitimacy and the consent of the governed. Legitimacy is often derived from fair and transparent processes, adherence to laws, and respect for human rights.

Global and Domestic Dimensions:

Politics operates at multiple levels, from local and national to international. Domestic politics focuses on issues within a country, while international politics deals with relations between states and global issues such as trade, security, and climate change.

Change and Continuity:

Politics is dynamic, reflecting changing social, economic, and cultural conditions. While institutions and practices may persist, political landscapes can shift dramatically due to revolutions, reforms, and evolving public attitudes.

Ethical Considerations:

Political actions and decisions often raise ethical questions about justice, equity, rights, and the common good. Political ethics explores these questions and seeks to balance individual and collective interests.

Understanding the nature of politics requires analyzing these and other aspects to grasp how societies organize themselves, resolve conflicts, and pursue collective goals.

1.6: EVOLUTION OF POLITICAL THEORY

Political theory is a complex and evolving field of study that has scholars for centuries. It is a discipline that explores the organization of societies, the distribution of power, and the principles governing governance. From ancient philosophers like Plato and Aristotle to contemporary thinkers like John Rawls and Judith Butler, political theory has undergone significant transformations, reflecting changes in societies, ideologies, and the global political landscape.

Ancient Political Theory started from Plato, an ancient Greek philosopher, sought to understand the ideal state. He introduced concepts like philosopher-kings and the allegory of the cave, reflecting his belief in a just, hierarchical society guided by wisdom. His work, "The Republic," laid the groundwork for discussions on justice, governance, and the role of the philosopher in politics.

Aristotle, another Greek philosopher, focused on the concept of virtue and its relevance to governance. His work "Politics" outlined various forms of government and advocated for a balanced, virtuous rule, known as the "polity".

Enlightenment Political Theory was introduced by John Locke and Social Contract the Enlightenment era brought new ideas about individual rights and the social contract. John Locke's "Two Treatises of Government" argued that political authority is derived from the consent of the governed, and citizens have the right to revolt against oppressive rulers. Jean-Jacques Rousseau and General Will Rousseau's "The Social Contract" explored the concept of the general will, emphasizing collective decisionmaking and the common good. His ideas influenced modern democratic thought and participatory governance.

Modern Political Theory was later introduced by Karl Marx and Class Struggle Marx's

"Communist Manifesto" and "Das Kapital" examined class struggle and the inevitability of a proletarian revolution. His work laid the foundation for Marxist and socialist political movements. John Stuart Mill and Liberalism. Mill's "On Liberty" and "Utilitarianism" advocated for individual freedoms and the harm principle. His ideas contributed to the development of liberal democracies and the protection of civil liberties.

Contemporary political theory include feminist political theorists like Simone de Beauvoir and Judith Butler have challenged traditional gender roles and power structures. They highlight issues of gender inequality, patriarchy, and the need for inclusive political systems. Postmodern thinkers like Michel Foucault and Jacques Derrida questioned the reliability of power, truth, and knowledge. Their work has influenced critical theory and deconstruction of established political narratives.

Challenges in contemporary political theory involve globalization, the interconnected world poses challenges in applying traditional political theories to complex, transnational issues. Global governance and cooperation have become central topics of debate. Political theory must collided with the intersection of identity, including race, ethnicity, sexuality, and gender. The recognition of diverse identities has led to debates on representation and social justice.

Environmental concerns include climate change and environmental degradation require new perspectives within political theory. Ecopolitics seeks to address the ethical and political dimensions of environmental issues. The digital age has raised questions about privacy, surveillance, and the impact of technology on political power. Ethical considerations regarding data, artificial intelligence, and cybersecurity have emerged.

Political theory has evolved significantly over the centuries, adapting to the changing landscape of political, social, and technological developments. From the idealism of Plato to the postmodern deconstruction of Derrida, political theory has continually sought to address the complexities of human societies and governance. Contemporary challenges, such as globalization, identity politics, environmental concerns, and technology, require ongoing engagement and adaptation of political theory to address the major issues of our time. As political theorists continue to collided with these challenges, the field remains a crucial source of insight, reflection, and guidance for policymakers, scholars, and citizens alike.

The evolution of political theory is a vast and complex subject that spans centuries and

encompasses a wide range of ideas, ideologies, and thinkers. Here's a brief overview of its development through different historical periods:

Ancient Political Thought

Ancient Greece:

Socrates, Plato, and Aristotle: They laid the foundational concepts of Western political thought. Plato's "Republic" and Aristotle's "Politics" are seminal works that explore justice, governance, and the role of the state.

Ancient Rome:

Cicero: His works emphasized the importance of natural law and the common good.

Polybius: He introduced the idea of mixed government and the cycle of political evolution.

Medieval Political Thought

Augustine of Hippo: His work "City of God" contrasted the Earthly City with the Heavenly City, influencing Christian political thought.

Thomas Aquinas: He integrated Aristotelian philosophy with Christian theology, emphasizing the importance of law and morality in governance.

Renaissance and Early Modern Political Thought

Niccolò Machiavelli: His work "The Prince" is a pragmatic guide to political power, distinct for its separation of politics from ethics.

Thomas Hobbes: In "Leviathan," he introduced the concept of the social contract and the necessity of a strong central authority to avoid chaos.

John Locke: His ideas on natural rights and government by consent were foundational to liberal political theory, as expressed in "Two Treatises of Government."

Enlightenment Political Thought

Baron de Montesquieu: In "The Spirit of the Laws," he advocated for the separation of powers, a concept crucial to modern democratic governance.

Jean-Jacques Rousseau: His work "The Social Contract" emphasized popular sovereignty and direct democracy.

Voltaire: He championed civil liberties and criticized absolute monarchy and religious intolerance.

19th Century Political Thought

Karl Marx and Friedrich Engels: They developed the theory of communism, critiquing capitalism and proposing a classless society.

John Stuart Mill: He advanced the ideas of utilitarianism and liberty, emphasizing individual freedom and limited government intervention.

20th Century Political Thought

Max Weber: He analyzed the nature of authority and the role of bureaucracy in modern society.

John Rawls: His work "A Theory of Justice" introduced the concept of justice as fairness and the idea of the original position and veil of ignorance.

Friedrich Hayek: He defended classical liberalism and free-market capitalism, critiquing central planning and socialism.

Contemporary Political Thought

Feminist Political Theory: Thinkers like Simone de Beauvoir, bell hooks, and Judith Butler have explored the intersections of gender, power, and politics.

Post-Colonial Theory: Scholars like Edward Said and Frantz Fanon have critiqued the impact of colonialism and advocated for decolonization and cultural identity.

Environmental Political Theory: Thinkers like Arne Naess and Murray Bookchin have addressed the relationship between politics and the environment, advocating for sustainable and ecocentric approaches to governance.

This overview highlights the major developments and key figures in the evolution of political theory. The field continues to evolve, incorporating new ideas and responding to contemporary challenges.

1.7: SUMMARY

Political theory's definition, nature, and scope have evolved over time. Political theory has broadened its focus from a narrow focus on the state to the point that it has encroached into the territory of social theory and even phenomenology, as in experience or viewpoint theories. Today's political theory is concerned with norms, but it is also worried with empirical issues such as how to create required political arrangements in the interests of justice, equality, and other goals. At the same time, postmodernism's antifoundationalism raises questions about the concept of theory. While postmodernism casts doubt on meta-narratives or "great theories," "micro theories" are also called into question, because perceptions differ depending on subjects and subject positions. Political theory has been viewed from this perspective. From universalism to particularisms, objectivism to subjectivism, and foundationalism to anti- foundationalism, has been a lengthy journey.

1.8: KEY TERMS

- **Democracy:** A system of government where power is vested in the people, who rule either directly or through elected representatives.
- **Republic:** A form of government in which the country is considered a "public matter" and the head of state is an elected or nominated president, not a monarch.
- **Totalitarianism:** An authoritarian form of government that seeks to control all aspects of public and private life, often through coercion and repression.
- **Liberalism:** A political philosophy advocating for individual rights, democracy, and free market economy, emphasizing personal freedom and equality.
- **Conservatism:** A political and social philosophy promoting traditional institutions and practices, and often advocating for gradual change rather than radical reform.
- **Socialism:** A political and economic theory advocating for social ownership and democratic control of the means of production, as well as a distribution of wealth aimed at reducing inequality.
- **Anarchism:** A political theory advocating for a society without government or hierarchical structures, where people voluntarily cooperate in self-managed communities.

- **Marxism:** A theory developed by Karl Marx and Friedrich Engels, which argues for a classless society through the abolition of private property and the establishment of a communist state.
- **Libertarianism:** A political philosophy emphasizing individual liberty, free markets, and minimal government intervention in personal and economic matters.

1.9: SELF ASSESSMENT QUESTIONS

- What do you mean by theory?
- What is Politics?
- What is Political Theory?
- Discuss the Nature and evolution of Political Theory.

1.10: REFERENCES

Darden, Keith; Mylonas, Harris (July 9, 2016). "Threats to Territorial Integrity, National Mass Schooling, and Linguistic Commonality". *Comparative Political Studies*.

B.Barry, 'The Strange Death of Political Philosophy' in *Democracy, Power and Justice: Essays in Political Theory*, Clarendon Press, Oxford, 1989

Sir I. Berlin, 'Does political theory still exist?' in P. Laslett and W.G. Runciman, *Philosophy, Politics and Society*, 2nd series (eds.) Blackwell, Oxford, 1964

Keith Darden and Anna Grzymala-Busse. 2006. "The Great Divide: Literacy, Nationalism, and the Communist Collapse". *World Politics*, Volume 59 (October): 83-115.

UNIT-2: THE TRADITION OF POLITICAL THEORY–I (LIBERAL, MARXIST)

Structure

- 2.1 Objectives
- 2.2 Introduction
- 2.3 The Features of Liberal Tradition
- 2.4 The Features of Marxist Tradition
- 2.5 The Difference Between Liberal and Marxist Tradition
- 2.6 Summary
- 2.7 Key Terms
- 2.8 Self Assessment Questions
- 2.9 References

2.1: OBJECTIVES

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

- What is Liberal Political Tradition
- What is Marxist Political Tradition
- The Difference Between Liberal and Marxist Tradition

2.2: INTRODUCTION

In today's times with increasing importance granted to the interventionist measures of the states, the study of the origins and role of the state becomes necessary in order to facilitate the understanding of the reasons and of the consequences of such measures through the opinions of some of the most important philosophers and economists about the formation and the role of the state in the life of individuals.

Political thought has been defined as 'thought about the state, its structure, its nature, and its purpose'. Several political thinkers and schools of thought have developed ideas about the nature and purpose of the state according to different points of view. When new ideas appeared, old ideas were criticized or modified. In the realm of political philosophy, it is not necessary that old ideas be dead before the new ideas become acceptable. Unlike the principles of natural sciences, the old and new principles of political theory exist simultaneously, claiming their rightful place.

The liberal state focuses on individual rights and freedom. It also argues for a neutral and minimal state. It replaces the divine right theory of the state and argues that a legitimate rule must be based on the consent of the people.

States work for the common good of the society and its major activity is understood as to be maintaining law and order and ensuring that everyone is treated with equality without any discrimination. In other words, a liberal state regards individuals as moral and rational agents. State's role is seen as providing them with the conducive conditions for growth and prosperity.

Its origin and growth can be traced back to the political struggles that took place in England and France with the rise and growth of capitalism which had led to a free market economy. These struggles focused on individual dignity, self-respect, private property and, power and status particularly of the emerging middle class of the society.

With the coming of the liberal state, there were some significant changes occurring in the political organisation of the society like representative and constitutional forms of government, rule of law, and governments based on the consent of the ruled. It stressed on a new discourse on rights, to uphold the natural and basic human-like rights - to life, property, freedom, justice and so on. For example, Adam Smith, a liberal thinker, emphasized on the individual urge to maximise economic interest or to achieve material gains and thereby improve their living standards or fortunes.

2.3: THE FEATURES OF LIBERAL THADITION

The protection of liberty is central to liberal theories about the nature and function of law. Following John Stuart Mill, liberals argue against the enforcement of morality on the ground that society's view of what is morally right does not justify the use of compulsion or control. Actions that wrong or harm individuals, but to which they consent – often called victimless crimes – are not appropriately criminalized on the liberal view. Thus, for a liberal, the dividing line between sex that should be criminalized and sex that should not be is the line between involuntariness and consent. Adultery, polygamy, sex between unmarried individuals, group sex, or same-sex sex should not be criminalized unless there is reason to believe one of the participants did not participate voluntarily. Sex that is judged to be immoral should not be condemned by the law on this basis. Rape law reform should abolish requirements irrelevant to the fact of consent, such as whether the victim resisted or the offender used force, but should continue to develop understanding of what constitutes consent and how consent is to be ascertained.

Distinguishing the consensual and the nonconsensual – and understanding the significance of this distinction for ethics and law – has been the subject of much recent discussion. One obvious difficulty for liberal theory is determination of the capacity to consent. From Mill on, liberals have typically held that their views apply fully to adults only, and then only when the adults are in full possession of their faculties. The criminalization of sex when the victim is a minor or is incapacitated could thus be regarded as outside the purview of the legal enforcement of morality. Liberals may, however, hold more complex views about the ability of near-adults to consent; liberals who hold such views might not regard all sex with an underage victim as of a piece, but might urge criminalization of those cases in which coercion is highly likely, such as sex with younger victims, or sex in which there is a significant age difference between the alleged offender and the victim. Or, they might support gradation of the seriousness of sex offenses based on the victim's age. Indeed, both liberals and feminists continue to debate the wisdom of paternalistic statutory rape laws generally, and of female-protective, gender-specific versions of these laws particularly. Similar problems attend consent by persons with limited intellectual capacities but with sufficient ability to make some of their own decisions. An additional set of problems concerns temporary impairment such as alcohol or drug use, particularly in cases where the impairment was either voluntary or the other party reasonably believes it was voluntary and that risks had been voluntarily assumed.

A second difficulty for liberals is what counts as consent. Does consent require explicit affirmation? Is it possible to have partial consent, for example to sexual intimacy but not to penetration, especially if the circumstances are such that the one is highly likely to be the outcome of the other? When must the consent occur? Are there openings for prior, or even after-the-fact, consent? With regard to the latter, Eric Chwang argues that *ex ante* and *ex post* consent are on a par in many respects. We are suspicious of after-the-fact consent vitiating the judgment that sex was rape, however, because of risks of manipulation (her change of mind was not truly voluntary), concerns that it is all too easy for perpetrators to believe that consent will occur (she will come around and realize that she liked it), and most importantly because with something as important as sex, "no" is weightier than "yes." Conversely, is it possible for consent to be withdrawn after the fact? What falsehoods vitiate consent? There are clear cases of fraud: a lying promise to pay for the sex, or deception about identity. Other cases are less clear, however: a promise to marry, assurances of commitment, or flattery of the victim.

There is general agreement among liberals that coerced consent is not genuine consent. But there is significant disagreement about what counts as coercion, beyond physical force or threats of physical force. Emotional harm, verbal abuse, psychological pressures, or economic dependency, have all been claimed to be forms of coercion that undermine consent. In a recent article, Sarah Conly uses features of physical force that are used to judge it as coercive, to develop an account of when psychological pressure is coercive and when it is not. These features include whether the coercer is acting intentionally to bring the psychological pressure to change the mind of someone known not to be consenting, whether the victim has no reasonable choice between doing what the coercer wants and a bad option that the coercer has introduced, and whether the bad option is legitimately introduced. In Conly's view, for example, it is legitimate for one person to tell another that he or she does not wish to continue a romantic relationship that does not include sex. Even if the pressure of the loss of the relationship is brought intentionally to change the other's mind, and actually does impel the other to do what he or she did not want to do, it is not rape in Conly's view if the will of the other is overcome and sex occurs under these circumstances.

Another difficult problem for liberal theorists is whether to accept a defense of reasonable mistake about whether the other was consenting. Some theorists have tried to link *mens rea* to the consent of the victim by saying that if the perpetrator had a reasonable belief that the other was consenting, there must actually have been consent. This view, however, fails to distinguish the question of whether the victim was consenting from the question of whether the perpetrator believed the victim was consenting, and the further question of whether that belief was reasonable. Using these distinctions, Marcia Baron, for example, argues that mistakes are possible regarding consent, but that unreasonable mistakes (including mistakes that are careless or the result of indifference) should not exculpate but might in appropriate circumstances mitigate the gravity of the offense. Douglas Husak and George Thomas argue that the criteria for determining whether a mistaken belief about consent is reasonable should be derived from empirical generalizations about how consent to sex is typically given or withheld. Donald Hubin and Karin Healy reject the idea that standards of reasonableness should be gendered and contend instead that the standard should be what it would be reasonable to expect a person to do in the circumstances under examination. Assaf Hamdani adds to the discussion the importance how the criminal law may create incentives to obtain information, especially when remaining ignorant is otherwise costless, as it may be with ignorance about the age of the victim.

Treatment of the victim raises many of the traditional questions of applied ethics over respect for autonomy. The victim is examined by law enforcement personnel (police and prosecutors) and by medical personnel, generally in a hospital emergency room, hopefully one where the staff is trained to deal with rape victims. Confidentiality is an initial concern. The victim may wish to ensure that what she tells the physician or lawyer be kept confidential. Yet she may not be consulted about the relevant limits on the conduct of these others. The prosecutor is not her lawyer, but the lawyer for the state, and thus does not have a professional duty of confidentiality owed to the victim. Although the physician may provide treatment, he or she may also see the function of the medical examination as retrieving and preserving evidence for the state. Especially if the victim is a minor, family members may press for information that the victim does not want to have shared, such as whether there was evidence of penetration.

Another applied ethics issue concerning the victim is informed consent to healthcare. Rape victims may not be told what to expect from a medical examination, including treatment to prevent infection, a pelvic exam to inspect for injury or sperm, discussion of the possibility of HIV exposure, or possible use of the morning after pill to prevent pregnancy. One study indicated, for example, that victims are typically not told that the morning after pill functions to prevent implantation rather than fertilization. Victims also may not be informed that they have a right to refuse treatment; medical personnel may pressure the victim to submit to an examination so that evidence can be gathered for law enforcement, or because they believe that treatment is in the patient's interest. Such coercion may be particularly troubling to a victim who already feels that she has been violated by the rape itself.

Indeed, professionals dealing with rape victims exhibit clear problems of role confusion. The prosecutor represents the state, not the victim, yet the victim may not understand this situation and may be surprised that she is interrogated and not protected as would be a client. She may even be surprised to find that her trauma is the state's case and may experience frustration at not being able to be fully informed or make choices about the proceedings. On the medical side, the healthcare personnel examining and treating her are her healthcare providers. At times, however, they may exhibit role confusion by investigating for the state, and this confusion may not be explained to the victim.

Liberal political theory encompasses several core features that define its approach to politics, society, and the role of the state. Here are some of the key features:

1. Individual Liberty

- **Personal Freedom:** Emphasis on the rights and freedoms of individuals, including freedom of speech, freedom of religion, and the right to privacy.
- **Autonomy:** The belief that individuals should have the autonomy to make their own choices and pursue their own goals.

2. Equality

- **Equal Rights:** Advocacy for equal rights under the law, ensuring that all individuals are treated equally by governmental institutions.
- **Equal Opportunity:** Striving to provide all individuals with the same opportunities to succeed, regardless of their background.

3. Democracy

- **Popular Sovereignty:** The idea that the authority of the government is derived from the consent of the governed.
- **Representative Democracy:** Support for systems where citizens elect representatives to make decisions on their behalf.

4. Rule of Law

- **Legal Equality:** The principle that all individuals are subject to the same laws and that these laws should be applied impartially.
- **Transparency and Accountability:** The belief that governments should be transparent in their operations and accountable to the people.

5. Human Rights

- **Inherent Rights:** The belief that certain rights are inherent to all human beings and must be protected by the state.
- **Universalism:** The idea that human rights apply universally, regardless of culture, nationality, or religion.

6. Justice

- **Fairness:** Ensuring that individuals receive what they are due, whether it be in terms of resources, opportunities, or treatment.
- **Distributive Justice:** Concern for the fair distribution of wealth and resources within society.

7. Tolerance and Pluralism

- **Acceptance of Diversity:** Encouragement of a society where diverse views, cultures, and lifestyles coexist peacefully.
- **Open Society:** Support for a social structure that allows for free expression and debate.

8. Free Market Economy

- **Economic Freedom:** Advocacy for minimal state intervention in the economy, allowing market forces to drive economic activity.
- **Property Rights:** Protection of private property rights as fundamental to economic freedom and prosperity.

9. Secularism

- **Separation of Church and State:** The belief that religion should not interfere with government policies and vice versa.
- **Religious Freedom:** Ensuring that individuals have the freedom to practice any religion or none at all.

10. Social Welfare

- **Safety Nets:** Support for government programs that provide a safety net for the most vulnerable in society.
- **Public Services:** Advocacy for access to essential services like education, healthcare, and social security.

11. Limited Government

- **Checks and Balances:** A system of checks and balances to prevent the abuse of power by any branch of government.
- **Constitutionalism:** Support for a constitutional framework that limits government power and protects individual rights.

12. Rationalism

- **Emphasis on Reason:** Valuing reason and evidence-based decision-making in both personal and political life.
- **Enlightenment Values:** Drawing on the Enlightenment tradition that promotes scientific inquiry, progress, and intellectual exploration.

Liberal political theory is a broad and adaptable tradition, continually evolving to address new social, economic, and political challenges while maintaining its foundational principles.

2.4: THE FEATURES OF MARXIST TRADITIONS

Marxism generally refers to the ideas of the German philosopher, Karl Marx. But Marxism does not mean exclusively the ideas of Marx. It includes the ideas of Marx, Friedrich Engels and their supporters, who call themselves Marxists. Thus, Marxism refers to the body of ideas, which predominantly contains the ideas of Karl Marx. Marxism is a living philosophy. Marxist thinkers are continuously contributing to the philosophy of Marxism. Thus, it is said that Marx is dead, but Marxism is still alive. The Marxist philosophy existed even before the birth of Karl Marx. This is the reason David McLellan has written three volumes on Marxism, viz., *Marxism before Marx*; *Thought of Karl Marx* and *Marxism after Marx*. Similarly, the Polish thinker Leszek Kolakowski has authored three volumes on Marxism. The point once again is that Marxism does not mean only the ideas of Karl Marx. Following the establishment of factories and the capitalistic mode of production during the 17th-18th centuries West, the conditions of the workers deteriorated. The workers who entered the factories were subject to all sorts of exploitation : long hours of work, life in slums, ill-health etc. The result was exploitation of the workers, ever-increasing gap between the rich and the poor, economic inequalities, degradation and alienation. Karl Marx and Frederick Engels realised clearly the adverse effects of capitalism and in the process, brought out what is called scientific socialism or Marxism (after the name of Marx). Those who contributed to the Marxian philosophy after Marx and Engels include, among others, V.I. Lenin (Russia), and Mao

Zedong (China).

Marxist political theory, based on the works of Karl Marx and Friedrich Engels, is a framework for understanding and analyzing society, politics, and economics. It critiques capitalism and envisions a classless, stateless society through the following key concepts:

1. **Historical Materialism:** This is the idea that material conditions, including the means and relations of production, shape society's structure and development. History is seen as a series of class struggles driven by economic forces.
2. **Class Struggle:** Marxism posits that society is divided into classes with conflicting interests. In a capitalist society, the primary conflict is between the bourgeoisie (capitalist class who own the means of production) and the proletariat (working class who sell their labor).
3. **Surplus Value:** This concept explains how capitalists extract profits from the labor of workers. Workers produce more value during their work than they receive in wages, and this excess value is appropriated by capitalists as profit.
4. **Alienation:** Marx argued that workers are alienated from their labor, the products of their labor, and their own human potential under capitalism. This alienation results from the commodification of labor and the lack of control workers have over the production process.
5. **Revolution and Dictatorship of the Proletariat:** Marxists believe that the proletariat must overthrow the bourgeoisie through a revolution. Following this, a transitional state, known as the dictatorship of the proletariat, would suppress counter-revolutionary elements and dismantle the capitalist state apparatus, leading to the eventual establishment of a classless, stateless society (communism).
6. **Communism:** The end goal of Marxist theory is a communist society where the means of production are communally owned, class distinctions are abolished, and the state withers away. In this society, wealth and power are distributed equitably, and individuals can fully develop their human potential.

Marxist political theory has influenced various socialist and communist movements worldwide, leading to the establishment of several Marxist-inspired states and contributing to ongoing debates

about capitalism, democracy, and social justice.

The Marxist political tradition encompasses a range of theories and practices rooted in the works of Karl Marx and Friedrich Engels. Its features include:

1. Materialist Conception of History:

- Emphasizes the role of economic factors in shaping history and society.
- Asserts that societal changes occur primarily through changes in the economic base (the mode of production).

2. Class Struggle:

- Central concept positing that history is defined by conflicts between social classes.
- In capitalist societies, this struggle is primarily between the bourgeoisie (capitalists) and the proletariat (workers).

3. Dialectical Materialism:

- A philosophical approach that views societal and historical development as a result of contradictions and their resolution.
- Considers change as a dynamic and conflictual process.

4. Surplus Value and Exploitation:

- Argues that capitalists exploit workers by appropriating the surplus value produced by labor.
- Surplus value is the difference between the value produced by workers and the wages they are paid.

5. Alienation:

- Describes how workers become alienated from their labor, the products they produce, and their own humanity under capitalism.

- Workers lose control over their work and creativity, leading to a sense of powerlessness and disenfranchisement.

6. Revolutionary Praxis:

- Advocates for the proletariat to engage in revolutionary action to overthrow the capitalist system.
- Emphasizes the need for class consciousness and collective action.

7. Dictatorship of the Proletariat:

- A transitional state in which the working class holds political power.
- Aims to dismantle the existing capitalist state and suppress counter-revolutionary forces.

8. Communism:

- The ultimate goal of the Marxist political tradition.
- Envisions a classless, stateless society where the means of production are communally owned.
- Aspires to a society where resources are distributed based on need, and individuals can fully realize their potential.

9. Critique of Ideology:

- Analyzes how dominant ideologies serve the interests of the ruling class.
- Explores how culture, religion, and other social institutions perpetuate capitalist exploitation.

10. Internationalism:

- Stresses the importance of international solidarity among the working class.
- Recognizes that capitalism is a global system and advocates for a worldwide proletarian movement.

11. Role of the Party:

- Emphasizes the need for a vanguard party to guide the proletariat in its revolutionary struggle.
- The party is seen as essential for organizing, educating, and leading workers toward communism.

The Marxist political tradition has evolved and diversified over time, leading to various interpretations and adaptations by different Marxist thinkers and movements. Despite these variations, the core principles of class struggle, materialist analysis, and the pursuit of a classless society remain central to the tradition.

2.5: THE DIFFERENCE BETWEEN LIBERAL AND MARXIST TRADITIONS

While the Liberal and Marxist traditions have some common ground, they cannot be merged in many ways. There are a lot of distinctions between them. Furthermore, when we compare distinct versions of one tradition to those of the other, these discrepancies take on specific forms. Liberalism presupposes a fairly stable and well-rounded view of human nature. Human nature is endowed with rationality and agency as intrinsic parts of it, according to this view. Human nature, on the other hand, is viewed as a historical product in Marxism. It is shaped by the vortex of the social ties in which it is situated, and it shapes those same social relations in turn. While Marxism does not deny human rationality and agency, it does claim that they are constrained by and must account for current social connections. Liberalism assumes a fairly consistent and well-rounded understanding of human nature. According to this viewpoint, human nature is endowed with rationality and agency as integral components of it. Marxism, on the other hand, views human nature as a historical product. It is shaped by the vortex of social links that surround it, and it in turn shapes those same social relations. While Marxism does not deny human rationality and agency, it does argue that they are restricted by contemporary social connections and must account for them. Liberalism assumes a fairly consistent and well-rounded understanding of human nature. According to this viewpoint, human nature is endowed with rationality and agency as integral components of it. Marxism, on the other hand, views human nature as a historical product. It is shaped by the vortex of social links that surround it, and it in turn shapes those same social relations. While Marxism does not deny human rationality and agency, it does argue that they are restricted by contemporary social connections and must account for them. Liberalism favours

giving the human mind more leeway in interpreting reality. The sphere of objective reality is usually separated from the subjective appropriation of the same in Marxism. In addition, it gives the former priority over the latter. Marxism, on the other hand, accepts that ideas can become independent actors when they become practises or gain control of people's hearts and minds.

The concepts and categories used by Marxism for social analysis and advocacy differ significantly from those used by Liberalism. Liberalism's discourse revolves around concepts and categories such "human" rights and freedoms, civil society, representation, separation of powers, public opinion, justice, and equality. Marxism, on the other hand, is built on a set of conceptions that include classes and class struggle, modes of production, production relations, and productive forces, base and superstructure, surplus appropriation, the state, revolution, and transitions. Marxism emphasises social classes as fundamental social units. It does not completely negate human agency, but it does assign social classes a historical role. Liberalism, on the whole, values the individual rational agent and gives him or her the ability to make independent decisions and live a life of their own. Marxism brings attention to the mechanisms at work in a class-divided society, which stifles and distorts human life and prevents people from realising their full potential. Liberals, on the whole, constrain human beings to a small area of common aspirations, leaving them to use their liberties to select what kind of human being they want to be. In comparison to Liberalism, Marxism seeks to provide a more comprehensive account of the path of human affairs and man's relationship with nature. Marxism highlights the processes at work in a class-divided society, which stifles and distorts human life and deprives people of their basic rights. Marxism is not an extra-terrestrial philosophy. It allows the world to inform our goals and objectives. However, because it envisions a rich constitution of the self through freely deciding themes, it does not have to preclude certain spiritual interests. While there are compelling streams of thought within Liberalism that confine human striving to this world, it is far more open to wards accepting human beings' transcendental and other-worldly strivings. Liberals are known for making more room for spiritual and other worldly interests. Marxism advocates a state of affairs in which there is no exploitation and a rich self-constitution coexists with the disintegration of the society. Its historical theory sees the course of class conflict in a capitalist society as pointing in that direction. While defending diverse sorts of equality, liberalism tries to strike a balance by allowing people to make their own decisions. It prefers to reform the existing society rather than aim for a society that is free of exploitation and oppression. The Liberal imagination did not place a premium on

community. Liberals, on the other hand, are striving to reach out to the community in a significant way in the wake of the growth of communitarianism as a distinct body of thought. Marxists have a well-thought-out and impassioned vision of revolutionary change. Liberals tend to view the current human predicament as eternal and permanent, and political radicalism is only used as a last resort if they subscribe to it. Revolutionary transformation is a moral act in defence of rights and justice for Marxists, whereas it is a moral act in support of rights and justice for Liberals.

On the notion, role, and importance of the state, Marxists and Liberals disagree. Liberals often regard the government as an inescapable evil. Its denial causes more harm than the suffering it endures. Marxists regard the state as a historical product born out of society's unresolvable class divisions. There is also a significant distinction between the many variants of Marxism and their Liberal counterparts. Many later iterations of the Marxist tradition saw themselves as genuine heirs to their forefathers' legacies. Leninism claimed to be the sole heir of Marx's and Engels' legacies. Similarly, Maoism declared itself the inheritor of Marx, Engels, and Lenin's legacies.

The Liberal versions that followed rarely claimed to be the actual voices of the previous versions. There is also a significant distinction between the many variants of Marxism and their Liberal counterparts. Many later Marxists saw themselves as genuine heirs to their forefathers' legacies. Leninism asserted that it was the sole heir of Marx and Engels' legacies. Maoism, likewise, declared itself the inheritor of Marx, Engels, and Lenin's legacies. The Liberal versions that came after rarely claimed to be the genuine voices of the previous versions. In contrast to Liberal variants of Marxism, the various versions of Marxism are significantly influenced by the ideas of a certain thinker. As a result, various forms of Marxism are frequently referred to by the name of their eminent proponent.

2.6: SUMMARY

Tradition and history, human imperfections with a love for prejudice and against reason, organic society with liberty and inequality, admiration of authority and power, strong plea for property and life rights, and belief in ethical, moral, and religious values are all characteristics of conservative ideology. Conservatism is a conservationist ideology. It arose primarily as a reaction to the fast-paced nature of political and economic change, particularly in the West. This is one of the reasons why the term "conservatism" is so resistant to change. It defends the principles of hierarchy, tradition, and order as a philosophy against the pressures of industrialization and the political

challenges of liberalism and socialism. Conservatism's future is doomed by its own constraints. It is unpopular in nations with a strong democratic bent because of its resistance to equality and, more importantly, its defence of inequality. As a result, conservatism has not succeeded in becoming a globally influential ideology. In and of itself, conservatism is far too wide, and as a result, it has become a hazy ideology: what is extreme now may not be so tomorrow.

We can deduct from the preceding discussion that anarchy refers to a society that lacks authorities or a governing body, as well as the general confusion and turmoil that results from this state. It could also apply to a society or a group of individuals that are completely opposed to hierarchy. Anarchy can be defined as the reduction or eradication of established forms of government and institutions. It can also refer to a country or any inhabited area that lacks a government or central authority. Individual anarchists advocate anarchy by proposing that government be replaced with private institutions.

2.7: KEY TERMS

- **Individual Rights:** The belief that individuals have inherent rights that must be protected from infringement, such as freedom of speech, religion, and privacy.
- **Equality:** The idea that all individuals should be treated equally under the law, with equal opportunities for success and participation in society.
- **Democracy:** The system of government where power is vested in the people, who exercise power directly or through elected representatives.
- **Social Contract:** A theory that individuals consent to surrender some of their freedoms and submit to the authority of the state in exchange for protection of their remaining rights.
- **Secularism:** The principle of separating religion from governmental institutions and ensuring that religious groups do not wield political power.
- **Pluralism:** The acceptance and encouragement of diverse groups, ideas, and cultures within a society.
- **Liberty:** The condition of being free from oppressive restrictions imposed by authority on one's way of life, behavior, or political views.

- **Alienation:** The condition in which workers are estranged from their labor, products, and fellow workers under capitalist systems, leading to a sense of powerlessness and dehumanization.
- **Surplus Value:** The difference between the value produced by labor and the actual wage paid to workers, which is appropriated by capitalists as profit.
- **Communism:** The ultimate goal of Marxist theory, where class distinctions are abolished, and the means of production are communally owned, leading to a classless, stateless society.
- **Revolution:** The process by which the working class overthrows the capitalist system and establishes a new social order, often through radical change.

2.8: SELF ASSESSMENT QUESTIONS

- What do you mean by Liberal Political Tradition?
- What are the basic features of Liberal Political Tradition?
- What do you mean by Marxist Political Tradition?
- What are the basic features of Marxist Political Tradition?
- What are the differences between Liberal and Marxist Tradition?

2.9: REFERENCES

Heywood, Andrew (2016) (Reprint) 'Political Theory: An Introduction', Palgrave, UK.

Marsh, D. and Stoker, G. (eds.) 'Theory and Methods in Political Science'. London: Macmillan.

Verma, S. P. (1996) 'Modern Political Theory', Vikash Publishing, 3rd Reprint, New Delhi.

Vinod, M.J and Deshpande, Meena (2013) 'Contemporary Political Theory', PHI, New Delhi

Benjamin Franks; Nathan jun; Leonard Williams (2018). Anarchism: A conceptual Approach.

O.P Gauba ; An introduction to political theory, 7th edition, 2017

K.K Ghai ; understanding political theory; kalyani publisher

Benjamin Franks; Nathan jun; Leonard Williams (2018). Anarchism: A conceptual Approach.

O.P Gauba ; An introduction to political theory, 7th edition, 2017

K.K Ghai ; understanding political theory; kalyani publisher

UNIT-3: THE TRADITION OF POLITICAL THEORY–II (ANARCHIST,CONSERVATIVE)

Structure

- 3.1 Objectives
- 3.2 Introduction
- 3.3 The Anarchist Tradition
- 3.4 The Conservative Tradition
- 3.5 Summary
- 3.6 Key Terms
- 3.7 Self Assessment Questions
- 3.8 References

3.1: OBJECTIVES

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

- Features of Anarchist Tradition
- What is Conservative Tradition?
- Features of Conservative Tradition

3.2: INTRODUCTION

Anarchism is a political philosophy and movement that is against all forms of authority and seeks to abolish the institutions it claims maintain unnecessary coercion and hierarchy, typically including the state and capitalism. Anarchism advocates for the replacement of the state with stateless societies and voluntary free associations. As a historically left-wing movement, this reading of anarchism is placed on the farthest left of the political spectrum, usually described as the libertarian wing of the socialist movement (libertarian socialism).

Although traces of anarchist ideas are found all throughout history, modern anarchism emerged from the Enlightenment. During the latter half of the 19th and the first decades of the 20th century, the anarchist movement flourished in most parts of the world and had a significant role in workers' struggles for emancipation. Various anarchist schools of thought formed during this period. Anarchists have taken part in several revolutions, most notably in the Paris Commune, the Russian Civil War and the Spanish Civil War, whose end marked the end of the classical era of anarchism.

In the last decades of the 20th and into the 21st century, the anarchist movement has been resurgent once more, growing in popularity and influence within anti-capitalist, anti-war and anti-globalisation movements.

Anarchists employ diverse approaches, which may be generally divided into revolutionary and evolutionary strategies; there is significant overlap between the two. Evolutionary methods try to simulate what an anarchist society might be like, but revolutionary tactics, which have historically taken a violent turn, aim to overthrow authority and the state. Many facets of human civilization have been influenced by anarchist theory, critique, and praxis.

3.3: THE ANARCHIST TRADITION

The etymological origin of *anarchism* is from the Ancient Greek *anarkhia* meaning "without a ruler", composed of the prefix *an-* ("without") and the word *arkhos* ("leader" or "ruler"). The suffix *-ism* denotes the ideological current that favours anarchy. *Anarchism* appears in English from 1642 as *anarchisme* and *anarchy* from 1539; early English usages emphasised a sense of disorder. Various factions within the French Revolution labelled their opponents as *anarchists*, although few such accused shared many views with later anarchists. Many revolutionaries of the 19th century such as William Godwin (1756–1836) and Wilhelm Weitling (1808–1871) would contribute to the anarchist doctrines of the next generation but did not use *anarchist* or *anarchism* in describing themselves or their beliefs.

The first political philosopher to call himself an *anarchist* (French: *anarchiste*) was Pierre-Joseph Proudhon (1809–1865), marking the formal birth of anarchism in the mid-19th century. Since the 1890s and beginning in France, *libertarianism* has often been used as a synonym for anarchism^l and its use as a synonym is still common outside the United States. Some usages of *libertarianism* refer to individualistic free-market philosophy only, and free-market anarchism in particular is termed *libertarian anarchism*.

While the term *libertarian* has been largely synonymous with anarchism, its meaning has more recently been diluted by wider adoption from ideologically disparate groups, including both the New Left and libertarian Marxists, who do not associate themselves with authoritarian socialists or a vanguard party, and extreme cultural liberals, who are primarily concerned with civil liberties. Additionally, some anarchists use *libertarian socialist* to avoid anarchism's negative connotations and emphasise its connections with socialism. *Anarchism* is broadly used to describe the anti-authoritarian wing of the socialist movement. Anarchism is contrasted to socialist forms

which are state-oriented or from above. Scholars of anarchism generally highlight anarchism's socialist credentials and criticise attempts at creating dichotomies between the two. Some scholars describe anarchism as having many influences from liberalism, and being both liberal and socialist but more so. Many scholars reject anarcho-capitalism as a misunderstanding of anarchist principles.

While opposition to the state is central to anarchist thought, defining *anarchism* is not an easy task for scholars, as there is a lot of discussion among scholars and anarchists on the matter, and various currents perceive anarchism slightly differently. Major definitional elements include the will for a non-coercive society, the rejection of the state apparatus, the belief that human nature allows humans to exist in or progress toward such a non-coercive society, and a suggestion on how to act to pursue the ideal of anarchy.

Anarchist theory encompasses a range of ideas, but some core features often include:

Anti-Authoritarianism: Anarchists oppose all forms of hierarchical authority, including the state, capitalism, and other forms of social domination. They believe that power should be decentralized and that people should govern themselves cooperatively.

Voluntary Cooperation: Anarchist theory emphasizes voluntary and cooperative interactions among individuals and communities, rather than coercive structures imposed from above.

Direct Action: Anarchists often advocate for direct action as a means of achieving social change. This involves taking action directly to address issues rather than relying on traditional political or legal systems.

Mutual Aid: The concept of mutual aid is central to anarchist theory. It refers to the practice of individuals and groups supporting each other voluntarily to meet their needs and build stronger communities.

Decentralization: Anarchists support the decentralization of power and decision-making, favoring local and small-scale forms of organization over centralized, hierarchical structures.

Critique of Capitalism: Many anarchists critique capitalism for its inherent inequalities and exploitation. They envision alternative economic systems based on shared resources and egalitarian principles.

Emphasis on Autonomy: Anarchists advocate for individual and collective autonomy, encouraging people to make decisions about their own lives and communities without external imposition.

Diverse Schools of Thought: Anarchist theory includes various schools of thought, such as anarcho-communism, anarcho-syndicalism, and individualist anarchism, each with its own emphasis and approach to achieving a stateless society.

These features reflect a broad commitment to creating a more just, equitable, and cooperative society free from imposed authority.

3.4: THE CONSERVATIVE TRADITION

Conservatism is a cultural, social, and political philosophy and ideology that seeks to promote and preserve traditional institutions, customs, and values. The central tenets of conservatism may vary in relation to the culture and civilisation in which it appears. In Western culture, depending on the particular nation, conservatives seek to promote and preserve a range of institutions, such as the nuclear family, organised religion, the military, the nation-state, property rights, rule of law, aristocracy, and monarchy. Conservatives tend to favour institutions and practices that enhance social order and historical continuity.

Edmund Burke, an 18th-century Anglo-Irish statesman who opposed the French Revolution but supported the American Revolution, is credited as one of the forefathers of conservative thought in the 1790s along with Savoyard statesman Joseph de Maistre. The first established use of the term in a political context originated in 1818 with François-René de Chateaubriand during the period of Bourbon Restoration that sought to roll back the policies of the French Revolution and establish social order.

Conservatism has varied considerably as it has adapted itself to existing traditions and national cultures. Thus, conservatives from different parts of the world, each upholding their respective traditions, may disagree on a wide range of issues. One of the three major ideologies along with liberalism and socialism, conservatism is the dominant ideology in many nations across the world, including Hungary, Iran, Israel, Japan, Poland, Russia, and South Korea. Historically associated with right-wing politics, the term has been used to describe a wide range of views. Conservatism may be either libertarian or authoritarian, populist or elitist, progressive or reactionary, moderate or extreme.

Edmund Burke has been widely regarded as the philosophical founder of modern conservatism. He served as the private secretary to the Marquis of Rockingham and as official pamphleteer to the Rockingham branch of the Whig party. Together with the Tories, they were the conservatives in the late 18th century United Kingdom. Burke's views were a mixture of conservatism and republicanism. He supported the American Revolution of 1775–1783 but abhorred the violence of the French Revolution of 1789–1799. He accepted the conservative ideals of private property and the economics of Adam Smith, but he thought that capitalism should remain subordinate to the conservative social ethic and that the business class should be subordinate to aristocracy. He insisted on standards of honour derived from the medieval aristocratic tradition and saw the aristocracy as the nation's natural leaders. That meant limits on the powers of the Crown, since he found the institutions of Parliament to be better informed than commissions appointed by the executive. He favoured an established church, but allowed for a degree of religious toleration. Burke ultimately justified the social order on the basis of tradition: tradition represented the wisdom of the species, and he valued community and social harmony over social reforms.

Another form of conservatism developed in France in parallel to conservatism in Britain. It was influenced by Counter-Enlightenment works by philosophers such as Joseph de Maistre and Louis de Bonald. Many continental conservatives do not support separation of church and state, with most supporting state cooperation with the Catholic Church, such as had existed in France before the Revolution. Conservatives were also early to embrace nationalism, which was previously associated with liberalism and the Revolution in France. Another early French conservative, François-René de Chateaubriand, espoused a romantic opposition to modernity, contrasting its emptiness with the 'full heart' of traditional faith and loyalty. Elsewhere on the continent, German thinkers Justus Möser and Friedrich von Gentz criticised the Declaration of the Rights of Man and of the Citizen that came of the Revolution. Opposition was also expressed by German idealists such as Adam Müller and Georg Wilhelm Friedrich Hegel, the latter inspiring both leftist and rightist followers.

Both Burke and Maistre were critical of democracy in general, though their reasons differed. Maistre was pessimistic about humans being able to follow rules, while Burke was sceptical about humans' innate ability to make rules. For Maistre, rules had a divine origin, while Burke believed they arose from custom. The lack of custom for Burke, and the lack of divine guidance for Maistre, meant that people would act in terrible ways. Both also believed that liberty of the wrong kind led to bewilderment and political breakdown. Their ideas would together flow into a stream of anti-

rationalist, romantic conservatism, but would still stay separate. Whereas Burke was more open to argumentation and disagreement, Maistre wanted faith and authority, leading to a more illiberal strain of thought.

Conservative theory, particularly in political and social contexts, often emphasizes several core features:

1. **Tradition and Continuity:** Conservatives value established traditions and institutions, believing that they provide stability and continuity in society. They often resist abrupt changes and prefer gradual reform over revolutionary shifts.
2. **Limited Government:** Many conservative theories advocate for a limited role of government in individual lives and economic affairs. They argue that a smaller government leads to greater personal freedom and responsibility.
3. **Individual Responsibility:** There is a strong emphasis on personal responsibility and self-reliance. Conservatives often believe that individuals should take responsibility for their own lives and that personal success comes from hard work and initiative.
4. **Free Market Economy:** Economic conservatism supports free-market capitalism and minimal government intervention in the economy. Conservatives argue that free markets lead to economic growth and prosperity.
5. **Social Order and Law:** Conservatives generally emphasize the importance of maintaining social order and upholding laws and norms. They often support a strong criminal justice system and law enforcement.
6. **Nationalism:** There can be a strong sense of national identity and pride in conservative theory. National sovereignty and cultural heritage are often highly valued.
7. **Skepticism of Utopian Ideas:** Conservatives are usually skeptical of radical or utopian ideologies that promise dramatic transformations of society. They often prefer practical, incremental improvements over sweeping changes.
8. **Moral Values:** Many conservative theories incorporate a focus on traditional moral and ethical values, often drawing from religious or cultural norms.

These features can vary somewhat depending on the specific conservative ideology or context, but they generally represent key aspects of conservative thought.

3.5: SUMMARY

In conclusion, anarchism presents a vision for a society grounded in freedom, equality, and mutual aid, free from the constraints of authoritarianism and hierarchical control. By advocating for self-management, voluntary cooperation, and direct action, anarchism challenges traditional power structures and seeks to create a world where individuals and communities can thrive autonomously. While diverse in its approaches and interpretations, anarchism consistently emphasizes the importance of solidarity, communal well-being, and the empowerment of individuals to shape their own destinies. Though often misunderstood or misrepresented, anarchism's core principles continue to inspire movements for social justice, environmental sustainability, and genuine democratic engagement.

Conservatism is a political philosophy that emphasizes the value of tradition, stability, and continuity within society. It advocates for the preservation of established institutions, practices, and cultural norms, arguing that they have evolved over time to serve society's best interests. Conservatives typically prioritize gradual change over radical reform, believing that abrupt shifts can lead to unintended consequences and social disruption. Conservatism encompasses a range of perspectives, from traditional conservatism, which focuses on cultural and social values, to fiscal conservatism, which emphasizes economic freedom and limited government intervention in the economy. Prominent conservative thinkers include Edmund Burke, who argued for the importance of tradition and gradual change, and Friedrich Hayek, who emphasized economic freedom and the dangers of central planning. Conservatism's enduring appeal lies in its commitment to preserving what is perceived as the best of the past while adapting to new challenges in a measured and thoughtful way. By balancing respect for tradition with the need for adaptation, conservatism seeks to maintain a stable and prosperous society.

3.6: KEY TERMS

- **Autonomy:** The principle of self-governance, personal freedom, and the right of individuals or groups to make decisions independently of higher authority.
- **Mutual Aid:** A form of voluntary reciprocal exchange of resources and services, emphasizing cooperation and support within a community.
- **Direct Action:** Political actions taken outside of institutional channels, including protests, strikes, and civil disobedience, aimed at achieving immediate goals or expressing dissent.

- **Decentralization:** The distribution of power away from a central authority, promoting local control and self-management.
- **Horizontalism:** The organization of society or a group in a non-hierarchical manner, ensuring equality and shared decision-making among members.

3.7: SELF ASSESSMENT QUESTIONS

- Discuss basic features of Anarchist Tradition.
- What is conservatism? Discuss its features.
- Find out the basic difference between Anarchism and Conservatism.

3.8: REFERENCES

Marsh, D. and Stoker, G. (eds.) 'Theory and Methods in Political Science'. London: Macmillan.

Verma, S. P. (1996) 'Modern Political Theory', Vikash Publishing, 3rd Reprint, New Delhi.

Vinod, M.J and Deshpande, Meena (2013) 'Contemporary Political Theory', PHI, New Delhi

Benjamin Franks; Nathan jun; Leonard Williams (2018). Anarchism: A conceptual Approach.

O.P Gauba ; An introduction to political theory, 7th edition, 2017

K.K Ghai ; understanding political theory; kalyani publisher

Benjamin Franks; Nathan jun; Leonard Williams (2018). Anarchism: A conceptual Approach.

O.P Gauba ; An introduction to political theory, 7th edition, 2017

K.K Ghai ; understanding political theory; kalyani publisher

UNIT-4: APPROACHES TO POLITICAL THEORY-I: NORMATIVE, HISTORICAL

Structure

- 4.1 Objectives
- 4.2 Introduction
- 4.3 Normative Approach
- 4.4 Historical Approach
- 4.5 Summary
- 4.6 Key Terms
- 4.7 Self Assessment Questions
- 4.8 References

4.1: OBJECTIVES

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

- What is Normative Approach
- What is Historical Approach

4.2: INTRODUCTION

Political science is one of the oldest discipline. It has its roots in ancient Greece and it started as a branch of philosophy. Aristotle is considered as father of political science. He called political science as a master science. It denotes the inter-disciplinary nature of political science and it is a science to be learned by the masters. Masters are those who have to deal with the decision making in the state. Thus the study of state, constitution became the core concern of political science. According to Garner, *political science begins and ends with the state*. If we look at the evolution of the discipline, it was dominated by philosophy in ancient times. It was overshadowed by religion /scriptures in medieval times. And it was Machiavelli who established the autonomy of politics from ethics and religion, and the autonomous status of the discipline was recognized.

Till 2nd WW, Political science primarily developed in Europe. After 2nd WW, it shifted to USA. In Europe, there has been greater emphasis on philosophy. In USA, there has been more emphasis on science/scientific research. Till 2nd WW, we call the state of discipline as traditional political science. It focused on the study of states and constitutions. The field was dominated by philosophical methods, historical and empirical methods. In the field of comparative politics, study

of constitutions was prominent hence Seaman's legal institutional method played role. After 2nd WW, political science developed in USA under guidance of APSA (American Political Science Association). This has led to the development of behavioural method. Behaviouralist focus on 1) The study of human behaviour rather than institutions. 2) Scientific methods rather than philosophical, legal or historical methods.

Behavioural methods were later on modified into post-behavioural approach. In American universities, post behavioural approach is the primary approach for research in political science. There is also a revival of philosophy in Europe, which has given rise to new approaches like post modernism, feminism, critical theory. Political science is a vibrant discipline with expanding frontiers. New areas of research are emerging ranging from family to environment. At times discipline became too expanded that there was a fear of discipline losing its identity. Hence scholars like Theda Skocpol calls for '*bringing the state back in*'. A call to make 'state' a core area of research. Political science as a discipline have greatest utility amongst social sciences. And it needs to be actively promoted in universities by funding agencies.

4.3: NORMATIVE APPROACH

The normative approach, in general, involves evaluating and establishing standards, values, and ideals to guide behavior, decision-making, and institutions. This approach contrasts with descriptive or empirical approaches, which focus on observing and explaining phenomena as they are. Here are the key aspects of the normative approach:

1. **Value-Based Judgments:** It emphasizes what should be done based on ethical, moral, or value-based considerations. It is concerned with prescribing norms or standards.
2. **Prescriptive Nature:** The normative approach is prescriptive, providing recommendations or guidelines on how things ought to be rather than merely describing them.
3. **Ethical and Moral Foundations:** It often draws on ethical theories and moral philosophy to justify norms and standards. This includes principles from theories such as utilitarianism, deontology, virtue ethics, and others.
4. **Ideal Standards:** It involves formulating and promoting ideal standards or models. These standards serve as benchmarks against which actual practices and institutions can be evaluated.
5. **Critique and Reform:** The normative approach often involves critiquing existing practices and institutions for not meeting established norms or ideals. It advocates for changes and reforms to align with these ideals.

6. **Guidance for Action:** It provides a framework for decision-making and action, helping individuals and institutions make choices that align with ethical and moral standards.
7. **Interdisciplinary Application:** While commonly associated with fields like political theory, ethics, and law, the normative approach can be applied in various disciplines, including economics, education, and public policy.

Examples in Different Fields:

- **Political Theory:** Normative political theory evaluates political systems and institutions based on principles of justice, equality, and freedom. For example, John Rawls' theory of justice as fairness proposes principles for designing just institutions.
- **Ethics:** Normative ethics involves establishing and justifying moral standards and principles that guide individual and collective behavior. For example, Immanuel Kant's categorical imperative provides a standard for moral actions.
- **Law:** In legal theory, the normative approach evaluates laws and legal systems based on principles of justice, rights, and fairness. It may advocate for legal reforms to better align with these principles.
- **Economics:** Normative economics involves making value-based judgments about economic policies and outcomes, such as advocating for policies that reduce inequality or promote welfare.

The normative approach is fundamentally about determining and advocating for what is right, just, and desirable, based on established norms and values. It serves as a guide for improving practices, institutions, and behaviors by aligning them with ethical and moral standards.

4.4: HISTORICAL APPROACH

Applying a historical approach to study political theory involves analyzing the development, context, and impact of political ideas and ideologies over time. Here's a structured way to do this:

1. **Identify Key Political Theories and Thinkers:** Begin by selecting the political theories or philosophers you want to study, such as liberalism, socialism, conservatism, or influential figures like Plato, Machiavelli, Locke, Marx, or Rawls.
2. **Contextual Analysis:** Place the theories or thinkers within their historical context. Understand the socio-political, economic, and cultural environment during the time they

developed their ideas. For example, consider the historical context of the Enlightenment for John Locke or the Industrial Revolution for Karl Marx.

3. **Historical Development:** Trace the evolution of the political theories over time. Examine how they originated, how they were received, and how they influenced subsequent political thought. Look for key events, debates, and movements that shaped their development.
4. **Primary and Secondary Sources:** Collect and analyze primary sources (original writings, speeches, letters) and secondary sources (scholarly articles, books, analyses). Ensure a critical evaluation of these sources to understand the original intent and subsequent interpretations.
5. **Causation and Influence:** Investigate the causes that led to the emergence of the political theories and their subsequent influence on politics, society, and other areas of thought. For example, analyze how Hobbes' view of human nature influenced his political theory in "Leviathan."
6. **Comparative Analysis:** Compare and contrast different political theories and thinkers. Identify similarities, differences, and interactions between their ideas. Understand how they responded to each other's works and the broader intellectual currents of their times.
7. **Change and Continuity:** Examine what has changed and what has remained consistent in the theories over time. Understand how the core principles have been adapted or challenged in different historical periods.
8. **Impact and Legacy:** Assess the practical impact of the political theories on historical events, policies, and movements. For example, explore the influence of Rousseau's ideas on the French Revolution or Marx's theories on 20th-century socialist states.
9. **Multiple Perspectives:** Consider diverse viewpoints, including critiques and alternative interpretations. This includes looking at how different groups or societies interpreted and applied the political theories.
10. **Thesis Development:** Formulate a central argument or thesis that encapsulates your findings and insights. This should provide a nuanced understanding of the historical development and significance of the political theories.
11. **Writing and Presentation:** Organize your research and analysis into a clear, coherent structure. Present your thesis, supported by evidence, in a well-organized manner.
12. **Revision and Peer Review:** Review your work for accuracy, clarity, and completeness. Seek feedback from peers or mentors to refine your analysis and presentation.

By following these steps, a historical approach to studying political theory can provide a deep understanding of how political ideas have evolved and influenced the world over time, offering valuable insights into contemporary political thought and practice.

4.5: SUMMARY

To studying political theory involves various approaches, each offering a different lens through which to understand political ideas and systems. This method emphasizes understanding political theory through the historical context in which it was developed. It examines the life, times, and influences of political theorists and how their ideas were shaped by their historical circumstances. To gain insight into how historical events and social conditions influenced political thought and to understand how these theories have evolved over time. Analyzing historical documents, studying biographies of theorists, and exploring the historical conditions that influenced their work. This approach involves analyzing and critiquing the fundamental concepts and principles of political theories. It seeks to understand the logical consistency and normative claims of political ideas. To engage with the theoretical underpinnings of political ideas and to assess their ethical and conceptual validity. Engaging in philosophical analysis, discussing key concepts (like justice, freedom, or authority), and applying critical thinking to evaluate the strengths and weaknesses of various theories. Both approaches complement each other, offering a comprehensive understanding of political theory by combining historical context with philosophical analysis.

The historical approach in research or analysis focuses on understanding events, phenomena, or developments within the context of their time. It involves examining sources from the period in question, such as documents, artifacts, and records, to reconstruct and interpret past events. This approach aims to provide a comprehensive understanding of how and why things happened the way they did, often looking at causes, effects, and the broader social, cultural, and political contexts. It helps to identify patterns, changes, and continuities over time. The Post-Behavioral perspective held that advanced procedures and research tools alone would not be enough to solve the world's social and political challenges. As a result, post-behaviorists fought behaviouralists' attempt to turn political science into a value-free science like other natural sciences. As a result, postbehaviouralists worked to make Political Science more relevant to society. It's important to note that post- behaviouralism is inextricably linked to behavioralism, as it arose from it. Post-

behaviouralists attempt to address the shortcomings of behavioralism by employing various strategies and methods in order to make political science more relevant to society.

4.6: KEY TERMS

- **Critical Theory:** Challenges traditional structures and seeks to uncover power dynamics within societal norms. Associated with the Frankfurt School and theorists like Max Horkheimer and Theodor Adorno.
- **Realism:** Focuses on the role of power and national interest in international relations, often emphasizing a pragmatic approach to politics. Key theorists include Hans Morgenthau and Kenneth Waltz.
- **Constructivism:** Emphasizes the role of ideational factors, such as beliefs and identities, in shaping political outcomes. Alexander Wendt is a significant contributor.

4.7: SELF ASSESSMENT QUESTIONS

- Discuss various Approaches to study Political Theory.
- What is Normative Approach? Discuss its features.
- Define how historical approach helps to study Political Theory.

4.8: REFERENCES

- Bhargava, R. and Ashok Acharya (2008) '*Political Theory: An Introduction*'. New Delhi: Pearson Longman.
- Vinod, M.J and Deshpande, Meena (2013) '*Contemporary Political Theory*', PHI, New Delhi
- Verma, S. P. (1996) '*Modern Political Theory*', Vikash Publishing, 3rd Reprint, New Delhi.
- Ramaswamy, Sushila (2010), '*Political Theory: Ideas and Concepts*', PHI Learning, New Delhi
- Bellamy, R. (1993), (ed.) '*Theories and Concepts of Politics*'. New York: Manchester University Press.
- Marsh, D. and Stoker, G. (eds.) '*Theory and Methods in Political Science*'. London: Macmillan.
- Heywood, Andrew (2016) (Reprint) '*Political Theory: An Introduction*', Palgrave, UK.

UNIT-5: APPROACHES TO POLITICAL THEORY-II: BEHAVIORAL AND POST-BEHAVIORAL

Structure

- 5.1 Objectives
- 5.2 Introduction
- 5.3 Behavioral Approach
- 5.4 Post-Behavioral Approach
- 5.5 Summary
- 5.6 Key Terms
- 5.7 Self Assessment Questions
- 5.8 References

5.1: OBJECTIVES

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

- What is Behavioral Approach
- What is Post-Behavioral Approach

5.2: INTRODUCTION

Behavioralism is one of the most modern approaches to the study of political science. But the development of this approach is spread over the whole of the 20th century. It was towards the end of 19th century that political scientists had realized the demerits of the traditional approaches. It was as early as 1908 that Graham Wales and A. F. Bentley strongly advocated on the study of psychology of the individual is meaningless. Behaviour of the person plays an important role in all political phenomena. Bentley emphasized on the role of the groups. In other words, he advocated the study of the behavior of the individual as a member of the groups. Charles, E. Merriam stressed on the 'way of functioning' of the individuals in the polity. To him, study of political science will be more scientific when one analyses the behavior of the man instead studying the institution. He presented his views in various international conferences during 1923 to 1925 which helped in the growth of behaviouralism.

It was after the second World War that Behaviouralism as a revolution entered into the field of the study of political science. Being influenced by the sociologists like Max Weber, Talcott Parsons, Robert Merton and many others; political scientists realized the importance of resolving social

problems. Many scholars like, Lasswell, David Easton, G. A. Almond, Powell, Herbert Simmon etc; produced many commendable pieces of research which were based on behavioural approach. The committees on 'political behaviour' and 'comparative politics' instituted by the American Political Association also helped a lot in bringing about behavioral revolution. These efforts helped behavioralism to flourish in a short period of time.

5.3: BEHAVIORAL APPROACH

Behavioralism is one of the most modern approaches to the study of political science. But the development of this approach is spread over the whole of the 20th century. It was towards the end of 19th century that political scientists had realized the demerits of the traditional approaches. It was as early as 1908 that Graham Wales and A. F. Bentley strongly advocated on the study of psychology of the individual is meaningless. Behaviour of the person plays an important role in all political phenomena. Bentley emphasized on the role of the groups. In other words, he advocated the study of the behavior of the individual as a member of the groups. Charles, E. Merriam stressed on the 'way of functioning' of the individuals in the polity. To him, study of political science will be more scientific when one analyses the behavior of the man instead studying the institution. He presented his views in various international conferences during 1923 to 1925 which helped in the growth of behaviouralism.

It was after the second World War that Behaviouralism as a revolution entered into the field of the study of political science. Being influenced by the sociologists like Max Weber, Talcott Parsons, Robert Merton and many others; political scientists realized the importance of resolving social problems. Many scholars like, Lasswell, David Easton, G. A. Almond, Powell, Herbert Simmon etc; produced many commendable pieces of research which were based on behavioural approach. The committees on 'political behaviour' and 'comparative politics' instituted by the American Political Association also helped a lot in bringing about behavioral revolution. These efforts helped behavioralism to flourish in a short period of time.

Behaviouralism emphasizes scientific, objective and value-free study of the political phenomena as conditioned by the environment, categorically the behavior of the individuals involved in that phenomena. As such, it stresses on the role of the behavior of the individual at various levels and

the scientific analysis. Behaviouralism is a reaction against traditional political science which did not take into account if human behavior as an actor in politics. Behaviouralism is different from behaviourism. Behaviourism is narrow in its application. It refers to the response of an organism as aroused by some stimulus. It does not consider the part played by the feelings, ideas, prejudices that determine the response of that individual. Behaviouralism, on the other hand, does take into account the role of the feelings, ideas and prejudices. David Easton distinguishes between behaviourism and behaviouralism through a paradigm. The paradigm adopted by behaviourists, according to him is S- R (Stimulus-Response). But the behaviouralists have improved it by making it as S-O-R (Stimulus-Organism-Response). David Easton regards behavioural revolution as an intellectual tendency on the part of the political scientists to study empirically the political behavior of individuals.

Features of Behaviouralism:

Commonly agreed features of Behaviouralism are the following;

It is a protest against the abstract nature of the traditional political theory. Traditional theorists dealt with only the institutions and not the behavior of the individuals involved. Behaviouralism, on the other hand, studies both the institutions and the behavior. However, behaviouralism ignores institutions only to the extent of their theoretical description. When the institutions provide a hint to the political behavior of the individuals involved, the institution becomes of importance to the behaviouralists. And they consider institutions as “patterns of individual behavior that are more or less regular and uniform. They are treated as sources of influence that shape political behavior.”

Behaviouralism adopts scientific method in studying political phenomena. It is more empirical. It comprises of such techniques as observation, interviews, survey research, case studies, data collection, statistical analysis, quantification, etc. Model building is another method of the behaviouralists like Easton’s and Almond’s model of political system and Cybernetics model of Karl Deutsch.

Features of Behaviouralism:

1. Empirical studies
2. Inter-disciplinary study
3. Scientific Theory building

As such, according to Easton behaviouralism has remarkable features like:-

1. Regularities
2. Verification
3. New techniques,
4. Quantification
5. Values – Value free
6. Systematization
7. Application of the theory.
8. Integration.

Regularities stand for discernible uniformities in Political behavior which can be expressed in theory-like statements facilitating explanation and prediction of political phenomena.

Verification implies acceptance of only that kind of knowledge which can be empirically tested and verified.

Technique symbolizes emphasis on the adoption of appropriate tools of data collection and analysis.

Quantification stands for the advocacy of rigorous measurement and data manipulation in political analysis.

Values, according to behaviouralists need to be separated from ‘facts’. Ethical evaluation is one thing, empirical explanation is another. Objective scientific enquiry has to be value-free or value-neutral.

Systematisation implies the behaviouralist’s conscious effort to build causal theories on the basis of logically interrelated structure of concepts and propositions.

The pure science advocacy is directed toward forging a link between theoretical understanding of politics and application of theory to practical problem-solving.

Integration aims at mixing political science with other social sciences. It marks a conscious move to encourage cross-fertilization ideas across the boundaries of separate social sciences.

5.4: POST-BEHAVIOURAL APPROACH

Behaviouralism dominated in the study of political Science for a decade. However, the behaviouralists drifted away from the path they had chosen for themselves. They got absorbed in finding out new techniques and methods for its study. In the process they lost the real subject matter. They got divided into two groups – the Theoretical behaviouralists and the positive behaviouralists. While the former laid emphasis purely on theory building, the latter concerned

themselves with finding out new methods for the study of political phenomena. Consequently, certain behaviouralists got disillusioned with behaviouralism towards the close of sixties. The main attack upon behaviouralism came from David Easton who was one of the leading behaviouralists. According to him, there is a “post – behavioural revolution” underway which is born out of deep dissatisfaction with the attempt to convert political study into a discipline modeled on the methodology of the natural sciences. In their efforts at research and application of scientific method, the behaviouralists had gone far away from the realities of social behavior. In this way, political science again lost touch with the current and contemporary issues.

The chief reasons for the growth of post-behaviouralism are- failure of the behaviouralists in addressing the social problems for their solutions; over- emphasis on research methods and tools, and consuming more time on conceptualizing or theory-building.

Features of Post-Behaviouralism:

Following are the characteristic features of post-behaviouralism-

It is a movement of Protest. It is a protest against the wrong direction which the behaviouralists had given to political science. As such, the post- behaviouralists stressed on “Relevance and Action”. They held that political science should be directed towards solving actual problems. So that it would be more relevant to the society. Political Scientists, according to them, should once again try to view political situation as a whole and in a right manner. They should deliberate on the basic issues of society like justice, liberty, equality, democracy etc.

Opposition to ‘Value-free’ concept:

David Easton, in his modification says that “value are inextinguishable parts of the study of politics. Science cannot be and never has been evaluatively neutral despite protestations to the contrary. Hence to understand the limits of our knowledge we need to be aware of the value premises on which it stands and alternatives for which this knowledge could be used”.

Future-oriented (Predictability):

Post-behaviouralism wants that the behaviouralists should link their empirical methods of research and approach for making theories that could solve present and future social problems. It must thus be future oriented. According to Easton, “Although the post-behavioural revolution may have all appearances of just another reaction to behaviouralism, it is in fact notably different. Behaviouralism was viewed as a threat to status quo; classicism and traditionalism..... the post –behavioural revolution is, however, future oriented. It does not seek to return to some golden age

of political research or to conserve to destroy a particular methodological approach. It seeks rather to proper political science in new direction.”

It is an Intellectual tendency:

Post-behaviouralism is both a movement and intellectual tendency. As a movement of protest, it has its followers among all sections of political scientists “in all generations from young, graduates to older members of the profession”. Easton says, it was “a genuine revolution, not a reaction; a becoming, not a preservation; a reform not a counter reformation.”

It would be wrong to identify post-behaviouralism with any particular political ideology. The whole improbable diversity-political, methodological and generational – was bound together by one sentiment alone, a deep discontext with the direction of contemporary political research.

David Easton, as such, speaks of the following as important features of post-behaviouralism:

1. Importance to substance over technique:

Post-behaviouralists say, it may be good to have sophisticated tools of investigation, but the more important point is the purpose for which these tools are being applied. Unless scientific research is relevant and meaningful for contemporary social problems, it is not worth being undertaken.

2. Emphasis on social change and not social preservation.

3. Greater focus on Reality.

Political science should address the needs of mankind by identifying the future social problems and by suggesting solutions to such problems.

4. Recognition of the existing values:

According to post-behaviouralists, unless values are regarded as the propelling force behind knowledge there is a danger that knowledge would lose purposes. If knowledge is to be used for right goals, values have to be restored to the central position. Human values need protection.

5. It is Action-oriented:

Knowledge must be put to work. “To know”, as Easton points out “is to bear the responsibility for acting, and to act is to engage in restoring society”. The post-behaviouralists as such, ask for action-science in place of contemplative-science.

According to post-behaviouralists, once it is recognized that the intellectuals have a positive role to play in society, and that this role is to try to determine proper goals for society and make society move in the direction of these goals, it becomes inevitable to politicize the profession-all professional associations as well as universities thus become not only inseparable but highly desirable.

Post-behaviouralists advocate that political science should be related to urgent social problems. It should therefore be purposive. Political scientists should find out solutions to contemporary problems. The research should be relevant to the understanding of social issues. Political scientists must play the leading role in acting for the post-behavioural change. To quote Easton, "the post-behavioural movement in political science is presenting us with a new image of our discipline and the obligations of our profession."

5.5: SUMMARY

While behavioralism has made significant contributions to the field of political science by promoting a more scientific and empirical approach, it has also faced criticism. Critics argue that it tends to oversimplify political reality by focusing too narrowly on measurable behaviors and neglecting the importance of cultural, historical, and institutional factors in understanding political phenomena. Despite these critiques, behavioralism has had a lasting impact on the discipline, influencing the development of various subfields within political science. Post-behaviouralists advocate that political science should be related to urgent social problems. It should therefore be purposive. Political scientists should find out solutions to contemporary problems. The research should be relevant to the understanding of social issues. Political scientists must play the leading role in acting for the post-behavioural change. To quote Easton, "the post-behavioural movement in political science is presenting us with a new image of our discipline and the obligations of our profession."

5.6: KEY TERMS

- **Behavioralism:** Behavioralism in political science refers to an approach that emphasizes the systematic study of political behavior, focusing on observable and measurable actions rather than abstract or normative theories.
- **Empirical:** originating in or based on observation or experience. Relying on experience or observation alone often without due regard for system and theory.

5.7: SELF-ASSESSMENT QUESTIONS

- What is behavioralism. Discuss its features.
- What is Post-Behavioralism. Discuss its features given by Easton.

- Find out the difference between Behavioralism and Post Behavioralism.

5.8: REFERENCES

Almond, G.A. and Powell, GB; (1978) "Comparative Politics: A Development Approach ", Oxford

Apter, David E., (1977) "Introduction to Political Analysis", Cambridge

Charlesworth, J. (ed.), (1967) "Contemporary Political Analysis ", New York

Dahl, Robert A., (1979) "Modern Political Analysis ", Englewood Cliffs

BLOCK-2: CRITICAL AND CONTEMPORARY PERSPECTIVES IN POLITICAL THEORY

Unit-6: Feminism: Origin and Development

Unit-7: Theories of Feminism

Unit-8: Postmodern Feminism

Unit-9: The Feminist Understanding of Politics and Power

Unit-10: Eco-Feminism

UNIT-6: FEMINISM: ORIGIN, DEVELOPMENT AND FEATURES

Structure

- 6.1 Objectives
- 6.2 Introduction
- 6.3 Meaning of Feminism
- 6.4 Growth of the Feminism
- 6.5 Features of the Feminism
- 6.6 Summary
- 6.7 Key Terms
- 6.8 Self Assessment Questions
- 6.9 References

6.1: OBJECTIVES

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

- Meaning of Feminism
- Origin and development of feminism
- Features of the feminism

6.2: INTRODUCTION

Feminism views the world a constrict mannerist recognizes diversity in the world it promotes equality. Within feminism power is used to denote employment with access to Education Health Employment. Feminism displays a respect for nature feminism is an ideology philosophy and attitude of mind.

It is seen that all over the world women experience discrimination unequal treatment in terms of food, nutrition healthcare, education, employment and mainstream decision activities. It is not enough for recognize those conditions or to be aware this has to be accompanied by active for example women may decide to Educate her daughter or let her pursue a career. In other words, one does not have to be a part of feminist group, even as a single person one may oppress it, feminism is a action oriented ideology a belief system. It is a body of knowledge though and theory. Feminism is not and should not be a typical urban middle-class concept. It touches all aspects of social life patriarchy and women oppression are found in all class castes, religion, group and culture, historically speaking feminist movement occurred in to waves. The first wave refers

to the late 19th century where feminist movements were mainly concerned with gaining equal rights for women. They mainly demanded Equal legal and political right; second wave feminism refers to feminist activities in the late 1960's and 1970's. Here women protest contended around women inequality, especially in family and workplace. Finally, in the last 10-15 years there is a third wave referring to differences and inequalities among women themselves. As the awareness regarding women issues develop, cultural differences are observed new ideas; the one's approaches come up.

6.3: MEANING OF FEMINISM

Feminism is, in short, the theory of political, economic, and social equality of the sexes (MerriamWebster). However, it is not just a theory. It is a collection of various ideas and actions taken

which have had a similar objective, which is to ensure equality between men and women. Even before feminism rose as a movement across the world decades ago, there have been women and men fighting for women to have equal rights and status in society. There are two words one is feminism and other is feminist. Feminism refers to approach theory while feminist is a person to believes in and act according to feminist theory or theories. Common sense meaning of feminist is “man hating”. Media also portrait it as careerist, middle class, academic westernised etc. However, this heat true. According to feminist thinkers, feminist is a person who believes in equality and justice for women. Feminist may be activists, social scientist, academic, poet, social worker who express their feminism in different way. Feminism is an ideology, philosophy an attitude of mind, a way of looking at anything. It is not one unitary concept but instead of decrease and multi faced grouping of ideas and action. Feminism is mainly concerned with women's inferior position in a society and with discrimination encountered by women because of their sex. Hence all feminists call for change in social, cultural, religious, political and economic fields. They work to reduce in equality and eventually to overcome it. A simple meaning of the term feminism is “looking at world from women's point of view.” It implies women's point of view's is relevant and effective for women, their perception and participation in social life.

Feminism is an awareness of women's oppression and exploitation in society at the place of work and with the family and the conscious action to change this situation. Feminism is an awareness of

patrician control, exploitation and oppression of material and ideological levels of women's labour fertility and sexuality in the family, at the place of work, and in society in general and conscious action by women and men to transfer the present situation. Both their definitions are elaborate and fell as many things. Common points in both the definitions are many. Firstly, feminism is at attitude of mind which needs to be developed or cultivated among men and women are society. Hence first aim is to spread awareness make people sensitive about women's issues, their oppressions to sensitize people, it is necessary to observe social facts collect data, analyse it and communicate it to public. Secondly both the definitions call for action. It is not enough to know or to be aware of social reality. People activists, should work to change the social condition. Hence some kind of action plan and participation in the action plan is required the conscious efforts to change the present situation. Thirdly both the definitions talk about women's oppression and exploitation take place within a family, at place of work, in political field etc. The second definition further states that this oppression takes place because of patriarchal control. Hence awareness of women takes place at both level material and at ideological level. This oppression may be done by men or by women for both the definition all over the world. Women experience discrimination unequal treatment in terms of food, nutrition, health care, education, employment, main stream decision-making activities. Further is not enough to recognize those condition or to be aware of than; this to be accompanied by action. The action can take place anywhere. For example, women may decide to educate her daughter or let her pursue, a career as a mother may stand by her daughter.

Feminism is something evolved, learnt by person through personal, first-hand experience, it is not something forced an individual from outside. Hence women's study is not just on academic paper or disciplined to be studied to be studied to score marks in the examination. It is something to be understood experienced and implemented. Finally, that study helps to re-examine society, re-interpret social theories from women's perceptions. Feminism is not and should not be typical urban middle-class concept. It touches all aspects of social life. Patriarchy and women's oppression are found in all castes, classes, religions, group and cultures. Hence feminist perspective is found in medicine, science film making, leaching, curriculum text-book etc. At different age level women may think differently, from child to old women experiences may be different, yet feminism influences personal life experiences at all levels. There is general notion that feminist is against marriage, peaceful names and household work. This is not correct, because many feminists are married. Further, what we do, we mean by peaceful names. Are our families

really peaceful? There are many forms of domestic violence. Women may be choice a house wife. What is important here is do women really have choice or most of them are forced to remain at home. Finally, feminist prefer the term “home maker” to house wife because it suggest positive role of women. There are two other concepts often used in this context. One is sexism and other is sexist. Sexism refers to unequal treatment of women because of their sex. A person who takes up a position of domination over and against woman, by virtue merely of his stands as a man is called sexist.

There is a yet another question often raised in this context is feminism a western concept? Implied idea is whether it is relevant in India or do we blindly, limited west. This question is supported by the argument that in India we have laws to protect women. It is true feminism as a concept used today is developed in the western world, but so also democracy, industrial revolution, bureaucracy etc. Just because it is first used in western society does not mean it is not relevant here. Further in India efforts are made in 19th century by social reformists to improve the states of women. Though the word feminism is borrowed from the west, the idea was these very much in this country. Finally the law remain in the pages of law books, what is imp in the extent to which these laws are followed in the society. Today women in India and south East Asia are raising issues very close to their culture. Most of them are working in informal sector, have low paid job, child marriage dowry death still continued. So we do not blindly imitate western society but raise issue relevant in our society. Though we had women prime minister does not mean status of ordinary women is high.

6.4: GROWTH OF THE FEMINISM

The term 'feminism' was first coined in 1837 by a French philosopher, Charles Fourier. Though the goals and ambitions for each movement depended considerably on society, culture, and the wants and needs of women in that region, historians believe that the main, common objective between all feminist movements was and continues to be trying to ensure equality between men and women as far as government, economic matters, socio-political matters, and all the different rights which were reserved for men, are concerned.

Scholars have divided the history of Western feminism into three ‘waves’. The first wave in the 19th and early 20th century primarily focused on women’s voting rights. The second wave refers to

the women’s liberation movement which began in the 1960’s and was concerned with the legal

and social equality of women. The third wave, beginning in the 1990's, builds on the apparent failures of second wave and tries to address them. The concept of waves is not used to describe/analyse feminism in the Indian context. Given the significance of the colonial situation when the women's movement first emerged and its close association with anti-colonial struggles, the term 'feminism' did not gain much currency in the women's movement's self-description in that period. In a later period, after Independence, women were engaged on multiple political fronts. Thus, the term 'women's movement' is more commonly used in the Indian context. It will be correct to say that even though the word feminism came to be Used in the 19th century. the concept came into existence much earlier. Feminism got a boost and emerged by the 19th century in 'waves' in the US and UK.

Feminist theory is the extension of feminism into theoretical or philosophical fields. It encompasses work in a variety of disciplines, including anthropology, sociology, economics, women's studies, literary criticism, art, history, psychoanalysis and philosophy. Feminist theory aims to understand gender inequality and focuses on gender politics, power relations, and sexuality. While providing a critique of these social and political relations, much of feminist theory also focuses on the promotion of women's rights and interests. Themes explored in feminist theory include discrimination, stereotyping, objectification (especially sexual objectification), oppression, and patriarchy. In the field of literary criticism, Elaine Showalter describes the development of feminist theory as having three phases. The first she calls "feminist critique", in which the feminist reader examines the ideologies behind literary phenomena. The second Showalter calls "gynocriticism", in which the "woman is producer of textual meaning". The last phase she calls "gender theory", in which the "ideological inscription and the literary effects of the sex/gender system are explored". Most feminist theories have been generated based on the experiences of women and have evolved through women's movements. Feminist theories form the main plank of women's studies which is spread over a variety of disciplines. These included history, geography, anthropology, sociology, art history, psychoanalysis, economics, science, literature, philosophy and theology apart from media, film and music.

The demands made by women's movements included the right to vote, to own property, reproductive or health rights and the right over their own bodies. They laid emphasis on the fundamental right to equality in every field of life and from this emerged the issue of equal pay for equal work, equal opportunity for careers, and opposition of oppression, patriarchy, domestic violence and sexual harassment. Initially beginning in the Western countries, the movement for

female rights spread far and wide and this has led to the development of a variety of feminisms all over the world.

Feminist thinking has been associated with various dominant political theories at different stages. For many decades, the categorization of feminism usually followed the differences in the ideological positions of its major proponents and the issues prioritized by them- thus, radicals, liberals, Marxists, socialists etc. However, over time, these lines became increasingly blurred and historians of feminism followed different principles of classification, causing a great deal of confusion regarding nomenclature. On the whole, radical feminism believed that patriarchy was the main cause of women's oppression and so a total restructuring of the society was necessary. They also do not absolve capitalism, (since it is based on patriarchal structures), but see patriarchy as more 'fundamental' and pre-dating capitalism. Liberal feminists aimed at the equality of men and women through reform without altering the structure of society. While socialist feminists found a link between the oppression of women and their exploitation and labour, Marxist feminists felt that the end of class oppression would lead to the end of gender oppression too. There are several other approaches to the 'woman question', which suggest various alternatives, for example, cultural feminism, anarchist feminism and separatist feminism, to name a few. Helene Cixous argues that writing and philosophy are phallogentric and along with other French feminists such as Luce Irigaray emphasize "writing from the body" as a subversive exercise. The work of Julia Kristeva, a feminist psychoanalyst and philosopher, and Bracha Ettinger, artist and psychoanalyst, has influenced feminist theory in general and feminist literary criticism in particular. However, as the scholar Elizabeth Wright points out, "none of these French feminists align themselves with the feminist movement as it appeared in the Anglophone world". More recent feminist theory, such as that of Lisa Lucile Owens, has concentrated on characterizing feminism as a universal emancipator movement.

6.5: FEATURES OF THE FEMINISM

Feminism is a social, political, and cultural movement that seeks to achieve gender equality by advocating for women's rights and challenging gender-based inequalities. Below are some of the key features of feminism:

Gender Equality

The core aim of feminism is to establish equal rights and opportunities for all genders, particularly focusing on overcoming the systemic inequalities faced by women.

Advocacy for Women's Rights

Feminism fights for women's access to the same rights and privileges that men have, including the right to vote, work, and participate fully in society.

Intersectionality

Modern feminism acknowledges that women's experiences are shaped not only by gender but also by race, class, sexual orientation, ability, and other identities. Intersectional feminism highlights that multiple forms of discrimination can intersect, leading to compounded disadvantages.

Challenging Patriarchy

Feminism identifies and critiques the patriarchal structures that perpetuate gender inequalities. Patriarchy refers to a social system in which men hold primary power and dominate in roles of leadership, moral authority, and control over property.

Reproductive Rights

Feminists advocate for reproductive rights, which include access to contraception, abortion, maternity care, and the right to make decisions about one's own body.

Workplace Equality

Feminism seeks to address wage gaps, workplace discrimination, and lack of opportunities for women in the workforce. Equal pay, parental leave, and work-life balance are key issues.

Combating Gender-Based Violence

Feminists work to end various forms of gender-based violence, such as domestic abuse, sexual harassment, and rape, emphasizing the need for social and legal reforms to protect victims and hold perpetrators accountable.

Body Positivity and Autonomy

Feminism promotes body positivity and challenges societal standards of beauty that objectify and oppress women. It supports individuals' rights to control their own bodies and reject unrealistic beauty norms.

Sexual Liberation

Feminism supports sexual liberation, emphasizing that women should have the right to freely

express their sexuality and make choices regarding their sexual relationships without fear of judgment or exploitation.

Empowerment and Representation

Feminism encourages the empowerment of women by advocating for increased representation in politics, media, education, and leadership roles.

Critique of Traditional Gender Roles

Feminism challenges traditional gender roles that define women's place in society as primarily domestic or secondary to men. It promotes the idea that individuals should have the freedom to choose their roles and responsibilities regardless of gender.

Global Perspectives

Feminism is not just a Western movement; it takes into account the diverse experiences of women around the world, acknowledging that gender issues vary across different cultural, political, and economic contexts.

Feminism, through its various waves (such as first-wave, second-wave, and third-wave feminism), has evolved over time to address different issues related to gender and continues to adapt to the changing dynamics of society.

6.6: SUMMARY

Feminist theory is the extension of feminism into theoretical or philosophical fields. It encompasses work in a variety of disciplines, including anthropology, sociology, economics, women's studies, literary criticism, art, history, psychoanalysis and philosophy. Feminist theory aims to understand gender inequality and focuses on gender politics, power relations, and sexuality. While providing a critique of these social and political relations, much of feminist theory also focuses on the promotion of women's rights and interests. Themes explored in feminist theory include discrimination, stereotyping, objectification (especially sexual objectification), oppression, and patriarchy. In the field of literary criticism, Elaine Showalter describes the development of feminist theory as having three phases. The first she calls "feminist critique", in which the feminist reader examines the ideologies behind literary phenomena. The second

Showalter calls "gynocriticism", in which the "woman is producer of textual meaning". The last phase she calls "gender theory", in which the "ideological inscription and the literary effects of the sex/gender system are explored".

6.7: KEY TERMS

- **Capitalism:** It refers to an economic system in which means of production, distribution, and exchange of wealth are in the hands of private individuals or corporations who invest, own, and maintain it. Capitalists are people who have capital money, assets, land, investment, and so on.
- **Feminism:** The advocacy of women's rights on the ground of the equality of the sexes.
Liberalism: Constitutes a philosophy based on the principle that every person is to be given equal opportunities and civil rights.
- **Post-modern Feminism:** It is an approach to feminist theory that incorporates post-modern and post-structuralist theory, seeing itself as moving beyond the modernist polarities of liberal feminism and radical feminism.
- **Socialist feminism:** It sets as its goal transforming basic structural arrangements of society so that categories of class, gender, sexuality, and race no longer act as barriers to equal sharing of resources. Class and gender intersect in shaping women's lives.

6.8: SELF ASSESSMENT QUESTIONS

- What is Feminism? Discuss its growth and development.
- Discuss about first wave of the feminism.
- Write an essay on second wave of the feminism.
- Discuss what are the key features of feminism.

6.9: REFERENCES

Synder, R. Claire, What Is Third-Wave Feminism? A New Directions Essay, University of Chicago Press, Chicago (2008), vol 34 (1): pp 175-196.

Bryson, Valerie, *Feminist Political Theory An Introduction* (Second Edition) Palgrave MacMillan, London (2003)

Walters, Margaret *Feminism: A Very Short Introduction*, University of Oxford, New York (2005).

Floral, Anastasia *Three Waves of Feminism: From Suffragettes to Grrls*, PhD thesis, Erasmus Program, European Union (2017).

Effiong, Angelic *A Brief history and Classification of Feminism, Environmental Education* the University of Calabar, Nigeria (2008).

UNIT-7: THEORIES OF FEMINISM

Structure

- 7.1 Objectives
- 7.2 Introduction
- 7.3 Meaning and Definition of Feminism
- 7.4 First Wave of Feminism
- 7.5 Second Wave of Feminism
- 7.6 Third Wave of Feminism
- 7.7 Summary
- 7.8 Key Terms
- 7.9 Self Assessment Questions
- 7.10 References

7.1: OBJECTIVES

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

- Meaning and Definition of Feminism
- What is first wave of feminism
- What is second wave of feminism
- What is third wave of Feminism

7.2: INTRODUCTION

Feminism is a range of socio-political movements and ideologies that aim to define and establish the political, economic, personal, and social equality of the sexes. Feminism holds the position that modern societies are patriarchal—they prioritize the male point of view—and that women are treated unjustly in these societies. Efforts to change this include fighting against gender stereotypes and improving educational, professional, and interpersonal opportunities and outcomes for women.

Originating in late 18th-century Europe, feminist movements have campaigned and continue to campaign for women's rights, including the right to vote, run for public office, work, earn equal pay, own property, receive education, enter into contracts, have equal rights within marriage, and maternity leave. Feminists have also worked to ensure access to contraception, legal abortions, and social integration; and to protect women and girls from sexual assault, sexual harassment,

and domestic violence. Changes in female dress standards and acceptable physical activities for women have also been part of feminist movements.

Many scholars consider feminist campaigns to be a main force behind major historical societal changes for women's rights, particularly in the West, where they are near-universally credited with achieving women's suffrage, gender-neutral language, reproductive rights for women (including access to contraceptives and abortion), and the right to enter into contracts and own property. Although feminist advocacy is, and has been, mainly focused on women's rights, some argue for the inclusion of men's liberation within its aims, because they believe that men are also harmed by traditional gender roles. Feminist theory, which emerged from feminist movements, aims to understand the nature of gender inequality by examining women's social roles and lived experiences. Feminist theorists have developed theories in a variety of disciplines in order to respond to issues concerning gender.

Numerous feminist movements and ideologies have developed over the years, representing different viewpoints and political aims. Traditionally, since the 19th century, first-wave liberal feminism, which sought political and legal equality through reforms within a liberal democratic framework, was contrasted with labour-based proletarian women's movements that over time developed into socialist and Marxist feminism based on class struggle theory. Since the 1960s, both of these traditions are also contrasted with the radical feminism that arose from the radical wing of second-wave feminism and that calls for a radical reordering of society to eliminate patriarchy. Liberal, socialist, and radical feminism are sometimes referred to as the "Big Three" schools of feminist thought.

Since the late 20th century, many newer forms of feminism have emerged. Some forms, such as white feminism and gender-critical feminism, have been criticized as taking into account only white, middle class, college-educated, heterosexual, or cisgender perspectives. These criticisms have led to the creation of ethnically specific or multicultural forms of feminism, such as black feminism and intersectional feminism. Some have argued that feminism often promotes misandry and the elevation of women's interests above men's, and criticize radical feminist positions as harmful to both men and women.

7.3: MEANING AND DEFINITION OF FEMINISM

At its core, feminism is the belief that women deserve equal social, economic, and political rights and freedoms. Over the years, feminism has focused on issues like the right to vote, reproductive

and sexual freedom, and equal pay. Feminism has also explored racism, gender norms, self-expression, and much more.

Feminist theory is the extension of feminism into theoretical or philosophical fields. It encompasses work in a variety of disciplines, including anthropology, sociology, economics, women's studies, literary criticism, art history, psychoanalysis, and philosophy. Feminist theory aims to understand gender inequality and focuses on gender politics, power relations, and sexuality. While providing a critique of these social and political relations, much of feminist theory also focuses on the promotion of women's rights and interests. Themes explored in feminist theory include discrimination, stereotyping, objectification (especially sexual objectification), oppression, and patriarchy. In the field of literary criticism, Elaine Showalter describes the development of feminist theory as having three phases. The first she calls "feminist critique", in which the feminist reader examines the ideologies behind literary phenomena. The second Showalter calls "gynocriticism", in which the "woman is producer of textual meaning". The last phase she calls "gender theory", in which the "ideological inscription and the literary effects of the sex/gender system are explored".

This was paralleled in the 1970s by French feminists, who developed the concept of *écriture féminine* (which translates as "female or feminine writing"). Hélène Cixous argues that writing and philosophy are *phallogentric* and along with other French feminists such as Luce Irigaray emphasize "writing from the body" as a subversive exercise. The work of Julia Kristeva, a feminist psychoanalyst and philosopher, and Bracha Ettinger, artist and psychoanalyst, has influenced feminist theory in general and feminist literary criticism in particular. However, as the scholar Elizabeth Wright points out, "none of these French feminists align themselves with the feminist movement as it appeared in the Anglophone world".

7.4: FIRST WAVE OF FEMINISM

The first wave of feminism was ruled by suffrage rights for women. The demand for equality and suffrage and the liberal feminist movement went back as far as Seneca Falls Convention in New York in 1848 when more than 300 men and women assembled for the nation's first women's rights convention. It was organised by Elizabeth Cady Stanton (1815-1902) to bring a political strategy of equal access and opportunity. This declaration started the suffrage movement. Formally, the first wave of feminism started in the United States of America along with other reform movements like abolition and temperance and was closely involved with women of the working classes. They

protested against the White House accusing the government of undemocratic practices of not enfranchising half of its citizens, unlike Germany. They were ready to get arrested while picketing, demonstrating, and protesting. Their acts were inspired by a radical agitator Alice Paul (1885-1977), who introduced militant tactics to the NWP: parades, picketing, marches, and burning of President Wilson's speeches.

Finally with the struggle of women like Alice Paul, Carrie Chapman Catt, president of the National American Women's Suffrage Association (NAWSA), Anna Howard Shaw, a former president of NAWSA, and others alike, women in the USA won the right to vote in 1920. It was also supported by Black abolitionists, such as Maria Stewart, Sojourner Truth, and Frances E. W. Harper. Participation by radical feminists like Elizabeth Cady Stanton also participated in this movement long back in 1868 to represent the National Labour Union Convention.

The Black women feminists faced another issue while supporting the suffrage movement. Many well-meaning sceptics feared that it would be a setback for men of colour, who were campaigning for enfranchised rights. So, even though they participated with white women for the right to vote, they showed the presence of sexism and racism together for White male dominance. However, the first wave was largely dominated by white, middle-class, well-educated women. They faced a severe backlash due to both World War I and World War II along with the Civil War in the United States of America. Therefore, propagandists of the suffrage movement then tried to counter the stereotypes of women by engaging in public persuasion, highly unwomanly behaviour, crossing the domestic boundaries (women's place was considered in the home to serve husband and children), and showing less feminine attributes like behaving masculine attributes and ignoring her biological weakness- a smaller brain and a more fragile physique. Later it was argued by some rights activists that women should get the right to vote from an argument of expediency because they are fundamentally different and they have to work on maternity and domesticity. Therefore, it would be advantageous to enfranchise women to get benefitted from their "innately" female concerns and they would perform their "duties" as mothers and housewives in a better way. Another argument in support of the right to vote for women is justice. Women and men were considered equal at least in the terms of law therefore extending their voting rights was giving them full citizenship. Some feminists also argued in favour of women's superior morality, in part of sophisticated rhetoric of equity, developed in Europe and the USA. It shared the Western political framework of enlightenment and liberalism, anchored in universalism. They consider

patriarchy an irrational and unprofitable entity that only makes women a cultural emblem of deficiency. According to them women should not only be considered equal by extending all their rights to them but should be given special attention due to their contributions and competencies. This form of feminism is called “equal-opportunities feminism” or “equity feminism”. They denied biological differences as a basis to validate theoretical or political discriminations, though they accepted these differences as the basis of social gender roles.

There were a few ground-breaking works that led the first wave and also prepared the base for the second wave. The famous books among them were: Mary Wollstonecraft’s *A Vindication of the Rights of Woman* (1792), written in the wake of the French Revolution, Virginia Woolf’s *A Room of One’s Own* (1929), and Simone de Beauvoir’s *The Second Sex* (1949). Woolf also brought the notion of lesbians up along with women’s writings and voices on social and political issues. Beauvoir produced an authoritative definition of patriarchy by which women face “othering” through a social process. She argued that by strengthening her body and will and practising various virtues women can avoid being dependent on their husbands.

During the first wave, along with liberal feminism, socialist/Marxist feminism also developed in the workers’ unions in the United States of America. It was the rise of communism in the former Soviet Union that was influencing the formation of social- democratic parties in Europe and the USA. Among the supporters of this form of feminism were, Rosa Luxemburg (1870-1919) in Germany, Alexandra Kollontai (1873-1952) in Russia, and anarchist Emma Goldman (1869-1940) in the United States, etc. Both liberal and socialist/Marxist feminists believe in equity and equal opportunities for women and men. However, socialist/Marxist feminists focus more on working-class women and their participation in the socialist revolution against class struggle. These socialist/Marxist feminists paved the road for second-wave feminism by talking about the private lives of women, the right to abortion, divorce, and non- legislative partnership, and also about sexism in upper-class society and within the socialist movement. While these forms of feminism were developing continuously, the concept of equity and equality has given a rise to the second wave of feminism, which we are going to study in the next part.

7.5: SECOND WAVE OF THE FEMINISM

The second wave of feminism is synonymously used for the radical feminist movement of women’s liberation in the late 1960s and early 1970s. It started with a protest against the Miss

America Pageants in 1968 and 1969. They followed the tactics of liberal feminism along with performing underground or guerrilla theatre against what they called the Pageants' "women's oppression". Later the Redstockings, the New York Radical Feminists, and other significant feminist groups also joined the protest in 1969 to protest the policies, and activities of the pageant and argued that such pageants unnecessarily highlight the way women look than what they do, think, and the very idea of their thinking. They compared the pageant walk with a cattle show and their protest included activities like crowning a sheep Miss America and throwing "oppressive" gender artefacts, such as bras, girdles, false eyelashes, high heels, and makeup in the trash before journalists. It was all done to oppose the patriarchal, commercialised, oppressive beauty culture.

The background of second-wave feminism had many global movements like student protests, the anti-Vietnam War movement, the lesbian and gay movement, and the civil rights and Black power movements in the United States of America. They were held against the interests of capitalist and imperialist power against oppressed groups. Women were part of that oppressed group. In the contemporary New Left, women were also facing sexism, classicism, and heterosexism along with racism. Therefore, they decided to form women-only "rap" groups, consciousness-raising groups through which they worked on empowering women and raising awareness and gendered oppression. The first writing in the second wave was *Sisterhood of Powerful* edited by Robin Morgan in 1970.

A major contribution in the second wave came from the group Redstockings, which derived its name from a combination of words read from socialist revolution and bluestockings, a term used for educated and strong-minded women of the 18th and 19th centuries. This short-lived radical feminist group gave household terms in the contemporary time like "personal is political", "pro-woman line", "sisterhood is powerful" etc. They worked based on the idea that women can collectively empower each other. According to them, women are not born passive and peaceful but they are born human. Juliet Mitchell argues in her book *The Subjection of Women* (1970) that radical second-wave feminism was based on neo-Marxism and psychoanalysis. She wrote that patriarchy is part of any bourgeois society in which sexual differences are more fundamental than class and race differences. Women have an undervalued class and economy that is based on unpaid service and caregiving work at home because they are given the primary social attachment to the family and reproduction. She stressed an unjustified relation between capitalism and patriarchy that particularly reports sexism as the character of women's oppression. In another book *Sexual*

Politics, Kate Millet (1969), stressed women's rights over their bodies and sexuality which can be different from the traditions of marriage and motherhood. There was opposition to heterosexuality also from some homosexual authors like Adrienne Rich and Audre Lorde who blamed heterosexuality as a reason for women's oppression. They argued that since heterosexuality is a compulsory part of society, it gives social power to men over women irrespective of class or race differences. In their works like "On Lies, Secrets, and Silence (Rich, 1980) and Sister Outsider: Essays and Speeches (Lorde, 1984), these authors tried to find out the relations between sexism, racism, classicism, and heterosexual relations. Hence, the early years of second-wave feminism were guided by sisterhood and solidarity across all racial and class differences. They gave the slogan "woman's struggle is a class struggle" and "the personal is political". They combined all the social, sexual, and personal struggles to counter the dual workload for women working outside and inside the home. Along with all these issues, Sheila Rowbotham and Angela Y. Davis see the hope of addressing the "woman question" by destructing capitalism and rising socialism. It would free women from being dependent on men and they would be involved in "productive and paid" labour. In the arguments over sex roles and beauty myths, radical feminists have similarities with liberal feminists.

It was argued by Rowbotham and Davis later that middle-class women's discontent due to lack of social power and political influence can be compensated by payment for housework to women. If paid work outside the home is not necessary, a kind of citizen's income and acknowledged presence in public institutions can be of much help to them. The liberal feminists of the second wave were focusing on counting sexism in private and public life by delivering criticism of gendered patterns of socialisation, for example in school books, parents' responses to girls and boys differently. At the same time, radical feminists were opposing this inclusion and counting of women's oppression. They were out rightly opposing the women's involvement in capitalist patriarchal institutions.

The second-wave feminism was also significant for the rise of the eco-feminist perspective. It was first propagated by Mary Daly in *Gyn/Ecology* (1978) and Starhawk in *The Spiral Dance: A Rebirth of the Ancient Religion of the Great Goddess* (1979). This form of feminism brought many significant developments in enterprises to turn them into "woman-only" corporations and zones. In the later years, it became a necessary part of sustainable development goals, corporate feminism and separatist women-only spaces, for example, "SAPPHO" on the internet. The famous statement

of Gloria Steinem (1934), “We’ve begun to raise our daughters more like our sons but few dare to raise our sons more like our daughters”, led the road ahead in this equity approach to different approach. At the same time, Nancy Hartsock (1983) articulated “Standpoint feminism” to expand the criticism of capitalism and patriarchy by analysing a post-war welfare society and its impacts on women in different situations. They worked based on women-friendly psychoanalytic theory to focus on the productive capabilities of women in the domestic spheres of motherhood and caretaking. The books, *The Reproduction of Mothering* (1978) by Nancy Chodorow and *In a Different Voice* (1982) by Carol Gilligan tried to understand the source of knowledge, and empowerment of women and the process for that. They focus on gender as culture and communication and the “genderlects”.

Ultimately, several differences among women and ways to address them brought “identity politics” that was marked by criticism from Black, working-class and lesbian feminists. They have opposed colonialism and capitalism but they are living in a complex power structure of it. In the feminist movement, they opposed the dominance of White, middle-class, and heterosexual feminist ideology to include different identities in this movement. These identities were spread across continents, cultures, races, ethnicities, and sexuality. Important texts for this are: *Ain’t I A Woman? Black Woman and Feminism* (1981) By Bell Hooks, and Trinh T. Minh-ha in *Woman, Native, Other: Writing Post-coloniality and Feminism* (1989). This movement was called “gyno-criticism”. It was developed by Elaine Showalter in *A Literature of Their Own* (1977). An African American author Alice Walker called it “Womanism” in her book *In Search of Our Mothers’ Gardens: Womanist prose* (1983). It strived to search women’s cultures and their integrated differences. They argued that along with understanding and analysing the different interrelated oppressive methods according to gender, class, and race, one should also know how they work with the help of each other. Black feminists worked on bringing gender and race into the national consciousness and addressing particular issues like poverty, health, and welfare through a gendered approach. They included different standpoints and identities in the mainstream feminist movement by talking about different experiences. To cite some examples here Trinh T. Minh-ha called her and her race’s experiences “other Others” and “unappropriated others”, and Gayatri Spivak spoke against the naivety of White feminists on third-world women. She called it “strategic essentialism” to show concerns about linguistic barriers among them to raise their voice. Hence

differences among feminism show that sexual feminism is universal whereas gender is historical and social and therefore contextual and changeable phenomena.

The second-wave feminists gave a sociological and cultural explanation, yet were partially successful in answering the question of the sexed body and differences among women. These differences are inherent among women and of their subordination. Hence, at the end of second-wave feminism, the question was not just of whether one is feminist or not, but also of which kind of feminist one was. It gave multiple subjects to theorise and analyse women's issues since the 1960s. These differences multiplied in the third wave of feminism which we are going to study next.

7.6: THIRD WAVE OF FEMINISM

The third-wave feminists were privileged to be born as capable, strong, and assertive social agents. When second-wave feminism was at the end during the 1980s with hardly any attempt to unite and rebuild it, the third wave emerged from their contestations. The rise of third-wave feminists has many theories on their birth years, ideologies, and terms' meaning. Several feminists have given a timeline of the emergence of the third wave-like Leslie Heywood in *The Women's Movement Today: An Encyclopaedia of Third Wave Feminism*, Jo Reger in *Different Wavelengths: Studies of the Contemporary Women's Movement* (2005), Rebecca Walker's *To Be Real: Telling the Truth and Changing the Face of Feminism* (1995), and Barbara Findlen's *Listen Up" Voices from the Next Feminist Generation* (1995) and other. For the first time, the term third-wave found its space in an anthology by M. Jacqui Alexander, Lisa Albrecht, and Mab Segrest entitled *The Third Wave: Feminist Perspectives on Racism*. It conceptualises the focus of the third wave which is the challenges faced by women of colour feminists to the racial biases of the second wave feminism. People started speaking against it. The existence of different consciousness as Chela Sandoval claims in "Genders" (1991), is vital to the next generation of "third wave" and provides different distinctions and distinctiveness. Since the mid-1990s, several academic texts published to delineate the contours and complexities of the third wave as a new feminist generation. Rebecca Walker (co-founder of the Third Wave Foundation (formerly the Third Wave Direct Action Corporation) wrote in her article *Becoming the Third Wave* (1992), "I am not a post-feminism. I am the Third Wave" and established distinct feminism from the second wave.

These third-wave feminists worked on showing a break from an earlier feminist generation because they considered second-wave feminism as triangulated in essentialism, universalism, and naturalism ultimately reflect in their political consequences. This is also reflected in the titles of their books like Walker's *To Be Real: Telling the Truth and Changing the Face of Feminism*, Drake's *Third Wave Agenda: Being Feminist, Doing Feminism*, Dicker and Piepmeier's *Catching a Wave: Reclaiming Feminism for the 21st Century* and others. Their focus on personal politics reveals remarkable gaps in their understanding of the first and second waves of feminism. It was termed a 'cross-generational moment through mother-daughter rhetoric to understand the feminist history and to imagine the feminist future. Therefore, to do so, a constructive dialogue between feminists – a dialogue not owned by anyone generation is raised through the third-wave feminist with (post) feminism. Third-wave feminism moves three steps ahead of the second wave in theorising its major questions. First is to respond to the collapse of the category of "women", third-wave feminists give a personal account to illustrate an intersectional and multi- perspectival version of feminism. Second third-wave feminists propose multivocality over synthesis and action over theoretical justification to counter the rise of postmodernism. The third step is to counter the sex wars, third-wave feminists focus on an inclusive and non-judgemental approach to the refuge to police the boundaries of the feminist political. In a way, they reject many points that can create further tension and prepare the ground for unity with a dynamic and welcoming politics of coalition. Third-wave feminists completely do not reject the agenda of second-wave feminism. They just try to reject the rigid ideological perspectives of second-wave feminists. Rebecca Walker explains that third-wave feminists do not want to form an identity that regulates their lives against someone and forces them to choose inflexible sides, black against white, oppressed against the oppressor, and women against men. It becomes more difficult for people from the communities of transgender, bisexual, interracial etc.

Several authors as mentioned earlier summarise the three major claims of third-wave feminism on how it differs from second-wave feminism. First, third-wave feminists necessarily try to have their distinctive version of feminism: We are the first generation for whom feminism has been entwined in the fabric of our lives; naturally, many of us are feminists.... This country hasn't heard enough from young feminists. We're here, and we have a lot to say about our ideas and hopes and struggles and our place within feminism" (Findlen 2006, 6–7, 9). Unlike second-wave feminists, third-wave feminists feel that they need not prove that they are entitled to equality and self-

fulfilment. They have their own set of challenges like a world colonised by the mass media and information technology where they are more sophisticated and media savvy. A large section of third-wave feminists gave importance to cultural production and critique by focusing on female pop icons, hip-hop music, and beauty culture rather than on traditional politics. However, it rejects the idea of defining third-wave feminists by the year of their birth but considers it a particular approach to women's understanding of what feminism means from where and when one entered the discourse of feminism. Second, third-wave feminists argue to be less rigid and less judgmental than their second-wave counterparts whom they call anti-sex, anti-femininity, and anti-male. They perceive interacting with men equally and sexual pleasure as they desire it (heterosexual or homosexual) bring more equality than staying away from it. Girl power is the central theme of the third wave. It says that natural human desires are not simply traps set by patriarchy. So they accept the feminine enculturation- Barbie dolls, makeup, fashion magazines etc. according to their view about themselves: sexy, campy, ironic, or just to decorate themselves without any related issue.

Third, third-wave feminists present themselves as more inclusive and racially diverse than second-wave feminists. Third-wave feminists include not only women from all races, ethnicities, religions, and classes, but also different identities based on their sexual orientation, ideologies, occupation, and also those women who were at clashed with feminism earlier. There are several primary texts on third-wave feminism that were written not only by women of race, class, or both but also by biracial (Jones 2006; Tzintzu'n 2006; Walker 2006a), bisexual (Walker 2006c), multicultural (Hurdis 2006; WeinerMahfuz 2006), and transgender (Wilchins 2006) authors on their own experiences. Though third-wave feminists claim to be more inclusive, the second-wave feminists were not exclusively White, middle-class women. Many women of colour played an important role in the second as well as the third wave, like Gloria Anzaldua, Cherrie Moraga, and Audre Lorde.

Hence third-wave feminists honour the earlier feminists but criticise their feminism and they strive to bridge contradictions that they experience in their own lives. They are more inclusive towards ambiguity than certainty and engage in multiple positions to explore inclusion and exploration. It reminds us how far feminism has come. It has represented women from local, national, and transnational levels while dealing with issues like violence against women, trafficking, body surgery, self-mutilation, and the overall "pornification" of the media.

7.7: SUMMARY

Feminism is a diverse and evolving movement focused on achieving gender equality and challenging systemic injustices faced by women and marginalized genders. Its core goals include advocating for equal rights, opportunities, and representation, while addressing issues like discrimination, violence, and socioeconomic disparities.

Feminism is a movement dedicated to achieving gender equality and addressing the systemic injustices faced by women and marginalized genders. It advocates for equal rights, opportunities, and representation, and works to combat discrimination, violence, and socio-economic disparities. Feminism encompasses various perspectives and approaches but is united by the goal of creating a more just and equitable society for everyone.

Concluding a discussion on feminism often involves recognizing its impact on various aspects of society, such as legal rights, workplace policies, and cultural attitudes. It also means acknowledging that while progress has been made, ongoing efforts are needed to address remaining inequalities and ensure that the benefits of feminism reach everyone.

Feminism is not a monolithic movement but rather a spectrum of ideologies and approaches, reflecting the diverse experiences and perspectives of those who support it. Its ultimate aim is to create a more just and equitable world for all individuals, regardless of gender.

7.8: KEY TERMS

- **Patriarchy:** A social system where men hold primary power and authority, and this is reflected in various institutions and societal norms.
- **Intersectionality:** A concept developed by Kimberlé Crenshaw that explores how different forms of discrimination (such as those based on race, class, gender, sexuality, etc.) intersect and overlap.
- **Gender Equality:** The state in which access to rights or opportunities is unaffected by gender.
- **Sexual Harassment:** Unwanted and inappropriate behavior of a sexual nature, often in the workplace or other professional settings.

- **Empowerment:** The process of gaining control and influence over one's life and circumstances, often used in the context of women's rights and social justice.
- **Reproductive Rights:** The rights of individuals to make decisions about their own reproductive health and access to services like contraception and abortion.
- **Patriarchal Norms:** Societal expectations and roles that reinforce male dominance and female subordination.
- **Gender Roles:** Societal expectations about how individuals should behave based on their gender.

7.9: SELF ASSESSMENT QUESTIONS

- What is Feminism? Discuss its growth and development.
- Discuss about first wave of the feminism.
- Write an essay on second wave of the feminism.
- Discuss what are the key features of feminism.

7.10: REFERENCES

Synder, R. Claire, What Is Third-Wave Feminism? A New Directions Essay, University of Chicago Press, Chicago (2008), vol 34 (1): pp 175-196.

Bryson, Valerie, Feminist Political Theory An Introduction (Second Edition) Palgrave MacMillan, London (2003)

Walters, Margaret Feminism: A Very Short Introduction, University of Oxford, New York (2005).

Floral, Anastasia Three Waves of Feminism: From Suffragettes to Grrls, PhD thesis, Erasmus Program, European Union (2017).

Effiong, Angelic A Brief history and Classification of Feminism, Environmental Education the University of Calabar, Nigeria (2008).

UNIT-8: POST MODERN FEMINISM

Structure

- 8.1 Objectives
- 8.2 Introduction
- 8.3 Origin and Development
- 8.4 Defining Post-Modern Feminism
- 8.5 Summary
- 8.6 Key Terms
- 8.7 Self Assessment Questions
- 8.8 References

8.1: OBJECTIVES

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

- Meaning of Post-Modernism
- Meaning of Post-Modern Feminism

8.2: INTRODUCTION

Postmodern feminism is a mix of post-structuralism, postmodernism, and French feminism that rejects a universal female subject. The goal of postmodern feminism is to destabilize the patriarchal norms entrenched in society that have led to gender inequality. Postmodern feminists seek to accomplish this goal through opposing essentialism, philosophy, and universal truths in favor of embracing the differences that exist amongst women to demonstrate that not all women are the same. These ideologies are rejected by postmodern feminists because they believe if a universal truth is applied to all women of society, it minimizes individual experience, hence they warn women to be aware of ideas displayed as the norm in society since it may stem from masculine notions of how women should be portrayed.

Postmodern feminists seek to analyze any notions that have led to gender inequality in society. Postmodern feminists analyze these notions and attempt to promote equality of gender through critiquing logocentrism, supporting multiple discourses, deconstructing texts, and seeking to promote subjectivity. Postmodern feminists are accredited with drawing attention to dichotomies

in society and demonstrating how language influences the difference in treatment of genders.

The inclusion of postmodern theory into feminist theory is not readily accepted by all feminists—some believe postmodern thought undermines the attacks that feminist theory attempts to create, while other feminists are in favor of the union.

8.3: ORIGIN AND DEVELOPMENT

French feminism, as it is known today, is an Anglo-American invention coined by Alice Jardine to be a section in a larger movement of postmodernism in France during the 1980s. This included the theorizing of the failure of the modernist project, along with its departure. More specifically for feminism, it meant returning to the debate of sameness and difference.

The term was further defined by Toril Moi, an academic with a focus on feminist theory, in her 1986 book *Sexual/Textual Politics*. In this book she further defined French feminism to only include a few authors such as Hélène Cixous, Luce Irigaray, and Julia Kristeva, while also creating a distinction between French feminism and Anglo-American Feminism. She states that the difference between the two is that Anglo-American feminists want to find a "woman-centered perspective" and a woman identity since they were not given the chance to have one in the past. French feminists believe there is no identity for a woman but that "the feminine can be identified where difference and otherness are found."

Elaine Marks, an academic in the field of Women's Studies, noted another difference between French and American feminists. French feminists, specifically radical feminists, criticized and attacked the systems that benefit men, along with widespread misogyny as a whole, more intensely than their American counterparts. Through American academics contriving their own concept of French feminism, it separated and ignored the already marginalized self-identifying feminists, while focusing on the women theorists associated with *Psych et po* (*Psychanalyse et politique*) and other academics who did not always identify as feminists themselves. This division ultimately ended up placing more importance on the theories of the French feminists than the political agenda and goals that groups such as radical feminists and the *Mouvement de liberation des femmes* (women's liberation movement) had at the time.

Butler

Postmodern feminism's major departure from other branches of feminism is perhaps the argument

that sex, or at least gender, is itself constructed through language, a view notably propounded in Judith Butler's 1990 book, *Gender Trouble*. They draw on and critique the work of Simone de Beauvoir, Michel Foucault, and Jacques Lacan, as well as on Irigaray's argument that what we conventionally regard as "feminine" is only a reflection of what is constructed as masculine.

Butler criticises the distinction drawn by previous feminisms between (biological) sex and (socially constructed) gender. They ask why we assume that material things (such as the body) are not subject to processes of social construction themselves. Butler argues that this does not allow for a sufficient criticism of essentialism: though recognizing that gender is a social construct, feminists assume it is always constructed in the same way. Butler's argument implies that women's subordination has no single cause or single solution; postmodern feminism is thus criticized for offering no clear path to action. Butler rejects the term "postmodernism" as too vague to be meaningful.

Paula Moya argues that Butler derives this rejection to postmodernism from misreadings of Cherríe Moraga's work. "She reads Moraga's statement that 'the danger lies in ranking the oppressions' to mean that we have no way of adjudicating among different kinds of oppressions—that any attempt to casually relate or hierarchize the varieties of oppressions people suffer constitutes an imperializing, colonizing, or totalizing gesture that renders the effort invalid...thus, although Butler at first appears to have understood the critiques of women who have been historically precluded from occupying the position of the 'subject' of feminism, it becomes clear that their voices have been merely instrumental to her" (Moya, 790). Moya contends that because Butler feels that the varieties of oppressions cannot be summarily ranked, that they cannot be ranked at all; and takes a short-cut by throwing out the idea of not only postmodernism, but women in general.

Frug

Legal scholar Mary Joe Frug, a founding member of a group of legal scholars known as the Fem-Crits, itself a part of the Critical Legal Studies movement, suggested that one "principle" of postmodernism is that human experience is located "inescapably within language". Power is exercised not only through direct coercion, but also through the way in which language shapes and restricts our reality. She also stated that because language is always open to re-interpretation, it can also be used to resist this shaping and restriction, and so is a potentially fruitful site of political

struggle.

Frug's second postmodern principle is that sex is not something natural, nor is it something completely determinate and definable. Rather, sex is part of a system of meaning, produced by language. Frug argues that "cultural mechanisms ... encode the female body with meanings", and that these cultural mechanisms then go on to explain these meanings "by an appeal to the 'natural' differences between the sexes, differences that the rules themselves help to produce"

8.4: DEFINING POST-MODERN FEMINISM

There are many commonalities between post-modernism and feminism. There are clear affinities between postmodernism's rejection of claims to objectivity and truth and feminist critiques of the partiality of male reason and the limitations of binary thought. Postmodernism's stress on difference and diversity also seems to support those feminists who reject the essentialism of some radical feminist thought and the tendency of white, middle-class feminists to generalize from their own experience. Postmodern ideas about the ubiquity of power also sound at first sight very like the claim that patriarchal power is exercised in personal life as well as through formal political institutions, while rejection by some feminists of mainstream politics in favour of the small-scale community and/or separatist activity might seem to be in line with Foucauldian notions of resistance by marginalized groups. At this kind of level, postmodernism might seem large to endorse what many feminists have long been saying, or what they have recently started to argue as a result of their own experience. Other writers, however, argue that postmodernism has much more profound implications for feminist thought; some believe that it is more genuinely subversive than anything that has gone before.

Early feminist writers differentiated between the concepts of 'sex' and 'gender'. For them, 'sex' referred to the biological factor and 'gender' to the social roles and cultural understandings that were attached to male or female bodies. Separating sex and gender had been politically significant for feminism as it followed that gender roles were socially and culturally constructed, rather than 'naturally' and thus could be reshaped. However, postmodern feminist scholars developed alternative ways of theorizing the relationship between sex and gender. For them, both sex and gender became to be seen as socially and culturally constructed.

Another area of debate for postmodernists is 'equality' and 'difference'. Joan Scott has argued, that it enables feminists to contest the ways in which equal rights and employment disputes are framed. These have required women either to claim equality by assimilating to a male norm or to abandon the goal of equality by asserting their 'different' needs, interests and characteristics. Scott, however, says that this apparent choice rests on a false dichotomy which constructs a hierarchical power relationship which privileges men, conceals differences amongst women and men and fails to see that 'equality is not the elimination of difference; difference does not preclude equality'.

While discussing postmodern feminism, the contribution of Judith Butler cannot be ignored. She argues that Societies divide human beings into two main genders, male and female and expect these men and women to fulfil different roles. Human individuals come to identify with a particular gender as they perform their gender roles repeatedly. The older feminist distinction between sex and gender, where sex was anatomical and gender was social, was given a new interpretation by Butler where she points out that both one's gender and sexual identity are a result of social processes. Social norms about how a girl behaves show the person who has been named a girl what she is expected to do, and by behaving in an expected way, the person becomes a girl. Butler argued, that women and men normally acquired their gender identity by behaving as women and men were expected to in society. She argues that, in a world in which no two people are identical, equality does not mean that they should somehow become 'the same, but that their differences can in some situations be deemed irrelevant; she also says that women can both demand entry into male-dominated areas of employment and insist that their traditional roles are more highly valued.

Butler argues that feminists should be wary of seeing 'sex' as a purely biological characteristic; rather, 'sex' is also socially and culturally determined. Butler suggests gender as diverse, not binary. An understanding of gender as separate from sex thus holds the potential for a greater diversity of masculinities and femininities, which, in turn, allows for the recognition of differently embodied gendered identities and expressions, or of different ways of being women.

8.5: SUMMARY

In conclusion, postmodern feminism offers a nuanced and critical lens through which to understand gender and power. By rejecting universalizing narratives, emphasizing intersectionality, and deconstructing traditional gender concepts, it provides a more inclusive and

complex analysis of women's experiences. This approach encourages a diverse range of voices and perspectives, recognizing that gender issues are not monolithic but vary greatly across different contexts. Postmodern feminism ultimately aims to challenge existing power structures and advocate for a more equitable and multifaceted understanding of identity and social justice. Postmodern feminist have been criticised for being overtly academic. The language and the ideas are used in a specific manner that no one is able to understand what they are trying to do. Hence, they are called as “feminism for academicians”.

8.6: KEY TERMS

- **Intersectionality:** A concept introduced by Kimberlé Crenshaw, it explores how different forms of identity (such as race, gender, sexuality, and class) intersect to create unique experiences of oppression and privilege.
- **Deconstruction:** A method of analyzing texts and concepts to reveal the underlying assumptions and biases, often used to challenge and reinterpret traditional feminist theories.
- **Multiplicity:** The idea that there are multiple, diverse experiences and identities rather than a single, unified perspective on gender and feminism.
- **Discursive Practices:** The ways in which language and social practices construct and define identity and power relations.
- **Hyperreality:** A concept from postmodern theory that suggests that media and cultural representations often blur the line between reality and simulation, affecting perceptions of identity and gender.
- **Performative Gender:** Based on Judith Butler's theory, this concept argues that gender is not a fixed identity but a series of acts and performances that create the appearance of a stable identity.

8.7: SELF ASSESSMENT QUESTIONS

- Critically discuss about Post-Modern Feminism.
- How post-modernism do does criticizes modernism?

8.8: REFERENCES

Sally Hines, Feminist and Gender Theories, in *Introducing Gender and Women's Studies* edited by Diane Richardson and V. Robinson, Bloomsbury Publishing, 2020.

Sephali Jha, *Western Political Thought*, Pearson Publication, Noida, 2018.

Stephen Brown, Postmodernism, in *Contemporary Political Concepts: A Critical Introduction* Edited by Georgina Blakeley and Valerie Bryson, Pluto Press, London, 2002.

Valerie Bryson, *Feminist Political Theory*, Palgrave Macmillan, New York, 2003.

Will Kymlicka, *Contemporary Political Philosophy*, Oxford University Press, USA, 2014.

UNIT-9: THE FEMINIST UNDERSTANDING OF POLITICS AND POWER

Structure

- 9.1 Objectives
- 9.2 Introduction
- 9.3 Feminist Perspective of Politics
- 9.4 Sex and Gender
- 9.5 Summary
- 9.6 Key Terms
- 9.7 Self Assessment Questions
- 9.8 References

9.1: OBJECTIVES

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

- The Feminist perspective of Politics
- Difference between Sex and Gender

9.2: INTRODUCTION

The feminist understanding of power comes from a view point of systemic oppression expressed through institutions like the different forms of patriarchies. The term ‘patriarchies’ is being used here in consciously as there seems to be no one homogenous way in which patriarchy affects men and women. Different social and historical positions makes people experience the power of patriarchy in extremely diverse ways. This kind of understanding has also shifted the debate to the idea of ‘masculinities’. The initial point was that patriarchy affects not just women, but also men and also the society in general. This understanding led us to the observation that interrogating the idea of ‘masculinity’ carries equal importance to the idea of feminism. Masculinity could be defined as the way in which the idea of the masculine has been constructed by patriarchal power in the society.

How are men affected by patriarchy? Just as women are expected to be homely, delicate, weaker in physical strength and men are expected to be strong and bread-winners. Patriarchy, which is ultimately a system of power, thus also defines the roles and capacities of men. It may appear as if

men are the oppressors and women are the victims of patriarchal power, yet, interventions by various scholars have told us that men are equally victimized by patriarchy.

9.3: FEMINIST PERSPECTIVE OF POLITICS

The feminist understanding of power comes from a viewpoint of systemic oppression expressed through institutions like the different forms of patriarchies. The term 'patriarchies' is being used here in consciously as there seems to be no one homogenous way in which patriarchy affects men and women. Different social and historical positions make people experience the power of patriarchy in extremely diverse ways. This kind of understanding has also shifted the debate to the idea of 'masculinities'. The initial point was that patriarchy affects not just women, but also men and also society in general. This understanding led us to the observation that interrogating the idea of 'masculinity' carries equal importance to the idea of feminism. Masculinity could be defined as how the idea of the masculine has been constructed by patriarchal power in society. How are men affected by patriarchy? Just as women are expected to be homely, delicate, and weaker in physical strength and men are expected to be strong and breadwinners. Patriarchy, which is ultimately a system of power, thus also defines the roles and capacities of men. It may appear as if men are the oppressors and women are the victims of patriarchal power, yet, interventions by various scholars have told us that men are equally victimized by patriarchy.

For instance, what happens to men who are not 'masculine' enough? There will be plenty of men who are not very good at physical labour, who would want to keep their hair long, or who would like to cook and stay at home. But we do not come across many such people in everyday life, because society expects them to behave in a manner fitting to 'men'. Men thus model themselves on this expectation of patriarchal masculinity. On the other hand, this issue of masculinity also affects people who cannot be 'masculine enough' even if they tried hard. Disability, caste, class and sexuality, intersect with this idea of 'being a man and create increasingly complex modes of being. A Dalit man, considered inferior to an upper caste man, will not be masculine enough. He will be filthy, dirty, weak, emasculated and not a man in the same way in an upper caste man will be.

Disability also creates its peculiar conditions. Since people with disability inhabit a different set of capabilities; our physical built environment may not allow them to exercise their abilities and capacities to the fullest. For instance, if our built environments were designed to have ramps instead of staircases, those of us who are in a wheelchair would have the best capability to navigate these spaces. While those of us using legs would find the uphill trudge increasingly tedious. Just as built environments are constituted by power relations, so is the society at large constituted by the power relationship of patriarchy. Imagine a man who is differently abled and cannot work in a typical office environment because there are no lifts or ramps or because the computers do not have screen-reading software installed on them, or simply because the management is not willing to accommodate different abilities. Now this man cannot be the traditional 'breadwinner' for his family, cannot participate in much of the public sphere and also thus cannot fulfil the role of a 'man' as expected by society. Patriarchal norms tell this person that he is not a man enough because he cannot work in an office space, or cannot lift heavy weights. This person then is also a victim of patriarchal norms which dictate how men should be. Sexuality is another such contested arena, which has in recent years contributed immensely to our understanding of sex and gender roles. The queer understanding of body, sexuality and capabilities rejects the idea of males being masculine and females being feminine. This perspective largely understands the human body, capability and sexuality as a continuum rather than as poles. Thus people who are anatomically male may be considered 'feminine' in other attributes or have so-called 'feminine' interests. Other groups like Hijras, present somewhat at the margins of the queer and sexuality discourse also pose a strong challenge to our understanding of gender.

9.4: SEX AND GENDER

Any understanding of the feminist perspective of politics, will either begin or come back sometime to the sex-gender debate. The split which the feminist movement made between the two concepts of sex and gender is crucial to our understanding of patriarchy and its gendered critique.

One rather simple way to understand the increasingly complex categories of sex and gender is to say that *sex* refers to the biological differences between women and men. These would include the anatomically different genitals or external sex organs, the presence of different sex hormones and ultimately the different chromosomal configuration of both these sexes. Gender would refer to an

array of social and political meanings attached to one's self. This is broadly what we call as the process of socialization. One is reminded hereof Simone De Bouvier's (1988) famous invocation that one is not born a woman but becomes one. One of the biggest contributions of feminist thought was to bring forth this distinction between sex and gender. Centuries of oppression and discrimination against women was based on the fact that they are biologically 'different' and thus 'weaker' than men. This may come across as their perceived inability to not participate in activities as diverse as physical labour and math. Women in short, are neither physically not mentally capable of competing with men. This is the rationale for having different gender and professional roles and also discriminatory pay scales for women as against men. While this discrimination seems to be resting on a biological basis, something which is natural and about which nothing much can be done – people will be born with either of the two types of sex organs (The position will be complicated a little further down the chapter), the situation is much more complex than this.

Men and women are socialized differently, even from before birth, based on which sex organ they seem to have. So people born with penises and what looks largely like a male anatomy, are this encouraged to play sports, play with guns and robots, take up subjects like math and computers in school and college. People born without penises (or with a vulva and vagina) are designated as females and are consequently taught domestic work, encouraged to remain indoors, play with dolls and talk softly. In contexts which are not middle and upper class, most of these people designated as women will probably never go to school and college, simply because of the fact that they are women and may not need that education. Those who do are almost always kept out of 'serious' fields like mathematics, physics and engineering.

According to Nivedita Menon (2008) , “A startling study in the USA of inter sexed infants (babies born with both ovarian and testicular tissue or in whom the sex organs were ambiguous) showed that medical decisions to assign one sex or the other were made on cultural assumptions rather than on any existing biological features. Thus, a baby might be made into a female but then still require hormonal therapy all her life to make her stay “female.” In other words, maleness and femaleness are not only culturally different, they are not even biologically stable features at all times.”

Thus the very process of 'sexing' at birth determines ones 'gender' and thus determines one's life chances. This is broadly known as biological determinism. Another example of this could be race,

where one's skin colour, is deemed as the sole and determining marker of one's capacities. The sex-gender distinction helps us to complicate the argument of biological determinism. Sex and gender may not always coincide in most individuals. If we were to take out the process of socialization from the process of upbringing children, then there is absolutely no scientific or philosophical logic by which males would turn out to be masculine men and females would necessarily be feminine women.

Feminist anthropologists, like Margaret Mead, have examined different cultural contexts to determine what is meant by masculinity and femininity across various cultures. According to Mead then, different societies have varied understandings of what it means to be masculine and feminine, without any direct overlapping of the biological specificities of the human body (Menon, 2008)

Roles and activities which are considered feminine, like cooking, crying, being physically weak are largely social constructions. Anyone can cook, clean and participate in care-giving provided that they are trained for it. Women are groomed for this role from even before they are born. Men are consciously kept away from the domestic front and encouraged to go out and 'play'. Obviously then, different skill sets develop. Similarly there is nothing naturally masculine about having short hair or being muscular. These have been fixed as attributes of being male by the societal and historical processes.

The report was particularly striking because the focus was the fact that a woman did such a thing rather than the fact that the crime had taken place or had been prevented. Further she has to be characterized as 'someone who was not expected' to do this, especially since she does not fit into the usual category of women with whom we associate such 'acts of courage'.

Thus the whole emphasis of the report is on creating the image of a woman who is very 'traditional' and also subscribes to the usual notions of the Indian woman, like covering her head. Yet she did something which is not a part of her usual gendered role. The very phenomenon of 'catching burglars' is something which strongly resonates with the notions of protecting the family and the idea of security.

Traditionally it is men who are supposed to perform this role. While women may have been able to

assert equal identity in several other fields, that of security and protection, especially in terms of physical safety is still something that we associate with males, partly because of the link to physical strength. A case like this, in some ways thus inverts that logic and could serve useful to undo certain stereotypes. But instead the feeling one gets after reading the report is that the issue here is not whether it was a male who should have been doing this. Or did the woman do it better. The focus is that a woman actually did something which is not at all 'expected' of her in 'normal' circumstances and thus she has to be portrayed as an icon.

"After the arrests were made, an exhausted Susheel almost fainted and had to be supported by her neighbours", the report went further to state. Now this is a statement which would almost never appear in any other routine crime story. This statement which comes towards the end of the narration about the day's events, actually in a way conforms to the accepted stereotype of a woman, who is unexposed and thus unprepared for such situations. It is as if by the act of 'fainting' she returns to the fold of the gendered female and re- establishes any patriarchal or social hierarchies that she might have disrupted.

Sexual division of labour thus also means that women do not get paid for the work that they do. Labour activities like cooking, cleaning, rearing of children and care, are not treated as 'labour' at all and are hence not paid for. These are rather considered as the 'duties' or worse still, 'natural inclinations' of women. Work or paid labour activity is what happens outside the house, which constitutes the realm of serious work which only men can do. Consequently women who work only at home are largely unpaid workers.

The distinctions between sex and gender have since then been hugely complicated. According to Nivedita Menon(2008) there have largely been four movements in this regard.

Menon writes, "Firstly, Scholars like Alison Jaggar argue that "sex" and "gender" are dialectically and inseparably related, and that the conceptual distinction that earlier feminists established between the two is not sustainable beyond a point. In this understanding, human biology is constituted by a complex interaction between the human body, the physical environment and the state of development of technology and society. Thus, as Jaggar puts it, "the hand is as much the product of labour as the tool of labour." What is meant here is that two processes are involved: human intervention changes the external environment and simultaneously, changes in the external

environment shape and change the human body”.

There is nothing natural or pre-given about the bodies of a man or a woman then. These bodies are a complex set of relationships and products of history, labour, environment and living conditions. Through this understanding we can safely assume then that sex and gender interact with each other in much more complex ways.

The second kind of complexity in this argument, according to Menon (2008), comes from the school of radical feminism, which argues for retaining the priority of biological differences, as this is what differentiates women from men and prevents us from falling into the unmarked category of the universal individual. Menon (2008) writes, “Radical feminists claim that on the contrary, patriarchal social values have denigrated “feminine” qualities and that it is the task of feminism to recover these qualities, and this difference between men and women, as valuable. The radical feminist position on the sex/gender distinction is that there are certain differences between men and women that arise from their different biological reproductive roles, and that therefore, women are more sensitive, instinctive and closer to nature”.

A third kind of understanding of this issues comes from the post modern perspective about the body and sexuality. Menon(2008)takes recourse to Judith Butler’s understanding of sexuality to say that, “Butler uses the term *heterosexual matrix* to designate the grid produced by institutions, practices and discourses, looking through which it appears to be “a fact of nature” that all human bodies possess one of two fixed sexual identities, with each experiencing sexual desire only for the “opposite sex.” From this view point, the removal of this grid or heterosexual matrix will reveal that sexuality and human bodies are fluid and have no necessary fixed sexual identity or orientation”.

9.5: SUMMARY

Creating exclusive spaces for women can be beneficial for limited purposes and contexts. It will enhance public participation, access to public spaces and economy, which will lead to certain kinds of empowerment. However, in the longer run there is a serious need for changing the overall structure of the public and the private spheres in order for them to become more egalitarian, equal

and gender friendly. However, the debate of difference vs. sameness creates a problem here. Do we want a gender-neutral environment which treats everyone equally, without due consideration to specific histories and problems? This is the condition where there is enough stress on formal equality but substantial equality lacks a bit. This is because while formally and legally everyone will be equal, yet in practice, since different people would have had different starting points in life, they would also have different life outcomes. For instance, if we look at existing public institutions like banks and schools, not every woman is able to access them because of varying life circumstances. Poverty, lack of freedom, lack of economic security and community restrictions can be the various reasons why women from certain contexts cannot access education or banks in spite of the facilities being there, i.e., substantial or actual opportunity and equality is missing even though the formal arrangements are present. A woman only school or college or bank will thus improve this state of affairs as women and their communities may feel safer and more enabled in these cordoned off spaces. Our experience with women colleges has been largely positive in this regard.

9.6: KEY TERMS

- **Patriarchy:** A social system in which men hold primary power and dominate roles in political leadership, moral authority, social privilege, and control of property.
- **Gender Equality:** The state in which access to rights or opportunities is unaffected by gender.
- **Intersectionality:** A framework for understanding how various forms of inequality and discrimination intersect and impact individuals differently based on their multiple identities, such as race, class, gender, and sexuality.
- **Sexism:** Prejudice or discrimination based on a person's sex or gender, often resulting in the devaluation of one gender over another.
- **Misogyny:** The dislike of, contempt for, or ingrained prejudice against women.
- **Patriarchal Norms:** Societal rules and expectations that reinforce male dominance and female subordination.

9.7: SELF ASSESSMENT QUESTIONS

- Discuss the basic features of feminism.

- Discuss feminist perspective of Politics.
- Discuss the basic difference between Sex and Gender.

9.8: REFERENCES

Buckingham, Susan (2020) Gender and Environment, In Diana Richardson and Victoria Robinson (Eds.) *Introducing Gender and women's studies*, Red Globe Press: London.

Kurian, Alka (2017) *Feminism and the Developing World*, In Sarah Gamble (Eds) *The Routledge Companion to Feminism and Postfeminism*, Routledge: London.

Rao, Manisha (2012) *Ecofeminism at the Crossroads in India: A Review*, DEP, No 20.

Shiva, Vandana (1988) *Staying Alive: Women, Ecology and Survival in India*, New Delhi: Kali for Women.

Warren, Karen & N. Erkal (1997) *Ecofeminism: Women, Culture and Nature*.

Warren, Karen (2000) *Ecofeminist Philosophy*, New York: Rowman and Littlefield Publishers.

UNIT-10: ECO-FEMINISM

Structure

- 10.1 Objectives
- 10.2 Introduction
- 10.3 Defining Eco-Feminism
- 10.4 Gendering Nature
- 10.5 Major Critique
- 10.6 Summary
- 10.7 Key Terms
- 10.8 Self Assessment Questions
- 10.9 References

10.1: OBJECTIVES

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

- Defining Eco-Feminism
- Gendering the Nature

10.2: INTRODUCTION

Eco-feminism is a branch of feminism and political ecology. Ecofeminist thinkers draw on the concept of gender to analyse the relationships between humans and the natural world. The term was coined by the French writer Françoise d'Eaubonne in her book *Le Féminisme ou la Mort* (1974). Eco-feminist theory asserts a feminist perspective of Green politics that calls for an egalitarian, collaborative society in which there is no one dominant group. Today, there are several branches of eco-feminism, with varying approaches and analyses, including liberal eco-feminism, spiritual/cultural eco-feminism, and social/socialist eco-feminism (or materialist ecofeminism). Interpretations of eco-feminism and how it might be applied to social thought include ecofeminist art, social justice and political philosophy, religion, contemporary feminism, and poetry.

Eco-feminist analysis explores the connections between women and nature in culture, economy, religion, politics, literature and iconography, and addresses the parallels between the oppression of nature and the oppression of women. These parallels include, but are not limited to, seeing women

and nature as property, seeing men as the curators of culture and women as the curators of nature, and how men dominate women and humans dominate nature. Ecofeminism emphasizes that both women and nature must be respected.

Though the scope of eco-feminist analysis is dynamic, American author and eco-feminist Charlene Spretnak has offered one way of categorizing eco-feminist work: 1) through the study of political theory as well as history; 2) through the belief and study of nature-based religions; 3) through environmentalism.

10.3: DEFINING ECO-FEMINISM

The application of eco-feminism to animal rights has established vegetarian eco-feminism, which asserts that "omitting the oppression of animals from feminist and eco-feminist analyses ... is inconsistent with the activist and philosophical foundations of both feminism (as a "movement to end all forms of oppression") and ecofeminism." It puts into practice "the personal is political", as many ecofeminists believe that "meat-eating is a form of patriarchal domination...that suggests a link between male violence and a meat-based diet." During a 1995 interview with *On the Issues*, Carol J. Adams stated, "Manhood is constructed in our culture in part by access to meat-eating and control of other bodies, whether it's women or animals". According to Adams, "We cannot work for justice and challenge the oppression of nature without understanding that the most frequent way we interact with nature is by eating animals". Vegetarian ecofeminism combines sympathy with the analysis of culture and politics to refine a system of ethics and action.

The key activist-scholars in materialist ecofeminism are Maria Mies and Veronika Bennholdt-Thomsen in Germany; Vandana Shiva in India; Ariel Salleh in Australia; Mary Mellor in the UK; and Ana Isla in Peru. Materialist ecofeminism is not widely known in North America aside from the journal collective at *Capitalism Nature Socialism*. A materialist view connects institutions such as labor, power, and property as the source of domination over women and nature. There are connections made between these subjects because of the values of production and reproduction. This dimension of ecofeminism may also be referred to as "social feminism", "socialist ecofeminism", or "Marxist ecofeminism". According to Carolyn Merchant, "Social ecofeminism advocates the liberation of women through overturning economic and social hierarchies that turn all aspects of life into a market society that today even invades the womb". Ecofeminism in this

sense seeks to eliminate social hierarchies which favor the production of commodities (dominated by men) over biological and social reproduction.

Spiritual ecofeminism is another branch of ecofeminism, and it is popular among ecofeminist authors such as Starhawk, Riane Eisler, and Carol J. Adams. Starhawk calls this an earth-based spirituality, which recognizes that the Earth is alive, and that we are an interconnected community. Spiritual ecofeminism is not linked to one specific religion, but is centered around values of caring, compassion, and non-violence. Often, ecofeminists refer to more ancient traditions, such as the worship of Gaia, the Goddess of nature and spirituality (also known as Mother Earth). Wicca and Paganism are particularly influential to spiritual ecofeminism. Most Wicca covens demonstrate a deep respect for nature, a feminine outlook, and an aim to establish strong community values.

In her book *Radical Ecology*, Carolyn Merchant refers to spiritual ecofeminism as "cultural ecofeminism". According to Merchant, cultural ecofeminism, "celebrates the relationship between women and nature through the revival of ancient rituals centered on goddess worship, the moon, animals, and the female reproductive system." In this sense, cultural ecofeminists tend to value intuition, an ethic of caring, and human-nature interrelationships.

10.4: GENDERING NATURE

Ecofeminist theory asserts that capitalism reflects only paternalistic and patriarchal values. This notion implies that the effects of capitalism have not benefited women and has led to a harmful split between nature and culture. In the 1970s, early ecofeminists discussed that the split can only be healed by the feminine instinct for nurture and holistic knowledge of nature's processes.

Since then, several ecofeminist scholars have made the distinction that it is not *because* women are female or "feminine" that they relate to nature, but because of their similar states of oppression by the same male-dominant forces. The marginalization is evident in the gendered language used to describe nature, such as "Mother Earth" or "Mother Nature", and the animalized language used to describe women in derogatory terms. Some discourses link women specifically to the environment because of their traditional social role as a nurturer and caregiver. Ecofeminists following in this line of thought believe that these connections are illustrated through the coherence of socially-

labeled values associated with 'femininity' such as nurturing, which are present both among women and in nature.

Alternatively, ecofeminist and activist Vandana Shiva wrote that women have a special connection to the environment through their daily interactions and that this connection has been underestimated. According to Shiva, women in subsistence economies who produce "wealth in partnership with nature, have been experts in their own right of holistic and ecological knowledge of nature's processes". She makes the point that "these alternative modes of knowing, which are oriented to the social benefits and sustenance needs are not recognized by the capitalist reductionist paradigm, because it fails to perceive the interconnectedness of nature, or the connection of women's lives, work and knowledge with the creation of wealth (23)". Shiva blames this failure on the Western patriarchal perceptions of development and progress. According to Shiva, patriarchy has labeled women, nature, and other groups not growing the economy as "unproductive". Similarly, Australian ecofeminist Ariel Salleh deepens this materialist ecofeminist approach in dialogue with green politics, ecosocialism, genetic engineering and climate policy.

10.5: MAJOR CRITIQUE

In the 1980s and 1990s ecofeminism began to be heavily critiqued as 'essentialism'. The critics believed ecofeminism to be reinforcing patriarchal dominance and norms. Post structural and third wave feminists argued that ecofeminism equated women with nature and that this dichotomy grouped all women into one category enforcing the very societal norms that feminism is trying to break.

Ecofeminism demonstrates an adherence to the strict dichotomy, among others, between men and women. Some critiques of ecofeminism note that the dichotomy between women and men and nature and culture creates a dualism that is too stringent and focused on the differences of women and men. In this sense, ecofeminism too strongly correlates the social status of women with the social status of nature, rather than the non-essentialist view that women along with nature have both feminine and masculine qualities, and that just as feminine qualities have often been seen as less worthy, nature is also seen as having lesser value than culture.

Eco-feminism asserts a divergent view regarding participation in existing social structures. As

opposed to radical and liberation-based feminist movements, mainstream feminism is tightly bound with hegemonic social status and strives to promote equality within the existing social and political structure, such as making it possible for women to occupy positions of power in business, industry and politics, using direct involvement as the main tactic for achieving pay equity and influence. In contrast, many ecofeminists oppose active engagement in these areas, as these are the very structures that the movement intends to dismantle.

Ecofeminist and author Noel Sturgeon says in an interview that what anti-essentialists are critiquing is a strategy used to mobilize large and diverse groups of both theorists and activists. Additionally, according to ecofeminist and author Charlene Spretnak, modern ecofeminism is concerned about a variety of issues, including reproductive technology, equal pay and equal rights, toxic pollution, Third World development, and more.

As it propelled into the 21st century, ecofeminists became aware of the criticisms, and in response they began doing research and renaming the topic, i.e. queer ecologies, global feminist environmental justice, and gender and the environment. The essentialism concern was mostly found among North American academics. In Europe and the global South, class, race, gender and species dominations were framed by more grounded materialist understandings.

Socialist feminist critiques

Social ecologist and feminist Janet Biehl has criticized ecofeminism for focusing too much on a mystical connection between women and nature and not enough on the actual conditions of women. She has also stated that rather than being a forward-moving theory, ecofeminism is an anti-progressive movement for women. The ecofeminist believes that women and nature have a strong bond because of their shared history of patriarchal oppression; whereas, the socialist feminist focuses on gender roles in the political economy. The socialist feminist may oppose the ecofeminist by arguing that women do not have an intrinsic connection with nature; rather, that is a socially constructed narrative.

Rosemary Radford Ruether also critiqued this focus on mysticism over work that focuses on helping women, but argues that spirituality and activism can be combined effectively in ecofeminism.

10.6: SUMMARY

This unit brings together the shared cause of women and the environment. It emphasizes the following elements of eco-feminism. The close interaction of women with the environment and nature. Dependence of women of third world countries on the environment for their needs and survival. Subordination and exploitation of both women and nature at the hand of a male-dominated and constructed society. This chapter highlights two major United Nations agreements viz. Agenda 21 and the Beijing Platform for Action on Women recognize women's role in environmental protection and preservation. The chapter also explains how gender and environment are mutually constituted: that depending on our gender, we experience environmental problems differently; that a dominant world views in which both women and nature are secondary to men. The unprecedented challenges, the present world is facing due to the environmental crisis demand collective action.

10.7: KEY TERMS

- **Ecological Justice:** The principle that all people, regardless of their social status, should have equal access to a healthy environment and that environmental harm is often linked with social injustice.
- **Environmental Racism:** The disproportionate impact of environmental hazards on people of color and marginalized communities.
- **Biocentrism:** An ethical perspective that considers all living beings as having intrinsic value, not just humans. Ecofeminism often incorporates biocentric ideas to challenge human-centric environmental policies.
- **Ecojustice:** A framework that combines ecological and social justice, focusing on the fair distribution of environmental benefits and burdens.
- **Sustainability:** The practice of meeting current needs without compromising the ability of future generations to meet their own needs. In ecofeminism, sustainability often includes social dimensions, such as gender equity.

- **Deep Ecology:** A philosophy that emphasizes the intrinsic value of all living beings and the need for a fundamental shift in human attitudes towards nature.
- **Green Feminism:** A term sometimes used interchangeably with ecofeminism, emphasizing the feminist critique of environmental policies and the integration of feminist principles into environmentalism.

10.8: SELF ASSESSMENT QUESTIONS

- What do you mean by Eco-Feminism?
- Discuss how feminism is related to ecology.
- Find out the steps towards gendering nature.
- Critically discussed about Eco-feminism.

10.9: REFERENCES

- Buckingham, Susan (June 2004) Ecofeminism in the 21st century, *The Geographical Journal*, 170
- Buckingham, Susan (2020) Gender and Environment, In Diana Richardson and Victoria Robinson (Eds.) *Introducing Gender and women's studies*, Red Globe Press: London.
- Kurian, Alka (2017) Feminism and the Developing World, In Sarah Gamble (Eds) *The Routledge Companion to Feminism and Postfeminism*, Routledge: London.
- Rao, Manisha (2012) Ecofeminism at the Crossroads in India: A Review, *DEP*, No 20.
- Shiva, Vandana (1988) *Staying Alive: Women, Ecology and Survival in India*, New Delhi: Kali for Women.
- Warren, Karen & N. Erkal (1997) *Ecofeminism: Women, Culture and Nature*.
- Warren, Karen (2000) *Ecofeminist Philosophy*, New York: Rowman and Littlefield Publishers.

BLOCK-3: POLITICAL THEORY AND PRACTICE

Unit-11: Democracy: Origin, Meaning and Development

Unit-12: Democracy: Liberal and Marxist

Unit-13: Contemporary Theories of Democracy

Unit-14: Democracy and Citizenship

Unit-15: Procedural Democracy and Its Critique

UNIT-11: DEMOCRACY: ORIGIN, MEANING AND DEVELOPMENT

Structure

- 11.1 Objectives
- 11.2 Introduction
- 11.3 Democracy: Origin & Development
- 11.4 Features of Democracy
- 11.5 Democratic Transitions
- 11.6 Summary
- 11.7 Key Terms
- 11.8 Self Assessment Questions
- 11.9 References

11.1: OBJECTIVES

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

- Origin and growth of Democracy
- The basic features of Democracy
- The concept of Democratic Transitions

11.2: INTRODUCTION

The notion of democracy has evolved considerably over time. Throughout history, one can find evidence of direct democracy, in which communities make decisions through popular assembly. Today, the dominant form of democracy is representative democracy, where citizens elect government officials to govern on their behalf such as in a parliamentary or presidential democracy. Most democracies apply in most cases majority rule, but in some cases plurality rule, supermajority rule (e.g. constitution) or consensus rule (e.g. Switzerland) are applied. They serve the crucial purpose of inclusiveness and broader legitimacy on sensitive issues—counterbalancing majoritarianism—and therefore mostly take precedence on a constitutional level. In the common variant of liberal democracy, the powers of the majority are exercised within the framework of a representative democracy, but a constitution and supreme court limit the majority and protect the minority—usually through securing the enjoyment by all of certain individual rights, such as freedom of speech or freedom of association.

The term appeared in the 5th century BC in Greek city-states, notably Classical Athens, to mean "rule of the people", in contrast to aristocracy, meaning "rule of an elite". Western democracy, as distinct from that which existed in antiquity, is generally considered to have originated in city-states such as those in Classical Athens and the Roman Republic, where various degrees of enfranchisement of the free male population were observed. In virtually all democratic governments throughout ancient and modern history, democratic citizenship was initially restricted to an elite class, which was later extended to all adult citizens. In most modern democracies, this was achieved through the suffrage movements of the 19th and 20th centuries.

Democracy contrasts with forms of government where power is not vested in the general population of a state, such as authoritarian systems. World public opinion strongly favors democratic systems of government. According to the V-Dem Democracy indices and The Economist Democracy Index, less than half the world's population lives in a democracy as of 2022.

11.3: DEMOCRACY: ORIGIN AND DEVELOPMENT

The term democracy first appeared in ancient Greek political and philosophical thought in the city-state of Athens during classical antiquity. The word comes from *dêmos* '(common) people' and *krátos* 'force/might'. Under Cleisthenes, what is generally held as the first example of a type of democracy in 508–507 BC was established in Athens. Cleisthenes is referred to as "the father of Athenian democracy". The first attested use of the word democracy is found in prose works of the 430s BC, such as Herodotus' *Histories*, but its usage was older by several decades, as two Athenians born in the 470s were named Democrates, a new political name—likely in support of democracy—given at a time of debates over constitutional issues in Athens. Aeschylus also strongly alludes to the word in his play *The Suppliants*, staged in c.463 BC, where he mentions "the demos's ruling hand". Before that time, the word used to define the new political system of Cleisthenes was probably *isonomia*, meaning political equality.

Athenian democracy took the form of direct democracy, and it had two distinguishing features: the random selection of ordinary citizens to fill the few existing government administrative and judicial offices, and a legislative assembly consisting of all Athenian citizens. All eligible citizens were allowed to speak and vote in the assembly, which set the laws of the city-state. However, Athenian citizenship excluded women, slaves, foreigners and youths below the age of military

service. Effectively, only 1 in 4 residents in Athens qualified as citizens. Owning land was not a requirement for citizenship. The exclusion of large parts of the population from the citizen body is closely related to the ancient understanding of citizenship. In most of antiquity the benefit of citizenship was tied to the obligation to fight war campaigns.

Athenian democracy was not only direct in the sense that decisions were made by the assembled people, but also the most direct in the sense that the people through the assembly, boule and courts of law controlled the entire political process and a large proportion of citizens were involved constantly in the public business. Even though the rights of the individual were not secured by the Athenian constitution in the modern sense (the ancient Greeks had no word for "rights"), those who were citizens of Athens enjoyed their liberties not in opposition to the government but by living in a city that was not subject to another power and by not being subjects themselves to the rule of another person.

Range voting appeared in Sparta as early as 700 BC. The Spartan ecclesia was an assembly of the people, held once a month, in which every male citizen of at least 20 years of age could participate. In the assembly, Spartans elected leaders and cast votes by range voting and shouting (the vote is then decided on how loudly the crowd shouts). Aristotle called this "childish", as compared with the stone voting ballots used by the Athenian citizenry. Sparta adopted it because of its simplicity, and to prevent any biased voting, buying, or cheating that was predominant in the early democratic elections.

Even though the Roman Republic contributed significantly to many aspects of democracy, only a minority of Romans were citizens with votes in elections for representatives. The votes of the powerful were given more weight through a system of weighted voting, so most high officials, including members of the Senate, came from a few wealthy and noble families. In addition, the overthrow of the Roman Kingdom was the first case in the Western world of a polity being formed with the explicit purpose of being a republic, although it didn't have much of a democracy. The Roman model of governance inspired many political thinkers over the centuries.

Ancient India

Vaishali, capital city of the Vajjika League (Vriji mahajanapada) of India, is considered one of the first examples of a republic around the 6th century BC.

Americas

Other cultures, such as the Iroquois in the Americas also developed a form of democratic society between 1450 and 1660 (and possibly in 1142), well before contact with the Europeans. This democracy continues to the present day and is the world's oldest standing representative democracy.

Middle Ages

While most regions in Europe during the Middle Ages were ruled by clergy or feudal lords, there existed various systems involving elections or assemblies, although often only involving a small part of the population. In Scandinavia, bodies known as things consisted of freemen presided by a lawspeaker. These deliberative bodies were responsible for settling political questions, and variants included the Althing in Iceland and the Løgting in the Faeroe Islands. The veche, found in Eastern Europe, was a similar body to the Scandinavian thing. In the Roman Catholic Church, the pope has been elected by a papal conclave composed of cardinals since 1059. The first documented parliamentary body in Europe was the Cortes of León. Established by Alfonso IX in 1188, the Cortes had authority over setting taxation, foreign affairs and legislating, though the exact nature of its role remains disputed. The Republic of Ragusa, established in 1358 and centered around the city of Dubrovnik, provided representation and voting rights to its male aristocracy only. Various Italian city-states and polities had republic forms of government. For instance, the Republic of Florence, established in 1115, was led by the Signoria whose members were chosen by sortition. In the 10th–15th century Frisia, a distinctly non-feudal society, the right to vote on local matters and on county officials was based on land size. The Kouroukan Fougá divided the Mali Empire into ruling clans (lineages) that were represented at a great assembly called the Gbara. However, the charter made Mali more similar to a constitutional monarchy than a democratic republic.

The Parliament of England had its roots in the restrictions on the power of kings written into Magna Carta (1215), which explicitly protected certain rights of the King's subjects and implicitly supported what became the English writ of habeas corpus, safeguarding individual freedom against unlawful imprisonment with the right to appeal. The first representative national assembly in England was Simon de Montfort's Parliament in 1265. The emergence of petitioning is some of the earliest evidence of parliament being used as a forum to address the general grievances of ordinary people. However, the power to call parliament remained at the

pleasure of the monarch.

Studies have linked the emergence of parliamentary institutions in Europe during the medieval period to urban agglomeration and the creation of new classes, such as artisans, as well as the presence of nobility and religious elites. Scholars have also linked the emergence of representative government to Europe's relative political fragmentation. Political scientist David Stasavage links the fragmentation of Europe, and its subsequent democratization, to the manner in which the Roman Empire collapsed: Roman territory was conquered by small fragmented groups of Germanic tribes, thus leading to the creation of small political units where rulers were relatively weak and needed the consent of the governed to ward off foreign threats.

In Poland, noble democracy was characterized by an increase in the activity of the middle nobility, which wanted to increase their share in exercising power at the expense of the magnates. Magnates dominated the most important offices in the state (secular and ecclesiastical) and sat on the royal council, later the senate. The growing importance of the middle nobility had an impact on the establishment of the institution of the land sejmik (local assembly), which subsequently obtained more rights. During the fifteenth and first half of the sixteenth century, sejmiks received more and more power and became the most important institutions of local power. In 1454, Casimir IV Jagiellon granted the sejmiks the right to decide on taxes and to convene a mass mobilization in the Nieszawa Statutes. He also pledged not to create new laws without their consent.

Early modern period

In 17th century England, there was renewed interest in Magna Carta. The Parliament of England passed the Petition of Right in 1628 which established certain liberties for subjects. The English Civil War (1642–1651) was fought between the King and an oligarchic but elected Parliament, during which the idea of a political party took form with groups debating rights to political representation during the Putney Debates of 1647. Subsequently, the Protectorate (1653–59) and the English Restoration (1660) restored more autocratic rule, although Parliament passed the Habeas Corpus Act in 1679 which strengthened the convention that forbade detention lacking sufficient cause or evidence. After the Glorious Revolution of 1688, the Bill of Rights was enacted in 1689 which codified certain rights and liberties and is still in effect. The Bill set out the requirement for regular elections, rules for freedom of speech in Parliament and limited the power of the monarch, ensuring that, unlike much of Europe at the time, royal absolutism would not

prevail. Economic historians Douglass North and Barry Weingast have characterized the institutions implemented in the Glorious Revolution as a resounding success in terms of restraining the government and ensuring protection for property rights.

Renewed interest in the Magna Carta, the English Civil War, and the Glorious Revolution in the 17th century prompted the growth of political philosophy on the British Isles. Thomas Hobbes was the first philosopher to articulate a detailed social contract theory. Writing in the *Leviathan* (1651), Hobbes theorized that individuals living in the state of nature led lives that were "solitary, poor, nasty, brutish and short" and constantly waged a war of all against all. In order to prevent the occurrence of an anarchic state of nature, Hobbes reasoned that individuals ceded their rights to a strong, authoritarian power. In other words, Hobbes advocated for an absolute monarchy which, in his opinion, was the best form of government. Later, philosopher and physician John Locke would posit a different interpretation of social contract theory. Writing in his *Two Treatises of Government* (1689), Locke posited that all individuals possessed the inalienable rights to life, liberty and estate (property). According to Locke, individuals would voluntarily come together to form a state for the purposes of defending their rights. Particularly important for Locke were property rights, whose protection Locke deemed to be a government's primary purpose. Furthermore, Locke asserted that governments were legitimate only if they held the consent of the governed. For Locke, citizens had the right to revolt against a government that acted against their interest or became tyrannical. Although they were not widely read during his lifetime, Locke's works are considered the founding documents of liberal thought and profoundly influenced the leaders of the American Revolution and later the French Revolution. His liberal democratic framework of governance remains the preeminent form of democracy in the world.

In the Cossack republics of Ukraine in the 16th and 17th centuries, the Cossack Hetmanate and Zaporizhian Sich, the holder of the highest post of Hetman was elected by the representatives from the country's districts.

In North America, representative government began in Jamestown, Virginia, with the election of the House of Burgesses (forerunner of the Virginia General Assembly) in 1619. English Puritans who migrated from 1620 established colonies in New England whose local governance was democratic; although these local assemblies had some small amounts of devolved power, the ultimate authority was held by the Crown and the English Parliament. The Puritans (Pilgrim Fathers), Baptists, and Quakers who founded these colonies applied the democratic organisation

of their congregations also to the administration of their communities in worldly matters.

By 1960, the vast majority of country-states were nominally democracies, although most of the world's populations lived in nominal democracies that experienced sham elections, and other forms of subterfuge (particularly in "Communist" states and the former colonies). A subsequent wave of democratisation brought substantial gains toward true liberal democracy for many states, dubbed "third wave of democracy". Portugal, Spain, and several of the military dictatorships in South America returned to civilian rule in the 1970s and 1980s. This was followed by countries in East and South Asia by the mid-to-late 1980s. Economic malaise in the 1980s, along with resentment of Soviet oppression, contributed to the collapse of the Soviet Union, the associated end of the Cold War, and the democratisation and liberalisation of the former Eastern bloc countries. The most successful of the new democracies were those geographically and culturally closest to western Europe, and they are now either part of the European Union or candidate states. In 1986, after the toppling of the most prominent Asian dictatorship, the only democratic state of its kind at the time emerged in the Philippines with the rise of Corazon Aquino, who would later be known as the mother of Asian democracy.

The liberal trend spread to some states in Africa in the 1990s, most prominently in South Africa. Some recent examples of attempts of liberalisation include the Indonesian Revolution of 1998, the Bulldozer Revolution in Yugoslavia, the Rose Revolution in Georgia, the Orange Revolution in Ukraine, the Cedar Revolution in Lebanon, the Tulip Revolution in Kyrgyzstan, and the Jasmine Revolution in Tunisia.

11.4: FEATURES OF DEMOCRACY

Democracy is a form of government where power is vested in the hands of the people, either directly or through elected representatives. Key features of democracy include:

Free and Fair Elections

Citizens have the right to vote in regular, free, and fair elections. These elections allow people to choose their representatives and leaders.

Rule of Law

The rule of law is central to democracy. All individuals and institutions, including the

government, are subject to the law. No one is above the law.

Protection of Fundamental Rights

Democracies guarantee the protection of fundamental human rights, such as freedom of speech, religion, assembly, and the press. Citizens can express themselves freely without fear of repression.

Separation of Powers

Democratic systems often feature a separation of powers between the executive, legislative, and judicial branches of government. This ensures checks and balances, preventing any single branch from becoming too powerful.

Majority Rule with Respect for Minority Rights

Decisions in a democracy are often made by majority rule, but there are protections to ensure that the rights of minority groups are not infringed upon.

Political Pluralism

Democracy supports political pluralism, allowing for multiple political parties and interest groups to exist and participate in governance. It encourages a diversity of opinions and ideologies.

Accountability and Transparency

Elected officials in a democracy are accountable to the people. Government activities and decision-making processes are transparent, enabling citizens to be informed and hold their leaders responsible.

Citizen Participation

Democracy encourages active participation of citizens in political processes, not only through voting but also through civic engagement, protests, and dialogue with government representatives.

Independent Judiciary

A key feature of democracy is an independent judiciary that interprets and enforces laws impartially, without influence from the executive or legislative branches.

Decentralization of Power

Power in democracies is often decentralized, with local governments having authority over certain matters, allowing for more direct participation by citizens in governance at local levels.

These features combine to create an environment where people have a say in how they are governed, fostering freedom, equality, and justice.

11.5: DEMOCRATIC TRANSITIONS

Democratization, or democratisation, is the structural government transition from an authoritarian government to a more democratic political regime, including substantive political changes moving in a democratic direction.

Several philosophers and researchers have outlined historical and social factors seen as supporting the evolution of democracy. Other commentators have mentioned the influence of economic development. In a related theory, Ronald Inglehart suggests that improved living-standards in modern developed countries can convince people that they can take their basic survival for granted, leading to increased emphasis on self-expression values, which correlates closely with democracy.

Douglas M. Gibler and Andrew Owsiak in their study argued about the importance of peace and stable borders for the development of democracy. It has often been assumed that democracy causes peace, but this study shows that, historically, peace has almost always predated the establishment of democracy.

Carroll Quigley concludes that the characteristics of weapons are the main predictor of democracy: Democracy—this scenario—tends to emerge only when the best weapons available are easy for individuals to obtain and use. By the 1800s, guns were the best personal weapons available, and in the United States of America (already nominally democratic), almost everyone could afford to buy a gun, and could learn how to use it fairly easily. Governments could not do any better: it became the age of mass armies of citizen soldiers with guns. Similarly, Periclean Greece was an age of the citizen soldier and democracy.

Other theories stressed the relevance of education and of human capital—and within them

of cognitive ability to increasing tolerance, rationality, political literacy and participation. Two effects of education and cognitive ability are distinguished:

- a cognitive effect (competence to make rational choices, better information-processing)
- an ethical effect (support of democratic values, freedom, human rights etc.), which itself depends on intelligence.

Evidence consistent with conventional theories of why democracy emerges and is sustained has been hard to come by. Statistical analyses have challenged modernisation theory by demonstrating that there is no reliable evidence for the claim that democracy is more likely to emerge when countries become wealthier, more educated, or less unequal. In fact, empirical evidence shows that economic growth and education may not lead to increased demand for democratization as modernization theory suggests: historically, most countries attained high levels of access to primary education well before transitioning to democracy. Rather than acting as a catalyst for democratization, in some situations education provision may instead be used by non-democratic regimes to indoctrinate their subjects and strengthen their power.

The assumed link between education and economic growth is called into question when analyzing empirical evidence. Across different countries, the correlation between education attainment and math test scores is very weak (.07). A similarly weak relationship exists between per-pupil expenditures and math competency (.26). Additionally, historical evidence suggests that average human capital (measured using literacy rates) of the masses does not explain the onset of industrialization in France from 1750 to 1850 despite arguments to the contrary. Together, these findings show that education does not always promote human capital and economic growth as is generally argued to be the case. Instead, the evidence implies that education provision often falls short of its expressed goals, or, alternatively, that political actors use education to promote goals other than economic growth and development.

Some scholars have searched for the "deep" determinants of contemporary political institutions, be they geographical or demographic.

An example of this is the disease environment. Places with different mortality rates had different populations and productivity levels around the world. For example, in Africa, the tsetse fly—which afflicts humans and livestock—reduced the ability of Africans to plough the land. This

made Africa less settled. As a consequence, political power was less concentrated. This also affected the colonial institutions European countries established in Africa. Whether colonial settlers could live or not in a place made them develop different institutions which led to different economic and social paths. This also affected the distribution of power and the collective actions people could take. As a result, some African countries ended up having democracies and others autocracies.

An example of geographical determinants for democracy is having access to coastal areas and rivers. This natural endowment has a positive relation with economic development thanks to the benefits of trade. Trade brought economic development, which in turn, broadened power. Rulers wanting to increase revenues had to protect property-rights to create incentives for people to invest. As more people had more power, more concessions had to be made by the ruler and in many places this process led to democracy. These determinants defined the structure of the society moving the balance of political power.

Robert Michels asserts that although democracy can never be fully realised, democracy may be developed automatically in the act of striving for democracy:

The peasant in the fable, when on his deathbed, tells his sons that a treasure is buried in the field. After the old man's death the sons dig everywhere in order to discover the treasure. They do not find it. But their indefatigable labor improves the soil and secures for them a comparative well-being. The treasure in the fable may well symbolise democracy.

Democracy in modern times has almost always faced opposition from the previously existing government, and many times it has faced opposition from social elites. The implementation of a democratic government from a non-democratic state is typically brought by peaceful or violent democratic revolution.

11.6: SUMMARY

The emergence of the internet and the social media has profoundly altered the conditions for political communication. The social media have given ordinary citizens easy access to voice their opinion and share information while bypassing the filters of the large news media. This is often seen as an advantage for democracy. The new possibilities for communication have fundamentally changed the way social movements and protest movements operate and organize.

The internet and social media have provided powerful new tools for democracy movements in developing countries and emerging democracies, enabling them to bypass censorship, voice their opinions, and organize protests. A serious problem with the social media is that they have no truth filters. The established news media have to guard their reputation as trustworthy, while ordinary citizens may post unreliable information. In fact, studies show that false stories are going more viral than true stories. The proliferation of false stories and conspiracy theories may undermine public trust in the political system and public officials. Reliable information sources are essential for the democratic process. Less democratic governments rely heavily on censorship, propaganda, and misinformation in order to stay in power, while independent sources of information are able to undermine their legitimacy.

11.7: KEY TERMS

- **Class Struggle:** The ongoing conflict between different classes in society, primarily between the working class (proletariat) and the owning class (bourgeoisie). This struggle is seen as the driving force of historical and social change.
- **Proletariat:** The working class who do not own the means of production and must sell their labor to survive.
- **Bourgeoisie:** The capitalist class who own the means of production and exploit the labor of the proletariat.
- **Dictatorship of the Proletariat:** A temporary state in which the working class holds political power, aiming to dismantle the structures of the capitalist state and transition to a classless society.
- **Means of Production:** The facilities and resources (factories, land, capital) used to produce goods and services. In Marxist theory, control over the means of production is central to class power.
- **Communism:** The final stage of Marxist theory, characterized by a classless, stateless society in which the means of production are commonly owned, and goods and services are distributed based on need.
- **Socialism:** The transitional stage between capitalism and communism where the working class controls the state and the means of production are publicly or commonly owned.
- **Surplus Value:** The value produced by labor that exceeds the cost of labor, which is appropriated by capitalists as profit. This concept is central to the critique of capitalist

exploitation.

- **Historical Materialism:** The Marxist theory that material conditions and economic factors are the primary influences on historical development and social change.
- **Dialectical Materialism:** The Marxist philosophy that political and historical events result from the conflict of social forces and are interpreted through a dialectical process of thesis, antithesis, and synthesis.
- **Revolution:** The radical and fundamental change in the political, economic, and social structure of society, often envisioned by Marxists as a proletarian revolution overthrowing capitalist structures.

11.8: SELF ASSESSMENT QUESTIONS

- What is Democracy? Discuss its features.
- Discuss about various types of Democracy.
- Write a note on Liberal perspective of democracy.
- Write a note on Marxist perspective of democracy.

11.9: REFERENCES

Tangian, Andranik (2020). Analytical Theory of Democracy: History, Mathematics and Applications. Studies in Choice and Welfare. Cham, Switzerland: Springer. ISBN 978-3-030-39690-9.

"Definition of DEMOCRACY". www.merriam-webster.com. Retrieved 5 July 2018. Locke, John. Two Treatises on Government: a Translation into Modern English. Oxford English Dictionary: "democracy".

UNIT-12: DEMOCRACY: LIBERAL AND MARXIST

Structure

- 12.1 Objectives
- 12.2 Introduction
- 12.3 Democracy: Meaning and types
- 12.4 Liberal Democracy
- 12.5 Marxist Democracy
- 12.6 Summary
- 12.7 Key Terms
- 12.8 Self Assessment Questions
- 12.9 References

12.1: OBJECTIVES

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

- Meaning and types of Democracy
- The concept of Liberal Democracy
- The concept of Marxist Democracy

12.2: INTRODUCTION

Democracy is a system of government in which state power is vested in the people or the general population of a state. Under a minimalist definition of democracy, rulers are elected through competitive elections while more expansive definitions link democracy to guarantees of civil liberties and human rights in addition to competitive elections.

In a direct democracy, the people have the direct authority to deliberate and decide legislation. In a representative democracy, the people choose governing officials through elections to do so. Who is considered part of "the people" and how authority is shared among or delegated by the people has changed over time and at different rates in different countries. Features of democracy oftentimes include freedom of assembly, association, personal property, freedom of religion and speech, citizenship, consent of the governed, voting rights, freedom from unwarranted governmental deprivation of the right to life and liberty, and minority rights. The notion of

democracy has evolved considerably over time. Throughout history, one can find evidence of direct democracy, in which communities make decisions through popular assembly. Today, the dominant form of democracy is representative democracy, where citizens elect government officials to govern on their behalf such as in a parliamentary or presidential democracy. Most democracies apply in most cases majority rule, but in some cases plurality rule, supermajority rule (e.g. constitution) or consensus rule (e.g. Switzerland) are applied. They serve the crucial purpose of inclusiveness and broader legitimacy on sensitive issues—counterbalancing majoritarianism—and therefore mostly take precedence on a constitutional level. In the common variant of liberal democracy, the powers of the majority are exercised within the framework of a representative democracy, but a constitution and supreme court limit the majority and protect the minority—usually through securing the enjoyment by all of certain individual rights, such as freedom of speech or freedom of association.

The term appeared in the 5th century BC in Greek city-states, notably Classical Athens, to mean "rule of the people", in contrast to aristocracy, meaning "rule of an elite". Western democracy, as distinct from that which existed in antiquity, is generally considered to have originated in city-states such as those in Classical Athens and the Roman Republic, where various degrees of enfranchisement of the free male population were observed. In virtually all democratic governments throughout ancient and modern history, democratic citizenship was initially restricted to an elite class, which was later extended to all adult citizens. In most modern democracies, this was achieved through the suffrage movements of the 19th and 20th centuries.

Democracy contrasts with forms of government where power is not vested in the general population of a state, such as authoritarian systems. World public opinion strongly favors democratic systems of government.

12.3: DEMOCRACY: MEANING AND TYPES

Although democracy is generally understood to be defined by voting, no consensus exists on a precise definition of democracy. Karl Popper says that the "classical" view of democracy is, "in brief, the theory that democracy is the rule of the people, and that the people have a right to rule".

Democratic principles are reflected in all eligible citizens being equal before the law and having equal access to legislative processes. For example, in a representative democracy, every vote has

(in theory) equal weight, and the freedom of eligible citizens is secured by legitimised rights and liberties which are typically enshrined in a constitution, while other uses of "democracy" may encompass direct democracy, in which citizens vote on issues directly. According to the United Nations, democracy "provides an environment that respects human rights and fundamental freedoms, and in which the freely expressed will of people is exercised."

One theory holds that democracy requires three fundamental principles: upward control (sovereignty residing at the lowest levels of authority), political equality, and social norms by which individuals and institutions only consider acceptable acts that reflect the first two principles of upward control and political equality. Legal equality, political freedom and rule of law are often identified by commentators as foundational characteristics for a well-functioning democracy.

In some countries, notably in the United Kingdom (which originated the Westminster system), the dominant principle is that of parliamentary sovereignty, while maintaining judicial independence.^{[24][25]} In India, parliamentary sovereignty is subject to the Constitution of India which includes judicial review. Though the term "democracy" is typically used in the context of a political state, the principles also are potentially applicable to private organisations, such as clubs, societies and firms.

Democracies may use many different decision-making methods, but majority rule is the dominant form. Without compensation, like legal protections of individual or group rights, political minorities can be oppressed by the "tyranny of the majority". Majority rule involves a competitive approach, opposed to consensus democracy, creating the need that elections, and generally deliberation, be substantively and procedurally "fair," i.e. just and equitable. In some countries, freedom of political expression, freedom of speech, and freedom of the press are considered important to ensure that voters are well informed, enabling them to vote according to their own interests and beliefs.

It has also been suggested that a basic feature of democracy is the capacity of all voters to participate freely and fully in the life of their society. With its emphasis on notions of social contract and the collective will of all the voters, democracy can also be characterised as a form of political collectivism because it is defined as a form of government in which all eligible citizens have an equal say in lawmaking.

Republics, though often popularly associated with democracy because of the shared principle of rule by consent of the governed, are not necessarily democracies, as republicanism does not specify *how* the people are to rule. Classically the term "republic" encompassed both democracies and aristocracies. In a modern sense the republican form of government is a form of government without a monarch. Because of this, democracies can be republics or constitutional monarchies, such as the United Kingdom.

Democracy is justified as having intrinsic as well as instrumental value. When democracy is valued as being good in itself it is held as having intrinsic value. It is valued as good because it is the fairest way of giving expression to equality among citizens. On the other hand, democracy may also be valued instrumentally. It is so because it fosters competition among political leaders and provides the people of the country with a better choice of leadership. It is instrumental in the sense that it makes everyone feel that they were a part of the decision-making process. It is also a way of minimizing the abuse of political power, by distributing it equally among citizens. Another explanation for being instrumental is its role in human development, to the extent that it encourages people to take responsibility for their political lives. Democracy derives its intrinsic value from its moral superiority as a way of giving effect to political equality. It is a way of arriving at decisions among a group of persons, whether citizens of a polity or members of a neighbourhood association or sports club, democracy is morally superior to any other way of arriving at decisions. This is so because the human race has not been able to devise any other way of arriving at a decision which are binding on all and which takes everybody's interest into account. This implies that people are the best judges of their interests and that equal citizenship rights are necessary to protect those interests.

Let us look at some of the important definitions of democracy as follows :

John Seeley – “Democracy is a government in which everyone has a share”

A.V. Dicey – “Democracy is that form of government in which the governing body is comparatively a large fraction of the population. He treated Democracy as a form of government under which majority opinion determines legislation”

C.C. Maxey – “Democracy is a search for a way of life in which the voluntary free intelligence and activity of men can be harmonized and coordinated with the least possible coercion”.

A.B.Hall – “Democracy is a popular government in the last analysis and for all practical purposes as being that form of political organization in which public opinion has control”.

R.G. Gettle – “Democracy is that form of government in which the masses of the population possesses the right to share in the exercise of sovereign power”

C.B. Macpherson – “Democracy is merely a mechanism for choosing and authorizing governments or in some other way getting laws and political decisions made”

S.M. Lipset – “Democracy may be defined as a political system which supplies regular constitutional opportunities for changing the governing officials and a social mechanism which permits the largest possible part of the population to influence major decisions by choosing among contenders for political office”

Joseph Schumpeter – “The democratic method is that institutional arrangements for arriving at political decisions which realizes the common good by making the people itself decide issues through the election of individuals who are to assemble in order to carry out its will”.

Robert Dahl – “Democracy is concerned with the political process by which ordinary citizens exert a relatively high degree of control over their rulers”

Lord Bryce – “The word democracy has been used ever since the time of Herodotus to denote the form of government in which the ruling power of a state is legally vested not in any particular class or classes but the members of the community as a whole. This means, in communities which act by voting, that rule belongs to the majority, as no other method has been found for determining peaceably and legally what is to be deemed the will of a community which is not unanimous.

Democracy is an evolving concept. So as and when necessary different forms of it arose in different parts of the world. Generally, two forms of democracy are more prevalent. These are - direct and indirect forms of democracy.

Direct Democracy:

A direct form of democracy happens to be the earliest form of democracy. It started functioning from the day democracy was first practised. In a direct democracy, all the people assemble in one place and decide the matters which concern them. It was prevalent in the city-state system of Ancient Greece. There the adult male citizens used to gather together in the Assembly and decide the important issues of the day. Presently this form of democracy is practised in Switzerland. The people of the cantons meet in the Landsgemeinde and elect cantonal officers and adopt legislation. The main tools or devices of direct democracy in Switzerland are Referendum, Initiative and Recall. The referendum is a special procedure of referring a particular bill or constitutional amendment to a popular vote, in which, if a majority of the people vote in favour, the bill becomes law; Initiative is a device which enables a specified number of people to draft a bill and send it to

the legislature for its consideration, and Recall enables the majority to recall their representative from office if they are not satisfied with his or her work.

Indirect Democracy:

Indirect democracy refers to that form of government in which the people elect their representatives to carry on the administration of the country. Indirect democracy depends on the size of the state. In a large state where direct democracy cannot be prevalent, indirect democracy is practised. In the modern age, this form of democracy is more prevalent. The huge population cannot assemble in one place to decide the affairs of the government. Here, the population elect their representatives periodically and these representatives run the government. The people of the land are the ultimate authority. The people elect the representatives for a fixed tenure and after its expiry, the representatives go back to the voters seeking a fresh mandate.

12.4: LIBERAL DEMOCRACY

Liberalism as a concept is of recent origin. It is generally thought to be inseparable from democracy so much so that the term democracy is applied to denote liberal democracy unless otherwise specified. The liberal theory was committed to the individual's right to unlimited acquisition of property and to the capitalist market economy which implies inequality not only in the economic sphere but in the political sphere also. Thus, classical liberalism of the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries insisted on property qualification for the right to vote. This was contrary to the democratic principles which imply equal entitlements of each individual not only in the matter of choosing a government but also to the other advantages accruing from organized life.

Classical liberalism fostered capitalism and a free market economy which were responsible for large-scale industrialization and urbanization. This gave rise to a large working class centered in large industrial cities and forced to live under sub-human condition created by a cruel, competitive economy. In due course this class became conscious of its strength and insisted on a voice at the decision level. Thus the liberal state was forced to accommodate democratic principles in order to save its own existence. The outcome of this combination emerged in the form of liberal democracy. It represents a combination of free market economy with a universal adult franchise. It is an attempt to resolve the conflicting claims of the capitalists and the masses by making gradual concessions in the form of a welfare state. This is, thus, the amalgamation of Universal Adult Franchise and a free market economy. It inspired the emergence of the concept of the welfare state,

which is apparently supposed to gulf the differences between the capitalist and the masses. This form of government has been quite popular throughout time as it is believed to represent the claims of all sections of the people and also gives them adequate rights and earmarks duties of a state.

Liberal democracy is based on certain principles. The principles are:

- (a) Government by consent
- (b) Public Accountability
- (c) Majority Rule
- (d) Constitutional government

The mechanism for making Liberal Democracy successful

Multiparty competition for power: Liberal democracy works as a reconciliation of the varying interests of the available groups and subgroups in the democratic society. This is best reflected in the form of a multiparty system which takes part in the free elections representing varying interests of those groups. The former Soviet Union and the Present People's Republic of China cannot be treated as democracies as they conceded monopoly of power to their respective Communist Parties, in spite of a façade of periodic elections. It supports Open competition.

Openness in public offices: One important feature that distinguishes liberal democracy from feudalism, monarchy and despotism is free and openness in public offices. Any citizen can have access to public office by following the prescribed procedure and fulfilling certain conditions (e.g.: age bar for applying for jobs, fixed term for the legislature etc). However, to secure due representation for all strata of the population, some seats in the decision-making bodies can be reserved for minorities or weaker sections.

Free and fair periodic elections based on Universal Adult Franchise: It is one of the greatest contributions of the liberal democratic tradition to make democracy participatory and representative.

Protection of freedom and liberties of the individuals: It is to the credit of liberal democracy that it provides the opportunity for freedom and liberty to the people. It constitutionally protects freedom and liberty through fundamental and legal rights.

Independence of the Judiciary: The independence of judiciary provides space for freedom and liberty because through this mechanism the organs of the government will be competent enough to deliver justice. Though it is imperative to have interdependence in between the executive and the legislature, it is extremely necessary that the judiciary is left completely independent of any influences. In a liberal democracy usually the judges are appointed strictly on the basis of merit, free from the influence of the politicians which capacitates the judges to deliver judgements freely and fairly thus ensuring justice for all sections.

Space for minority rights: A liberal democracy accommodates diverse groups including the minorities. All are tried to be provided with equality, liberty and justice are accorded proper rights and entitlements.

As discussed above, liberal democracy sprang up by the 18th and 19th centuries in the Age of Enlightenment in Europe. The Enlightenment intellectuals challenged the conventional view prevailing during that time. They put forward the argument that human affairs should be guided by reason as well as the principle of liberty and equality. They had firm faith in the equality of men and therefore, opposed to the idea of rule by noble blood which has a privileged connection with God. It made one person superior to the other which was opposed to the notion of equality. Such ideas forwarded by the Enlightenment Intellectuals inspired the American and French revolutions. This led to the emergence of liberal democracies in different parts of the world. However in each and every democracy, the form varies. For example, India , Brazil, USA etc represent the federal republic, whereas Great Britain, Japan, Canada represent constitutional monarchy; and USA represents the presidential form and UK represents the parliamentary form of government. Moreover, there is prevalence of semi-presidential systems like in France and Russia. When the first liberal democratic model was established, the liberals were regarded as those harbouring extreme views and it was also believed that the liberals would destroy the international peace and stability. While opposing democracy, the monarchists became the defenders of traditional values. Many alliances were forged among the opponents of democracy to prevent the further spread of democratic values. Moreover, despite resistance, by the 19th century democracy gained widespread momentum and became a dominant value in the international arena.

It may be mentioned here that mere fulfilment of the structural conditions of democracy should not lead to complacency. For example, a developing nation like in India, where there is existence of more than one political party competing for political power it may simply involve conflict and

competition between certain dominant and vocal interest groups (large manufacturers, rich peasants and landlords) for acquiring political power and not for public interests. Again, vested interests may try to foster a feudal political culture among the people so as to reduce them to submissive voters rather than vehicles of social change. Interestingly, there may be no formal restriction on entry to positions of political power but the actual power wielders may serve the interests of a tiny class. It is also possible that the judiciary is independent of both the executive and the legislature, but dispensation of justice at times may not be effective. So the existence of the mere structure of liberal democracy is no guarantee of achieving the objectives of democracy. Therefore, the prolonged and actual practice of liberal values within democracy is what is of utmost importance.

The contradictions within democracy have given birth to newer developments in the realm of liberal democracy such as post-liberal democracy and neo-liberal democracy. Laski is one of the most powerful advocates of post-liberal democracy who revised liberalism in the light of socialistic achievements and draws itself close to the concept of democratic socialism. This is a contemporary view of liberal democracy which has taken names such as pure democracy, socialist democracy, people's democracy, etc. Macpherson is also one of the post-liberal democratic theorists.

In the western capitalist countries neo-liberalism is a label used to refer to a type of capitalist political philosophy concerning international trade between developed and developing countries. Introduced by economist such as Friedrich Hayek, Milton Friedman neo-liberalism tries to bring in the concept of a stable currency, a balanced budget and free market capitalism within the framework of neo-liberal democracy.

12.5: MARXIST DEMOCRACY

Marxists, in principle, do not oppose democracy. On the other hand, they claim that their "democracy" is genuine whereas the bourgeois democracy is 'fake' and a 'sham'. Marxists do not regard democracy as a political system. They view it as a system of values and a form of society. In the latter sense, democracy does not have a final point of achievement. It is a continuously growing process. Thus democracy goes on struggling to go beyond itself, in the process retaining its essence and improvising it further.

As a political system, democracy is a class organism. It is meant to serve the interests of a particular class. Lenin distinguishes working class democracy from bourgeois democracy. The latter serves the interests of the bourgeoisie -a small minority - whereas the former promotes the interests of the proletariat the vast majority of the society. When socialism - the transitional phase matures into communism, democracy as a political system will cease to exist, but democracy as a system of values will flourish. A communist society is a democratic society because it nourishes democratic values like socio-economic equality and the absence of exploitation of one class by another. According to Lefebvre, Marx regards democracy "not as a system but as a process which comes down essentially to a struggle for democracy. The latter is never completed because democracy can always be carried forward or forced back. The purpose of struggle is to go beyond democracy and beyond the democratic state, to build a society without state power". 16 According to Marxists, in bourgeois democracy, the state is controlled by the economic elites-the finance capital. The members of this class, by occupying key posts in different branches of the power structure, use the government to promote the interests of their class. Some other Marxists take a slightly different view. They do not think that the organs of the government are manned by the members of rich class. They believe that the latter, by preferring to stay outside the government, dominate policy-making process from behind the scene. They allow the state some autonomy so that the state can utilise that autonomy to better serve their interests. It is thus clear that both Marxist view-points - capitalists controlling the government machinery (a) from within, (b) from without- point to the same proposition that the government in capitalist countries is controlled by economic elites who use it to further their own interests. Marxists reject the legitimacy of elections in bourgeois democracies. They argue that political parties in bourgeois states hardly differ from one another in respect of ideology. The ideologies of all of them are designed to buttress the interests of rich people. As a result, the poor people of capitalist countries have little choice. Whichever party they vote for would help the rich against them. Marxists further argue that in bourgeois democracies justice is very expensive. It is only the rich who can get judgments in their favor. They gave the money to buy justice. By money power and political influence they can close the eyes of the court to their crimes and other misdeeds. The poor, even if innocent, would be punished by courts. They have little leverage vis-a-vis the judiciary. The judiciary, it is contended, is not impartial. It has got a class character. It is manned by the representatives of the rich class and, no wonder, derives its interests. Before we make a critical examination of the Marxist theory of democracy, we may bring to an end the preceding discussion by quoting Lenin from his State

and Revolution. He said: The dictatorship of the proletariat - the organization of the vanguard of the oppressed as the ruling class for the purpose of suppressing the oppressors - for the first time becomes democracy for the poor, democracy for the people, and not democracy for the money-bags. The dictatorship of the proletariat imposes a series of restrictions on the freedom of the oppressors, the exploiters, the capitalists.

12.6: SUMMARY

Democracy, describing a form of popular government is a result of socio-economic changes. The evolution of the concept can be traced back to nearly 2500 years back in Greece. It has been conceptualised to acquaint the people with the ideas of equality, liberty and justice. It has been formed from the words 'Demos' and 'Kratos' referring to the rule of the people. However modern democracy achieved its present status after prolonged struggle. Making Democracy operational largely depends on the size of the state where it is in operation. The concept of democracy has been defined by different political philosophers at different time from Lord Bryce, Lipset to Macpherson Robert Dahl and others. Democracy took different forms at different time and places as per the needs of the society and polity like procedural substantive, participatory, representative etc. Tolerance, social welfare, liberty, equality, peaceful constitutional elections etc., are important principles of democracy. An aware and vigilant population with a vigorous public opinion, literate, effective and enlightened leaders makes democracy successful. Liberal democracy is a form of democracy bringing liberalism to the realm of democracy comprising a constitutional government by consent and majority rule providing public accountability.

12.6: KEY TERMS

- **Rule of Law:** The principle that all individuals and institutions are subject to and accountable to law that is fairly applied and enforced.
- **Separation of Powers:** The division of government responsibilities into distinct branches to prevent any one branch from exercising the core functions of another. The typical division is into the executive, legislative, and judicial branches.
- **Constitutionalism:** The idea that government authority is derived from and limited by a body of fundamental law or constitution.
- **Class Struggle:** The ongoing conflict between different classes in society, primarily

between the working class (proletariat) and the owning class (bourgeoisie). This struggle is seen as the driving force of historical and social change.

- **Proletariat:** The working class who do not own the means of production and must sell their labor to survive.
- **Bourgeoisie:** The capitalist class who own the means of production and exploit the labor of the proletariat.
- **Dictatorship of the Proletariat:** A temporary state in which the working class holds political power, aiming to dismantle the structures of the capitalist state and transition to a classless society.
- **Means of Production:** The facilities and resources (factories, land, capital) used to produce goods and services. In Marxist theory, control over the means of production is central to class power.
- **Communism:** The final stage of Marxist theory, characterized by a classless, stateless society in which the means of production are commonly owned, and goods and services are distributed based on need.
- **Socialism:** The transitional stage between capitalism and communism where the working class controls the state and the means of production are publicly or commonly owned.
- **Surplus Value:** The value produced by labor that exceeds the cost of labor, which is appropriated by capitalists as profit. This concept is central to the critique of capitalist exploitation.
- **Historical Materialism:** The Marxist theory that material conditions and economic factors are the primary influences on historical development and social change.
- **Dialectical Materialism:** The Marxist philosophy that political and historical events result from the conflict of social forces and are interpreted through a dialectical process of thesis, antithesis, and synthesis.
- **Revolution:** The radical and fundamental change in the political, economic, and social structure of society, often envisioned by Marxists as a proletarian revolution overthrowing capitalist structures.

12.7: SELF ASSESSMENT QUESTIONS

- What is Democracy? Discuss its features.
- Discuss about various types of Democracy.

- Write a note on Liberal perspective of democracy.
- Write a note on Marxist perspective of democracy.

12.8: REFERENCES

Tangian, Andranik (2020). Analytical Theory of Democracy: History, Mathematics and Applications. Studies in Choice and Welfare. Cham, Switzerland: Springer. ISBN 978-3-030-39690-9.

"Definition of DEMOCRACY". www.merriam-webster.com. Retrieved 5 July 2018. Locke, John. Two Treatises on Government: a Translation into Modern English. Oxford English Dictionary: "democracy".

UNIT-13: CONTEMPORARY THEORIES OF DEMOCRACY

Structure

- 13.1 Objectives
- 13.2 Introduction
- 13.3 Elitist Theory of Democracy
- 13.4 Pluralist Theory of Democracy
- 13.5 Criticisms
- 13.6 Summary
- 13.7 Key Terms
- 13.8 Self Assessment Questions
- 13.9 References

13.1: OBJECTIVES

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

- Various contemporary theories of democracy
- What is Elitist theory of democracy
- What is pluralist theory of democracy

13.2: INTRODUCTION

The success of democracy as an ideology and the development of counter-democratic ideologies, several other variants of democracy emerged all over the world. In this context, a new interpretation of democracy was offered which sought to accommodate a specific space for a particular section of the society (elite) or terms of concentrating power in several groups (plural). These new variants of democracy try to contest that instead of power being concentrated in the hands of the people, it is better to be in the hands of a few elites. This concept was developed in the second half of the 19th century by Vilfredo Pareto and Mosca and several other political sociologists with their different perspectives on the elitist theory of democracy. However contesting the elite concept of democracy, towards the 1950s and 1960s, another concept emerged in the form of the pluralist theory of democracy which believed that powers lay in several associations both government and non- government and not in the hands of a few.

13.3: ELITIST THEORY OF DEMOCRACY

In philosophy, political science and sociology, elite theory is a theory of the state that seeks to describe and explain power relationships in society. The theory posits that a small minority, consisting of members of the economic elite and policymaking networks, holds the most power—and that this power is independent of democratic elections. Through positions in corporations and influence over policymaking networks, through the financial support of foundations or positions with think tanks, or policy-discussion groups, members of the "elite" exert significant power over corporate and government decisions. The basic characteristics of this theory are that power is concentrated, the elites are unified, the non-elites are diverse and powerless, elites' interests are unified due to common backgrounds, and positions and the defining characteristic of power is institutional position. Elite theory opposes pluralism, a tradition that emphasizes how multiple major social groups and interests have an influence upon and various forms of representation within more powerful sets of rulers, contributing to representative political outcomes that reflect the collective needs of society.

Even when entire groups are ostensibly completely excluded from the state's traditional networks of power (on the basis of arbitrary criteria such as nobility, race, gender, or religion), elite theory recognizes that "counter-elites" frequently develop within such excluded groups. Negotiations between such disenfranchised groups and the state can be analyzed as negotiations between elites and counter-elites. A major problem, in turn, is the ability of elites to co-opt counter-elites.

Democratic systems function on the premise that voting behavior has a direct, noticeable effect on policy outcomes, and that these outcomes are preferred by the largest portion of voters. A study in 2014, correlated voters' preferences to policy outcomes, found that the statistical correlation between the two is heavily dependent on the income brackets of the voting groups. At the lowest income sampled, the correlation coefficient reached zero, whereas the highest income returned a correlation above 0.6. The conclusion was that there is a strong, linear correlation between the income of voters and how often their policy preferences become reality. The causation for this correlation has not yet been proven in subsequent studies, but is an area of research.

According to Pareto in every society, there is an unceasing movement of individuals and elites from higher to lower levels, and from lower to higher levels resulting in a 'considerable increase of the degenerate elements in the classes which still hold power and, on the other hand, in an increase of elements of superior quality in the subject classes. Pareto thought that if the governing elite does

not find ways to assimilate the exceptional individuals from the subject classes, an imbalance is created in the polity. This may result in the existing elite being dislodged through violent overthrow. This leads to the ultimate extinction of every elite group in society. This dissolution of the elite groups makes the social equilibrium unstable. Pareto opines on different types of circulation of elites. (i) between different categories of the governing elite itself, (ii) between the elite and the rest of the population. The latter may involve (a) individuals from the lower strata entering the existing elite, and /or (b) individuals in the lower strata forming new elite groups and entering into a struggle for power with the existing elite. Thus, the circulation of the elite implies the replacement of one elite by another.

13.4: PLURALIST THEORY OF DEMOCRACY

Pluralism as distinctive element of different types of democracy is a central topic within both the theory and the political science –in classical authors and in modern ones– with regard to the original steps of a system and to its following evolutions¹. The issue acquires a renewed importance before the processes of political development and “fundamental” democratisation that are unfolded in America and in Europe during the 19th and the 20th centuries. But it also returns to the scene as a crucial factor since the decade of 1980, when the world enters the “third wave” of democracy and we go through a cycle of relevant political transformations, combined with processes of structural reform (in a “neoliberal” key), that modify in substantial terms the preceding development models. This is a deep historical transition –a true “change of epoch”–, that affects the Latin –American regions in a peculiar way and that is located –country to country– in a landscape of diversity: as where the course of the reforms is concerned, as in what is referred to the alternatives of democracy, with its different shapes and eventual benefits in the specific area of pluralism (Lanzaro 2001). It is here where the questions on the past are bounded with the questions on the present. When focusing on the analysis of the current transition it is good to review the traces of history.

The Pluralist doctrine was developed by English writers like John Figgis, F.W. Maitland and G.D.H. Cole, Robert Dahl, Sartori, Presthus, Hunter, Bartelson, Agger, etc. The Pluralist theory of democracy refers to a model in which power is not concentrated in the hands of a group or class but is diffused among many interest groups competing against each other for power. During the 1950s and 1960s in America, the concept of pluralism gained importance as a reworked version of liberal democracy challenging the rule of the elite on the ground that this model tries to establish

that the function of policy making is not indulged in by elected representatives or any elite. Rather it is an outcome of the interaction among the various groups in a society. This model is perfectly suitable for a plural society. They are not against democracy, rather they hold the notion that democracy is best realized in a plural society through the decentralization of power among plural elements. This theory has been derived from the pluralist theory of sovereignty. The main content of the theory has been derived from the postulate that “rejecting the indivisibility of the sovereignty and monopoly of the state they held that social structure is plural and that is why power distribution must be plural. The state is divided into certain structures and power must be distributed among these units of the state. Groups are a very important component of society and all activities of the state are activities of these groups, that is why they must be equally empowered. This is essential and natural for the upliftment of the society.” Classical pluralism is of the view that politics and decision-making are located mostly in the framework of government, however, many non-governmental groups use their resource to exert influence. The central question for classical pluralism is how power and influence are distributed in a political process. Groups of individuals try to maximize their interests. Lines of conflict are multiple and shifting as power is a continuous bargaining process between competing groups.

Miss M.P.Follet in her famous book, ‘The New State’ has summed up the highlights of pluralism in the following manner. The points are: The pluralists prick the bubble of the present state’s right to supremacy. They see that the state which has been slowly forming since the middle ages with its pretences and unfulfilled claims has not earned either our regard or respect. They recognize the value of the group and they see that the variety of our group life today has a significance which must be immediately reckoned with politically. They plead for the revivification of local life. The pluralist sees that the interest of the state is not always identical to the interests of its parts. Pluralism is the beginning of the disappearance of the crowd. Pluralism contains the prophecy of the future because it has with its keenest insight, seized upon the problem of identity, association and federalism. About the above-cited points, Gettle describes the contribution of the pluralists in these words, “their emphasis on the fact that states, despite legal omnipotence should be subject to moral restraints is a desirable reaction against the idealization of the state and the doctrine that state is an end in itself free from moral restraint. The pluralists also make a timely protest against the rigid and dogmatic legalism of the Austinian theory of sovereignty”. He further remarks that pluralists emphasise the necessity of studying the facts of political life in a rapidly changing social system. In this connection, they point out the growing importance of non-political groups, the

danger of over-interference by the state, the proper functions of groups and the desirability of giving to such groups greater legal recognition in the political systems.

Features of the Pluralist Theory of Democracy

Pluralist democracy is operational through different associations rather than through only the government and the people. The government in such a system is formed collectively representing different groups emerging in the social process. The political power is however exercised only by the government which is formed by the people representing a large number of private associations, groups and organizations.

Pluralist democracy also works based on consensus. They are of the view that people are rational so they are capable of good and desired decision making and they can participate in politics through their organized group. These groups are primary units of politics. Elections are very important in a pluralist democracy. Elections are reflections of public opinion. They are not only the means of electing the elites but of ensuring the participation of people to realize the real meaning of democracy. Decentralization of power, separation of power and federal division of power in the system allows for the proper functioning of the government. Adequate representation in the government from all sections of the population facilitates continuous communication between the governors and the governed as well as the government and the masses. Open competition for power provides a platform for every association or group to participate in the government. Instead of one, there are several centres of power and hence all groups have an equal share and participate in policy making and decision making.

13.5: CRITICISMS

The theory challenges the concept of state sovereignty and the supreme power of the state. On the contrary, it is observed that state sovereignty maintains a law and order situation and the absence of state sovereignty may lead to anarchy in the state. Traditional theorists are of the view that pluralists do not have faith in popular sovereignty (sovereignty of the people). They do not support the pluralists because the latter gives undue importance to the groups than individuals. One of the important conditions for the maintenance of law and order in society is the activeness of the state which is possible only when the state is legally supreme and indivisible. If power is decentralized everywhere there are every possibility that conflict and chaos will break out leading to the failure of constitutional mechanisms. There is a presence of groups and individuals who are constantly

opposed to each other. Their presence after results in conflicts and chaotic situations. So, it did only the presence of a unitary and centralized power like the state which can only maintain an orderly society. Therefore instead of numerous groups and associations, the overriding power should be with the state. To the Marxists conferring the power in the hands of the people, that too in associations or groups is a mistake as they are incapable of ruling a state properly. Instead, there should be one political party to control power in the state. Despite being levelled with numerous criticisms, the pluralist theory is accepted on the ground that it supported the idea of politics of consensus and the necessity of public opinion and popular government. This theory though does not have much significance independently, yet the emergence of multiple groups in terms of interest and pressure groups as well as corporate groups is an indicator of the fact that this theory still stands valid, taking the form of neo-pluralism. In the words of Robert Dahl, it is to be called polyarchy.

13.6: SUMMARY

During the 19th century through the writings of Pareto, Mosca and Michels, the elite theory emerged accommodating the contemporary condition of society. Pareto regarded elites as those powerful minorities in society that are psychologically and intellectually superior. Mosca is of the view that elites are those intellectuals, who have moral and material superiority and hold powers in society. Michels, on the other hand, regards elite rule as natural and necessary and safe because the masses are apathetic towards governance. The elitist theorists justified the rule of the few on the ground that the masses are ignorant intellectually and psychologically inferior, not equipped to handle democratic processes and as a result, they cannot act as responsible leaders. The Elitist theory is criticized on the ground that it excludes the ability of the masses as today mass government is regarded as the popular government. It is based on institutional and not ideological aspects of democracy. The Elitist theory wrongly advocates the view that the object of democracy is not the welfare and development of the people. As a reaction to the belief in popular sovereignty and aristocracy or oligarchy, pluralism emerged justifying the division of powers among different groups and associations. Developed by writers like Figgis, Maitland, Cole, Dahl and Sartori etc, pluralism referred to a model in which power is diffused among many interest groups competing against each other for power. The concept emerged from the fact that the welfare and development of society are possible only if there are rights and freedom of association. Pluralism features collective representations, collective consensus, politics through organized groups, decentralization

and separation of powers, equal share and participation in policy-making etc. Critics of pluralism opine that it is difficult to maintain law and order if power is not concentrated in the hands of the state. Critics argue that pluralism would lead to a condition of anarchy and the society would become fragile which is not desirable.

13.7: KEY TERMS

- **Elite:** A small group of people with a disproportionate amount of wealth, power, or influence in society.
- **Oligarchy:** A form of power structure in which power rests with a small number of people.
- **Iron Law of Oligarchy:** A political theory stating that all forms of organization, regardless of how democratic they may be at the start, will eventually and inevitably develop oligarchic tendencies.
- **Pluralism:** A condition or system in which multiple groups, interests, or ideologies coexist and have a role in decision-making, contrasting with the centralization of power in elites.
- **Political Elites:** Individuals or groups who possess a disproportionate amount of political power and influence.
- **Meritocracy:** A system in which advancement is based on individual ability or achievement, often used to justify the power of elites.
- **Interest Groups:** Organized groups that aim to influence public policy and decision-making processes.
- **Pluralism:** A condition or system in which multiple groups, interests, or ideologies coexist and have a role in decision-making.
- **Lobbying:** The act of attempting to influence the decisions of government officials, typically by interest groups.
- **Political Resources:** Assets that interest groups use to exert influence, such as money, information, expertise, and public support.
- **Civil Society:** The sphere of voluntary associations, organizations, and institutions that exist independently of the government and represent various interests and values.
- **Compromise:** The process of making concessions to reach an agreement, often a key aspect of decision-making in a pluralist democracy.
- **Coalitions:** Alliances of interest groups that come together to achieve common goals.

13.8: SELF ASSESSMENT QUESTIONS

- What is democracy?
- Discuss features of Elitist theory of democracy.
- Discuss features Pluralist theory of democracy.

13.9: REFERENCES

Austin, Granville (1999) Working a Democratic constitution: The Indian Experience, New Delhi, Oxford University Press.

Narayan Jayprakash (1975) Nation Building in India, Varanasi, Navachetan Prakashan

Chandra, B. (2008). Communalism: A primer. New Delhi: National Book Trust.

Das, H. H. (1991). India: Democratic government and politics. Delhi: Himalaya Publishing House.

Gahrana, G. K. (1998). Secularism and the Indian Society. In Pachauri. V. K (Ed). Social

Juergensmeyer, M. (1994). Religious Nationalism: Confronts the Secular State. Delhi: Oxford University Press

Kar, P. K. (1998). Indian Society. New Delhi: Kalyan Publication.

UNIT-14: DEMOCRACY AND CITIZENSHIP

Structure

- 14.1 Objectives
- 14.2 Introduction
- 14.3 Democracy: Conceptual Analysis
- 14.4 Approaches to Democracy
- 14.5 Citizenship
- 14.6 Citizenship and Democracy
- 14.7 Summary
- 14.8 Key Terms
- 14.9 Self Assessment Questions
- 14.10 References

14.1: OBJECTIVES

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

- What is Democracy
- Various Approaches to Democracy
- What is Citizenship
- Citizenship and Democracy

14.2: INTRODUCTION

It is difficult to talk about people, power, and politics without discussing citizenship and democracy. These are highly debated concepts, much like advocacy. But some reflection on what they mean is vital for planning and doing effective advocacy. These concepts help us define what kind of political system we are striving for, and the roles, rights, and responsibilities of all the participants. In this chapter, we look at different perspectives on these concepts that have informed the Guide's approach to advocacy. We also include exercises to guide your own discussions about citizenship and democracy.

Democracy is generally understood as 'government of the people, by the people, and for the people' and that is why; it cannot survive without citizenship. With the advent of representative democracies, there is a shift towards passive citizenship from active which could be seen as the

challenge of legitimacy in front of the state. Citizens' support for democracy is a key requirement for its sustainability while lack of popular support could be exploited by authoritarian forces for their own benefits. Hence, in the contemporary context, it becomes important to analyze the relationship between democracy and citizenship.

14.3: DEMOCRACY: CONCEPTUAL ANALYSIS

The many changes occurring around the globe are stretching and reshaping forms of social organization and decisionmaking processes. To meet the challenges of the times, advocates and organizers may find it helpful to revisit the meaning of democracy and citizenship in their work. Throughout the world, many countries have undergone exciting reforms that have opened up political processes to people. In countries such as the Philippines and South Africa, authoritarian governments have been brought down. In others, governments have taken significant measures to include women and other marginalized groups in public life. Countries such as Brazil, Bolivia, and Thailand have institutionalized laws about people's participation in policymaking. Fairer elections have occurred without violence in dozens of countries where people have voted for the first time. But there is a long road between successful elections and accountable governments. Along this road civil society continues to struggle for a legitimate voice and for honest, committed leaders to help guide the process. As economic globalization changes the terrain of economic development and the power of national governments, the challenges for improving political structures and relationships grow.

The meaning of democracy is often controversial among activists. In many workshops, people have resisted a full discussion of democracy because it often provokes heated, even angry, debate. This is partly because some people seem to equate democracy with the external imposition of models that do not seem to fit the reality of their context. This is especially true where the promise of democracy has not materialized. This resistance also sometimes arises out of confusion about the relationship between political democracy and economic liberalization. In some places, democracy means "free market", and people's experience with the free market has been mixed and the subject of considerable debate. It is precisely these sensitivities that make the subject worth discussing. The following exercise, "What is Democracy," helps people begin to grapple with the meaning and practice of democracy in more depth.

Bryce- Democracy is a form of government in which the ruling power of a state is largely vested not only in any particular class or class but in the members of the community as a whole.

C.F. Strong- By democracy we mean a system of government in which the majority of members of a political community participate through a method of representation. It ensures that the government is ultimately responsible for its action toward that majority.

There is no clear cut universally acceptable definition of democracy applicable to political systems at all times. But the commonness among all is that it is a rule by people. Over time, some definitional issues are raised, such as- What is meant by all the people or all the people? Whether political power is shared equally among all? In ancient Greece which is considered to be the birthplace of democracy –“all did not include all”. Women, slaves, criminals, and non-taxpayers did not have the right to participate in the policy-making process. In modern times majority rule is based on a number only.

However, democracy is the best among the prevalent forms of government. Apart from the quantitative aspect of majority rule, it is based on many qualitative aspects such as individual liberty, individual rights etc. Democracy is a government in which power and civic responsibility are exercised by all adult citizens, directly, or through their freely elected representatives.

14.4: APPROACHES TO DEMOCRACY

Democracy is a process so its dynamic. It can fit into any political system and can be interpreted from different angles. All democrats focus on people's participation and the common good. There are two popular approaches to democracy 1) Liberal Approach and 2) the Marxist Approach.

Liberal Approach- The liberals consider the individual to be the centre of the state system and the state exists for the sake of the individual. The individual is the end and the state is the means. The philosophy of democracy entirely lies in providing maximum freedom to the individual. The state which provides more freedom and more liberty to the individual is considered to be more democratic. According to John Locke, “the state had to ensure the safety of the life, liberty and property of the individual”.

The liberal theory has been developed in three phases and each phase has a different name. These are 1) Classical Liberal theory 2) Elitist Theory 3) Pluralist theory.

Classical Liberal Theory of Democracy

The main idea of this theory is that the protection of individual rights and liberty is the primary concern of the state. The individual has the right to resist the state and also revolt against the state if it fails. The advocates of this theory are John Locke, Rousseau, JS Mill, Montesquieu, Bentham etc. Contractualism like Locke and Rousseau thinks that government is based on contract and consent so it has limited power. Montesquieu advocated the principle of separation of power which supports decentralization of power. The utilitarians like Mill and Bentham emphasise the participation of people in the political process. They think that the “greatest good of the greatest number” should be the priority of the government.

Key Features

- 1) Man is at the centre of democracy.
- 2) Democracy aims at protecting individual right and liberty.
- 3) The government is constitutional, limited and accountable.
- 4) It is based upon the consent of the people

Elite Theory of Democracy.

This theory discovers political inequality and unequal distribution of political power. This theory is a contradiction to the liberal theory which is based on rule of law and majority rule. This theory says that a superior minority rules over the majority. The exponents of this theory are Vilfredo Pareto, Gaetano Mosca, Robert Michels and C. Wright Mills. All of them accepted unequal enjoyment of political power in society. Pareto highlights on the intellectual and psychological basis of elite rule. He divided the elite into Governing elite and the Non-governing elite. He laid down the idea of the circulation of the elite.

The pluralist Theory of Democracy

In contrast to the elitist view of democracy, the Pluralist view holds that power is divided and distributed among various sections, and organizations of articulate interests.

Elements of Pluralism

- a. Powers are divided and distributed.
- b. The presence of principles and practices like separation of power and checks and balances reduces the risk of hijack or abuse of power and the emergence of dictatorship.
- c. Sovereignty is not at the exclusive possession of the state nor any other organization or association.

Marxist Theory of Democracy

Marxists view democracy from a different angle. They criticize the classical view of democracy as bourgeois democracy and consider it as 'fake and sham'. They never reject democracy. For them, democracy is a social system based on certain values instead of a political system or process. They claim to be more democratic than the liberals. Marxists also agree that democracy is based on majority rule. In a society, the proletariat / the poor constitute to be the majority. In a non-Marxian society, power is captured by the bourgeois/ capitalist. Marxian democracy focuses on political equality as well as economic and social equality. They claim their democracy to be real and the bourgeois democracy is fake.

14.5: CITIZENSHIP

In its earliest form, citizenship focused on the city instead of the state as is evident from the experience of ancient Greek city states or polis. In general terms, citizenship is a relationship between an individual and state. It is seen in the context of complementary rights and responsibilities. According to T H Marshall, citizenship is 'full and equal membership in a political community'. There are certain rights, duties, and responsibilities that citizens have, but they can either be denied or partially extended to aliens and other noncitizens residing in a country. Generally, full political rights like the right to vote and to hold public office are extended to citizens only. The usual responsibilities that the citizens have towards the state include allegiance, taxation, and military service. According to Kymlicka and Norman, there are three basic dimensions of citizenship. The first dimension is that citizenship is a legal status which depends on civil, political and social rights. In this sense, the citizen can act within the limits of law as a free citizen and retains the right to have protection of law. However, it does not mean that the citizen takes part in formulation of law. Also, it does not indicate that the rights will be uniform between citizens. The second aspect is that the citizens are seen as political agents as they are expected to actively participate in political activities of a society through its political institutions. The last

dimension considers citizenship to be membership in a political community which creates a unique identity. Such understanding of citizenship rules out the fact that it also has an identity dimension like shared history, culture, religion or language and focuses only on a nation state perspective. There are mainly three discourses on citizenship namely civic republicanism, liberal and critical. Civic republicanism stands for love and service to one's political community, local, state and national. It argues for strong civic values or civic literacy which is an important component of citizenship. It requires identification with and commitment to the goals of political community gained through the process of education and active engagement in democratic process. On the other hand, the liberal discourse gives importance to individual rights and autonomy. It also highlights deliberative values of discussion, disagreement and consensus building. Political liberalism envisions citizenship that takes a critical attitude towards all authority keeping focus on liberty. There are two sides to liberal political citizenship. One, the citizen is entitled to rights and equal treatment and two, citizens are participants in self-rule. The third discourse on citizenship is critical which challenges the civic republicans and political liberals. It includes feminist, reconstructionist, cultural and transnational perspectives. It raises critical questions about identity (who are citizens), membership (who belongs and the location of boundaries) and agency (how we might best enact citizenship). Critical discourse focuses on exclusion based on gender, culture, ethnicity, nationality, race, sexuality or socio-economic class and tries to broaden and deepen liberal agendas of human freedom.

14.6: CITIZENSHIP AND DEMOCRACY

Population constitutes an essential element of a state. When the population enjoys rights, performs duty shows obligation toward the state is transformed into citizen and constitute civil society. In a democracy, the civil society is not only ruled it also regulates the government. In a democracy, the citizen constitutes to be an essential and significant element. Citizen constitutes an important component of social, and political community. The quality of democracy and the successful working of democracy depend mainly on the active participation of citizens. A quality citizen is the source of an accountable government.

The relationship between citizens and democracy is bilateral. Both are dependent on and complimentary to each other. A quality civil society results in a quality democracy and vice versa.

Democracy requires active citizens' involved in the policy-making process. It is the citizen who is the friend, philosopher, guide and master of democracy.

The relationship between the citizen and democracy is manifold, continuous, and harmonious. It is like the relationship between soil and a plant. Soil texture is responsible for plant growth. The plant is equally helpful for soil conservation and fertility. Without soil, there is no plant and without plants, the soil is degraded. This can be analysed from various points as follows.

- a. **The state is the protector of individual life and liberty.** All the theorists regarding the origin of the state beginning from Aristotle to contractualism agree that the state is created to provide security to the life and property of the individual. It is the responsibility of the state to create an environment where the individual will develop maximum. An individual has natural rights like the right to life and liberty. Every state must ensure the protection of life and freedom for citizens. In the pre-state period, the individual had unrestrained liberty. The state ensures restricted liberty within the framework of law so that others' liberty can be protected.
- b. **State Promotes Human Rights-** Every individual has the right to live without fear and discrimination. This is the basis of Human rights. State not only endeavours right to life and liberty but also creates an environment which will enable citizens to lead a complete life. Elimination of discrimination of any form, protection from social evils, and satisfaction of minimum needs is the prime duty of the state. So the state has identified some rights and provided them with legal protection. Citizens belonging to all age groups, sex, race, colour, and castes are given these rights.
- c. **Respect for Public opinion.** Democracy respects popular sovereignty. Public opinion is the central theme of democracy. Democracy is chiefly based on public opinion. In the Formation of government, the functioning of government and even in the transfer of power public opinion plays a vital role. The wish of the people should be reflected in government action. The state should be careful in expressing a public opinion without any restraint.

- d. **The democratic obligation of the State toward the citizens.** As per contractualism, the individual has surrendered its sovereignty to the state it has become an obligation of the state to take care of the citizen in the time of need. With the advancement of time, various revolutions and events have conferred more and more obligations over the state. The Chairperson of the National Human Rights Commission, Dr Justice A.S. Anand has emphasized that “the State must ensure everyone has the right to adequate food, education and enjoyment of highest attainable standards of physical and mental health.”

These obligations are as follows:

- The greatest good of the greatest number.
- Maintenance of law and order.
- Protection from foreign aggression.
- Promotion of democracy and political justice
- Social welfare measures
- Economic growth
- Maintenance of harmonious relationships among different sections.
- Reduction of inequality in any form.
- Encourage political participation

14.7: SUMMARY

Democracy is generally understood as ‘government of the people, by the people, and for the people’ and that is why; it cannot survive without citizenship. With the advent of representative democracies, there is a shift towards passive citizenship from active which could be seen as the challenge of legitimacy in front of the state. Citizens’ support for democracy is a key requirement for its sustainability while lack of popular support could be exploited by authoritarian forces for their own benefits. The relationship between democracy and citizenship can be analyzed along three dimensions. First is the rights and responsibility dimension. In contemporary liberal democracies, there is more emphasis on rights than responsibility. It means that citizens are passive holders of rights while they do not develop public virtues of responsibility towards the nation. Second, there was active citizenship in ancient Greek democracies but with the advent of representative democracies, passive citizenship has become more visible. Individuals need to keep

in mind that active citizenship is more than voting or fulfilling public obligations. It is not only choosing officials and using the system; but also involves making and shaping the system's structures and rules. Lastly, there is a debate over whether there should be focus on 'differences rather than common and shared elements' while formulating citizenship in a country. This brings out the debate about citizenship and multiculturalism. Will Kymlicka has argued that certain sorts of 'collective rights' for minority cultures are consistent with liberal democratic principles, and that standard liberal objections to recognizing such rights on grounds of individual freedom, social justice, and national unity, can be answered. He further argues that request for accommodation of cultural rights actually reflects minorities' desire to integrate and not to remain autonomous in citizenship.

14.8: KEY TERMS

Naturalization: The process by which a non-citizen acquires the nationality or citizenship of a country.

Dual Citizenship: The status of being a citizen of two countries simultaneously.

Birthright Citizenship: Citizenship granted to individuals born within a country's territory, regardless of the nationality of their parents.

Natural-Born Citizen: A person who has citizenship by virtue of being born in a country or to citizen parents.

Citizenship Test: An examination that applicants for naturalization must pass, which typically includes questions on history, government, and the rights and responsibilities of citizens.

Permanent Resident: A non-citizen who is legally allowed to live and work in a country indefinitely but does not have all the rights of a citizen.

Visa: An endorsement on a passport indicating that the holder is allowed to enter, leave, or stay for a specified period in a country.

14.9: SELF ASSESSMENT QUESTIONS

- Make an analysis on democracy.
- Discuss various approaches to study Democracy.
- What is Citizenship.

- Write an notes on Citizenship and Democracy.

14.10: REFERENCES

Austin, Granville. (1999). 'Working a Democratic Constitution: The Indian Experience', New Delhi: Oxford university Press.

Chandra, B. (2008). 'Communalism: A primer', New Delhi: National Book Trust.

.Das, H. H. (1991). 'India: Democratic government and politics', Delhi: HimalayaPublishing House

Fadia, Babulal (1984). State politics in India Volume I. Radiant publishers, New Delhi. pp. 92–122.

Robert L. Hardgrave and Stanley A. Koachanek (2008). India: Government and politics in a developing nation (Seventh ed.). Thomson Wadsworth. p. 146. ISBN 978-0-495-00749-4.

UNIT-15: PROCEDURAL DEMOCRACY AND ITS CRITIQUE

Structure

- 15.1 Objectives
- 15.2 Introduction
- 15.3 Procedural Democracy
- 15.4 Critique of Procedural Democracy
- 15.5 Summary
- 15.6 Key Terms
- 15.7 Self Assessment Questions
- 15.8 References

15.1: OBJECTIVES

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

- The concept of Procedural Democracy
- Critique of Procedural Democracy

15.2: INTRODUCTION

Procedural democracy or proceduralist democracy, proceduralism or hollow democracy is a term used to denote the particular procedures, such as regular elections based on universal suffrage, that produce an electorally-legitimated government. Procedural democracy, with its centering of electoral processes as the basis of democratic legitimacy, is often contrasted with substantive or participatory democracy, which centers the equal participation of all groups in society in the political process as the basis of legitimacy.

The term is often used to denote an artificial appearance of democracy through the existence of democratic procedures like elections when in reality power is held by a small group of elites who manipulate democratic processes to make themselves appear democratically legitimate.

15.3: PROCEDURAL DEMOCRACY

The percent of formal democratization observers think India is a successful democracy. Participation and competition are the evaluation criteria. The regularity of elections in India and the fierce competition amongst political parties to run in elections serve as indicators of all this. Indicators of participation include the percentage of voters who turn out and the percentage of

votes that each party receives. The supporters of this strategy are optimistic about India's electoral system, which they view as an example of democratic achievement in general. Survey techniques are used to gauge democracy by those who view electoral success in terms of competitiveness and participation. They extrapolate the election's key patterns based on voter turnout, vote share, or statistical techniques like correlation, coefficient, or regression analysis. They observe the complex relationships between the socioeconomic facts in certain constituencies and the turnout rate and participation.

It was aimed at procedural democracy to help India become a more united country. Studies on democracy in India during the early years after independence were primarily concerned with determining how the implementation of the universal adult franchise and regular elections contributed to the development of the country. It was known as the modernization theory, and it proposed that developing nations went through a process of modernization with a stable democracy as its end goal. This process of modernization would be accompanied by the socio-economic modernization of urbanisation and the spread of mass media, education, wealth, and equality. It was believed that the development in India would strengthen democracy and the divisions based on caste, religions, etc., would disappear. However, these hopes were belied in the following period. Selig Harrison apprehended a dangerous decade in India in the 1960s in the face of recurrent linguistic and ethnic violence. The violence which started in the 1950s itself, was further escalated in the 1960s and 1970s; the defeat of the Congress in several states in the 1967 assembly elections and the imposition of emergency in the country during 1975-1977 were examples of people's discontentment of emergency. Unable to meet the challenge democratically, the political executive responded to these by authoritarianism, personalisation of the institutions and imposition. Scholars responded to emergency as an aberration.

It was aimed at procedural democracy to help India become a more united country. Studies on democracy in India during the early years after independence were primarily concerned with determining how the implementation of the universal adult franchise and regular elections contributed to the development of the country. It was known as the modernization theory, and it proposed that developing nations went through a process of modernization with a stable democracy as its end goal. This process of modernization would be accompanied by the socio-economic modernization of urbanisation and the spread of mass media, education, wealth, and equality. Procedural democracy is quite different from substantive democracy, which is manifested

by equal participation of all groups in society in the political process. Certain southern African countries such as Namibia, Angola, and Mozambique, where procedural elections are conducted through international assistance, are possible examples of procedural democracies.

For procedural democrats, the aim of democracy is to embody certain procedural virtue. Procedural democrats are divided among themselves over what those virtues might be, as well as over which procedures best embody them. But all procedural democrats agree on the one central point: for procedural democrats, there is no "independent truth of the matter" which outcomes ought track; instead, the goodness or rightness of an outcome is wholly constituted by the fact of its having emerged in some procedurally correct manner.

15.4: CRITIQUE OF PROCEDURAL DEMOCRACY

The critique of procedural democracy is provided by the scholars who study the substantive democracy. In their opinion, it views democracy in a limited way. Electoral democracy is minimal democracy. Free and fair elections, universal adult franchise, political parties, pressure groups and availability of constitution etc. are not sufficient conditions for democracy, though they are necessary. Democracy has to be located in the society and taken out of the institutional mode. This alternative view of democracy can be termed as the substantive democracy. Bentham argued for a "social agenda of democratisation". Democracy has to be grounded in the reality of society, apart from the participation and competition in the elections. Fareed Zakaria, however, criticises the substantive democracy in that it views democracy in the normative terminology as "good governance", with a wide range of rights; it does not consider the descriptive democracy. In the past two decades, in India, substantive democracy has also found a significant place in the discourse on democracy. The assessment of substantive democracy is sought to be made in relation to the role of the state (with democracy) on the issues concerning the nation-state - secularism, welfarist and development in India; and also the role of the state regarding these issues in the context of globalisation. Niraja Jayal argues that there are two types of arguments regarding the relationship between the state and democracy: one, there can be no democracy without an effective state which can exist when there is a strong civil society to counter the authoritarianism of the state. Jayal argues that both state and society are complimentary to each other in relation to the setting up of democracy. But in the absence of the universal criteria of citizenship, the

pasticularistic interests can hijack the project of democracy In her opinion Indian state is an interventionist state whose thrust has been developmental rather than welfare state.

Civil Society is also an essential ingredient of substantive democracy. In India there are two viewpoints on the civil society. One, it considers all associations and collective actions as civil society, irrespective of the issues they take up; two, only those associations which take up two issues of universal significance, not sectarian, and whose foundation is secular/universal are considered civil society. Recently a new debate has got momentum in our country: the debate between the communitarians and the liberal, the relationship between the individuals and the communities; within and between them. The rise of identity politics Dalits, OBCs, women, tribal"s, ethnicity, environmental issues, etc, - the new social movements - and the inability of the discourse which privileges democracy , with the elections have necessitated the focus on substantive democracy. This has been viewed both as a challenge to the nation-state and as an increase in the democratic content of the country with the understanding that India is becoming more democratic, a position which Ashutosh Valley opted for. The most ardent critique of the nation-state perspective is provided in the writings of tile scholars representing the peripheries of the country like North-East India. This perspective proposes the alternative in the form of the "province - state". Sanjib Baruah's book Indian against Itself 'is a representative of this perspective. This all has happened with the simultaneous rise of the large number of issues governance, civil society, social capital, Human rights, etc. The existence of all these factors is taken as an indicator of the existence of democracy in the country. Even here there are opposite views which suggest both the absence and presence of these factors.

With the introduction of the 73rd and the 74th Constitutional Amendments, the decentralization has been democratised and the scope of democracy has expanded to include the women, OBCs and Dalits at the grass root level. Prior to this the dominant social groups exclusively dominated the institution of the local self-governance. This defeated the very purpose of democracy. The transfer of 29 subjects to the local bodies has added to the democratic decentralisation, however, democratic decentralisation gets impeded in the light of the fact that in several cases women members of the PRIs (Panchayati Raj Institutions) are proxies of the male members of their families. The increasing role of crime, money, etc., has further eroded tile creditability of local-level democracy. Nevertheless, wherever the public action has coexisted with institution of local self-government, the institutions of local self-government have functioned democratically.

Usually, the assessment of democracy in India has been done at the national, state or district level and the functioning of the democracy at these levels has been independent of each other. There has been the "top-bottom", not the "bottom-up" approach to democracy in India. Atul Kohli, however, has covered three levels - nation, state and district in his book, *Democracy and Discontent: India's Crisis of Governability*.

Scholars like O'Donnell have underlined the need to see the differences within democracy (citizenship). Following this tradition, Patrick Heller has "disaggregated" democracy in order to view the "its degrees" in India. Comparing Kerala with rest of the country, he opines that there is more democracy in Kerala than the rest of the country. It is possible due to the existence of the "robust civil society" and an "effective state" there unlike in rest of the country; here the effective/substantive democracy is indicated by the progress in the areas of education, health and distributive justice, their extension to the subaltern groups.

Atul Kohli argues that the Indian democracy is facing a crisis of governability. It is indicated by the growing disjuncture between weakening institutions and multiplying demands. Erosion in the credibility of political parties, leaders, and the indiscipline political mobilisation of various social groups, and class conflicts within the society has caused the crisis of governability in India. The state elite has played a crucial role in the politics of political disorder crisis of favorability.

The survival of Indian democracy has baffled some observers, for whom it is a "puzzle" or "exception" of the third world political systems; it has survived diversities on the basis of caste, religion, language, etc., which often result in violence. Arend Lijphart explains this 'puzzle' by providing a consociational interpretation. The theory of consociationalism based on the premise that in a multi-ethnic society, power is shared among different groups of the society. The consociationalism in a society is contingent upon four conditions: (1) government of coalition in which all ethnic groups are represented (2) cultural autonomy of groups of consociation (3) their proportional representation in politics and civil services and (4) minority veto on the issues concerning the minority rights and autonomy. Lijphart argues that the success of the Congress system, coalition government's federalism, principles of protective discrimination, and constitutional provisions of the religious and cultural rights of minorities, and minority veto

through political pressure are indication of the success of Indian democracy, in a consociational way. Indian democracy has survived on the principles of "power-sharing system" - as it prevails in Austria, Netherlands, Switzerland, Lebanon and some other countries. In this system all major groups shared power in a consociational way. This system prevailed during the first two decades following Independence. Lijphart, however, concedes that during the past few years with the decline of the Congress system, and attack on the minorities and the rise of the BJP, the trends have been in contravention to the consociational theory. Paul R Brass criticises the consociational model as not applicable to India at all. This is so both in the context of modern history and contemporary politics. Though different groups might come together to form a consociation or alliances, their internal squabbling always poses a threat to consociation.

15.5: SUMMARY

In conclusion, procedural democracy underscores the importance of democratic processes and institutions, prioritizing the mechanics of how decisions are made and leaders are chosen. While it ensures essential democratic principles like free and fair elections, political equality, and the rule of law, it does not necessarily address the quality or inclusiveness of the outcomes of these processes. By focusing on the procedural aspects, this model emphasizes the importance of maintaining democratic norms and safeguarding civil liberties, ensuring that citizens have the mechanisms to participate in governance and hold their leaders accountable. However, it also faces criticism for potentially neglecting deeper issues of social and economic inequality that can affect the overall health and effectiveness of a democracy.

15.6: KEY TERMS

- **Free and Fair Elections:** Elections held without coercion, manipulation, or unfair advantages, allowing citizens to choose their representatives freely.
- **Universal Suffrage:** The right of all adult citizens to vote, regardless of race, gender, or social status.
- **Political Pluralism:** The existence of multiple political parties and ideologies, allowing for a diversity of views and choices in the political process.
- **Rule of Law:** The principle that all individuals and institutions, including the government, are subject to the law and must act within the legal framework.

- **Separation of Powers:** The division of government responsibilities into distinct branches (executive, legislative, judicial) to prevent the concentration of power and ensure checks and balances.
- **Transparency:** Openness in government actions and decision-making processes, allowing citizens to be informed and hold their leaders accountable.
- **Accountability:** The requirement for government officials to be answerable to the public and to justify their actions and decisions.
- **Civil Liberties:** Fundamental rights and freedoms, such as freedom of speech, assembly, and press, that must be protected in a democratic society.
- **Independent Judiciary:** A judicial system that operates without influence or pressure from other branches of government or external forces, ensuring impartiality and fairness in the application of the law.
- **Political Participation:** The active involvement of citizens in the political process, including voting, campaigning, and engaging in public discourse.

15.7: SELF ASSESSMENT QUESTIONS

- Discuss the features of procedural democracy.
- Critically examine procedural democracy.

15.8: REFERENCES

Chandra, B. (2008). 'Communalism: A primer', New Delhi: National Book Trust.

Das, H. H. (1991). 'India: Democratic government and politics', Delhi: Himalaya Publishing House.

Pant, A. D. And Gupta, S. K. (Ed.). 'Multy Ethnicity and National Integration: A Political Anthropological View'. Allahabad: Vohra Publication and Distributors.

Sharma, R. N. (2000). 'Textbook of Educational Philosophy'. New Delhi: Kanishka Publishers and Distributors.

BLOCK-4: THE GRAMMAR OF DEMOCRACY

Unit-16: Deliberative Democracy

Unit-17: The Grammar of Democracy: Political
Participation

Unit-18: The Grammar of Democracy: Representation

Unit-19: Pluralist Theory of Democracy

Unit-20: Elitist Theory of Democracy

Unit-21: Direct and Indirect Democracy

UNIT-16: DELIBERATIVE DEMOCRACY

Structure

- 16.1 Objectives
- 16.2 Introduction
- 16.3 Meaning of Deliberative Democracy
- 16.4 Features of Deliberative Democracy
- 16.5 Summary
- 16.6 Key Terms
- 16.7 Self Assessment Questions
- 16.8 References

16.1: OBJECTIVES

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

- What is deliberative democracy
- Characteristics of deliberative democracy

16.2: INTRODUCTION

Deliberative democracy or discursive democracy is a form of democracy in which deliberation is central to decision-making. Deliberative democracy seeks quality over quantity by limiting decision-makers to a smaller but more representative sample of the population that is given the time and resources to focus on one issue. It often adopts elements of both consensus decision-making and majority rule. Deliberative democracy differs from traditional democratic theory in that authentic deliberation, not mere voting, is the primary source of legitimacy for the law. Deliberative democracy is related to consultative democracy, in which public consultation with citizens is central to democratic processes. The distance between deliberative democracy and concepts like representative democracy or direct democracy is debated. While some practitioners and theorists use deliberative democracy to describe elected bodies whose members propose and enact legislation, Hélène Landemore and others increasingly use deliberative democracy to refer to decision-making by randomly-selected lay citizens with equal power.

Deliberative democracy has a long history of practice and theory traced back to ancient times, with an increase in academic attention in the 1990s, and growing implementations since 2010. Joseph M. Bessette has been credited with coining the term in his 1980

16.3: MEANING OF DELIBERATIVE DEMOCRACY

Deliberative democracy holds that, for a democratic decision to be legitimate, it must be preceded by authentic deliberation, not merely the aggregation of preferences that occurs in voting. Authentic deliberation is deliberation among decision-makers that is free from distortions of unequal political power, such as power a decision-maker obtained through economic wealth or the support of interest groups. If the decisionmakers cannot reach consensus after authentically deliberating on a proposal, then they vote on the proposal using a form of majority rule. The roots of deliberative democracy can be traced back to Aristotle and his notion of politics; however, the German philosopher Jürgen Habermas' work on communicative rationality and the public sphere is often identified as a major work in this area.

Deliberative democracy can be practiced by decision-makers in both representative democracies and direct democracies. In elitist deliberative democracy, principles of deliberative democracy apply to elite societal decision-making bodies, such as legislatures and courts; in populist deliberative democracy, principles of deliberative democracy apply to groups of lay citizens who are empowered to make decisions. One purpose of populist deliberative democracy can be to use deliberation among a group of lay citizens to distill a more authentic public opinion about societal issues but not directly create binding law; devices such as the deliberative opinion poll have been designed to achieve this goal. Another purpose of populist deliberative democracy can be to serve as a form of direct democracy, where deliberation among a group of lay citizens forms a "public will" and directly creates binding law. If political decisions are made by deliberation but not by the people themselves or their elected representatives, then there is no democratic element; this deliberative process is called elite deliberation. According to Fishkin, this process attempts to indirectly filter the mass public opinion because representatives are better equipped with the knowledge of the common good than ordinary citizens.

James Fearon and Portia Pedro believe deliberative processes most often generate ideal conditions of impartiality, rationality and knowledge of the relevant facts, resulting in more morally correct outcomes.^{[12][13][14]} Former diplomat Carne Ross contends that the processes more civil, collaborative, and evidence-based than the debates in traditional town hall meetings or in internet forums if citizens know their debates will impact society. Some fear the influence of a skilled orator. John Burnheim critiques representative democracy as requiring citizens to vote for a large package of policies and preferences bundled together,

much of which a voter might not want. He argues that this does not translate voter preferences as well as deliberative groups, each of which are given the time and the ability to focus on one issue.

16.4: FEATURES OF DELIBERATIVE DEMOCRACY

Fishkin's model of deliberation

James Fishkin, who has designed practical implementations of deliberative democracy through deliberative polling for over 15 years in various countries, describes five characteristics essential for legitimate deliberation:

- *Information*: The extent to which participants are given access to reasonably accurate information that they believe to be relevant to the issue
- *Substantive balance*: The extent to which arguments offered by one side or from one perspective are answered by considerations offered by those who hold other perspectives
- *Diversity*: The extent to which the major positions in the public are represented by participants in the discussion
- *Conscientiousness*: The extent to which participants sincerely weigh the merits of the arguments
- *Equal consideration*: The extent to which arguments offered by all participants are considered on the merits regardless of which participants offer them

Studies by James Fishkin and others have concluded that deliberative democracy tends to produce outcomes which are superior to those in other forms of democracy. Desirable outcomes in their research include less partisanship and more sympathy with opposing views; more respect for evidence-based reasoning rather than opinion; a greater commitment to the decisions taken by those involved; and a greater chance for widely shared consensus to emerge, thus promoting social cohesion between people from different backgrounds. Fishkin cites extensive empirical support for the increase in public spiritedness that is often caused by participation in deliberation, and says theoretical support can be traced back to foundational democratic thinkers such as John Stuart Mill and Alexis de Tocqueville.

Cohen's outline

Joshua Cohen, a student of John Rawls, argued that the five main features of deliberative democracy include:

1. An ongoing independent association with expected continuation.
2. The citizens in the democracy structure their institutions such that deliberation is the deciding factor in the creation of the institutions and the institutions allow deliberation to continue.
3. A commitment to the respect of a pluralism of values and aims within the polity.
4. The citizens consider deliberative procedure as the source of legitimacy, and prefer the causal history of legitimation for each law to be transparent and easily traceable to the deliberative process.
5. Each member recognizes and respects other members' deliberative capacity.

Cohen presents deliberative democracy as more than a theory of legitimacy, and forms a body of substantive rights around it based on achieving "ideal deliberation":

1. It is free in two ways:
 1. The participants consider themselves bound solely by the results and preconditions of the deliberation. They are free from any authority of prior norms or requirements.
 2. The participants suppose that they can act on the decision made; the deliberative process is a sufficient reason to comply with the decision reached.
2. Parties to deliberation are required to state reasons for their proposals, and proposals are accepted or rejected based on the reasons given, as the content of the very deliberation taking place.
3. Participants are equal in two ways:
 1. Formal: anyone can put forth proposals, criticize, and support measures. There is no substantive hierarchy.
 2. Substantive: The participants are not limited or bound by certain distributions of power, resources, or pre-existing norms. "The participants...do not regard

themselves as bound by the existing system of rights, except insofar as that system establishes the framework of free deliberation among equals."

4. Deliberation aims at a rationally motivated consensus: it aims to find reasons acceptable to all who are committed to such a system of decision-making. When consensus or something near enough is not possible, majoritarian decision making is used.

In *Democracy and Liberty*, an essay published in 1998, Cohen updated his idea of pluralism to "reasonable pluralism" – the acceptance of different, incompatible worldviews and the importance of good faith deliberative efforts to ensure that as far as possible the holders of these views can live together on terms acceptable to all.

Gutmann and Thompson's model

Amy Gutmann and Dennis F. Thompson's definition captures the elements that are found in most conceptions of deliberative democracy. They define it as "a form of government in which free and equal citizens and their representatives justify decisions in a process in which they give one another reasons that are mutually acceptable and generally accessible, with the aim of reaching decisions that are binding on all at present but open to challenge in the future".

They state that deliberative democracy has four requirements, which refer to the kind of reasons that citizens and their representatives are expected to give to one another:

1. Reciprocal. The reasons should be acceptable to free and equal persons seeking fair terms of cooperation.
2. Accessible. The reasons must be given in public and the content must be understandable to the relevant audience.
3. Binding. The reason-giving process leads to a decision or law that is enforced for some period of time. The participants do not deliberate just for the sake of deliberation or for individual enlightenment.
4. Dynamic or Provisional. The participants must keep open the possibility of changing their minds, and continuing a reason-giving dialogue that can challenge previous decisions and laws.

16.5: SUMMARY

Deliberative democracy values open and public deliberation on Issues of common concern. It starts from the assumption of individuals as autonomous persons but does not view the social relationships between these autonomous persons as relationships of conflict or interest. Rather, it sees people as relating to each other and seeking to influence each other through reasoned argument and persuasion. For advocates of deliberative democracy, persuasion is the best basis for political power, because it alone respects the autonomy of individuals and values their capacity for self- government. It also gives individuals control over an important aspect of their lives, and makes for greater and continuous accountability of political power. Unlike participatory democracy, which requires individuals to be constantly engaged in making decisions, deliberative democracy allows for a political division of labour between citizens and professional politicians, though citizens are involved in deliberation about public issues.

16.6: KEY TERMS

- **Deliberation:** The process of carefully considering and discussing various perspectives and arguments before making a decision.
- **Public Reasoning:** Engaging in discussions that are open and accessible to all, where participants provide justifications for their views that others can understand and critique.
- **Consensus:** A general agreement or shared understanding among participants after deliberation, although not necessarily unanimous.
- **Inclusiveness:** Ensuring that all relevant voices and viewpoints are represented and heard in the deliberative process.
- **Legitimacy:** The acceptance and justification of decisions based on the fairness and transparency of the deliberative process.
- **Epistemic Quality:** The idea that deliberation should lead to well-informed and rational decisions, based on the quality of the arguments and evidence presented.
- **Equality:** The principle that all participants in the deliberative process should have

an equal opportunity to contribute and influence the outcome.

- **Public Sphere:** The arena where individuals come together to discuss and debate public issues, ideally free from governmental control or corporate influence.
- **Procedural Fairness:** Ensuring that the process of deliberation is fair and equitable, with clear rules and opportunities for all participants to contribute.
- **Reflective Judgment:** The capacity to reflect on one's own views and those of others in order to make well-considered decisions.

16.7: SELF ASSESSMENT QUESTIONS

- What is deliberative Democracy?
- Explain basic features of deliberative democracy.
- Critically discuss deliberative democracy.

16.8: REFERENCES

Joshil. R. P. and G.S. Narwani, 2002, Panchayat Raj in India: Emerging Trends Across the states, Rawat Publications, Jaipur, New Delhi.

Bhattacharya Mohit, 1999, Restructing Public Administration: Essays in Rehabilitation, Jawahar Publishers & Distributors, New Delhi.

Arora Ramesh K. (ed). 2001, Management in Government: Concerns and Priorities, Aalekha Publishers, Jaipur.

Arora Ramesh K. (ed), 2004, Public Administration: Fresh Perspectives, Aalekha Publishers, Jaipur.

Siva Subrahmanyam K. & R.C. Chowdhury, 2002, Functional and Financial Devolution on Panchayats in India, NIRD, Hyderabad.

Sivarama Krishna K.C., 2003, Power to the People: The Politics and Progress of Decentralisation, Konark Publishers, New Delhi.

UNIT-17: THE GRAMMER OF DEMOCRACY: POLITICAL PARTICIPATION

Structure

- 17.1 Objectives
- 17.2 Introduction
- 17.3 The Meaning of Political Participation
- 17.4 Forms of Political Participation
- 17.5 Political Participation and Political Parties in India
- 17.6 Summary
- 17.7 Key Terms
- 17.8 Self Assessment Questions
- 17.9 References

17.1: OBJECTIVES

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

- What is Political Participation
- The concept of Political Participation
- Discuss forms of Political Participation
- What is Political Parties
- Political parties and political participation in India

17.2: INTRODUCTION

Participatory democracy is a type of democracy, which is itself a form of government. The term "democracy" is derived from the Greek demos and karatos). It has two main subtypes, direct and representative democracy. In the former, the people have the authority to deliberate and decide legislation; in the latter, they choose governing officials to do so. While direct democracy was the original concept, its representative version is the most widespread today.

Public participation, in this context, is the inclusion of the public in the activities of a polity. It can be any process that directly engages the public in decision-making and gives consideration to its input. The extent to which political participation should be considered necessary or appropriate is under debate in political philosophy.

Joining political parties allows citizens to participate in democratic systems, but is not considered participatory democracy.

Participatory democracy is primarily concerned with ensuring that citizens have the opportunity to be involved in decision-making on matters that affect their lives. It is not a new concept and has existed in various forms since the Athenian democracy. Its modern theory was developed by Jean-Jacques Rousseau in the 18th century and later promoted by John Stuart Mill and G. D. H. Cole, who argued that political participation is indispensable for a just society. In the early 21st century, participatory democracy has been more widely studied and experimented with, leading to various institutional reform ideas such as participatory budgeting.

17.3: THE MEANING OF POLITICAL PARTICIPATION

Participation is both an activity and an attitude. As an activity it is a social activity. Someone taking a morning walk is not participating in anything. Someone taking part in a 100-meter race does. Someone staying in a neighborhood for a long time without knowing any of one's neighbors is not having a participant attitude. What then is political participation? Of course, we mean a kind of political activity and a kind of political attitude. Since the 50's however it has attracted widespread attention and there seems to be a general agreement among the Political Scientists on the value and necessity of further political participation. But this apparent agreement conceals major disputes both at the levels of political theory and practical politics. Before we explore these we should begin with the concept of political participation itself.

The concept of political participation has been popularised in Political Science by the Behaviouralists. Of course arguments in favor of greater political participation had been advanced by republican and democratic theorists from Rousseau onwards and are still in use by contemporary political theorists. The behaviouralist paradigm rides on a liberal view of politics. Classically, such a view draws a distinction between state and individual on the one hand and public and private on the other; it also leans on the side of the latter categories. Accordingly, when participation is seen as an attitude, it is taken as an individual's favourable orientation to the state or government. That was the basis use of culture and political culture as social science concepts dates only from 1950s.

Here the political culture is seen as a shorthand expression to denote the set of values within which a political system operates. It is something between the state of public opinion and an individual's personality characteristics. According to Gabriel Almond, it is the 'particular pattern of orientations' to political objects in which a political system is embedded. Orientations are predisposition to political action and are determined by such factors as tradition, historical memories, motives, norms, emotions and symbol: the culture, therefore,

represents a set of propensities. These orientations may be broken down into cognitive orientations (knowledge and awareness of the political effects), affective orientations (emotions and feelings about the objects) and evaluative orientations (judgment about them). Almond (with Verba) later developed a typology of ideal political cultures or citizen types. Where most people are oriented to the input processes and see themselves as able to make demands and help to shape policies, the political culture is participant; the British, American and Scandinavian political systems best represent this ideal. Similarly, government as the point of reference of individual's activity becomes the feature of political participation as an activity. Thus writes Birch : ' political participation is participation in the process of government, and the case for political participation is essentially a case for substantial number of private citizens (as distinct from public officials or elected politicians) to play a part in the process by which leaders are chosen and/or government policies are shaped and implemented.' The Communitarians find problem with this Liberal concept of participation because of its 'individualism' and government as the locus of participation. They argue that more important than participation in the process of government through the 'politics of right' is participation at community level for 'politics of common good. They argue that more important than participation in the process of government is exercise of autonomy which can be developed and exercised in a certain kind of social environment, an autonomy-supporting community, not a government. Thus, Political participation can, then be seen broadly as participation in the political life of the community or civil society with different agents and levels of participation such as running a community health club by a religious group or participating in a N.G.O.sponsored campaign for literacy. Following the same logic political participation may be for serving political obligation of a democratic citizen to lead a participatory social life and just not for the civil obligation to the government on the question of law and order. Wider political participation must include some degree of democratic control either over or within large-scale economic enterprises, decentralisation of government to smaller units, such as region or locality, considerable use of referenda etc.

17.4: FORMS OF POLITICAL PARTICIPATION

The concept of political participation accommodates the following main forms of political participation:

- voting in local or national elections;
- voting in referendums;
- canvassing or otherwise campaigning in elections;

- active membership of a political party;
- active membership of a pressure group;
- taking part in political demonstrations, industrial strikes with political objectives, rent strikes in public housing, and similar activities aimed at changing public policy;
- various forms of civil disobedience, such as refusing to pay taxes or obey a conscription order;
- membership of government advisory committees;
- membership of consumers' councils for publicly owned industries;
- client involvement in the implementation of social policies;
- various forms of community action, such as those concerned with housing or environmental issues in the locality.

If we take into account the broad concept of political participation, we can probably increase the list by adding such forms as:

- 1) Performing social duties such as jury service and military duties;
- 2) Town/ village meetings and public debate on controversial issues;
- 3) Various forms of codetermination, such as student-faculty committees in the universities and government advisory committees;
- 4) Shared project management involving full-scale partnership, delegation or empowerment such as benefit-sharing arrangements or developmental projects;
- 5) New social movements seeking and promoting personal and collective identity, such as women's movement and movements for ethnocultural identities.

On the whole there are several levels and forms at which and through which people may participate politically, as involved objects of a process of economic and political transformation set in motion by someone else, as expected beneficiaries of a programme with pre-set parameters, as politically co-opted legitimisers of a policy or as people trying to determine their own choices and direction independent of the state.

17.5: POLITICAL PARTICIPATION AND POLITICAL PARTIES IN INDIA

5 For that we must note the specificity of Indian politics and party politics in India. Indian politics are distinctive among contemporary developing societies in having had democratic durability for about fifty years- excepting the brief emergency period-with many paradoxical features like high voter turnout amid high rate of illiteracy and agrarian population, multilevel electoral process with many electoral areas not yet fully dominated and controlled by organised political parties, coexistence of various organised interest associations with intermediaries between people and bureaucracy, non-party movements. Specifically Indian types of interest associations, including religious and caste groups. The Indian party system is also distinctive, showing major differences with its European and American counterparts. Paul Brass writes: 'Party politics in India display numerous paradoxical features, which reveal the blending of Western and modern forms of bureaucratic organisation and participatory politics with indigenous practices and institutions. India's leading political party, the Indian National Congress, is one of the oldest in the world, yet it has not succeeded in providing the nucleus for an institutionalised party system which can be fitted easily into any one of the conventional categories of party system in the west. The social heterogeneity of India has added to the complexity of the Indian party system. This has increasingly made it impossible for a single set of parties to emerge across the country. Major transformations have taken place since Independence in India's party system. At the center of change in the party system is the rise of the BJP. Irrespective of the nature of changes in the party system, parties have continued to remain in the centre of Indian politics. Opinion polls in India have repeatedly shown that people generally vote more for the party than for the candidate. In some cases parties have been solid, creating deep loyalties that continue from generations to generations, giving election symbols of parties" tremendous psychological significance. After the 73rd and 74th Amendments, parties have found a new level of operation in the Panchayat and Nagarpalika institutions. This has widened the reach of election machinery and made political parties even more significant as agents of political participation. Keeping these points in mind let us now note the role of the Indian political parties as agents of political participation.

6 Political Participation through an Increasingly Competitive Party System

- 7 Any observer of Indian political scene would not miss the tremendous growth of political parties in power. This growth has taken place both at the national and state levels. This growth has been fuelled by fragmentation of existing parties in terms of vote share, seat share and evolution of electoral alliances at both the national and state levels; the emergence of new political parties like BJP, BSP etc. and new coalitions of parties like NDA. A long-range overview of the Congress Party reveals an increasingly narrowing scope of political participation at within-party level as well as widening political participation outside. Before the transfer of power, the Congress was synonymous with the nationalist movement and represented a mass wave by including within its fold different political groups such as the Communists and the Socialists. This ensured a truly broad-based political participation by the Indian masses because the objective of the nationalist movement was an abstract one of Independence. Some restriction of the participatory role of the Congress party took place between 1946- 1950 when the party changed from the earlier one that fought for independence. With the knowledge that after the Second World War, independence was forthcoming certain realignments started taking place within Congress. Several secessions took place from the congress involving the Communists, Muslim separatists and the socialists as a result of which within-party participation got somewhat restricted. The most influential account of congress organisation after independence was given by Rajni Kothari in his *Politics in India* (1970). He presented it as a differentiated system in which the different levels of party organisation were linked with „the parallel structure of government, allowing for the dominance of a political centre as well as dissent from the peripheries, with opposition functioning as dissident congress groups. Kothari gave it the simple name 'Congress system'. This ensured political participation mainly through factional conflicts. On this, Brass writes:
- 8 Factions contested for control of the important committees at each level through formal elections preceded by membership drives in which competing faction leaders attempted to enroll, even if only on paper, as many member-supporters as possible. Although the factional conflicts which developed often became intense and bitter and were accompanied by frequent charges of " bogus enrolments," they also served to keep the party organisation

alive and to compel party leaders to build support in the districts and localities throughout the country.

- 9 The 1967 elections marked the trend of political fragmentation sharply. The Congress vote was dropped by almost 5 per cent. It had managed to win only 54 per cent of the seats. Earlier in the previous parliament it had 74 per cent of the seats. In many states it failed to win a majority. In as many as nine states- Punjab, Haryana, Uttar Pradesh, Madhya Pradesh, Bihar, West Bengal, Orissa, Madras and Kerala-there came nonCongress governments. Within the party also conflict grew between the Syndicate and Indira Gandhi leading to a split in 1969. The newly formed Congress derived its identity from its leader in real terms. Elections within the party were stopped. Chief Ministers were appointed by the central high command. The massive electoral victory of the party in 1971 further increased political centralization that culminated into the Emergency in 1975. The popular reaction against this was a landmark in terms of political participation. It brought for the first time a non-Congress coalition government, the Janata government, at the centre. The Congress took the opportunity of coming back to power in 1980 against a divided opposition. The eighth general election took place in December 1984 in the shadow of Indira Gandhi's assassination and brought Rajeev Gandhi into power as the leader of the Congress (I). This did not alter the trend of political centralization within the party. Growing political dissension in the country and controversies of Bofors kickback formed the background of 1989 general elections. The Congress (I) was defeated, securing only 197 seats in the Lok Sabha. The National Front, though it could not win support of the BJP and the Left parties.
- 10 That government lasted only a year and paved the way for the Chandrasekhar government with Congress-I support that was quickly withdrawn and the ninth Lok Sabha was dissolved less than a year and a half after its formation. Halfway through the general elections, Rajeev Gandhi was assassinated and Congress (I) recovered its position somewhat due to sympathetic and favourable electoral support. Even then it failed to win a majority and became the single largest party with 232 seats. P. V. Narasimha Rao, elected leader of the party was appointed Prime Minister. The Rao regime eventually secured majority by winning over the Ajit Singh faction of the Janata Dal. But the party failed to regain its organisational strength and was set in a path of steady decline which culminated

in its removal from power after 1996 elections; when BJP emerged as the single largest party but short of majority, and various regional parties like Telugu Desam Party, the DMK, the AGP and Janata Dal the breakaway Congress group in Tamil Nadu, led by G. K. Moopanar and the left parties came together to form a bloc-NF-LF bloc, later called the United Front. However with President S. D. Sharma deciding to invite A. B. Vajpayee of the BJP to form government despite Congress (I) support to the United Front, he formed the government but only for seven days. H. D. Deve Gowda of the Janata Dal next formed the United Front government with Congress(1) support where for the first time in history a left party-the CPI-- joined a government at the centre. In 1996 itself BJP forged alliances with Shiv Sena.

- 11 In 1998 it strengthened its alliances by a soft Hindutva image and became attractive as a partner for a regional or state-based party opposed to the Congress or congress allied regional rival(Punjab, Maharashtra, Tamil Nadu, Karnataka, Haryana, Orissa) or to a Congress faction (Trinamool congress) versus major regional party(West Bengal). It managed to adopt a national agenda and win post-election allies (Chautala's Haryana Lok Dal) and external supporters (TDP, NC) for coalition government at the centre. The Congress failed to return to power as the BJP managed to sustain and expand the same coalition, now formally called the National Democratic Alliance (NDA) adding the TDP, Goa's MGP, and the Pate1 faction of the Karnataka Janata Dal, switching partners in Tamil Nadu and Haryana. The above trends showing the decline of the Congress and rise of new contenders for power at the central level make it clear that a pattern of fragmentation of the party system has been taking place together with electoral alliances, adding to competitiveness of the party system and participation of increasing number of parties in power, maybe towards a loose bipolarity at the national level. The above trend has not been limited to the national level only, but has also affected the states for the general elections between 1967- 1989. The phenomena of consold action of non-Congress vote (Madhya Pradesh, Rajasthan, Himachal Pradesh etc.), Congress-led alliances of state-based minor parties (Kerala, Tripura), a left-front coalition versus Congress (West Bengal) and so on could be seen. The same could be seen for State Assembly elections. Here the Congress party's position eroded even more than for parliamentary elections, and the consolidation of principal challenger parties or alliances at the state level was marked. The process of alliance formation has been complex and multidimensional at state level but it

could be noted that they were driven less by ideological considerations or social divisions and more by the imperative to aggregate votes. On the whole, it could be argued that as agents, political parties in India have not only multiplied, but also have also been participating more effectively in the sharing and management of powers.

17.6: SUMMARY

The concept of political participation has assumed a new significance in the Indian democratic process. The credit goes to the Behaviouralists for espousing this concept as an essential aspect for the democratic process. Various forms of political participation include voting in referendums, membership in political parties and pressure groups, government advisory committees, involvement in the implementation of social policies etc. The proliferation of political parties in an increasingly competitive system also contributed to the widening political participation across various sections of society. The non-party institutions like the NGOs have also been addressing the concerns of the people in the form of women's movements, anti-big dam movements etc. Other major factors of political participation include increased voter turnout, political assertions of the caste and religious groups and also disadvantaged groups. The final assessment of an effective participation and its impact on the Indian democratic process is subject to various interpretations and disputes.

17.7: KEY TERMS

- **Electoral Participation:** Involvement in voting or running for public office.
- **Civic Engagement:** Activities that promote or improve community and political life, such as volunteering or attending public meetings.
- **Political Activism:** Engaging in actions to promote or oppose political causes, often involving protests, advocacy, or campaigning.
- **Grassroots Movements:** Community-driven efforts aimed at creating political or social change from the bottom up.
- **Lobbying:** Efforts by individuals or groups to influence legislators and public policy.
- **Public Opinion:** The collective attitudes and beliefs of individuals on political and social issues.
- **Political Efficacy:** The belief that one's actions can influence political processes and outcomes.

- **Political Parties:** Organized groups that seek to gain political power by electing members to office.
- **Interest Groups:** Organizations that advocate for specific issues or policies and seek to influence public policy and legislation.
- **Civil Rights:** Legal protections and freedoms guaranteed to individuals, often tied to political participation and activism.
- **Voter Turnout:** The percentage of eligible voters who actually cast a vote in an election.
- **Direct Democracy:** A form of democracy where citizens vote on laws and policies directly, rather than through elected representatives.
- **Representative Democracy:** A system where citizens elect representatives to make decisions and pass laws on their behalf.

17.8: SELF ASSESSMENT QUESTIONS

- What do you mean by Political Participation.
- Discuss various forms of Political Participation.
- Discuss how political parties promote political participation in India.

17.9: REFERENCES

Granville, Austin (2003). Working a democratic constitution: A history of the Indian experience. Delhi: Oxford University Press. p. 215. ISBN 978-0195656107

Pillay, Anashri (2019), "The Constitution of the Republic of India", in Masterman, Roger; Schütze, Robert (eds.), Cambridge Companion to Comparative Constitutional Law, Cambridge University Press, pp. 146–147,

James S. Fishkin (2011). When the People Speak. Oxford University Press. ISBN 978-0-19-960443-2.

Roger Osborne (2006). Civilization: A New History of the Western World. Jonathan Cape Ltd. ISBN 0-224-06241-7.

Carne Ross (2011). The Leaderless Revolution: How Ordinary People Can

UNIT-18: THE GRAMMER OF DEMOCRACY: REPRESENTATION

Structure

- 18.1 Objectives
- 18.2 Introduction
- 18.3 Meaning of Political Representation
- 18.4 Types of Representation
- 18.5 Summary
- 18.6 Key Terms
- 18.7 Self Assessment Questions
- 18.8 References

18.1: OBJECTIVES

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

- The meaning of Political Participation
- Various types of Participation

18.2: INTRODUCTION

Political representation is the activity of making citizens "present" in public policy-making processes when political actors act in the best interest of citizens according to Hanna Pitkin's *Concept of Representation* (1967).

This definition of political representation is consistent with a wide variety of views on what representing implies and what the duties of representatives are. For example, representing may imply acting on the expressed wishes of citizens, but it may alternatively imply acting according to what the representatives themselves judge is in the best interests of citizens.

And representatives may be viewed as individuals who have been authorized to act on the behalf of others, or may alternatively be viewed as those who will be held to account by those they are representing. Political representation can happen along different units such as social groups and area, and there are different types of representation such as substantive representation and descriptive representation.

18.3: MEANING OF POLITICAL REPRESENTATION

Under the *accountability* view, a representative is an individual who will be held to account.

Representatives are held accountable if citizens can judge whether the representative is acting in their best interest and sanction the representative accordingly. The descriptive and symbolic views of political representation describe the ways in which political representatives "stand for" the people they represent. *Descriptive* representatives "stand for" to the extent that they resemble, in their descriptive characteristics (e.g. race, gender, class etc.), the people they represent. On the other hand, *symbolic* representatives "stand for" the people they represent as long as those people believe in or accept them as their representative.^[6] Hanna Fenichel Pitkin argues that these views of political representation give an inadequate account of political representation because they lack an account both of how representatives "act for" the represented and the normative criteria for judging representative's actions. Hence, Pitkin proposes a *substantive* view of representation. In this view of political representation, representation is defined as substantive "acting for", by representatives, the interests of the people they represent.

In contrast, Jane Mansbridge has identified four views of democratic political representation: promissory, anticipatory, surrogate and gyroscopic. Mansbridge argues that each of these views provides an account of both how democratic political representatives "act for" the people they represent and the normative criteria for assessing the actions of representatives. *Promissory* representation is a form of representation in which representatives are chosen and assessed based on the promises they make to the people they represent during election campaigns. For Mansbridge, promissory representation, preoccupied with how representatives are chosen (authorized) and held to account through elections, is the traditional view of democratic political representation. Anticipatory, surrogate and gyroscopic representation, on the other hand, are more modern views that have emerged from the work of empirical political scientists. *Anticipatory* representatives take actions that they believe voters (the represented) will reward in the next election. *Surrogate* representation occurs when representatives "act for" the interest of people outside their constituencies. Finally, in *gyroscopic* representation, representatives use their own judgements to determine how and for what they should act for on behalf of the people they represent.

Under Andrew Rehfeld's general theory of representation, a person is considered a representative as long as the particular group they represent judges them as such. In any case of political representation, there are representatives, the represented, a selection agent, a relevant audience and rules by which the relevant judge whether a person is a representative. Representatives are those who are selected by a selection agent from a larger set of qualified individuals who are then judged

to representatives by a relevant audience using particular rules of judgement. The rules by which a relevant audience judges whether a person is a representative can be either democratic or non-democratic. In a case where the selection agent, relevant audience and the represented are the same and the rules of judgment are democratic (e.g. elections), the familiar democratic case of political representation arises and where they are not, undemocratic cases arise.

18.4: TYPES OF REPRESENTATION

An alternative way of considering types of representation is as follows:

Substantive representation

Substantive representation occurs when representatives' opinions and actions reflect the wishes, needs, and interests of the people they represent. Democratic theorists often study substantive representation in terms of ideological congruence, meaning that representation is high when representatives hold the same policy positions as their constituents. Recent research shows that the ideological opinion-policy relationship is upheld for both foreign and domestic affairs, although foreign affairs and defense policy were long considered immune to public pressure. According to Hanna F. Pitkin's *The Concept of Representation* (1967), the standard for assessing the quality of substantive representation is the representative's responsiveness to the evolving needs of their citizenry. As a result, low substantive representation in representative democracies usually arises from representatives' inability to judge and act on the interests of the public rather than inactivity in office. Pitkin also argues that substantive representation should be apparent through the nature of government action between elections. Thus, substantive representation is predicated on the fact that democracy is evident between elections rather than isolated to formal procedures like voting.

Recently, Pitkin's concept of substantive representation has been criticized by several political scientists on the grounds that it "assumes a static notion that interests are entities waiting to be brought into the representational process." Among these scholars is Michael Saward (2010), who argues that substantive representation should be constructed as a process of "claims-making" in which representatives "speak for" their constituents. However, Ellie Severs (2012) disparages this logic, as she claims it obscures the interactions between representatives and the represented that are essential to the substantive representation process.

Substantive representation is not a universally accepted concept; minimalist theorists like Adam Przeworski (1999) reject the idea that representatives can be driven to act in the best interests of the public. In contrast to substantive representation, minimalists believe that democracy is merely a

system in which competitive elections select rulers and that democracies should be defended regardless of the outcomes they produce for their citizenry. Nonetheless, democratic theorists often consider substantive representation to be salient due to its emphasis on action in office, particularly in relation to the interests of women and ethnic minorities.

Descriptive representation

Scholars have defined representation as "the making present in some sense of something which is nevertheless not present literally or in fact". Descriptive representation is the idea that a group elects an individual to represent them who in their own characteristics mirror some of the more frequent experiences and outward manifestations of the group. This descriptive representation can have again different types such as "perfect over representation", "over representation", "proper representation", "under/nominal representation" & "No representation". In this form of representation, representatives are in their own persons and lives in some sense typical of the larger class of persons whom they represent. For example, certain ethnic groups or gender-based groups may want to elect a leader that shares these descriptive characteristics as they may be politically relevant. Disadvantaged groups may gain benefit from descriptive representation primarily in two ways:

1. When there is mistrust: This refers to a situation where communication between the group and its representatives has been inadequate. In these cases, descriptive representation promotes vertical communication between representatives and their group of constituents.
2. When interests are uncrystallized: In certain historical moments, citizen interests are not clearly defined. Either the issues have not been on the political agenda for long, or candidates have not taken public positions on them. In this case, the best way to have one's substantive interests represented is often to choose a descriptive representative whose characteristics match one's own.

Descriptive representation can be instituted by political parties independently where they set aside a certain number of party seats for particular groups. It can also be instituted through national electoral quotas either by reserving seats for office or candidate quotas for political parties.

Traditionally, quotas have been thought of as a way of providing adequate representation for previously disadvantaged groups such as women or oppressed ethnic groups. However, another way of conceptualizing quotas is to institute a maximum or ceiling quota for advantaged groups. This may improve the meritocracy of the system and improve the process of candidate selection. Empirically, quotas show mixed results. In Lesotho, quota-mandated female representation has had

no effect or even reduced several dimensions of women's engagement with local politics. In Argentina, quotas have mandated negative stereotypes about women politicians. Meanwhile, in India, women are more likely to win an election in a constituency that formerly had quotas, even when the quotas are removed, and women leaders provide public goods favoured by women constituents. Evidence also shows that while caste-based quotas may not change stereotypes of how people view the oppressed caste group, they do change the social norms of interaction between caste groups

Dyadic representation

Dyadic representation refers to the degree to which and ways by which elected legislators represent the preferences or interests of the specific geographic constituencies from which they are elected. Candidates who run for legislative office in an individual constituency or as a member of a list of party candidates are especially motivated to provide dyadic representation. As Carey and Shugart (1995, 417) observe, they have "incentives to cultivate a personal vote" beyond whatever support their party label will produce. Personal vote seeking might arise from representing the public policy interests of the constituency (by way of either the delegate, responsible party, or trustee models noted above), providing it "pork barrel" goods, offering service to individual constituents as by helping them acquire government services, and symbolic actions.

The most abundant scientific scholarship on dyadic representation has been for the U.S. Congress and for policy representation of constituencies by the members of the Congress. Miller and Stokes (1963) presented the seminal research of this kind in an exploratory effort to account for when alternative models of policy representation arise. Their work has been emulated, replicated, and enlarged by a host of subsequent studies. The most advanced theoretical formulation in this body of work, however, is by Hurley and Hill (2003) and by Hill, Jordan, and Hurley (2015) who present a theory that accounts well for when belief sharing representation, delegate representation, trustee representation, responsible party representation, and party elite led representation will arise.

Collective representation

The concept of collective representation can be found in various normative theory and scientific works, but Weissberg (1978, 535) offered the first systematic characterization of it in the scientific literature and for the U.S. Congress, defining such representation as "Whether Congress as an institution represents the American people, not whether each member of Congress represented his or her particular district." Hurley (1982) elaborated and qualified Weissberg's explication of how

such representation should be assessed and how it relates to dyadic representation. Stimson, MacKuen, and Erikson (1995), offer the most advanced theoretical exposition of such representation for the U.S. Congress. And the latter work was extended in Erikson, MacKuen, and Stimson (2002).

In most parliamentary political systems with strong (or ideologically unified) political parties and where the election system is dominated by parties instead of individual candidates, the primary basis for representation is also a collective, party based one. The foundational work on assessing such representation is that of Huber and Powell (1994) and Powell (2000).

18.5: SUMMARY

Political representation is at the heart of democracy. Whether democracy is understood as popular rule or as effective fate control by the people, representation is the means to realize the democratic idea of giving people a voice in large states. Thus, from a normative point of view, there should be a causal relationship between citizens' interests and policy decisions of representatives. Elections are the major link establishing causality between the wishes of the people and acts of governance. However, how and whom citizens elect varies considerably across democracies. The two ideal types or "two visions of democracy". In a proportional electoral system, citizens elect parties voting for lists and parties determine by candidate selection how those lists are composed. The causal link between citizens and representatives differs clearly between the two kinds of elections. The mandate in the majoritarian model is given to a person, and this person is held accountable in the next elections for her performance. In the proportional model, the mandate is given to a party, and the party is held accountable in the next elections. Thus, different actors have the duty to deliver representation in different electoral systems: individual deputies in the majoritarian, political parties in the proportional model. This implies that representatives should have different roles and foci of representation depending on the mode of their election. The two visions of democracy embedded in the two electoral systems carry distinct normative ideals about good representation. Looking at political representation in democracies from a comparative perspective, electoral systems seem to induce the respective orientation toward the mandate and whom to represent by different incentives for candidates running in single-member districts or on party lists. The role of a party delegate is more frequent in proportionality, and the delegate and trustee roles more frequent in majoritarian systems. In majoritarian systems, representatives are very much

inclined to represent the median voter of the district; in proportional systems, representatives rather tend to represent their party voters.

18.6: KEY TERMS

- **Constituency:** A geographic area whose residents are represented by elected officials. For example, a congressional district.
- **Electorate:** The body of citizens eligible to vote in elections.
- **Delegate:** An individual chosen to represent others, often at conventions or meetings, and may be bound to vote according to the preferences of the constituents they represent.
- **Trustee:** An elected official who makes decisions based on their own judgment and expertise, rather than strictly adhering to the preferences of their constituents.
- **Descriptive Representation:** When elected representatives reflect the demographic characteristics of their constituents, such as race, gender, or socioeconomic status.
- **Substantive Representation:** When elected officials advocate for policies and interests that align with the needs and desires of their constituents, regardless of demographic similarity.
- **Political Accountability:** The concept that elected officials are answerable to their constituents for their actions and decisions, and can be held accountable through mechanisms like elections.
- **Proportional Representation:** An electoral system in which parties gain seats in proportion to the number of votes they receive, aiming to reflect the diversity of voter preferences more accurately.
- **Majoritarian Representation:** An electoral system where the candidate or party with the majority of votes wins, often used in single-member districts.
- **Gerrymandering:** The manipulation of electoral district boundaries to favor a particular party or group, which can distort representation.
- **Political Participation:** The involvement of citizens in the political process, including voting, campaigning, and engaging in political discussions.
- **Bureaucracy:** The administrative system governing any large institution, including government, where elected representatives often interact with various agencies and departments.

18.7: SELF ASSESSMENT QUESTIONS

- What do you mean by Representation?
- What is Political Representation?
- Discuss various types of Political Representation.

18.8: REFERENCES

Pitkin, Hanna (1967). *The Concept of Representation*. Berkeley and Los Angeles: University of California Press.

Rehfeld, Andrew (2006). "Toward a General Theory of Political Representation". *The Journal of Politics*. 68: 1–21.

Political Representation - Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy

Pitkin, Hanna (1967). *The Concept of Representation*. Berkeley and Los Angeles: University of California Press.

Narayan Jayaprakash (1975) 'Nation Building in India', Varanasi, NavachetanPrakashan.

S.C. Kashyap (1999) (Eds,) 'our Parliament' , National Book trust

Khanna H. R (2008)'Making of Indian Constitution ', New Delhi, Easton BookCompany

UNIT-19: PLURALIST THEORY OF DEMOCRACY

Structure

- 19.1 Objectives
- 19.2 Introduction
- 19.3 Pluralist Democracy: Meaning
- 19.4 Features of Pluralist Democracy
- 19.5 Criticisms
- 19.6 Summary
- 19.7 Key Terms
- 19.8 Self Assessment Questions
- 19.9 References

19.1: OBJECTIVES

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

- Meaning of Pluralist theory of Democracy
- Basic features of the Pluralist theory of Democracy
- Criticism to pluralist theory of Democracy

19.2: INTRODUCTION

As a response to the marked success of the democracy as an ideology and development of counter-democratic ideologies, a number of other variants of democracy emerged all over the world. In this context, a new interpretation of democracy was offered which sought to accommodate a specific space for a particular section of the society (elite) or in terms of concentrating power in several groups (plural). These new variant of democracy tries to contest that instead of power being concentrated in the hands of the people, it is better to be in the hands of a few elites. This concept developed towards the second half of 19th century by Vilfredo Pareto and Mosca and a number other political sociologists with their different perspectives of the elitist theory of democracy. However contesting the elite concept of democracy ,towards the 1950s and 1960s, another concept emerged in the form of the pluralist theory of democracy which believed that powers actually lay in a number of associations both government and non-government and not in the hands of a few.

19.3: PLURALIST DEMOCRACY: MEANING

The concept of pluralism emerged in response to the traditional theory of democracy which believed in the concept that sovereignty rests only with the state. It also rejected the view that power rests with an elite group. The pluralists are of the view that power resides in several organizations rather than in one. The power resides not in the hands of the rich neither in the hands of the poor. Power resides in every social, political and economic groups. Hence power exists in a decentralized form in a pluralist society. They justified it on the ground that social structure is pluralistic or federal and that is why the power structure of the society is also pluralistic.

Meaning of the Pluralist theory of Democracy

The Pluralist doctrine was developed by English writers like John Figgis, F.W. Maitland and G.D.H. Cole, Robert Dahl, Sartori, Przeworski, Hunter, Bartels, Agger, etc. The Pluralist theory of democracy refers to a model in which power is not concentrated in the hands of a group or class but is diffused among many interest groups competing against each other for power. During 1950's and 1960's in America the concept of pluralism gained importance as a reworked version of liberal democracy challenging the rule of the elite on the ground that this model tries to establish that the function of policy making is actually not indulged in by elected representatives or any elite. Rather it is an outcome of the interaction among the various groups in a society. This model is perfectly suitable for a plural society. They are not against democracy, rather they hold that the notion that democracy is best realized in a plural society through the decentralization of power among plural elements. This theory has been derived from pluralist theory of sovereignty. The main content of the theory has been derived from the postulate that—"rejecting the indivisibility of the sovereignty and monopoly of the state they held that social structure is plural and that is why power distribution must be plural. State is divided into certain structure and power must be distributed among these units of the state. Groups are a very important component of a society and all activities of the state are actually activities of these groups that is why they must be equally empowered. This is essential and natural for upliftment of the society."

Importance of Pluralism

Miss M.P. Follet in her famous book, 'The New State' has summed up the highlights of pluralism in following manner. The points are: The pluralists prick the bubble of the present state's right to supremacy. They see that the state which has been slowly forming since the Middle Ages with its

pretences and unfulfilled claims has not earned either our regard or respects. They recognize the value of the group and they see that the variety of our group life today has significance which must be immediately reckoned with in a political way. They plead for revivification of local life. The pluralist see that the interest of the state is not always identical with the interests of its parts. Pluralism is the beginning of the disappearance of the crowd. Pluralism contains the prophecy of the future because it has with its keenest insight, seized upon the problem of identity, of association and of federalism. In relation to the above cited points, Gettle describes the contribution of the pluralists in these words, “their emphasis on the fact that states, in spite of legal omnipotence should be subject to moral restraints is a desirable reaction against the idealization of the state and the doctrine that state is an end in itself free from moral restraint. The pluralists also make a timely protest against the rigid and dogmatic legalism of the Austinian theory of sovereignty”. He further remarks that the pluralists emphasises the necessity of studying the actual facts of political life in a rapidly changing social system. In this connection, they point out the growing importance of non-political groups, the danger of over interference by the state, the proper functions of groups and the desirability of giving to such groups greater legal recognition in the political systems.

19.4: FEATURES OF PLURALIST DEMOCRACY

A pluralist democracy is actually operational through different associations rather than through only the government and the people. The government in such a system is formed collectively representing different groups emerging in the social process. The political power is however exercised only by the government which is formed by the people representing a large number of private associations, groups and organizations. Pluralist democracy also works on the basis of consensus. They are of the view that people are rational so they are capable of good and desired decision making and they can participate in politics through their organized group. These groups are primary units of politics. Elections are very important in a pluralist democracy. Elections are reflections of public opinion. They are not only the means of electing the elites but of ensuring participation of people to realize the real meaning of democracy. Decentralization of power, separation of power and federal division of power in the system allows proper functioning of the government. Adequate representation in the government from all sections of the population facilitates continuous communication between the governors and the governed as well as the government and the masses. Open competition for power provides a platform for every association

or group to participate in the government. Instead of one there are several centres of power and hence all groups have an equal share and participate in policy making and decision making.

19.5: CRITICISM

The theory challenges the concept of state sovereignty and supreme power of the state. On the contrary it is observed that state sovereignty maintains law and order situation and absence of state sovereignty may lead to anarchy in the state. Traditional theorists are of the view that the pluralists do not have faith in popular sovereignty (sovereignty of the people). They do not support the pluralists because the latter give undue importance to the groups than individuals. One of the important conditions for the maintenance law and order in society is activeness of the state which is possible only when state is legally supreme and indivisible. If power is decentralized everywhere there is every possibilities that conflict and chaos will break out leading to the failure of constitutional mechanisms. There is presence of groups and individuals which are constantly opposed to each other. Their presence after results in conflicts and chaotic situations. So, it did only the presence of a unitary and centralized power like the state which can only maintain an orderly society. Therefore instead of numerous groups and association the overriding power should be with the state. To the Marxists conferring power in the hands of the people, that too in associations or groups is a mistake as they are incapable of ruling a state properly. Instead there should be one political party to control power in the state. In spite of being levelled with numerous criticisms, the pluralist theory is accepted on the ground that it supported the idea of politics of consensus and necessity of public opinion and popular government. This theory, though does not have much significance independently, yet the emergence of multiple groups in terms of interest and pressure groups as well as corporate groups is an indicator of the fact that this theory still stands valid, taking the form of neo-pluralism. In the words of Robert Dahl, it is to be called polyarchy.

19.6: SUMMARY

During the 19th century through the writings of Pareto, Mosca and Michels, the elite theory emerged accommodating the contemporary condition of the society. Pareto regarded elites as those powerful minority in the society that are psychologically and intellectually superior. Mosca is of the view that elites are those intellectuals, having moral and material superiority which holds powers in a society. Michel's, on the other hand regards elite rule as natural and necessary and safe

because masses are apathetic towards governance. The elitist theorists justified the rule of the few on the ground that masses are ignorant intellectually and psychologically inferior, not equipped to handle democratic processes and as a result they cannot act as responsible leaders. The Elitist theory is criticized on the ground that it excludes the ability of the masses as today mass government is regarded as the popular government.

19.7: KEY TERMS

- **Interest Groups:** Organizations or associations that seek to influence public policy and government decisions on behalf of their members or causes.
- **Political Pluralism:** The idea that multiple groups, interests, and viewpoints coexist and compete for influence within a political system.
- **Power Distribution:** The concept that power is not concentrated in the hands of a single group or elite but is distributed among various groups and individuals.
- **Competing Interests:** The notion that different groups with varying interests and priorities vie for attention and influence in the policymaking process.
- **Bargaining and Compromise:** The process through which different interest groups negotiate and reach agreements to address conflicting interests and achieve policy outcomes.
- **Pluralist Democracy:** A democratic system where governance is influenced by the interactions and negotiations among multiple interest groups rather than a single dominant group or ideology.
- **Policy Outcomes:** The results or decisions that emerge from the interactions and negotiations among interest groups and government officials.
- **Representation:** The idea that various groups in society have the opportunity to be represented in the political process and contribute to decision-making.
- **Public Opinion:** The collective preferences and attitudes of the general public, which interest groups often seek to sway or represent.
- **Access and Influence:** The ability of interest groups to gain access to policymakers and exert influence over political decisions and policies.

19.8: SELF ASSESSMENT QUESTIONS

- Discuss the pluralist theory of democracy.
- Discuss factors responsible for pluralist theory of democracy.
- Discuss the features of pluralist theory of democracy.
- What are the criticisms of the pluralist theory of democracy.

19.9: REFERENCES

Ghai. K.K. (2003) 'Indian Government and Politics', Kalyani Publisher, New Delhi.

Yogesh, Atal (1981) 'Building a Nation(essays on India)', Abhinav Publisher, New Delhi

Dovi, Suzanne. "Political Representation". The Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy (Winter 2017 Edition). Retrieved 21 March 2018.

Pitkin, Hanna (1967). The Concept of Representation. Berkeley and Los Angeles: University of California Press.

Rehfeld, Andrew (2006). "Toward a General Theory of Political

UNIT-20: ELITIST THEORY OF DEMOCRACY

Structure

- 20.1 Objectives
- 20.2 Introduction
- 20.3 Meaning of Elite
- 20.4 Theories of Elite
 - 20.4.1 Pareto's View
 - 20.4.2 Mosca's View
 - 20.4.3 C.W.Mill's View
 - 20.4.4 Mitchell's View
- 20.5 Circulation of Elites
- 20.6 Democratic Theory
- 20.7 Summary
- 20.8 Key Terms
- 20.9 Self Assessment Questions
- 20.10 References

20.1: OBJECTIVES

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

- Meaning of Elites
- Different theories of elites
- Circulation of elites
- Democratic theory of elites

20.2: INTRODUCTION

History is neither made by the masses nor by ideas, nor by silently working forces but by elite who from time to time assert themselves. Governing elite from its position of control of government and having power of the state determines which values shall be expressed in public policy and which values shall be realized in government operations. There are as many elite as there are values. The word "elite" was used in the 17th century to describe commodities of excellence and then it was used to refer to superior social groups as military chiefs or men of higher social

nobility. But it came to use in social and political writings in 1930s in Britain and America through the sociological theories of elites notably in the writings of Pareto and Mosca. The concept of the political elite refers to a select group of individuals within a society who wield significant influence and control over political decision-making. These individuals typically occupy key positions in government, institutions, or other centers of power, enabling them to shape policies, guide political processes, and impact the direction of a nation. The notion of a political elite is rooted in the recognition that not all members of a society have equal access to political power or influence. Political elites can emerge from various backgrounds, such as elected officials, bureaucrats, business leaders, intellectuals, and influential individuals within social and cultural spheres. Their influence may be formal, as seen in the case of government officials, or informal, stemming from connections, wealth, or expertise.

20.3: MEANING OF ELITE

In general, the term ‘elite’ refers to those people who hold social and political powers in a society and who have the highest indices in their branch of activity. The concept refers to inequality in virtue, knowledge, capability, status and position. One is treated as a member of the elite group in that particular field or branch in which one is better placed vis-à-vis the rest of one’s companions. If “elite” as a general term is applied to those who enjoy a higher status in their fields because of their excellence, we need another term for the minority, who possess the power to rule and we give the name ‘political elite’ to them. Political class refers to all those groups in society which exercise political power of influence and are directly engaged in struggles for political leadership. The political elite is a smaller group within the political class. It comprises those individuals who actually exercise political power in a society at any given time. It includes members of the government and of the higher administration, military chiefs and leaders of powerful economic enterprises. The term "elite" generally refers to a select group of individuals or entities that are considered superior or outstanding in a particular field, often due to characteristics such as wealth, power, education, skill, or influence. The concept of elite can be applied in various contexts, including social, economic, political, cultural, or academic spheres.

20.4: THEORIES OF ELITE

Theory of elites started from Pareto and Mosca (Italians), Michels (Swiss-German), Gasset (Spaniard), and then it was dealt with by Schumpeter (Economist), Lasswell (Political Scientist) and C. Wright Mills (Sociologist).

20.4.1: Pareto's View

Pareto (The mind and society) defines 'elite' in two different ways. He begins with a very general definition that, that people who have highest in their branch of activity, to that class, we give the name of elite. But in the second sense, which was more important than the former one, he uses the term 'elite' to the minority that possesses the qualities necessary for its action to full social and political powers. Those who occupy the top position are always the best. So he points out that in every population one finds two strata: (I) a lower stratum, the non – elite, and (II) a higher stratum, the elite which is again divided into two, namely (i) the governing elite, and (ii) the non-governing elite. Pareto observed that the upper stratum of society, the elite, nominally is composed of certain groups of people that are called aristocracies and plutocracies.

20.4.2: Mosca's View

Mosca (the ruling class) makes a distinction between 'elite' and 'masses'. He writes: in all societies two classes of people appear a class that rules and a class that is ruled. The former is always the less numerous, performs all political functions, monopolizes power and enjoys the advantages that power brings to them; whereas the second, the more numerous class, is directed and violent. For governing elite Mosca uses that term 'political classes. The minority is usually composed of superior individuals who possess some special attributes for which they become influential in society. But, Mosca's elite is not an autocrat, as he says that the political class itself is influenced and restrained by a variety of 'social forces' representing numerous different interests in society, and also by moral unity which can be expressed in the form of rule of law. Mosca later on admits that, the governing classes are also controlled by the representative system of government, voting and numerous social forces. In Mosca's theory, the elite does not rule by force and fraud, but 'represents' in some sense, the interests and purpose of important influential groups in society. The 'class' concept may be referred to Marx's theory which states that in every society two categories of people may be distinguished: (a) a ruling class, and (b) one or more subject classes. The ruling class, being in possession of power and the class struggle and only with the victory of the working class, followed by the emergence of a classless society.

20.4.3: C.W.Mills's View

Curtis Wright Mills (the power elite) explains his preference for the term 'Power Elite' rather than "Ruling Class" by saying "Ruling Class" is a badly loaded phrase, "Class" is an economic

term; “Rule” is a political one. The phrase “Ruling Class” thus contains the theory that an economic class rules politically. According to Mills, in every society power has been concentrated not only in the hands of economic cases, but also in the hands of political and military classes. The higher agents of each of these domains have a notable degree of autonomy and that by way of coalition they make up and carry important decisions. Men exercising power in these spheres constitute a cohesive class and to this class, Mills gives the name ‘Power elite’.

Mills defines the power elite in much the same way as Pareto defines his ‘governing elite’, for he says, “we may define the power elite in terms of the names of power as those who occupy the command posts”. Mills distinguishes three major elite the corporation heads, the political leaders and the military chiefs. He goes on to enquire whether these three groups together. His answer to these questions is that these groups do form single elite because they are representatives of an upper class, which has to be regarded as a ruling class. Mills has emphasized the unity of the elite which has to be regarded as a ruling class. Mills has emphasized the unity of the elite which can be obtained by the homogeneity of its social origins. Mills further argues that the interchange of personal between the three spheres also provides the cohesiveness to the elite group.

By ‘power elite’, Mills means a contrast between the organized ruling minorities with the unorganized majority or masses and thereby distinguishes it from the “ruling class” as used by Marx. In Mill’s study of the “Power elite”, there is an attempt to explain the power position of three principal elite taken separately that of business executives by the growth in size and complexity of business corporation; that of the military chiefs by the growing scale and expense of the weapons of war, determined by technology and the state of international conflict; and that of the national political leaders, by the decline of the legislature, of local politics and of voluntary organizations. However, nowhere, then, the division is natural and predetermined and Mills had regarded it as unfortunate and unavoidable. Carl J. Friedrich observes that one of the most problematical parts of all elite doctrines is the assumption that the men of power do constitute a cohesive group. In the light of continuous change in the composition of the majority, it is not possible to say under conditions prevailing in functioning of democracy, that those who play some considerable part in government constitute a cohesive group. This view of elite is stated “the rulers are not at all close knit or united. They are not so much in the centre of a solar system, as in a cluster of interlocking circles, each one largely occupied with its own professionalism and expertise, and touching others only at one edge. They are not a single establishment but a ring of establishments,

with slender connections. The friction and balance between the different circles is the supreme safeguard of democracy. No one man can stand in the centre, for there is no centre". Mills rejects this fashionable liberal –minded doctrine, which he summarizes as follows: "Far from being omnipotent, the elite are though to be so scattered as to lack any coherence as a historically force..... Those who occupy the formal places of authority are so checkmated-by other elite exerting pressure, or by the public as an electorate or by constitutional codes- that although there may be upper classes, there is no ruling class; although there may be a system of stratification, it has not executive top. "He insists that the three principal elite-economic, political and military are, infect, a cohesive group.

20.4.4: Mitchell's View:

The name of Roberto Mitchell's (1876-1936) is associated with that is known as the Iron Law of Oligarchy, which he declares as "One of the iron laws of history, from which the most democratic modern societies and, within those societies, the most advanced parties, have been unable to escape". The primary factor supporting this law is the element of organization. No movement or party can hope to succeed in modern times without organization. "Organization" is simply another way of spelling "Oligarchy". As a movement or party grows in size, more and more functions have to be delegated to inner circles of leaders, and, in course of time, the members of the organization are officers acquire great freedom of action and vested interest in their position. The growth of this kind of oligarchy is supported by Mitchell's who had made a through study of mass mind. The majorities of human beings, according to Mitchells is apathetic, indolent and slavish, and are permanently incapable of self-government? They are susceptible to flattery. Leaders easily take advantages of these qualities to perpetuate themselves in power. Once the leaders reached the pinnacle of power,, nothing could bring them down. "If laws are posed to control the dominion of leaders, it is the laws which gradually weaken and not the leaders". Revolutions occur in history and tyrants are deposited but new tyrants arise, and the world goes on as before.

The conceptual scheme of elite theories thus comprises the following notions; in every society there is and must be a minority which rules over the rest of society. The minority is the 'Political class' or 'governing elite' or power elite' composed of those who occupy the posts of political command and those who can directly influence political decisions. They believe that, the minority undergoes changes in its membership over a period of time, ordinarily by the recruitment of new individual members from the lower strata of society, sometimes by the incorporation of new social

groups and occasionally by the complete revolutions. According to Pareto, if there will be no circulation of elite, it may result in considerable increase of the degenerate elements in the class which still hold power and on the other hand, an increase of elements of superior quality in subject class. In such a case, the social equilibrium becomes unstable and the slightest shock will destroy it. A conquest or revolution produces an upheaval, brings new elite to power and establishes a new equilibrium.

The question arises: What leads to the degeneration of the governing elite which destroys the social equilibrium and gives rise to the circulation of elite? Pareto answers the question in terms of changes taking place in the psychological characteristics of the elite. In order to assess the value of this explanation, it is necessary to consider briefly Pareto's concept of 'residues'. By 'residues' Pareto means the qualities through which a person can rise in life. He has made a list of six residues, namely, residues of combinations, persistence of aggregates, of sociability, of activity of the integrity of the individual and of sex. But, he attaches the primary importance to the residues of 'combinations' and the 'persistence of aggregates' with the help of which the governing elite tries to maintain itself in power. The 'residues of combination' means 'cunnings' and the 'residues of persistent aggregates' means force, Elite must possess at least these two residues, namely 'cunningness' and force. When there is a change and force', there is degeneration of the qualities of elite and the same qualities are cultivated in some of the mass, which leads to circulation of elite. Pareto's explanation for circulation of elite is based upon the historical examples. But the history, he uses is not comprehensive and broad-based to support his explanation of circulation of elite. Moreover his study or rise and decline of elite as such is equally unsatisfactory as Pareto has not tried to show how the changes in the psychological traits of human mind makes place leading to rise and decline of elite.

20.5: CIRCULATION OF ELITES

Like Pareto, Masco also believed in the theory of circulation of elite. According to Masco, the distinguishing characteristic of the elite is that should possess the "aptitude to command and to exercise political control". Then he describes the circulation of elite as follows: "When the aptitude to command and to exercise political control is no longer the sole possession of the legal rulers but has become common enough among other people, when outside the ruling class another class has formed which finds itself deprived of power though it does have the capacity to share in the responsibilities of government then that law has become as capacity to an obstacle in the path of an

elemental force and must, by one way or another, go “Again he writes”...Within the lower classes, another ruling class, or directing minority, necessarily forms, and often this new class is antagonistic to the class that holds possession of the legal government”.

Like Pareto, Mosca does not attach supreme importance to the psychological characteristics of individual in his explanation of the rise and fall of elite but he refers to the germination of new ideas, ideals, interests or problem in the society. If a new source of wealth develops in a society. If the practical importance of knowledge grows, if an old religion declines, or a new one is born, if a new current ideas spread, thus simultaneously far reaching dislocations occur in the ruling classes. Mosca speaks of ‘political formulae’ which the elite must know in order to command and remain in power. The political formulate may not and generally does not embody absolute truth. It may as well be merely a plausible myth, which is accepted by the people. Even by simple fraud or myth, if the elite can cajole and move the people and keep them in subjugation, they can remain in power. When the elite forget about this political formula, the circulation of elite becomes inevitable.

Schumpeter made a similar observation in an essay on ‘Social Classes in an Ethically Homogeneous Milieu’. One of the most valuable features of Schumpeter’s study is that it considers together the individual and social factors in the circulation of elite. In the movement of families between classes, he argues, social assent is influenced by individual endowment in energy and intelligence, and also by social circumstances such as, the openness of the upper class, and the opportunities for enterprise in new fields of activity. Similarly, in the rise and fall of whole classes, some weight must be attributed to the qualities of individuals, but a more important influence is exerted by structural changes affecting the functions of the elite groups”..... The position of each class in the total national structure depends on the one hand, on the significance that is attributed to (its) function, and on the other hand, on the degree to which class successfully performs the function”. Thus Schumpeter recognizes that new social groups may be formed in a society as a result of economic or cultural changes, that such groups may then increase their social influence in so far as the kinds of activity in which they engage become of vital importance to society at large, and that these activities may in due course, produce changes in the political system and in the social structure as a whole. However Schumpeter, in a latter work, *Capitalism, Socialism and Democracy*, discusses, the changes in culture which are helping to bring about the decline of capitalism, but he treats these changes as secondary and largely dependent upon changes in the economic order.

Thus, we find there is not one type of political elite but there are different types of elite. As in the society, different interests and different values, systems coexist, so also there are different elite groups who have ascended to the top on their spheres. T. B. Bottom ore says that among the social groups, which have risen to prominence in the tremendous social and political changes of the 20th century, there are three types of elites, namely, the intellectuals, the managers of industry and the high government officials. They have often been singled out as the inheritors of the functions of earlier ruling classes and as vital agents in the creation of new forms of society.

Of these groups, the intellectuals are the most difficult to define, and their social influence is the most difficult. The intellectuals include the persons who contribute directly to the creation, transmission and criticism of ideas; they include writer, artists, scientists, philosophers, religious thinkers, social theories, political commentators. They have direct concern with the culture of the society and they are the catalysts of social change. Intellectuals are found in almost all societies, but their functions and their social importance very considerable. In some societies, the intellectuals have come close to being governing elite. Intellectual, are more or less independent group and they taken prominent part in radical and revolutionary movement.

A second group which has attracted attention as potential ruling elite is that constituted by managers of industry. They are the keepers of the community's materials welfare. Burnham speaks that we are living in a period of transition from one type of society to another, from a capitalist society to a type which he prospers to call the "Managerial Society". Burnham's argument is that the managers are taking over the economic power which was formerly in the hands of the capitalist owner of industry and are thus acquiring the power to shape the whole social system. The managers shall be a distinct social group, but they shall be a cohesive group, aware of their group interests in struggle for power by attempting to show the individuals ideology of capitalism is being replaced by a managerialistic ideology. They are he elite in the sense that they have high prestige and take important economic decisions, and that they are increasingly aware of their position as a functional group.

The third social group-the high government officials, appear to be a powerful elite in modern societies. High government officials are of two types, namely, the political executives and the bureaucratic executives. The idea of bureaucratic elite originated in the works of Max Webber who did not believe that the power of bureaucracy could be checked by political authorities, even in a democratic system. Power of bureaucracy has been increased because of the increase in the range of activities undertaken by the state and by the growing complexity of public administration. They

are also a functional group who shape public policies and implement them and through that bring economic changes in society.

This account of three elite suggests a number of interesting conclusions about the relation between elite and classes. No one can be regarded as contenders for the place of the governing elite. None of these groups is sufficiently cohesive or sufficiently independent to be considered in such light.

In the developing countries, the problem is somewhat different. In these countries the society is changing fast due to rapid industrialization and economic advancement. With this, there is the problem of competition intrude and economic advancement. With this, there is the problem of commute in trade and investment with this, advanced counties of the world, to contend with political instability, with popular demands for high levels of consumption and welfare and with the powerful opposing forces of traditional ways of life. In such conditions five types of elite are found in such developing societies. These elite customarily and variously take the leadership of the industrialization, modernization and development process. These five types are 1) a dynastic elite 2) the middle class 3) the revolutionary, intellectuals 4) the colonial administrators, and 5) the nationalist leaders.

In every society, development or developing, totalitarian or democratic, there is a minority who effectively rules over the majority. Elite theory believes in government by chosen few, while democracy is a government by law. Some the question arises how elite rule in a democracy, or in other words, how democracy and government by elite reconcile.

Karl, Mannheim, who in his earlier written had connected elite theories with fascism, played an important role in reconciling the two. In his letter, writings, he finds no contradiction between elite and democracy, when he writes that “The actual shaping of policy is in the hands of elite; but this does not mean that the society is not democratic”.

20.6: DEMOCRATIC THEORY

- Now the question arises what is the meaning of democratic theory of elite? This theory explains that as a form of government democracy permits elite to form freely and establishes a regulated competition between elite for the position of power. On the other hand, the mass of the population is able to participate in ruling society at least in the sense that it can exercise a choice between the rival elite. It is sufficient for democracy that the individual citizens, though prevented from taking directorate in government al the time, have at least the possibility of making the aspirations felt at certain intervals. Even if the

elite rule in a democracy, they are restrained and controlled by the people and they make policies in the interest of the people, because they come to power by the people. The difference between a totalitarian system and democracy was that whereas in the former the minority rule despotically, in the latter it is not possible as there is the fear that if the minority would be autocrat, they would be removed from office by the people. The democratic elite have a mass background; that is why it can mean something for the mass. The theorists of democracy discover a more general system of checks and balances in the plurality of elite, which characterizes democratic societies. As different groups of men looking for different ways of obtaining support from the masses, different political parties are formed and enter into a competition with each other to obtain support for power, the governing elite can not rule despotically and the government becomes a business of compromises. Those who are in power, become considerate, because they themselves have been, and will one day again be in opposition. The democratic theory of elites, also known as elite theory or elite pluralism, is a perspective within political theory that acknowledges the existence and influence of elites in democratic societies. Unlike more idealistic views of democracy that emphasize equal participation and representation for all citizens, elite theory recognizes that certain individuals or groups, often termed elites, have a disproportionate impact on political decision-making.

Key elements of the democratic theory of elites include:

1. **Pluralism:** Elite theory is closely associated with pluralism, which posits that power is distributed among various competing groups and interests in society. Pluralists argue that no single group monopolizes power, and different elites may exert influence in different policy areas.
2. **Elites as Specialized Actors:** According to this theory, elites are individuals or groups with specialized knowledge, skills, or resources that give them a comparative advantage in certain areas. These elites may include business leaders, intellectuals, political leaders, or other influential figures.
3. **Competition among Elites:** Rather than viewing elites as a unified and conspiratorial force, the democratic theory of elites emphasizes competition and conflict among different elite groups. The competition between elites is seen as a driving force in shaping public policy.

4. **Public Participation:** While elites may play a significant role in decision-making, democratic theorists of elites do not necessarily argue against popular participation in politics. They contend that citizens can influence decision-making through voting, activism, and other forms of civic engagement.
5. **Instrumental Role of Government:** Elites are often seen as playing an instrumental role in the functioning of government. Their expertise and resources can contribute to effective governance, but the theory acknowledges the potential for elites to pursue their own interests at the expense of broader societal interests.
6. **Checks and Balances:** Similar to other democratic theories, the democratic theory of elites recognizes the importance of checks and balances to prevent the abuse of power. This can involve institutional mechanisms, legal frameworks, and the role of the media in holding elites accountable.

20.7: SUMMARY

Again, in a democracy, there is a more rapid and extensive movement of individuals into and out of the elite. There are increasing number of elite positions in relation to the population as a whole and the elite develop a less “aristocratic” outlook and regard themselves as being closely linked with the masses, and that, in consequence of various leveling influences, they come closer to the masses in their style of life. While the democratic theory of elites provides a more realistic portrayal of power dynamics in democratic societies, it is not without criticism. Some argue that it may downplay the influence of socioeconomic inequalities and structural factors that can limit the ability of all citizens to participate equally in the political process. Despite debates, the theory remains influential in understanding how power is distributed and contested in democratic systems.

20.8: KEY TERMS

- **Elite:** the most powerful, rich, gifted, or educated members of a group, community, etc
- **Executive:** The executive refers to a person or group of persons having administrative or supervisory authority in an organization or in government authority.
- **Pluralism:** a situation in which people of different social classes, religions, races, etc., are together in a society but continue to have their different traditions and interests.

20.9: SELF ASSESSMENT QUESTIONS

- What is an elite? Discuss different types of elite.
- Discuss the features of democratic theory of elite.
- Discuss Mosca's views on circulation of elites.

20.10: REFERENCES

Barry, B.(2001). Culture and Equality: An Egalitarian Critique of Multiculturalism. Cambridge. Harvard University Press.

Bhargava R. & Acharya, A.(2008). Political theory: An introduction. Pearson Education India. New Delhi. Bissondath, N. (1994). Selling Illusions: The Cult of Multiculturalism in Canada. Penguin Books. Ettoualy,

Kymlicka, Will. (2005). Contemporary Political Philosophy: An Introduction. Oxford: Delhi).

UNIT-21: DIRECT AND INDIRECT DEMOCRACY

Structure

- 21.1 Objectives
- 21.2 Introduction
- 21.3 Democracy: Meaning & Types
- 21.4 Direct and Indirect Democracy
- 21.5 Virtues and vices of democracy
- 21.6 Summary
- 21.7 Key Terms
- 21.8 Self Assessment Questions
- 21.9 References

21.1: OBJECTIVES

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

- Meaning Democracy
- What is direct and indirect Democracy
- Virtues and Vices of Democracy

21.2: INTRODUCTION

The term democracy and the classical conception of democratic rule are firmly rooted in Ancient Greece. Like other words that end in ‘cracy’ – such as autocracy, aristocracy and bureaucracy – democracy is derived from the ancient Greek word *kratos*, meaning ‘power’ or ‘rule’. Democracy therefore means ‘rule by the demos’, *demos* standing for ‘the many’ or ‘the people’. In contrast to its modern usage, democracy was originally a negative or pejorative term, denoting not so much rule by all, as rule by the property-less and uneducated masses. Democracy was therefore thought to be the enemy of liberty and wisdom. While writers such as Aristotle were prepared to recognize the virtues of popular participation, they nevertheless feared that unrestrained democracy would degenerate into a form of ‘mob rule’. Indeed, such pejorative implications continued to be attached to democracy until well into the twentieth century. Democratic government has, however, varied considerably over the centuries. Perhaps the most fundamental distinction is between democratic systems, like those in Ancient Greece, that are based upon direct popular participation in

government, and those that operate through some kind of representative mechanism. This highlights two contrasting models of democracy: direct democracy and representative democracy. Moreover, the modern understanding of democracy is dominated by the form of electoral democracy that has developed in the industrialized West, often called liberal democracy. Despite its undoubted success, liberal democracy is only one of a number of possible models of democracy, and one whose democratic credentials have sometimes been called into question. Finally, the near universal approval which democracy currently elicits should not obscure the fact that the merits of democracy have been fiercely debated over the centuries and that, in certain respects, this debate has intensified in the late twentieth century. In other words, democracy may have its vices as well as its virtues.

21.3: DEMOCRACY: MEANING AND TYPES

Although the democratic political tradition can be traced back to Ancient Greece, the cause of democracy was not widely taken up by political thinkers until the nineteenth century. Until then, democracy was generally dismissed as rule by the ignorant and unenlightened masses. Now, however, it seems that we are all democratic. Liberals, conservatives, socialists, communists, anarchists and even fascists have been eager to proclaim the virtues of democracy and to demonstrate their democratic credentials. This emphasizes the fact that the democratic tradition does not advance a single and agreed ideal of popular rule, but is rather an arena of debate in which the notion of popular rule, and ways in which it can be achieved, is discussed. In that sense, democratic political thought addresses three central questions. First, who are the people? As no one would extend political participation to all the people, the question is: on what basis should it be limited – in relation to age, education, gender, social background and so on? Second, how should the people rule? This relates not only to the choice between direct and indirect democratic forms, but also to debates about forms of representation and different electoral systems. Third, how far should popular rule extend? Should democracy be confined to political life, or should democracy also apply, say, to the family, the workplace, or throughout the economy? Democracy, then, is not a single, unambiguous phenomenon. In reality, there is a number of theories or models of democracy, each offering its own version of popular rule. There are not merely a number of democratic forms and mechanisms but also, more fundamentally, quite different grounds on which democratic rule can be justified. Classical democracy, based upon the Athenian model, is characterized by the direct and continuous participation of citizens in the processes of government.

Protective democracy is a limited and indirect form of democratic rule designed to provide individuals with a means of defence against government. As such, it is linked to natural rights theory and utilitarianism. Developmental democracy is associated with attempts to broaden popular participation on the basis that it advances freedom and individual flourishing. Such ideas were taken up by New Left thinkers in the 1960s and 1970s in the form of radical or participatory democracy. Finally, deliberative democracy highlights the importance of public debate and discussion in shaping citizens' identities and interests, and in strengthening their sense of the common good. Critics of democracy have adopted various positions. They have warned, variously, that democracy fails to recognize that some people's views are more worthwhile than others'; that democracy upholds majority views at the expense of minority views and interests; that democratic rule tends to threaten individual rights by fuelling the growth of government; and that democracy is based upon the bogus notion of a public interest or common good, ideas that have been further weakened by the pluralistic nature of modern society.

21.4: DIRECT AND INDIRECT DEMOCRACY

In the Gettysburg Address, delivered at the time of the American Civil War, Abraham Lincoln extolled the virtues of what he called 'government of the people, by the people, and for the people'. In so doing, he defined between two contrasting notions of democracy. The first, 'government by the people', is based upon the idea that the public participates in government and indeed governs itself: popular self-government. The second, 'government for the people', is linked to the notion of the public interest and the idea that government benefits the people, whether or not they themselves rule. The classical conception of democracy, which endured well into the nineteenth century, was firmly rooted in the ideal of popular participation and drew heavily upon the example of Athenian democracy. The cornerstone of Athenian democracy was the direct and continuous participation of all citizens in the life of their polis or city-state. This amounted to a form of government by mass meeting, and each citizen was qualified to hold public office if selected to do so by lot or rota. Athenian democracy was therefore a system of 'direct democracy' or what is sometimes referred to as 'participatory democracy'. By removing the need for a separate class of professional politicians, the citizens themselves were able to rule directly, obliterating the distinction between government and the governed and between the state and civil society. Similar systems of 'town-meeting democracy' continue to be practised at a local level in some parts of the USA, notably in New England, and in the communal assemblies employed in Switzerland. The

town meeting is, however, not the only means through which direct democracy can operate. The most obvious of these is the plebiscite or referendum, a popular vote on a specific issue which enables electors to make decisions directly, instead of selecting politicians to do so on their behalf. Referendums are widely used at every level in Switzerland, and are employed in countries such as Ireland to ratify constitutional amendments. The UK held a referendum in 1975 on continued membership of the then European Community, in 1979 on establishing devolved assemblies in Scotland and Wales, and since the election of the Blair government in 1997 referendums have been held on Scottish and Welsh devolution, the Northern Ireland peace deal and the introduction of a London mayor. In the USA, referendums have increasingly been used in local politics in the form of 'propositions' or popular initiatives. A form of direct democracy has also survived in modern societies in the practice of selecting juries on the basis of lot or rota, as public offices were filled in Athenian times. Advocates of direct democracy further point out that the development of modern technology has opened up broader possibilities for popular participation in government. In particular, the use of so-called interactive television could enable citizens to both watch public debates and engage in voting without ever leaving their homes. Experiments with such technology are already under way in some local communities in the United States. Needless to say, modern government bears little resemblance to the Athenian model of direct democracy. Government is left in the hands of professional politicians who are invested with the responsibility for making decisions on behalf of the people. Representative democracy is, at best, a limited and indirect form of democracy. It is limited in the sense that popular participation is both infrequent and brief, being reduced to the act of voting every few years, depending on the length of the political term. It is indirect in the sense that the public is kept at arm's length from government: the public participates only through the choice of who should govern it, and never, or only rarely, exercises power itself. Representative democracy may nevertheless qualify as a form of democracy on the grounds that, however limited and ritualized it may appear, the act of voting remains a vital source of popular power. Quite simply, the public has the ability to 'kick the rascals out', a fact that ensures public accountability. Although representative democracy may not fully realize the classical goal of 'government by the people', it may nevertheless make possible a form of 'government for the people'. Some advocates of representative democracy acknowledge its limitations, but argue that it is the only practicable form of democracy in modern conditions. A high level of popular participation is possible within relatively small communities, such as Greek city-states or small towns, because face-to-face communication can take place between and amongst citizens.

However, the idea of government by mass meeting being conducted in modern nation-states containing tens, and possibly hundreds of millions of citizens is frankly absurd. Moreover, to consult the general public on each and every issue, and permit wideranging debate and discussion, threatens to paralyse the decision-making process and make a country virtually ungovernable. The most fundamental objection to direct democracy is, however, that ordinary people lack the time, maturity and specialist knowledge to rule wisely on their own behalf. In this sense, representative democracy merely applies the advantages of the division of labour to politics: specialist politicians, able to devote all their time and energy to the activity of government, can clearly do a better job than would the general public. Nevertheless, since the 1960s there has been a revival of interest in classical democracy and, in particular, in the idea of participation. This reflects growing disenchantment with the bureaucratic and unresponsive nature of modern government, as well as declining respect for professional politicians, who have increasingly been viewed as self-serving careerists. In addition, the act of voting is often seen as a meaningless ritual that has little impact upon the policy process, making a mockery of the democratic ideal Civic disengagement and declining electoral turnout in many parts of the world are thus sometimes viewed as symptoms of the malaise of representative democracy.

21.5: VIRTUES AND VICE OF DEMOCRACY

In modern politics there is a strange and perhaps unhealthy silence on the issue of democracy. So broad is respect for democracy that it has come to be taken for granted; its virtues are seldom questioned and its vices rarely exposed. This is very different from the period of the English, American and French revolutions, which witnessed fierce and continual debate about the merits of democracy. Indeed, in the nineteenth century, when democracy was regarded as a radical, egalitarian and even revolutionary creed, no issue polarized political opinion so dramatically. The present unanimity about democracy should not, however, disguise the fact that democrats have defended their views in very different ways at different times. Until the nineteenth century, democracy, or at least the right to vote, was usually regarded as a means of protecting the individual against over-mighty government. Perhaps the most basic of democratic sentiments was expressed in the Roman poet, Juvenal's question, 'Quis custodiet ipsos custodes? [Who will guard the Guardians?]' Seventeenth-century social contract theorists also saw democracy as a way in which individuals could check government power. In the eyes of John Locke, for instance, the right to vote was based upon natural rights and, in particular, the right to property. If government,

through taxation, possessed the power to expropriate property, citizens were entitled to protect themselves, which they did by controlling the composition of the taxmaking body. In other words, there should be 'no taxation without representation'. To limit the franchise to property owners would not, however, qualify as democracy by twentiethcentury standards. The more radical notion of universal suffrage was advanced by utilitarian theorists like Jeremy Bentham. In his early writings Bentham advocated an enlightened despotism, believing that this would be able to promote 'the greatest happiness'. However, he subsequently came to support universal suffrage in the belief that each individual's interests were of equal value and that only they could be trusted to pursue their own interests. A more radical case for democracy is, however, suggested by theorists who regard political participation as a good in itself. As noted earlier, Jean-Jacques Rousseau and John Stuart Mill have usually been seen as the principal exponents of this position. For Rousseau, democracy was a means through which human beings achieved freedom or autonomy. Individuals are, according to this view, free only when they obey laws which they themselves have made. Rousseau therefore extolled the merits of active and continuous participation in the life of their community. Such an idea, however, moves well beyond the conventional notion of electoral democracy and offers support for the more radical ideal of direct democracy. Rousseau, for example, derided the practice of elections employed in England, arguing that 'the people of England are only free when they elect their Member of Parliament; as soon as they are elected, the people are slaves, they are nothing'. Although Mill did not go so far, remaining an advocate of electoral democracy, he nevertheless believed that political participation was beneficial to both the individual and society. Mill proposed votes for women and the extension of the franchise to include all except illiterates, on educational grounds, suggesting that it would foster among individuals intellectual development, moral virtue and practical understanding. This, in turn, would create a more balanced and harmonious society and promote 'the general mental advancement of the community'. Other arguments in favour of democracy are more clearly based upon its advantages for the community rather than for the individual. Democracy can, for instance, create a sense of social solidarity by giving all members a stake in the community by virtue of having a voice in the decision-making process. Rousseau expressed this very idea in his belief that government should be based upon the 'general will', or common good, rather than upon the private or selfish will of each citizen. Political participation therefore increases the feeling amongst individual citizens that they 'belong' to their community. Very similar considerations have inclined socialists and Marxists to support democracy, albeit in the form of 'social democracy' and

not merely political democracy. From this perspective, democracy can be seen as an egalitarian force standing in opposition to any form of privilege or hierarchy. Democracy represents the community rather than the individual, the collective interest rather than the particular. Even as the battle for democracy was being waged, however, strident voices were raised against it. The most fundamental argument against democracy is that ordinary members of the public are simply not competent to rule wisely in their own interests. The earliest version of this argument was put by Plato, who advanced the idea of rule by the virtuous, government being carried out by a class of philosopher kings, the Guardians. In sharp contrast to democratic theorists, Plato believed in a radical form of natural inequality: human beings were born with souls of gold, silver or bronze, and were therefore disposed towards very different stations in life. Whereas Plato suggested that democracy would deliver bad government, classical elitists, such as Pareto (1848–1923), Mosca (1857–1941) and Michels (1876–1936), argued that it was simply impossible. Democracy is no more than a foolish delusion because political power is always exercised by a privileged minority, an elite. In *The Ruling Class* ([1896] 1939), Mosca proclaimed that in all societies ‘two classes of people appear – a class that rules and a class that is ruled’. In his view, the resources or attributes that are necessary for rule are always unequally distributed and, further, a cohesive minority will always be able to manipulate and control the masses, even in a parliamentary democracy. Pareto suggested that the qualities needed to rule conform to one of two psychological types: ‘foxes’, who rule by cunning and are able to manipulate the consent of the masses; and ‘lions’, whose domination is typically based upon coercion and violence. Michels proposed that elite rule followed from what he called ‘the iron law of oligarchy’. This states that it is in the nature of all organizations, however democratic they may appear, for power to concentrate in the hands of a small group of dominant figures, who can organize and make decisions, rather than in the hands of the apathetic rank and file. A further argument against democracy sees it as the enemy of individual liberty. This fear arises out of the fact that ‘the people’ is not a single entity but rather a collection of individuals and groups, possessed of differing opinions and opposing interests. The ‘democratic solution’ to conflict is a recourse to numbers and the application of majority rule – the rule of the majority, or greatest number, should prevail over the minority. Democracy, in other words, comes down to the rule of the 51 per cent, a prospect which Alexis de Tocqueville famously described as ‘the tyranny of the majority’. Individual liberty and minority rights can thus both be crushed in the name of the people. A similar analysis was advanced by J.S. Mill. Mill believed not only that democratic election was no way of determining the truth – wisdom cannot

be determined by a show of hands – but also that majoritarianism would also damage intellectual life by promoting uniformity and dull conformism. A similar view was also expressed by James Madison at the US Constitutional Convention at Philadelphia in 1787. Madison argued that the best defence against such tyranny was a network of checks and balances, creating a highly fragmented system of government, often referred to as the ‘Madisonian system’. In other cases, a fear of democracy has sprung not so much from the danger of majority rule as from the nature of the majority in most, if not all, societies. Echoing ancient reservations about popular rule, such theories suggest that democracy places power in the hands of those least qualified to govern: the uneducated masses, those likely to be ruled by passion and instinct rather than wisdom. In *The Revolt of the Masses* ([1930], for instance, Ortega Y Gasset (1885–1955) warned that the arrival of mass democracy had led to the overthrow of civilized society and the moral order, paving the way for authoritarian rulers to come to power by appealing to the basest instincts of the masses. Whereas democrats the more conservative notion of natural hierarchy. For many, this critique is particularly directed at participatory forms of democracy, which place little or no check upon the appetites of the masses. J.L. Talmon (1952), for example, argued that in the French Revolution the radically democratic theories of Rousseau made possible the unrestrained brutality of the Terror, a phenomenon Talmon termed ‘totalitarian democracy’. Many have seen similar lessons in the plebiscitary forms of democracy which developed in twentieth century fascist states, which sought to establish a direct and immediate relationship between the leader and the people through rallies, marches, demonstrations and other forms of political agitation.

21.6: SUMMARY

No other invention of this new technological era has proliferated as rapidly as the Internet. The internet has rapidly accelerated the development of transnational relations fostering a kind of mutual influence and interdependence. The Internet affects democracy in a number of ways. Its role in combating totalitarian regimes is, indeed, positive, for it creates access to information and thus, undermines the monopoly of the government in question. But on the other hand, the Internet creates problems also for democracy insofar as it weakens the state’s regulative capacity. The transnational interpretation of societies by the Internet undermines the capacity of governments to govern effectively. Further, as far as national security is concerned, the Internet has opened up new possibilities for asymmetrical conflicts. States can sustain massive damage from netbased attacks, not from other states but from individuals. Nevertheless, the new information technology will

probably, on balance, reinforce the existing power structures rather than weaken them.

21.7: KEY TERMS

- **Pluralist Democracy:** A democratic system where governance is influenced by the interactions and negotiations among multiple interest groups rather than a single dominant group or ideology.
- **Policy Outcomes:** The results or decisions that emerge from the interactions and negotiations among interest groups and government officials.
- **Representation:** The idea that various groups in society have the opportunity to be represented in the political process and contribute to decision-making.
- **Public Opinion:** The collective preferences and attitudes of the general public, which interest groups often seek to sway or represent.
- **Access and Influence:** The ability of interest groups to gain access to policymakers and exert influence over political decisions and policies.

21.8: SELF ASSESSMENT QUESTIONS

- Discuss the direct democracy and its features.
- Discuss factors responsible for pluralist theory of democracy.
- Discuss the features of indirect democracy.
- What are the criticisms of the indirect democracy?

21.9: REFERENCES

Ghai. K.K. (2003) 'Indian Government and Politics', Kalyani Publisher, New Delhi.

Yogesh, Atal (1981) 'Building a Nation(essays on India)', Abhinav Publisher, NewDelhi

Dovi, Suzanne. "Political Representation". The Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy (Winter 2017 Edition). Retrieved 21 March 2018.

Pitkin, Hanna (1967). The Concept of Representation. Berkeley and Los Angeles: University of California Press.

Rehfeld, Andrew (2006). "Toward a General Theory of Political