

PHIDSC253
SOCIAL AND POLITICAL PHILOSOPHY

UNIT I

Social and Political Philosophy : Scope and Concerns : Its relation to Sociology and Ethics

1. What is Social Philosophy?

Ans: Social Philosophy is one of the main and important branches of Philosophy. It is the thoughtful consideration of human society. It gives insight into the actual activities of human beings in the society. A Social Philosopher tries to study society from philosophical point of view and tries to find out the link between human society and the basic nature of Ultimate Reality.

2. Mention different definitions of Social Philosophy.

Ans: According to Mackenzie, 'Social Philosophy seeks to explain the nature of society in the light of the principle of social solidarity'. Social Philosophy aims at interpretation of society with reference to the norm of 'social unity'. F W Blackmar maintained that Social Philosophy is based upon the general facts of society. It makes general observations on the nature of society. Social Philosophy and Social sciences are closely connected. According to Morris Ginsberg, 'Social Philosophy aims at the formulation of the general principles of human behavior through speculation on social phenomena'. For Bertrand Russell, 'Social Philosophy seeks the conditions in which all the constructive tendencies of man (such as love and sympathy) Social marriage and education can provide maximum possible opportunities to produce the people who can save the world from future catastrophe. "Social philosophy studies the interactions and inter-relations that exist among men and their groups"'.

3. Explain the scope of social philosophy.

Ans: Social Philosophy as a science of society reflects upon the basic nature of human relationships in society. It studies the interrelation of social organizations and the relation of individual to these organizations. It speculates upon the principles that underlie the human behavior. Social Philosophy studies the structure and functions of social systems and investigates into their philosophical implications. Social Philosophy studies the most fundamental laws which influence social cohesion, social progress, social change and social disintegration. It seeks insight into the causes of social crimes, juvenile delinquency, child labor, honor killing, gender differentiation, injustice, and inequality. It tries to find out the root causes of social pathology and suggests the remedies for it. Social Philosophy seeks to discover and restore the social bonds that hold the mankind together. Social Philosophy reflects upon the impact of science and technology on human society and gives a comprehensive philosophy of civilization. It incorporates the conclusions of other sciences and gives their philosophical interpretation. Social Philosophy has axiological point of view. It defines the social values such as common good, happiness, peace, security, justice,

freedom, excellence/beauty, punctuality and discipline. We live in globalizing world and society is becoming more and more inclusive. Social Philosophy is concerned with the problems of marginalization of certain sections of society all over the world on the basis of birth, education, skills, gender, age, profession and possessions. The traditional social institutions such as religion, family and marriage are undergoing radical changes. The social values need modification or redefinition to enhance the progress of individuals and groups. Social Philosophy tries to meet all the requirements to maintain social solidarity. It views the entire mankind as one family which has a unique kind of fraternity and commitment. The unity and the wholeness of such a family aim at the realization of love, compassion and justice for its members. The scope of Social Philosophy includes everything which has human and social significance.

4. Explain the nature of Social Philosophy.

Ans: Social Philosophy is the philosophy of practice. It inquires into 'what is Right or Good for man and society'. Social Philosophy deals with the individual's Highest Good in the society. It is primarily concerned with general questions concerning the problems of society such as social cohesion, social progress and social disintegration. In its early period, Social Philosophy tried to seek the answer of the question, whether the society is natural or conventional? Human beings have freedom of choice. The question gave rise to the conceptions of Social Contract to form society and Organic Unity of society. Rousseau said, 'man is born free and yet is everywhere in chains'. Social Philosophy seeks insight into the unity and order of human society. Social Philosophy is the philosophical study of the questions about human social behavior. It is concerned with the institutions like family, educational institutions, economic institutions such as business and markets. It is also related with religious and social institutions for recreation and enjoyment. The social classifications like race, caste and gender too are studied in Social Philosophy.

Social Philosophy is Normative. Social Philosophy concentrates its attention on the unity of mankind. Its effort is to study the meaning and worth of the present, past and future modes of existence. Social Philosophy looks beyond the actual existence and seeks to discover the ideals that bring Highest Good for all. It shows that individual Good is deeply involved in the realization of common Good. Social Philosophy is concerned with what ought to be done to realize the ideal involved in our social existence. Social philosophy studies the ideals that are found in the society. It suggests the means to realize those ideals through the social institutions such as family, education, the state etc.

Social Philosophy is Evaluative. Social Philosophy evaluates the various means to realize common Good. Customs, traditions and various social institutions are means to achieve order, stability and harmony in the society. These customs, traditions and institutions with their set of rules and laws impose several restrictions on the conduct and behavior of its members. Social Philosophy aims at the criticism of social interactions and the social relations in the community. It is mainly concerned with the study of the values of various social phenomena. Social Philosophy formulates the rules for ideal social interactions. Social philosophy seeks to explain the nature of society in the light of

the principle of social solidarity. It shows the value on which social progress of man depends. Social Philosophy tries to expose the drawbacks of social institutions and the social behavior of people. It sets the higher ideals for the guidance of conduct in human society.

Social Philosophy is Speculative. Social Philosophy is the speculation upon the basic principles of human behavior, the supreme values of human life and the purpose of entire existence. A social philosopher is deeply concerned with the study of the inner implications of social phenomena. Social Philosophy attempts to understand the patterns, changes and tendencies of societies. It explores philosophical questions about social issues, social behavior and social values.

Social Philosophy is not based on empirical method. Social values are implied in social activities. The principles of Social Philosophy are the basic conditions of any social relationship. The ideals of Social Philosophy are a priori. They cannot be determined from our experiences.

Social Philosophy is Critical. According to Ginsberg, Social Philosophy must take into account the results of social sciences before formulation of the general principles of human behavior. Social Philosophy has two main functions namely Critical and Constructive. Social Philosophy criticizes the actual social existence in the light of common Good. It points out the shortfalls in the social phenomena. It tries to find out the logic of the postulates and the methods of social sciences. The Critical function of Social Philosophy consists in verifying the validity of approaches and methods.

Social Philosophy is Constructive. According to Ginsberg, the criticism by Social Philosophy is constructive. The Social philosopher applies his standards of value to the various social phenomena. He seeks to find out the conditions which make the society a harmonious whole. The Constructive aspect of Social Philosophy studies the validity of the social ideals. Social Philosophy gives insight into human tendencies which, with proper training can raise the level of social life. It also seeks solutions to get rid of all defective tendencies operative in a social group. Social Philosophy not only points out the drawbacks in the social interactions but shows the measures to rectify them and thereby improves social conditions.

Social Philosophy Transcends the Conclusions of Other Sciences. The thinkers like Mackenzie, Blackmar, Ginsberg and Sorokin maintained that Social Philosophy is closely connected with social sciences. E. S. Bogadus points out that Social Philosophy gives broad interpretation of human personality and society on the basis of the scientifically collected data on social phenomena. Social Philosophy is not a mere unity of the conclusions of various sciences. Social Philosophy transcends various conclusions (data) provided by other branches of knowledge. It is the study of the most fundamental and general laws of social behavior and social change.

Social Philosophy has passed through the stages of the speculative study to the descriptive study; from the descriptive study to the analytical study and from the analytical study to the philosophical reflections. Now it is facing the critical issues of single parent family, marriage, live-in-relationships, gender equality, and new educational and work institutions. By going beyond the received data, Social Philosophy interprets the meaning of ever changing human life in the society.

5. Explain the relation of Social Philosophy with sociology.

Ans: For Aristotle, man is a rational as well as social animal. Man is completely dependent upon the society for the satisfaction of bare needs. Man without society would be a savage beast leading to solitary, poor, nasty, brutish and short life. The human cultures, customs, religion, beliefs, thoughts, the notions of right/wrong, good/evil, all are outcome of social life. Social Philosophy determines the ideals of social life. It gives insight into the means that will be useful to bring out social welfare and the values that should be sought for social prosperity.

Sociology is the science of the web of social relationships. It is the science of the origin, structure and development of the society. The social groups and social institutions are formal expressions of social relationships in human beings. Sociology investigates into the basic social nature of man manifested in a variety of social behavior. Social Philosophy is philosophical reflection on the basic laws which operate in the society and influence human relations.

The human relationships are influenced by the cultural, religious and geographical conditions. The human customs and social institutions vary in their nature and structure. Sociology is concerned with the basic social tendencies common in all human beings. Social Philosophy is concerned with the realization of common good through social awakening. It tries to find out the philosophical implications of the generalizations of Sociology.

Social Philosophy and Sociology are closely connected with one another. There is a lot of overlapping in both the branches of knowledge. Sociology studies natural, structural and functional aspects of social phenomena. Its aim is to understand the evolution and transformation of human habitations. Social Philosophy studies the teleological and the meaning aspect of social phenomena. It seeks the purpose and the meaning of entire human existence.

Sociology is a positive discipline that gives us a faithful description of multidimensional society. Social Philosophy is a normative discipline that goes beyond the actual existence and seeks to discover the ideal that is highest good for all. The key concept of Sociology is 'social relations' where as the key concept of Social Philosophy is 'to seek ideals in social relations'.

6. Explain the relation of Social Philosophy with Ethics.

Ans: Social Philosophy and Ethics, both are said to be philosophy of practice. They give insight into the actual activities of human beings in the society. These branches of Philosophy inquire into 'what is Right or Good for man and society'.

Social Philosophy deals with the individual's Highest Good in the society. Ethics deals with the Summum Bonum (Supreme Good) of individual life. Social Philosophy and Ethics are complementary to each other. Their ideal is 'Highest Good'. Social Philosophy seeks this ideal through a study of social relationship of the individuals. Ethics tries to study this ideal from the standpoint of an individual. However, Ethics presupposes the existence of individual in a society.

Social Philosophy studies all social relationships including moral principles involved in these relationships. It is concerned with nature of relationships between individuals in society.

Ethics studies the conduct of individual as an agent, interacting with other individuals. It must be remembered that personal as well as social development depends upon the harmony and the stability in a society.

Social Philosophy is primarily concerned with the study of social relations in a community. Ethics is mainly concerned with the study of the conduct of individuals. Social Philosophy evaluates customs, traditions and various social institutions. It aims at the criticism of social interactions and the social relations in the community. It is mainly concerned with the study of the values of various social phenomena.

Ethics evaluates rightness or wrongness of human actions with reference to intentions of the agent. It aims at character building of individual by cultivation of moral values such as non-violence, truth, non-possession and self control. Moral values acquire fuller and deeper meaning in a developing civilization. There is intimate relation between Social Philosophy and Ethics.

7. Define Political Philosophy.

Ans: Political Philosophy can be defined as “philosophical reflection on how best to arrange our collective life – our political institutions and our social practices”. It is the study of the relationship between individuals and society. Political Philosophy is a “branch of Philosophy which studies fundamental questions concerning the communal life of human beings”.

Modern political thinkers like Simon state that ‘Political Philosophy is a decision making process’. Political Philosophy as a branch of Philosophy can be understood through the perspectives of metaphysics, epistemology and axiology. Political Philosophy unfolds the ultimate reality side, the methodical (knowledge) side and the value aspect of political life. Through the perspectives of metaphysics, epistemology and axiology Political Philosophy gives insights into the various aspects of the origin of the state, its institutions and laws.

8. What is the scope of Political Philosophy?

Ans: Political Philosophy as a branch of philosophy studies fundamental questions concerning the social or communal life of human beings. It inquires into the principles of justification of power and governance. It inquires into the origin, nature and purpose of State. It seeks justification of certain forms of State.

Political Philosophy includes the questions about the source and extent governmental authority. It asks, ‘What characterizes a good government?’ Political Philosophy raises the question about the relationship between individuals and their world, their society and their environment. What are the limits or extent of freedom of individual citizens? The issues of obedience or disobedience to the rule of law are discussed in Political Philosophy.

Political Philosophy inquires in the origin of property rights and the best way to distribute the property and the benefits among the citizens. It seeks the best economic system for the prosperity of the citizens. The equal treatment to all the citizens irrespective of gender needs careful analysis of the concept of equality.

Political Philosophy raises the questions about the principles that guide the dealings of one state with other states. So the issues of globalization, international justice, war and peace are discussed in Political Philosophy. It seeks insight into the general principles that guide the decisions of the state. Political Philosophy try to give a clear and coherent notions of equality, liberty, justice, needs and interests, public interest, rights and welfare. It aims at conservation of traditional knowledge or distinguishing features in a particular nation or state.

Political Philosophy aims at the unity in diversity. It aims at the peaceful coexistence among a variety of social groups that is a global community.

9. What is the nature of Political Philosophy?

Ans: Political Philosophy is the reflection on how to organize our collective life. Its aim is to find out the conditions in which social relations of man are possible. It deals with principles which underlie the political institutions such as state and government. Political Philosophy is a thought provoking process about the political institutions and social practices of human beings. It seeks insight into the ideals of state, the functions of the state etc. It seeks to establish the fundamental principles that justify the form of the state and the rights of its citizens. Political Philosophy analyzes and interprets the concepts like Justice, Freedom, Security, Discipline, Peace; Human Welfare etc. It attempts to apply these concepts to the social and political institutions. Let us know more about the nature of Political Philosophy –

Political Philosophy is a rational discipline : Political Philosophy is a rational discipline that creates system and order in the totality of our experience. It inquires into the meaning and the scope of the concepts such as authority, justice, liberty, democracy and public interest. The investigation into the meaning of the concepts should be regularly done. Such a rational scrutiny of concepts is like cleaning the house of thoughts. It leads towards the mental clearance in the understanding of concepts. Political philosophy does not aim at acquisition of new information. It aims at the acquisition of the habit of careful thoughts.

Political Philosophy is normative : Political Philosophy sets norms, ideal standard for the society, government and other political institutions. It sets doctrines for ‘What ought to be done’. (Plato’s ‘Republic’ depicts an ideal society i.e. Utopia) Political Philosophy is normative. It aims to give reasons for accepting or rejecting a doctrine or ideology. Prof NV Joshi mentions three ideals of political life namely, Justice, Love and Freedom.

Political Philosophy critically evaluates beliefs : The unique feature of philosophy is its self criticism. It attempts to give the rational grounds either for accepting a belief or rejecting a belief. It happens when the validity of prevailing beliefs is challenged. The doctrines in question are

scrutinized by a) Logical Consistency and b) Accordance with the actual facts of the world. Political Philosophy is a philosophy of action or practice. It does not determine what is true or false. It determines what is right or wrong and what is good or bad. The critical evaluation of the beliefs in question provides direct and indirect support to the beliefs. The direct support consists in highlighting the reasons to accept the belief. The indirect support consists in eliminating the alternative beliefs.

Political Philosophy clarifies concepts : Political Philosophy is concerned with the meaning of general ideas or concepts. A concept is a general idea or a notion that applies to a number of things. The concepts of Political Philosophy such as society, authority, justice, liberty, equality and democracy are highly general and vague too. The clarification of concepts is done by analysis, synthesis and improvement of concepts. Analysis consists in specifying or defining its elements. Synthesis consists in showing logical relationship between showing implications of concepts. Improvement of concept consists in modification or revision of the concept by introducing more coherent or clear definition of the concept.

Political Philosophy inquires into the system of relations between men : Political Philosophy aims at discovering the conditions of individuation in and through social relations. It does not exist in vacuum. That is why the society is considered as an organic whole and every member becomes a part of it. All individuals are conscious units seeking to realize one and the same common purpose. The state is a perfect system of relations between men. It is a perfect organization of social relations of men in accordance with the demands of reason. The state preserves, encourages and regulates a variety of interests of its citizens. The state as the source of absolute and sovereign authority can lead to happy and prosperous life of its citizens. Political Philosophy inquires into the principles which underlie the political organizations such as forms of government.

The problems of Political Philosophy change with the material circumstances of life : Political Philosophy seeks to establish the basic principles in the relationship between the individuals and the society. It seeks solutions to the crisis that entire civilization confronts.

Political Philosophy arises from the need to arrange the collective life. Obviously it is open to change and there is always a need of philosophical justification. The approach of Political philosophers reflects the general tendencies of their epoch. In ancient Greek time, Political Philosophy raised the questions regarding various forms of political organizations. Plato gives us a sketch of ideal government. Aristotle speaks of different forms of government. The central question for Greek thinkers was to search ideal form of state. Confucius in China sought to find means of restoring political unity and political stability through cultivation of virtues. Chanakya in India aimed at political unity and stability through imposition of discipline. St Thomas Aquinas emphasized the harmony inherent in reason and revelation. In Medieval Europe the proper relationship between Church and State became a central issue in Political Philosophy. In the Nineteenth century the question of social welfare became major issue of philosophical inquiry. The question was how an industrial society should organize its economy and its welfare system.

Another question rose, how far the rule of one person (state) over other person (state) is justifiable? Modern era discussed the meaning, the interpretation and the scope of the concepts such as justice, freedom, political obligation, authority, citizenship, power, property, sovereignty, coercion, fraternity, equality and collective responsibility.

Contemporary thinkers focus upon the questions of social justice, feminism, environment and the political institutions that reflect their cultural, linguistic or regional identity. The major issue today is the obligation of human race towards the Mother Nature. Thus the problems in Political Philosophy change in accordance with the empirical and material circumstances of life.

10. What is the relation of political philosophy with ethics?

Ans: Ethics is the science of Highest Good of an individual in the society. The question of morality arises when human beings live in a group. Political Philosophy studies the relationship between individuals and society. Ethics and Political Philosophy are the branches of philosophy, both are normative and both are critical in the approach. Both of them deal with human conduct. Ethics is concerned with the aspect of 'virtue' in human conduct; the individual life of men. Its concern is to build good, moral character.

Political Philosophy studies fundamental questions concerning the communal life of human beings. Political Philosophy reflects upon how best to arrange our collective life – our political institutions and our social practices. It seeks the answers of the questions like, what is the best way to govern our interactions. What responsibilities do we have to each other? In other words, Political Philosophy is concerned about 'public utility', to build a peaceful, prosperous and harmonious community. The focus of Ethics is on individual mind while the focus of Political Philosophy is on collective mind. Ethics deals with the Summum Bonum of individual life. It aims at Self-Realization of an individual. Its aim is to unfold and develop the potentialities of an individual. Political Philosophy is concerned with the welfare of individual in the State.

Political Philosophy unfolds the value aspect of political life. Political Philosophy is a thought provoking process about the political institutions and social practices of human beings. It seeks insight into the ideals of state, the functions of the state etc. The aim of Political Philosophy is 'peaceful global community' that provides security, stability and prosperity to its citizens. Ethics seeks insight into the notions such as moral and nonmoral actions, virtues, intentions and motives of action, merits or demerits of action, values of human life, virtues of character, consequences and responsibilities of action etc. The emphasis of Ethics is inner control over outer activities. Political Philosophy analyzes and interprets the concepts like Justice, Freedom, Security, Discipline, Peace; Human Welfare etc. It attempts to apply these concepts to the social and political institutions.

Political Philosophy seeks the justification for the measures of external control. Ethics and Political Philosophy aim at the acquisition of the habit of careful thoughts. Both criticize, evaluate and improve the related concepts. Improvement of concept consists in modification or revision of the

concept by introducing more coherent or clear definition of the concept. Political Philosophy arises from the need to arrange the collective life. Obviously it is open to change and there is always a need of philosophical justification. The views or theories put forth in Political Philosophy neither true nor false. They are either good or bad; either right or wrong. This is axiological perspective provided by Ethics.

UNIT II

Concept of family, Marriage, Society, Nation and State (Social Contract Theory)

Q.1. What is society?

Ans: A society is a group of people who share a culture, institutions, and social interactions. Societies can be based on geography, shared interests, or a common way of life.

Q.2. What is marriage?

Ans: In social philosophy, "marriage" is considered a socially recognized and sanctioned union between two individuals, usually understood as a legal contract that establishes rights and obligations within a relationship, often with the primary function of regulating sexual activity, procreation, and the raising of children, while also solidifying kinship ties within a community; it is seen as a fundamental social institution present in various forms across different cultures.

Q.3. What is social contract theory?

Ans: In political philosophy, the social contract is an idea, theory, or model that usually, although not always, concerns the legitimacy of the authority of the state over the individual. Conceptualized in the Age of Enlightenment, it is a core concept of constitutionalism, while not necessarily convened and written down in a constituent assembly and constitution.

Q.4. What do you mean by the concept of Family?

Ans: The early and classical definitions emphasised that the family was a group based on marriage, common residence, emotional bonds, and stipulation of domestic services. The family has also been defined as group based on marital relations, rights and duties of parenthood, common habitation and reciprocal relations between parents and children. Some sociologists feel that the family is a social group characterised by common residence, economic co-operation and reproduction.

Q.5. What is the relation between nation and state?

Ans: A nation is a group of people who share a common identity, while a state is a political entity with a governing body and territory. A nation-state is a state that is dominated by a single nation. nation is a group of people with a common language, history, culture, and (usually) geographic territory. A state is an association of people characterized by formal institutions of government, including laws; permanent territorial boundaries; and sovereignty (political independence).

A nation state is a state in which the vast majority of people follow the same identity and are aware of it. The nation state is an ideal in which ethnic and political borders coincide. "A nation state is a sovereign state in which the majority of its subjects are united by forces that define a nation, such as language or common descent," according to one definition. Since a nation does not have to have a majority ethnic group, it is a more descriptive concept than "country."

Q.6. What is marriage?

Ans: Different people define it in different ways. Not even sociologists are able to agree on a single meaning. For our purposes, we will define **marriage** as a legally recognized social contract between two people, traditionally based on a sexual relationship and implying a permanence of the union. In creating an inclusive definition, we should also consider variations, such as whether a legal union is required (think of "common-law" marriage and its equivalents), or whether more than two people can be involved (consider polygamy). Other variations on the definition of marriage might include whether spouses are of opposite sexes or the same sex, and how one of the traditional expectations of marriage (to produce children) is understood today.

Sociologists are interested in the relationship between the institution of marriage and the institution of family because, historically, marriages are what create a family, and families are the most basic social unit upon which society is built. Both marriage and family create status roles that are sanctioned by society.

Q.7. What is a family?

Ans: A husband, a wife, and two children—maybe even a pet—served as the model for the traditional Canadian family for most of the 20th century. But what about families that deviate from this model, such as a single-parent household or a homosexual couple without children? Should they be considered families as well?

The question of what constitutes a family is a prime area of debate in family sociology, as well as in politics and religion. Social conservatives tend to define the family in terms of structure with each family member filling a certain role (like father, mother, or child). Sociologists, on the other hand, tend to define family more in terms of the manner in which members relate to one another than on a strict configuration of status roles. Here, we will define **family** as a socially recognized group (usually joined by blood, marriage, or adoption) that forms an emotional connection and serves as an economic unit of society. Sociologists identify different types of families based on how one enters into them. A **family of orientation** refers to the family into which a person is born. A **family of procreation** describes one that is formed through marriage. These distinctions have cultural significance related to issues of lineage.

Drawing on the three sociological paradigms we have been studying in this introduction to sociology, the sociological understanding of what constitutes a family can be explained by symbolic interactionism, critical sociology, and functionalism. Symbolic interactionist theories indicate that families are groups in which participants view themselves as family members and act accordingly. In other words, families are groups in which people come together to form a strong primary group connection, maintaining emotional ties to one another over a long period of time. Such families could potentially include groups of close friends as family. Critical sociology emphasizes that the forms that define the "typical" family unit are not independent of historical changes in the economic structures and relations of power in society. The typical large, extended

family of the rural, agriculture-based economy 100 years ago in Canada was much different from the single breadwinner-led “nuclear” family of the Fordist economy following World War II and different again from today’s families who have to respond to economic conditions of precarious employment, fluid modernity, and norms of gender and sexual equality.

In addition, the functionalist perspective views families as groups that perform vital roles for society—both internally (for the family itself) and externally (for society as a whole). Families provide for one another’s physical, emotional, and social well-being. Parents care for and socialize children, a function that prepares new members of society for their future roles. While interactionism helps us to understand the subjective experience of belonging to a “family” and critical sociology focuses on how families configure themselves in response to political-economic pressures and changes, functionalism illuminates the many purposes of families and their role in the maintenance of a balanced society (Parsons and Bales 1956). We will go into more detail about how these theories apply to family in later sections.

Q.8. How is marriage and family relevant to society?

Ans: Marriage and family are key structures in most societies. While the two institutions have historically been closely linked, their connection is becoming more complex. The relationship between marriage and family is often taken for granted in the popular imagination but with the increasing diversity of family forms in the 21st century their relationship needs to be reexamined.

Different people define it in different ways what marriage is. Not even sociologists are able to agree on a single meaning. For our purposes, we will define marriage as a legally recognized social contract between two people, traditionally based on a sexual relationship, and implying a permanence of the union. In creating an inclusive definition, we should also consider variations, such as whether a formal legal union is required (think of common-law marriage and its equivalents), or whether more than two people can be involved (consider polygamy). Other variations on the definition of marriage might include whether spouses are of opposite sexes or the same sex, and how one of the traditional expectations of marriage (to produce children) is understood today.

Sociologists are interested in the relationship between the institution of marriage and the institution of family because, historically, marriages are what create a family, and families are the most basic social unit upon which society is built. Both marriage and family create status roles that are sanctioned by society.

The question of what constitutes a family is a prime area of debate in family sociology, as well as in politics and religion. Social conservatives tend to define the family in terms of a “traditional” nuclear family structure with each family member filling a certain role (like father, mother, or child). Sociologists, on the other hand, tend to define family more in terms of the manner in which members relate to one another than on a strict configuration of status roles.

Here, we will define family as a socially recognized group joined by blood relations, marriage, or adoption, that forms an emotional connection and serves as an economic unit of society. Sociologists also identify different types of families based on how one enters into them. A family of orientation refers to the family into which a person is born. A family of procreation describes one that is formed through marriage. These distinctions have cultural significance related to issues of lineage (the difference between patrilineal descent and matrilineal descent for example).

We can analyze the family as a social form that comes into existence around five different contents or interests: sexual activity, economic cooperation, reproduction, socialization of children, and emotional support. The types of family form in which all or some of these contents are expressed are diverse: nuclear families, polygamous families, extended families, same-sex parent families, single-parent families, blended families, and zero-child families, etc. However, the forms that families take are not random; rather, these forms are determined by cultural traditions, social structures, economic pressures, and historical transformations. They also are subject to intense moral and political debate about the definition of the family, the “decline of the family,” or the policy options to best support the well-being of children. In these debates, sociology demonstrates its practical side as a discipline that is capable of providing the factual knowledge needed to make evidence-based decisions on political and moral issues concerning the family.

Q.9. What are the divisions of family?

Ans: The family is an excellent example of an institution that can be examined at the micro- or macro- levels of analysis. For example, the debate between structural functionalist and conflict sociologists on the rise of non-nuclear family forms is a macro-level debate. It focuses on the family in relationship to a society as a whole. Since the 1950s, the functionalist approach to the family has emphasized the importance of the nuclear family — a cohabiting man and woman who maintain a socially approved sexual relationship and have at least one child — as the basic unit of an orderly and functional society. Although only 39% of families conformed to this model in 2006, in functionalist approaches, it often operates as a model of the normal family, with the implication that non-normal family forms lead to a variety of society-wide dysfunctions such as crime, drug use, poverty, and welfare dependency.

On the other hand, conflict theory emphasizes the inequalities and power relations within the family and their relationship to inequality in the wider society. The contemporary diversity of family forms does not indicate the “decline of the family” (i.e., of the ideal of the nuclear family) but the diverse responses of the family form to the tensions of gender inequality and historical changes in the economy and society. In this perspective, the nuclear family should be thought of less as a normative model for how families should be and more as an historical anomaly that reflected the specific social and economic conditions in North America following the Second World War. These are analyses that set out to understand the family within the context of macro-level processes or society as a whole.

At the micro-level of analysis, sociologists focus on the dynamics between individuals within families. One example, of which probably every married couple is acutely aware, is the interactive dynamic described by exchange theory. Exchange theory proposes that all relationships are based on giving and returning valued “goods” or “services.” Individuals seek to maximize their rewards in their exchanges with others. How do they weigh up who is contributing more, and who is contributing less, of the valuable resources that sustain the marriage relationship (such as money, time, chores, emotional support, romantic gestures, quality time, etc.)? What happens to the family dynamic when one spouse is a net debtor and another a net creditor in the exchange relationship?

In *The Unbearable Lightness of Being*, the Czech novelist Milan Kundera describes the way every relationship forges an implicit contract regarding these exchanges within the first six weeks. It is as if a template has been established that will govern the nature of the conflicts, tensions, and disagreements between a married couple for the duration of their relationship. Kundera is writing fiction, but the dynamic he describes exemplifies a micro-level analysis in that this “contract” is a

form created through the interaction between specific individuals. Afterwards, it acts as a structure that constrains their interaction. In the more severe cases of unequal exchange, domestic violence, whether physical or emotional, can be the result. The dynamics of “intimate terrorism” and “violent resistance” describe the extreme outcomes of unequal exchange (Whynacht, 2021).

Q.10. What are the theoretical perspectives of marriage and family?

Ans: Sociologists study families on both the macro- and micro-level to determine how families function. Sociologists may use a variety of theoretical perspectives to explain events that occur within and outside of the family. In this Introduction to Sociology, we have been focusing on three perspectives: structural functionalism, conflict theory, and symbolic interactionism.

When considering the role of family in society, functionalists uphold the notion that families are an important social institution and that they play a key role in stabilizing society. They also note that family members take on status roles in a marriage or family. The family — and its members — perform certain functions that facilitate the prosperity and development of society.

Anthropologist George Murdock defined the family narrowly as “a social group characterized by common residence, economic cooperation, and reproduction,” which “includes adults of both sexes, at least two of whom maintain a socially approved sexual relationship, and one or more children” (Murdock, 1949). Murdock conducted a survey of 250 societies and determined that there are four universal residual functions of the family: sexual, reproductive, educational, and economic (Lee, 1982). In each society, although the structure of the family varies, the family performs these four functions.

According to Murdock, the family (which for him includes the state of marriage) regulates sexual relations between individuals. He does not deny the existence or impact of premarital or extramarital sex, but states that the family offers a socially legitimate sexual outlet for adults (Lee, 1982). Although societies differ greatly to the degree that they place limitations on sexual behaviour, all societies have norms governing sexual behaviour. The function of the family is to establish the stated norms around sexual gratification.

This outlet for legitimate sexual relations gives way to reproduction, which is a necessary part of ensuring the survival of society. Each society needs to replace the older people with new generations of young people. Again, the institution of the family provides a socially legitimate and regulated form in which children are produced and given recognized status in society. Societies which practice celibacy, like the religious community of the Shakers — an offshoot of the Quakers who believed in the second appearance of Jesus Christ — were dysfunctional in this regard as they were unable to maintain sufficient population to remain viable. By the 1920s there were only 12 Shaker communities left in the United States.

Once children are produced, the family plays a vital role in training them for adult life. As the primary agent of socialization, the family teaches young children the ways of thinking and behaving that follow social and cultural norms, values, beliefs, and attitudes. Parents teach their children manners and civility. A well-mannered child (presumably) reflects a well-mannered parent. In most societies, the family unit is responsible for establishing the emotional security and sense of personal self-worth of its members, which begins in childhood. When families fail to do this they are seen as dysfunctional.

Parents also teach children gender roles. Gender roles are an important part of the economic function of a family. The functionalist Talcott Parsons (1943) emphasized that in each family, there is a division of labour that consists of instrumental and expressive roles. Men tend to assume the instrumental roles in the family, which typically involve work outside of the family that provides financial support and establishes family status. Women tend to assume the expressive roles, which typically involve work inside of the family, which provides emotional support and physical care for children (Crano and Aronoff, 1978). According to functionalists, the differentiation of the roles on the basis of sex ensures that families are well-balanced and coordinated.

When family members move outside of these roles, the family is thrown out of balance and must recalibrate in order to function properly. For example, if the father assumes an expressive role, such as providing daytime care for the children, the mother must take on an instrumental role such as gaining paid employment outside of the home in order for the family to maintain balance and function. Stay-at-home dads are becoming more common today but their non-traditional role can still produce ambiguity in their claim to status in the community.

Parsons (1943) also argued that in modern North American society, the differentiation between these roles created tension or strain on individuals as they tried to adapt to the conflicting norms or requirements (roles) between the American occupational and kinship systems. There was an “asymmetrical relation of the marriage pair to the occupational structure” in which the norms of equality between spouses in the family system were undermined by the inequality of status in the occupational system between paid employment outside the home and unpaid domestic work inside the home. Parsons argued that the result of this division was strain in relation to the patterning of sex roles. While men became narrow instrumental specialists, incapable of a full expressive life, women turned to expressive tasks to create a functional equivalent to demonstrate their skills and fundamental equality to their husbands.

The fourth function of the family Murdock identified is economic. The family is understood as a primary economic unit where the economic well-being of family members is provided. In premodern family forms, the extended family itself is the basis of the economy. As a unit it produces the basic needs of its members including food, shelter, health care, and comfort in general. In modern society, some of these economic functions, like production and health care, are taken over by other social institutions, but the family remains the principal unit of consumption. Family members coordinate their incomes to provide economically for the rest of the family.

Q.11. Write a note on social contract theory.

Ans: The social contract theory is not only the most ancient but also the most famous of the theories regarding the origin of the state. The substance of this theory is that state is the result of an agreement entered into by men who originally had no governmental organisation. In the first period there was no government and no law. The people lived in a state of nature. After some time they decided to set up a state. That they did by means of a contract. The social contract theory described the original condition of men as the 'state of nature'. To escape from the condition of the state of nature man made a social contract. To some writers the contract was pre-social and to others it was pre-political. Writers on this theory are agreed on the point that the state of nature preceded the establishment of government there was no organised life in the state of nature. Each lived according to his own wish and fancies. No man made laws were there to control man. The law known to men living in the state of nature was the law of nature or natural law. There was none to interpret the law or adjudicate. Hence men lived under uncertain conditions. When men felt the

need to escape from this type of life he did so by common agreement or contract. As a result of this, a civil society was created. Thus creation of civil society preceded the emergence of the state. In the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries the supporters of the social contract theory multiplied and there was more or less universal acceptance of the doctrine. Hooker was the first scientific writer who gave a logical exposition of the theory of social contract. The theory found real support in the writings of Thomas Hobbes, John Locke, Jean Jacques Rousseau who are known as contractualists.

UNIT III

Social Progress, Reform, Revolution, Democracy, Secularism

Q.1. What is the meaning of social progress?

Ans: Social progress is defined as the capacity of a society to meet the basic human needs of its citizens, establish the building blocks that allow citizens and communities to enhance and sustain the quality of their lives, and create the conditions for all individuals to reach their full potential.

Q.2. Why do we need social progress?

Ans: A society which fails to address basic human needs, equip citizens to improve their quality of life, protect the environment, and provide opportunity for many of its citizens is not succeeding. Inclusive growth requires both economic and social progress.

Q.3. What do you mean by Social Progress or Social development?

Ans: In ordinary sense development means 'a gradual unfolding'; a fuller working out of the details of anything; the growth of what is the germ (Oxford English Dictionary). It is in this sense that we can speak of the development of a child, or of a disease. But it is difficult to speak in the way of social development.

Social development implies that there are only two (related) social processes to which it seems possible to apply the term 'development', namely, the growth of knowledge and growth of human control over the natural environment as shown by technological and economic efficiency. In most recent sociological writings, the term development has been used in quite a different way; first, to differentiate two broad types of society (industrial and the agricultural) and secondly, to describe the process of industrialization or modernization. This kind of knowledge has been represented in a simple historical model as a movement of society through three stages mainly: traditional society, transitional society and modern society, where the development of human powers of production is the most significant element in the transformation of society. The critics of modernization theory of development however have conceptualized development not only in terms of economic growth, but also emphasized that development is: a) the removal of poverty, b) unemployment, c) inequality, d) ill health, e) ensuring participation in health programmes, and f) attain good quality of life in the context of overall development of the society. This holistic approach is embodied in

the concept of sustainable development. The World Population Conference in Bucharest (1974) recognized the linkages between population and sustained development. Population policies and programmes were to be reflected as specific national imperatives. In the Indian context social development implies: a) eradication of poverty b) improving productivity c) provision of minimum needs d) development of human resources e) raising status of women f) improving technical and managerial aspects. Special efforts have been initiated to provide a social safety net to the poor. These efforts have been directed to break the complex nexus of low literacy, ill health and high fertility. Let us have a brief look at the programmes directed towards social development.

Q.4. What is a political philosophy in support of social reform?

Ans: Progressivism is a left-leaning political philosophy and reform movement that seeks to advance the human condition through social reform. Adherents hold that progressivism has universal application and endeavor to spread this idea to human societies everywhere.

Q.5. What is a Reform?

Ans: Reform can be simply defined as improving by making changes in the existing conditions. This includes modification made in laws, practices, policies, etc. without completely overthrowing a government. Reforms usually do not involve creating drastic changes. In a reform, the power structure of a country remains the same even though modifications are made. These modifications are made with the aim of creating more stability. Reforms can be brought with the intention of eradicating pressing social issues such as poverty, homelessness, drug usage, etc. While some reforms can bring about positive changes in a society, others remain ineffective or even worsen the situation.

During the later part of the 18th century, when Industrialization was very high in England, the working conditions of the common man were very low. The number of hours that people had to work was excessive, which resulted in poor health conditions. The reforms that came about during this period, which restricted the number of working hours and improved the working conditions of the people, can be considered as an instance where reforms were effective and had a positive impact on the people.

Q.6. What is a Revolution?

Ans: Revolution can be defined as the overthrow of a government by force, in favor of a new system. Unlike a reform, this includes making drastic changes. Also, a revolution completely topples the prevailing power structure. It does not operate at a moderate pace and is not peaceful. A revolution works towards the destruction of a status quo.

The French revolution in 1789 can be considered as an example of a revolution. During this period, people were fed up of the existing power structure and of the insurmountable taxation, which led people to the overthrow of the power structure.

Q.7. What is the difference between Reform and Revolution?

Ans: The difference between Reform and revolution stems from the methods they use to achieve the results they desire. History bears evidence to various reforms and revolutions that have taken place world over. These have been the means of making changes within the power structure of a society. A reform can be viewed as an instance where changes have been made to the existing power structure. It does not completely overthrow a government but works within the power structure. On the other hand, a revolution completely rejects the prevailing power structure for a new one. It disrupts the existing status quo by adopting drastic measures. The French revolution can be taken as an example. Unlike a revolution, a reform is rather low paced. It only brings about moderate changes. This highlights that reforms and revolutions are different from one another. Through this article let us examine the differences between a reform and a revolution.

Q.8. What do you mean by democracy?

Ans: Democracy is often said to mean 'rule by the people'. An example of this is any system of government in which people vote their elected representatives into parliament.

Q.9. What are the different types of democracy?

Ans: Representative Democracy and its Critics Since direct democracy is not possible in large and complex societies, the mechanism through which people take part indirectly in government is through electing representatives to carry out their will. For early social contract theorists, such as Hobbes and Locke, representative government was a form of government authorised by the people to act on its behalf. For Rousseau, however, sovereign power over the state should rest in the hands of the citizenry and its "general will". because the opinions and interests of representatives could never be identical to those of the electorate.

Be that as it may, today representative government - based on the majority principle - is considered the best way of giving effect to the democratic impulse. It has, however, two types of critics, those who consider it unrealistic (Schumpeter and the elite theorists) and those who consider it inadequate. The Schumpeterian view of democracy projects this statement of the classical eighteenth century theory of democracy as an inaccurate account of what democracy is really about. To Joseph Schumpeter, the classical theory of democracy assumes - mistakenly - that sovereignty lies in the hands of the people who elect individuals to an assembly where their will can be carried out. Democracy is projected as an institutional arrangement for arriving at political decisions which realises the common good in this way. In reality, however, Schumpeter argues, democracy is not about popular sovereignty. It is not really the case that the primary task of democracy is to vest political power in the hands of a sovereign electorate, and its secondary task to elect leaders. On the contrary, the main purpose of democracy seems to be to elect leaders from among a given set of candidates, who compete with each other for the people's vote. Leadership is the driving-force, the people merely give their endorsement to one or the other leader. This has been called the "realist" theory of democracy.

Participatory Democracy

The classical theory of participatory democracy is found in the writings of Rousseau and John Stuart Mill. Rousseau's theory depends upon the participation of every individual citizen in political decision-making. The relationship between citizens is one of interdependence, such that each individual is equally dependent upon all the others viewed collectively as sovereign. Participation is important not only in decision-making, but also as a way of protecting private interests and ensuring good government. For Mill, as for Rousseau, participation has an educative function for citizens. Popular democratic government is Mill's ideal polity, in which participatory institutions foster active citizenship and a public-spirited character. This is the mechanism through which the individual is made to take public interest into account and to make decisions guided by the idea of the common good, rather than by his own selfish interests. Thus, democratic institutions - especially local ones - are "a school of political capacity".

In large and complex societies, direct participatory democracy is clearly impossible. Nevertheless, contemporary democratic theorists - such as Carole Pateman and Benjamin Barber - have argued in favour of participatory or "strong" democracy, in which the ordinary citizen is more fully involved in decision-making processes than is possible within the limits of representative democracy. This could take the form of strengthening local democracy, so that citizens are involved in community affairs and social movements. Advocates of participatory democracy generally follow Mill 'in attaching importance to civic education as a way of creating a more active and politically engaged citizenry. Above all they believe that political participation is central to the good life for human beings and that it helps to restrain the abuse of power by public officials.

Deliberative Democracy

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.

Social democracy

Social democracy is a form of democracy that is based on a strong commitment to equality. Social democrats, therefore, support the idea of the welfare state based on redistribution. They believe in the liberal institutions of representative democracy, but wish to combine these with the ideal of social justice. To the extent that liberalism frequently takes the form of right-wing libertarianism - a belief in the unfettered freedom of the individual and the free market - social democracy is more

egalitarian than liberalism. However, it is less radical than Marxian socialism and may be said to stand at the intersection of these two ideologies. Indeed, it has been said that social-democracy is more than democracy and less than socialism!

Social democrats argue that all individuals should get an equitable share of society's resources, in order to realise their own plans of life. If poverty or disability or belonging to a minority are obstacles in this respect, then it is the duty of the state to remove such obstacles. Social democracy is thus particularly concerned with providing the conditions for the well-being of workers, women, the disabled, the elderly, members of cultural minorities, and so forth. It is basically interested in creating the conditions for equality, so that all citizens can enjoy their democratic rights to the same extent. It sees democracy as not only a form of government, but also a principle that should inform collective life in society as a whole.

Cosmopolitan Democracy

Cosmopolitan democracy is an idea advanced by political theorists in the context of globalisation. With the coming into being of forms of supranational organisation - such as the European Union - and 'with the advance of economic and cultural globalisation,' it is believed that democracy must also respond to these challenges beyond the borders of the nation-state. The idea of cosmopolitan democracy is a response to this challenge. Though there is no single institution of global governance that has replaced the national state, this theory points to the global civil society being created by the phenomenon of "globalisation from below". The new solidarities being forged across national borders give rise to the notion of cosmopolitan citizenship. The environmental movement and the women's movement are two notable examples of this. As the world is getting more rapidly and closely connected through the communications and internet revolutions, the implications of these developments for democracy are uncertain. Do these technological innovations make governments more or less accountable? Is it really possible for citizens to participate in them? For instance, though the majority of members of the World Trade Organisation (WTO) are developing countries, who represent a majority of the world's citizens, the WTO continues to be responsive to the more prosperous nations and their interests.

Q.10. What is the concept of secularism?

Ans: Secularism, in its core, means the separation of religion from the state and a neutral stance towards all religions. It's about ensuring equal treatment for all religions and preventing the state from favoring or adopting any particular religion. This concept also includes freedom of religion and tolerance, allowing individuals to practice or not practice any faith without interference from the government.

Q.11. Who is the father of secularism?

Ans: The "father of secularism" is generally considered to be George Jacob Holyoake, a British secularist, co-operator, and newspaper editor. He coined the term "secularism" in 1851 and is credited with popularizing the idea of secularism as a distinct philosophy and movement.

Q.12. What are the different types of Secularism?

Ans: The manner in which we have so far discussed secularism can be characterized as political secularism, which emphasizes the separation of the state and the church. This separation is meant to promote secular values in the functioning of the public sphere. These secular values in general can be said to focus on a certain kind of neutrality of treatment among religions, and to prevent any kind of discrimination among people, and institutions based on religious grounds. However, as we have partially discussed earlier that in practice different states interpret these secular ends differently. Analytically speaking, a secular state can be characterized as having a dissociation with religion at the level of (i) ends, (ii) institutions, and (iii) laws and policies. How a state practices separation from religion at these levels allows for different characterizations of any state. Ideally, a secular state must be neutral on religion on all the above-mentioned levels. A secular state can be distinguished from (i) a theocratic state, eg. Iran, (ii) a state with one established religion, eg. Great Britain, and (iii) a state with multiple established religions, Ashokan empire or Akbar's policy towards religions may come closest to this characteristic. Neutrality among all established religions may seem close to secularism, however, at the most abstract and fundamental level secular states must allow for their own secular ends, and not those established by religion. They must also cater to those who do not believe, or choose to believe in another religion than the one they are born into. The state's ends and ideas of welfare should not distinguish among citizens based on religion.

A very significant issue that emerges here is the case study of India as a secular state. Scholars have argued that India presents a different understanding of the term secularism, than that followed in the West. Others have claimed that it is only a derivative of the western notion. That debate aside, there are certain features of Indian secularism that make it distinctive in its approach to secularism, and are worthy of consideration. One of the foremost features in this regard is the acceptance of group/ community-based rights of religious groups, which is not accepted in western models. As argued earlier, in the European framework, religion is considered an individual centric, private activity, which cannot be entertained in the public sphere. India's approach to secularism is characterized as principled distance, as opposed to one-sided exclusion, mutual exclusion or strict neutrality. What this entails is that the state's engagement with religion, as a publicly significant activity, is underwritten by principles of secular values, and religion is not just removed from the public sphere. Religion may intervene in the public sphere, or likewise the state may intervene in religious matters, if they are guided by secular values of equality, liberty, justice etc. There is a demonstrable historical lineage and definite merits to this approach, in principle; however, this is not an uncontroversial position. In practice, it has been witnessed that it is not always easy to decide what values should be promoted as part of the public domain. For instance, individual liberty versus equality amongst religions may very well be at stake, and not allow for a clear resolution. At a deeper level, this takes us back to the crisis of secularism, where the separation between religion and state is not easy to execute.

UNIT IV

Social Contract Theory

Relation between an Individual and Society : Individualism, Socialism and Collectivism

Q.1. What is social contract theory?

Ans: In political philosophy, the social contract is an idea, theory, or model that usually, although not always, concerns the legitimacy of the authority of the state over the individual. Conceptualized in the Age of Enlightenment, it is a core concept of constitutionalism, while not necessarily convened and written down in a constituent assembly and constitution.

Write a note on social contract theory.

Ans: The social contract theory is not only the most ancient but also the most famous of the theories regarding the origin of the state. The substance of this theory is that state is the result of an agreement entered into by men who originally had no governmental organisation. In the first period there was no government and no law. The people lived in a state of nature. After some time they decided to set up a state. That they did by means of a contract. The social contract theory described the original condition of men as the 'state of nature'. To escape from the condition of the state of nature man made a social contract. To some writers the contract was pre-social and to others it was pre-political. Writers on this theory are agreed on the point that the state of nature preceded the establishment of government there was no organised life in the state of nature. Each lived according to his own wish and fancies. No man made laws were there to control man. The law known to men living in the state of nature was the law of nature or natural law. There was none to interpret the law or adjudicate. Hence men lived under uncertain conditions. When men felt the need to escape from this type of life he did so by common agreement or contract. As a result of this, a civil society was created. Thus creation of civil society preceded the emergence of the state. In the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries the supporters of the social contract theory multiplied and there was more or less universal acceptance of the doctrine. Hooker was the first scientific writer who gave a logical exposition of the theory of social contract. The theory found real support in the writings of Thomas Hobbes, John Locke, Jean Jacques Rousseau who are known as contractualists.

Q.3. What is the concept of individualism?

Ans: Individualism is a concept emphasizing the moral worth and significance of the individual, advocating for personal autonomy, self-reliance, and the priority of individual interests over societal or group needs. It contrasts with collectivism, which prioritizes group harmony and shared goals. Individualism also implies a focus on individual rights, freedom, and the pursuit of personal goals.

Q.4. What is socialism in simple words?

Ans: Socialists believe that sharing ownership of the means of production equally among society would increase people's quality of life. Socialists want to give people free access to basic life necessities like food, housing, and healthcare. Some socialists also believe employment should be guaranteed as a human right.

Q.5. What do you mean by collectivism?

Ans: Collectivism refers to a worldview in which social behavior is guided largely by goals that are shared by a collective, such as a family, tribe, work group, or political or religious association. Interdependence and group solidarity are valued.

Q.6. What is the relationship between the state and individual?

Ans: Speaking about an Individual and State in the perspective of idealists, individuals have no right to resist governmental instructions. It is the individual's cardinal obligation to unconditionally accept the dictates of the state since the will of the state is the valid will of the person.

Q.7. What is the relationship between the state and the individual according to Hegel?

Ans: The relationship between the individual and the state is marked by freedom. According to Hegel, it is in the state that freedom is first realized. The freedom of the individual is therefore inexorably tied to her membership of the state.

Q.8. Write a note on individualism.

Ans: The individualistic theory stands for maximum amount of individual initiative and freedom. It champions the cause of liberty. Liberty is considered to be the highest human value. Man should have complete liberty of thought and action in order to achieve the fullest development of his personality. It advocates freedom of the individual and non-interference of the State in the sphere of the individual activities.

The individualistic theory of the State is as old as the State itself. The root of this theory may be traced back to the earliest political philosophy of the Sophism of ancient Greece. However, as a political philosophy, it developed in the writings of John Locke, an English political philosopher of the 17th century, who was an ardent advocate of individualism. It came into prominence in the 18th and 19th centuries. A group of economists known as the physiocrats in France in the eighteenth century were considered to be the pioneers of individualism. The Physiocrats raised their battle-cry of "laissez-faire" or "leave individual alone". They totally opposed to the State interference in the economic sphere.

Individualism partly developed due to the Industrial Revolution in the eighteenth century which had supported the idea of free competition, free trade and noninterference of the State in the economic system. As a social and political theory, it reached its peak in the nineteenth century. Adam Smith, John Stuart Mill, Herbert Spencer and F.A. Hayek are main exponents of this theory. Adam Smith advocated free competition and noninterference of the State in economic system. He denounced the laws which restricted free competition and free interaction of demand and supply. J.S. Mill was a strong advocate of individual freedom. He wrote, "Over himself, over his own body and mind, the individual is sovereign." Herbert Spencer was also a great champion of individual liberty. He said, "Every man is free to do that which he wills, provided he infringes not upon the

equal freedom of any other man.” F.A. Hayek strongly denounced planning and the State interference. He condemned planning as “a road to serfdom” (slavery)

The individualistic theory is otherwise known as “the Laissez Faire Theory.” The term “laissez faire” in the French language means ‘let alone’ or ‘leave alone’. According to this theory, the State should ‘leave alone’ the individuals and should not interfere in the sphere of individual activities. It puts emphasis on individual happiness and prosperity. It assumes that individual is the centre of activities in any social system. The individualistic theory considers the State as ‘a necessary evil’. It is an evil because it encroaches upon the freedom of individuals. As it is an evil, it is better to have as little of it as far as possible. But at the same time, the State is regarded as ‘necessary’ because of selfish and egoistic nature of human beings. It is necessary in order to stop the anti-social activities of individuals in the society. But it should not be all powerful, omnipotent and Omni competent. Hence it is considered as a ‘necessary evil’. They should have complete freedom to live and move freely in society. They should not face any obstruction from outside. The functions of the

State should be confined to a minimum possible extent. The State is viewed as a negative institution. It should exist only to hinder the hindrances. The individualistic theory advocates maximum freedom of the individuals and minimum functions of the State. It supports the idea of “that State is the best which governs the least.” Hence the individualists advocate “maximum possible individual freedom and minimum possible State action.” The individualists stand for a police State.

The function of a policeman is only preventive or negative in character. Likewise the State should prevent the lawbreakers and hinder the hindrances on the path of individual in realization of his best self. “The State is simply a policeman, and its duty is neither more or less than to prevent robbery and murder and enforce contracts.” The State is also compared to a “night watchman” whose job is merely a negative one. The individualists are not unanimous as to what should be the legitimate functions of the State. Most of the individualists allow the State to perform the following two categories of functions:

1. Maintenance of law and order within State.
2. Protection of individuals against the external aggression. or internal rebellion.

Regarding the first category of functions, it is said that it is the duty of the state to protect life, liberty and property of the individuals. It should protect individuals from physical injury, slander and personal harms. It should also protect individual against false contract or breach of contract and should see enforcement of contracts being lawfully made. The sole function of the government is to protect the individual from violence or fraud.

With regard to the second category of function, it is the duty of the State to protect the individuals against external aggression or internal rebellion beyond these functions, the individualist do not allow the State to perform any other functions.

Q.8. Write a note on socialism.

Ans: Socialism is a concept that has its roots in the socio-economic doctrine. The term was coined by Saint Simon in early 19th century in the West. Although the attributes attached to socialism such as social cooperation, upliftment of the weaker sections in a society, struggle for social justice and so on, existed prior to 19th century but scholars argue that the current understanding of the term socialism evolved in the 19th century only. Generally, the term socialism is used in two different yet interdependent ways. One is that socialism denotes values, ethics and other principles of this sort of imagination. Socialism in this sense is characterised by the ideas of liberty, equality, fraternity, social justice, classlessness, cooperation, abundance, peace and so on (See: Narayan, 1936). Second is that it signifies the practical aspects of socio-political institutions that also symbolize the socialist principles. Socialism at the level of institutions contrasts the capitalist mode of economy by marking a shift from the capitalist modes of ownership and control of the production to the public or collective ownership of the production system. This shift which is based on the notions of social justice and equality has grabbed the attention of socialists as well as others involved in the welfarist activities but these two notions do not alone represent socialism. There are a variety of meanings attached to the term socialism however, in this unit, we will focus on socialism in terms of its economic aspects and the welfare of human beings.

Socialism marks its evolution through the abolition of bourgeoisie order of the society. The scientific study of socialism is still undeveloped. Socialist scientists have so far not succeeded to take the science of socialism to a next stage. They have overlooked the functioning of economic system and also failed to comprehend the functioning of various economic institutions characterised by division of labour and private property ownership. Marx's concept of socialism is referred to as scientific socialism because Marxism is based on the study of past. Marx's socialism, which is also called as scientific socialism comprises three fundamental categories such as economics, politics and philosophy. Within economics, Marx propounded the theory of surplus value through value of labour theory. In political arena, Marx and Engels understood and analysed the principles of class struggle that existed in capitalism to create a new form of society called socialist society through one-party rule of proletariats. Within the field of philosophy, Marx borrowed Hegel's theory of dialectics to develop dialectical materialism, a theory which is now known as the theory of dialectical materialism.

Socialism became most influential during the Gandhian era of Satyagraha movement. During this period, various other influential leaders in India, such as Swami Dayanand, campaigned for promoting equality in India. Socialists generally dealt economically with the notions of equality but there are others who focussed more on promoting social equality such as Bankim Chandra. Gandhian model of socialism has its base on the ethical and reformatory factors. Gandhi advocated non-violence and argued that western democracy and communism were objectionable to the Indians for their lacking of the true freedom (Gandhi, 1951). The contributions of the nationalist thinkers highlighted the economic difficulties that existed in India without inhibiting the notions of socialism. The economic turmoil however helped in the growth of an ideology which is based on the ideals of socialism in India.

Q.9. Write a note on State Socialism.

Ans: The concept of state socialism means involvement of the state in abolishing the discriminatory practices that existed in capitalism such as low wages and inequalities. State socialism promotes the idea of welfare state. It denotes a specific model of economic and political organization in a society and is based on the idea of collectivism. State socialism is not just an economic doctrine but some scholars argue that it is more of a moral and welfarist movement which is based on the ideas of justice and equality. State socialists argue that in order to abolish the exploitation from the production system and endorse social welfare, the state needs to interfere in the production state of affairs through legislative means which will serve the interests of the downtrodden. This demands the nationalization of the means of production in order to have an equal distribution of production among the workers. The state acts as an organ for the promotion of equality and equal distribution of resources and towards moral responsibilities, the state functions towards the upliftment of weaker sections in a society.

Q.10. Write a note on Military Socialism.

Ans: Military socialism is a term used in to denote the collective aim of the armed personnel during the war. In military socialism, income value and value of social status of the citizens is determined by the status held in the armed group. There is no claim of private ownership of the means of production. No individual in war can have individual aims, which would otherwise downgrade the essence of war. Military personnel usually stay in camps which are the communal arrangements. They collectively partake in activities which give direction to their lives, including their familial matters.

Q.11. Write a note on Planned Socialism.

Ans: While in capitalism, the capitalists engage in the production process to satisfy their own interests. Competition was also predominant in capitalism and it lacked coordination. But in planned socialism, there is a collective or what is also called as mixed ownership of the means of production by the public. Planning in socialism denotes planning to produce. In planned socialist economy, the coordination and distribution of production is carried out by the state through proper planning. Production in the socialist system is done to satisfy the needs and demands of people (See: Sahai, 1986). The distribution of production is based on the amount of contribution that people make in the production process. Under planned socialism, there are certain objectives fixed by the government. To achieve them, the state comes up with a planning. All the issues concerning the economy are covered under the plans of the government. The planning agency is generally called as Central Planning Authority and in India we read planning commission earlier and now we have the Niti Aayog who serves at this front.

Q.12. What do you mean by collectivism?

Ans: Collectivism refers to a worldview in which social behavior is guided largely by goals that are shared by a collective, such as a family, tribe, work group, or political or religious association. Interdependence and group solidarity are valued.

Q.13. Write a note on collectivism.

Ans: Collectivism is an important concept in both economics and politics. Similar to individualism it is a foundational principle to understand many different ideological systems. At its heart, collectivism is a set of principles centered on the belief in the idea that the goal of any society is to achieve the best common good for all or most citizens. This means, that economic or political systems based on the principles of collectivism favor policies that allow for a high degree of government intervention in the economy in order to promote the greatest good for most people.

On the economic or political spectrums, collectivism is positioned on the left side. This is because the left side of the spectrum is most often associated with a high degree of government intervention in both economic and political affairs. Therefore, people who support the principles of collectivism argue in favor of cooperation among citizens. This means that they support the idea that citizens in a given country should pool their resources and cooperate in order to deliver social programs and services that benefit all or most people. Economically, this would mean that people should be able to rely on the government for programs such as welfare, public education, public healthcare and senior pensions. Collectivism is best associated with the ideology of socialism which developed throughout the 19th and 20th centuries. As such, it is generally agreed that collectivism is made up of several different main principles, including:

- Economic Equality
- Public Ownership
- Cooperation
- Collective-Interest
- Government Regulation

These principles emerged throughout the 19th and 20th centuries in response to the earlier development of capitalism. As such, most historians view the advent of collectivism as an attempt by some societies to correct issues related to ideologies on the right-side of the economic spectrum. Ideologies based on collectivist values include: Communism, Marxism, and Socialism. As well, some modern democratic countries contain elements of collectivism while also maintaining some individualistic principles. Economists consider these societies to be examples of a mixed economy, welfare state or modern liberalism.

Public ownership is a central principle of collectivism. It is the idea that the government should have the ability to own property, which could include: land, businesses, products, ideas, etc. For example, in the Soviet Union (Communist Russia) the government owned the means of production. This was especially apparent in the collectivization plan that Soviet leader Joseph Stalin carried out during the 1930s in the Ukraine. It involved the government assuming ownership of previously privately owned farms. A central argument for government ownership is

the idea that the government should ensure the continuation of an essential service. The hope is that public ownership of the business will help control prices for average consumers while also providing a service that, if it failed, would be harmful to the citizens of the country. As well, from a Marxist perspective, public ownership was seen as positive because it could potentially help prevent exploitation of the workers at the hand of wealthy business owners.

Cooperation is another important principle of collectivism. It is the idea that citizens in a country should work towards a common goal rather than competing against each other. It is similar to another collectivist principle which is collective-interest. It is the idea that a society should act, economically, in the interest of all people for the common good. For instance, collectivist societies would support the idea that the government should fund and operate social programs that are in the best interest of most, if not all people. A social program is a government-funded and program that is, in general, universally provided to all citizens of the country. As such, it involves both cooperation and collective-interest because citizens are cooperating in order to provide a service or program that will benefit most or all people in society. There are many examples of social programs in modern democratic nations, including: old age pensions, some form of government funded healthcare, public education, welfare, etc. For example, countries such as Canada, the United States and England offer public education to citizens of their countries. The idea is that a basic education for all citizens is in the collective-interest of the country as a whole and not just for individual people. For example, public education allows low income citizens to afford to send their children to school and receive a similar education to others in the same country. Truly collectivist societies, such as Cuba, also display cooperation and collective-interest in the creation and maintenance of their publically-funded healthcare system.

The final principle of collectivism is government regulation to ensure the equitable distribution of income. It is the idea that the government has a role to play in the economy in terms of solving issues related to wages and income gaps. Economists refer to this as 'economic equality' because it involves the government trying to create more equality among people in society in terms of their income. For example, at different times in history, such as the Industrial Revolution or the Great Depression, there has been wide income gap between the highest earners and the lowest earners. Some economists have argued that a wide income gap was one of the main causes of the Great Depression. Governments across North America and Europe have sought to solve this issue through government regulation. For instance, minimum wage laws were created to protect working class citizens from being taken advantage of by wealthy owners. The idea was that the government should set a minimum wage such that those earning the lowest amounts in society are still able to take care of the basic necessities of life. While this may not always be true, minimum wage laws show the government's attempt to increase the equitable distribution of income in society through government influence and intervention in the economy. This idea was also an important element of the writings of Karl Marx in 'The Communist Manifesto'. For example, Marx famously stated: "From each according to their ability, to each according to their need". In this quote, Marx is arguing for economic equality because he believes that society should take from those with a strong ability and provide for all citizens. As such, most societies that are based

on Marxist values believe in some form of redistributing the income of society to prevent issues related to poverty and homelessness.

UNIT V

Justice, Liberty and Equality Terrorism and Insurgency

Q.1. What is justice?

Ans: Any discussion of the concept of justice has to take into account its multi dimensional character. The answer to 'what is justice' can only be given by indicating guidelines (values) along which men have thought of justice and will continue to do so. It changes with the passage of time. Thus, what was justice in the past, may be injustice in the present and vice-versa. Thus, there have been the 'egalitarian' perception of justice where the highest place is accorded to the value of equality; the 'libertarian' perception in which liberty is the ultimate value; the Divine view in which justice is the execution of God's will, the 'hedonist' makes 'the greatest good of the greatest number' the criterion of justice; to the 'harmonizer' justice is the harmonizing of different elements and values to produce a satisfactory balance. Some identify justice with 'duty' or with maintenance of peace and order; others view it as an elitist function. Thus, justice concerns the right of the individual as well as the social ordering of society. It is legal and moral at the same time. In short, it is an ethical concept.

Q.2. What do you understand by distributive justice? How is it related to economic justice?

Ans: Distributive justice subjects to the condition of general welfare. It demands that the state of national economy be reshaped in a way that the benefits are made available to the common man. In this way, the idea of economic justice comes to imply a socialistic pattern of society. The first task of economic justice is to provide employment, food, shelter and clothing to every able-bodied citizen. In regard to this area of satisfying the primary and basic needs of all, it has been correctly said that freedom is meaningless if it prevents the achievement of economic justice. Thus, the liberals believe that economic justice can be attained in society if the state provides welfare services and there is progressive system of taxation; a fair return for work provision of social security like old age pension, gratuity and provident fund. However, the Marxist view of justice has its origins in the area of economics. According to Marx, the positive law of the state is imposed on its members by the authority of the class, which controls the means of production. Law is determined by the economic interest of the ruling class. When private property is abolished and the working class controls the means of production, then the laws are bound to reflect the interest of the working class. Therefore, the content of justice depends upon the class controlling the means of production. When the state withers away, as contemplated by the communists, there will be justice without an economic origin. Modern liberals have since long given up the doctrine of

economic laissez-faire. Redistributive justice (of which Aristotle spoke) is an integral part of 'revisionist liberalism' as advocated by J.W. Chapmen, John Rawls and Arthur Okun. These writers advocate "redistributive justice" with its implication of state intervention in the economy in the interest of justice and freedom for all.

Q.3. What is social justice? On what grounds has it been criticised?

Ans: Social justice relates to the balance between an individual's rights and social control ensuring the fulfillment of the legitimate expectations of the individual under the existing laws and to ensure him benefits and protection against any encroachment on his rights. Let us examine the term, 'social justice' in terms of the following aspects of justice, viz. one, the notion of the predominance of the interest of the community and two, the notion of 'reform', or social change.

With the decline of the laissez-faire doctrine, a new awareness has developed that the rights of an individual should be reasonably restricted in the interests of the community because the ends of social justice require the reconciliation of individual rights with that of community interest. It also presumes that in the event of a conflict between the two, the community interest must prevail over individual concerns. Social justice is, thus, closely linked with the idea of what constitutes public good or community interest. Today with the penetration of democracy into the social and economic spheres, community interest has come to encompass not only the political (fair treatment in political matters) but also the social (non-discrimination in social areas) and economic (fair distribution of income and wealth) spheres. Thus, social justice ranges from the protection of minority political rights to the abolition of untouchability and the eradication of poverty. As such, in the backward countries of the world, the idea of social justice enjoins upon the state to make concerted efforts for the improvement of the downtrodden and weaker sections of the community.

Social justice is used to denote organization of society on the basis of ideas of fairness and equality current at the time. It seeks a revision of social order so as to have a more equitable society. Men through the ages, have sought changes in social order, just as much as they have also sought to preserve a given social order. Social justice stands for reformatory justice, for revision of the social order and a redistribution of rights to suit current ideas of fairness. When Aristotle spoke of 'distributive justice' he had reformatory or what Raphael calls "prosthetic" justice in mind, because its aims was to modify the status quo.

Theories of social justice are criticised on three grounds. Firstly, demands for social justice, by implication, enlarge the activities of the state. The state, then, will have to decide, "who gets, what, when and how." Where the officers of the state develop vested interests, such subjective determination is not likely to serve the ends of social justice. Secondly, policies of social justice and their implementation require curtailment of liberty. How much of liberty should be sacrificed for how great/small social justice becomes a problem difficult to solve. Lastly, it is difficult to assess which are the basic needs that have to be satisfied to fulfill the criteria of social justice and which justify departure from equality. However, when the Indian Constitution announces reservation of seats in legislature, educational institutions and public employment, it entails

departure from equality. Various justifications are offered for these policies in terms of justice. Firstly, that such treatment compensates for the hundred years of deprivations. Secondly, that these measures are necessary for realising ultimate equality to bring them on an equal footing with society and thirdly, that justice can be done only if the state comes forward with preferential policies to help them gain social respect, economic viability and political status.

Q.4. Discuss John Rawls's theory of justice.

Ans: Different political theories offer different pictures of what would be a really just social order. Two of these theories are, the utilitarian theory, and John Rawls's theory of justice as fairness. Utilitarian theory asserts that the social order in which the largest number of people can have the highest satisfaction of their utility is just. But from its very early days, critics have found great difficulties with utilitarianism. In this backdrop, Rawls's theory has offered, an alternative to utilitarianism. Rawls's book, *Theory of Justice* gives a final interpretation of the concept. To discuss Rawls's theory of justice, his method of approaching moral problems must be mentioned first, which is in the contractarian tradition of social philosophy. But at the same time, Rawls's method entails that the conclusions of moral reasoning be always checked and readjusted against intuitive moral notions and this contrasts with others in the contractarian tradition, who maintain that the rules of justice are those that would be agreed to in a hypothetical setting. Rawls places men behind the 'veil of ignorance' in a hypothetical original position where individuals are deprived of the basic knowledge of their wants, interests, skills, abilities and of the things that generate conflicts in actual societies. But they will have what Rawls calls 'a sense of justice'. Under these circumstances, Rawls argue, people will agree to accept two principles of justice in the lexical order. First, is the equality principle where each person is to have an equal right to the most extensive liberty compatible with a similar liberty to others. Here, equal liberties can be concretised as the familiar rights of liberal democratic regimes. They include the equal right to political participation, freedom of expression, religious liberty, equality before the law and so on. The second principle Justice is called the difference principle where Rawls argues that inequalities can only be justified, if it benefits the least advantaged. John Rawls's concept of justice has two aspects to it. Firstly, it postulates a "constitutional democracy", that is, government of laws and one, which is restrained, responsible and accountable. Secondly, it believes in the regulation of the free economy "in a certain way". "If law and government", writes Rawls's, "act effectively to keep market competitive, resources fully employed, property and wealth widely distributed over time, and to maintain the appropriate social minimum, then if there is equality of opportunity underwritten by education for all, the resulting distribution will be just". The "redistributionists" have their critics too. Thus, Mare F. Plattner makes two arguments against the view of justice. Firstly, he believes that although equality is a cherished value, it may not be possible to have it at the expense of efficiency. According to Plattner, this problem of equality versus increased wealth lands Rawls into an inconsistency. Thus, on the one hand, Rawls "absolutely refuses to allow that those who make a greater economic contribution deserve greater economic rewards". Yet his "difference principle" (which specifies that "social and economic inequalities are to be arranged

so that they are to the greatest benefit of the least advantaged”) nonetheless affirms that it is just to grant them greater economic rewards insofar as these serve as incentives to increase their contribution in ways that ultimately benefit the disadvantaged. The second argument Plattner makes is that the redistributionist wants to refuse to the individual the reward of his “honest industry “and instead, considers all produce as the “common asset” of society as a whole. And this Plattner wants us to believe, undermines the “moral foundations of private property and therewith of liberal society”.

Q.5. Write a note on equality.

Ans: The crux of freedom, for Gandhi, is not being unrestrained or unhindered but to cultivate love and service as these are the quintessence of human nature. Freedom is worthwhile as long as it fulfils basic needs in dignity. Gandhi pleads for both freedom and equality of status which he thinks would make it possible for the establishment of a universal community of free persons. Those who accept such a community would have to overcome the artificial barriers of race and creed, wealth and power, class and nation. If one segment augments for itself at the expense of others it would be adopting an undemocratic method and would have to use arms to defend the injustice that it perpetrates. The possessing class would always be in fear of dispossession and the oppressed would be storing up resentment. Gandhi laid emphasis on equal claim that every individual is entitled to by birth and he also acknowledges that in spite of many setbacks, the human civilisation has enhanced the philosophy of oneness and that is how we see that the ideals of justice, equality and freedom have been accepted by the major philosophies and social movements. This is also a reflection of the growing consciousness of being human which had to fight continuously a process which tried to retard them from this noble mission. Gandhi’s talisman of keeping the face of the poorest in mind while making policies and in undertaking any social reform is with the concern to bring the marginalised and the most vulnerable into the mainstream of politics and society. He champions the basic rights of the untouchables and women, as they have been objects of domination and humiliation. He rejects ascriptive properties such as gender, class, birth, caste, education or nationality that can justify unequal treatment and disqualify some as moral agents.

For Gandhi, equality logically follows from non-violence; non-violence entails non-exploitation and non-exploitation is impossible without equality and thus equality and non-violence are interdependent. In Gandhi’s perception, freedom and equality are also inter-related; without social and economic equality, there cannot be freedom and without freedom, there can be no social and economic equality. Thus, in Gandhi’s thought, freedom, equality and nonviolence mutually depend on one another and together constitute justice, which is the basis of good society.

Q.6. What is liberty?

Ans: Liberty is such a word which attracts the attention of everybody because human life is not possible without it and nor the man can make any progress in his life. This is reason that from the very beginning, the man has been struggling for the attainment of liberty and whenever he found any danger to his liberty, he opposed it with his full might. The forceful idea of liberty fills the

people with courage and fighting spirit which would match the strength of any despot. The idea of liberty has been the most powerful weapon in the hands of the unarmed and it has defeated the strong armies of dictators and imperialists and has opened the path of freedom and progress. Many persons have lost their lives in the struggle for liberty. From the very ancient times, man's liberty has been suppressed either by despotic kings or by priests, or by conventions. But in spite of all this, man struggled through many obstacles and gained its ultimate result. This is the age of democracy and in it man has got different kinds of liberty and in this chapter we will discuss, the meaning, various kinds and different concepts related to liberty.

Q.7. What is the meaning of liberty?

Ans: Liberty is such a concept that everybody knows it, loves it and tries to achieve it. But very few persons know the real meaning of this concept. Gilchrist has rightly said, "Everyone has a vague notion of liberty and desire for it, but among the people using the word, perhaps only two will be able to say what exactly that means." A common man thinks that liberty means no restraint. But this meaning is not correct, because in civilized society, man cannot be given the right to do anything. Liberty, actually is congenial atmosphere, which is essential for the overall growth of man. Liberty is limited by the social principles and laws of the state. Origin of the word Liberty- The word liberty has been derived from Latin word 'Liber which means, absence of restraints. If we accept this meaning of liberty then man is free to do whatever he wants to do. But this is the negative aspect of liberty. Infact, liberty is possible only with restraints. According to McKechnie, "Freedom is not the absence of all restraints, rather the substitution of rational for the irrational one."

Q.7. What are the different kinds of liberty?

Ans: 1. Natural Liberty-Contractualists have propagated the idea of natural liberty. They are of the opinion that man is born free, therefore, he should be given absolute freedom. According to Rousseau, "Man is born free but everywhere he is in chains." Contractualists like Hobbes, Locke and Rousseau think that man has actual freedom only in the state of nature, but with the origin of the state man has lost his natural freedom. In the state of nature, he was free like birds chirping and flying. But in civilized society, no such liberty can be given which is against social and moral principles. Liberty is not license. Real freedom can be enjoyed only in the state and the society.

2. Civil Liberty-The liberties which man gets being the member of the society is termed as civil liberties. This concept of liberty is against the concept of natural liberty. This concept does not give absolute rights according to one's wishes but this liberty can be enjoyed within the restrictions imposed by the state and society. According to Gettell, "Civil liberty consists of rights and privileges which the state creates and protects for its subjects." Civil Liberty includes personal liberty, religious liberty, liberty to express thoughts and views, liberty to get together etc. Two aspects of Civil Liberty-There are two aspects of Civil Liberty-(i) Not to create obstacle in the way of others in the process of enjoying liberty. State protects man's liberty from other men and organizations. (ii) Security against the government to the human beings. This is done by providing

fundamental rights which are included in the constitution of that country. If government goes against these fundamental rights, man has every right to go to the judiciary. According to Laski, "Liberty is never real unless the government can be called to account and it should always be called to account when it invades rights. Civil liberty depends upon the capacity and form of the state and so, it is not uniform in all the states."

3. Political Liberty-Political Liberty means active participation in the administration of the state. According to Laski, "Political Liberty is the power to be active in the affairs of the state." In short, Political Liberty is that constitutional liberty in which the people have the right to elect their own government. It also includes the following rights:- (i) Right to Vote (ii) Right to be elected (iii) Right to hold public office according to one's qualifications (iv) Right to criticize the policies of the government etc. Political Liberty is another name to Democracy and these liberties are possible only in a democratic state. According to Prof. Laski, two conditions are necessary for the protection of political liberty and these are I. Everybody should get equal opportunities to get education. It will create awareness among the people and they will be able to enjoy their rights and liberties properly. II. The press should be free and fair so that the people get right information.

4. Economic Liberty-Economic the absence of this liberty is the base of all other liberties, because in worthless without liberty man cannot enjoy other liberties. Lenin has said, "Civil liberty is unemployment economic liberty." Economic liberty means security from poverty, him proper chance etc. This liberty frees the man from the exploitation of the master and gives security and opportunity to earn his livelihood. According to Laski, "By economic liberty we mean According to find reasonable significance in the earnings of one's daily bread." to Universal Declaration of Human Rights, economic liberty included the rights given as under- (i) Right to work, (ii) Right to reasonable wages, (iii) Right to form trade unions, (iv) Right to rest and leisure. Prof. Laski includes the right to participate in administration of the, factory, in the category of economic liberty. In the words of Prof. Laski, "Economic Liberty implies democracy Marxists lay much emphasis on economic liberty in comparison to other liberties, because according to them, food comes first and anything else later.

5. National Liberty-National Liberty is opposite to colonialism and imperialism. According to this, a state has right to self determinations and self-government. According to Jefferson, National Liberty means, "Every man and everybody of men on earth, possess the right of self-government." According to national liberty, every nation has the right to establish a sovereign state and can be free from any external or internal control. This liberty includes, the liberty to run the administration of the state in any form or way, liberty in foreign affairs, liberty in economic and social set up etc. No state can use force upon another nations. Before 1947, the Indians were not having National Liberty. But now India has got national independence. But this does not mean that National Liberty is absolute. This liberty can be used only for propagating friendship among other nations. Powerful states cannot be given liberty to overpower weaker states.

6. Religious Liberty-Religion has got a great impact on human being. Nobody can tolerate any type of interference in his religious matters. This is the reason why many states give the religious liberty to the citizens. Secular state provides the liberty to adopt any religion and keeps herself neutral from religious affairs. But in the dictatorial state no religious liberty is provided to the citizens. Besides this, the state cannot impose any particular religion. In fact, today religion is considered the personal matter of an individual and to obey or not to obey any religion depends upon the will of an individual. In communist states, individual has the right to religious freedom, but he does not have the right to propagate his religion. But one point should be noted that religious liberty can be enjoyed only in restraints.

7. Moral Liberty-T.H. Green, Rousseau, Kant, Hegel and Bosanquet are in the favour of moral liberty. Moral liberty creates such conditions which enable an individual to become a rational being as a result of which he becomes able to distinguish between right and wrong, true and false, moral and immoral, religious and irreligious etc. The individual, therefore should be morally free and the state should create such conditions necessary to ensure moral liberty to man. In fact, moral liberty is concerned with the inner consciousness of an individual meaning by that an individual is at liberty to act according to his innerconsciousness and when state tries to repress the innerconsciousness of a person then it destroys the moral liberty of an individual. Opposite to it state creates proper conditions to ensure moral liberty of an individual.

8. Individual Liberty-Individual liberty means that man has liberty to do anything which does not affect others. According to J.S.Mill, man should have liberty in self-regarding actions because in his own words, "Over himself, over his body and mind, the individual is sovereign." But many scholars do not accept this view, because they think there is no such action which does not affect others. While living in society, while enjoying his personal liberty one has to look into the interests of others and he cannot be given any such liberty which restricts the liberty of others. Important saying is, "My liberty ends where others liberty begins." So, there is a close relationship between personal liberty and social liberty and personal liberty can be enjoyed within the boundaries fixed by the society.

Q.8. What is terrorism?

Ans: Terrorism today has acquired importance due to its serious consequences and scope. Simultaneously it can be considered as a very complex concept, which is very difficult to define. Besides, the types of implications attached to this phenomenon are multidimensional and very difficult to be handled by a single and straight forward strategy. Broadly speaking it is an act of violence which seeks to instill terror in the minds of people in general and the ruling establishments in particular. Usually the methods applied by the terrorists are in the form of murder, threat to murder, bombing, kidnapping, ransom, extortion, hijacking, attacking passengers of bus or train, looting of banks, devastating railway tracks, demoralising people, police, judiciary, investigating agencies etc. It is not a direct war, but rather a new kind of warfare waged by small groups of people against the innocent or neutral persons working in the system. The very purposes of such

terrorists are to create instability in the system and finally to get the publicity of their message to larger audience which was not possible otherwise. Hence in a way through the cult of violence they want to get their so called wrongs righted. Thus, according to Baylis and Smith, it can only be subsumed that: a) Agreement on what constitute terrorism continues to be difficult given the range of potential acts involving violence. b) Terrorism, or acts of violence by sub-state groups, has been separated from criminal acts on the basis of the purpose for which violence is applied, namely political change. c) Terrorist groups succeed when their motivations or grievances are perceived to be legitimate by a wider audience. Disproportionate or heavy handed responses by states to acts of terrorism serve to legitimize terrorist groups. d) The definition of terrorism is open to subjective interpretations but the technologies associated with this have improved terrorist capabilities.

Q.9. What are the causes of terrorism?

Ans: The causes of terrorism are found both in domestic and external factors prevailing in the nation state or at the international levels. These two fold causes can be summarized as under: 8.4.1 Domestic Causes i) Alienation from the Political System ii) Existing Problem of Poverty, Illiteracy and Development iii) Religious Sectarianism in the Plural Societies iv) Secessionist Tendencies Existing in Plural Systems v) Instability of Political System 8.4.2 External Causes i) Role of External Powers ii) Proxy War iii) Narcotic Drug Trafficking iv) Jehadi Fundamentalism v) Negative Consequences of Globalisation

Q.10. What are the characteristics of terrorism?

Ans: Before the basic features of terrorism are explained, it must be made clear at the outset that contemporary terrorism is neither limited to small scale violence nor is restricted in terms of time and space. Even its actions have a far-reaching consequence affecting people at global level. Besides, the means/strategies/weapons applied by them are of so powerful nature that it has acquired very high-tech nature. This changed type of terrorism has the capacity even to face regular state armed forces in a very convincing manner. Due to these emerging trends following prominent features of contemporary terrorism can be deciphered.

To Create Large Scale Violence First and foremost the nature of terrorist organisation is to create large scale violence and panic among civilians or common masses so that credibility of political system is eroded. Besides such events also create instability in the political system so their very purpose of dethroning or ultimate demise of the system can be ascertained. The arrival of new weapons technologies and its access to the terrorist-groups have further enhanced such types of threats. With the emerging nature of 'high-tech' terrorism the violent actions by them have acquired global repercussions. Therefore, impact of these organisations became wide spread having spillover impacts beyond the boundaries of nation states.

Global Access Earlier the scope of terrorist activities remained limited to a small area in the country or to one state itself. Now it has developed large scale linkages not only with the organisations in

its home state but have spread beyond its borders and across countries and continents. Hence the impact of their action reaches different parts of the world. Besides, new strategies are being adopted by them. Latest-techniques available in any part of the world become available to them. These trans-national characters of terrorism restrict the working of government beyond some level. Besides, some terrorist-groups can take refuge in one's enemy territories. Moreover, legal actions cannot be pursued against them at all times. This nexus of one country's terrorist-organisation with other national groups makes them more aggressive and deadlier than before. Hence this changed character is more dangerous in magnitude and scope of their activities.

Acquisition of Ideological Moorings of Fundamentalism Another important characteristic of terrorist-groups has been the acquisition of changed ideological moorings in terms of religious fundamentalism. Day by day to increase the influence of their activities religious fundamentalism is gaining predominance among its followers. The camouflaging of religious teaching provides them easy access to common people to devise affinity for their strategies. This not only provides support of larger population but also work as a convincing tool for them to be associated with their actions. A study by Rand Corporation of USA has revealed that numbers of religious terrorist-organisation are increasing among the terrorist-organisations. For instance, in 1980 the total such groups were listed as 64 out of which only 2 were religious based, in later years share of such groups has enhanced with greater pace, i.e. in 1992-11 out of 48, 1994-16 out of 49, 1995-26 out of 96 and in 1999-64 out of 99.

Non-state Actors Fighting War with State Actors Terrorist-groups are non-state entities fighting against the recognised state actors at the international level. Not only they are fighting against state system and de-stabilizing them, but are also making efforts towards the acquisition of such elements which are related to states. For instance, some groups like LTTE in Sri Lanka or Al Qaeda in Pakistan and Afghanistan, Islamic state in Syria are acquiring control over certain territories and running parallel governments in their respective areas. Similarly they are maintaining regular armies to fight against the states. These armies are also well equipped to the extent to fight war like between two nations. Consequently, a dangerous trend has emerged regarding competition and conflict among state and non-state actors creating situation of civil war within the nation state systems.

Acquired High-Tech Status Another feature of terrorism is the changing nature of strategies of these groups. Earlier the scope of terrorism used to be limited to certain areas or specific region, now its activities are being carried out with small arms and traditional tactics of warfare. With the changing times the impact of terrorism can be witnessed across borders or even at global levels; there has been change in their strategies also. These international terrorist activities have become very high-tech. They are using all types of weaponry and machine as used by highest-military apparatus in the country. Even apprehensions are being raised that they may not catch hold of weapons of mass destruction (WMDs). They are using guns, tanks, bombers, fighter-aircrafts etc, to run their activities. Besides, the use of all types of means of communications has further enhanced the lethal capabilities of these high tech groups.

Adopted Posture of Jehadi War A very recent phenomenon that has influenced terrorism is its dimension of 'jehadi' war or use of concept of 'just war'. Earlier terrorist activities were engulfed in various socioeconomic and political discriminations and for the rectification of those fight with state system was planned. In contemporary times a new conception of justification of terrorist activities has been made on the name of 'jehad' or religious warfare. This type of warfare is declared as war fought for a just cause. In this context, fundamentalism especially Islamic fundamentalism has emerged very strongly in West, Central and South Asia in particular where there is large number of Muslim population. This in a way limits the questioning of right and wrong about these activities and simultaneously linking it to a broad geographic area and demographic region in the realm of terrorism.

Linked with Narcotic Drugs Trafficking Finally, terrorism has acquired serious dimension due to changed pursuit of these activities in modern times. It has already been discussed as to how means of communication and access to high tech weaponry have changed the gravity and intensity of terrorism. This has been further enhanced through its linkages with organised crime, smuggling of small weapons and funding of these activities by the earnings of narcotic drug trafficking. The huge drug trafficking in two important regions in Asia, i.e. triangle of crescent and golden triangle, have provided solid economic support base for the running of terrorism in this region and at global levels. Simultaneously all kind of organised crime had joined hands with them to further enhance their deadly deals. These dangerous consequences are manifest during working of these groups during in last two decades in this area. Thus, international terrorism is not a new phenomenon to the world in general and India in particular. Terrorism is fundamentally an attack on the state. It may be described as an act of violence, committed against innocent people to create fear, with an underlying political motive. It is different from insurgency or revolutionary / guerrilla warfare, as it is an overwhelmingly criminal act rather than merely a political offence. In present times it has undergone tremendous change due to the technological revolution. It enables instant transmission of ideas and information at a global level, by the terrorist outfits who can now exploit 'cyber' terrorism as well as the deadly and sophisticated Precision-Guided Missiles (PGMs), and other weapons of mass destruction. The rise of religious fundamentalism has introduced a new ideology which sanctifies 'Jehad' (holy war) and 'Fidayeen' (suicide) attacks. Terrorism today, therefore, has been transformed into a trans-national, high-tech, lethal and global phenomenon.

Q.11. What are the different types of terrorism?

Ans: Terrorism can be classified in terms of its scope and dimension of its activities. Though it is very difficult to put those in specific categories yet a broad division can be made in terms of their activities. It is because terrorist activities overlap both in terms of their working as well as consequences. In terms of its scope it is usually divided into following categories: 1) Religious Terrorism 2) Regional Terrorism 3) Political Terrorism 4) Ideological Terrorism 5) Urban Terrorism 6) International Terrorism 7) State Terrorism However, some critics are of the view that working of old terrorist groups also differ in terms of the magnitude and type of violence created by them. As a result they can broadly be classified into six categories: 1) Civil disorder 2) Political

terrorism 3) Non-Political terrorism 4) Quasi-terrorism 5) Limited political terrorism 6) State sponsored terrorism The perpetrators of acts of terrorism can be individuals, groups, or states. According to some definitions, clandestine or semi-clandestine state actors may also carry out terrorist acts outside the framework of a state of war. However, the most common image of terrorism is that it is carried out by small and secretive cells, highly motivated to serve a particular cause and most of the deadly operations in recent times have been executed by such groups.

Q.12. What are the implications of terrorism?

Ans: The nature and magnitude of terrorism prevalent today has serious implications for the world at large. It has affected global peace in numerous ways and poses grave threat to humanity.

Threat of Non-Conventional Nature Terrorism has created grave threat of non-conventional nature, which is very difficult to be identified and resolved. Due to trans-national roots of terrorist its activities are found in different countries and even to some destinations beyond the imagination of the states. The changed characters of its operation and its high tech nature have made it difficult for the states to handle the challenges posed by such groups in an adequate manner. Moreover, target of such groups are civilian population that creates more panic and instabilities for any political system. Thus, it is a grave threat for the society, as well as, for the state systems.

Boost to Fundamentalism Contemporary linkages of terrorism with religious moorings have turned it into fundamentalism. This type of terrorism is manifested in the form of 'Jehad' and 'Fidayeen' attacks which are very difficult to be controlled. They not only make the backward or lesser developed societies more vulnerable by recruiting people from them on the pretext of serving religious tenets, but also create cleavages among different societal groups to be divided on religious lines. As a result, some communities, especially Muslim, have been marginalised in many parts of the world. Since it is situated in proximate region of India, therefore, the latter has suffered most due to spill over impact of such activities in its neighbourhood. This situation becomes all the more grave when activities of such nature are sponsored by the states in the form of proxy war.

Close Nexus between Terrorism and Organised Crime A close nexus between terrorism and organised crime have led to the erosion of state authorities in many part of the world. States sometimes are facing the problems even of parallel government being run by these groups. Now-a-days, the dangerous consequences are arising as they are being funded by the earnings through the smuggling of narcotic drugs. Besides, threat to global peace, nearer home the Indian state is more exposed to such activities. The funds raised through drug smuggling activities have made it possible for the terrorist groups to acquire latest and highly lethal category of arms in huge quantity.

Linkages of Terrorists with WMD's and Grave Threat to Peace The race for the acquisition of weapons of mass destructions (WMDs) by the nondemocratic states, poses serious threats to their stability and governance, subsequently adding to further complexities. In these unstable polities the chances of acquisition of such weapons by the terrorists can create havoc for the world. Recent

proliferation of nuclear technologies by some states through clandestine route has exposed the concerned societies to greater danger as the same route can be used by these groups to export such technologies abroad. These developments have endangered the safety of not only one or two states; rather has created grave threat which can lead to annihilation of all humanity.

Q.13. What are the steps taken by UN as solution to terrorism?

Ans: The UN has focused on two way solution for the problem of terrorism i.e. legal and political solutions. In legal sphere, UNO and its special agencies have developed a network of international agreement, which concentrates on preparing fundamental legal documents to curb organised terrorism? These specialised agencies like: Civil Aviation Organisation I.A.E.A. and others are making efforts in this direction. The United Nations Office on Drugs and Crime has collated the 12 Universal conventions (international agreements) and protocols against terrorism signed since 1963. Although many states have not signed them, all seek to create consensus that certain acts count as terrorism (for example hijacking a plane), in order to create the means to prosecute them in signatory countries.

Q.14. Define insurgency. How does it differ from terrorism?

Ans: Different scholars define insurgency in different ways. Despite differences, all of them largely agree that there is a common feature in the definition of insurgency: insurgency is an organized armed resistance against the state or constituted authority with the aim of overthrowing the regime. And those people who are engaged in insurgency activities are known as 'insurgents'. Insurgency, therefore, involves at least one non-state actor or movement that fights against an established authority to achieve political change (Marston, 2005). S. K. Chaube defines insurgency as a rebellion against an order or an authority. He adds that an insurgent may have a completely different viewpoint on the same issue, and he is one who does not accept a prevailing order, for whom an 'insurgency' is an act of resistance or transformation (Chaube 1997). The Indian Army's Doctrine for Sub Conventional Operations defines insurgency "an organized armed struggle by a section of the local population against the state, usually with foreign support. Its goal may be seizure of power and replacement of the existing regime or even liberation of a defined area"

Insurgency is often assumed as identical with terrorism, although there are differences between them. The insurgent tends to use similar kind of violent activities as terrorist do. However, unlike terrorism, insurgency movements generally involve or require material or moral support from some section of the population in order to justify their existence and also to erode the legitimacy of the government. In this regard, insurgent groups normally carry out information and psychological warfare for propaganda and mass political mobilization (Singh 2018: 249, MOD 2006). Terrorist groups, on the other hand, do not enjoy popular support. The goal of an insurgency is to challenge the existing authority with an attempt to bring political change for the control of its territories or a part of it. But the terrorist groups do not attempt to bring political change. Instead, they used violence even against the civilian targets to instill fear and alter public perception on the

effectiveness or legitimacy of the government. A concept related of insurgency is counter-insurgency. It means those measures which are taken by the state to counter the insurgency. It may be defined as a comprehensive civilian and military efforts designed to simultaneously defeat and contain insurgency and address its root cause. However, there is no single set of technique for counter-insurgency. It requires a wide range of military, civilian, political, economic, or social actions of various kinds executed by the government in order to undermine an insurgency and also resolve its root causes. The mere use of force may help to contain or suppress a rebellion for certain period, but it cannot resolve the problem and bring a lasting solution. Therefore, in most countries, including India, counter-insurgency operations are usually executed in a combination of civilian and military means backed by appropriate political, economic, and social measures and also perception management aimed at winning 'hearts and minds' of the people (MoD, 2006). In India, military measure includes imposition of AFSPA (Armed Force Special Power Act), 1958 in the insurgency-affected areas. Under the provisions of AFSPA, the army is authorized to arrest a person and search an area suspected to be involved in insurgency.

Q.15. What were the factors responsible for the emergence of insurgency?

Ans: There are various factors that lead to the genesis of insurgency. Some are real and some are imagined or constructed (history, ideology, politics, ethnicity, religion, language, or combination of different factors). Consciousness about the identity based on these factors has been variously conceptualized as ethnonationalism, nationalism, etc. The insurgencies have leaders, cadres or popular support, ideologies and specific goals. They have wide range of goals: some insurgencies call for separate state, others for regional autonomy while some others demand for secession or complete independence. Insurgency is in fact a collective mobilization. Insurgencies are often accompanied with violence involving state machineries and insurgents. Occurrence and levels of insurgency have not been a permanent feature. Drawing from India's experience, Paul Staniland (2017) has identified three types of insurgency in India as: (i) tribal and ethno-nationalist separatist insurgency as in the Northeast or Punjab (ii) religious minority separatist as in Jammu and Kashmir (iii) ideological or Maoist insurgency in central and eastern India. But what is common among insurgencies is the popular dissatisfaction against the established regime and their common desire to bring political change, usually for the right to self-determination.

Anjana's