

# POLITICAL SCIENCE AND INTERNATIONAL RELATIONS

Crash Course & Test Series 2020  
Test 01

Name : Saday Choudhary  
Test Date : 29<sup>th</sup> Oct, 2020  
Email :  
Mobile :  
UPSC Roll No. : 6306505

S.No.	a	b	c	d	e	Total
01				x	x	
02				x	x	
03				x	x	
04						
05				x	x	
06				x	x	
07				x	x	
08				x	x	
Grand Total						

	Poor	Average	Good	Very Good	Excellent
Understanding of Questions					
Structure & flow					
Subject Knowledge					
Presentation					

OVERALL REMARKS

Q-1(a)

Normative Approach in Political Theory.

(10)

'Political Theory' refers to a body of knowledge that helps us to make a sense of various political phenomenon; to find out the meanings of abstract, but important, concepts like freedom, justice, etc.; and to put a finger upon the underlying causes that leads to change (maybe the electoral changes or even the revolutionary changes).

Political Theory can be divided into two heads:

- ① Normative (Prescriptive): It deals with what 'ought' to be. Ex → ideal conception of justice
- ② Empirical (Positive): It deals with what 'is' in practical life. Ex → Voter behaviour

Normative political theory is the oldest discipline in terms of political philosophy. Right from the times of Socrates, it's striving to find the ideal virtues on which our lives should be based. In the words of Socrates, 'Knowledge is virtue', which means that knowing what is good or bad is the essence of good human life. Plato's 'Theory of forms'

is equally an attempt at normative political theory, where he tried to contrast ideals with the reality.

In recent times, normative theory found its expression in the works of Rawls's Theory of justice, where he strived to show how social justice should look like.

However, normative theories faced increasing resistance from behavioural school due to their abstract, value-loaded and unverifiable nature. But soon, they made a comeback in the form of post-behaviouralism, which is a synthesis of behaviourism and normative theories.

In words of Isaiah Berlin, the purpose of political theory is not just to explain, but also to tell what ideals we should aim for. And that is why, normative political theory will always remain relevant.



Q-1(b) Feminist Theory of State.

(10)

Feminism is a political ideology that believes in equality of sexes, and strive to achieve the legitimate place for the women in all fields of life. However, it doesn't believe in uniformity <sup>of sexes</sup>, but rather diversity, i.e., 'to each according to his own'.

Feminist theory of State finds its roots in the maxim 'Personal is Political'.

They abhor the divide between public life and private life, and consider the family to be the first institution of patriarchy (Susan Moller Okin).

However, their Theory of State is <sup>not</sup> consistent. At one point, they look towards state intervention in the family lives to end this basic structural discrimination. But at the same time, they are suspicious of the state, calling it as the 'Highest institution of patriarchy'.

Another inconsistency arises with their concept of 'Differentiated Citizenship', propounded by Iris Marion Young. This requires the state to intervene in favour of the women through

affirmative action, but at the same time  
Cynthia Enloe says "when I look at  
the state, 'it looks male to me'".

Thus, feminists need a more refined &  
conceptualised Theory of State, which  
will come along as it would go on  
to assimilate its metaphysical diversity  
(like black feminism, post-colonial feminism,  
etc.) with time.

Q-1(c)

Foucault's Theory of Power.

(10)

Foucault's views on power belongs to the Post-modern school of thought, and are both radical as well as unconventional.

His Theory of power begins with the premise that 'Knowledge is Power' (replacing the Socratic maxim of 'Knowledge is virtue' to contemporary realities). Those who hold Knowledge can direct the discourses as per their wishes. Discourses, in the form of theories currently circulating in the society, holds the key to ideological manipulation. People make sense of their realities with the help of discourses. Thus, the ultimate power lies in the domination over discourses.

Another point is that 'Power is everywhere'. Unlike the conventional view of power, which concentrates power in an individual or the state, in Foucault's theory people embody power. They transmit among themselves in the form of social relations they hold. Power runs throughout the society,



just like a network of blood capillaries in the body.

Power can rise from anywhere, i.e., it is multi-directional, and not unidirectional as per the conventional theories. People are both a vehicle of power, and the sites of power. They embody power, they transmit power, and they actively live power.

In turn, power helps people in gaining identity. By disciplining them, and making them a useful part of society, it provides them with a sense of identity. Thus, power has both productive & identity functions. This concept of Foucault is called Disciplinary power, and later on govern-mentality, and helps in explaining the reality of our modern lives to a large extent.



Q-1(d)

Aurobindo's concept of Indian Nationalism.

(10)

Aurobindo is the greatest spiritual philosopher of Indian Nationalism. Being a radical in his earlier days, he was fiercely critical of Moderate nationalists. But later on, he turned towards spirituality & gave the theory of INTEGRAL HUMANISM.

When British dismissed the idea of India as 'merely a geographical entity', moderates conceded that 'India was a nation in-making'.  
(Surendranath Banerjee)

Aurobindo strongly repudiated this view through his article 'New flames for the Old lamps', he said that India has always been a nation. Its spirit might be sleeping at the moment, but it was destined to rise and lead the humanity towards its salvation.

Aurobindo's nationalism draws inspiration from two factors: Neo-vedantism of Swami Vivekanand & historical patriotism of Bankim Chandra Chattopadhyay (and his

book 'Anandmath').

However, his nationalism was just an intermediate step in the realization of larger goal of cosmopolitanism. He believed in fundamental fraternity of entire humanity, and for which India had to play a leading role. Thus, India's freedom was inevitable.

In this way, he gave a spiritual character to Indian nationalism, and rallied youths behind the idea of 'Mother India'.

Q-1(e)

Concept of Dharma in Indian Political Philosophy.

(10)

Indian political philosophy is entwined with religious doctrine, the concepts of 'Dharma' & 'Danda' being seen as two sides of the same coin. Without one, another can't exist.

The very basis of state is led on the concept of Dharma, for which 'Manu' was sent on this earth. He was the I ruler as well as lawmaker, and said that 'upholding Dharma is the primary duty of the King'.

Dharma came into being to supplement cosmic law (Rita), which was seen as incapable alone to address evil tendencies among people. By supplementing, and not supplanting, the cosmic law, Dharma entails a continuity between natural law and the territorial law.

Not only in Hinduism, but also in Jain & Buddhist ~~the~~ political thought, upholding Dharma is the greatest good. However,

Dharma is defined differently in different schools, with Brahmanism laying stress on upholding varna-ashram while non-Brahmanical schools focus on doing one's duties.

In words of Bhikhu Parekh, Dharma & Danda both form the core of Indian political & spiritual thoughts. The only difference is that of the emphasis.

Though there is no word synonym to 'Dharma' in Western political thought, its centrality in Indian political thought makes it almost equivalent to ancient philosophical conception of VIRTUE in Greek thought.



Q-2(a)

"One with immediate proximate territory is the natural enemy." (Kautilya). Discuss. How far is it appropriate to consider Kautilya as Indian Machiavelli.

(20)

Political Advisor to Emperor Chandragupta Maurya, Kautilya is known as greatest political realist of India. His book 'Arthashastra' is not only a manual on administration, but also a golden standard of statecraft.

Kautilya's concepts cover almost all fields of statecraft: international or domestic, regular or extraordinary situations, public life or king's day-to-day conduct, Arthashastra has authoritative word for all spheres of life.

Major contribution of Kautilya, however, lies in his Mandate Theory. He first mentions 7 generic elements of every state:

- ① King → He is the center of all authority. If he is virtuous, he can even turn bad elements into good. But if

he is corrupt, there is no remedy

- ② Amatyas → Senior ministers & King's councillors; Must be wakeful, brave & handsome
- ③ Durg → King's forts; describe his defensive & offensive capabilities
- ④ Bal → Army; Regular system of muster, training and organization
- ⑤ Kosh → Treasury; King should have enough resources to tide over crises
- ⑥ Janapada → The public district; Place where King's subject lives, and where he ultimately draws authority from
- ⑦ Mitra → Ally/friends; Shows King's popularity & goodwill.

Now for all these elements, Kautilya described 12 types of states. Thus, for every move, the King has to keep in mind 84 elements. This comprehension and analysis is the striking genius of Kautilya.

- |   |                  |
|---|------------------|
| ① Ari → Enemy                               | ② Mitra → Friend |
| ③ Ari-mitra → Enemy's friend                |                  |
| ④ Mitra-mitra → Friend's friend             |                  |
| ⑤ Ari-mitra-mitra → Enemy's friend's friend |                  |

- ⑥ Parshvanigraha → Enemy in the back
- ⑦ Parshvanigraha - sara → Enemy's friend in back
- ⑧ Akaranda → friend in back
- ⑨ Akaranda - sara → friend's friend in back
- ⑩ Nijigishu → King himself
- ⑪ Udaia → Neutral states; Giving way to both <sup>armies</sup>
- ⑫ Madhyatha → Middle state between two states, territorially sandwiched

Being a realist, he believed in expansionist foreign policy. That is the only way for a King to become 'Chakravartin Samrat'. His brilliant real-politik is visible even today's international arena. For ex → India is actively supporting Afghanistan all these years so that it can have a definitive edge over Pakistan. China's courting of Pakistan is again based on similar considerations against India.

\* KAUTILYA AS INDIAN MACHIAVELLI ? → Due to his realist philosophy as well as his separation of ethics from politics, Kautilya is often called Indian Machiavelli (Jawahar Lal Nehru in his book 'Discovery of India') Looking deeper into Arthashastra, and given



the fact that he was able to see his advices being implemented during his lifetime (while Machiavelli couldn't), Kautilya's prescriptions seem to be even harsher. This prompted Max Weber to comment, "Kautilya is more Machiavellian than Machiavelli himself".

However, beneath all these harsh advices, there is an underlying pursuit to maintain law & order in an otherwise chaotic society. He was focussed upon devising a neat administrative system, which could withstand evil tendencies of human nature. Machiavelli, himself, was a nationalist out & out; beneath all his advices was the deep desire to see Italy as a unified & flourishing state.

Thus both Kautilya & Machiavelli share an uncanny resemblance, but not in the sense they are made to look in theory. They were patriots above all, just that their realist philosophy made a distinction between means & ends.



Q. 2(b)

Gramsci's Theory with its reconceptualization of relations between base & superstructure and recasting power as hegemony marks a major breakthrough in Marxist Theory.  
Comment.

(15)

Analysing the nature of state with the help of his theory of Historical materialism, Marx gave base - superstructure model of the state. In his conception, economic relations form the basis of state, and other all institutions like Church, educational institution, civil society, etc. are merely a reflection of the base. We need not do anything specific to decimate the superstructure, once the workers would revolt & destroy the economic base structure, the superstructure will itself come to an end.

However, the failure of socialist Revolution in many countries, and the inability of workers to revolt in the others, prompted later Marxists to probe reasons for such resilience of Capitalism. This led to foundation of Structural school of Marxism,

also known as Neo-Marxism, and Gramsci is its chief exponent.

In his works contained in 'Prison Notebooks', Gramsci gave a restructured model. He said that the civil society is not merely a part of the superstructure, it is a separate superstructure in itself. It lies between the state/capitalist class at the bottom and the other public structures at the top.

It helps in transmitting public grievances to the base, so that capitalism can keep itself safe from crisis tendencies, while at the same time generating acceptance for dominant class values. This Gramsci called as the process of 'manufacturing consent', which helps the capitalist class to uphold its legitimacy to rule.

This legitimacy is manufactured by 'organic intellectuals' of the ruling class like priests, artists, etc. It is so subtle in form that people don't even recognize it. Gramsci calls this as Hegemony in contrast with coercive power, and defines it as 'the ideas actively lived by the oppressed as a form of common sense'.

In order to bring successful revolution, workers need to have their own class of organic intellectuals like technicians, supervisors, etc. Further, they need to fight at two levels, unlike the conventional view:

- ① War of Position: Ideological war fought over protracted duration
- ② War of Manoeuvre: ~~A~~ Violent conflict, which is a final and sudden blow to capitalism.

This reconceptualisation marked a turning point in Marxist thought. Later thinkers like Althusser build upon this concept through his theory of Interpellation, where he differentiated between Ideological & coercive state apparatus.

Thus, Gramsci permanently deflected the course of Marxist thought, and his ideas were even successfully employed world over. For ex → Indian national movement between 1920 - 1940 was Gandhi's War of ~~pos~~ position, while Quit India Movement in 1942 can be properly called his war of manoeuvre.



Q-2(c)

"Power is what keeps the public realm in existence." (Hannah Arendt).

(15)

In light of the above statement, critically examine the relevance of Arendt's theory of power.

Hannah Arendt is the most outstanding & unconventional thinker of our times, whose concepts deals with civic republicanism and participatory politics.

She <sup>has</sup> differentiated between power, force and strength.

In her view, force belongs to the nature while power belongs to the people.

Strength is a character of individual but

~~for~~ power pertains to public, i.e., group of people.

She calls violence as something that belongs to the state while power is an instrument of civil society. Thus, violence is anti-  
thesis to power.

Thus, power can properly be defined as the property of people, that comes into existence when people act in concert with each other. It disappears when they go back to their private spheres, representing the notion of civic participation.



Thus in her Theory of power, people embody power and it is a property of public sphere.

If people are not acting in concert with each other, the public realm automatically disappears and more often than not, its place is taken by the state. When people lose power in this manner, they lose their freedom, which is a combination of natality (to create something new) and plurality. As man is the only creature that can debate, deliberate & take part in public proceedings, with the loss of public sphere, he loses his character of zoon politikon. He becomes just <sup>another</sup> cog in the wheel, doing 'Animal Labour'.

Thus in order to realize his full potential, public realm is sine qua non. It's only where he can deliberate, discover truth, create something new and attain his full human nature. But this public sphere exists only if people act together, and

claim what is rightfully theirs. This keeps the state confined to its sphere, preventing it from an all-encroaching totalitarian entity.

In today's world, when authoritarian regimes are becoming a norm, the conception of power holds unequivocal importance. As we have just seen that during COVID crisis, as people went back to their private spheres, the governments acquired extra-ordinary powers of surveillance. Once the crisis gets over, it is our duty to come together & demand for accountability. This public realm, and the resultant display of power, will be our only guide to get back to the 'Old Normal' rather than get used to the 'New Normal'.

Q-4(a)

(20)

Give the salient features of theory of natural rights. What is the relationship b/w natural rights & human rights? Analyse the debate around Asian values.

Theory of Natural Rights has its origin in 17<sup>th</sup> century Social Contract Theory of John Locke. In his conception, the men in ~~the~~ state of nature were rational creatures, but in order to pre-empt any conflictual situation as well as to obtain a law & order situation, they contracted to form a government. However, they didn't transfer all of their rights to the state unlike Hobbesian concept, but retained the rights to life, liberty & property. These rights were later came to be called as 'Natural Rights'.

These rights, being rooted in nature as they are, are inviolable. Neither the state nor the fellow citizens ~~can~~ <sup>can</sup> violate them, and even if they do, the individual has every right to recourse (or to revolt, in case of state).



Since they are granted to each individual on the grounds of being human, they are equal as well as universal, i.e., not limited by artificial territorial boundaries.

Moreover, these rights are absolute, and their provision doesn't depend on any reciprocal conception of obligations. However, in so far as they are not enshrined in law, i.e.; if we move to pre-LOCKIAN era, they are merely moral claims with no punitive backings.

The theory of natural rights has been criticised by utilitarians on this very basis, for they stand for legalistic conception of rights. In the words of Bentham, "Natural Rights are non-sense, non-sense built upon itself. Rights lie where the law says they lie".

Another critique comes from the historic tradition, which roots rights into traditions of not the nature. Edmund Burke considers tradition to be the timeless wisdom, and has limited faith in the collective rationality of humans.

\* RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN NATURAL & HUMAN RIGHTS :->

Human rights are often rooted into the tradition of natural rights. The Lockean conception of natural rights holds equally true for human rights. They even share the same basic characteristics of equality, inalienability, permanence, inviolability, etc.

However, there were few scholars who raised the question about confining the rights of future generation through social contract. So, it was concurred upon that a better basis was needed to root HKs into natural rights.

The ~~Teleology~~ teleological tradition of Thomas Paine provided a solution to this by making HKs necessary for their own ends, i.e., to lead a happy & prosperous life by the individual

But a serious challenge to both the theories of natural rights as well as the human rights arose from Asian values. Deriving from 'Historical' view of Edmund Burke, certain tradition-focused ideologies like Multiculturalism, value-relativism, communitarianism, etc. came into existence. Asian Values drive

inspiration from such schools and emphasise upon diversity in culture & society for different notions of human rights. Calling conventional HRs (as enshrined in UDHR) as Western cultural imperialism since they promote individualism & utilitarianism, the Asian rights focus on solidarity, discipline, respect for authority, etc. Malaysia's former PM Malathir Mohammed is chief exponent of this view.

However, Asian values are criticised by people like Amartya Sen as promoting authoritarianism in the name of multi-culturalism. Feminist scholars are also fierce critique for such values calling them as 'flagbearer of patriarchy'.



Q-4(b)

"Liberalism has many critics, both within & without." Elucidate.

(15)

Liberalism is the oldest among political ideologies. Propounded by John Locke in 17<sup>th</sup> century, it has been remarkably resilient and popular. The existence of different perspectives within the Liberalism is precisely the reason behind this, as it helps in reforming and rejuvenating the ideology.

Initially, Liberalism emerged as the ideology of capitalist class. Based upon the free-market ideology of Adam Smith, its main theme was utilitarianism. It believed in passive individualism, night-watchman state, negative freedom and equality before law. Its main exponents were Locke & Bentham, and it was called as CLASSICAL LIBERALISM.

With the advent of Marxism in 18<sup>th</sup> century, Liberalism faced an existential crisis. However, with the emergence of MODERN LIBERALS like T.H. Green & J.H. Laski, it reformed itself to make a comeback. It began to adapt towards state intervention for

liberal

welfare based upon economic policies of Keynes, as well as ~~the~~ positive conception of equality where the state 'removes the hindrances'. This school held appeal not only in traditional bastions of western countries, but also the developing countries of III world.

For ex → Indian constitution contains fundamental rights & Directive Principles influenced by Harold J. Laski.

Later on, CONTEMPORARY LIBERALISM came into existence with rollback of state in 1970s. This school was called Neo-classical Liberalism, with Hayek & Milton Friedman as its chief exponents. It believed in market fundamentalism, just as the Libertarian school believes in individual fundamentalism. However, the most fierce critique of such liberalism was offered by Social Liberals like John Rawls & Amartya Sen, who while espousing positive conception of ~~of~~ freedom, kept the individual at the core of their philosophy of social justice.

Outside critiques include Marxists who calls it as an ideology of bourgeois class, while post-colonial scholars calls it as a form of neo-colonialism now carried out through globalisation.

Others like Multiculturalists & Value-relativists calls it a form of cultural imperialism.

Despite all this, Liberalism still remains the ruling ideology among most of the countries of the world, and has shown an enviable capacity to reform in the face of criticism.



Q-4(c)

(15)

"The concept of equality is a fundamental concept in normative political theory. However, it's also one of the most complex & contested." Elucidate.

A.V. Dicey says that there are few concepts in political science that can be defined in different ways, yet all the ways can be perfectly correct. Such concepts are called essentially <sup>contested</sup> concepts, and equality is one such concept.

Right from the time of Plato, political theory has grappled with the concept of equality, but no one definition ~~can~~ <sup>could</sup> ever be agreed upon. However, there is a broad agreement over these 3 concepts, and different political ideologies use them as per their leanings :-

- ① EQUALITY BEFORE LAW :- This concept ~~dates~~ has its origins in the rise of capitalism, when the system of classes replaced the feudal system based on birth privileges. Since classes were thought to be open and mobile, this was an egalitarian concept back then, and it conveys equal protection of law on everyone irrespective of their status in the society. This is one concept of equality every ideology

agrees on. Although Marxists call it purely procedural/formal concept of equality, it nevertheless has made inroads in their thought as well.

② EQUALITY OF OPPORTUNITY :-> This forms the cornerstone of Liberal political ideology. It lies at the base of meritocratic society, where everyone gets an opportunity to utilise their talents. However, this is often criticised as inequalitarian that it ignores natural inequality like disabilities. By espousing the principle of 'to each according to his own', it gives a headstart to already prosperous people in the garb of meritocratic society.

The social liberals like John Rawls and Amartya Sen have tried to fix these shortcomings through their theories of social justice. While Rawls proposed to 'organise inequalities in a way that they are in the best interest of least prosperous member of the society' through his difference principle, Amartya Sen has espoused his approach of 'Capabilities as Freedom'.

③ Equality of Outcomes :-> This concept is supported by Marxists, based on Marx's maxim of 'To each, according to his needs'. This ensures proper equality, the same end point for everyone. However, Liberals have criticised it for killing individual incentive while the others have linked it to rise of Totalitarianism since state controls all the aspects of life.

At present, the most successful & agreed upon approach has been that of Equality of Opportunity but with Affirmative action, where the state encourages the disadvantaged sections of society.

Ex -> Reservation to SC/ST/OBC in India for education, jobs, etc.

This ensures the synthesis of both <sup>a</sup>meritocratic as well as <sub>an</sub> egalitarian society.



Q-5(a)

Relative Autonomy theory of the State.

(10)

In orthodox Marxism, state is referred to as the executive committee of the bourgeoisie class. It only appears neutral in liberal ideology, but is in fact works in overall benefit of the capitalist class.

However, when Modern Liberals began to attract working class, and communist revolutions failed to occur, Marxists were forced to rethink their assumptions.

This gave rise to Structural school of Marxism, which analyzed the structure of the state in capitalist societies and gave the theory of relative autonomy of the state.

In this, the state gains some leverage when different equally organized and well-established associations emerge. For ex → Trade unions to represent the workers & business lobbies for the capitalists in USA.

So from the outside it appears to be relatively autonomous in normal circumstances.

However it is only relatively autonomous because if crisis occurs, it will always interfere in the favour of capitalist class.

for ex → Democrats under Obama bailing out big banks during 2008 crisis by using taxpayers' money.

<sup>Nikos</sup>  
~~Stavros~~ Paulantzas has applied this theory to western countries, while Kamza Alvi has further developed it for III world developing countries in the form of 'Theory of Underdeveloped State'. Here the state appears to be relatively neutral because it acts as a referee between indigenous & metropolitan bourgeoisie. for ex → Pakistan

(10)

Q.5(b)

Affirmative Action.

Equality has been an essentially contested concept. While the Liberals stressed upon Equality of Opportunity on the basis of 'To each, according to his merit', the Socialists don't settle down for anything less than the equality of outcomes, i.e., 'To each, according to his needs'.

In such a scenario, affirmative action is the most logical as well as viable mid-point. It refers to the intervention of state in favour of disadvantaged sections. Thus, it is a form of reverse discrimination.

This not only allows people to utilise their talents & capabilities through equality of opportunity available to all, but also helps in creating a more equal & just society. This is close to the Social-Liberal approach of capabilities as development, where the state helps its people to develop by compensating for natural (e.g. disability) or historic (e.g. racialism, sexism, etc.) disadvantages.



However, it's often criticized by Libertarians as compromising merit as well as individual incentive, the criticism is often directed at the way these policies are implemented, and not the concept of affirmative action in itself.

Affirmative action has been successfully employed in India in the form of reservation policy for SC/STs, which has resulted in providing them fair opportunities to compete on an equal footing.

Q-5(c)

### Relationship between Liberty & Equality.

(10)

Both Liberty & Equality have been the cornerstone of modern political thought. While Liberty means the freedom to do whatever one wants to do, Equality stands for equal treatment & respect to all.

However, the relationship between Liberty & Equality has always been conflictual. While the Liberals supported individualism, and hence complete liberty to develop according to one's own genius, it has often had inegalitarian implications.

Socialists, on the other hand, are more concerned with equality. They believe in a community living in harmony with each other, arrived at with the concept of absolute equality. This egalitarianism, however, often suppressed individual incentive to work since no one is going to be better off than the other in any case.

There have been many attempts to reconcile this antagonism like Rawls' Theory of Justice and Dworkin's ambition & endowment sensitive auction theory. However, the most spectacular attempt was undertaken by Rousseau in his [social contract theory].

By allowing people to participate as equals in deliberative law-making, he made sure that people were following the laws that they themselves made. Hence, they were under their own rules, thus truly liberated.

This theory not only reconciled the antagonism between equality & liberty, but also the antagonism between individual autonomy & state authority.



Q-5(d)

Difference between Domination &amp; Hegemony. (10)

When the communist revolutions as predicted by Marx didn't occur in capitalist countries, Neo-Marxists like Gramsci began to probe the causes behind resilience of capitalist system. In this context, Gramsci arrived at different ways in which power can be wielded to avoid crisis-tendencies.

**Domination** is coercive power. It is the power that is visible in public sphere, & is often yielded by the state to get its command fulfilled. It is easy to detect, and thus resist. Hence, it often breeds discontent, and may even lead to revolution.

Ex → State's power for retributive justice to the criminal, even if it involves capital punishment

**Hegemony**, on the other hand, is a more subtle form of power. It is ideological, created by civil society instead of the state.

It contains some elements from both the dominant & oppressive classes, and hence is considered to be attractive. In the words of Gramsci himself, "Hegemony is the power that is actively lived by the oppressed <sup>in</sup> ~~at~~ the pen of common sense". Since it is not visible as such, it is also difficult to resist.

for ex → The power of Blue jeans which became a rallying cry for people from Eastern Europe to breakaway from USSR.

However, in order to maintain its control, the state apparatus needs to have both coercive as well as attractive power. Domination without hegemony is blind, while hegemony without domination is lame.

Q-5(e)

Concept of Overdeveloped State.

(10)

Applying the structural theory (Marxist) of Relative Autonomy of the state, Hamzi Alvi developed the post-colonial theory of an overdeveloped state where the state apparatus resembles fully-developed countries while the societies remain traditional. This makes the state a powerful referee ~~to~~ among vested interests, and it appears to be relatively neutral.

He applies this theory to the state of Pakistan during 1970s. There three types of vested interests existed:

- ① Metropolitan Bourgeoisie (foreign capitalists)
- ② Indigenous Bourgeoisie (Domestic capitalists)
- ③ Feudal lords (Zamindars, etc.)

The state with all its military & bureaucratic apparatus balances one interest with the others, but leaves the society impoverished as a whole.

As far as the influence of state concerns,



It comes from the institutions it inherited from colonial masters, viz. bureaucracy.

Also, the need for an all-powerful party to steer the country is often fulfilled by the party that led freedom struggle since it enjoys legitimacy in the eyes of the people. Ex → Muslim League in this case.

The army comes from the need to safeguard its new-found independence for the state.

Thus the state with all its apparatus becomes a hegemon, and no one interest can influence its decisions. In such a scenario, it appears to be relatively neutral. Moreover, in comparison to the rural & peasant society, the state appears to be overdeveloped.

Q-6(a)

"Deliberative democracy questions narrow & the limited conception of political participation in liberal democracies."

Comment. Discuss the normative ideas related to deliberative democracies.

(20)

In the words of Abraham Lincoln, "Democracy is a form of government for the people, of the people & by the people". Right from the Greek democracy during the times of Socrates or the 'Ganasanghas' in India during Buddha's life, democracy has been present in ~~f~~ one form or the other.

Initially, Direct democracy was practised, where people themselves took part in the law-making. The instruments of such democracy are Referendum, plebiscite, Initiative, Recall, etc. Even in Swiss cantons today, such direct democracy still exists.

However, with the growth of government's functions in terms of complexity, law-making became a specialized function. Modern nation states began to find it difficult to involve people in political affairs on a day-to-day basis. The direct democracy of

Aristotle or Rousseau gave way to Parliamentary democracy. It began to be called as Representative democracy, with Edmund Burke & J.S. Mill being its chief proponents.

However, deliberations are a major part of any decision-making process. No enlightened conclusion can be arrived at without taking into account views of all the political bearings. This is the common thread running between both Direct & Representative democracy. While in Direct democracy, people themselves arrived at a conclusion; in Representative democracy, legislatures serve precisely this function.

J.S. Mill is the chief exponent of Deliberative democracy. In his view, "Intellectual development & moral health presupposes an individual's capacity to reason". Only if people can reason and speak their mind openly, they can develop upto their potential and the truth can be discovered. Similar concern is voiced in <sup>Neo</sup> Marxist view of Habermas. He gives the concept of 'Ideal Speech Situation'.



where people have the capacity to speak, as well as they get a chance to speak without any fear of repression. This is the pre-condition for <sup>realizing</sup> people's ~~liberty~~ <sup>true</sup> selves. Even a more passionate defence for deliberative democracy comes from Hannah Arendt's conception of political, where she goes on to say that power springs up automatically when people act in concert in public sphere. Thus, deliberative democracy enjoys a support from all sides of political spectrum.

There have been many normative ideas associated with deliberative democracy. In terms of liberty, Rousseau says that "People are truly free when they live under the laws made by themselves". In terms of equality, D.E. Shaw says, "Democracy is not just a majoritarian rule; Minorities are the real custodian of democracy".

Scholars like Amartya Sen agrees on intrinsic value of political participation, while J.S. Mill believes in harmony between

interests of the state & the citizenry by saying that "No state becomes great by dwarfing its own citizens".

Thus deliberative democracy has always been a properly value-loaded term. It shows us the way about how things out to be. In today's age, when ~~India's~~ parliaments world over are moving towards low productivity & adjourned sessions more than ever, the ideals of deliberative democracy becomes a gold standard. They are both rational as well as historical.

Q. 6(b)

fascism is a hodge-podge of several ideologies & creed. Critically Examine.

(15)

The unusual thing about fascism as a political ideology is that it still has not found a proper definition in political theory. It can best be described by Schumpeter's economic terminology of 'Creative Destruction', i.e., an ideology aimed at destroying existing processes & institutions, and simultaneously creating 'its new institutions & processes in their place.

Fascism is largely considered to be an inter-war phenomenon, when it became the ruling ideology of Italy & Germany. But history suggests that fascist tendencies have always been present, up till now in the form of Neo-fascism. Not only is it an European phenomenon as fascist regimes have existed in Japan (Asia) & Argentina (Latin America) also.

fascism coincides with Liberalism in its conception of state, which is regarded



as a 'neutral referee between conflicting class interests'. The fascist concept of 'Corporate State' does exactly this, by mediating b/w the capitalists & the workers.

They borrow from Socialists the idea of an all-powerful state, non-competitive political system and obligations without corresponding rights.

They even take inspiration from Science through the Darwinian theory of 'Survival of the fittest', which forms the basis for their racial theory of Nazi supremacy.

They are inspired from Conservatives for their veneration towards history, past glory & traditions. They attract masses by promising them the revival of past glory.

However, this is not to say that fascism is an altogether borrowed ideology. It might have been a hodge-podge of ideologies, but it has certain elements that set it apart. In the words of Hannah Arendt, "There is no contemporary equivalent for the

fascist ideology".

They use ideology as a tool for propaganda. Their survival depends upon particular socio-economic conditions, where the social order has broken down and superfluous masses have emerged. They use terror for the sake of it, not as a means to some end. They revere their Supreme Leader & follow a kind of personality cult. ~~There~~

Thus, fascism is a properly modern ideology whose understanding has still not been complete, and it keeps on evolving regularly with new dimensions.

Q-6(c)

"Plato's philosophy is the most savage & most profound attack on liberal ideas which history can show." (Cassman). Discuss.

(15)

In his book 'Enemies of Open Society', Karl Popper calls Plato as a totalitarian, and sums up his views by saying that "Republic is a totalitarian assault upon democracy & Plato is an evil genius".

This viewpoint is further shared by Cassman when he shows the contradiction of core liberal values with the values propounded by Plato in his book, 'Republic'.

In Liberalism, liberty is the 1<sup>st</sup> virtue. But by dividing a ~~society~~<sup>society</sup> into 3 classes, the Kings, soldiers & the artisans, Plato has effectively made society stagnant. People cannot even take up a vocation as per their wishes, and hence have absolutely no control over their lives.

The next value of equality has been flagrantly violated by his metaphysical theory of souls. He considers soul to be made up of different metals viz.



gold, silver & copper, and on the basis of such a myth he assigns them unequal positions in the society. Even his theory of justice is based upon people doing their duty, which implies that if a person even tries to do something else, he not only violates the principle of equality but also of justice.

The major basis of Liberalism is the institution of [pvt. property], upon which Locke founded his social contract theory. However, by proposing communism of property and even the family, Locke out & out assaulted Liberalism.

Nowhere is this contrast more starkly visible than his theory of Philosopher King. Liberals have always supported [Nightwatchman state], with state only intervening in the least possible number of areas. But Plato ends up making his state an absolutist state, where the Philosopher King has all the knowledge as well as all the powers.

The breaking point comes when he even openly discards rule of law by giving his philosopher-king absolute powers, saying that "It will be foolish to limit the expert practitioners of medicine to the books of medicine".

However, a lot of things in Plato's thoughts are contested, and hence we should not read too literally into him. He was a child of his times, and was trying to give an ordered & well-maintained state. We should understand him in his proper context, then only we will be able to grasp the depth of his political philosophy, which made Emerson remark that 'Plato is Philosophy. Philosophy is Plato'.