GS SCORE

An Institute for Civil Services

IAS 2019

POLITICAL SCIENCE

TEST SERIES

By: Dr. PIYUSH CHAUBEY

TEST: 2

t.me/BooksandYou

GS SCORE

Political Science Test Series 2019

TEST - 02

POLITICAL SCIENCE

Time Allowed: 3 hrs. *Max. Marks: 250*

SECTION - A

1. Answer the following questions in about 150 words each:

(a) Major theories on Democracy (10)

(b) Gender Identity Interface (10)

(c) Representative Democracy (10)

(d) Notion of liberty in Indian political thinking (10)

(e) Equality of Resources. (10)

2. Attempt all questions:

(a) Explain Equality as a normative ideal for society with help of views of scholars. (15)

(b) Hannah Arendt's views on Banality of Evil. (15)

(c) Discuss in detail the views of Foucault on power with special reference to its novel or unique aspects. (20)

3. Attempt all questions:

(a) Discuss the notion of Global Justice with special reference to views of Thomas Pogge. (15)

(b) Discuss in detail the Sapt-Anga of a state as per views of Kautilya. (15)

(c) What is political theory how it is different from Political thought? Discuss Easton understanding of decline of Political theory? Examine. (20)

4. Attempt all questions:

(a) Analyse the origin and theoretical justification for "Natural Rights"? What kind of relationship does it enjoy with Human Rights? (15)

(b) Draw parallels between Arthashastra tradition and the 'Realist' tradition represented by Machiavelli. (15)

(c) What is Affirmative action? What are the major arguments for its continuation and abolition? (20)

GS SCORE

Join Telegram Groups

To Boost Your Preparation

PDF4Exams

Click Here

One stop solution for study materials of all competitiveexams

Newspapers & study materials

The Hindu Zone Official

Click Here

TestSeries4Exam

Click Here

All paid test series availabble without any cost

All e-Magazines in your hand

Pdfbasket

Click Here

Hindi Books

Click Here

All study materials in Hindi

eSandesh (An Indian App)

For More download eSandesh App from play store

https://telegram.me/pdf4exams https://telegram.me/Pdf4Mains2019

SECTION - B

5. Answer the following questions in about 150 words each:

   (a) Fascism as Adventurer's Philosophy - Sabine. (10)

   (b) Challenges being faced by feminism. (10)

   (c) Aurobindo on Nationalism (10)

   (d) Luck Egalitarianism (10)

   (e) Normative conception of political theory (10)

6. Attempt all questions:

   (a) Discuss in detail the various features of Buddhist theory of State and government. (15)

   (b) Analyse the Justification and criticisms of the notion of "Competitive Equality of Opportunity". (15)

   (c) How does Gandhiji differentiate his notion of development from that of West? What role do ethics and spiritualism play in it? (20)

7. Attempt all questions:

   (a) What are the major limitations and drawbacks of Ancient Indian Political Tradition? (15)

   (b) Political mobilization through internet. Discuss. (15)

   (c) Globalization and Human rights share a deep yet paradoxical relationship. Analyse the reasons. (20)

8. Attempt all questions:

   (a) Ambedkar's criticism of Marxism in Indian Context (15)

   (b) Discuss the major aspects of Post-Colonial feminism. (15)

   (c) What are the feminist complains against the concept of participatory democracy? (20)

❖❖❖❖❖

GS SCORE

https://telegram.me/pdf4exams https://telegram.me/Pdf4Mains2019

POLITICAL SCIENCE

Answer Hints: Test No.2

SECTION - A

1. (a) Major theories on Democracy

Protective

Rooted in liberalism, the protective theory believes government exists to protect the rights of individual citizens. Governmental involvement in the lives of citizens should be focused on protecting material wealth and maintaining a free market. A protective democracy acknowledges there will be an imbalance in wealth and assumes the elite will be in power. Broad-based civic engagement is discouraged unless it is related to protecting civil liberties.

Pluralist

The pluralist theory suggests that democracy, or power, should be dispersed among a variety of specialized groups, often special interests. Pluralists believe that citizens are disinterested in becoming involved. Those who are engaged do so through smaller political groups. Governmental leadership rests in the hands of those who are elected, and they are generally considered elite. Special interest groups play an important role and jockey for power in areas related to specific issues and values.

Developmental

Developmental democracy assumes the best about society. Under this theory, citizens are engaged in civic issues and focused on what is best for society as a whole, and democracy is connected to morality. As citizens become involved in government, they acquire an understanding and appreciation of what is needed to improve services and communities. Engaged citizens are responsible community members. The developmental theory acknowledges the need for elected officials but believes the people are responsible for selection and oversight of their work.

Participatory

Participatory democracy emerged in the 1960s and focuses on retooling government to encourage more citizen involvement. During this time, student activism was common and issues such as the Vietnam War and civil rights provided an avenue for engagement. Advocates for participatory government believe that non-governmental agencies, such as corporations, have too much control over the welfare of their employees. The main idea of this theory is to provide more involvement and control over all governmental laws and non-governmental rules pertaining to American citizens.

1. (b) Gender Identity Interface

A new kind of rethinking of the sex/gender distinction comes from locating "gender" in a grid of identities –caste, class, race, religion. This would mean that the biological category of "women" does not necessarily have shared interests, life situations or goals. This kind of understanding has arisen from the political practice of women's movements all over the world which has increasingly shown up the fact that "women "do not exist as a pre-existing subject which can simply be mobilized by the women's movement.

https://telegram.me/pdf4exams https://telegram.me/Pdf4Mains2019

That is women identify themselves not only, and not even necessarily primarily, in terms of their gender, but as black, or Muslim or Dalit, or peasant. So in many cases, women may be easier mobilized in terms of their religion then by the women's movement.

Further, all politically active women do not necessarily act as feminists – they may well be representing interests and structures of power which feminist politics in India has sought to struggle against. Thus, we find women active in Hindu-right wing politics and in anti-lower caste movements like the agitation against the Mandal Commission.

In other words, in this understanding, the feminist sex/gender distinction must take into account other modes of constituting identity. Depending on the context, even as feminists , one may have to privilege caste or class identity over gender in some cases, just as it can be expected or Dalit activists to privilege gender over calls and caste in some contexts.

1. (c) Representative Democracy

Representative democracy is type of democracy founded on the norm of elected people representing a group of people, as opposed to direct democracy. In modern democratic states, representatives are voted for by, and are ultimately accountable to the electorate. Different methods of selecting representatives are described in the article on electoral systems, but often a number of representatives are elected by, and responsible to, a particular subset of the total electorate: this is called his or her constituency. The representatives form an independent ruling body charged with the responsibility of acting in the people's interest, with enough authority to exercise swift and resolute initiative in the face of changing circumstances.

Representative Democracy is typically associated with Liberal Democracy which describes the political system which originated in the USA and Western Europe and has subsequently been adopted in numerous Third World countries and may gradually be well established in the former USSR and its former satellites in Eastern Europe. Liberal Democratic regimes may be classified as either Presidential or Parliamentary systems and there are also important variations within these broad categories.Representative democracies are based upon numerous interconnected principles:

1. The existence of regular, free, fair elections based upon universal suffrage and secret ballots.
2. The existence of competing political parties offering electoral choice.
3. The existence of electoral laws supervised by an independent judiciary.
4. Freedom of speech and association.
5. Freedom to stand as an election candidate.
6. "Reasonable" relationships between votes cast and representatives elected.
7. Availability of accurate unbiased political information.

It can be established that the main intent of representative democracy is to protect the rights and interests of the citizens in the country, this is accomplished by giving them a strong voice within the government.

Major benefits of representative democracy:

- **Citizen Representation:** In this type of government, the people have the say in who is elected into any form of government office. These elected officials then make decisions based on what the people want, and in the best interest of majority of people. They represent the citizens in ways that they could not do for themselves.
- **A Place to Turn To**: By having elected officials in all areas of the country, if someone has an issue that they think should be addressed or something that they feel should change, they

https://telegram.me/pdf4exams https://telegram.me/Pdf4Mains2019

can easily access their local official. These officials can then help them with their problems and guide them through the steps they need to take to get it to the next level of government.

- **Great Participation:** Knowing that they have a voice in the government urges people to be more educated and up to date on issues that are happening in the country as well as the world.

Main drawbacks of Representative Democracy:

- **Misplaced Trust:** Once the election process is over, the people's voice in government is virtually done. They have to put their faith and trust in the person that they elect to communicate and do things that they've promised to do. This is hardly the case. Many times these elected officials have hidden agendas that are not in the best interest of the citizens.
- **The Majority Rules**: The election process of representative government focuses only on the majority. The minority groups, no matter how significant their issues may be, are rarely characterised simply because they do not have the majority of the votes to get an official into office. This causes a feeling of separation with these groups as well as feeling like their issues are not as important.
- **No Accountability:** Once elected, officials can do whatever they satisfy, and this often includes breaking campaign promises that they made to be elected in the first place. When things go wrong, or not in favour of the people, there are no repercussion for these officials. The only possible consequence that could come is that they would not be re-elected.

1. (d) Notion of liberty in Indian political thinking

- The concept of liberty has not received sufficient attention in the ancient and medieval political thinking. In fact, individual liberty was circumscribed by the concept of Dharma. Dharma, made up of sacred texts, customs and traditions, was supposed to establish a just and harmonious order. In classical Hindu philosophy freedom meant Mukti, Moksha or Dharma. It was an escape from this world, the unity of Ataman with Paramatma. It was liberation of the soul from the body.
- Strict social code, theory of Karma and rebirth further reinforced the control on the individual and did not leave much room for the individual liberty. Deviation was allowed only if Dharma itself was in danger. Only if a particular course of action was not prohibited by customs, traditions and the sacred texts did some freedom to choose became possible. For instance, Kautilya, argued that usages and customs should be allowed to prevail in the case they did not come into conflict with the stipulations of Dharma.
- But the notion of freedom started to occupy a prominent space in the political discourse during the nationalist movement. The ideas of freedom embodied in the Indian Constitution were drawn from the Western tradition. However, when they were applied to the Indian context they led to different emphases. A number of leaders and thinkers argued that mere personal or political liberty is inadequate. It must be supplemented by a notion of social liberty which should be understood in the Indian context as absence of restraint imposed by caste barriers or by untouchability.
- In the writings and practices of Gandhi, a different notion of liberty emerged called Swaraj. It implied absence of external restraints on man's activities and self-imposed internal restraint by man. External restraints were not only political and economic but also cultural and moral. Internal restraints were those that were imposed by one's own desire, prejudices, passion and other motives. For Gandhi the absence of such restraints should result in self-direction to develop an authentic human existence. He saw any external control, even of a moral agent or a benevolent state as dangerous to freedom In the long run. Vivekananda, Aurobindo and Tagore forcefully defended the notion of freedom and mind.

https://telegram.me/pdf4exams https://telegram.me/Pdf4Mains2019

1. (e) Equality of Resources.

Ronald Dworkin being critical of welfare egalitarianism advocates his theory of 'equality of resources'. He rejects 'starting-gate theory of equality' which assumes initial equal resource as 'just' and thereafter laissez-faire as 'fair'. In other words, when inequalities emerge due to unequal talents, there is no redistribution to equalize. But for Dworkin 'justice requires an equal auction from time to time' and 'equality of resources' is devoted to whole life because 'we must not allow the distribution of resources to be endowment-sensitive that is be affected by the difference principle'. He has devised a formula to overcome this problem, which is insurance.

Dworkin explains his theory of equal distribution of resources through the hypothetical example of shipwreck survivors in a desert island with abundant resources and no native population. He explains step by step how equality in resources can be attained through proper distribution of resources among the shipwreck survivors. For distribution to be equal, it should not be 'arbitrary' and 'unfair', but should pass the 'envy test'. That is, division of resources is equal only when nobody will prefer another's bundle of resources and 'no one will envy another's set'. Thus all are left with the same stock. 'They enter the market with equal terms'. This kind of resource distribution is possible in a simple economy but even there, after few years one notices inequalities in the position of resources is a complex ideal and one time distribution is not enough, but it should be made life time distribution.

Dworkin also considers post-distribution situation. After a few years, resource equality which has taken into consideration the personal resources while distributing the impersonal resources turns into inequality due to the different ways people have used their resources. Two factors count for the inequality: talent and luck. To overcome these, income tax and insurance are prescribed.

He distinguishes between two types of lucks: 'brute luck', which just falls and 'option luck', which is deliberative and calculative. Insurance should be made available to overcome the bad effects of brute luck. For instance, the failure of crops due to excessive rain is brute luck that will affect the resource position adversely. If A has insured for his crops, he has taken a calculated decision (option luck). He has an option either to insure or not to insure. In case crops fail, he gains if not he loses. He takes a risk. B does not take insurance (option luck) and, loses, when crops fail. This results in inequality of fortune. Whether B needs to be compensated? Dworkin says no, because it is the result of option luck, not of brute luck. Thus the notion of responsibility is integral component of the luck theory.

Richard Arneson raises certain pertinent practical questions regarding, the 'ethic of equality of resources' which takes into consideration the personal talents at the time of distribution as part of brute luck. The problem of how much compensation should be given to the low talented person? How to evaluate the talent? All such questions need to be debated and answered.

2. (a) Explain Equality as a normative ideal for society with help of views of scholars.

Samuel Scheffler rejects the commonly known conceptualization of the value of equality as a distributive ideal and defines it as, "a moral ideal governing the relations in which people stand to one another". His conceptualization of equality is as follows:

- Equality is a moral value. Therefore, it is normative in nature.
- Equality is a social ideal.
- Equality is a political ideal.

There is undeniable differences among people. Contingencies, traits, abilities, and circumstances of each person are different.Samuel Scheffler consider equality as a moral, social and political ideal. He writes:

As a moral ideal, it asserts that al people are of equal worth and that there are some claims that people are entitled to make on one another simply by virtue of their status as persons. As a social

https://telegram.me/pdf4exams https://telegram.me/Pdf4Mains2019

ideal, it holds that a human society must be conceived of as a cooperative arrangement among equals, each of whom enjoys the same social standing. As a political ideal, it highlights the claims that citizens are entitled to make on one another by virtue of their status as citizens, without any need for a moralized accounting of the details of their particular circumstances. .

He does not deny the distributional implications of the social and political equality but the individualistic circumstances should be considered while distributing. His view differs from Luck egalitarianism as it addresses the question of inequality generated by inequalities in endowments, resources, wealth, income and even the choices of individuals. He argues 'neither complete choice-sensitivity nor complete endowment-insensitivity seems morally plausible in its own right'. What needs to be avoided is 'excessive variations in people's shares of income and wealth, and this will mean, among other things, that they have reason to oppose institutions that allow too much scope for differences in people's natural and social circumstances to translate into economic inequalities'.

The normative ideal of equality should be the basis of 'society of equals'. The basic question of political, philosophy according to Scheffler is 'what it is for people to relate as equals', 'what so of social, political, and economic institutions, are appropriate to such a society'. Thus equality relates not to the equal treatment of members by the state, but it is a normative value concerning the relations among the members. The social, economic and political institutions become subservient to the desired goal of moral equality.

Scheffler recognizes the significance of the debates regarding many of the present differences and discriminations regarding gender, sex, race, religion, culture, and ethnicity, which are related to the normative value of equality in human relations.

2. *(b) Hannah Arendt's views on Banality of Evil.*

- **Eichmann in Jerusalem: A Report on the Banality of Evil** is a book by political theorist Hannah Arendt. Arendt, a Jew who fled Germany during Adolf Hitler's rise to power, reported on Adolf Eichmann's trial for The New Yorker.Arendt's subtitle famously introduced the phrase "the banality of evil," which also serves as the final words of the book.
- Adolf Eichmann was one of the most pivotal actors in the implementation of the "Final Solution." Charged with managing and facilitating the mass deportation of Jews to ghettos and killing centers in the German-occupied East, he was among the major organizers of the Holocaust.
- In part, at least, the phrase refers to Eichmann's behaviour at the trial as the man displayed neither guilt for his actions nor hatred for those trying him, claiming he bore no responsibility because he was simply "doing his job". His response was "Duty is Duty".
- He did not have any hatred for Jews and he was just simply following orders from his superior officers.

  Arendt argues that the most of such crimes are committed by normal people and not psychopaths because normal people have stopped using their imaginative capacities. Eichmann made no effort to understand the moral and human consequences of his actions against the Jews. He simply chose not to use his thinking capacity, else he would have understood the pain of his victims.
- As per Arendt, **' Evil becomes banal (Ordinary) when ordinary people participate in it, build distance from it and justify it in countless ways. Evil does not look like evil when it becomes faceless'**. Any act no matter how gruesome or evil can be justified on the grounds that the masses were ready for it. Evil eventually becomes a part of daily life if it is not named and opposed.

https://telegram.me/pdf4exams https://telegram.me/Pdf4Mains2019

2. (c) *Discuss in detail the views of Foucault on power with special reference to its novel or unique aspects.*

Foucault thinks that it is wrong to consider power as something that the institutions possess and use oppressively against individuals and groups, so he tries to move the analysis one step beyond viewing power as the plain oppression of the powerless by the powerful, aiming to examine how it operates in day to day interactions between people and institutions.

In the first volume of Histoire de la sexuality he argues that we must overcome the idea that power is oppression, because – even in their most radical form – oppressive measures are not just repression and censorship, but they are also productive, causing new behaviours to emerge.

As opposed to most Marxist thinkers, Foucault is concerned less with the oppressive aspect of power, but more with the resistance of those the power is exerted upon. For example, the Marxist thinker Louis Althusser studied mainly how people are oppressed by the state institutions and how they build themselves as individuals through the mystifying action of the ideology. While for Althusser individuals are just puppets of the ideological and repressive apparatus and power is seen as acting from top downwards, Foucault proposes an alternative model in which power relations dissipate through all relational structures of the society. This enables him to build a model of the daily and mundane manners in which power is exerted and contested, as well as an analysis centred on the human individual as an active subject, not as a simple object for the power.

Usually, power is understood as the capacity of an agent to impose his will over the will of the powerless, or the ability to force them to do things they do not wish to do. In this sense, power is understood as possession, as something owned by those in power.

But in Foucault's opinion, power is not something that can be owned, but rather something that acts and manifests itself in a certain way; it is more a strategy than a possession: "Power must be analysed as something which circulates, or as something which only functions in the form of a chain. Power is employed and exercised through a netlike organization. Individuals are the vehicles of power, not its points of application".

This way of understanding power hat two key features: power is a system, a network of relations encompassing the whole society, rather than a relation between the oppressed and the oppressor;

Individuals are not just the objects of power, but they are the locus where the power and the resistance to it are exerted.

Mark G.E. Kelly thinks that these features can be further nuanced. In his opinion, Foucault's view of power, as presented in Surveilleretpunir. Naissance de la prison, involves the following features:

- The impersonality, or subjectlessness, of power, meaning that it is not guided by the will of individual subjects;
- The relationality of power, meaning that power is always a case of power relations between people, as opposed to a quantum possessed by people;
- The decentredness of power, meaning that it is not concentrated on a single individual or class; The multidirectionality of power, meaning that it does not flow only from the more to the less powerful, but rather "comes from below," even if it is nevertheless "nonegalitarian";
- The strategic nature of power, meaning that it has a dynamic of its own, is intentional".

Together with these, says Kelly, other features can be identified – but they are not present in the cited work, but in Histoire de la sexualité: power is coextensive with resistance, it is productive – i.e., it causes positive effects –, and it is ubiquitous – i.e., it can be found in any type of relation between the members of society, being a possibility condition for any relation.

https://telegram.me/pdf4exams https://telegram.me/Pdf4Mains2019

Conceiving power as strategy and not as possession means to think of it as something that has to be exerted and not something that can simply be acquired It is not localized exclusively in certain institutions or individuals, but it is rather a set of relations dispersed throughout society: "I am not referring to Power with a capital P, dominating and imposing its rationality upon the totality of the social body. In fact, there are power relations. They are multiple; they have different forms, they can be in play in family relations, or within an institution, or an administration".

This view directly contradicts the Marxist one, which regards power as a form of repression or oppression Foucault thinks that power must be understood differently than repression, which simply forces individuals to obey: "if power was never anything but repressive, if it never did anything but say no, do you really believe that we should manage to obey it?" Therefore, says Foucault, power is "coextensive with resistance; productive, producing positive effects; ubiquitous, being found in every kind of relationship, as a condition of the possibility of any kind of relationship."

In the first volume of Histoire de la sexualité, Foucault says that "where there is power there is resistance". This means that the power relations between individuals cannot be reduced to master-slave or oppressor-victim relations, but they are productive relations, because they imply resistance – without which no power relation can be conceived: where is power, there is always someone who resists it.

For Foucault, the state is not mainly something that owns power, but rather something which builds a system of relations between individuals so that the political system works. In Surveilleretpunir. Naissance de la prison, he reviews the ways in which power was exerted in various stages of European history and shows how the monarchic power system was replaced by the democratic one. He uses in an expressive way the punishment imagery: while the symbol of monarchic power was the public execution, that of democratic power is discipline, imprisonment away from public eyes.

The meaning of this change in how outlaws are punished is a change in the power streams running through society: the public execution was the external symbol of royal power, used from top downwards (the king stood for the power of the nation), but it is replaced by democratic means of punishment, such as imprisonment, which tells that now power is exerted by the whole nation.

Foucault contrasts these two ways of exerting power, helping us to understand the differences: "This new mechanism of power is more dependent upon bodies and what they do than upon the earth and its products. It is a mechanism of power which permits time and labour, rather than wealth and commodities, to be extracted from bodies. It is a type of power which is constantly exercised by means of surveillance rather than in a discontinuous manner by means of a system of levies or obligations distributed over time. It presupposes a tightly knit grid of material coercions rather than the physical existence of a sovereign. It is ultimately dependent upon the principle, which introduces a genuinely new economy of power, that one must be able simultaneously both to increase the subjected forces and to improve the force and efficacy of that which subjects them."

Then, the French thinker examines how discipline, as a type of self-regulation encouraged by institutions, becomes the norm in modern societies and acts as for the individual as an instrument to change the reality and himself: "We must cease once and for all to describe the effects of power in negative terms: it "excludes", it "represses", it "censors", it "abstracts", it "masks", it "conceals".

In fact, power produces; it produces reality; it produces domains of objects and rituals of truth". The institutions use various types of power enforcement, with specific mechanisms and techniques: Foucault shows how the hospital, the clinic, the prison and the university share some of these disciplinary techniques and practices. Discipline is a concern for control internalized by every individual, referring to temporal bench-marks, bodily posture and functions, sublimation of wishes and immediate emotions. All these are effects of the disciplinary pressure, but are also actions that, through pressure initially imposed externally, lead to self-discipline for the individual and eventually to the production of the individual himself as a subject.

https://telegram.me/pdf4exams https://telegram.me/Pdf4Mains2019

The most significant feature of Foucault's thesis is his stress on the productive nature of power's modern exercise. His main aim was to turn a negative conception upside down and attribute the production of concepts, ideas, and the structures of institutions to the circulation and exercise of power in its modern forms."

3. (a) Discuss the notion of Global Justice with special reference to views of Thomas Pogge.

Many contemporary thinkers have advocated the cosmopolitan approach to global justice. Prominent among those who have enriched the debate about global justice by following this approach are Brain Barry, Charles Beitz, Thomas Pogge, Hillel Steiner, Henry Shue, and Charles Jones. Though there are some significant differences as to the existence or non-existence of global principles of distributive justice, the recipients of distribution, practical measures to be followed to establish global justice, all of them subscribe to the core elements of cosmopolitanism. They are:

1. Principles of distributive justice should be applied to the world as a whole: A distinction is to be made between the 'scope of the principle of justice' and 'the magnitude of the duties imposed'. Accepting the principle of global justice does not mean committing 'financial hara-kiri' that is transferring ones wealth for the sake of global poor.

2. Rejection of communitarian or nationalist arguments regarding the application of principle of justice. Communitarians restrict it to a cohesive community and nationalist to the boundaries of a specific state. Charles Beitz (2005) writes: "*cosmopolitanism stands opposed to any view that limits the scope of justification to the members of particular types of groups, whether identified by shared political values, communal histories, or ethnic characteristics.*"

3. World citizenship: Each individual is the citizen of the world and owes obedience to worldwide community. In this respect, cosmopolitanism is Universalist. All the people all over the world need to be treated equally.

4. The unequal distribution of world resources, its causes and the remedy.

5. There are three dimensions to global justice: the economic, political and of course moral.

6. The question of responsibility for the relief of global poverty. The relief for global poverty and inequality are the twin issues that have been dealt with by all the cosmopolitans.

Some thinkers have distinguished between two forms of cosmopolitanism: Samuel Scheffler discriminates between the 'extreme' and the 'moderate'; David Miller distinguishes between the 'strong' and the 'weak' on account of morality; and Sirm6n Caney distinguishes between 'radical' and 'mild' on the basis of the meaning of justice. He writes:

Radical cosmopolitanism, makes the two following claims: first, there are global principles of distributive Justice (the positive claim), and the second, there are no state-wide or nation-wide principles of distributive justice (the negative claim). Mild cosmopolitanism, by contrast, simply affirms the positive claim. As such it can accept the claim, denied by radical cosmopolitanism, that people have special obligations, of distributive justice to fellow nationals or fellow citizens. Now cosmopolitans differ in their position here.

The two major differences between the cosmopolitan and the statist approach are:

1. ***Reasons for the global inequality:*** 'Statists emphasize that inequality in poor societies may be due to a specific public political culture and societal traditions that support certain background political institutions'. Therefore, for the statists the internal, factors like lack of good work-culture, leadership, inability to sustain the egalitarian system and corruption become important. On the other hand, the cosmopolitans emphasize the role of international order for the global poverty.

https://telegram.me/pdf4exams https://telegram.me/Pdf4Mains2019

2. Moral responsibility: The statists argue that the moral responsibility for justice is territory, or community bound, whereas the cosmopolitans argue that it need not be territorially restricted.

THOMAS POGGE'S THEORY OF GLOBAL JUSTICE

- Thomas Pogge's theory of global justice is basically normative as it raises the moral questions of inequality and duty. It is supported by empirical facts that are historical and contemporary. His main concern is poverty and its merciless consequences: "*billions of people have suffered greatly from poverty related causes: from hunger and malnutrition, from child labor and trafficking, from lack of access to basic health care and safe drinking water, from lack of shelter, basic sanitation, electricity, and elementary education*", 'leading' to poverty deaths. This statement is supported by the United Nations Development Programme (UNDP) Human Development Reports. The special feature of these human sufferings, which he calls 'horrifying statistics' is that females and people of color are more in number.

- Thomas Pogge (2004) refutes the rationalization of the development economists that severe poverty persists due to the domestic reasons like 'bad governance, 'sexist culture', 'geography', etc., and draws attention to 'the huge impact of the global economic order on the incidence of poverty worldwide'. One of the names of development economists that Pogge takes is that of Amartya Sen. for Pogge, more than the internal factors, the nature of global order promoted by the leaders from rich countries and supported by the leaders of the poor countries is responsible of social injustice.

- The major thesis of Thomas Pogge's book *World Poverty* and *Human Rights: Cosmopolitan Responsibilities and Reforms* published in 2002 is that the responsibility for achieving the global justice falls 'more on the advantaged citizens of the affluent countries'. The basic assumptions of his theory of justice are:

    1. The moral responsibility of global poverty and the consequent miseries greatly falls on the citizens of affluent countries.

    2. The relationship between the increase in population and the quality of life is such at when people suffer and die due to poverty, in no way it reduces the moral responsibility.

    3. 'Severe poverty is avoidable', but it is not done because the social conditions that promote the global inequality are being 'shaped and enforced'.

Thomas Pogge very strongly argues that the solution and remedy to *global inequality,* poverty and injustice lies in 'duties'. Between the negative and positive duties his focus as he claims is on *negative and intermediate duty,* the duty not to harm and the duty of avoiding the harm respectively. He considers negative duties to be 'more stringent' than the positive moral duties as argued by *Peter Singer, Henry Shue, Peter Unger,* and others. But he is doubtful about whether the citizens of the rich countries responds respond to the appeals made by these thinkers, and, therefore, he makes an effort to relate these citizens morally to the question of deprivation which he calls pervasive 'radical inequality'. And interestingly he puts the major blame for it on:

1. The affluent citizens of the rich countries.

2. The political and economic elites of the poor countries.

- And rejecting the historical cause, for this radical inequality that is the rich countries of today were the colonial masters of yester years who ruled and exploited their colonies, he puts forth an argument where the cause lies in the present institutional set up. Thus, rejecting the arguments of luck egalitarians, he says the main cause for global injustice lies in the institutional set-up national and international.

https://telegram.me/pdf4exams https://telegram.me/Pdf4Mains2019

- Finally, he locates the cause for global poverty in global order. The process of how the global order is created is a complex issue. But nevertheless he pinpoints two inter-related things: the global order and the national regime. He holds:
- *... The global institutional order is shaped by the political leaders of the most powerful countries, who in turn are selected and shaped by their domestic institutional arrangements, so the global institutional order powerfully shapes the national regimes, especially of the weaker countries as well as the composition, incentives, and opportunities of their lining elites.*
- The remedy according to Pogge lies in the reforms of global institutional order where a percentage of Global Resource Dividend (GRD) goes to eradication of global poverty.

3. (b) Discuss in detail the Sapt-Anga of a state as per views of Kautilya.

Saptanga Theory of State-

The Saptanga Theory of Kautilya, is given in his book 'Arthasastra'.According to the theory, the State consists of seven elements. Kautilya adopts the seven limbs theory ofthe state of Indian tradition or Saptanga which are;

1. Swami,
2. Amatya,
3. Janpad,
4. Durg,
5. Kosha,
6. Sena
7. Mitra.

He suggests a state can only function when all these elements or limbs ofa body politic are mutually integrated and cooperate well with each other.

Swami (The Sovereign King) –

- The king was referred to as the Lord or Swami and placed at the top of the body politics. Kautilya says a perfect king should have the following qualities:

a) He should have an inviting nature.

b) He should have qualities of intellect and intuition.

c) He should have great enthusiasm.

d) He should have qualities of self-restraint and spirit.

- In addition Kautilya mentions the king should be from a high family, be non-fatalistic, Endowed with strong character and should be religious and truthful.
- He should be free of passion, anger, greed,and fickleness and capable of self-management, observing the customs taught by elderly people andhave the capacity to make judgments like when to go to war and when to seek peace through a treaty.
- He should have a sense of sovereignty andowe allegiance to anybody and be the king of one wholepolitical organization and not part of it.

https://telegram.me/pdf4exams https://telegram.me/Pdf4Mains2019

Amatya (Ministers) –

By Amatya Kautilya refers to higher officials of the state like ministers and notnecessarily just ministers. The king should keep checking the integrity of the amatyas from time to time and he also advises the king to appoint 3 amatyas instead of two since two amatyas can easily join hands and conspire against the king. He says the qualities of a high official should be:

- he must be a *janpad*, a nativeof the county that he is an official of,
- come from a good family,
- be Adequately trained,
- have foresight,
- eloquence,
- dignity,
- enthusiasm,
- have administrative Ability,
- knowledge of scriptures,
- And high character.

Janpad (Territory and People) - Territory and People constitute the third limb of the state in Kautilya's Arthashastra. Kautilya gives a clear cut description of what an ideal territory would be like. He says the territory should be free from muddy, rocky, saline, uneven and thorny areas and from wild beats. There should be lands that are fertile with lots of timber and elephant forests.there should be plenty of arable land and richness of cattle and the land should bewholesome to cows and men. The territories should not be dependent on rains too muchand have waterways. Also there should be roads and good markets capable of bearing thearmy and taxation. The people populating a state should have the qualities of being hostile to the foes, be powerful enough to control the neighboring kings and consist of people who are pure and devoted. The people should respect the rule of law and the government Kautilya also says the people should consist of industrious agriculturists and a majority of lower classes of economically productive *vaish*and*shudras*. Also the masters of the people should be not too intelligent so that they can be controlled by the king easily.

Durg (Fort) - Kautilya identifies forts as the fourth limb and mentions four kinds of forts that a king needs. He says the four kinds of forts that are necessary are: water forts, hill forts, desert forts and forest forts. The water and hill forts are suitable for defending the populationand the desert and forest forts and suitable as head quarters for wild regions and to serveas places to run away to in case of emergency. Kautilya says the power of a king dependson the forts which should be fit for fighting and to defend the state.

Kosha (Treasury) - Kautilya clears puts great store by the economic resources of a state and mentions that the success of a state depends upon its treasury size which should have enough gold and silver to see the king through long periods of calamity. The treasury should belegitimately acquired by the king or his predecessors. **The treasury is easily increased when; (1)** there is opulence of the industrial department run by the state, **(2)** there is apropensity for commerce **and (3)** abundance in harvest. In cases of emergency Kautilya finds no problem with the king raising revenue even through means such as a higher assessment on first class and fertile land and heavy taxes on merchandise etc. He also condones in emergencies for the king to exploit the superstitious and religious sentimentsof the people.

https://telegram.me/pdf4exams https://telegram.me/Pdf4Mains2019

Sena (Army) - Kautilya mentions the army or Sena as the limb that the king needs to control both hisown people and his enemy's. **Kautilya talks about six types of army; (1)** hereditary forces, **(2)** hired troops, **(3)** soldiers of fighting corporations, **(4)** troops belonging to an ally, **(5)** troops belonging to the enemy **and (6)** soldiers of wild tribes. Interestingly the best of the six according to Kautilya is the hereditary army composed of members of the Kshatriya caste for they are loyal to the king and are committed to serve the king through wealand woe and have powers of endurance and superior fighting skills because they have fought many battles.

Mitra (Ally) - Kautilya finally stresses on the need for political friends in the other states because nostate functions in isolation. Kautilya classifies allies into **two kinds;** *Sahaj*(natural) and *Kritrim* (acquired). The *sahaj*ally is one who is close by territorially and has been inherited as a friend from fathers and grandfathers and the *kritrim*ally is one who isresorted to temporarily for the protection of wealth and life. Kautilya prefers the *sahaj*ally over the *kritrim*one if the *sahaj*ally is free from deceit and is capable of making large scale preparations for war quickly and on a large scale. The nature of state is organic. A strong state consisted of these seven elements.

3. (c) What is political theory how it is different from Political thought? Discuss Easton understanding of decline of Political theory? Examine.

Political thought is the thought of the whole community that includes the writings and speeches of the articulate sections such as professional politicians, political commentators, society reformers and ordinary persons of a community. Thought can be in the form of political treatises, scholarly articles, speeches, government policies and decisions, and also poems and prose that capture the anguish of the people. Thought is time bound; for instance, the history of the twentieth century. In short, political thought includes theories that attempt to explain political behaviour, and values to evaluate it and methods to control it.

Political theory, unlike thought, refers to the speculation by a single individual, usually articulated in treatises as models of explanation. It consists of theories of institutions, including that of the state, law, representation and of election. The mode of enquiry is comparative and explanatory. Political theory attempts to explain the attitudes and actions arising from ordinary political life and to generalise about them in a particular context: this political theory is concerned about/with the relationships between concepts.

Decline of Political Theory

- According to David Easton the ever-increasing role of historicism is a major cause of the decline of political theory. In his words: "Political theory has been devoted to a form of historical researches that has robbed it of its earlier, constructive role". What is historicism? It is defined as a belief that history is governed by inexorable laws of change and that human actions are guided by permanent ultimate purposes. For long period political theory was in one way or other dominated by history and this led political theory to insignificance. Easton has cited the example of Dunning's work.

- Dunning believed that political theory was nothing but a historical account of condition and consequences of political ideas. Traditional political, scientists generally built up the principles of political science on the basis of historical facts which they collected from past history.

- This approach made political theory completely dependent on history and it lost its own identity. Not only Dunning, other political scientists were also exponents of this concept and among them Sabine is pioneer. He, in his famous work A History of Political Theory, has explained the deep and inseparable relationship between history and political theory.He has said that political theory is the product of politics and history contains the incidents of politics. Easton is of opinion that because of the excessive dependence of political theory on historical facts and data there is practically no difference between history and political science.

https://telegram.me/pdf4exams https://telegram.me/Pdf4Mains2019

- Another important factor responsible for the decline of political theory in the estimation of Easton is "hyper-factualism" which generally means excessive depen-dence upon facts and the failure to relate facts to the theory. It is said that from the very beginning of twentieth century there has occurred a lot of research in the field of political science but the contribution of this research to the articulation of political theory is not noteworthy. Political science research, according to Easton, is generally characterized by "Hyper-factualism" and a failure to marry empiricism to theory. Because of this hyper-factualism a conceptualization of political theory has not taken place.
- Easton has strongly criticized the approach of many political scientists. They normally collect data with a lot of enthusiasm and they begin to generalize them singularly. And this generalization takes place in a narrow way. This narrow perspective was interpreted by science. But in the opinion of Easton this cannot be called science and this must not constitute the basis of any viable political theory.
- In the opinion of Easton: "Most factual research is concerned with singular generalization, not with broader type of theory. Such research is what we call pursuit of the facts about political life". He also says that why or for what purposes facts are collected that is not properly explained. The fact is that Easton does not disapprove the collection of facts from history. What he disapproves is that excessive dependence of facts and apathy to explain them in proper context.

4. (a) Analyse the origin and theoretical justification for "Natural Rights"? What kind of relationship does it enjoy with Human Rights?

The idea of a natural right is based on a political theory that every person has basic rights that the government cannot deny, now matter where they live. It is important to point out that the word 'natural' can take on a few different meanings depending on the context. 'Natural' can mean being independent from society or, from a theological perspective, based on the obligations God has given man. No matter from what context the word 'natural' is derived, no government or society can deny these rights, especially if that denial is based on any discriminatory factors such as age, gender, race, or nationality.

Natural Rights Theory

- In ancient times there was a doctrine known as the Doctrines of Natural Law. These doctrines held that because people are creatures of God and nature, they should be able to live their lives based on the rule of God or nature. As time went on, a man by the name of John Locke helped to modify ,.these doctrines of natural law, based on his belief that everyone was naturally good and rational.
- Because he believed that the government was obligated to serve the people, and protect their natural rights, he strived for a government that really represented the people and their interests. This lead to the modern concept of natural rights — not only do we have these rights, but no person or society can violate or take those rights from us.The theory of natural rights is criticised on many grounds.
- Rights cannot be natural simply because they were the possessions of men in the state of nature. There can never be rights before the emergence of society: the notion of pre-society rights is a contradiction in terms. If at all there was anything in the state of nature, they were mere physical energies, and not rights. Rights presuppose the existence of some authority to protect them. To say that natural rights existed in the state of nature is to make them absolute or beyond the control of society.

https://telegram.me/pdf4exams https://telegram.me/Pdf4Mains2019

- For Bentham, the doctrine of natural rights was 'a rhetorical non-sense upon stilts.' Laski also rejects the whole idea of natural rights. Rights, as natural rights, are based on false assumptions that we can have rights and duties independently of society. Burke had pointed out that "we cannot enjoy the rights of civil and uncivil state at the same time: the more perfect the natural rights are in the abstract, the more difficult it is to recognise them in practice".

  The idea of human rights is also closely related to that of natural rights: some acknowledge no difference between the two, regarding them as synonymous, while others choose to keep the terms separate to eliminate association with some features traditionally associated with natural rights.

- Natural rights, in particular, are considered beyond the authority of any government or international body to dismiss. The 1948 United Nations Universal Declaration of Human Rights is an important legal instrument enshrining one conception of natural rights into international soft law. Natural rights were traditionally viewed as exclusively negative rights, whereas human rights also comprise positive rights.

4. (b) *Draw parallels between Arthashastra tradition and the 'Realist' tradition represented by Machiavelli.*

With the vast difference in the Italian and Indian historical, geographical and cultural situations, some Subjects and themes of the Prince and the Arthashastra are, nevertheless, common. There are some similarities of opinion on various issues raised by Kautilya and Machiavelli which are as follows-

1. Firstly, For instance, the acquisition, preservation and expansion of the State. Both realistically analyse the methods by which a king may rise to supreme power and maintain it against all odds. In both, we find the duality of treatment of the feelings and susceptibilities of men and the tendency to legitimize force and fraud in the interest of the State. For, both the authors, the State, vis-a-vis the interest of a person are paramount. Both of them held the belief that, through a proper and critical study of history, one could deduce not only the causes of maladies of society, but also the cures thereof. Imbued with an enduring value, these precepts have validity, not only for the writer's contemporary time, but for the future too.

2. Secondly, There is another close affinity between the ancient Indian thinker and the modern Italian thinker. Both of them approach the common political problems in the same spirit and temper. Kautilya belonged to the Arthashastra School which looked at the political phenomenon without linking them in any way with divine agency or revelation. The approach was thus religious and rational. The Modern Italian thinker affected a break with the medieval way of thinking and reasoning and adopted the empirical or historical method of investigation and emancipated the State from the bondage to ecclesiastical authorities.

3. Thirdly, in the field of real politics, there is much that is common between Kautilya and Machiavelli. Kautilya is aware that the Swami (king) can hardly feel secure in a State where persons shorn of power by him are still alive and well. Similar insistence was that of Machiavelli while cautioning the Prince against any possible conspiracy and scandal. Both Kautilya and Machiavelli advised the ruler to be merciless, cruel and unscrupulous while suppressing internal disruptions and external aggressions. The former provided different kinds sanctions which coercive in nature and punishments prescribed by him were stringent and cruel. But Machiavelli, while elaborating the theme of the art of war, did not mention cruel techniques like blinding through the use of poisonous powders for attaining political goal. Kautilya surpassed Machiavelli and left him for behind while sanctioning several barbarous and cruel measures for attaining success. No ethical code supports Kautilya's

https://telegram.me/pdf4exams https://telegram.me/Pdf4Mains2019

methods for swimming success. For the sake of the country's security all kinds of measures including violence and fraud were welcome and they could not be considered as reprehensible. This is what both Kautilya and Machiavelli advocated. To them, end justified the means.

4. Both Kautilya and Machiavelli were quite pessimistic in their approach to human nature. It seems that the former treated men with contempt as they were unreliable and entrust wrongly. Hence they should not be taken into confidence. He, however, made "no categorical statement regarding the corruptibility of human nature in general". Machiavelli, on the other hand, categorically said that people were ungrateful, fickle, deceitful avaricious, vicious, evil, mean, corrupt and unreliable. He, therefore, suggested that there should be strong political force to restrain the deviant behaviour of the people. Force and fraud were welcome measures as they checked their psychological aberration. He upheld a more pervert conception of human nature than Kautilya. He considered men to be greedy, selfish and cruel. They understood only the language of force. Kautilya now here made a generalized statement about the weakness or perversity, or selfishness of man.

4. (c) What is Affirmative action? What are the major arguments for its continuation and abolition?

Affirmative action is the strategy to errand members of a disadvantaged group who currently suffer or historically have suffered from discrimination within a culture. Often, these people are deprived for historical reasons, such as oppression or bondage. The notion of "affirmative action" was first used in the United States in "Executive Order No.10925", signed by President John F. Kennedy on 6 March 1961, which included a provision that government contractors "take affirmative action to ensure that applicants are employed, and employees are treated during employment, without regard to their race, creed, colour, or national origin." In 1967, gender was added to the anti-discrimination list. In 1989, the International Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Racial Discrimination stipulated (in Article 2.2) that affirmative action programs may be required of countries that ratified the convention, in order to rectify systematic discrimination. It also states that such programs "shall in no case entail as a consequence the maintenance of unequal or separate rights for different racial groups after the objectives for which they were taken have been achieved."

In simple term, Affirmative action is anticipated to promote the opportunities of defined minority groups within a society to give them equal access to that of the majority population. In India, Reservation in India is a form of affirmative action designed to improve the well-being of backward and under-represented communities defined primarily by their caste.

Affirmative action denotes to the policies and laws that attempt to redress a situation of discrimination and promote equal opportunity. Affirmative action is also related to positive discrimination, which entails means to compensate or counter the effects of prejudices in terms of race, gender and / or disabilities. The nature of policy and terminology used vary from country to country.

The norm of affirmative action is to encourage societal equality through the preferential treatment of socioeconomically deprived people. Often, these people are disadvantaged for historical reasons, such as oppression or slavery (Christophe Jaffrelot, 2003). Historically and internationally, support for affirmative action has sought to accomplish several goals such as bridging inequalities in employment and pay; increasing access to education; enriching state, institutional, and professional leadership with the full spectrum of society; redressing apparent past wrongs, harms, or hindrances, in particular addressing the apparent social imbalance left in the wake of slavery and slave laws.

There are different kinds of affirmative action. Some are direct e.g. provisions demanding that certain quantitative or qualitative targets be reached through admission to schools, employment and political appointments. Quantitative targets are also known as quotas and they could be designed to have immediate or medium/ long term effect.

https://telegram.me/pdf4exams https://telegram.me/Pdf4Mains2019

Affirmative Action could also be indirect, consisting of programmes which support certain categories to support their performance or improve their access. While many researchers argue that affirmative action measures have, or should have a short life span, in practice, some affirmative action programmes have been of long duration, going through expansions and modifications over time. Indeed, proponents argue that Affirmative Action measures should continue until they reach their goals or until it is proven that they have negative outcomes for other groups.

Affirmative action policies have been proved as effectual way to balance structuctural disparities in many societies.

- Affirmative action guarantees representation of minorities and disadvantaged groups in positions of authority. These representatives can function as inspiring role models, which in the long term can help fight prejudices and stereotypes.
- Affirmative action contributes to diversity in schools, universities, companies and public administrations.
- These policies are a fair compensation for centuries of racial or gender discrimination.
- Affirmative action policies help disabled people enter the labour market and thus contribute to the economy of their countries. They also allow them earn a living and relieve the government from having to sustain them.
- People who start from a disadvantaged position deserve extra support to develop their full potential. Without affirmative action many would not even consider some jobs or areas of study.

Nonetheless, affirmative action policies have also many critics. In the US, by the late 1970s, reverse discrimination was an issue of heated debate. Critics opined that affirmative action is reverse discrimination and further claim that affirmative action has disagreeable side-effects in addition to failing to achieve its goals. They contend that it hinders reconciliation, replaces old wrongs with new wrongs, weakens the achievements of minorities, and encourages individuals to identify themselves as underprivileged, even if they are not. It may increase racial tension and benefit the more privileged people within minority groups at the expense of the least fortunate within majority groups (such as lower-class white people).

Major disadvantages of affirmative action:

- Affirmative action can be biased against those who are not part of the minorities or groups protected. Sometimes people that fulfil the basic criteria for a job or a vacancy in a university may not be accepted.
- These policies may upsurge racial or ethnic tensions. The members of a group may develop a negative attitude towards a minority if they perceive that due to positive discrimination they are being excluded or see their chances of getting some jobs or positions limited.
- Positive discrimination can be very difficult to apply in societies where ethnic divides are not very clear and people often have mixed backgrounds.
- It is argued that these policies or laws serve to reinforce the separation and division among different groups. In some countries it is even illegal to classify people according to their race or ethnic background for this same reason.
- The basic principles to define the groups reached by these policies and the quotas allocated or type of preferential treatment are often doubtful.

There are other critics who stated that affirmative actions are not good practices. Challengers of affirmative action such as George Sher consider that affirmative action diminishes the

https://telegram.me/pdf4exams https://telegram.me/Pdf4Mains2019

accomplishments of people who are chosen based on the social group to which they belong rather than their qualifications, thus rendering affirmative action counterproductive (She, 1983). According to Bacchi, affirmative action violates the principle of equality stems from the fact that affirmative action viewed from wrong perspective, namely that serves to the advantage to less qualified people (Johan Rabe, 2001).

But affirmative action is intended to enhance the life of deprived people. Affirmative action is a set of measures approved by governments and public and private institutions such as political parties, educational establishments, corporations and companies to address a history of systemic discrimination and exclusion of particular social groups or to encourage the efforts of particular social groups in the interests of certain development goals. Affirmative action is expected to improve development indicators by reducing inequalities and facilitating the contribution of particular social groups to development.

SECTION - B

5. (a) Fascism as Adventurer's Philosophy - Sabine.

Fascism as the ideology of war and national expansion, to quote Sabine was "an adventurer's philosophy. By no rational calculation either of individual happiness or of tangible national benefit could such a purpose be made plausible.

Select pieces of their writings were picked up to provide a respectful authencity and expedient solutions required by fascism from time to time. For example, Mussolini, having no time himself assigned the task of building up a theory of state to Giovanni Gentile who belonged to the Italian School of Hegelian Philosophy. Mussolini "took what Gentile offered him". The result was adoption of the Hegelian language to camouflage the real intention rather than signifying the substance of Hegel's thought. Noteworthy is the fact that Mussolini, as late as 1920, regarded the state as a 'curse to mankind'. While in power, he had to glorify all things that the state was associated with. In actual governmental performance, Fascism did not bring about any significant structural changes in Italy and Germany. Economic social stagnation persisted under Fascism.

The meaning of Fascism poses considerable difficulties owing to the fact that the ideas characterizing fascism are untidy and incoherent. These are derived from a variety of sources and socio-cultural traditions. So one does not find a classical text like Marx's Das Capital, to authoritatively outline and delineate the central ideas of Fascism. Moreover, fascism 'Chemical indifference to intellectual honesty' (Sabine) further contributes to the elusive ideational categories that it portrays.

5. (b) Challenges being faced by feminism.

- In the first place, the women's movement has become increasingly fragmented and incoherent; indeed, some question whether the notion of a women's movement is any longer meaningful.
- Although united by a common desire to advance the role of women, feminists disagree about how this can be achieved and about what it means in practice. Divisions have long existed – between reformist and revolutionary feminists, between radical and socialist feminists, and over highly controversial issues such as separatism and lesbianism. However, these have now proliferated, with divisions emerging over issues such as prostitution, pornography and censorship, abortion, motherhood, race and ethnicity, the welfare state, and so on.
- However, such a broad range of concerns and interests be more an indication of feminist strength than a source of feminist weakness. Indeed, it may merely serve to highlight the fact that feminism has developed from a political movement into a political ideology that, like other ideologies, encompasses a range of often-competing traditions.

https://telegram.me/pdf4exams https://telegram.me/Pdf4Mains2019

- A further problem is that, particularly in the 1980s and 1980ss, feminism operated in a hostile political environment. In Islamic countries, the advance of fundamentalism was reflected in pressure for the exclusion of women from politics and public life, the abolition of their legal rights and a return to the veil.
- A conservative backlash against feminism was also evident in the industrialized West. Both the Thatcher and the Reagan administrations in the 1980s, for instance, were openly anti-feminist in their call for the restoration of 'family values' and in their emphasis upon women's traditional role as mother and housewife. The new right tried to reassert 'profamily' patriarchal values and ideas, not only because they are seen to be 'natural' but also because they are viewed as a guarantee of social order and stability.
- Feminism in the twenty-first century also faces the problem that many of its original goals have been achieved or are being achieved, which is the basis of the post-feminism critique. Just as the right to vote was won in the early years of the twentieth century, so 'second wave' feminism successfully campaigned in many countries for the legalization of abortion, equal pay legislation, anti-discrimination laws and wider access to education and political and professional life. Some have even suggested the victory of feminism can be seen in the emergence of a new breed of man, no longer the chauvinist bigot of old, but the 'new man', who has come to terms with the 'feminine' elements of his make-up and is prepared to share domestic and family responsibilities within the 'symmetrical family'.
- The so-called men's movement has in fact argued that matters have gone further still, that men have become the victims of gender politics and is no longer its beneficiaries. This perspective suggests that the advance of feminism has simply gone 'too far'. Confronted by the decline of traditional 'male' occupations, faced with growing competition from women in the workplace and at home, and deprived of their status as 'breadwinners', there is a danger that men, particularly young men, will retreat into a culture of non-achievement, unable to cope with a future that is female.

5. (c) Aurobindo on Nationalism

Aurobindo's concept of nation was deeply influenced by Bankimchandra-a great Bengali novelist. Aurobindo's understanding, the 'nation' is a mighty 'Shakti' composed of all the shaktis of all the millions of units that make up the nation. It is thus a living entity. He expressed his deep feelings of love and dedication to the motherland in numerous articles and poems. Such patriotism he believed could work miracles. Thus, Aurobindo's definition-of nationalism had a spiritual dimension, unlike the ordinary patriotic understanding of the terms nationalism. Nationalism in his opinion is not merely a political movement. It is neither a political programme nor an intellectual past time. In his opinion, nationalism is akin to religion. It is a faith and a creed which one has to live. It is a religion which has come from God. Hence, it cannot be crushed. Even if attempts are made by external forces to suppress it, it re-emerges and survives due to the strength of God in it. Nationalist movement sparked off by the partition of Bengal was in the opinion of.

Aurobindo a divinely inspired and guided movement. In his opinion, this movement was not guided by any political self-interest, but it was a religious mission which the people were trying to fulfil. Thus for him, "nationalism is a religion by which people try to realise God in their nation, and their fellow countrymen".

5. (d) Luck Egalitarianism

The last two decades of the 20th century has seen many changes in the political and economic field nationally and globally, which has affected the debates relating to equality.

The collapse of Soviet Union, increased privatization and increased role of market has given a fillip to capitalism intensifying economic inequalities in all liberal countries. Income disparities all over

https://telegram.me/pdf4exams https://telegram.me/Pdf4Mains2019

the world have increased, particularly in countries having liberal democratic models. These factors have shaped the egalitarian debate. Egalitarians debated about what needs to be equalized and why.

Luck or fortune conception of equality is one of the 'dominant positions among the egalitarians'. One can notice be roots of luck egalitarianism in Rawls, but he did not develop it. It was Dworkin who systematically develops this position, which has been already discussed.

Elizabeth Anderson uses the terms 'luck egalitarianism' and 'equality of fortune', as synonyms. The defenders of luck egalitarianism are: Philipe Van Parijis, Richard Arneson, Gerald Cohen, Ronald Dworkin, Thomas Nagel, Eric Rakowski, John and Roemer. Samuel Scheffler (2003) notes two changes in this list of luck egalitarians. Firstly, Richard Arneson more recently has abandoned the version of luck egalitarianism and has defended a view that he calls "responsibility-catering prioritarianism". Secondly, puts Dworkin in the category of luck egalitarians which was rejected by Dworkin. But even then some of his ideas fall in line with the main arguments of luck egalitarians. The three statements in his book make the scholars to consider him as the luck egalitarian:

1. "In principles ... individuals should be relieved of consequential responsibility for those unfortunate features of their situation that are brute bad luck, but not, from those that should be seen as flawing from their own choices".

2. "If someone has been born blind or without talents others have, that is his bad luck, and, so far as this can be managed, a just society would compensate him for that bad luck. But, if he has fewer, resources than other people now because he spent more on luxuries earlier, or because he chose not to work, or to work at less remunerative jobs than others chose, then his situation is the result of choice not luck, and he is not entitled to any compensation" .

3. "The general goal of equality of resources is that distribution should be sensitive to choice but not to circumstance".

These statements indicate luck egalitarianism has different versions, even those who do not want to be tagged as luck egalitarians due to some of their views, fall to that category. Therefore, it becomes necessary to identify the fundamental presuppositions of luck egalitarianism. The fundamental assumptions of luck egalitarianism can be listed as:

- 'Choice' and 'circumstance' distinction or 'option luck' and 'brute luck' distinction. Option luck refers to the good or bad outcomes of voluntary choice of a person. Brute luck refers to that which is beyond human control.

- Inequalities that are derived from the voluntary choices of people are acceptable. Inequalities that are derived from 'brute luck', i.e. circumstances over which individuals have no control are unjust and not compensated.

- Equality is a distributive idea; the basic concern is to eliminate the effects of distribution of brute luck. In other words neutralize the brute luck and provide equal starting point.

5. (e) *Normative conception of political theory*

Normative Conception

- The normative conception in political theory is known by different names. Some people prefer to call it philosophical theory, while others refer to it as ethical theory. The normative conception is based on the belief that the world and its events can be interpreted in terms of logic, purpose and ends with the help of the theorist's intuition, reasoning, insights and experiences. In other words, it is a project of philosophical speculation about values.

- The questions, which are asked by the normativists, would be: what should be the end of political institutions? What should inform the relationship between the individual and other

https://telegram.me/pdf4exams https://telegram.me/Pdf4Mains2019

social organisations? What arrangements in society can become model or ideal and what rules and principles should govern it?

- One may say that their concerns are moral and the purpose is to build an ideal type. Hence, it is these theorists who have always conceived 'utopia' in the realm of political ideas through their powerful imagination. Normative political theory leans heavily towards political philosophy, because it derives its knowledge of the good life from it and also uses it as a framework in its endeavour to create absolute norms. Infact, their tools of theorisation are borrowed from political philosophy and therefore, they always seek to established inter-relationships among concepts and look for coherence in the phenomena as well as in their theories, which are typical examples of a philosophical outlook.
- Leo Strauss has strongly advocated the case for normative theory and has argued that political things by nature are subject to approval or disapproval and it is difficult to judge them in any other terms, except as good or bad and justice or injustice.
- But the problem with the normativists is that while professing values which they cherish, they portray them as universal and absolute. They do not realise that their urge to create absolute standard for goodness is not without pitfalls. And that ethical values are relative to time and space with a heavy subjective content in them, which precludes the possibility of any creation of absolute standard. We will do well to remember that even a political theorist is a subjective instrument in the assessment of the world and these insights are conditioned by many factors, which may be ideological in nature.
- The exponents of empirical theory take normativists to task for
  - relativity of values
  - cultural basis of ethics and norms
  - ideological content in the enterprise and
  - abstract and utopian nature of the project
- It is true that the proponents of the normative conception get preoccupied with the inquiry in to the internal consistency of theory and that pertains, mostly to the nature of ideas and rigour in the method, while remaining unmindful and sometimes, even negligent about the empirical understanding of the existing social and political reality.
- Thus, it turns out to be an illusory and deceptive exercise in theory-building in the name of high and noble normative concerns. But in the distant past those who championed normative theory always tried to connect their principles with the understanding of the reality of their times. Therefore, all normative enterprises in the past had direct or indirect empirical referents and Plato's theory of justice could be a good example to illustrate it.
- In recent times, again the old sensibility within the normative theory has re-emerged and the passion for good life and good society has been matched by methodological and empirical astuteness. John Rawls' A Theory of Justice is a case in point which attempts to anchor logical and moral political theory in empirical findings. Rawls, with his imagination, creates 'original position' to connect normative philosophical arguments with real world concerns about distributive justice and the welfare state. Some other theorists are also attending to the tasks of developing moral theories about equality, freedom and democracy by rooting them to every day concerns and marrying them to specific situations.
- Some normative theorists of the new generation have also started discarding the well-known inclination of theory, more a characteristic of the older days, under which either exuberant

https://telegram.me/pdf4exams https://telegram.me/Pdf4Mains2019

justification for the existing arrangements was offered or they hesitated to critique them and thus, carried the level of status – quoism in their thought. Now, a new crop of theory has surfaced known as critical theory, which as a part of the normative project, is engaged with political events and tries to combine ideas with practice, and also makes effective interventions to facilitate changes for the better in society and politics.

6. *(a) Discuss in detail the various features of Buddhist theory of State and government.*

- The Buddhist view of kingship (government)does not invest the ruler with a divine right to govern the realm as he pleases. This contrasts with the Chinese view of the legitimacy of government, which is based on the "Mandate of Heaven."
- The king or the government is expected to observe the ten duties of king or government, the seven safeguards against decline, and the four assistances to the people and to be guided by numerous other codes of conduct stated in Buddha's teaching.
- The Ten Duties of Government are: charity (dana in Pali), morality (sila), self-sacrifice (paricagga), integrity (ajjava), kindness (maddava), austerity (tapa), patience (akkodha), nonviolence (avihamsa), forbearance (khanti), and nonopposition to the will of the people (avirodha).
- The first duty, that of charity (dana), demands that a ruler should contribute generously toward the welfare of the people and makes the implicit assumption that a government should have the competence to provide adequately for its citizens.
- The second duty of government, morality (sila in Pali), is based on the observance of the five precepts of Buddha's teaching, which entail refraining from the destruction of life, theft, adultery, falsehood, and indulgence in intoxicants.
- Buddhists believe that the ruler must have a high moral character in order to win the respect and trust of the people; thus the ruler is in a position to ensure others' happiness and prosperity and to provide a proper example as a role model. When the king or the government does not observe the dhamma (the rule of morality or ethics), state functionaries become corrupt, and when state functionaries are corrupt the people are subjected to suffering.
- Self-sacrifice (paricagga) is the third duty of government. Paricagga is sometimes translated as "generosity" and sometimes as "self-sacrifice."The former overlaps with the meaning of the first duty, dana; so the latter, self-sacrifice as the ultimate generosity or giving up all for the good of the people, would appear to be the more appropriate interpretation.
- The fourth duty of government is to observe "integrity" (ajjava), which implies incorruptibility in the discharge of public duties as well as honesty and sincerity in personal relations. Buddhists believe that those who govern should be wholly bound by the truth – in thought, word, and deed.
- The fifth duty of government is to practice "kindness" (maddava). A ruler has to have thecourage of feeling concern for the people's welfare. By virtue of this courage, the ruler has thecare of public services in his mind and heart.
- The sixth duty, "austerity" (tapa), impliesthat a ruler must adopt simple habits, developself-control, and practice spiritual discipline.This duty prevents rulers from abusing publicproperties and taxpayers' money. It is designedto safeguard against corrupt practices in thegovernment.
- The seventh, eighth, and ninth duties, "patience" (akkodha), "nonviolence" (avihamsa), and "tolerance" (khanti), are similar. Rulers must not allow personal feelings ofenmity and ill will to erupt into destructiveanger and violence. It is incumbent on a ruler tocultivate true

https://telegram.me/pdf4exams https://telegram.me/Pdf4Mains2019

tolerance, which serves him/herto deal wisely and generously with the shortcomings and provocation of even those enemiess/he could crush with impunity.

- Violence isinhumane and absolutely contrary to theBuddha's teachings. A good ruler relinquishesill will and anger with loving kindness, wickedness with virtue, parsimony with liberality, andfalsehood with truth. These are all relevant tothe seventh, eighth, and ninth duties of rulers.
- The most significant among the ten duties ofgovernment is the tenth, which states that theruler must not oppose the will of the people. Avirodha ("non-opposition to the will of thepeople") is the Buddhist endorsement ofdemocracy. This was supported by numerousstories of the kings during the Buddha's time,in the ancient world.
- The true meaning of the tenth duty, non-opposition to the will of people,is a reminder that the legitimacy of governmentis founded on the consent of the people, whohave the power to withdraw their mandate atany time if they lose confidence in the ruler'screditability or in his/her ability to serve theirbest interest.
- The ten duties of government or king inthe tradition of Buddha's teachings greatlyinfluence several Asian societies. The conceptof these duties is not very different from theconcept of representative democracy, which iscurrently practiced in the world's democraticcountries.

6. (b) ***Analyse the Justification and criticisms of the notion of "Competitive Equality of Opportunity".***

Competitive Equality of Opportunity

- This has caught the attention of contemporary political analysts, theorists and philosophers. Both the supporters and the critics fervently justify and oppose competitive equality of opportunity on the ground of egalitarianism. The first group connects it to the values of liberty and justice, the second focuses on the unfair consequences of it, as it accentuates inequality that exists at the starting point. Equality of opportunity, when perceived as the starting point equality, will not result in equality of outcome as the outcome depends on many factors like talent, ability, preferences, etc.
- Another name for competitive equality is meritocracy. The main argument of meritocracy is that a person should, hold the position according to his ability. What one gets as a result of one's effort and ability is just. Getting what is due to a person is morally justified. One gets what one deserves. But against this position, it is argued that the circumstances in which a person is placed like his race, class, caste, sex are 'morally arbitrary' as they are not within his control and, therefore, they need to be considered while deciding what one should get. Birth is an accident, being born into a race, caste, class or sex is an accident. Given a chance everybody wants to be born in such a place where he is in an advantageous position. But he has legitimate claim over what he makes out from his talent, merit and hard work. In other words, competitive equality of opportunity justifies meritocracy on the ground of fairness and justice. It also implies that the objectives to be achieved are scarcer than the aspirants and there is open competition for scarce resources.
- Therefore, the question of who should get what and what should be the criteria for distribution arises. This is race like situation. All should have a chance to stand and run at the starting point, but only the person with ability will 'win' the race. Since the start point equality does not result in equality of outcome the equality debate becomes serious. Different positions are taken from ideological moral perspective.
- Though competitive equality is egalitarian in certain respects, criticism has come from radical egalitarians and' pluralists. It is argued that if one accepts, competitive equality of opportunity,

https://telegram.me/pdf4exams https://telegram.me/Pdf4Mains2019

the nontransferable natural endowments which are morally arbitrary and unjust, and over which man has no control decide the allocation of resources. But the supporters argue that the natural talents by themselves will not producer results. They need to be nourished and developed which involves hard labor, perseverance and determination sometimes a lifelong effort. For instance, a musician or a dancer charging a huge sum of money for a concert or a programme, a scientist drawing a big salary, a heart surgeon taking huge bill are all justifiable morally on the ground that they deserve the money that they are getting.

- For instance, suppose A and B born with almost the same level of talents, given the same education and training, this far they are equal. But A puts a lot of time and effort to develop his natural talent and earns more than B, and B remains where he was being lazy and lethargic. A and B in this case are given equal opportunity to get a position or office. A naturally succeeds and B fails. They are responsible for their condition. Inequality is created. There is a difference of opinion among egalitarians as to the moral justifiability of this form of inequality.

Criticism of Competitive Equality of Opportunity: Some have argued that 'equality of opportunity is incompatible with other forms of social justice; it has been widely contended that racial or sexual justice may be impossible' under this conceptualization. 'Reverse preference', similar to reservation for SC/ST and OBC in India are the case in point. But according to Llyod Thomas (1977), the ideas of 'compensatory justice' or 'positive discrimination' do not apply where competitive equality exists. There is a lot of live debates among the social scientists around the world as to the desirability of unqualified equality of opportunity.

6. (c) How does Gandhiji differentiate his notion of development from that of West? What role do ethics and spiritualism play in it?

- The Gandhian view of development is radically different from the Western model of development. It was based upon his metaphysical idealism with emphasis on the supremacy of ethical values and a moral approach to the problem of development. It was a plan of political, social and moral reconstruction and a critique of the Western model of development based essentially upon industrialization.

- Gandhi made a distinction between economic and real development. Real development, according to him, is moral. It is development in the pursuit of truth through love and non-violence. Economic development connotes the limited material advance. There have been different views on whether material development means real development or whether it comes into conflict with moral development. However, Gandhi's answer was very simple. He did not agree with the view that material development leads to moral development. Whereas an unlimited material progress did not mean moral or real development, material degeneration below a certain level can breed moral degeneration.

- He believed that material development beyond a given minimum was in conflict with moral progress. In other words, he favoured material development so long as it was morally justified and to the extent it helped to remove poverty. Seeking more than the minimum required was bad because greed destroyed human values like honesty, high thinking etc.

- Moreover, it demands increased production, which in turn results in exploitation, state control and centralism. For Gandhi economic policies which were harmful to the moral well-being of the individual of the nation were immoral and hence sinful. He did not measure development in terms of money simultaneously; Gandhi was equally emphatic that a minimum standard of living was necessary for the existence of an orderly society. Securing one's livelihood in a well-ordered society should be and is found to be the basic thing in the world.

https://telegram.me/pdf4exams https://telegram.me/Pdf4Mains2019

- However, by livelihood; he meant simple means of existence: Food, Clothing, Shelter and Education. His idea of development was not an increase in the number of millionaires but the absence of starvation. According to Gandhi, development is measured in terms of happiness and happiness is not only bodily welfare. Man could be really happy if he obeys moral laws. The search for material well-being that disregards moral conditions was contrary to the divine order. Thus the problem of material development versus moral or real development can be reduced to the problem of defining happiness and setting up a standard or an ideal for measuring the achievement of happiness.

- According to Gandhi, the root of happiness lies in spiritualism. The real development is the pursuit of truth because only this can lead to God and that is happiness. For this, only deliberate and voluntary reduction of wants or what he called 'voluntary poverty' could promote real happiness and contentment. People who continue the pursuit of wealth as their goal deviate from that ideal. Not only the religious scriptures but the entire history of human civilization bears testimony to the fact that the ideal form of development is moral and not material and that the standard of morality is nothing but the standard of truth.

- From economic point of view, development meant removal of extreme poverty. For this Gandhi favoured abolishing all social barriers so as to improve the material conditions and standard of life of the people. This could be achieved by increasing production as well as equitable distribution of national resources. For increasing production, Gandhi had strong reservations about industrialization and large scale mechanization. Industrialization is the outcome of man's greed for more and more profits. The machine by rendering men unemployed deprives them of livelihood; by reducing work to a mechanical performance, it derives out all creative instincts and destroy man's initiative.

- Also industrialization leads to centralization which in turn leads to exploitation of the village by the urban or the city centers. Hence the ideal system according to Gandhi is the village self-sufficiency and manufactures for use and not for trade. The goods to be produced and consumed should be concerned with basic necessities and there is hardly any room or justification for the production of modem luxuries and amenities. The village could use machine but it should not displace labour.

- He wanted the society to be active rather than industrialized. In this context, he propounded the theory of 'bread-labour', which implied that amount of physical labour which is required from each person to produce the necessities of life. That much labour time must be spent by everybody in physical labour. With regard to distribution, in his early writings Gandhi emphasized the concept of absolute equality. That is, no work or profession is superior or inferior to any other, a lawyer or scavenger should receive equal payment.

- However, later, he came round the view that beyond a minimum living wage which would ensure the worker a decent home, a balanced diet and sufficient Khadi to cloth himself with, differences could be permitted only on the basis of different needs.

- In short, Gandhi's view on development can be summed up as Social Equilibrium. A society which is too poor materially must progress towards this ideal by attempting to improve its material conditions. Conversely, a society which has superfluous wealth must renounce some of it in order to attain that stage. This social equilibrium can be attained through individual and social reformation, through various physical, mental and social rules, and improvement in the material progress through cottage industries, spinning wheel and village improvement. Development is a complex web of moral, social and material relationships.

- The moral basis of this development lies in Truth, Ahimsa, continence, non-possession, non-stealing, fearlessness, Swadeshi, bread-labour, toleration, faiths, vegetarianism, nature cure and simplicity in life. At special level, it means equality of women, removal of untouchability

https://telegram.me/pdf4exams https://telegram.me/Pdf4Mains2019

prohibition, education, communal harmony, equilibrium between city and village and lastly, the material basis of development lies in increasing wealth through village and cottage industries, decentralization of economic production, and redistribution of wealth between labour and capital through trusteeship.

7. (a) What are the major limitations and drawbacks of Ancient Indian Political Tradition?

Most of the above mentioned sources being religious in nature; it is very difficult to isolate facts of politics from it. Dharma sutras give an idealized picture of society and politics which hardly reflect the reality. Most of the scholars who have Indian political thought have taken the authority of these sources for granted although its time, place and authenticity are riddled with uncertainties.

Yet another difficulty is that most of the works on Indian political traditions were written during the nationalist movement with a purpose to counter the imperialist ideology of the Western scholars. The imperialist ideology was developed by some Western scholars who made an attempt to study the ancient Indian history. Their understanding of Indian history was based to assumptions. They are:

- The main intellectual preoccupation of ancient Indians was philosophy and it lacked in political or material speculations.
- The Indians never knew the feeling of nationality. The practical implications of these conclusions were dangerous to the demand of self-rule in India. They implied that the Indians were incapable of maintaining their material world and therefore, the British should manage it for them.
- The second implication was that since Indians had no sense of nationhood, it was in keeping with their traditions that they should be subjected to autocratic rule. Indian nationalist historians churned out a host of literature to counter the imperialist ideology. Bhagavanlal Inderjit Bhandarkar, R.L. Mitra, B.G. Tilak and Later K.P. Jayaswal, R.K. Majumdar, B.K. Sarkar came out with their own interpretation of Indian history to prove the falsification of imperialist ideology. They strongly argued that what was prevalent in ancient India was not autocratic rule, but limited monarchy.

Important limitations of this nationalist and revivalist approach to the study of Indian political thought.

- A fulsome adoration of ancient Hindu institutions, it tended to alienate the Muslims.
- The approach gives a false sense of past values.
- It glossed over the fact that, whether it was monarchy or republic, the two upper Varnas dominated the two lower Varnas who were generally excluded from all political offices.
- Many Indians fought shy of the religious aspects of ancient Indian polity and, as if to cover a sense of guilt, took too much pains to prove the secular character of the ancient Indian state. They little realized that even in the Western world, theocracy existed till the first half of the 18th century.
- In its zeal to prove itself a superior civilization, it hardly showed any interest in studying the ancient institutions in the light of the evolution of primitive tribes as known from anthropology

Apart from the above mentioned characteristics, Professor Bhikhu Parekh mentions some other distinguishing features of the Hindu political traditions. They are:

- The Hindu tradition is basically in-egalitarian. Although it developed the idea of the moral equality of all men, it never developed the social, legal and political groups.

https://telegram.me/pdf4exams https://telegram.me/Pdf4Mains2019

- The Hindu tradition of political thought is pluralistic in orientation. The Hindu political writers from the very beginning recognized the autonomy of social groups.
- Political thought in early India was largely uncritical and apologetic of the established social order. Most Hindu writers justified the caste system as the caste based conception of dharma, the largely fatalist concept of karma, the degradation of the Shudras and the slaves, the extensive moral interference of the state and so on.
- It ignored the whole area of social conflict. Many Hindu writers wrote mainly for the attention of the rulers.
- Their works are largely manuals of ethics or administration; hence, it is largely didactic and practical.

7. (b) Political mobilization through internet. Discuss.

- The Internet constitutes a new space for political mobilization. Mobilizing via the Internet can be extremely low-cost compared with other methods such as faceto-face or telephone contact, given that the marginal cost of sending one more e-mail or subscribing an additional person to a bulletin distribution list is practically zero. It also allows a very decentralized kind of mobilization because anyone with access to the Internet can send e-mails or write comments on online forums and websites to motivate people to vote for a certain candidate or to organize an action or activity. Thus, it is possible that the exposure to appeals to participate in a political activity increase in number – quantitative change – or vary in the type of sender or activity proposed – qualitative change – simply by having access to the Internet and, in particular, by being an e-mail user.
- Political mobilization is a fundamental element for understanding why some members of the public participate while others do not . It seems logical to suppose that the existence of a new, low-cost, decentralized medium of mobilization will result in a greater number of appeals to participate, which in turn might result in an increase in political participation. Therefore, online mobilization could be an explanatory factor as to why access to the Internet has a positive effect on participation. However, there are two relevant considerations that qualify this general proposition.
- First, the behavioural codes of the Internet make it unadvisable for the sender to contact unknown people via e-mail, given that this type of action is considered 'spam'. A political association which indiscriminately bombards the public with information or announcements may achieve the opposite result to that which it hopes for: that the recipients will develop a negative attitude towards it. Thus, according to Krueger, the Internet constitutes a special case, where the cost of mobilizing associations or individuals falls particularly on the recipient. A person has to subscribe to bulletins or distribution lists to receive political information from an association or has to visit certain web pages to read about planned events.
- Second, the hypothesis that greater mobilization leads to greater participation assumes that all types of mobilization are equally effective. However, we know that this is not the case: for example, face-to-face contact to encourage voting is more effective than other methods which are cheaper for the initiator of the communication, such as telephone, letter or e-mail.
- In this case, it is not evident that greater mobilization via the Internet leads to greater participation, given that it is possible that the sender of appeals for participation stops using more effective methods such as personal contact. In any case, there is very little empirical evidence on this question.

https://telegram.me/pdf4exams https://telegram.me/Pdf4Mains2019

- Mobilization in the virtual and real worlds may differ qualitatively in relation to the type of activity being promoted and the person who issues the request. It is possible that mobilization via the Internet is used more intensively for certain kinds of political activities and therefore the opportunities generated by requests to participate can be different from those offered offline. Recent research has shown that both social movements and traditional political organizations have intensified their task of mobilization, thanks to the use of the Internet. While the traditional players use it only as an extension of their traditional means of communication, non-conventional players are experimenting with more innovative kinds of political uses.
- On the other hand, the emergence of a medium which allows mass communication that is fast, cheap and decentralized has meant that many individuals have become prominent figures in an activity traditionally carried out by organizations. Anti-sweatshops' campaigns are a good example of the characteristics and power of this kind of mobilization. Anyone with access to e-mail can become a mobilizing agent by sending/forwarding e-mails or writing comments on websites, fora and blogs without the need for any more resources than the time they dedicate to it. This brings with it an immediate organizational capacity which can sometimes even lead to highly significant political events such as those seen in Spain in the days following the attacks of 11 March 2004.

7. (c) ***Globalization and Human rights share a deep yet paradoxical relationship. Analyse the reasons.***

In terms of the impact of globalization on human rights, two important dimensions/models can be discussed:

1. **The positive optimistic model:** The focus here is on how globalization might result in economic development and, hence, better protection of civil, political and economic rights. The assertion here is that globalization results in the creation of new opportunities for growth and development. This is the 'engine of development' model. David Lerner argued that multinational investment, as an engine of economic development, promotes economic rights through investment and job creation, and civil and political rights through the creation of a stable and tolerant environment. The positive relationship model also argues that nothing needs to be done by social actors to promote human rights. Rather, human rights will emerge as it were, as societies globalize. This is a reference to the trickle-down wealth creation model. Another dimension of the optimistic model draws the link between globalization and human rights, by highlighting the intervening variables between wealth and human rights. Globalization opens up markets. Markets are the basis of the liberal economic order. The liberal economic is the basis of democracy; and democracy is the basis of human rights.
2. **The negative model:** It focuses: on how globalization could result in 'under-development', 'de-development' and lesser protection of human rights. Critics of globalization posit an opposite model of the relationship between, globalization and human rights. Hence the argument being made is that globalization of capitalism may not result in globalization of democracy and civil, economic and political rights: Hence citizens are more likely to enjoy their human rights, if they live in a locally, rather than globally controlled environment.

The critics of globalization emphasize de-development, rather than wealth as vening variable between globalization and human rights. Joseph Stiglitz for example is critical of the way the International Monetary Fund (IMF) encourages 'hot money' investments, often disregarding then national economic goals. Scholars have argued that the trend of globalization, privatization and deregulation of the economy could be at the expense of social and economic rights of the citizens and hence could weaken human rights. Moreover, it is argued that the rapid globalization of markets increases the gap between the haves and the have not's, shields capital and disenfranchises the masses.

https://telegram.me/pdf4exams https://telegram.me/Pdf4Mains2019

Globalization's proponents and opponents tend to exaggerate their respective points of view. A wide-ranging approach is perhaps called for, recognizing the challenges and opportunities that globalization poses.

Some writers argue that as the world globalizes, no positive transformation of the human rights; situation of the people will occur without a social movement for those rights. This can be so even when all democratic and economic indicators are positive. Citizens in places now being reached by globalization do not have to wait for years; before attaining their rights. Globalization speeds up their access to the very notion and idea of rights. To expedite this process the global communications plays a critical role. Such a communications network enables the formation and promotion of global social movements taking up the cause of human rights. Global solidarity is a very important dimension of globalization.

THE GLOBALISATION OF HUMAN RIGHTS

Richard Falk has spoken of two trends in the, globalization process:

1. **Globalization-from-above**: This involves economic and political collaboration among state actors and, agents of capital formation such as financial and corporate agents-the World Bank, International Monetary Fund, transnational corporations, etc.: Such collaboration has led to the institutionalization of such policies and strategies which have impacted negatively on local peoples cultures and economies:

2. **'Globalization from below':** This refers to social, political and cultural collaboration among local, national and international agencies such as the United Nations and non-governmental organisation.

Both these levels of globalization are significant. Today international human rights and the phenomenon, of globalization have created an environment that puts pressure on states to respect constitutional rights and international human rights, both by state and private actors.

The globalization of human rights has been a revolutionary development in the contemporary times. Herbert Morais argues that 'the formidable body of international conventions and declarations can truly be said to have finally elevated individuals to the status of subjects of international law, whose human rights are entitled to full protection under both national and international law'. Such a globalized world has manifested itself in a variety of ways:

1. The Communist regimes in former Soviet Union and Eastern Europe have been replaced by democratic regimes, with respect for rule of law and human rights. These have paved the way for free market systems, leading to a greater recognition of the dignity and rights of individuals.

2. The rise of multinational corporations have given private economic actors the possibility to partake in the promotion of human rights through their investments and operations worldwide. This has also given rise to the rise of various human rights organizations.

3. Technological globalization, especially the internet; has' increased the power of human world over. This prevents states from concealing their human rights violations.

4. A major factor in the promotion of human rights the world over has been the emergence of human rights NGOs, like Amnesty International, Human Rights Watch, Doctors Without Borders, Asia Watch, etc.

David Held perceives human rights as the rights of individuals. Such a perception of Rights itself is contested by many Asian and African scholars, who emphasize the collective rights of individuals and their responsibilities; over individual human rights of western conventions. He argues that there would be less resistance to the discourse on human rights, if the developing world has a greater say in the farming and process of global governance. In this case, rights would no longer be

https://telegram.me/pdf4exams https://telegram.me/Pdf4Mains2019

perceived as a means of gaining socio-economic dominance, but they would rather have universal legitimacy. This is because the rights to health, welfare, freedom of cultural expression; freedom of association and information, right to participation in public deliberation and elections, etc. are rights which are of direct, concern to the Third World. Human rights cannot be taken as established and it calls for a democratic discussion and a cosmopolitan approach.

GLOBALISATION, STATE AND HUMAN RIGHTS

Globalization has resulted in the resurfacing of the debate surrounding the rights of peoples, minorities and related communities. This has resulted in new challenges to the human rights movement the world over. Globalization has lifted up a new historical moment in the conceptual development of human rights, viz. the opportunity to acknowledge collective human rights in addition to individual ones. The Vienna Declaration which was adopted on June 25, 1993 and later endorsed by the UN General Assembly highlighted a number of key issues/areas of relevance in this context: one, it promotes the interdependence of democracy, development and human rights; second, it supported the creation of new mechanisms to promote and protect the' rights of women, children and indigenous peoples; third, the Declaration made a strong case for the ratification of all international, human rights instruments; and finally, it called for the creation of a Commissioner-a High Commissioner for Human, Rights.

Although sovereignty may be eroding as states join international bodies and enter into international agreements and conventions, there are still questions about enforcement powers vis-a-vis human rights. Minimum international standards are required for the protection of human rights.

GLOBALISATION, THE RIGHT TO DEVELOPMENT AND THE HUMAN RIGHTS DEBATE

The right to development has been popularly perceived as a comprehensive economic, social, cultural and. political process, which aims at the constant, improvement of the well-being of the entire population. It is a situation in which all human rights and fundamental rights are fully realized. Development as a concept entered the human rights perspective through the debate over the right to development. The United Nations had as early as 1986 proposed the right to development. This Declaration defined development as an inalienable right by virtue of which every human person and all peoples are entitled to participate in, contribute to and enjoy economic, social, cultural and political development, in which human rights and fundamental freedoms can be fully realized.

Human rights ought to play a larger role in the process of development. The contemporary debate focuses on the nature of this role. Its importance has been brought out by Donnelly by referring to the United Nations Development programme's 'work on human development.

To quote: *Human rights and sustainable development are inextricably linked, only if development is defined to make this relationship reiterative. Sustainable human development simply redefines human rights, along with democracy, peace and justice as subsets of development.*

The practical implications of promoting rights in development can be perceived from the following perspectives:

- The need to launch independent national assessments of human rights.
- To align national laws with international human rights standards- and commitments.
- To promote human rights norms.
- To strengthen a network of human rights organisation.
- To promote a rights-based-enabling economic development.

Hence sustainable development is an inalienable human right by virtue of which every human person and all peoples are entitled to participate in, contribute to, and enjoy economic, social, cultural and political development, in which all human rights and fundamental freedoms can be

https://telegram.me/pdf4exams https://telegram.me/Pdf4Mains2019

fully realized. Since the 1990's human rights has come to be linked to the good governance agenda. The World Bank in one of its important reports brings this out by declaring that, "by helping to fight corruption, improve transparency and accountability in governance, strengthen judicial systems and modernize financial sectors, the bank contributes to building environments in which people are better able to pursue broader range of human rights."

8. (a) Ambedkar's criticism of Marxism in Indian Context

Where Ambedkar agreed with Marxists

- The achievements of the Soviet Union exercised a powerful attraction for Ambedkar. This lasted through much of the 1940s with Ambedkar calling for nationalization of land and basic industries for some time calling himself a state socialist. Ambedkar like some communists felt that State Socialism was necessary for the rapid industrialization of India. Private enterprise cannot do it, and if it did it would produce those inequalities of wealth which private capitalism has produced in Europe and which should be a warning to Indians. He accepted that class and exploitation was a result of property, but took a far more conservative stand on the abolition of private property.

- Ambedkar in the 1930s lead the anti-landlord struggles in the Konkan and fights of textile workers in Bombay- in both cases uniting with caste Hindus and also sharing a platform with communists. During the same time there was for a brief period a coming together of the socialists, communists and Dalits under the banner of the Samyukta Maharashtra Samiti. Themes that they united on were land reforms and peasant rights. Where he broke with the Marxists was over issues of caste and religion.

- Though Ambedkar saw Buddhism as an alternative to Marxism, he ironically posed Marxist questions. His words echoed his interpretation of Marx's famous saying in the Theses of Feuerbach, 'Philosophers have only interpreted the world differently; the point however is to change it.' In his essay on 'Buddha or Karl Marx' Ambedkar had rephrased this as 'The function of philosophy is to reconstruct the world and not to waste its time in explaining the origin of the world.' He used Marxian ideas to formulate the problems but used Buddhist mans and methods to achieve these ends.

- Ambedkar saw the Sangha as the ideal Communist society wherein there a was democratic, communistic sharing of property, where status was in terms of seniority, not in terms of birth or social status or of any presumed 'merit' of knowledge.

Ambedkar's criticism of Marxism in Indian Context

- Ambedkar pointed out how the class system had an "open-door character", whereas castes were "self-enclosed units". He gave a brilliant explanation of caste's forced endogamy: "Some closed the door: others found it closed against them." The image throws up a phenomenon opposite to the Kafkan idea of law: the (Hindu) gatekeeper of law, in Ambedkar's explanation, is also the lawgiver, and he allows entry by birth, but no exit. Once entry has been secured in Hindu society, as Ambedkar argued, everyone who is not a Brahmin is an other. Hinduism is a uniquely self-othering social system, whose (touchable) norms are secured by declaring a brutal exception: untouchability.

- In his comparison of Buddha and Marx, Ambedkar bypasses Marx's idea of private property and keeps out the question of capital ownership. He also does not complicate the relation between 'law' and 'government'. These appear to be limitations of the historical conjuncture of Dalit politics. But Ambedkar finds the materialist and non-violent character of Buddhism to be evoking another thinkable historical version of a Marxist society.

https://telegram.me/pdf4exams https://telegram.me/Pdf4Mains2019

- Some critics in the Indian Left see the Dalit movement as being merely a 'politics of recognition' and having no revolutionary potential. It is a shallow view of the movement against segregated exploitation that seeks to penetrate entrenched hegemony. The politics against untouchability demands more than good wages and working conditions: it asks for a reconfiguration of the socio-cultural space and the elimination of a violated and untouchable 'bare life'.
- Ambedkar had warned that the Indian socialist would have to "take account of caste after the revolution, if he does not take account of it before the revolution".
- Ambedkar was disillusioned by the Marxists as they had been rather unreceptive about the Poona Pact, which was to deal with the issues of the Dalits. EMS Namboodiripad's comment in his History of the Indian Freedom Struggle makes this clear: 'However this was a great blow to the freedom movement, for this lead to the diversion of the people's attention from the objective of full independence to the mundane cause of the upliftment of Harijans.'
- The indifference to caste by the communists becomes a central lacuna at a time when Marxism was penetrating India as a powerful ideology. This lack of attention to caste can be seen in the following ways: as a failure to press the issue in the workers' and peasants' organizations within which they worked; as a failure to form any separate organization or front to represent Dalits or take up struggles on caste issues (ironically the Gandhian and Hindu fundamentalists did have these) and as a failure to mention programmes for untouchability and caste issues in the political programmes of the Communist Party or other front parties. It was not until the second congress of the CPI in 1948 that the issue was taken up in detail.
- The communists' fight for untouchable rights proposed a confrontation with Ambedkar, denouncing him as 'separatists' 'opportunistic' and 'pro-British'. It also treated caste prejudice as 'bourgeois divisiveness', it made no effort to go into the specificity of caste exploitation and asked untouchables to join the 'democratic revolution' (of which they were a 'reverse force' not the main force).
- Also what bothered Ambedkar about the Marxists in India were their upper caste origins. He felt that their caste-status made them unwilling to look at forms of exploitation which questioned their male, upper-caste interests and also that they were incapable of handling caste or other 'non-class' contradictions.
- Ambedkar believed that a science of historical materialism, which Marx had initiated was not capable of handling 'non-class' factors such as caste and patriarchy. 'The class category provided a marvellous tool for Indian Marxists to interpret what they saw around them within one grand framework of a theory of exploitation and liberation, but at the same time blinding them to other factors in their environment, so that instead of being inspired by the multifaceted struggles of low caste peasants and workers to develop their own theory and practice, they instead sought to narrow these struggles and confine them within a 'class' framework.' (Omvedt 1994:184)
- Marxism downplayed non-economic factors such as gender and caste arguing that these could be taken care of with the socialist revolution and Ambedkar disagreed with the undue importance that Marxists gave to the economic sector also he believed that many of Marx's these like the economic interpretation of history, the inevitability of revolution and the pauperization of the proletariat were not entirely true.
- To him the effect of the Marxists on the social movements of Dalits was to pull them away from solutions that were socio-cultural in nature. Thus Ambedkar turned upside down the Marxian concept of base-superstructure. He believed that property was not the only source of power, religion and social status too could generate power and felt India needed a social-

https://telegram.me/pdf4exams https://telegram.me/Pdf4Mains2019

religious revolution rather than an economic one. He believed that if caste was annihilated the economic base would automatically change. Buddhism he stressed was an all-round alternative to Marxism, capable of solving the problems of conflict and suffering as Marxism could not.

- Ambedkar did not agree with the Marxian concept of the 'Withering away of the State' as he felt that this had not happened in any communist society and was unlikely to happen. He also felt that the communists were unable to give a satisfactory answer to what would take the place of the State if it did wither away. He feels the building up of the Communist State is a useless effort. If it cannot be sustained except by force and if it results in anarchy when the force holding it together is withdrawn what good is the Communist State? He therefore avers that, the only thing which could sustain it after force is withdrawn is Religion. He observes: "But to the Communists, Religion is anathema. Their hatred to Religion is so deep seated that they will not even discriminate between religions which are helpful to Communism and religions which are not. The Communists have carried their hatred of Christianity to Buddhism without waiting to examine the difference between the two." [Buddha and His Dharma]
- Also Ambedkar had problems with the idea of the dictatorship of the proletariat that the Marxists proposed as he felt that any sort of dictatorship was violent and undemocratic. He felt that the communists did not recognize the fact that the Buddha had established communism within the Sangha without any force or violence.
- He agreed with Marx that there was a need to reconstruct the world so as to make it more beneficial to the marginalized and bring about equity. But he argued that this need not be done through force and violence which the Communist's used, as the strikes and actions they prompted were often to the detriment of the weakest sections of society. Ambedkar felt that though Marxism spoke of collective ownership what occurred in practice was actually state ownership where the dominant nationalist party replaced the class party with claims to represent the oppressed masses.
- He believed that the world could be reconstructed effectively through non-violent means, through the Buddhist Dhamma and Sangha.
- Marxists criticized Ambedkar as being 'petty bourgeois', identifying the idealism (return to religion) and reformism presumed to be implicit in his theory with a kind of backward 'peasantist' consciousness; this has invariably been the response of even the most favourable left assessments.

8. (b) Discuss the major aspects of Post-Colonial feminism.

Postcolonial feminism is a relatively new stream of thought, developing primarily out of the work of the postcolonial theorists who concern themselves with evaluating how different colonial and imperial relations throughout the nineteenth century have impacted the way particular cultures view themselves. This particular strain of feminism promotes a wider viewpoint of the complex layers of oppression that exist within any given society.

Postcolonial feminism began simply as a critique of both Western feminism and postcolonial theory, but later became a burgeoning method of analysis to address key issues within both fields. Unlike mainstream postcolonial theory, which focuses on the lingering impacts that colonialism has had on the current economic and political institutions of countries, postcolonial feminist theorists are interested in analyzing why postcolonial theory fails to address issues of gender. Postcolonial feminism also seeks to illuminate the tendency of Western feminist thought to apply its claims to women around the world because the scope of feminist theory is limited. In this way, postcolonial feminism attempts to account for perceived weaknesses within both postcolonial theory and within Western

https://telegram.me/pdf4exams https://telegram.me/Pdf4Mains2019

feminism. The concept of colonization occupies many different spaces within postcolonial feminist theory; it can refer to the literal act of acquiring lands or to forms of social, discursive, political, and economic enslavement in a society.

In **AudreLorde'**s foundational essay, "The Master's Tools Will Never Dismantle the Master's House", Lorde uses the metaphor of "the master's tools" and "the master's house" to explain that western feminism is failing to make positive change for third world women by using the same tools used by the patriarchy to oppress women. Lorde found that western feminist literature denied differences between women and discouraged embracing them. The differences between women, Lorde asserts, should be used as strengths to create a community in which women use their different strengths to support each other.

Chandra Talpade Mohanty, a principal theorist within the movement, addresses this issue in her seminal essay "Under Western Eyes". In this essay, Mohanty asserts that Western feminists write about Third World women as a composite, singular construction that is arbitrary and limiting. She states that these women are depicted in writings as victims of masculine control and of traditional culture without incorporating information about historical context and cultural differences with the Third World. This creates a dynamic where Western feminism functions as the norm against which the situation in the developing world is evaluated. Mohanty's primary initiative is to allow Third World women to have agency and voice within the feminist realm.

In the article "Third World Women and the Inadequacies of Western Feminism", Ethel Crowley, writes about how western feminism is lacking when applied to non-western societies. She accuses western feminists of theoretical reductionism when it comes to Third World women. Her major problem with western feminism is that it spends too much time in ideological "nit-picking" instead of formulating strategies to redress the highlighted problems. The most prominent point that Crowley makes in her article is that ethnography can be essential to problem solving, and that freedom does not mean the same thing to all the women of the world.

Relationship to Western feminisms

Postcolonial feminism began as a criticism of the failure of Western feminism to cope with the complexity of postcolonial feminist issues as represented in Third World feminist movements. Postcolonial feminists seek to incorporate the struggle of women in the global South into the wider feminist movement. Western feminists and feminists outside of the West also often differ in terms of race and religion, which is not acknowledged in Western feminism and can cause other differences. Western feminism tends to ignore or deny these differences, which discursively forces Third World women to exist within the world of Western women and their oppression to be ranked on an ethnocentric Western scale

Postcolonial feminists do not agree that women are a universal group and reject the idea of a global sisterhood. Thus, the examination of what truly binds women together is necessary in order to understand the goals of the feminist movements and the similarities and differences in the struggles of women worldwide. The aim of the postcolonial feminist critique to traditional Western feminism is to strive to understand the simultaneous engagement in more than one distinct but intertwined emancipatory battle.

This is significant because feminist discourses are critical and liberatory in intent and are not thereby exempt from inscription in their internal power relations. The hope of postcolonial feminists is that the wider feminist movement will incorporate these vast arrays of theories which are aimed at reaching a cultural perspective beyond the Western world by acknowledging the individual experiences of women around the world. Ali Suki highlights the lack of representation of women of color in feminist scholarship comparing the weight of whiteness similar to the weight of masculinities. This issue is not due to a shortage of scholarly work in the global South but a lack of recognition and circulation. This reinforces Western hegemony and supports the claim of outweighed representation of white, Western scholars. Most available feminist literature regarding the global South tends to be written by Western theorists resulting in the whitewashing of histories.

https://telegram.me/pdf4exams https://telegram.me/Pdf4Mains2019

Feminist postcolonial theorists are not always unified in their reactions to postcolonial theory and Western feminism, but as a whole, these theorists have significantly weakened the bounds of mainstream feminism. The intent of postcolonial feminism is to reduce homogenizing language coupled with an overall strategy to incorporate all women into the theoretical milieu. While efforts are made to eliminate the idea of the Third World "other", a Western Eurocentric feminist framework often presents the "other" as victim to their culture and traditions. **Brina Bose** highlights the ongoing process of "alienation and alliance" from other theorists in regards to postcolonial feminism; she emphasizes, "...the obvious danger both in 'speaking for' the silent/silenced as well as in searching for retaliatory power in elusive connections..." There is a tendency throughout many different academic fields and policy strategies to use Western models of societies as a framework for the rest of the world. This critique is supported in other scholarly work including that of **Sushmita Chatterje**e who describes the complications of adding feminism as a "Western ideological construct to save brown women from their inherently oppressive cultural patriarchy.

8. (c) What are the feminist complains against the concept of participatory democracy?

Feminist Critique of Participatory Democracy

- From feminist perspectives two key problems with participatory democracy are tits failure to recognize the additional burdens on women's time, and its emphasis on the workplace as the most important site of increased participation. If men have trouble getting round to all of those meetings, then what about the democratic women? Every society defines women as the carers those ultimately responsible for looking after the young and the sick, not to mention their able bodied husbands. The available time left over for meetings will not amount to much.

- The other central complaint relates to the importance attached to paid work. Participatory democracy rejects the conventional distinction between public and private spheres and seek to extend the scope of democracy by embracing worker self-management, worker cooperatives, democratic decision making at work, in doing so, however they reflect a perennial masculine bias. Most men will hope to work full time through the majority of their adult years and will see their identities in that spirit. Most women, by contrast have a more broken and distanced relationship to their place of work.

- Even with the extraordinary increase in female wage employment since the Second World War, women have to take time off work to have babies, frequently return to employment on a part-time basis and almost invariably have to juggle their time between their paid and unpaid employment. In recent decades the workplace has become considerably more significant in defining and directing women's lives, but women's relationship to work remains profoundly different from men's. They may experience their harshest subordination not at work but at home, while the time they can devote to worker self-management will be severely constrained.

- The individual can at least pretend to be sexually neutral, but one who gives it a moment of thought would say the same is true about work. Men and women have a different relationship to work, and a different relationship to time, and no version democracy that rests its case on increased participation at work can be neutral between women and men. As Carole Pateman notes, the debate between liberal and radical democrats has revolved endlessly around one particular notion of public and private, concentrating on whether the economy and workplace are private or public and whether democracy in the workplace is feasible or desirable. Neither of the opposing positions deals with women's lives.

❖❖❖❖❖