INTRODUCTION TO POLITICAL THEORY

Ameya Ambulkar

INTRODUCTION TO POLITICAL THEORY

INTRODUCTION TO
POLITICAL THEORY

Ameya Ambulkar

CONTENTS

<div align="center">

CHAPTER 1

**EXPLORING THE FOUNDATIONS OF POLITICS: UNDERSTANDING
POWER, LEGITIMACY AND THE MODERN NATION STATE**

</div>

<div align="center">

Ameya Ambulkar, Assistant Professor

Department of ISME, ATLAS SkillTech University, Mumbai, Maharashtra, India

Email Id- ameya.ambulkar@atlasuniversity.edu.in

</div>

ABSTRACT:

This paper major goal is to help students comprehend the meaning of the word "political." The pursuit of an order that men deem to be good is at the heart of politics. The word "politics" comes from the Greek word "polis," which also means "city" and "state." The ancient Greeks' approach to politics represented a new way of feeling, thinking, and, most importantly, relating to one's fellow citizens. Even if the people' statuses varied in terms of their money, knowledge, etc., they were all on an equal footing as citizens. The idea of politics is what instills reason in the populace. The activity that is unique to this new entity called a citizen is politics. Politics may be studied scientifically because, despite its dependence on human nature from which it derives, politics exhibits predictable patterns. It is possible to agree that comprehending politics entails comprehending the requirements, purposes, and aspirations of human existence. It has to do with how people conduct their politics. Power is the goal of politics. This game is being played simultaneously by several people, who are competing with one another. Since it occurs inside the state in national affairs and among the states in international affairs, the state serves as the focal point of the whole activity. This introductory unit of the first block of the new Bachelor's degree-level course in political theory informs you of the principles of the study of political science as well as the meaning of politics in general. This chapter defines politics, defines what a state is, describes and explains the idea of power, and discusses legitimation and delegitimization.

KEYWORDS:

Legitimacy, Modern Nation State, Politics, Political Science, Power.

<div align="center">

INTRODUCTION

</div>

Greek political studies focused on constitutions and developed generalizations about the connections between political affiliations and human nature. The notion of recurring cycles was perhaps its strongest element. Tyranny often results from monarchies, which are then overthrown by aristocracies, which then degenerate into oligarchies that exploit the populace, which are then overthrown by democracies, which in turn degenerate into the intolerable instability of mob rule, whereupon some strongman establishes himself as a monarch and the cycle starts all over again. According to Aristotle, a polity what he refers to as the ideal kind of balanced constitution must have some aspect of democracy. He studied a variety of constitutions and had a keen interest in how politics worked. He believed that demands for equality were the driving force behind all revolutions. The best illustration of politics as a human activity with offices that clearly restrict the use of power is ancient Rome. Romans used two phrases to emphasize a crucial difference when thinking about power.

A Practical Activity Is Politics

Politics is a practical activity that involves discussion and conflict about how to best organize human potential. It is thus a matter of power, or more specifically, the ability of social actors, organizations, and institutions to preserve or alter their physical and social environments. It

concerns the resources that support this capability as well as the factors that shape and sway how it is used. As a result, politics is a phenomenon that affects both public and private life and is present in all organizations, institutions, and communities. All relationships, institutions, and structures involved in the creation and continuation of societal life reflect it. Every part of our lives is shaped by politics, which is also essential to the emergence of societal issues and the methods used to address them [1], [2].

Uncertain Definition of Politics

It is hard to provide a concise definition of politics that encompasses all we automatically classify as political. The word "politics" has several meanings and applications. The closest we can get to a succinct definition of politics is that it is the process by which organizations come to legally binding decisions by working to resolve conflicts among their members. This definition contains important details.

Politics's nature

Politics is a group activity that involves participants who recognise or at least accept a shared destiny. Robinson Crusoe was unable to engage in politics as a result. Politics assumes an initial plurality of viewpoints, if not about the ends themselves, then at least regarding the methods. If everyone always agreed, politics would be unnecessary. Politics entails bridging these gulfs via dialogue and persuasion. Politics consequently revolves upon communication. Political choices become the group's official policy, obliging members to follow orders that may, in certain cases, be enforced by physical force. If choices are only made via the use of violence, force, or threat, it is unlikely that politics will exist since the process of achieving a consensus will be undermined.

The communal nature of human existence leads to the requirement of politics. We live in a community where choices about how to share resources, interact with other groups, and make plans for the future must be made collectively. A family debating where to go on vacation, a nation choosing to go to war, or the planet trying to reduce environmental harm are instances of groups trying to make choices that will impact all of its members. We must practise politics because we are social animals and have no other option.

Politics: An Unavoidable Aspect of Human Nature

Therefore, despite the fact that the word "politics" is often used cynically to disparage the pursuit of private gain while posing as an interest in the public good, politics is in reality an unavoidable aspect of the human condition. In fact, according to the Greek philosopher Aristotle, "man is by nature a political animal." He didn't simply mean that politics are inevitable; he meant that they are the fundamental human activity. Political participation is what most clearly distinguishes humans from other animals. According to Aristotle, involvement in a political society is the only way for individuals to demonstrate their actual nature as morally upright, rational creatures. Rarely, if ever, do group members first agree on the best course of action. Even if the aims are shared, there may still be disagreements on the methods. However, a choice must be taken, and once it is, everyone in the group will be bound by it. Politics is thus the process through which a variety of viewpoints may be presented and then incorporated into a final conclusion. Politics is comprised of public choice, as Shively observes, "Political action may be interpreted as a way to work out rationally the best common solution to a common problem - or at least a way to work out a reasonable common solution."

Since everyone is familiar with the definition of "politics," some may even find the inquiry unnecessary. What one reads about or sees on television is what is referred to as "politics." It focuses on the actions of politicians, particularly those of political party leaders. What is the purpose of politics? What exactly makes these actions "political" and what is the definition of politics? If one begins with a definition that frames political activity, one may claim that politics is concerned with the power struggles among politicians. The majority of individuals would undoubtedly agree with this definition. Also, likely to be agreed upon is the definition of politics as the interstate interactions on a global scale. Despite the statement that "politics is about power and how it is distributed," power is not an intangible concept. It is embodied in people. Power is a connection that exists whenever someone can force someone else to do anything against their will. As a result, a situation characterized by leadership, dominance, and submission occurs. In the opening of his renowned 1918 lecture, "Politics as a Vocation," Max Weber argued that the term "politics" was "extremely broad-based and comprises any kind of independent leadership in action."

Politics is present wherever such independent leadership in action occurs. According to our definition, political refers to any circumstance in which there are power dynamics, i.e., when individuals are restrained, controlled, or otherwise subject to authority. It would also include circumstances when individuals were restrained by a system of institutions or organizations rather than by their own free choice. A wide definition of politics has the benefit of demonstrating that it is not always a topic of government or always concerned with the actions of politicians. Politics may be found whenever there is a structure of power and a battle to obtain or hold positions of authority. In this sense, one might discuss "university politics" or the politics of labour unions. 'Sexual politics' refers to the dominance of males over women or efforts to change this relationship [3], [4]. However, in a more constrained sense, everything is politics, which has an impact on our lives via the agency of those who wield and manage state authority as well as the goals for which they do so. After initially providing a very broad definition of politics in terms of general leadership in the lecture cited above, Weber went on to provide a much more specific definition: "We wish to understand by politics," he wrote, "only the leadership, or the influencing of leadership, of a political association, hence today, of a state." According to this viewpoint, the state serves as the primary political organization. A political issue is one that has to do with the state, who possesses state power, how that authority is used, the implications of that usage, etc.

DISCUSSION

Here, a new problem arises: what is state? There isn't a consensus on the proper response, and the issue is by no means simple to answer. The state exists in a variety of forms, each of which differs significantly from the others. The contemporary nationstate, which has dominated global politics since the French Revolution, is obviously distinct from the Greek city-state. The modern liberal-democratic state that prevails in Western Europe and Britain contrasts with the fascist regimes of Hitler and Mussolini. Additionally, it differs from the states that were present in Eastern Europe and the former USSR. The definition of such concepts is crucial to understanding politics and is unquestionably a key component of this work. The objective is to demonstrate how each form differs from the others and the importance of those differences.

State: Political institutions and social context-related differences

States vary from one another in terms of their political structures as well as the social environments that they aim to preserve. In contrast, the fascist state is ruled by the head of state and lacks representational institutions like a parliament and an independent judiciary.

The key distinction between Western and Soviet-style systems in terms of the social context is the former's incorporation into a society structured in accordance with the principles of a capitalist economy, as opposed to the latter's ownership and control of society's productive resources by the state. Because each state is so uniquely constituted and acts within a highly distinct social context, the nature of the state and the objectives it serves are significantly impacted by these differences. The state may take many various forms, but regardless of the shape one has in mind, the state itself is not a solid block. First of all, the state is distinct from the government. The government is only one of many different components that make up this complex. In a liberal-democratic state modelled after the West, people in power really create the government. In order to hold sway over the state's power structures, they assume official positions and speak in the state's name. To adapt the metaphor, the government inhabits one of the numerous mansions that make up the state's residence.

Views of State by Ralph Miliband

Ralph Miliband lists these several components, which collectively make up the state, in his book The State in Capitalist Society. The government is the primary, but by no means the only, component of the state machinery. The second is the administrative component, sometimes known as the government or bureaucracy. In liberal-democratic regimes, this administrative executive is meant to be impartial and execute the directives of the elected officials in charge. However, the bureaucracy may really possess its own authority and be able to exercise its own power. The military and police, the state's "order-maintaining" or repressive arm, are listed third and fourth, respectively, on Miliband's list. Any constitutional system must include an independent court that can serve as a check on those in positions of authority. The local government is the fifth component. These organizations in various federal systems are in charge of their own areas of authority, free from interference from the central government, and they enjoy a high degree of autonomy from it. As evidenced by the debate in British politics over the elimination of the Greater London Council and the metropolitan counties, the disagreement over how to pay for local government, "rate capping," and other related topics, the relationship between the central and local governments may emerge as a significant political issue. The parliament under the British system and representative assemblies might be included as the sixth and last item on the list. Political parties may also be brought up, however they typically do not function as a component of the governmental infrastructure, at least not in a liberal democracy. They perform their obvious function in the representative legislature, where the competitive struggle between the administration and the opposition is, at least in part, played out [2], [5].

Various State Forms

The nation state is known as the contemporary state. A historical process that dates back thousands of years has led to the state's current nature. It involves the interaction of many different elements, including political awareness, kinship, conflict, property, and technical advancements. Tribal State, Oriental Empire, Greek City State, Roman World Empire, Feudal State, and Modern Nation State are some of the shapes that states have taken throughout history. Following the 1648 signing of the Treaty of Westphalia, the modern nation state emerged. It caused the creation of territorial states that consolidated political power inside a certain region while separating internal affairs from exterior ones. The creation of the modern nation state, as well as the development of international law, the legal equality of nations, and contemporary theories of sovereignty, were all made possible by the division of the globe into different entities, each with its own national identity. The rise of nation states was further aided by the American and French revolutions.

Liberal and Marxist viewpoints are dominant in the contemporary understanding of state. The liberal viewpoint is flexible because it has evolved through time in response to societal requirements and individual preferences. Early liberals had a poor opinion of the state since they favoured not meddling in people's personal affairs. However, the welfare state, which aims to balance individual liberty with social good, is linked with 20th-century liberalism. The Marxist view opposes the liberal conception of the state, characterizing it as a tool of class, and wants to create a society devoid of both classes and states via a proletariat revolution. But after the Russian Revolution, there was no longer a classless, stateless society in Russia, and throughout the Soviet era, we saw the concentration of power in the hands of a small number of people. Liberal and radical feminist viewpoints on state may be primarily regarded from two angles. According to liberal feminists, the government may help achieve gender equality by implementing measures such as increasing the number of women in parliament and expanding social programmes to include women. Radicals, on the other hand, see the state as a tool of power and attribute women's undervalued standing in society to the uneven division of labour inside families. So they challenge the liberal thesis that the state is unbiased and impartial.

The discussion returns to Weber's previously cited lecture, "Politics as a Vocation." After stating that the state, which is the primary political association, is the primary focus of politics, Weber went on to claim that the state cannot be defined in terms of the tasks or goals it pursues.

There was no single duty that decided the state. As a result, the state had to be defined in terms of the particular tools it used, which ultimately consisted of physical force. "A human community that successfully claims the monopoly of the legitimate use of physical force within a given territory" is what Weber defined as the state. Here, three independent components are combined: the state's authority over a certain territory, or geographic region; the use of physical force to uphold that control; and thirdly, and perhaps most significantly, the exclusive right to employ such force or coercion. The majority, if not all, of people who are under the authority of the state, must recognize its legitimacy. The idea that each state exists within a certain social context was also highlighted by Weber, who came to the conclusion that politics for him meant "striving to share power or striving to influence the distribution of power either among states or among groups within a state."

The interaction between the state and society is a key topic in political studies. A state-centered view of politics does not entail that its investigation should disregard what occurs in society at large and how it could, in Weber's words, "influence the distribution of power." The ongoing expansion and consolidation of governmental authority is a further truth that cannot be disregarded. If the state is seen as a highly developed instrument of dominance, then the expansion of its scope and power has been a defining feature of modern history. The contemporary state needs an ever-more-complex bureaucracy to handle a widening range of responsibilities. It requires more sophisticated and powerful armed forces, more regulated welfare organizations, and a broader variety of activities than was the case before. Both liberal-democratic systems in their capitalist socioeconomic setting and socialist systems with their communal economic framework are subject to this expansion of the state's power and its growth and development. According to Weber, this rise was most clearly shown by the establishment of a competent, trained, and logically effective bureaucracy.

Marx, a person with a very distinct political and theoretical background, agreed with him on this. Marx discussed the expansion of governmental authority in France, which he considered as representative of the contemporary state, in the Eighteenth Brumaire of Louis Bonaparte. He explained how socialism will finally lead to the end of the state and the emergence of self-

governing societies free from specialist repressive machinery. On the other hand, Weber thought that socialism would need even more administrators to run a collectivized economy and society [6], [7].

A Rightful Use of Power

The key is that although force is necessary for the state, it is not its only foundation. The idea of using power lawfully enters the picture at this point. Power may be used in a variety of ways, including the state's power in general. Although it may be the most straightforward to comprehend, coercion is simply one kind of power. Not all power interactions should be analysed using the same simplistic methodology. A lecturer who, by using persuasive reasoning and a depth of knowledge, aids students in developing their views is in a position of authority, yet not against the will of the pupils. More importantly, all individuals in positions of authority work to convince those who are under their control that their authority is morally and legally justifiable.

The process of legitimation is being attempted with this reason in an effort to gain support. To contrast it from powers that are followed only out of fear of penalties, one might refer to such justified or acknowledged power as "authority." People submit to legitimate authority in these circumstances because they believe it is morally correct to do so. For whatever reason, they think the people in positions of authority should be allowed to maintain their dominance. They have the right to command and lawful power. According to a modern power analyst, legitimate authority is a power relationship in which the power holder has a recognised right to command and the power subject has a recognized duty to follow.

Weber, Max, on Legitimation

Weber asserts that there are three different sorts of legitimation, or different ways to defend the exercise of authority. The first kind relates to conventional dominance. There, the use of power is justified by the use of custom and habit; power has always been vested in the individuals or families in question.

The second kind of legitimation is charismatic. People submit to the authority figure because of the leader's remarkable character traits. The legal-rational kind is the third and final type. People follow certain people when they are given the go-ahead to govern in clearly defined domains by particular laws. Another way to put it is that the legal-rational type has a procedural quality, while the first two kinds are of a personal nature. It fits the contemporary idea of political authority as a result. It is dominance as 'executed by the modern'servant of the state' and by all those carriers of authority who in this sense resemble him,' as Weber puts it.

It goes without saying that those in positions of power will want their authority to be seen as genuine. From their perspective, such acceptance would allow for a significant "economy" in the use of force. People will comply willingly and freely. The instruments of coercion may thus be focused on individuals who do not recognize the legitimacy of the power structure rather than having to be continuously demonstrated.

There will always be those who follow the rules in every political system because breaking them would result in punishment. However, it is obvious that the degree to which people willingly follow the rules or regulations because they recognize the legitimacy of the existing order enhances the stability of any democratic system. As a result, they respect the legitimacy of directives given by individuals with authority under the law. In truth, a mix of compulsion and agreement keeps all political institutions in place.

Legitimation: Political Science's primary concern

These are the causes, in C. Wright Mills' words, "The idea of legitimation is one of the central conceptions of political science," of why it is so important. The strategies used by those in positions of power to defend their positions, as well as the degree to which they are successful, are at the heart of the study of politics. Any political system must be thoroughly studied in order to determine how much of the power structure is based on force rather than agreement, and how much of it is accepted as legitimate by the populace. In other words, the means by which a system of power is legitimised, it is crucial to identify the real justifications of authority that are presented. The 'political formula' of every political system is thus, as the elitist theorist Mosca notes. Furthermore, the legitimacy issue is crucial when discussing the themes of political system stability and transformation. A person's consent may be given or revoked. It is true that political regimes may continue to function even when sizable portions of the populace no longer see them as legitimate. One may use the example of South Africa or Poland, where it seemed that the Jaruzelski administration had little support from a sizable portion of the populace. The key argument is that a dictatorship in this scenario must depend heavily on force. It subsequently finds itself in a more fragile situation, exposed to the effects of chance happenings. The system may last for a long period. One need for a revolutionary transformation, nevertheless, emerges once it relies on force rather than agreement.

'Delegitimation' process

This explains why a period of prolonged opposition to the dominant ideals of the system generally precedes a revolution. This might be referred to as a "delegitimation" process when the concepts that support the current system of power are contested. The notions of Divine Right and autocracy were mocked and debunked by philosophers and other opponents of the absolute state long before the old French system was overthrown. Such a delegitimization effort helped to weaken the underpinnings of the previous regime. It paved the ground for its downfall via revolution. A contemporary example of this would be what happened to the Weimar Republic, when sizable portions of the German populace lost faith in the democratic system and supported Hitler's National-Socialist party out of fear of a communist alternative. The outcome was the swift and painless demise of the republic. All around the European Continent, comparable causes produced similar results.

As was the case in Italy, Spain, Austria, and Hungary, many liberal democratic systems in the west were destroyed and replaced by fascist or semi-fascist authoritarian regimes. The basic conclusion must be that every system loses its stability once it is no longer seen as legitimate by its people. Finally, it should be remembered that political systems will always undergo cycles of legitimation and delegitimization. Through the many routes available for the legitimation of the present system, the legitimation process is carried out in more or less subtle ways. Legitimizing concepts are ingested from the very beginning of schooling, disseminated via a range of social interactions, and propagated particularly through the impact of the newspaper, television, and other mass media. Readers, listeners, and viewers are essentially coerced into accepting or accepting views that are deemed acceptable within the framework of the system. Beyond certain bounds, an action is described as being illegal. Being made to seem really ugly eliminates a number of political options [6], [8].

Controlled Consent

Subversive notions may still be avoided entirely by using yet more potent techniques. They could be stopped at the source, which is the conscious or even subconscious mind. The ability to influence and shape people's awareness such that they accept the current situation without

ever being aware of other options is a crucial aspect of power. Therefore, consent is now twisted consent. We are all impacted by the current "climate of opinion" to some level. From then, a descending scale leads to a situation where the state makes the purposeful decision to manipulate people's brains in order to foster a single, widespread mindset. Any totalitarian state still has this goal in mind, and Goebbels' propaganda factory in Nazi Germany served this objective. C. Wright Mills defined manipulation as "power wielded unknown to the powerless." The manipulation of consciousness via mechanisms, according to Peter Worsley, is becoming more significant in contemporary culture. Marxists would describe the end result of such controlled agreement as a "false consciousness." It might be countered that the manipulation of consciousness is impossible under liberal-democratic societies, because individuals have the freedom to voice their decision. Only when there is no opportunity for free will, such as in one-party systems, can manipulation take place. Additionally, it is said that if people have the freedom to choose but don't really pick an alternative to the status quo for instance, by backing political movements calling for drastic change it is acceptable to infer that the current social structure is 'what people desire' in general. This would support the idea that it is impossible to overstate the significance of political choice and the freedom to express that decision [9], [10]. However, 'what people desire' is somewhat influenced by a number of things. No decision is made in a vacuum. In other words, the decision itself cannot be seen as entirely free from the effects of a legitimation process.

CONCLUSION

The state has the right to use its lawful authority. The ability to dominate is authority. Power is a narrower idea than authority. The situation's requirements imply a comprehension of politics. It is the result of a certain circumstance. The emergence of the modern nation state has stabilised the international order, yet there are still many problems facing today's countries. Some communities are dispersed over a wide area, yet they feel connected due to shared religion, culture, or linguistic traits. For instance, the Kurds, who are dispersed over Turkey, Syria, and Iraq, want their own state. There have also been instances when different ethnic groups created states but failed to unite as a country, such as the former Soviet Union. Then there are the problems with immigrants who have naturalised as citizens of other nations but yet maintain ties to their home country. There are non-traditional dangers like terrorism, global warming, drug trafficking, food security, etc. that need joint security rather than being handled by one nation alone. States would also have to give up part of their power and sovereignty to do this in the greater good of mankind. Therefore, in order to remain relevant in rapidly evolving times, the contemporary nation state must confront these concerns.

REFERENCES:

[1]   D. McCormack, "Living with others inside the self: Decolonising transplantation, selfhood and the body politic in Nalo Hopkinson's Brown Girl in the Ring," *Med. Humanit.*, 2016.

[2]   P. T. Giamario, "The Laughing Body Politic: The Counter-Sovereign Politics of Hobbes's Theory of Laughter," *Polit. Res. Q.*, 2016.

[3]   E. H. Susanto, S. Azeharie, And W. P. Sari, "Bureaucracy, Leadership And People Characteristics (A Review Of Communication Public Official After Political Reformation)," *Proceedings Of The 2016 Global Conference On Business, Management And Entrepreneurship*. 2016.

[4]   P. T. Giamario, "The Laughing Body Politic," *Polit. Res. Q.*, 2016.

[5]　Z. A. R. Awang Azman Awang Pawi, Rosmadi bin Fauzi, and Suffian Mansor, "The Rise of Politic Ethnonationalism in the State of Sarawak Borneo," *J. Sci. Res. Dev.*, 2016.

[6]　Y. Sunesti, "VEILING: Between Social Imaginary and the Politic of Multiculturalism In Indonesia and Malaysia," *Musãwa J. Stud. Gend. dan Islam*, 2016.

[7]　S. Han, "The body politic, 1982," *Fem. Stud.*, 2016.

[8]　D. Labbé, "Critical reflections on land appropriation and alternative urbanization trajectories in periurban Vietnam," *Cities*, 2016.

[9]　M. Desai, "Gendered violence and India's body politic," *New Left Review*. 2016.

[10]　S. Mu'adi, "The Claim to Bureaucratic Neutrality in Indonesian Politic," *Int. J. Manag. Adm. Sci.*, 2016.

CHAPTER 2

EVOLVING PERSPECTIVES IN POLITICAL THEORY: FROM TRADITION TO POST-MODERNISM

Neha Nitin Karnik, Associate Professor
Department of ISME, ATLAS SkillTech University, Mumbai, Maharashtra, India
Email Id- neha.karnik@atlasuniversity.edu.in

ABSTRACT:

Political theory may be distinguished from words like political science, political philosophy, and political ideology, but many people use these phrases interchangeably. Political theory and political science vary from one another due to the broad change in intellectual perspective that contemporary science has caused. Political science has made an effort to provide tenable rules and generalizations about politics and political action. By holding it up to philosophical or ethical standards, political theory analyses political phenomena, processes, and institutions as well as real political activity. It examines the issue of the ideal political system, which is a subset of a broader and more basic issue, namely the optimal way for a person to live their life within a wider society. Study of the ancient literature is a crucial part of the subject since it tackles eternal concerns while addressing present and local challenges. A great literary work that, despite its local context, addresses enduring issues in life and society has all the elements of a classic in political philosophy. It is the epitome of everlasting knowledge and belongs to all of humanity as opposed to just one particular culture, area, people, or period.

KEYWORDS:

Culture, Political Philosophy, Political Theory, Tradition.

INTRODUCTION

Political theories in particular cannot be taken as the right or complete explanation of an occurrence. Future interpretations of an event's significance from fresh perspectives, each of which explains and analyses from a certain stance or concern in political life, are always possible. Political theory is crucial in this quest as well since it provides a view of politics that is superior to that of the average person. Political theory and political science don't conflict because they have different scopes of study and jurisdictions, not because they have different goals. Political theory provides ideas, concepts, and theories that are then integrated into political science for the purposes of analysis, description, explanation, and critique.

Political philosophy offers broad explanations for concerns like what constitutes justice, notions of right, the difference between "is" and "ought," and other political difficulties. Political philosophy is a subset of normative political theory since it makes an effort to connect disparate ideas. Though not all political theorists are political philosophers, it is likely appropriate to claim that all political philosophers are theorists. Understanding political philosophy, which is a complicated activity, requires examining the many ways in which its recognized masters have engaged in it. No one philosopher or historical era can be considered to have definitively defined it, just as no single painter or school of painting has ever executed all we understand by painting.

Political thought is the collective opinion of a community, and it comprises the writings and speeches of the more intelligent members, including professional politicians, political pundits, social reformers, and everyday citizens. Thought may take the shape of political

treatises, academic works, speeches, choices made by the government, as well as songs and prose that express the suffering of the populace. The history of the 20th century is an example of how thought is time-bound. In a nutshell, political philosophy consists of theories that make an effort to explain political activity, as well as values to assess it and strategies to influence it.

Unlike philosophy, political theory relates to the hypothesis of a single person, often expressed in treatises as models of explanation. It includes conceptions of many institutions, including as the state, the law, representation, and elections. Explanatory and comparative research methods are used. Political theory is concerned with/with the links between ideas and conditions, and it aims to explain the attitudes and behaviours coming from everyday political life and generalise about them in a specific setting. Political philosophy makes an effort to comprehend or resolve disagreements between political views that, depending on the situation, may seem equally valid [1], [2].

Political ideology is a methodical, all-encompassing philosophy that seeks to provide a comprehensive understanding of human nature and society that can be applied to all situations, combined with a comprehensive plan for achieving it. The father of contemporary philosophies, according to many, is John Locke. Marxism is another well-known example of an ideology that may be summed up by the claim that philosophy should transform the world rather than just explain it. Political philosophy is all political ideology, but the opposite is not true. Numerous ideologies, including fascism, nazism, communism, and liberalism, have existed throughout the 20th century. Political ideology is characterised by its dogmatism, which, unlike political philosophy, forbids and encourages critical assessment in the pursuit of realising the ideal society. Political ideology, in the opinion of Gamine and Sabine, is an antithesis of political theory since it is a more recent development and, as a result of positivism, is founded on arbitrary, unverifiable value preferences. Additionally, Gamine differentiates between a political thinker and a publicist. He claims that although the former has a thorough mastery of the subject, the latter is more interested in pressing concerns.

Additionally, Germino, like Plato, has drawn a distinction between knowledge and opinion, with the latter serving as the basis for political theorists. Every political theorist has two roles: one as a scientist and the other as a philosopher. How each one is divided will depend on the individual's temperament and interests.

He can only make a meaningful contribution to knowledge by integrating the two positions. If the author has preconceived notions about what the objectives of political life are, the scientific component of a theory may look cohesive and relevant. The way reality is portrayed reveals the philosophical underpinnings.

Political thought is cold and impersonal. Without making any implicit or explicit judgements about what is being shown, it depicts political reality as a science. As a philosophy, it lays forth guidelines for behaviour that guarantee a happy living for everyone in society, not just for certain people or classes. The theorist will not personally be interested in the political structures of any one nation, group, or party.

Without this interest, his perception of reality, his ideal of the happy life, and the uniqueness of his theory will not be muddled. An ideology's purpose is to defend a certain kind of societal authority. The ideologue is a party with an interest; this interest may be to uphold the current quo or to critique it in the hopes of bringing about a new power structure. We prefer rationalization to dispassionate prescription. We have a warped view of reality rather than an objective representation.

Theory Developments in Politics

Political theory modifications usually take into account societal developments. Political theories are developed in response to issues that arise at various points in time. It is highly appropriate for Hegel to symbolically describe political philosophy as "the owl of Minerva takes flight when shadow of darkness falls." We would be wise to keep in mind that political thought, which also results from societal challenges, is restricted by space and time. As a result, it differs from theory, which transcends these constraints and demonstrates its value in comprehending and elucidating political phenomena of various types and origins. This occurs as a result of ideas being cleared and cleansed of prejudices and biases to get at certain principles that are not only timeless but may even be said to be knowledge. While engaging in theorising, political theorists strive for those concepts whose comprehension may improve life rather than doing so to satisfy their whims and fancies. Additionally, the majority of thinkers in this endeavour are driven by the current political climate. Political theory's history demonstrates how social illnesses and diseases have lubricated theorising tools, allowing for the challenging of many established norms and practises as well as the underlying premises that underlie them. However, it is true that the inspiration for theory always stems from a failure of some kind and the corresponding belief that circumstances may be improved by a greater knowledge and may finally be addressed. Political philosophy must thus do more than just provide a quick solution and accept a compromise. Instead, it must identify the underlying causes of the issue and provide solutions in the form of an alternate set of guiding principles. Therefore, each theory effort has to have a "vision" that allows the theorist to look beyond the current challenges. Political philosophy may be distinguished from poetry or art in this area. Political theory and other creative endeavours like art and poetry are similar in terms of perspective, thoughts, and ruminations. The political theorist differs from a poet in that his impulse and quest are deliberate actions with a specific purpose, while a poetic deed is spontaneous. Therefore, poetry is not given the stature of a theory because of creativity, but rather because of awareness [3], [4].

Towards A Definition of Politics

Different individuals define political theory in various ways. According on the focus and comprehension of its constituent parts, the definitions differ. Political theory, according to Sabine's well-known definition, is anything that "has characteristically contained factors like the factual, the causal, and the valuational." Political philosophy is "dispassionate and disinterested activity," according to Hecker. Regardless of when and when it was first published, it is a corpus of philosophical and scientific knowledge that may deepen our understanding of the world we live in now and the world we will live in future. So, one may argue that what we mean by political theory is a logically consistent set of hypotheses that explain a certain class of political facts. It means that a theory, unlike mind, cannot take into account several facts at once and must limit its attention to a certain class or category of problems.

Importance of Principles in Theory

A reader learning about political theory for the first time could believe that studying the institutions rather than more abstract ideas is adequate to comprehend the nature and character of society. It is feasible to study institutions, but it is important to understand that since institutional arrangements are built on various sets of ideas, they differ from society to society. This epiphany forces us to confront the fundamental question of whether reality or ideas, facts or concepts, are more significant. Do reality mirror ideas, or does reality originate from ideas?

DISCUSSION

A political theory obituary was quickly written by many observers in the middle of the 20th century. Others mentioned its decrease. Others declared it to be dead. Political theory was said to be in the "doghouse" by one person. This pessimistic perspective is caused by the fact that the classical tradition in political theory is largely filled with value judgements that are beyond the purview of empirical examination. Normative theory was criticised by logical positivists in the 1930s and behaviouralism afterwards. According to Easton, political philosophy has lost its ability to be helpful since it is preoccupied with some kind of historical shape. He ascribes historicism in political philosophy to William Dunning, Charles H. Mcllwain, and George M. Sabine. This kind of political theory opposes aspects of history and philosophy in political theory and has discouraged students from undertaking a comprehensive study of value theory. Easton looked at the causes of political theory's downfall in general and its transition towards historicism in particular. First and foremost, political scientists have a propensity to adopt the moral tenets of their time, which results in a loss of the constructive approach. The focus is on discovering and revealing one's values, which suggests that it is no longer necessary to consider the worth of these moral ideals, but rather to simply comprehend their "origins, development, and social impact." Existing ideals are supported by historical examples. Second, moral relativism is to blame for the historical attention a thought has gotten. He cited historicism, moral relativism, hyper factualism, and positivism as the four main causes of the collapse of political philosophy.

Bringing Political Theory Back

Political theory started researching the history of ideas in the 1930s with the aim of defending liberal democratic theory against the totalitarian ideologies of communism, fascism, and nazism. Lasswell attempted to further the goals and directions set out by Merriam by developing a scientific political theory with the ultimate goal of regulating human conduct. Scientific political theory describes rather than prescribes, in contrast to the classical approach. In the writings of Arendt, Theodore Adorno, Marcuse, and Leo Strauss, political theory in the conventional sense was very much alive. They had beliefs in liberal democracy, science, and historical development, which markedly diverged from the general notions in American political science. They all disapprove of political utopianism and political messianism. Arendt began her critique of behavioralism by focusing primarily on the responsibility and uniqueness of the human person. She argued that the behavioural quest for consistency in human nature has only served to stereotype people.

In order to address the contemporary political problem, Strauss reiterates the value of classical political philosophy. He disagrees with the idea that all political theory is ideological in origin and reflects a certain socio-economic interest since most political theorists are driven by the desire to identify the fundamentals of the proper social order. Truth must be a political philosopher's main concern. Philosophies from the past are examined for coherence and consistency. The writers of the political theory classics are better because they were brilliant and careful in their writing. The 'new' political science was found to be lacking when compared to classical political theory, especially that of Aristotle, according to Strauss, who examines the methodology and goals of the field. Aristotle believed that a political philosopher or political scientist had to be objective since he had a more thorough and precise comprehension of human aims.

Because philosophy and science both have theoretical and applied components, political science and political philosophy are interchangeable terms. Aristotle's political science also assesses political issues, upholds the discretion of wisdom in real-world situations, and sees

politics as fundamentally an ethical endeavour. These underlying assumptions are refuted by behavioralism, which distinguishes between theoretical and applied sciences in place of political philosophy and political science. It believes that theoretical sciences are generated from applied sciences, but not in the way that the classical tradition imagines. Behaviouralism, like positivism, is catastrophic because it disallows the understanding of underlying concepts [5], [6]. Their failure to discriminate between good and evil or the righteous and unjust is obvious given the emergence of totalitarianism. They seem powerless. In response to Easton's criticism of historicism, Strauss argues that the new science is to blame for the fall in political theory since it highlighted and aided the West's broader political problem by generally ignoring normative matters. According to Vogelin, political philosophy and political science are interdependent, and neither is feasible without the other. Political theory is an experienced knowledge of the proper order in both the person and society, not an ideology, utopia, or scientific approach. It must analyse the order issue critically and experimentally. Theory is an effort to formulate the meaning of life by delineating the details of a specific class of experiences, not merely any opinion on how people live in society. The legitimacy of its argument comes from the collection of experiences to which it is always required to return in order to provide empirical support.

Theory of Politics Approaches

Different political theory concepts used by theorists might be challenging to recognise and classify. The challenge comes from the inclination of theorists to go on an exercise in which they begin drawing on many notions and traditions. As we shall show in a moment, this is more true of modern political theory than of earlier theories. In the past, theorists often maintained a purity of idea while developing theories, seldom straying from the framework they had selected. However, this is not true of the present, which is home to a crop of theories that seem hybrid in character. But generally speaking, there are three main conceptions of political theory that may be used to conceptualise, assess, and evaluate both the historical and contemporary views. Historical, normative, and empirical are their names.

Historical Perspective

Many theorists have tried to construct theories using historical materials and insights. One of the leading proponents of the historical notion is Sabine. According to him, the only way to answer a question such, "What is the nature of political theory?" is to describe how it has reacted to historical developments and particular circumstances. In other words, from this viewpoint, political theory becomes situation-dependent, where each historical context creates a problem that is then resolved by the theory's developed answers. This philosophy of political organisation shows traditionalism. Cobban also thinks that the conventional approach, which fully instills a sense of history, is the proper method to approach political theory's challenges. It is true that history serves as an invaluable guidance in our effort to create theories and teaches us not to be overconfident in our uniqueness. Along with illuminating the causes, it also suggests that thinking in ways other than those that are popular and dominant is feasible. The knowledge of history also makes us more aware of the shortcomings of previous generations, connects them to current wisdom, and fosters our capacity for imagination.

In addition, the historical perspective makes a substantial contribution to our normative view. Our social and political world may have its roots in the past, according to the history of ideas. And getting to know them better would reveal how, why, and from whence we have particular values, standards, and moral expectations. We may question these ideals and evaluate their usefulness using this feeling inside of us. However, blindly adhering to this

idea is not without its foolishness. The effort known as political theory is innovative in that each particular circumstance is distinct and fraught with fresh difficulties. As a result, the value of the past might sometimes become obsolete and even become a barrier if one is unaware of this fact. As a result, it is unlikely that this method will be useful in political theory beyond a certain point since it is always tied to outdated concepts from outdated eras. The concepts' suggestive qualities continue, but their theoretical role is significantly diminished [7], [8].

Normative Strategy

Different names exist in political theory for the normative idea. While some prefer to call it ethical theory, others prefer to call it philosophical theory. The normative conception is founded on the idea that the theorist's intuition, reasoning, insights, and experiences may be used to understand the world and its occurrences in terms of logic, purpose, and goals. In other terms, it is an endeavour of philosophical value speculating.

What should happen to political institutions, are some of the issues posed by normativists. What should guide a person's interactions with other social organisations? What social structures may serve as models or the ideal ones, and what laws and values need to control them? It's possible to argue that their moral concerns are moral, and the goal is to create an ideal type. Thus, it is these theorists who have always used their vivid imagination to imagine "utopia" in the context of political beliefs. Political philosophy has a major influence on normative political theory since it gives the theory's knowledge of the desirable life and serves as a foundation for its attempts to establish unbreakable rules.

Since they really use political philosophy's tools for theorising, they constantly endeavour to build connections between concepts and search for coherence in both reality and their hypotheses, which are classic characteristics of a philosophical worldview. Leo Strauss has fervently defended normative theory and maintained that political actions are by their very nature susceptible to acceptance or disapproval, making it difficult to evaluate them in any other way than as fair or unjust, good or terrible. However, the issue with normativists is that while proclaiming ideals they hold dear, they present them as universal and unquestionable. They are unaware that their desire to establish unwavering moral standards might lead to problems. Ethics have a strong subjective component and are thus relevant to time and location, making it impossible to establish an absolute norm. We would do well to keep in mind that even political theorists use subjective tools to evaluate the reality, and that various variables, some of which may be ideological in origin, influence their views. Empirical theory proponents oppose normativism for

1. Value relativity
2. The origins of ethics and standards in culture
3. Enterprise material that is ideological; and
4. The project's abstract and utopian character.

However, in the distant past, people who supported normative theory made an effort to link their beliefs with an awareness of the realities of their era. The ancient sensibility within normative theory has recently reappeared, and methodological and empirical acumen have been matched by a desire for a decent life and a good society. A Theory of Justice by John Rawls is an example of how to try to ground moral and logical political theory on facts. In order to link normative philosophical arguments with concerns about distributive justice and the welfare state in the actual world, Rawls invents a "original position" using his imagination.

Empirical Method

Political theory has not been dominated by normativism in the 20th century; rather, it has been controlled by an alternative idea known as empirical political theory, which draws its hypotheses from actual data. Political theories that make value judgements are not given the status of knowledge by empirical political theory. Therefore, it follows that normative political theory is disproved as nothing more than a personal choice. To make political theory more objective and scientific, and hence a more dependable basis for policymaking, the movement for value-free theory first gained traction. Positivism became the name for this new perspective. Political theorists under the sway of positivism sought out to develop scientific knowledge about political phenomena based on the idea that it could be objectively tested and shown. Thus, they made an effort to develop a natural science of society, and in doing so, they reduced philosophy to the status of a scientific auxiliary. Such a theory-centered view also depicted the theorist as an objective observer who has been stripped of all allegiances and values.

The empiricist theory of knowledge, which claims to have complete criteria to determine what defines truth and falsity, served as the foundation for this empirical endeavour in political theory. The experimentation and verification concept is where this criteria gets its essence. A 'Behavioural Revolution' arose when political philosophy was in tatters as a result of its impact. In the 1950s, this revolution assumed a dominant position within political theory and, by promoting new elements, absorbed the whole area of study and research. They comprised:

1. Promotion of quantitative analytical techniques
2. Dismantling the normative framework and fostering empirical research that is amenable to statistical analysis
3. Rejecting and not accepting the history of ideas
4. Concentrate on micro-study since it was easier to apply empirical therapy to.
5. Praise for specialism
6. Data collection from an individual's conduct and
7. Call for research that has no value.

Of fact, there was a surge of anti-theory sentiment, and those who attacked theory in the traditional sense had a field day. The concept of theory was mocked and associated with ideology, abstraction, metaphysics, and utopia. Even some adventurers recommended abandoning theory as an endeavour.

They even conflated thought and reality in their haste to achieve objectivity of knowledge and reduced thinking to a component of reality. As a result, they quickly drew the wrath and ire of certain science philosophers who presented a plan for a post-positivist approach to science. Karl Popper established the notion of "falsification" as a standard for scientific knowledge and maintained that all knowledge was conjectural, provisional, and distant from the absolute truth.

This helped to set the new tone. Imre Lakatos, Mary Hesse, and Thomas Kuhn's critique of the purportedly scientific theory was a significant turning point or breakthrough in the philosophy of science. All cognitions are reliant on understanding and interpretation as a form of inter-subjective communication, and Kuhn's book The Structure of Scientific Revolution was a pioneer in exposing the flaws and inadequacies of the positivist paradigm. Kuhn persuasively claimed that the creation of the semantic framework was influenced not only by irrational customs but also by rational discourses that were shaped by interpretation and critique [9], [10].

A Modern Approach

In the 1980s and 1990s, contemporary political theory emerged on the intellectual scene, primarily as a reaction to long-standing traditions in theory and as a sharp critique of the Enlightenment concepts of reason and science, to which all previous traditions in political theory were linked. They examined numerous elements that political theory had claimed as the cornerstone of reality and set out to establish new rules for understanding and imagining the new social and political landscape that some of them dubbed the "post-modern condition." To yoke the different theoretical developments that are now apparent under one general framework of analysis would be arbitrary. For instance, debating communitarianism, multiculturalism, and post-structuralism all at once would be intellectual outrage against them, their worries, and their convictions.

Due to the enormous divergence and difference in their histories, normative concerns, theoretical frameworks, and empirical referents. However, one might still put forth the theoretical groundwork for their discussion of political philosophy. The following categories might be used to group together many of the present ideas and theorists.

Dissidence from universalism

Modern political theory has opted to critically examine the generalisations made by earlier political theories, regardless of the tradition to which they belonged. They saw liberal universalism as lacking a social or chronological context, and they believed that it had been masked by a veiled "particularism" that was mostly based on the experience of western culture. They contend that relying on universal principles is equivalent to standardisation and, as a result, a violation of justice, which may be ingrained in a specific society or way of life and may represent its own norms and values. Recent times have brought this to light fairly forcibly, and the communitarian theory and the multicultural theory have dubbed these so-called universalist theories as being fundamentally "exclusivist," since they have always offered one view of "good" as the sole vision of humanity.

An examination of grand narratives

On the basis that there is an overarching or transcendental "foundation" of reality and truth, both liberal and Marxist grand narratives have come under scrutiny. Due to the ongoing contestation of all widely acknowledged foundations in political theory, including state, sovereignty, and power, certain current views have been dubbed "anti-foundational." To be fair to them, they merely deny transcendental underpinnings, not all of them. The big narratives are being attacked head-on by post-modernists, who contend that there is no such thing as an objective pre-given reality or an objective social good that can sustain such grand narratives and their designs.

Post-positivism

It brings to mind the old debates on value neutrality in social science that the behaviouralists in political theory once supported. According to modern ideas, political theory is an intrinsically normative and politically involved effort that is intended to provide recommendations and a future vision. They dismiss value-free ventures as meaningless.

Comparative and empirical

The post-positivist trend among modern theorists does not prevent them from arguing that empirical and comparative techniques are necessary before any effort is made at generalisation.

One such example that is subject to circumstance is multiculturalism. In fact, using a system like this to compare actual data across cultures and countries would serve as a check on too generalisation. Despite the fresh perspectives offered by current political theory, they have several flaws. In contrast to traditional political theory, there has not yet been much comparative-empirical research, and there is a strong inclination among theorists to draw from one another. Only when the normative enterprise is connected to reality can it be beneficial. Therefore, connecting normative theory to the concrete realities of society and politics is the true difficulty. The only way a sound political theory with fair generalisations can develop is in this manner, which would also get over the post-modernist perspective's limitations and its relativity and diffusion flaws, which aren't always good for political endeavours. This might bring up what Sheldon Wolin refers to as "epic theory."

CONCLUSION

Political theory takes on distinct meanings in various traditions since we all have different views of it. We have seen why political theory develops as well as how it influences and determines the course of history by allowing for political engagement on the part of people. The many notions that theorists hold have also been explored, and their shortcomings have been drawn out.

The modern business has been explored along with its drawbacks, despite its promises that it would expand our grasp of social and political realities.

The aforementioned discussion makes it clear that philosophy and science cannot be substituted for one another in the endeavour known as political theory if the goal is to liberate humanity, and that even in the absence of anything referred to as objective "good" or "truth," an attempt at a practical basis for theory should be made. Not only is it desired, but it may also be derived.

Any initiative in political theory that combines factual data with normative ideas by rigorously critiquing them might pave the way for innovative political theory that will serve as the foundation for our future movements.

REFERENCES:

[1]   N. Carpentier, "Beyond the ladder of participation: An analytical toolkit for the critical analysis of participatory media processes," *Javnost*, 2016.

[2]   S. Otjes, "What's right about the left-right dimension? The causes and the consequences of ideological inconsistency on economic issues in Germany," *Ger. Polit.*, 2016.

[3]   A. Meijer and M. P. R. Bolívar, "Governing the smart city: a review of the literature on smart urban governance," *Int. Rev. Adm. Sci.*, 2016.

[4]   M. Shaw, "Global Society and International Relations: Sociological Theory and Political Perspectives," *SSRN Electron. J.*, 2016.

[5]   A. K. Jorgenson, "Environment, development, and ecologically unequal exchange," *Sustainability (Switzerland)*. 2016.

[6]   H. Mayer, F. Sager, D. Kaufmann, and M. Warland, "Capital city dynamics: Linking regional innovation systems, locational policies and policy regimes," *Cities*, 2016.

[7]   C. Ward and M. B. Aalbers, "Virtual special issue editorial essay: 'The shitty rent business': What's the point of land rent theory?," *Urban Studies*. 2016.

[8]   G. Schreder, F. Windhager, M. Smuc, and E. Mayr, "A mental models perspective on designing information visualizations for political communication," *eJournal eDemocracy Open Gov.*, 2016.

[9]   N. Heynen, "Urban political ecology II: The abolitionist century," *Prog. Hum. Geogr.*, 2016.

[10]   M. J. White and C. Johnson, "Perspectives on Migration Theory – Sociology and Political Science," 2016.

CHAPTER 3

EXPLORING THE DIMENSIONS OF LIBERTY: A COMPARATIVE ANALYSIS OF POLITICAL AND PHILOSOPHICAL PERSPECTIVES

Sarika Kumar, Assistant Professor
Department of ISME, ATLAS SkillTech University, Mumbai, Maharashtra, India
Email Id- sarika.kumar@atlasuniversity.edu.in

ABSTRACT:

As a core democratic virtue, the notion of liberty has long been an important and developing one in modern political and social thinking. This research explores the many facets of liberty and considers how they may be interpreted and used within various ideological systems. This unit looks at the historical development of liberty and its limits in democratic societies, from classical liberals emphasising the absence of external constraints to socialists calling for the removal of social and economic barriers and the nuanced viewpoints of thinkers like J.S. Mill and Isaiah Berlin. In the context of capitalist systems, it also takes into account the Marxist criticism of liberty. We acquire insights into the reasons and constraints of liberty within contemporary democracies by studying several parts of this complicated notion. In contemporary political and social thought, liberty is seen as a central idea and a basic democratic virtue. With the development of contemporary civil society and political power came the idea of liberty. Liberals have approached the idea differently even though it is closely related to their philosophy. Marxists are skeptical of liberal ideas of liberty and would completely reframe the idea based on wholly different societal and individual presumptions. We will examine many stances on liberty in this unit as we work to understand its implications, justifications, and bounds. Each portion of the unit, which covers a distinct facet of the idea, is separated into a separate unit.

KEYWORDS:

Democratic Virtue, Liberal, Liberty, Political.

INTRODUCTION

Liberal thinking, which focuses on the rational individual and draws a line between that person and his or her domain of autonomy, the state, and society, is rooted in the notion of liberty. 'Absence of limitations' is what is meant by the term 'liberty' in everyday use. In other words, it denotes a situation in which a person who is competent of making thoughtful judgements about his or her personal affairs is unrestricted by other forces, such as the state and society. However, the idea of liberty also developed along with the concepts of a political society and political power. All people' freedoms are now equally recognised, and it is understood that reasonable constraints on that freedom may be justifiable on the basis that they provide the framework necessary for the peaceful enjoyment of such freedom. A "negative" conception of liberty is one where freedom is defined as the lack of restrictions. Thinkers like T.H. Green developed a "positive" understanding of liberty that took into consideration the circumstances that allowed a person to be really free. Thus, having the ability to act and the opportunity to do so included having liberty as a desirable concept. This theory served as the foundation for the welfare state, which mandated that the government take proactive measures to create the environments in which people could truly exercise their freedom to act and grow as individuals. Marxists believed that freedom could not exist in a capitalist society, despite attempts to do so by thinkers like J.S. Mill and Isaiah Berlin. They emphasized that a capitalist society isolates a person from both his or her social surroundings

and their true selves. As is evident, several schools of thought have had diverse perspectives on liberty. But it nevertheless represents a cornerstone of democratic thinking.

'Absence of restrictions' is the most prevalent definition of liberty, which liberals consider to be one of their basic tenets. In the backdrop of the development of new socio-economic and political ties in contemporary Europe, the idea of liberty first appeared. The concept was based on the idea of a rational person who could make informed judgements. It was believed that the rational person was capable of self-determination, or the ability to make choices that affected him or herself. The person needed independence from all types of social, political, and economic restrictions in order to develop his abilities. As a result, the concept of liberty as the lack of constraints or as an area of personal autonomy evolved. However, as a person does not live in a social organisation alone but rather in relation to other people, it is necessary to acknowledge that other individuals have an equal right to their own domains of autonomy. It was essential that a system of constraints and regulations be established and followed by everyone in order for the various claims of each person to autonomy to be realised with the least amount of conflict.

Philosophers like Hobbes, Locke, and Rousseau proposed conceptions of the social compact that defined liberty as the lack of restrictions. Additionally, they put forward the foundation for how personal freedom will develop at the same time. As a result, the notion of political community was founded on the concomitant acknowledgement of people's talents and autonomy as well as the need of submitting everyone to a shared set of restrictions on their freedom. Therefore, it is important to remember that liberty which is often understood to imply freedom from restrictions or impediments to human activity and is seen as a democratic ideal has always been thought of as existing within a set of particular limits in social interactions. What constitutes legitimate types of liberty in contemporary democracies has its limits [1], [2]. The definition of liberty, its components, and the reasons for restrictions on it will all be covered in the section that follows.

According to the definition of liberty in the introduction, it is the lack of restrictions. When one's activities and decisions are unhindered or unrestricted by those of another, one is said to be free or at liberty to do so. It is crucial to know that restrictions relate to obstacles put in place by governmental and other bodies. Therefore, terms like incarceration, bondage or servitude, submission to the law, etc., may be understood to refer to situations where freedom is not present. We know that contemporary democratic social and political organisations are established on legal and institutional frameworks, which attempt to ensure equal treatment of each individual's liberty, even when states of unfreedom like incarceration or submission to laws may seem to be restrictions on freedom. Therefore, no community will have an unrestricted "right to liberty." Every civilization will have a set of constraints on liberty, which are justifiable because people accept them as the ideal circumstances for maximising liberty. Libertarians often characterise liberty as the "absence of restraints" or "absence of external constraints." There are two ways that liberty might be seen negatively.

The primary barrier to freedom in the first is seen as the law. For example, Hobbes defined freedom as the "silence of the laws." According to this perspective, a person's freedom is only constrained by what other people willfully forbid them from doing. Therefore, this interpretation would seem to indicate a clear limit on both law and government. But as philosophers like John Locke have shown, a dedication to liberty does not entail the abolition of the rule of law. Instead, it implies that the only purpose of legislation should be to safeguard an individual's freedom from outside interference. Locke argued that legislation expands and protects liberty rather than restricting it.The second perspective defines liberty as the "freedom of choice." For instance, Milton Friedman argues in Capitalism and Freedom

(1962) that "economic freedom" is the ability to make decisions in the market, including the freedom of the consumer to choose what to buy, the freedom of the worker to choose his or her line of work, and the freedom of the producer to decide what to produce and who to hire. To pick means that the person may make an unrestricted and free choice from a variety of possibilities.

When discussing liberty, it's common to distinguish between the ideas of "absence of external constraints" and "the existence of conditions which enable or facilitate," i.e., between negative and positive views of liberty. To put it another way, the difference between having the 'freedom to do' something and really being able to. A person must not be constrained or hindered from doing something in order to be free or at liberty to do it. While to be able to accomplish something means to have the ability, whether material or otherwise, to do it. For instance, even though one is free or unrestricted to apply for any job, one could not have the skills or financial means to make their application meaningful. Political philosophers often draw a difference between liberty as the absence of restrictions and the circumstances that justify liberty. A person who is legally free and not prohibited from eating at a pricey restaurant could not really experience any liberty as a result of that legal freedom [3], [4]. In this situation, the state must take some appropriate measure to ensure the right to food. This justification has been used to support social policies meant to broaden peoples' chances. The state is believed to be strengthening liberty by taking such constructive action in addition to reducing inequality.

DISCUSSION

Jeremy Bentham, James Mill, John Stuart Mill, Henry Sidgwick, Herbert Spencer, and the classical and neo-classical economists, who backed the claims of individuals to be free from needless restraints of capricious government, are examples of English political thinkers who embodied the negative conception of liberty. Negative liberty's key political tenet was that "everyone knows his own interest best" and that the government shouldn't determine an individual's goals and objectives. The integrity of the contract was crucial to the theory. This premise of sanctity included the belief that signing a contract constituted an expression of liberty and the exercise of human choice, even if the contract's terms restricted individual freedom. Therefore, according to this school of thought, a person's liberty was determined by the space in which he was left alone rather than by the effectiveness of their actions. The easiest way to understand the idea of negative liberty is as a theory about what it means to be free. Although the phrase "freedom to starve" is often used to decry negative liberty, this notion is not entirely accurate. It simply asserts that state involvement cannot be justified on the grounds that it improves freedom, even when justifications from the area of inequality may be used. This does not necessarily impose a bar on state action. Negative liberty has, however, historically been linked to laissez-faire economics, and the majority of its proponents preferred a small government. The idea is neutral in that it works with a variety of political ideologies and defines a state of liberty without recommending that it be good or bad.

Social Democrats, Socialists, and Modern Liberals have all criticised the destructive view of liberty. Some of the early criticisms of negative freedom were produced by the liberals of the nineteenth century, particularly T. H. Green and to a lesser degree J. S. Mill. They believed that although capitalism had eliminated feudal hierarchy and legal restraints (particularly those pertaining to economic endeavours), it had also exposed vast numbers of people to poverty, unemployment, and sickness. Such conditions were seen as impeding liberty just as much as statutory limitations and societal constraints. T. H. Green (1836–1982), one of the first liberals to embrace the ideal of liberty, described freedom as the capacity of individuals

"to make the most and best of themselves." This freedom doesn't only mean being left alone; it also means having the ability to take action, which draws attention to the potential that each person has. The Welfare State was founded on the idea of positive liberty. The concept has driven governmental adoption of social welfare policies, fusing equality and freedom in the process. The concept of liberty as it relates to Mill will be examined in the section that follows. Mill seems to support a pessimistic understanding of freedom, or the person's sovereign authority over their body and intellect. In the end, however, Mill's understanding of "individuality" led him closer to a favourable understanding of liberty [5], [6].

The liberty concept of J.S. Mill

On Liberty by J. S. Mill had a big impact on 1960s academic discussions. It is believed that Mill's writings present the unfavourable theory of liberty. It was Mill's extreme disdain for tradition, laws, and social norms that served as the foundation for his arguments in favour of individual freedom. Additionally, it is frequently said that Mill believed that since a free action was undertaken, regardless of how immoral, it had some element of goodness. While Mill saw limitation on people's freedom of action as immoral, he did not think it was wholly unjustified. However, he believed that there was always a presumption in support of liberty within society. Therefore, anybody placing restrictions on someone's freedom had to have a good reason for doing so.

According to Mill, liberty should promote the development of "individuality." Individuality is the distinct and singular quality that makes each human being wholly unique, and freedom is the realisation of that quality, i.e., personal development or self-determination. Humans' inherent uniqueness made them proactive rather than passive and sceptical of prevalent social norms, allowing them to reject conventions unless they were seen to be legitimate. Therefore, freedom in Mill's perspective seems to be more than just the lack of constraints and involves the conscious development of certain desired attitudes. This is why Mill is often seen as leaning towards a positive notion of liberty. The idea of choice is fundamental to Mill's interpretation of freedom. This is clear from his assertion that a person who allows others to "choose his plan of life for him" lacks the ability to be "individual" or to make decisions for oneself. The 'apelike' talent of mimicry appeared to be the only ability he or she had. A person who decides to prepare for himself, however, "employs all his faculties." People needed to fight against factors or norms and practises that prevented self-determination in order to develop their uniqueness and, in turn, achieve the condition of freedom. However, Mill also believed that relatively few people had the ability to rebel and exercise free will. The others were happy to live in "unfreedom" by submitting to "apelike imitation." This makes Mill's idea of liberty seem elitist as only a small group, not the whole populace, could benefit from individualism.

Like other liberals, Mill placed emphasis on the separation of the individual from society. Mill made a distinction between self-regarding and other-regarding behaviours, i.e., those that impacted the person solely and those that affected society as a whole, when discussing acceptable or defensible constraints on human liberty. Only to avert damage to others may any limitation or interference with a person be acceptable. The person had sovereign power over his own conduct. Because the individual is the greatest judge of his own interests, law and society could not interfere to advance a person's "best interests" in a society where the connection between individuals and society is not "paternal." The notion that an act may only be restrained if it caused injury to others also disproves the notion that certain behaviours are inherently evil and must be punished regardless of whether they cause harm to others. Additionally, Mill's framework disavows Bentham's concept of "utilitarianism," which would have justified intervention if it maximized the public good.

Mill believed that his principles did not preach a moral indifference to the self-regarding behaviour of others and that it was acceptable to use persuasion to discourage immoral behaviour. However, the line between the individual and the society is not strict in Mill in that all acts do affect others in some way. Additionally, Mill firmly believed in the significance of liberty as a tool for advancing social good. This is particularly true of his defences of unrestricted freedom of speech, opinion, and expression as well as the right to union and assembly. Since truth will arise through a free competition of ideas, Mill believed that all constraints on open conversation should be lifted. It should be noted that in the current list of rights, freedom of speech is seen as a more desirable democratic goal than economic liberty.

Two Concepts of Liberty: Isaiah Berlin

Isaiah Berlin attempts to reconcile the negative and positive ideas of liberty, i.e., the notion of liberty as the lack of restrictions with the diverse viewpoints related to its functioning within the social environment, in his now-classic work Two Concepts of Liberty (first published in 1958). By asking, "What is the area within which the subject - a person or group of persons - is or should be left to do or be what he is able to be, without interference from other persons?" Berlin's "negative" conception of liberty may be understood. The issue of "what, or who, is the source of control or interference that can determine someone to do, or be, this rather than that?" is addressed in the positive meaning, on the other hand.

On the other side, positive liberty views freedom as "self-mastery" rather than merely being left alone. A unique theory of the self is included in the theory. The higher and lower selves of the personality are separated. An individual's true, long-term objectives come from their higher selves, whereas their lower selves are only concerned with their illogical, ephemeral wants. A person is only really free to the degree that his or her higher self has control over their lower selves. Thus, a person may be free in the sense that they are not constrained by outside forces but yet be a slave to illogical cravings; this is different from being unfree, as in the case of a drug addict, alcoholic, or compulsive gambler. The primary characteristic of this idea is that it is explicitly evaluative; also, it is used only in relation to idealistic lifestyles. The concept of positive liberty requires a unique understanding of the self and does not simply presume that there is a field of endeavour in which the person should focus.

According to the idea, when someone is pointed in its direction, they are emancipated. A belief in positive liberty, according to critics of Berlin's theory, may imply the assumption that all other values, such as equality, rights, and justice, are secondary to the highest ideal of greater liberty. Additionally, the promotion of totalitarian ideologies may result from the notion that an individual's higher goals are similar to those of collectivities like classes, countries, and races [7], [8].

A Marxist Analysis ofthe Freedom Concept

The liberal viewpoints that have been mentioned above are distinct from the Marxist conception of freedom. The key distinctions may be drawn from the Marxist analysis of capitalist society, the link between the person and society, and the Marxist concept of the individual and society. Marxists would regard the idea of liberty based on the liberal notion of the person and society as circumstances of unfreedom because they believe that the individual and his freedom of choice are important to the liberal perspective. Marxists believe that the bounds of autonomous areas for the free exercise of choice do not divide the person from other members of society. They are really rather dependent on one another. Likewise, the idea of individuality is changed into the idea of rich individuality, which emphasises the social embeddedness of the individual and the notion that people can only achieve a state of

creative excellence and develop their capacities in a society that seeks the development of all of its members. Therefore, according to Marxists, true freedom comes from the development of creative individuality and cannot be attained in a capitalist society where people are divided along lines of self-interest and can only pretend to be free while actually being constrained by exploitation structures. A condition of freedom can only exist in a society that is devoid of the self-serving promotion of private interests. Therefore, freedom is impossible to obtain in a capitalist society.

These ideas were presented in 1844 Karl Marx's Economic and Philosophic Manuscripts and Friedrich Engel's Anti-Duhring. Engels talks about the idea of freedom as a phase in which one passes from need to freedom. When a person is subject to the will of another, such condition is known as necessity. Man has the ability to recognise and comprehend the forces that shape and control his existence, according to Engels. Thus, man has gained scientific knowledge about the natural laws that govern his life and has also learned the best practises for coping with these rules. Ironically, the powers of production that have historically held man in servitude or, to put it another way, constrained him to the world of need, have prevented him from escaping their yoke. Man must possess both the knowledge of human history and the power to alter it in order to achieve freedom. Man may only expect to escape the sphere of need and reach the realm of freedom with the aid of scientific socialism. The vision of a communist society outlined by Marx and Engels in the Communist Manifesto includes freedom as a key element. Freedom can only be attained in a communist society where there is no class exploitation.

Karl Marx claims that the capitalist system is dehumanising in his book Manuscripts. It not only distances the person from his inner self, but also cuts him off from society's cultural influences. According to Marx, freedom can only be restored by changing the environments in which alienation occurs. Therefore, full freedom could only be attained in a communist society where the means of production were collectively owned and each member of society collaborated with one another for the advancement of all. Therefore, freedom is seen positively in Marx's paradigm, signifying self-fulfillment and self-realization, or the realisation of one's actual essence. The actual sphere of freedom, according to Marx, is "the development of freedom for its own sake." Marx thought that only through the experience of creative labor working with others to meet our needs could this potential be achieved. According to this theory, Robinson Crusoe was a stunted and hence unfree person who was deprived of the social interactions that allow people to find satisfaction. Robinson Crusoe had the highest amount of negative freedom conceivable since no one else on his island could check or restrain him. Marx's idea of "alienation" perfectly reflects this idea of freedom. Labour is reduced under capitalism to a simple commodity that is moulded and directed by impersonal market forces. Marx believed that capitalist workers experience alienation because they are cut off from their true nature. They are alienated from the things they produce through their labour, from the labour process itself, from other people, and finally from their "true" selves. Since only unalienated effort may lead to personal satisfaction, freedom is consequently tied to it.

Additional Modern Theories of Liberty

There are other intellectuals who have addressed the concept of liberty, expanding upon the views articulated by thinkers on both sides of the ideological divide. Apart from Berlin, whose work is likely the most prominent among the current works on liberty, these other thinkers have discussed the notion of liberty. Like Berlin and Mill, Milton Friedman was a liberal who articulated the idea of liberty as a key component of the capitalist society in his book Capitalism and Freedom. One crucial component of liberty was the ability to trade

freely. Friedman demanded that the state give up caring about welfare and social security in order to advance this freedom and focus instead on upholding law and order, defending property rights, carrying out contracts, etc. Friedman believed that not only was liberty necessary for people to freely and voluntarily trade goods and services, but that this freedom could only be realised in a capitalist society. Furthermore, economic freedom was the ideal and necessary precondition for political liberty.

F. A. Hayek developed a philosophy of liberty that underlines the unfavourable function of the state in his 1960 book The Constitution of Liberty. According to Hayek, a person is in a condition of liberty when they are not subject to the capricious will of another person. In order to show the precedence and independence of individual liberty over other types of freedom, including political freedom, Hayek refers to this as individual freedom and separates it from others. According to Hayek, the definition of liberty as the 'absence of restrictions' should be upheld. Real liberty, which consists in the independence of the person from restrictions, would perish if the state expanded its interference in the name of freedom.

Another set of scholars who were obviously inspired by the Marxist understanding of freedom underlined how loneliness is fostered by liberty as it is practised in contemporary capitalist countries. According to Eric Fromm (1900–1988), the reason aloofness exists in contemporary society is because people are cut off from their creative potential and social connections. This isolation caused the guy to become physically and morally detached, which negatively impacted his mental health. The only way the person could reintegrate into society was via creativity and teamwork. One Dimensional Man: Studies in the Ideology of Advanced Industrial Society, written by Herbert Marcuse in 1968, also examined the nature of alienation in capitalist cultures. According to Marcuse, capitalist cultures stifle people's ability to be creative and multifaceted. The only way a man can express himself is as a perpetual consumer focused on meeting his bodily wants.

CONCLUSION

The notion of liberty is dynamic and diverse, and it has undergone multiple iterations throughout history according to various political and philosophical traditions. The classical liberal viewpoint emphasises individual autonomy and independence from intervention, and liberty is sometimes characterised as the lack of external limitations. Socialists and contemporary liberals have criticised this perspective, claiming that in order for there to be actual freedom, there must also be circumstances that allow people to live meaningful lives. The complexity of liberty has been highlighted and nuanced viewpoints have been offered by thinkers like J.S. Mill and Isaiah Berlin. Berlin's difference between negative and positive liberty offers a framework for understanding how freedom may be both empowering and restricting, while Mill's focus on individuality and self-development broadens the concept of liberty beyond the lack of restraints. Marxist analysis contends that genuine freedom can only be attained in a society free from exploitation and class distinctions, challenging the fundamental basis of liberal concepts of liberty. Marxists contend that the limitations of capitalism systems, in which people are cut off from their own selves and the fruits of their labour, impede actual freedom.

REFERENCES:

[1]   J. Carroll, "The Ethics of Isolation for Patients With Tuberculosis in Australia," *J. Bioeth. Inq.*, 2016.

[2]   K. M. McMann, "Measuring Subnational Democracy," *SSRN Electron. J.*, 2016.

[3] J. Lurie, "Liberty and Diversity: An Example of the Garden State Variety: Lipp v. Morris, 579 F.2d 834 (1978)," *New Jersey Stud. An Interdiscip. J.*, 2016.

[4] L. Prados de la Escosura, "Economic freedom in the long run: Evidence from OECD countries (1850-2007)," *Econ. Hist. Rev.*, 2016.

[5] B. A. Arrigo and A. Acheson, "Concealed carry bans and the American college campus: a law, social sciences, and policy perspective," *Contemp. Justice Rev. Issues Crim. Soc. Restor. Justice*, 2016.

[6] H. J. Lauth, "The internal relationships of the dimensions of democracy: The relevance of trade-offs for measuring the quality of democracy," *Int. Polit. Sci. Rev.*, 2016.

[7] M. Vorobej, *The concept of violence*. 2016.

[8] J. A. Sandoval and S. J. Collins, "Cultural Indicators and Global Freedom of the Press," *J. Intercult. Commun. Res.*, 2016.

CHAPTER 4

EXPLORING THE COMPLEXITIES OF EQUALITY: THEORETICAL CHALLENGES, PERSPECTIVES AND IMPLICATIONS

Kajal Dipen Chheda, Assistant Professor
Department of ISME, ATLAS SkillTech University, Mumbai, Maharashtra, India
Email Id- kajal.chheda@atlasuniversity.edu.in

ABSTRACT:

This course addresses the broad idea of equality, looking at numerous aspects and ideas related to it. It starts out by analysing anti-egalitarian viewpoints before getting into the liberal defence of inequality. The course explores formal equality, equality of opportunity, and equality of outcomes, illuminating how these ideas interact in current political philosophy. The link between equality and liberty is also a topic of controversy, and the notion that they are intrinsically incompatible is refuted. Also taken into consideration are feminist viewpoints on equality. The final product of this course is a thorough review of the continuing discussions and changing ideas about equality in our society. Understanding equality and addressing some of the significant theoretical challenges related to this idea are the major goals of this course. This section   Examine some of the anti-egalitarian positions; Discuss the liberal justification of inequality; and finally, evaluate the relationship between equality and liberty. Describe the concept of equality. Discuss some of the fundamental principles of equality. Describe formal equality, equality of opportunity, and equality of outcomes.

KEYWORDS:

Equality, Liberty, Legal Equality, Political.

INTRODUCTION

The concept of equality seems to be the main topic of discussion in contemporary politics and political thinking. Society viewed birth-based hierarchy as normal. This has not been the case for a very long time. In actuality, the premise underlying contemporary political theory is that all people are created equal. The American Civil War and the French Revolution of 1789 continue to be two extremely important historical turning points in the development of the concepts of democracy, equality, and freedom. One questioned mediaeval hierarchy while the other highlighted racial disparities. It was difficult to embrace the concept of equality, however. R.H. Tawney bemoaned the 'Religion of Inequality' in British society in a piece he wrote in 1931. Not merely the fact that there are inequities in society, but also the acceptance of them as normal and inevitable, appears to have troubled him. Many changes have occurred since the Second World War, and the concept of equality has been much more widely accepted.

The women's movement and the expansion of the colonized globe both significantly expanded the discussion of equality. In sum, this course has delved into the complex world of equality, illuminating its many facets and theoretical foundations. Evidently, the notion of equality has undergone a major evolution throughout time, moving from legal equality based on shared humanity to more complex concepts like equality of opportunity and results. It is obvious that equality still serves as a fundamental organising concept even if there are heated disagreements over it. With an increasing understanding that they may coexist and even strengthen one another, the relationship between equality and liberty once thought to be

incompatible is shown to be more complicated. The feminist viewpoint also emphasises the significance of tackling gender differences within the more general rhetoric of equality. This course gives us the information and resources we need to participate in these important discussions and work towards a more equitable society as we continue to struggle with inequality in all of its manifestations.

In the current setting, we may claim that equality has been acknowledged as a crucial organizing principle for human existence; nonetheless, fierce arguments persist about where and how equality should be enforced. Applying the equality principle to how money and income are distributed in society is a considerably more divisive topic. In this regard, it would be helpful to note that there has been a serious resurgence of anti-egalitarian thinking in recent years, which has been strengthened by the rising popularity of the political economy school that contends that egalitarian policies stifle market efficiency and, in the long run, harm everyone. Egalitarians must, however, hone their arguments in response to a fresh set of obstacles; often, they start by making it abundantly apparent that they are not calling for ultimate equality and that, as a result, uniformity is not at all included in their plan. Instead, diversity is what they want to protect [1], [2].

A Variety of Equalities

Specified Equality

The English philosopher John Locke is still regarded as one of the most persuasive proponents of the notion of equality based on the inherent equality of individuals. (It goes without saying that women have absolutely no place in Locke's plan of things!) By discussing equality and universality as a result of this shared humanity, Kant furthered his argument. As a result, formal equality evolved to signify that all people should be treated equally because of their shared humanity. The concept of equality before the law, or legal equality, is the most significant manifestation of this philosophy. No matter their caste, ethnicity, colour, gender, or other characteristics, or their religion or social standing, everyone should be treated equally under the law. This was a positive start in the battle against special advantages based on race, gender, social class, and other factors, but it was still a fairly constrained idea. This theory disregards the possibility that class, gender, or caste-based handicaps may be so severe that people would not be able to take advantage of the legal equality that the law grants to everyone.

It would be relevant to mention in this regard that Marx's article "On the Jewish Question" was inspired by this insufficiency to study this issue. While legal equality was a tremendous advancement, he argued that it could not lead to genuine liberation. Despite the fact that the market liberated individuals from the constraints imposed by social class and other comparable categories, it also produced class distinctions that were supported by the presence of private property.

As a result, Marxists refer to legal equality in this sense as market equality, which is nothing more than a façade to hide the profoundly uneven character of society. This suggested that people had radically different market values.

As a result of the reality that people are not equal in the majority of significant areas, egalitarians have moved away from the idea that all people are created equally and must thus have equal rights. As a result, the term "equality" is now used more in a prescriptive than a descriptive meaning; measures that advance the concept of equality without relying on certain descriptive characteristics of people would be supported.

The Equalization of Chances

Equality of opportunity, said simply, is the elimination of all barriers to one's own personal growth. It implies that promotions should be contingent on skills and careers should be available to talent. Status, ties to one's family, upbringing, and other such considerations shouldn't be permitted to influence decisions. An incredibly appealing concept that is concerned with what is considered to be the beginning point in life is equality of opportunity. The inference is that for there to be equality, all people must start out on an even playing field. However, this need not have any egalitarian repercussions [3], [4]. Uneven results are permissible and justified precisely because everyone had an equal starting point. The disparity would therefore be attributed to varying innate gifts, work ethic, or even chance.

DISCUSSION

In this way, it would seem that equality of opportunity gives everyone the same chance to compete in a hierarchical society. If that's the case, it doesn't seem like a very egalitarian principle. Thus, equality of opportunity is a sign of an unequal society, even if it is founded on the lofty ideal of merit. This theory is based on the dichotomy between nature and convention, with the claim being that ethically acceptable distinctions may be made based on various natural attributes such as abilities, skills, hard effort, and so forth. The opposite is true for distinctions brought about by societal norms or customs, such as poverty and homelessness. However, the reality is that a particular societal preference is what really qualifies a natural differentiation like beauty or intellect as a meaningful basis for social distinction. As a result, we can see that the line separating nature from convention is not as sharp as egalitarians would have us believe.

The acceptability of maintaining open careers to talents, offering fair equal chance, and the several variants on the idea of positive discrimination all contribute to the institutionalization of equality of opportunity. All of these contribute to the appearance of rationale and acceptability in the system of inequality. The essential premise is that advantage itself is unaffected by criticism as long as the competition has been fair. Without a doubt, a system like this would produce individuals who focus only on their unique skills and personality traits. Because they are only capable of thinking in terms of competition, this robs them of any sense of community with their people. Perhaps the only society that can result from this is one that is made up of successful people on the one hand and failed people who blame themselves for their apparent failure on the other. The attempt to artificially separate the accomplishments and failures of one generation from the next is yet another issue with equality of opportunity.

It is clear from this that the liberal view of equality is grounded on equality of opportunity. Due to the fact that these are chances that result in uneven results, this advocacy runs counter to any genuine notion of equality. As a result, this philosophy doesn't care about the results and is just concerned with the process. This is fully consistent with the liberal notion that people are the fundamental building block of society and that we should enable people to pursue their own interests. Does this imply that egalitarians will disregard opportunities for all people? Without a doubt, no. They would, however, operate within a more expansive understanding of equality of opportunity, providing everyone with the tools necessary to develop their abilities in a gratifying and meaningful manner. In an equal society, no one would be denied the chance to really grow in their abilities. Living a good life would be the true equitable use of this chance. Egalitarians would strive to create social circumstances that allow everyone the chance to have good lives since it is impossible to guarantee that everyone leads a valuable life.

Equiparity of Results

The notion of equality may also be expressed in terms of the equality of outcomes, which shifts the focus from the life's beginning to the final result. Marx, for example, believed that any equality right that is restricted by a bourgeois economy can only be partial. He therefore contended for complete social equality, which could only be achieved by the abolition of private property. The assurance of every other equality, according to proponents of equality of result, would be insufficient as long as equality of outcome is not guaranteed. The goal of equality of outcome is criticised because, in their view, it would only result in unfairness, stagnation, and, worst of all, dictatorship. For instance, Hayek has argued that since individuals are so diverse from one another, any system that treats them equally ultimately creates inequality. It is said that the pursuit of equality comes at the expense of personal freedom. It is suggested that the imposition of socialist egalitarian policies undercuts a person's dignity and self-respect, and the associated paternalism prevents an individual from making a logical decision [5], [6].

A Few Basic Equality Principles

Egalitarians reject the notion that everyone should or is equal. It is not an elementary mathematical concept. We may benefit by outlining some of the fundamental values that egalitarians would adhere to. The first commitment is to the notion that every person has a right to the fulfilment of his or her fundamental requirements and that they do not tolerate a society that is marked by significant differences in the level of life. They are dedicated to creating a society where everyone may live happy, fulfilled lives in circumstances that are not merely tolerable. Equal regard is another important value, which involves resistance to any demeaning behaviour or situations; ideally, a community built on compassion. An egalitarian viewpoint would be opposed to extreme disparities in wealth and income, not only between people but also across countries. In addition to providing everyone with the opportunity to engage in meaningful work in a secure environment, it would also incorporate democratic control over the economy and the workplace. Political equality, it goes without saying, encompasses a broad range of civil rights and a democratic involvement in all facets of life so that people are able to manage and shape their lives in a more meaningful manner. It goes beyond the right to vote and the ability to run for any public office. The complicated concept of equality also encompasses issues of sexual, racial, ethnic, and religious equality. It goes without saying that one cannot hope to achieve an entirely comprehensive list of equality, and in that lies the notion of equality's reforming potential.

Few Comments Opposing Equality

It is said that the idea of equality is unworkable in reality since society and social processes are compared to competitions where not everyone can come out on top. Such issues were previously raised during our prior examination of outcome equality. One may respond by claiming that this criticism stems from a certain conception of how society and the person work. The ideologies that see equality as a danger to freedom in recent years are connected with the names of Hayek, Friedman, and Nozick. Nozick is especially critical of liberals who support welfare policies in order to increase equality of opportunity, such as John Rawls and Ronald Dworkin. Libertarians like Nozick counter the claim that social disparity erodes self-respect by asserting that, on the contrary, it is egalitarianism that robs individuals of their dignity. By recognising the uniqueness of each person and the differences among people, Nozick contends that inegalitarian communities demonstrate a greater regard for individuals. Since self-esteem is founded on factors that distinguish individuals, there would be no foundation for it in an egalitarian society since there would be no disparities based on power,

position, money, or social standing. Those who feel that every effort to promote equality leads to the expansion of the state and, as a consequence, reduces individual freedom have a very strong opposition. This is the fundamental question of the link between equality and liberty in western political thought, which we shall examine a little later.

Liberal Justification for Unequitable Treatment

However, liberals do think that it is right and fair if differences are earned and warranted by virtue of individuals's diverse backgrounds or merits. They reject sex, colour, and class as important factors for treating people differently. Liberal ideology is certain that inequality is permissible as long as it can be justified by rewards or punishments for unique characteristics and talents or unique contributions to society. One cannot help but notice that the characteristics of the society in issue limit what is honourable, unique, or a service to society. Furthermore, it is difficult to determine the value of a single person's contribution, and if someone withdraws after donating, are they actually making a contribution at all? This whole stance appears to go against the fundamental liberal tenet that all persons are deserving of respect and value equally and reduces people to a collection of skills and capabilities. However, in more recent periods, contemporary liberals like Rawls and Dworkin have rejected merit and deprivation as justifications for inequality.

Instead, they support a system of consideration that treats all people equally morally, regardless of individual differences in aptitude or skill. They build this equality on the notion that everyone has the same capacity for decision-making and the power to choose a course for their lives. For example, Rawls rejects as morally arbitrary the distribution of rewards based on ability or effort since, in his view, disparities in talents and skills are just realities of nature and no one should profit or suffer as a result of the existence or lack of these abilities or skills. In order to make the "basic structure of society can be arranged so that these contingencies work to the good of the least fortunate," he advises treating these innate qualities as a societal asset.

According to Rawls, the best approach for guaranteeing that natural resources do not result in unjust benefits is the so-called difference principle. According to the justice principle, social and economic disparities must be set up in a way that is both most beneficial to the underprivileged and associated with offices and positions that are available to everyone under fair equality of opportunity. As a result, this definition of equality is significantly more expansive than the classic liberal rights. Unfair rewards are justifiable as incentives for the least advantaged people, not because of differences in talents. Dworkin also criticises the classic liberal views on equality and concedes that certain welfare and redistribution measures are necessary. On the basis that it posits the inevitable existence of institutionalised disparities between classes, Macpherson has questioned Rawlsian equality. In doing so, Rawls disregards the reality that class-based inequality would have an impact on other dimensions of equality since it would lead to uneven power relationships between members of various classes [7], [8].

Feminism And Equality

Feminists attempt to view the subject of equality from a gender perspective. Justice, Gender and the Family by Susan Okin, published in 1980, is a significant work in this regard. It has been argued that enacting equal opportunities laws or applying redistributive justice by expanding the application of equality principles to different contexts cannot, in and of themselves, create equality because such laws and principles operate in a setting already tainted by the gender gap a gap caused by social practises. Many of these actions don't specifically target women, but they nonetheless promote inequality and give it the appearance

of legitimacy as a whole. Thus, even though the law may not explicitly discriminate between the sexes, married women with jobs are particularly disadvantageous in a gender-biased culture. Women also tend to be separated into certain occupations.

Feminists argue that gender roles are socially constructed and have nothing to do with women's actual position of substantive inequality, which includes their limited voice in family decision-making, their responsibility for childrearing, and their subsequent exclusion from the labour force. However, if the state becomes engaged, particularly in family life, in order to abolish gender difference, it may even anger feminists. It may be simpler to be conscious of gender disparity and to place oneself in societal norms and socially prescribed positions, but it might be challenging to take corrective action. Nothing substantial in terms of gender equality can be accomplished until the women themselves see their inequality, their subservient place in the household, and step forward to reorient the social structures.

Equalities and freedom

It is sometimes said that freedom and equality are incompatible and that there is no way to resolve this issue. De Tocqueville, who feared mass compliance and the tyranny of the majority, believed that equality posed a potential threat to liberty. Some of the more contemporary names linked with this perspective include Friedman, Nozick, and Hayek. By arguing that efforts to achieve equality always involve force and the loss of liberty, such a stance willfully creates a conflict between liberty and equality. They make the implication that because people vary in terms of their aptitudes and capacities, variations in their lives are inescapable, and a natural inclination towards inequality is inescapable. Any effort to change this would need authoritarian repression, which entails loss of freedom. An egalitarian society is not a uniform society; this effort to link equality with uniformity is intentional. It would be a society in which every person, given her or his unique and varied abilities, could lead a life that was equally important and fulfilling. The notion of liberty that underlies the claim that equality and freedom cannot coexist has been referred to as the "negative conception" of liberty. In fact, they argue that the positive idea of liberty is really a ruse that passes for liberty. The lack of intentional meddling in someone's life is seen as liberty in the negative perspective. Egalitarians, on the other hand, define freedom as having the opportunity to make decisions that are both meaningful and practical. Such a conception of liberty would quickly connect it to concerns about gaining access to social and institutional power structures, satisfying material and economic needs, and of course, having education and information.

Egalitarians contend that everyone must have a life that is equally meaningful and pleasant in order to achieve equality in social power, economic prosperity, and educational attainment. Egalitarians are seeking equality in this way because it has been suppressed by institutional and social institutions of power. The extreme wealth disparities substantially impair liberty. Undoubtedly, education is a liberating force since it expands our horizons and equips us with a variety of talents. Therefore, it may be argued that any disparity in access to any of these components would restrict the individual's capacity to lead a fulfilling life, which, according to egalitarians, is the core of the concept of liberty. Egalitarians contend that being left alone does not automatically result in a person being free. They contend that authority, money, and education are the fundamental pillars of liberty and that a society cannot be free if it cannot guarantee equality in these spheres. As a result, we can see that, far from being at odds with one another, liberty and equality are really not just compatible but also interdependent. The majority of the 20th century was a period when equality seldom needed to be justified. It was seen as the fundamental idea around which civilizations and countries should be structured. But as this century comes to a conclusion, there is a real intellectual and political effort to

portray equality as immoral. The anti-egalitarians argue that the pursuit of equality would seriously jeopardise both the inalienable character of the right to property and the fundamentally plural structure of society.

We attempted to investigate the meaning of the term "equality" in this unit. Given that our society is struggling to overcome many forms of inequality, its importance is all the more apparent. Formal equality, which subscribes to the idea that all humans have a common humanity, is equality in the narrowest sense. As we have seen, equality of opportunity may eventually be used to excuse inequity [9], [10]. The definition of equality is distorted by result equality. We also evaluated the contemporary liberal defence of inequality and how it only supports inequality when it benefits the most disadvantaged members of society. The feminist criticism of equality was also noted. Finally, we looked at the discussion around the connection between equality and liberty and discovered that a pejorative view of liberty makes the two ideas seem incompatible.

CONCLUSION

In conclusion, this course has illuminated the many facets and theoretical underpinnings of the complex realm of equality. It is obvious that the idea of equality has changed greatly throughout time, moving from a conception of legal equality based on common humanity to more nuanced ideas like equality of opportunity and results. Even in the midst of vehement debates, equality is still clearly a basic organising concept. There is now a growing understanding that equality and liberty may coexist and even promote one another, contrary to the previously held belief that they cannot coexist. The feminist viewpoint emphasises how crucial it is to address gender differences within the more general rhetoric of equality. As we battle inequality in all of its manifestations, this course provides us with the information and tools necessary to participate in these crucial discussions and fight towards a more equitable society. The quest of equality is a crucial and continuous endeavour, essential to the concepts of justice, human rights, and social development as we traverse the difficulties of our rapidly evolving environment. We can work to create a society that is fairer and more inclusive for everyone via ongoing discussion and careful consideration.

REFERENCES:

[1]   F. Prati, R. J. Crisp, F. Pratto, and M. Rubini, "Encouraging majority support for immigrant access to health services: Multiple categorization and social identity complexity as antecedents of health equality," *Gr. Process. Intergr. Relations*, 2016.

[2]   A. Klarsfeld, E. S. W. Ng, L. Booysen, L. C. Christiansen, and B. Kuvaas, "Comparative equality and diversity: Main findings and research gaps," *Cross Cult. Strateg. Manag.*, 2016.

[3]   L. Gartzia and E. Lopez-Zafra, "Gender Research in Spanish Psychology, Part II: Progress and Complexities in the European Context," *Sex Roles*, 2016.

[4]   B. Akala and J. Divala, "Gender Equity Tensions in South Africas post-apartheid higher education: in defence of differentiation," *South African J. High. Educ.*, 2016.

[5]   T. Jiang, X. Chen, Q. Wu, J. Ma, W. Susilo, and W. Lou, "Towards efficient fully randomized message-locked encryption," in *Lecture Notes in Computer Science (including subseries Lecture Notes in Artificial Intelligence and Lecture Notes in Bioinformatics)*, 2016.

[6]   K. Lynch *et al.*, *Affective equality: Love, care and injustice*. 2016.

[7]   G. N. Grapiglia, J. Yuan, and Y. xiang Yuan, "A derivative-free trust-region algorithm for composite nonsmooth optimization," *Comput. Appl. Math.*, 2016.

[8]   N. Hudson, "Equality and Human Rights Commission – Is Britain Fairer?," *Divers. Equal. Heal. Care*, 2016.

[9]   M. L. Schmid, "Computing equality-free and repetitive string factorisations," *Theor. Comput. Sci.*, 2016.

[10]   F. Colgan, "LGBT company network groups in the UK: Tackling opportunities and complexities in the workplace," in *Sexual Orientation and Transgender Issues in Organizations: Global Perspectives on LGBT Workforce Diversity*, 2016.

<div align="center">

CHAPTER 5

EXPLORING THE DYNAMICS OF RIGHTS: FROM THEORETICAL FOUNDATIONS TO HUMAN RIGHTS PRINCIPLES

</div>

<div align="center">

Aditya Kashyap, Assistant Professor

Department of ISME, ATLAS SkillTech University, Mumbai, Maharashtra, India

Email Id- aditya.kashyap@atlasuniversity.edu.in

</div>

ABSTRACT:

The idea of rights and its theoretical foundations are explored in depth in this section. It looks into the essence of rights, clarifies their importance, and focuses on all of its many elements. Rights are defined as social claims that are necessary for individual growth and society well-being. Because governments do not give rights, but rather defend and recognise them, democracy rests on preserving the rights of its population. Rights are fundamental for a person's development since they are social in nature and emerge from social processes. This chapter differentiates between rights and privileges while highlighting the universality and social roots of each. It emphasises the interdependence of rights, obligations, and social standards while acknowledging their dynamic character. Liberal democracies place greater value on political and individual rights than on economic and social rights. Socialism advocates the rights structure that is opposed to capitalism. Laski, a liberal with a leftward bent, believes that rights are necessary for personal growth but prioritises economic rights above social and political rights. A list of fundamental rights that all people have by virtue of being human is set out in the UN Declaration of Human Rights. The idea of rights and the theoretical foundation that supports them in this unit. This chapter discusses the nature of rights, explains what they represent, and lists the key ideas surrounding them.

KEYWORDS:

Economic, Freedom, Human Right, Property, Social.

<div align="center">

INTRODUCTION

</div>

Rights are social prerogatives required for the development of the human personality. These are the property of the people and they create the circumstances that allow them to pursue being who they are. They are communal: provided by society and protected by government. Even the government cannot take them away from people. They represent a certain period in the evolution of civilisation. The nature and substance of rights vary along with society. Theories of rights provide only a limited account of their definitions, genesis, and nature. The notion of natural rights is accurate as long as it emphasises the fact that rights are inherent to social demands, which makes them natural. In a similar vein, the legal theory of rights is accurate in so far as it designates the state as our rights' guarantee. There are several types of rights. Humans have the following rights: the right to life, equality, security of one's person and property, freedom, access to education and employment, religious freedom, the right to vote, and the right to hold public office.

Rightfully referred to as social claims, rights assist people in becoming their best selves and in the development of their identities. Democracy must be there for the people if it is to be their form of governance. Maintaining a system of rights for its citizens would help such a democratic government serve the people to the best of its ability. Governments never provide rights; they only serve to defend them. States never grant rights; they only serve to acknowledge them. Rights are always social since they arise from society and its specific

social circumstances. persons have the right to their own rights, which they exercise in order to fully develop their personalities. Rights exist for persons and belong to individuals [1], [2].

Rights: Nature and Meaning

An essential issue in political theory has long confounded, if not perplexed, political philosophers: the connection between the individual and the state. Political philosophers have argued about who is more important the state or the individual and what each party owes to the other. Some philosophers, such as Plato, hold the view that only the state can provide justice and that it is the responsibility of each person to carry out their tasks to the best of their ability. These thinkers are referred to as idealists. Others, like John Locke, believe that the state is only a means to an end, and that that aim is the person. As a result, they believe that individual rights are sacred and untouchable. Individual rights are a recent concept that emerged in Europe around the 15th and 16th century. These rights' origins in society and that they serve as safeguards against state absolutism are concepts that have just recently come to light. Rights do not belong to the state since they belong to people. Since rights belong to each individual, they are prerequisites for that person's growth. Our social nature produces rights, which are the outcome of our social membership.

Defining Rights

Rights are social claims that are essential to the formation of the human personality. They are not rights that one is endowed with. Some persons in ancient and mediaeval periods had the right to enjoy privileges. However, no one could assign the title of rights to these privileges. Because they are not entitlements, rights are not privileges. Rights and privileges vary from one another; rights are our claims against other people, while privileges are favours that certain people get at the expense of others. Rights are universal in the sense that everyone is guaranteed them, however privileges are not universal since only a small number of people may enjoy them. Without any kind of discrimination, all people are granted rights; nevertheless, only a chosen few are granted privileges. Privileges are earned by patronage, while rights are obtained as a matter of right. Privileges are characteristics of undemocratic institutions, whereas rights originate in democratic society. One statement that demonstrated the naturalness of rights, i.e., that men have rights because they are, by nature, human beings, was made by Thomas Jefferson: "Men are endowed by their creator with certain inalienable rights." No one would wish to argue against the idea that males including women have rights or should have rights.

However, this fact does not imply anything different. This fact makes no attempt to define anything. Holland defined rights as "one man's capacity of influencing the act of others, not by his own strength but by the strength of society," which indicates that Holland is only referring to rights as a social claim. Other components of rights have not been given their proper position in a definition of rights. Bosanquet and Laski include the position of society, the state, and man's personality in their definitions of rights, but they too ignore the crucial aspect of "duty" as a part of "rights," which is what Wilde says: "A right is a reasonable claim to freedom in the exercise of certain activities." "A right is a claim recognised by society and upheld by the state," asserts Bosanquet. In the words of Laski, "Rights are those conditions of social life without which no man can seek, in general, to be himself at his best."

A practical definition of rights should include specific topics. One of them is the social claim element, which states that rights come from society and that there are no rights prior to, above, or in opposition to society. Another aspect of rights is "the development of personality," which means that they belong to the individual and are a key component in helping to advance that person's personality. This aspect includes the individual's right to

oppose the government if the latter's action is incompatible with that person's personality. Furthermore, the state's function within the framework of rights must be included in the concept of rights. This component emphasises that the state simply upholds rights; it does not give them. According to Laski, a state may be judged by the rights it upholds. Because they are politically recognised, rights exist. Insofar as they are preceded by obligations that person has as a member of society, rights are socially sanctioned claims. Rather than following rights, obligations came first. Duties are antecedent to rights in this sense, and this is what restricts both the nature of and the exercise of rights. Absolute rights are a contradiction in language; there are no such things. As Raphael correctly notes, the contrast between rights as "liberties" and rights as "claims" has grown in significance for social and political thought.

DISCUSSION

On the basis of the previously described topics, it is rather simple to determine what the fundamental components of rights are. The definition of rights itself conceals the essence of rights. Rights are claims in and of themselves; they are claims. Although all claims are not rights, rights are claims. Rights are those claims that society accepts as legitimate. Rights are just theoretical claims without such acknowledgment. Given the way society is structured, an individual may plainly have no rights beyond those that are recognised by the society. According to Hobhouse, "Rights are what we can reasonably expect from others and from them, and all real rights are prerequisites to social welfare." As a result, some of the rights that anybody may demand are those that are required for him to perform the duty that society expects of him. Rights are social; they are social in the sense that they arise from society at any given time; they are social in that they are never, and in fact, cannot be, anti-social; they are social in that they did not exist before the emergence of society; and they are social in that they cannot be exercised against the common good perceived by society.

Rights, as social claims, provide the circumstances essential for personality development in people. These circumstances are made, made available, and generated. These circumstances are made, provided, and created by the state, not by society. The state enables rights by establishing prerequisites. Therefore, it establishes a foundation for the enjoyment of rights. It just acts as their guardian and defender; it does not create rights. The state does not have the authority to 'take' away an individual's rights. The state loses its claim to the loyalty of its citizens if it fails to uphold rights in the sense of creating the circumstances for their growth. Rights are reactions to the society in which they are found. The nature of rights depends heavily on the social norms and ethos that prevail at a given period and location. The components of rights evolve together with society and its circumstances. This is the manner in which we refer to rights as being dynamic. There will never be a set of rights that are universally valid for all future eras. Powers and rights need to be separated. Every person has a certain amount of strength from nature to meet their wants. Power is pure energy and a physical force. No system of rights can be built based only on coercion. A person does not automatically have a right just because they are powerful. As a human being who belongs to society, he or she has rights. The only things an isolated individual has are energy, physical force, and procedure. In addition to our rights as social beings, or members of society, we also have abilities as individuals. As social creatures and as solitary individuals, we have no authority and no right to speak, act, or behave anyway we like.

Rights are reactions to our actions. They are of the 'returns' or 'rewards' kind. After we have contributed to society and others, they are given to us. We only "own" after "owing." In addition to being the results of our obligations, rights also reflect the work we put in. The benefits we get from others after carrying out our obligations to them are known as rights. Rights do not have an absolute nature. A compromise between a person's rights as an

individual and the interests of the community to which they belong is necessary for their wellbeing as members of that society. A list of rights must recognise that nothing can be absolute or unchecked since doing so would cause societal anarchy and turmoil.

Different Rights

The fundamental prerequisites for human individuality are rights. The rights framework that each person has access to determines how their personality will develop. distinct state systems acknowledge various rights; for example, Indians have distinct rights than Americans. Different rights would be prioritised in a liberal-democratic society than in a socialist one. We categorise rights into moral, legal, civil, political, economic, and social categories for this reason. They are referred to as basic rights since they are protected by the national constitution. As fundamental prerequisites for the development of the human personality, rights must be made accessible to citizens of all governments. The UN Declaration of Human Rights acts as a guide and a mandate for governments to acknowledge and uphold certain rights for their own populations.

The right to life is a fundamental right, without which all other rights are useless, and it is the framework within which the principal rights that are accessible to the people may be broadly categorised. This right entails that the state must provide the preservation of life and protection from any harm, including suicide, which is illegal. The right to equality has several facets, including the elimination of all forms of social, economic, and political discrimination and the guarantee of equal protection under the law. The right to equality includes protected discrimination, which is protected under the Indian Constitution. Similar to the right to equality, the right to freedom includes a number of dimensions, including freedom of expression, of the press, of assembly, of association, of travel, of dwelling, and of choosing a profession. The distinctive quality of this privilege guaranteed to Indians by the constitution has been that it must be utilised within justifiable limitations. Individuals also have the right to freedom of religion, conscience, and belief.

Another crucial right without which it is difficult for a man to develop his individuality is the right to education. Man cannot have a meaningful life if he is uninformed. Being a societal plague, illiteracy needs to be eradicated. Promoting education should be the state's obligation. The right to labour, the right to social security, and the right to leisure and relaxation are a few examples of economic rights. A person cannot benefit from other rights if they lack employment and financial stability. The right to own and pass down property is a component of the economic right to property. In liberal democracies, it is seen as a crucial right. There are individual political rights. These liberties are what give them the status of complete citizens. The right to vote, to run for office, to occupy public office, and the right to create political parties are a few of these that need to be mentioned [3], [4].

A list of rights is provided to Indian people under the constitution. The following are referred to as the fundamental rights: the right to equality, the right to freedom, the right against exploitation, the right to freedom of religion, the right to cultural and educational freedom, and the right to constitutional remedies. The latter is a crucial right because it ensures the protection of all the other rights. The liberal-democratic regimes guarantee that political rights take precedence over social rights and that social rights take precedence over economic rights. In socialist nations, economic rights come first, followed by social and political rights.

Concepts of Rights

There are several theories of rights that describe the nature, history, and significance of rights. The social welfare theory of rights views rights as social that should be exercised in

the interest of both the individual and society. The theory of natural rights describes rights as inherent to human nature; the theory of legal rights acknowledges rights as legal; the historical theory of rights declares rights as products of traditions and customs; the idealistic theory, like the theory of legal rights, relates rights only with the state; and the historical theory of rights pronounces rights as products of traditions and customs. The evolution of rights as they are known to us began modestly: civil rights with contractualists; rights as the result of traditions with historicists; rights as prescribed by law with jurists; political rights with democrats; social rights with sociologists and pluralists; socio-economic rights with socialists and Marxists; and human rights with UN advocates. This justification oversimplifies our rights and their origins.

Natural Rights Theory

The primary proponents of the notion of natural rights are Thomas Hobbes (Leviathan, 1651), John Locke (Two Treatises on Government, 1690), and J.J. Rousseau (1762), "The Social Contract." After introducing the social contract theory, these contractualists maintain the belief that men have natural rights in their natural condition and that these rights were ascribed to people as though they were the fundamental characteristics of men as men. Therefore, the contractualists proclaimed that rights are unalienable, unscriptural, and unassailable. There are several arguments against the doctrine of natural rights. Simply because rights belonged to mankind in their natural form does not make them natural. Pre-society rights are a contradiction in language since they can never exist before society emerges. If there were any rights in the natural world, they were nothing more than bodily energy. In order for rights to exist, a governing body must exist.

How could one envisage rights in a state of nature if there was no state: who would protect people's rights in a state of nature? Contractualists are at a loss for words. Saying that natural rights were absolute or unaffected by civilization would imply that they existed in the state of nature. Laski also disagrees with the concept of natural rights, calling it "a rhetorical non-sense upon stilts" according to Bentham. The idea that humans might have rights and obligations apart from society is the foundation of rights as natural rights. Burke had eloquently said that we cannot simultaneously enjoy the rights of a civil and an uncivil state: the more perfect natural rights are in theory, the more difficult it is to uphold them in actuality. In the sense that they constitute the prerequisites for human beings to realise who they are, rights are natural. When Laski asserts that rights "are not natural in the sense that a permanent and unchanging catalogue of them can be compiled, rather they are natural in the sense that under the constraints of a civilised life, facts demand their recognition," he demonstrates his understanding of the importance of rights [5], [6].

Principles of Legal Rights

The same meaning is conveyed by the terms "legal theory of rights" and "theory of legal rights." The theory of legal rights may be seen as an alternative term for the idealist theory of rights, which aims to position rights as a state-produced good. The names of Laski, Bentham, Hegel, and Austin may be named as proponents of such beliefs. They contend that the state bestows rights. The idea views rights as a claim that the people are given by the state's might. Since the state is the source of rights, they are neither prior nor anterior to the state, according to these theories. They also stipulate that the state establishes a legal framework that protects those rights and that it is the state that enforces the exercise of those rights. Because the law establishes and upholds rights, the nature of rights also changes as the law's provisions change. A Grammar of Politics, written by English Labour Party theorist and political scientist Harold Laski (1893–1951), which was initially published in 1925 and subsequently

amended virtually every two years, outlines his clear opinions on the system of rights. Laski has the following opinions on the nature of rights: They are social obligations owed to each person as a member of society they support each person's unique personality and attempt to be their best selves; and they are "those social obligations without which no man can seek to be his best self." The state only acknowledges and protects rights by upholding them. Rights are never absolute; absolute rights are a contradiction in terms. They are dynamic in nature in so far as their contents change according to place, time, and conditions. They go along with duties; in fact, duties are prior to rights; the exercise of rights implies duties. If Laski were to grant a person rights, he would do so in the following order: the right to work, the right to enough pay, the right to fair working hours, the right to education, the right to elect one's own rulers, and then any further rights.

According to Laski, establishing economic rights is necessary before granting political rights because "where there are great inequalities, the relationship between men is that of the master and the slave." Without economic equality, political freedom is worthless. The right to education is just as important but comes in lower on the list since it is the only means by which a person may effectively execute all the other rights. One is more likely to use their political rights with sincerity if they have access to economic and social rights (such as education). However, contrary to what proponents of these ideas would have us think, the state does not really establish our rights; rather, it only defends and preserves them. If we acknowledge that the state created rights, we will have to accept the idea that if the state can grant us rights, it can also revoke them. Undoubtedly, such a viewpoint would declare the state to be absolute. In such scenario, we would only have the rights that the state chose to grant us.

Historically Grounded Theory of Rights

The prescriptive theory of rights, also known as the historical theory of rights, views the state as the end result of a protracted historical process. It adheres to the theory that traditions and conventions give rise to rights. Burke, a conservative, maintained that whatever that the people may use or enjoy for an extended period of time without interruption belongs to them. Every right, when taken into account, is built on the power of extended observing. Traditions and customs assume the form of rights as a result of their stabilisation via frequent and continuing use. Edmund Burke's works from the 18th century are where the notion first appeared, and sociologists eventually accepted it. Since it rejects the legal theory of rights, the historical theory of rights is significant in this regard. Insofar as it refutes the doctrine of natural rights, it is equally significant. The state recognise what including rights persists across time, according to supporters of historical theory. The historical theory of rights has several drawbacks of its own. It cannot be said that all of our traditions lead to rights; for example, neither the Sati system nor infanticide do so. Not all of our rights have their roots in tradition. For instance, the right to social security is unrelated to any tradition.

Rights under the Social Welfare Theory

According to the social welfare theory of rights, social wellbeing is predicated on the existence of rights. According to the notion, the state should only accept rights that advance social welfare. Although Bentham may be considered the social welfare theory's 18th-century proponent, Roscoe Pound and Chafee are among its current proponents. The theory suggests that insofar as they are based on the consideration of common welfare, rights are creations of society. Since rights are the conditions of social good, claims that are incompatible with the general welfare and are thus rejected by the community do not become our rights. Also not without flaws is the social welfare theory of rights. It focuses on the social welfare aspect,

which is an imprecise concept. varied individuals have varied interpretations of the Benthamite maxim "greatest good of the greatest number." If the state ultimately determines what "social welfare" is, the theory proves to be the legal theory of rights. According to critics like Oscar Wilde, "if rights are created by taking social expediency into consideration, the individual is without a defence and helplessly dependent upon its arbitrary will [7], [8]."

Marxist conceptions of rights

The economic structure of a certain historical era is used to interpret the Marxist theory of rights. Various socioeconomic formations would have various rights systems. The state is a class institution since it is a tool in the hands of the economically powerful class, and the laws it creates are likewise class laws. So viewed, the feudal state defends the system of rights (such as privileges) that the feudal system favours via the use of feudal laws. Similar to this, the capitalist state defends the set of rights that benefit the capitalist system via capitalistic legislation. Marx argues that the class that controls society's economic structure also controls its political authority, and it utilises this dominance to advance and defend its own interests above those of all others. The socialist state would defend and advance the interests and rights of the working class via the proletariat laws in the socialist society that is modelled after the capitalist society.

Because the socialist society, in contrast to the capitalist world, is a classless society, its state and laws guarantee everyone's rights who lives in the classless society, not only those belonging to a certain class. According to the Marxists, the socialist state would work to establish socialism based on the tenet of "from each according to his ability to each according to his work," and the system of rights for everyone would follow this order: economic rights (work, social security) first, followed by social rights (education), and political rights (franchise rights). The focus on a non-exploitative socialist economy is what distinguishes the Marxist theory of rights from Marxism itself, which both suffer from its deterministic worldview. Because non-economic elements also play a part in shaping the superstructure, neither the economic component alone serves as the foundation of society nor is the superstructure a reflection of only the economic base.

The Human Rights

 Human rights were not born of men; rather, they were born with them, as S. Ramphal very well noted. They arise more from fundamental human dignity than from the United Nations' initiatives. They are considered human rights since they apply to all people. Human rights may be roughly described as those liberties that are essential to our existence as creatures of humanity. They are crucial because they encourage us to make use of and grow our abilities, skills, and intellect. They are founded on humankind's growing yearning for a life that upholds each person's intrinsic value and dignity while also treating them with respect.

The Charter's Articles 13, 55, 62, 68, and 76 all make reference to the promotion of universal respect for human rights. Under Roosevelt's leadership, the Commission on Human Rights, which was part of the UN Economic and Social Council, spent nearly 2.5 years drafting the Universal Declaration of Human Rights. The day became known as Human Rights Day when the UN General Assembly passed this Declaration on December 10, 1948. The Declaration of Human Rights has 30 articles, and from articles 3 to 15, there includes a list of customary rights. These rights include the freedom from arbitrary detention, the right to a fair trial, the equal protection of the law, the freedom to move about, the right to one's nationality, the right to seek refuge, and others. The rights listed in paragraphs 16 to 21 include additional significant rights. These include the right to property, the ability to marry, the ability to have a family, the right to fundamental freedoms including the freedom of speech and opinion, the

right to peaceful assembly and association, and the right to participate in one's own country's governance. Articles 22 through 27 include provisions pertaining to economic rights. These include the right to work, protection from unemployment, reasonable compensation, the ability to organise trade unions, the right to relaxation and recreation, the right to a sufficient standard of living, the right to education, and the right to take part in the country's cultural life. Articles 28, 29, and 30 guarantee social/international order, obligations to the society, which is the only setting in which the free and complete development of a man's personality is possible, and, accordingly, the protection of these rights.

The International Bill of Human Rights begins with the Universal Declaration of Human Rights. Following it are the 1966-adopted Optional Protocol, International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights, and International Covenant on Economic, Cultural, and Social Rights.

CONCLUSION

All organization is built on the foundation of human rights. They are included throughout the UN charter. The Preamble of the UN Charter makes a commitment to affirming trust in basic human rights, the value and dignity of each individual, the equality of men and women, and the rights of all countries, big and small.

The rights unit, in summary, provides insightful understandings of the complexity of rights and their fundamental significance to society. Rights are social claims that promote both individual growth and society advancement rather than arbitrary privileges.

They are not granted by governments and do not exist independently of social norms. Instead, rights result from the intricate interaction of social dynamics, responsibilities, and duties. This lesson emphasizes the need to establish a balance between each person's rights and the overall welfare of society, stressing that when rights are carefully used, they help create a peaceful and fair society.

Anyone interested in the complex structure of human societies and the values that underpin them must understand the ideas and theories of rights.

REFERENCES:

[1]   H. Clarke, P. Whiteley, W. Borges, D. Sanders, and M. Stewart, "Modelling the dynamics of support for a right-wing populist party: the case of UKIP," *J. Elections, Public Opin. Parties*, 2016.

[2]   E. Vayena and J. Tasioulas, "The dynamics of big data and human rights: The case of scientific research," *Philos. Trans. R. Soc. A Math. Phys. Eng. Sci.*, 2016.

[3]   C. Bening, C. Bening, and R. Leyh, "Right atrial contractile dynamics are impaired in patients with postcapillary pulmonary hypertension," *Exp. Ther. Med.*, 2016.

[4]   R. Sanders, "Norm Proxy War and Resistance Through Outsourcing: The Dynamics of Transnational Human Rights Contestation," *Hum. Rights Rev.*, 2016.

[5]   C. C. Berning and E. Schlueter, "The dynamics of radical right-wing populist party preferences and perceived group threat: A comparative panel analysis of three competing hypotheses in the Netherlands and Germany," *Soc. Sci. Res.*, 2016.

[6]   E. Thielemann and M. Hobolth, "Trading numbers vs. rights? Accounting for liberal and restrictive dynamics in the evolution of asylum and refugee policies," *J. Ethn. Migr. Stud.*, 2016.

[7]   M. E. McCormack, J. A. Lopez, T. H. Crocker, and M. S. Mukhtar, "Making the right connections: Network biology and plant immune system dynamics," *Curr. Plant Biol.*, 2016.

[8]   T. H. Lee and E. H. Telzer, "Negative functional coupling between the right fronto-parietal and limbic resting state networks predicts increased self-control and later substance use onset in adolescence," *Dev. Cogn. Neurosci.*, 2016.

CHAPTER 6

EXPLORING THE MULTIFACETED NOTION OF JUSTICE: UNITING POLITICAL IDEALS AND PRINCIPLES

Anand Kopare, Associate Professor
Department of ISME, ATLAS SkillTech University, Mumbai, Maharashtra, India
Email Id- anand.kopare@atlasuniversity.edu.in

ABSTRACT:

This chapter explores one of the core and most important ideas in political philosophy and political science: justice. It explains the complex nature of justice by breaking it down into its constituent parts, investigating many theories about it, and demonstrating its delicate relationship with liberty, equality, and the rule of law. In order to shape political institutions, direct governmental goals, and support philosophical ideas, justice is crucial. It is the point where political principles come together and mesh, acting as a fulcrum for society harmony and moral behaviour. This chapter bridges the gap between morality and law by conducting a thorough investigation of justice in all of its forms. It does so in order to highlight how deep an impact justice has on both the social structure and individual rights. Fundamentally, justice is the compass that directs political structures and practises in the direction of equity, objectivity, and the defence of individual and collective rights. The idea of justice will continue to change along with civilizations as they encounter new problems, acting as a ray of hope for a society that strives to strike a balance between everyone's freedom and equality. One of the most fundamental and significant ideas in political science in general and political theory in particular, the notion of justice is discussed in this section. This chapter defines justice, distinguishes its numerous components, identifies and describes the various views of justice, and describes the connection between liberty, equality, the rule of law, and justice.

KEYWORDS:

Equality, Justice, Liberty, Political, Political Philosophy.

INTRODUCTION

You must all be acquainted with terms like law, rights, liberty, and equality at this point. Understanding the notion of justice will be made easier by having previously studied these ideas. In actuality, the justice component ties the aforementioned ideas together. We will first attempt to comprehend the concept's significance in all of its many facets in this unit. After that, we'll look at the many philosophies of justice. Additionally, we'll make an effort to highlight the connection between equality, law, and justice. One of the main objectives of the state is to provide justice. Plato's Republic, one of the oldest political treatises, was an effort to create a decent society. Its core idea was justice. Therefore, a thorough comprehension of this idea will aid in assessing various political systems, their programmes, and the philosophies upon which they are predicated. Justice is the political values' reconciler and synthesizer since it is, in the words of Aristotle, "what answers to the whole of goodness."

Personality Of Justice

Justice has several facets, which must be considered in any study of the notion. Only by stating the principles (values) along which mankind have thought of justice and will continue to think of justice can the question "what is justice" be answered. With time, it undergoes alteration. As a result, what was fair in the past could now be unfair, and vice versa. Thus, there have been "egalitarian" and "libertarian" perceptions of justice, in which the value of

equality is given the highest place; "divine" views, in which justice is the execution of God's will; "hedonist" perceptions, in which "the greatest good of the greatest number" is made the criterion of justice; and "harmonizer" perceptions, in which justice is the harmonizing of various elements and values to produce a satisfactory balance. Justice is often associated with 'obligation' or with the preservation of peace and order, whereas for others it is an aristocratic responsibility. Justice therefore affects both the social structure of society and each individual's rights. It is both morally right and lawful. It is, in essence, an ethical idea [1], [2].

Truth and the Law

The concepts of "natural justice" and the state's authoritative law were merged by Roman attorneys. As a result, both civil law and international law are consistent with the law of nature. However, this stage of the law is abstract. through actuality, justice is found through the application of the law. Justice and law both aim to uphold societal order. The principal proponent, John Austin, argues that the law must serve as a tool for justice on the one hand, and as a tool to thwart mischief on the other.

Legally speaking, if the administration of justice falls short of the criteria of impartiality demanded by the processes of the legal system, i.e. While a law might be deemed morally unfair if it doesn't uphold moral notions of justice, the accused should be informed of the allegations brought against him, given a reasonable chance to defend himself, etc. However, morality goes beyond justice. Because justice is meant to be unbiased, it is often shown wearing a blindfold. There shouldn't be any distinction between two extremes, such as high and low income. Justice now requires impartiality as a prerequisite. Does this imply that there is no discrimination necessary for justice?

Discrimination and Justice

Aristotle and Plato argued for "proportionate equality" in conjunction with the concept of "righteousness" as an alternative way to understand justice. When Aristotle states: "Injustice arises when equals are treated unequally," the philosophical meaning of justice shifts in an empirical direction. This implies that if there were sex-based discrimination in a democracy, it would entail treating equals unfairly. A heavyweight wrestler competing against a lightweight would also be unfair. As a result, discrimination based on disparities is necessary for fairness and is pertinent to the tasks carried out. Additionally, according to Plato's notion of justice, individuals should live their lives in accordance with the principle of functional specialization.

The principle of "proper stations," according to which a man should only practice that to which his nature is most suited, is now known as justice. There are both private and public components to this. If we assume that there is nothing better for a man than to do a job that he is best suited to do, there is also nothing better for society than to ensure that each should be filling the station to which he is best entitled by virtue of the unique element of his personality. The three components of reason, spirit, and hunger have been emphasized in order for the person and the state to maintain their right boundaries.

Additionally, incidents of discriminatory treatment in private life are often unaffected by the legislation. However, the state would be justified in intruding if it led to societal damage, such as when certain groups were denied human rights in untouchability situations. A legislation prohibiting it would thus be just. Additionally, it is impossible for the various facilities to be completely equal. Due to this, Babasaheb Dr. B R Ambedkar requested that Scheduled Castes have access to temples and opposed creating separate temples, schools, or dormitories for them [3], [4].

DISCUSSION

Aristotle's theory became the cornerstone of what is known as the distributive justice doctrine. The main takeaway from Aristotle's justification is that justice is either "distributive" or "corrective"; the former entails fair distribution among equals, while the latter applies when a remedy for an injustice is offered. Marx states that "from each according to his ability to each according to his work" is the guiding principle for distributive justice in the socialist society that emerged after the revolution. Recent political economists' work reflects the notion of distributive justice. J.W. here is used to allude to his work. Chapmen has validity because he works to reconcile the concept of justice with his beliefs in the "economic rationality of man," the "consumer's sovereignty," and each person's right to "moral freedom." According to him, the distribution of advantages, which maximises benefits in line with the idea of consumer sovereignty, seems to be the first rule of justice. The second tenet is that a system is unfair if it benefits a select few in-material terms at the cost of the majority. It means that maintaining justice calls for no one to profit at the cost of another.

Economic and distributive justice

The condition of the public good is a requirement of distributive justice. It requires that the nation's economy be changed in such a manner that the general public may profit. In this approach, the concept of economic justice starts to suggest a socialistic social structure. Providing every able-bodied person with job, food, housing, and clothes is the first step in achieving economic justice. It has been accurately said that freedom is useless if it hinders the realisation of economic justice in this area of meeting the fundamental needs of everyone. Liberals thus believe that economic fairness in society may be achieved if the government provides welfare services, there is a progressive taxation system, and there is a fair reward for effort in the form of social security such an old age pension, a gratuity, and a provident fund. However, the economics discipline is where the Marxist conception of justice first emerged.

Marx argues that the power of the class that controls the means of production imposes the positive law of the state on its citizens. The economic interests of the governing class dictate the law. The laws must represent the interests of the working class after private property is eliminated and the working class owns the means of production. As a result, the class that controls the means of production determines the nature of justice. There will be justice without an economic foundation when the state disintegrates, as the communists envision. Modern liberals have long ago abandoned the laissez-faire economic philosophy. The'revisionist liberalism' espoused by J.W. is fundamentally based on redistributive justice, of which Aristotle spoke. Arthur Okun, John Rawls, and Chapmen. These authors support "redistributive justice," which implies government involvement in the economy for the sake of fairness and individual freedom.

Community Justice

In order to guarantee that an individual's legal expectations are met and that he receives benefits and protection from any violations of his rights, social justice seeks to strike a balance between that individual's rights and societal control. In light of the following dimensions of justice, let's explore the word "social justice." two ideas: the idea of "reform," or social transformation, and the idea that the community's interests come first. Community interest is the dominant factor. With the demise of the laissez-faire philosophy, a new understanding of the need to balance a person's rights with the needs of the society has emerged. Social justice demands that individual rights and communal interests be balanced. Additionally, it assumes that if there is a disagreement between the two, the public good must take precedence over private interests. Thus, the concept of what comprises the public good

or the interests of the community is intimately related to social justice. Community interest now encompasses not only the political fair treatment in political affairs, but also the social non-discrimination in social areas, and economic fair distribution of income and wealth sectors as a result of democracy's expansion into the social and economic spheres. So, social justice encompasses everything from the defence of minority political rights to the elimination of untouchability and poverty. As a result, the concept of social justice requires governments in underdeveloped nations to make deliberate efforts to better the lives of the underprivileged and weaker members of society [5], [6].

Social or Reform Change

The term "social justice" refers to the organisation of society in accordance with then-current notions of justice and equality. It aims to change social norms in order to create a society with more equity. Men have attempted to modify societal structures throughout history in the same way that they have worked to maintain existing structures. Social justice refers to reformative justice, the reorganisation of society, and the redistribution of rights in accordance with contemporary notions of justice. Since their goal was to change the current quo, Aristotle had reformative justice or what Raphael refers to as "prosthetic" justice in mind when he talked of "distributive justice." Justice did not mandate that governments care for the jobless a century ago. Charity was meant to do that. Today, it is believed that the state has a responsibility to care for the jobless and provide them with work as a result of the operation of conceptions of "reformative" or "prosthetic" justice.

Pound's Social Justice Illustration

The reinforcement of the concept of social justice is very well conveyed in Dean Roscoe Pound's interpretation, which sets out eight legal precepts and provides a six-fold example of social interest. So, by ensuring a fair social order, the concept of social justice advances human wellbeing.

Objections to social justice

Three reasons are given for criticising social justice theories. First, social justice demands implicitly expand the scope of the state's operations. When state personnel have vested interests, such arbitrary choice is unlikely to serve the purposes of social justice. The state will then have to determine "who gets, what, when and how." Second, the execution of social justice measures necessitates the restriction of liberty. It becomes challenging to determine how much liberty should be given in exchange for how much or little social fairness. Finally, it might be challenging to determine which fundamental needs must be met in order to satisfy social justice requirements and which justifies deviating from equality. However, it legally speaking implies a deviation from equality when the Indian Constitution declares the reservation of seats in the legislature, educational institutions, and public jobs. There are several explanations for these measures that relate to justice. First off, such care makes up for a century of privations. Thirdly, justice can only be served if the state steps forward with preferential policies to help them achieve social respect, economic viability, and political status. Second, these measures are necessary for realising ultimate equality to put the historically disadvantaged on an equal footing with society.

Ordinary Justice

Procedural justice is a more constrained understanding of what constitutes justice. In this meaning, the phrase is used to refer to the rules and processes that are applied to individual activities rather than to specify redistribution of wealth or values. In essence, it promotes the

rule of law and aims to do away with human behaviours that are arbitrary. This idea focuses on individuals rather than collectivities. According to this perspective, breaking rules and procedures, cutting in front of the line, or giving certain people an unfair edge in a competition would be unjust. According to procedural theorists (like Hayek, for instance), setting standards for income transfer would result in authoritarianism and the unwarranted surrender of liberty. To maintain the pattern demanded by equality, the state must continually intervene. They believe that even if the government has a welfare programme, it has nothing to do with justice. Procedural theory of justice detractors contends that merely adhering to the rules does not guarantee a fair outcome. Some groups benefit more than others from the norms that develop in a social setting. A free competition may thus not necessarily be a fair competition. Second, for those who lack economic power, a free-market relationship may be equally oppressive; for them, the liberty of a free market would be useless.

Justice Theory of John Rawls

Political philosophies provide varying visions of what a really fair social order might look like. The utilitarian theory and John Rawls' theory of justice as fairness are two of these theories. According to utilitarian theory, a fair social structure is one in which the greatest number of individuals may have the maximum level of value satisfaction. However, utilitarianism has been criticised heavily since its inception. In this context, Rawls' theory has provided a utilitarian alternative. A Theory of Justice by John Rawls offers a concluding analysis of the idea. It is necessary to first analyse Rawls's technique of treating moral issues, which is in the contractarian school of social philosophy, before discussing his theory of justice. In contrast to other contractarians who contend that the rules of justice are those that would be accepted in a hypothetical situation, Rawls' method requires that the moral reasoning's conclusions be constantly checked and readjusted against intuitive moral notions. In Rawls' hypothetical starting position, men are hidden behind a "veil of ignorance," devoid of the fundamental knowledge of their desires, interests, aptitudes, and the factors that lead to conflicts in real society. But they'll possess what Rawls refers to as "a sense of justice."

In these conditions, according to Rawls, individuals will concur to adopt two justice principles in the lexical order. The first is the equality principle, which states that everyone has an equal right to the greatest amount of freedom that is still consistent with other people's freedoms. The well-known freedoms of liberal democratic regimes may be concretized here as equal liberties. They consist of things like the equal right to participate in politics, the freedom of speech, the right to practise one's religion, and equality before the law. Rawls contends that the difference principle, which states that inequalities can only be justified if they assist the least advantaged, is the second guiding principle. Justice according to John Rawls has two facets. First, it assumes a "constitutional democracy," or a government based on laws that is constrained, accountable, and responsible. Second, it supports the "in a certain way" regulation of the free market. The distribution will be fair if there is equality of opportunity supported by universal access to education, according to Rawls. "If law and government act effectively to keep market competitive, resources fully employed, property and wealth widely distributed over time, and to maintain the appropriate social minimum," he writes [7], [8].

Critics of the "redistributionists" also exist. Mare F. Plattner offers two reasons in opposition to the aforementioned theory of justice. In the first place, he thinks that although equality is a highly regarded ideal, it may not be feasible to achieve it at the price of effectiveness. According to Plattner, Rawls is forced into a contradiction by the issue of equality vs rising wealth. Thus, on the one hand, Rawls "absolutely refuses to allow that those who make a greater economic contribution deserve greater economic rewards". His "difference principle"

which states that "social and economic inequalities are to be arranged so that they are to the greatest benefit of the least advantaged" nevertheless affirms that it is just to give them greater economic rewards insofar as these serve as incentives to increase their contribution in ways that ultimately benefit the disadvantaged. The second claim made by Plattner is that those who support redistribution wish to deny each person the benefits of their "honest industry" and instead view all output as a "common asset" for society as a whole. The "moral foundations of private property and therewith of liberal society" are undercut by this, according to Plattner.

Justice: A Synthetic Term

Perhaps the best way to think of justice is as a synthesis word. The issue of justice is a conciliatory one. The goal of justice is to reconcile different equalities (political, social, and economic) with different liberties (political, social, and economic), as well as to reconcile liberty in general, in all of its manifestations, with equality in general, in all of its manifestations. Justice, in a nutshell, is the synthesis of opposing values and the maintenance of these values in a condition of balance. Several famous authors have made decisions on their positions on the liberty vs. equality debate. When discussing the French Revolution, Lord Acton made the famous statement that "the passion for equality made vain the hope of freedom" many years ago. The proponents of "liberty alone," such as W. The statement "Equality is only attained by a stringent repression of natural development" is made by E. Lecky in his book Democracy and Liberty.

Actually, both liberty and equality are important because, as Carritt says, they are interconnected. Equality improves the content of freedom. In addition, it is freedom that gives men the ability to demand equality. Give men freedom, and sooner rather than later they will demand equality. There are various methods to illustrate how equality and liberty are interconnected. Consider how a blatantly unequal distribution of income might undermine the right to vote and the freedom of expression. The affluent are better positioned to both campaign and spread ideas. The propaganda machine is more accessible to the rich. The adage of Harold Laski that "every attempt of an individual to assert his liberty in a society of unequals will be challenged by the powerful" is still relevant today. In essence, we discover that political freedom and economic democracy must coexist. A deeper look reveals that, although first seeming to be mutually exclusive, a number of political ideals are really complimentary and interconnected. In any event, justice's job is to combine or resolve the diverse, often at odds values. Justice is the guiding concept that determines how different rights political, social, and economic are distributed in the sake of equality and freedom. Such a notion of justice develops throughout time as social cognition progresses. It is a developing idea that reflects social reality and desire in this way.

What we have seen thus far gives the idea that justice is primarily a normative notion with applications in many areas, including law, ethics, and religion, even if its implications also extend to the social, political, and economic realms. Justice must meet the criteria of impartiality. Being impartial does not imply that everyone should be treated equally and without bias. To treat equals equally and unequals unequally is one view. However, discrimination must primarily be based on relevant factors. Justice necessitates fair value discrimination. In social justice, the needs of the people are emphasised. In the social context of India, it also asks for preferred policies. Contrarily, procedural justice demands the application of the law and the elimination of arbitrariness. According to Rawls' theory of justice, people must decide which social system they want. Naturally, they would choose an equitable society. His viewpoint accords everyone the same fundamental liberty. All offices should have inequalities associated to them. The underprivileged group ought to get the most

from them.In the end, however, it will be beneficial to emphasise that justice is the tying force of crucial political ideals rather than entering further into the discussion over the complex implications of justice.

For instance, if the equality standard is breached, there cannot be liberty, and if there is no justice, there cannot be equality. It is obvious that the principles of liberty and equality are inextricably linked with justice. Similarly, we may argue that there cannot be liberty without a right, and that there cannot be protection for rights without an effective legal framework that guarantees the administration of justice. Again, it should go without saying that the notions of rights and law are fundamentally linked with the idea of justice. The most crucial thing to remember at this point is that the notion of justice not only forms the fundamental connection between the norms of law, liberty, equality, and rights, but also that it is inextricably linked to them. In this way, justice serves as a mediator and synthesis of political principles. Justice is "the chiefest interest of man," according to Daniel Webster, and he couldn't have been more correct.

CONCLUSION

In conclusion, the discussion of justice in this chapter highlights the fundamental significance of the topic for political philosophy and science. Justice originates as a dynamic and developing idea, growing through time to meet the changing values and requirements of society. By balancing the often at odds ideals of liberty and equality, rights and law, it plays a reconciliatory function.

In contrast to being a static ideal, justice constantly forms and is moulded by the social, political, and economic environments it exists in. This chapter has shown that the idea of justice is not one-dimensional but rather has several facets, including conceptions of procedural justice, economic justice, social justice, and distributive justice. Philosophers like John Rawls have put justice at the centre of their ideas for a fair society, seeking to find a balance between individual freedom and social equality.

In addition, the chapter has shed light on the function of justice in directing practises and policies, such as affirmative action and social welfare programmes, which try to right past wrongs and promote a more just and equitable society. Although there are challenges and disagreements with the idea of justice, it is nevertheless a crucial benchmark for building a more moral and fair society.

REFERENCES:

[1]   A. Ludwig, "E 'value' ating Forensic Science," *Forensic Sci. Policy Manag. An Int. J.*, 2016.

[2]   M. T. A. Lopes Cardozo and R. Shah, "A conceptual framework to analyse the multiscalar politics of education for sustainable peacebuilding," *Comp. Educ.*, 2016.

[3]   S. Shlomo Agon, "Non-compliance, renegotiation and justice in international adjudication: A WTO perspective," *Glob. Const.*, 2016.

[4]   J. Howard, K. Nash, and S. Rodriguez, "Missing Stories: The Messy Processes, Multifaceted Risks, & Multiple Roles of Critical Ethnographers," *Crit. Quest. Educ. (Special Issue)*, 2016.

[5]   J. Eliastam, "Interrupting separateness, disrupting comfort: An autoethnographic account of lived religion, ubuntu and spatial justice," *HTS Teol. Stud. / Theol. Stud.*, 2016.

[6] F. R. Waitoller and B. L. Pazey, "Examining competing notions of social justice at the intersections of high-stakes testing practices and parents' rights: An inclusive education perspective," *Teach. Coll. Rec.*, 2016.

[7] K. K. Yap, "Inequality Issues in Stem Cell Medicine," *Stem Cells Transl. Med.*, 2016.

[8] C. Baker and J. Obradovic-Wochnik, "Mapping the Nexus of Transitional Justice and Peacebuilding," *J. Interv. Statebuilding*, 2016.

CHAPTER 7

EVOLVING DEMOCRACY: UNDERSTANDING THE COMPLEXITIES AND IMPACT OF INDIA'S DEMOCRATIC JOURNEY

Hemal Thakker, Assistant Professor
Department of ISME, ATLAS SkillTech University, Mumbai, Maharashtra, India
Email Id- hemal.thakker@atlasuniversity.edu.in

ABSTRACT:

Over time, the idea of democracy has changed and grown more inclusive. One of the most contentious issues in political science, everyone agrees on the meaning but disagrees on the best way to implement democracy. The several sorts of democracies, from direct to representative, result from this. New aspects of democracy, including e-democracy, are emerging as a result of the changing times. India is a diverse country, but democracy has managed to endure because it has provided room for political contestation and the chance to voice a variety of views. For the sake of the disadvantaged, India needs to improve the representativeness and accountability of its democratic process. The many facets of democratic government are explored in depth in this democracy course. It looks at the beginnings and development of democracy, different types of democracy, Indian democratic values, and difficulties India's democracy has experienced. With Greek origins, democracy denotes "rule by the people," but how it is carried out differs from country to country. The course emphasizes the significance of an educated voter and a free press as democratic societies struggle to strike a balance between equality and liberty. It also talks on the benefits of democracy, such the suppression of famines and public accountability. The course examines the procedural and substantive aspects of democracy and covers several forms of democracy, from direct to representative. It explores historical viewpoints, such as liberal and ancient democracy, as well as contemporary ideas like e-democracy. A review of Indian democracy, stressing its advantages and disadvantages, finishes the course.

KEYWORDS:

Democracy, E-Democracy, Government, Indian Democracy, Legitimacy.

INTRODUCTION

Since the first democratic government is said to have started at Athens in the fifth century BC, democracy has Greek roots. The Greek term "demokratia" is where the English word "democracy" comes from. It is a fusion of the Greek words "demos," which means "people," and "kratos," which means "power." Therefore, democracy is defined as "rule by the people," which provides the government real legitimacy since it is founded on the permission of the governed. Democracy is widely understood to represent popular rule and sovereignty, but how those things will be realised differs from nation to country. Because of this, there are many various types of democracy in use today, from totalitarian regimes like North Korea's to those based on Islam like those in Pakistan and Turkey to parliamentary systems like India's. Democracies struggle with the inherent conflict that exists between liberty and equality. Individual liberty advocacy might be detrimental to equality, and the opposite is also true. Democracies run the risk of becoming weakened to the point where the majority rules at the expense of minority, which is another problem. If voters in a democracy have a high level of maturity and knowledge, this can be checked to a considerable extent. A truly free press should be added to this in order to maintain an impartial and balanced public

opinion. The essential essence of a democratic system is one of government accountability, which is ensured by an educated voter and a free press.

Democracy is seen as a superior form of governance to others for a variety of reasons. Considerations on Representative Government, written by J. S. Mill in 1861, lists three benefits of democracies over non-democracies. First, unlike under an authoritarian or aristocratic type of governance, democracy forces decision-makers to consider the public's interest and opinion. Second, democracy helps decision-makers to choose the finest ideas by including other points of view into the decision-making process. Third, democracy aids in the development of people' character by encouraging traits like reason, independence, and independent thought. Political leaders are under pressure from the public opinion as a result, and if they want to stay in power, they cannot disregard the public's opinions. Amartya Sen, a Nobel laureate, has discussed the connection between democracies and famines, claiming that democracies that are working have never seen famines because their leaders are responsible to the people and cannot neglect their fundamental needs. Britain and France were the birthplaces of modern democracy, which eventually expanded to other nations. Corruption and ineptitude, the abuse of authority, a lack of accountability, and the unfair reign of monarchs based on the idea of divine rights were some of the factors that led to the emergence of democracy [1], [2].

In a wider sense, democracy refers to both a condition of society and a type of governance and state. Socioeconomic equality characterises a democratic society, whereas access to an inclusive and transparent political system characterises a democratic state. The following are some common definitions of the word democracy:

1. Rule by the underprivileged and the impoverished Equal opportunity and personal responsibility, not hierarchy and privilege
2. Redistribution and welfare to lessen socioeconomic inequality
3. Decisions are made using the majority rule.
4. Safeguarding minority rights by limiting the power of the majority
5. Holding elections for public office to fill positions.

A democracy has a variety of characteristics. Some of the fundamental elements of democracy include a written constitution, the rule of law, human rights, independent media and judiciary, and the division of powers between the executive, legislative, and judicial branches. The concept of democracy has advanced significantly from its uninclusive beginnings in ancient Greece. The Greek democracy was 'undemocratic' in spirit since it excluded women, slaves, and foreigners. Even in contemporary democracies like France, Britain, and the US, where certain groups were denied the right to vote while privileged males were granted it, this mentality persisted. In addition to advocating for humankind's popular sovereignty, the French Revolution of 1789 also spoke of liberty, equality, and brotherhood.

However, women were denied the right to vote, and France began granting all adults the right to vote only in 1944. Women were granted the right to vote in the US in 1920 and in Britain in 1928. However, racial prejudice persisted in the US, and African American men and women were not granted the right to vote until 1965. India has advanced in this area compared to Western democracies since it implemented universal adult franchise in 1950, the year its constitution entered into effect, and in fact became the first democratic state in history to do so. Women first exercised their right to vote in municipal elections in Saudi Arabia in 2015, which is the newest nation to permit women to vote.

Depending on how the people govern, democracy may be categorised as either direct or representational. The foundation of direct democracy is unrestricted, direct public engagement in political decision-making. To guarantee that all points of view are considered and the best conclusions are made, all adult citizens participate in the decision-making process. The lines between the state and civil society, as well as between the government and the governed, are blurred under a direct democracy. A prime example of direct democracy is the city state system used in ancient Greece. Direct democracy is still used today in Swiss cantons. Since individuals are more inclined to obey choices made by them alone, direct democracy provides higher legitimacy. Additionally, it produces highly knowledgeable citizens who take part in decision-making. However, a city-state and a nation-state are quite different in size (geography, population). This is why it is difficult to practise direct democracy in large contemporary nation states. The emergence of representative democracy, which first occurred in northern Europe in the 18th century, provided a solution to this problem. A constrained and indirect type of democracy is representative democracy. It is constrained due to the low level of public involvement in voting in a few years, and it is indirect since people exercise their power indirectly via their chosen representatives. Representative democracies often fall into one of two categories: presidential or parliamentary [3], [4]. There are more parliamentary democracies than presidential democracies in the globe. While more representational than presidential democracies, parliamentary democracies are nevertheless comparatively less stable.

DISCUSSION

The procedural (minimalist) and substantive (maximalist) points of view may both contribute to a thorough understanding of democracy. Simply put, the procedural component is concerned with the methods used to achieve democracy. It makes the case that regularly held competitive elections supported by broad political involvement and adult universal suffrage would result in a democratically chosen government. Joseph Schumpeter defined democracy as a "institutional arrangement for arriving at political decisions in which individuals acquire the power to decide through a competitive struggle for the vote of the people" in his 1942 book Capitalism, Socialism, and Democracy. Similar opinions have been expressed by Huntington, who said that "the central procedure of democracy is the selection of leaders through competitive elections by the people they govern." However, the minimalist approach assumes that people are inert beyond voting and that they are thus ruled by their representatives. This viewpoint places more emphasis on how to elect a democratic government than it does on liberty and freedom. Without checks and balances, elected officials might abuse their positions of authority and control for their personal gain, resulting in a covert tyranny. Instead of the people who should have the last say in a democratic system, the government may serve the elites in charge. Between the 1980s and 1990s, Argentina and Brazil both experienced similar situations. Although there are sometimes conducted elections, Central Asian regimes might also be categorised as procedural democracies due to the concentration of power in the hands of a single person. According to Terry Karl, adopting a minimalist perspective might also result in the "fallacy of electoralism," in which the electoral process is prioritised above other aspects of democracy. Fareed Zakaria refers to it as "illiberal democracy," a situation in which democratically elected governments disobey constitutional restraints on their authority and deny their people access to fundamental freedoms and rights.

The procedural view's limitations are addressed by substantive democracy, which contends that social and economic disparities may make it difficult for individuals to participate in the democratic process. It focuses on results, such as socioeconomic equality, rather than goals in

order to effectively serve the governed. In a way, it discusses the 'common good' as opposed to the advantage of a select few. Through redistributive justice, the rights of marginalised groups like women and the poor are safeguarded, allowing the state to intervene to create the circumstances necessary for their political participation. This viewpoint has emerged as a result of the work of several political scientists, including John Locke, Jean-Jacques Rousseau, Immanuel Kant, and John Stuart Mill. Rousseau maintained that formal varieties of democracy are tantamount to slavery and that the only democracies with political legitimacy are egalitarian democracies, in contrast to Schumpeter who thought that a notion of democracy which aspires for ambitious types of equality is harmful [5], [6].

Democracy types

Ancient democracy

Classical democracy is founded on the polis, or city state, of Ancient Greece, with a specific form of government that evolved in the most significant and influential Greek city-state and was based on public assemblies. This model's outstanding aspect was how politically engaged the residents were. Citizens participated to decision-making and public positions in addition to attending Assembly sessions. However, it did not provide citizenship to women, slaves, or outsiders. It is important to note that the male residents of Athens could only find free time to engage in political activities because of the slaves and women. Because of this, it was unfair and undemocratic to exclude them from citizenship. In his book The Republic, Plato criticised the democratic system in Athens, claiming that people were unable to govern themselves intelligently and needed the guidance of philosopher kings and guardians who were better qualified to do it.

Liberal Democracy

Vilfredo Pareto, G. Mosca, Robert Michels, and Joseph Schumpeter all advanced this idea. The idea was created in sociology, but it also has significant political science implications. Michels presented his "iron law of oligarchy," contending that regardless of its initial goals, every organisation eventually degenerates into an oligarchy that amounts to the domination of a select few. According to Mosca, humans may be divided into the governed and the ruled. Regardless of the kind of government, the ruling elite has the majority of the power, fame, and fortune. Because the governed lack leadership skills, they follow the elite. Since the elites would dominate the power, money, and decision-making in practise, this argument raises severe concerns about democracy and contends that it cannot exist.

Multiparty Democracy

Pluralists disagree with the elitist idea and think that policy-making is a decentralised process where many groups negotiate for their points of view to be adopted. In contrast to a few elites, it is the outcome of interactions between many groups. More formally organised and vociferous organisations shape public policy. Karl Mannheim, Raymond Aron, Robert Dahl, and Charles Lindblom are some of the primary proponents of this idea. Polyarchy, defined by Dahl and Lindblom as rule by many people as opposed to all citizens, is a concept. They came to the conclusion that no elite could consistently control the political process, despite the fact that those who are politically privileged and economically strong had greater influence than average people.

Democratic Participation

All democracies are participative in the sense that their foundation in the will of the people assures that they be so. However, there is a potential that in a democracy, people' only

function will be to cast ballots. In complicated democracies with a diversity of people split by caste, class, religion, area, etc., the distance between the elected officials and the people develops. Participatory democracy, in contrast to elitist and pluralist ideas, encourages active public engagement in policymaking to guarantee the common good is promoted and to make the government more accountable to the people. Participatory democracy was backed by Jean J. Rousseau, J. S. Mill, and C. B. Macpherson. The highest authority is in the hands of the people since it is their unalienable right, according to Rousseau, who also stated that citizens should be involved in government activities. According to Mill, the finest kind of government is one that encourages moral, intellectual, and energetic characteristics in its people.

Democratic Deliberation

According to the theory of "deliberative democracy," public discussions among people should serve as the foundation for political choices. This is necessary to generate the finest judgements for the interest of the public. John Rawls and Jurgen Habermas have advocated for a deliberative democracy by focusing on the quality of the process for the greatest results. In order to achieve a decent political system, Rawls thought that reason may triumph over self-interest. Habermas thought that honest processes and transparent communication would result in reasonable and widely accepted judgements.

Citizens' Democracy

The term "people's democracy" describes democratic designs produced by the Marxist school. Due to their emphasis in social equality, Marxists have developed their own conception of democracy in opposition to the Western model, which they claim solely produces political equality. When the proletariat begins making political choices after the proletarian revolution, people's democracy is formed. This would ultimately give place to a kind of Communism known as self-government. Lenin modified Karl Marx's vision of the proletariat's rule by introducing the idea of the party serving as the proletariat's vanguard. Lenin did not, however, put in place any controls to make sure that the party's senior leaders remained answerable to the proletariat.

Political Socialism

Although social democracy and communism have similar aims, social democracy represents a fundamental shift in Marxist theory. By regulating the means of production, rather than via revolution, it seeks to achieve a socialist society. The Marxist criticism of democracy, which views it as a "bourgeois" front for class power, is untrue, according to social democrats. Instead, social democrats believe that in order to realise the socialist principles, democracy is vital. They support government control of commerce and industry as a result, ensuring the welfare of the populace. The Social Democratic Workers' Party was established in Germany in 1869 thanks to the efforts of August Bebel and Wilhelm Liebknecht, who also launched this organisation.

E-Democracy

Although this idea is relatively recent, it is founded on the work of prior thinkers. The use of information and technology to improve or even replace representative democracy is known as e-democracy or electronic democracy. Digital communication might be used to address difficulties that are common to all democracies, such as issues of size, a lack of time, a reduction in community values, and a lack of possibilities for policy discourse. To increase active public engagement in policymaking, proponents of e-democracy have expanded on the concepts of participatory democracy.

India's Democracy inA Nutshell

India, which gained independence from British control in 1947, is often referred to as the greatest democracy in the world with more than 800 million eligible voters. The Constituent Assembly was established with indirectly elected members to write the constitution of India because Indians did not want to embrace a British-imposed constitution. However, given that the Constituent Assembly was not directly chosen by the people, it is significant that an indirectly elected assembly eventually endorsed the idea of universal adult franchise. J. L. Nehru, Sardar Patel, B. R. Ambedkar, and N. V. Gadgil advocated the establishment of parliamentary democracy in India during discussions in the Constituent Assembly while bearing in mind that India had experience with this system dating back to the British era. Others opposed parliamentary democracy, including R N Singh, Loknath Mishra, and Brajeshwar Prasad. According to R. N. Singh, it is challenging to locate a large number of trustworthy ministers, deputy ministers, parliamentary secretaries, etc. He contended that a presidential system of governance would make it simple to elect an honest leader.

The Assembly chose the parliamentary form of government, taking into account India's prior experience with it. According to some academics, democratic institutions were foisted onto Indians who had any prior experience with them since democracy was a Western idea. But contemporary politics as it relates to bringing people together around common causes and pressing demands upon the state began in India in the middle of the 19th century. The middle class and traditional elites founded associations and organisations like Poona Sarvjanik Sabha, which lay the groundwork for democracy in India. Through the steady growth of legislative councils at the provincial and national levels throughout the British era, the concept of democracy gained traction in India. Periodic elections with adult voting rights have made sure that democratic institutions and practises are deeply ingrained in Indian politics throughout the post-independence era [7], [8]. The state legislature, the Parliament, and the ministries are all becoming more representative in today's society as a result of changes in the sociological makeup of political parties. The following are the major characteristics of Indian democracy:

1. 'Sovereign Socialist Secular Democratic Republic' is how India is referred to in the Preamble of its Constitution. The 'one person, one vote' principle is the foundation of the parliamentary democracy in India.
2. On the basis of adult franchise, free and fair elections are conducted on a regular basis for state legislatures and the Parliament.
3. The written Indian Constitution, which is paramount and is interpreted and protected by an independent court, ensures the rule of law.
4. The judiciary, legislature, and executive all have separate authorities.
5. The Indian Constitution guarantees its citizens certain fundamental rights, including the rights to equality (Articles 14–18), to freedom (Articles 19–22), to protection from exploitation (Articles 23–24), to freedom of religion (Articles 25–28), to education and culture (Articles 29–30), and to recourse against the government (Articles 32).

In India, there is a multi-party system with national and regional parties competing for political influence, keeping it active and energetic. According to the Indian Constitution, the Leader of the Opposition is the head of the biggest party in opposition in each House, but that party must have at least 10% of the total number of seats in the House. Since the government does not meddle with the media in India, it may effectively mobilise public opinion about the government's policies.

The operation of democracy in India is responsible for a lot of accomplishments. The first is that India's democratic experience has disproved critics who said it would not last given the country's diversity in terms of caste, religion, language, culture, and location. In contrast to its neighbours, India's democracy is strong, demonstrating the endurance of its democratic institutions and practises. India has been able to raise its literacy rate, lower its rate of poverty, and integrate the disadvantaged groups into society via the democratic process. Power has shifted from the dominant castes and classes to the underprivileged castes and classes nearly entirely via democratic processes and without the use of force. India is rapidly transitioning from being a consumer of help to becoming an aid giver on a global scale as it provides economic assistance to its neighbours in South Asia.

However, a few issues continue to raise concerns about India's democracy. In India, political violence is one of the main problems that has to be addressed. For instance, the insurgency and naxalism in North-East India are often mentioned as a stain on Indian democracy. It is crucial to restate what Dr. Ambedkar, the head of the committee responsible for creating India's Constitution, stated at this point. He had claimed that merely political equality would not be sufficient and called for economic and social equality as well. Long-term social and economic disparity would be risky for political democracy because those who suffer may overthrow the system. Additional electoral changes are required in India in order to address problems including voter fraud, desertion, and the influence of money and armed forces during elections. The weak are suffering as corruption and economic disparity weaken the rule of law and have an adverse effect on how democracy functions. Due to the low turnout for voting to choose their MPs, there is insufficient representation. Even India's "first past the post" electoral system is unrepresentative by design and may work against the interests of disadvantaged groups.

CONCLUSION

Finally, democracy is a dynamic idea that has drastically changed through time. It provides a wide range of shapes, each with its own set of benefits and difficulties. India, sometimes described as the biggest democracy in the world, has made significant strides in ensuring political representation for its multicultural population. However, issues including political unrest, economic inequalities, and electoral changes continue to exist. India must keep improving the openness and accountability of its political processes if it is to attain real democracy.

As discussed in this course, democracy is not a static structure but rather a dynamic system that changes to meet the demands and ambitions of its people. For democratic ideas and principles to be promoted in communities all over the globe, it is essential to understand its intricacies. In the grand scheme of things, it wouldn't be fair to label India's democracy as a success or a failure. To lead to substantive democracy, procedural democracy has to be developed, made more representative, and held responsible.

REFERENCES:

[1]   M. Scholz-Wäckerle, "Democracy Evolving: A Diversity of Institutional Contradictions Transforming Political Economy," *J. Econ. Issues*, 2016.

[2]   S. Zartaloudis, "Politics in Contemporary Portugal: Democracy Evolving," *West Eur. Polit.*, 2016.

[3]   OCED, "The Evolving Role of Higher Education in U.S. Democracy," *eJournal Public Aff.*, 2016.

[4]   C. P. Harbour and D. A. Smith, "The completion agenda, community colleges, and civic capacity," *Community Coll. J. Res. Pract.*, 2016.

[5]   C. D. Ferriter, "The Uses of Race and Religion: James Baldwin's Pragmatist Politics in The Fire Next Time," *James Baldwin Rev.*, 2016.

[6]   A. F. Cooper and A. B. Farooq, "Emerging donors: the promise and limits of bilateral and multilateral democracy promotion," *Cambridge Rev. Int. Aff.*, 2016.

[7]   M. N. Konye, "Which theory of communication is 'political correctness'?," *J. Educ. Cult. Soc.*, 2016.

[8]   N. Iroz-Elardo and M. McSharry McGrath, "Social Learning Through Stakeholder Engagement: New Pathways from Participation to Health Equity in U.S. West Coast HIA," *Chronicles Heal. Impact Assess.*, 2016.

CHAPTER 8

UNRAVELING GENDER: ANALYZING PATRIARCHY, POLITICS AND INEQUALITY

Jaimine Vaishnav, Assistant Professor
Department of ISME, ATLAS SkillTech University, Mumbai, Maharashtra, India
Email Id- jaimine.vaishnav@atlasuniversity.edu.in

ABSTRACT:

As a response to the exclusion of women from preexisting critical frameworks, the idea of gender evolved. It aimed to modify the philosophical theory of knowledge and the substantive setting of these fields. Because it ignored the skewed relationships between men and women, it became common practise in social sciences to analyse society in terms of caste, class, and race. This phrase was created to cast doubt on the new concepts and theories that may explain the structure and dynamics of male-female relationships as well as the ways in which they overlap in a broader framework of power relations. The intersection of gender with pre-existing explanatory paradigms has so far been a challenging topic, despite the fact that gender is inspired by many research on various elements of women's lives. Even though gender has become a significant analytical category today, it is characterised by an interpretative stance that restricts the kind of issues that may be asked. One such translation, where gender is interpreted as a coterminous battle between the sexes and is proclaimed to go beyond patriarchy, is the universal identification of gender with inequity. One of the main goals of gender sociology has been to demonstrate that since disparities are the outcome of social processes and not 'natural' biological differences, they may be overcome. In the latter half of the 20th century, feminists and social scientists tended to see bodies as organic biological constructs onto which cultural (gender) meanings were imprinted. Later, particularly in the wake of Michel Foucault, an understanding of how cultural practises and meanings really shape how bodies are produced emerged.

KEYWORDS:

Cultural, Gender, Inequality, Patriarchy, Politics.

INTRODUCTION

Contemporary political theory was mainly believed to have a gender-neutral orientation until feminist theory became a recognised academic position. This presumption is now the target of intense criticism. Up until now, feminists have been the main researchers who have investigated gender in political theory. Because it is feminists who are most aware of the folly of equating males with people and masculinity with objectivity. It is thus completely viable to think about gender in political theory from viewpoints other than feminist, despite the fact that feminist political theory has recently openly theorised gender. For instance, there is a growing amount of writing on men and masculinity that is separate from the substantial body of writing on women that has emerged and that may help to enrich discussions of gender in political theory. Despite this, feminists have had the biggest political incentive and intellectual desire to examine gender in political theory given the predominately male character of politics up to the present.

Our political, social, and interpersonal landscapes are shaped by gender. Modern political theory must be seen through the prism of gender in order to comprehend the limitations and underlying presuppositions of existing ideas as well as to open up new discussions. We see

gender as entirely natural because it is ingrained so deeply in our institutions, behaviours, convictions, and wants. Political science as a field of study and politics as social phenomena are both gendered. Today, political analysis encompasses much more than just those in official government and the politics of distribution. It currently includes several new organisations that advocate for "gender trouble" (such as intersectionality, sexuality, and post-structuralism), as well as novel conceptions of masculinity and femininity in a variety of settings, from the private sphere to the chambers of Parliament. Gender is still largely disregarded in academic political science despite the dynamic relationship between gender and politics and the long history of gender activism. Despite the fact that women and gender were fundamental to creating the welfare state, creating postcolonial countries, conducting war and terrorism, and generally maintaining social and economic privilege, they were rendered invisible by the traditional focus on politics as the study of the electoral system, political elites, and formal institutions.

The work of political theorists like John Locke, who founded much of their theories on the analytical separation of the public and private spheres, may be used to trace the origins of these fundamental beliefs about what constituted politics in the Anglo-American tradition. This widely held belief in the transcultural and transhistorical universality of the public-private split—namely, that citizens or heads of home were the ones who were engaged in the public sphere—was adopted by the Anglo-American disciplines. In a private domain where "every man's home is his castle" and he is free to act whenever he pleases without intervention from the state, this submerged women into the household or family. Politics became a masculine domain where women were rightfully barred as political subjects as a result of this theoretical exclusion of women from the public sphere. In turn, the private sphere was seen as being outside of politics and not belonging in the legitimate subject matter of the discipline, at least when it came to women. However, the inconsistencies and gender bias that underpin the notion of different spheres are exposed when governments are considered as having a right to regulate women's access to abortion, sexuality, and male aggression against female family members [1], [2].

Meaning: Gender

The term gender has been assigned a highly definite meaning whether employed sociologically or as a mental category. In its most recent form, the term "gender" refers to the sociocultural categorization of men and women, their social roles, and other social constructs. It serves as an analytical tool for comprehending how society views both men and women. The difference between sex and gender was created to address the widespread propensity to blame women's subjugation on their physical makeup. For centuries, people have held that the differences in the traits, obligations, and position ascribed to men and women in society are caused by nature, that they are inherent and, hence, unalterable. Each culture has its own methods for valuing girls and boys and giving them various roles, reactions, and characteristics. "Gendering" refers to the social and cultural "packaging" that is done for boys and girls beginning at birth. According to Ann Oakley, one of the first feminist researchers to utilise this idea, gender refers to the societal categorization of men and women as "masculine" and "feminine." Typically, biological data may be used to determine whether a person is male or female. It is impossible to determine someone's gender in the same manner since the standards are cultural and change depending on the time and location. Both the consistency of sex and the gender's diversity must be acknowledged. Gender has no biological basis, and sex and gender are not naturally associated.

Gender is a set of relationships that form through time to define male and female, masculinity and femininity, and to structure and control how individuals interact with one another and

with society. It is thoroughly ingrained in every sphere of society, including our institutions, public areas, works of art, fashion, and movement. Every environment, from government offices to street activities, has gender ingrained within the experience. It permeates every aspect of life, including going to the toilet, dining out, strolling down the street, and attending church and school. And there is a logical connection between each of these contexts and circumstances. The fact that "women" and "gender" now hold relatively important positions in development discourses and practises is a result of modernization of these discourses and practises. It's important to have a firm understanding of gender as a sociocultural element that cuts across all others. It is an all-encompassing factor in the sense that gender may be used to explain every other factor that cuts over several categories, including race, class, age, ethnicity, etc. Different socio-cultural settings have gender systems developed that dictate what is expected, permitted, and appreciated in a woman/man and a girl/boy in these particular circumstances. Gender roles are ingrained via the socialisation process; they are malleable rather than permanent. Gender systems are institutionalised via law, culture, customs, political and economic systems, and educational systems. When using a gender perspective, the system that defines gender roles and duties, access to and control over resources, and decision-making potentials is the emphasis rather than on specific women and men [3], [4].

DISCUSSION

It's crucial to stress that women are not synonymous with the idea of gender. Women, men, and the interactions between them are all included in the term "gender." Men and women should both be concerned with and involved in the promotion of gender equality. Research on gender perspectives has recently placed a much more direct emphasis on males. The increasing attention paid to males is done thus through three basic strategies. First, males must be seen as allies in the fight for gender equality and given greater opportunities to participate. Second, the understanding that males must alter their attitudes and behaviours in many areas, such as those pertaining to health and reproductive rights, before gender equality can be achieved. Thirdly, gender structures that are in existence in many circumstances are harmful to both men and women because they impose unreasonable expectations on males and dictate how they should act. Both men and women are doing a great deal of fascinating study on masculine identities and masculinity. Future tactics for engaging with gender views in development will be significantly impacted by the greater attention being paid to males. In terms of access to sources of income, health care, and educational opportunities as well as participation in social, economic, and political activities without bias, we speak about equality. Relationships of power and authority, class and caste hierarchies, and sociocultural traditions, rituals, and norms all contribute to gender inequities.

Policy And Gender

In the majority of contemporary democracies, gender equality has taken centre stage in popular political debate. No one should be denied the right to participate in politics, and men and women should naturally have equal rights. However, the degree and nature of equality vary significantly not just across nations but also between other political realms. There are a number of reasons why certain nations or particular policy sectors are more gender equal than others, and a variety of factors, including institutional and cultural traits as well as regime and institutional aspects, have been used to explain why male politicians still hold a disproportionate amount of power in politics. There is a lot of literature about gender and politics. Voting, campaigning, and leadership are only a few of the political actions where there is gender disparity. There are also variations in political knowledge, socialisation,

attitudes, and the status of women in political theory. There are several ways to tackle a variety of political and gender-related topics.

First, women are recognised in political science's categories and analyses, gendering such traditional "units of analysis" as citizens, voters, legislators, parties, legislatures, states, and countries. Another focus on women has looked at political activity in fields that are often seen as being beyond the purview of political science. Gender has been studied as a structure of social organisation in a third area. Last but not least, conflicts within the larger feminist movement, including those of LGBTQ scholars, women of colour scholars, women in the developing world, post-colonial feminists, and women of colour (women of marginalised races and ethnicities) who pushed for a place in the study of gender politics, occasionally finding some degree of accommodation and other times becoming frustrated with resistance.

Politics and gender have an incredibly contradictory relationship. One the one hand, it is obvious that gender concerns are crucial to any comprehension of politics. Politics has a long history of being a traditionally male pursuit, both in practise and in study. Politics has traditionally been the most overtly male human activity of all, according to many observers. Compared to other social practises, it has been more restricted to males and more overtly masculine. Women, their interests, or their viewpoints have proven hard to include into the formal expressions of politics found in government. The majority of the time, women have been discouraged from engaging in conventional political action and excluded from it. In this way, gender-related concerns have long been integral to how politics are defined and carried out. However, it is often believed that gender-related concerns have little effect on politics. Women's absence from politics might be seen as a sign that gender problems aren't important to politics if gender is seen as identical with women [5], [6].

Goal of gender equality; tactic of gender mainstreaming

The United Nations prefers to use the word "gender equality" rather than "gender equity." Gender equity refers to a component of social justice that is often based on tradition, custom, religion, or culture, and which most frequently works against women. It is wrong to utilise equality in this way to benefit women. The use of the word equality was decided upon during the Beijing summit in 1995. According to gender equality, a person's chances, rights, and duties are not determined by their gender at birth. Equality does not mean "the same as"; hence, the promotion of gender equality does not imply that men and women would eventually converge into one another. There are quantitative and qualitative aspects to gender equality. The qualitative element relates to gaining equal impact on determining development objectives and results for women and men, while the quantitative aspect refers to the aim to achieve equitable representation of women, enhancing balance and parity. Due to the varied roles and duties that men and women have, it is important to give both men and women's perspectives, interests, needs, and priorities equal weight when making plans and decisions.

There are two reasons to support gender equality.

1. First and foremost, it is an issue of social justice and human rights for women and men to have equal rights, opportunities, and responsibilities.
2. Second, achieving more gender equality is a prerequisite and a useful indicator for sustainable, people-centered development. In addition to being important for social justice, the perspectives, needs, and objectives of men and women must be taken into account in order to improve development processes.

Governments and international organisations have endorsed gender equality as a goal. It is protected by covenants and agreements made on a global scale. However, there are trends of

inequality throughout the world in terms of sex trafficking and trafficking in women, violence against women, and the underrepresentation of women in politics and decision-making systems. In order to advance gender equality, these problems must be resolved. Changes in attitudes and relationships, institutional and legal frameworks, economic institutions, and political decision-making processes are only a few of the many layers that must be altered to achieve more equality between men and women.

Through the development of gender capability and responsibility, gender mainstreaming is an organisational method to integrate a gender perspective into all facets of an institution's policies and operations. By the middle of the 1980s, the 1970s-era initiatives for integrating women into development via the creation of distinct women's units or programmes inside governmental and development organisations had achieved only little headway. Given this, it was determined that wider institutional reform was necessary to counteract the prevalent male advantage. Activities targeted specifically towards women were no longer considered adequate additions. 'Gender mainstreaming' has now been endorsed as a strategy for advancing gender equality by the majority of significant development organisations and many governments. Gender mainstreaming serves as a tool rather than an aim in and of itself. The recommendations for more gender mainstreaming in the Economic and Social Council's (ESCSOC) Agreed Conclusions (1997/2) do not call for greater gender equality within the UN, but rather greater focus on gender perspectives and the pursuit of gender equality. Creating distinct women's initiatives inside work programmes or even include women's components within already existing work programme activities is not required for gender mainstreaming. Gender perspectives must be taken into account as an essential component of all actions across all programmes. Making gender perspectives – what men and women do and the resources and decision-making processes they have access to – more central to all policy development, research, advocacy, development, implementation, and monitoring of norms and standards, as well as planning, implementation, and monitoring of projects – is one way to achieve this.

Both the ECOSOC Agreed Conclusions from 1997 and the Beijing Declaration and Platform for Action from 1995 established gender mainstreaming as an international mission. The General Assembly's special session to accompany the Beijing Conference (June 2000) resulted in a significant strengthening of the mandate for gender mainstreaming. Governments are not being forced to implement gender mainstreaming by the UN. Since the middle of the 1990s, member states have participated in intergovernmental debates on gender mainstreaming and have unanimously accepted mainstreaming as a significant worldwide approach for advancing gender equality. Targeted initiatives to help women are still required notwithstanding the mainstreaming plan. These initiatives explicitly address the needs and objectives of women, for instance via enacting laws, developing policies, conducting research, and implementing projects and programmes. Projects that focus specifically on women continue to be crucial in the fight for gender equality. They are still required since gender mainstreaming procedures have not yet been fully evolved and gender equality has not yet been achieved [6], [7].

The reduction of existing gaps, acting as a catalyst for the promotion of gender equality, and building a constituency for altering the status quo are all aided by targeted programmes that particularly target women or the promotion of gender equality. Women-specific programmes may empower women and serve as a vital incubator for concepts and tactics that can be used to more general interventions. Men-focused initiatives help the advancement of gender equality by creating male allies. It is important to realise that these two tactics—gender mainstreaming and women's empowerment—are not at all antagonistic to one another. The

acceptance of gender mainstreaming inside a company does not mean that focused efforts are no longer required. In a very real sense, the two approaches complement one another since gender mainstreaming must be done in a way that empowers women.

The Problems and Trends of Gender

Due to the basic distinctions and disparities between men and women, gender is a problem. There are certain general trends that indicate problems that should always be taken into account despite the fact that these discrepancies and inequities may appear in various ways in particular nations or industries. The components listed below might be used as a jumping off point to investigate how and why gender disparities and inequalities are important in a particular circumstance.

Political power disparities (representation, access to decision-making). All around the globe, women are underrepresented in political processes. Within formal decision-making systems (such governments, community councils, and policy-making institutions), gender inequalities in authority should be examined and understood. The reality that women often have different goals, needs, and interests than males is frequently not obvious due to the underrepresentation of women and the low visibility of women's opinions. Objectives at the national, regional, or subregional levels, as well as the particular needs and objectives of a community, are often determined without the meaningful participation of women.

Differences across families. Within homes, there are recognised differences in people's capacity for negotiation and decision-making as well as their access to resources. This has raised issues with research and policy that are predicated on the idea that families operate as groups where everyone benefits equally. The study of differences and inequalities at the household level is important for understanding a number of important issues, such as how well men and women respond to financial incentives, how to design efficient HIV/AIDS prevention strategies, and how to create fair and appropriate social security policies.

Different legal standings and rights. Women are often denied equal rights to personal status, security, land, inheritance, and work prospects by law or practise, notwithstanding national constitutions and international agreements that affirm equal rights for men and women. In addition to being vital as a means in and of itself, addressing these barriers for women is also crucial for developing successful national policies for raising economic development and productivity, lowering poverty, and attaining sustainable resource management. It is the obligation of the whole world community to take action to protect women's rights, not simply a tiny handful of female campaigners.

Labour division inside the economy. Women and men are disproportionately represented in the manufacturing sector, the formal and unofficial economy, agriculture, and other vocations in the majority of the world's nations. In addition, women are more likely than males to work "non-standard" occupations (part-time, temporary, home-based), in low-paying jobs, and to have less access to productive assets like education, skills, property, and credit. Because of these tendencies, women and men are likely to be affected differently by economic trends and policy. For instance, trade liberalisation has had varying effects depending on the industry, with repercussions for both gender equality and economic development that have just lately come under study.

Disparities in the unpaid/domestic sector. Women often carry out the duties and chores associated with taking care of and nurturing the family in most nations. These responsibilities increase the burden for women and often prevent them from participating in politics or growing their businesses. Recent studies have attempted to show the connections between

this "reproductive work" and the "productive" sector of the economy. In particular, they have shown how the reproductive sector can be impacted by the effects of trade, investment, and public spending policies, as well as how all productive activities depend on the development and maintenance of a healthy labour force through this work at the household level. The emphasis has shifted significantly from showing how economic policies have adversely impacted welfare in a gender-specific way to showing how gender prejudices have a negative impact on the outcomes of the same economic policies.

Sexual assault against women. Gender inequality may also take the form of gender-based violence, such as that committed by a woman's intimate partner (domestic violence), an enemy army using ethnic cleansing as a pretext, or sexual exploitation, such as that which results from the trafficking of women and girls. Inequalities between men and women manifest themselves in a variety of ways that are hard to quantify and alter. Gender stereotypes are often the basis for beliefs about proper conduct, independence, and aptitudes, which differ for men and women. The tendency of ideas and practises to support and mirror one another (the one giving the justification for the other) adds to the difficulty of enacting change [8], [9].

Understanding gender inequality under patriarchy

The institutionalisation of male dominance over women on a physical, social, and economic level is known as patriarchy. Some feminists use the idea of patriarchy to describe how both global and local systems consistently subordinate women. These institutions limit the options and opportunities available to women, which benefits males. There are many different ways to understand patriarchy. The foundations of patriarchy, however, are often found in the sexual violence and reproductive roles of women, which are intertwined with processes of economic exploitation. The primary 'sites' of patriarchal oppression have been characterised as domestic labour, paid employment, the state, culture, sexuality, and violence. Occupational segregation, exclusion, and uneven compensation are examples of patriarchal 'practises' that discriminate against women based on their gender.

In order to combat not just uneven gender relations but also unfair capitalism relations, which are often perceived as supporting patriarchy, the notion of patriarchy has been included into gender and development theorising. Feminists who argue that patriarchy is to blame for gender inequality often criticise male-biased social norms and institutions and advocate for more female autonomy or even secession as a solution. According to certain viewpoints, women may exercise some degree of flexibility within a rigid patriarchal society by striking a patriarchal bargain with males.

This requires a trade-off between men's duty to provide for their wives and kids and women's liberty. Though it may aid in understanding the scope of gender inequality, a general theory of male dominance is unable to address its complexity. It often presumes that discrimination against women is constant over time and geography.

Therefore, more contemporary thought has rejected such an all-encompassing idea, emphasising the necessity for thorough historical and cultural investigation to comprehend gender-based oppression. Women are not a homogenous group that is subject to the same restrictions. Other social disparities such as class, caste, ethnicity, and race intersect with gender inequalities and may, in certain circumstances, take precedence over gender issues. Women are denied the opportunity to resist and develop change-making tactics due to a strict and pervasive view of patriarchy. It is necessary to conduct a thorough examination that considers complexity, diversity, and the agency of women.

CONCLUSION

The notion of gender and its complex interactions with politics, society, and culture have been thoroughly explored in this course. The process of going through the course content has made clear how gender has developed into a crucial analytical category, challenging preconceived notions and paradigms about social systems and human nature. Understanding that gender is a complicated socio-cultural construct that forms and is influenced by numerous aspects of our life is one of the main lessons learned from this course. Gender inequality must be addressed in order to achieve social justice and human rights since it is clearly established in our institutions, practises, and beliefs. The course has emphasised how crucial it is to comprehend how gender functions in the political sphere, bringing light on problems like uneven representation, power imbalances, and gender-based violence. The importance of gender mainstreaming as a tactic to include gender views into all parts of policymaking and implementation has been highlighted in the course's discussions of policy and development. Not only is achieving gender equality important for social justice, but it is also crucial for long-term, inclusive growth. However, the course has also brought attention to the enduring issues and patterns of gender inequality, including the underrepresentation of women in politics, inequalities in the unpaid domestic sector, prejudiced acts, and violence against women. These problems need ongoing focus and response.

REFERENCES:

[1]   R. Ghosh, "Gender and Diversity in India: Contested Territories for HRD?," *Adv. Dev. Hum. Resour.*, 2016.

[2]   A. K. Summit, D. Kalmuss, J. DeAtley, and A. Levack, "Unraveling the Slut Narrative: Gender Constraints on Adolescent Girls' Sexual Decision-Making," *Am. J. Sex. Educ.*, 2016.

[3]   L. Oates-Indruchová, "Unraveling a Tradition, or Spinning a Myth? Gender Critique in Czech Society and Culture," *Slavic Rev.*, 2016.

[4]   R. A. Lasrado, K. Chantler, R. Jasani, and A. Young, "Structuring roles and gender identities within families explaining suicidal behavior in South India," *Crisis*, 2016.

[5]   R. Ghosh, "Gender and Diversity in India," *Adv. Dev. Hum. Resour.*, 2016.

[6]   V. Roel and K. Antonio, "Unraveling the Predictive Power of Telematics Data in Car Insurance Pricing," *SSRN Electron. J.*, 2016.

[7]   R. B. Rosengaus and J. L. Reichheld, "Phenoloxidase activity in the infraorder isoptera: Unraveling life-history correlates of immune investment," *Sci. Nat.*, 2016.

[8]   D. Sarigiannis, S. Karakitsios, A. Gotti, E. Handakas, and K. Papadaki, "The exposome and Health Impact Assessment," *Eur. J. Public Health*, 2016.

[9]   J. T. Mortimer and P. Moen, "The Changing Social Construction of Age and the Life Course: Precarious Identity and Enactment of 'Early' and 'Encore' Stages of Adulthood," in *Handbooks of Sociology and Social Research*, 2016.

CHAPTER 9

EXPLORING THE DYNAMICS OF CITIZENSHIP

Malcolm Firdosh Homavazir, Associate Professor
Department of ISME, ATLAS SkillTech University, Mumbai, Maharashtra, India
Email Id- Malcolm.homavazir@atlasuniversity.edu.in

ABSTRACT:

In order to fully comprehend its many facets and address key theoretical issues related to it, this class digs into the multidimensional idea of citizenship. The chapter examines the development of citizenship throughout history, the differences between civil, political, and social rights, as well as how citizenship is identified and obtained via birth, marriage, and naturalisation. It also explores many theoretical stances on citizenship, such as democratic, conservative, free-market, communist, diverse, feminist, and Gandhian views. The idea of global citizenship is also looked at, emphasising the duties and responsibilities people have as citizens in a globalised society. Essentially, this chapter provides a thorough investigation of citizenship and its fluid character in modern society. Understanding citizenship and addressing some of the significant theoretical challenges related to this idea are the major goals of this lesson. In this chapter, the notion of citizenship is explained, along with some of its fundamental concepts and diverse theories.

KEYWORDS:

Civil, Citizenship, Country, Political, Social Rights.

INTRODUCTION

A connection between the state and the citizen is called citizenship. Citizenship is linked to three categories of rights: civil, political, and social rights. The first forms of citizenship were exclusive in that they denied citizenship privileges to groups like slaves, women, and the lower classes. With the passage of time, this has changed, and today's nations work to provide citizenship rights to everyone. A crucial component of every democracy is the active involvement of its citizens in shaping the political landscape in accordance with their preferences. The modern conception of citizenship closely resembles the liberal tradition, in which people have certain rights against the government. Other viewpoints, such as Gandhian, feminist, and global, attempt to provide fresh views on the idea of citizenship by overcoming gender and national boundaries.

Citizenship, broadly speaking, is a connection between a person and a state. It is seen in light of complementary rights and obligations. 'Full and equal participation in a political society' is what citizenship, according to T. H. Marshall, entails. Only individuals with property were granted citizenship privileges under the early forms of citizenship, which were constrained and exclusive in character.

These rights were not extended to slaves or women. The desire for equality became stronger with the emergence of contemporary liberal nations, and for the socioeconomic participation of the disadvantaged groups, citizenship rights were given to them. Citizens must actively participate in governance that provides accountability for a democracy to improve. In every democracy, passive citizenship may result in stagnation and further polarise the public's perception of the representatives. The debate over citizenship has been reignited as a result of a number of factors, including state opposition to welfare policies, rising defence budgets,

increased government digital surveillance, marginalization of weaker groups, environmental concerns, and multicultural pressures in the West as a result of globalization [1], [2].

Citizenship Concept

Citizenship is the status of a person who is accepted by tradition or law as a legitimate member of a country or a sovereign state. Multiple citizenships are possible, and being stateless refers to not being a citizen of any state. 'Citizen' may be interpreted in two different ways: narrowly defined or broadly defined. In a strict sense, it refers to a person who lives in a city or has the luxury of doing so. While in a general sense, a citizen is someone who lives inside a state's boundaries. In a legal sense, citizenship and nationality are synonymous. Conceptually, nationality is an issue of international relations, while citizenship is concentrated on the internal political activity of the state. complete citizenship in the contemporary period includes complete civil and social rights in addition to active political rights. The ability to vote for elected officials and to run for office is historically the biggest distinction between a citizen and a national. Since ancient times, there has been a separation between full citizenship and other, inferior ties. Up to the 19th and 20th centuries, it was common for just a small portion of a city's or state's population to be full citizens. The majority of individuals used to be denied citizenship because to their gender, class, race, religion, or other characteristics.

Citizenship is linked to three different categories of rights: civil, political, and social. Individual liberties like liberty, freedom of speech and expression, etc. are connected to civil rights. As they protect dissent in a democracy, these rights may be considered as a kind of power against the state. Political rights, such as the right to vote, the ability to start or join a political party, and others, are included in the political dimension and allow a person to participate in the political life of his or her nation. In a democracy, these rights are connected to legislative institutions. The right to share social and cultural legacy is referred to as the social dimension. The notion of a welfare state gained popularity after World War II, and it is the responsibility of the state to provide a minimal level of living in order to eliminate inequality among its residents. Social rights have been lagging behind civil rights in a conflict between civil and social rights.

Identifying Elements

Each nation has its own laws, rules, and requirements for who is eligible to become a citizen. On a variety of factors, one may be acknowledged or given citizenship. Generally speaking, citizenship based on place of birth is automatic; nevertheless, in certain circumstances, an application may be necessary.

There are two kinds of citizens: natural born and naturalised. Those who are citizens of a state by virtue of their birth or family ties are known as natural born citizens. Foreigners who successfully complete the requirements set out by the relevant nation are given citizenship via naturalisation. A person who wants to be a citizen of another nation must renounce his citizenship in his own nation. After meeting the requirements established by that nation for this reason, anybody may become a citizen of a foreign country.

Citizenship by Birth: A person may be eligible to become a citizen of a certain state if either or both of their parents are residents of that state. The right to citizenship by descent is often restricted by states to a certain number of generations born outside the state. In nations with a civil law system, this kind of citizenship is uncommon.

Born in a Country: Some persons are citizens of the country in where they were born by default. This kind of citizenship, which is widespread in nations under common law, has its roots in England, where those who were born in the realm were considered the monarch's subjects.

Citizenship by Marriage: Based on a person marrying a citizen, several nations expedite the naturalisation process. Countries that receive such immigrants often have laws intended to prevent fraudulent marriages, in which a citizen marries a non-citizen—typically for money—without having any intention of cohabitating.

States often offer citizenship via the process of naturalisation to those who entered the nation lawfully, received a permission to remain, or were granted political asylum and also resided there for a certain amount of time. Some nations have requirements for naturalisation, such as passing a test to prove a reasonable understanding of the language or culture of the host nation, having good moral character, swearing allegiance to their new state or its ruler, and renouncing their previous citizenship. Some jurisdictions permit dual citizenship and don't demand that those who get naturalised legally relinquish any prior citizenship [3], [4].

There is a clear contrast between an alien and a citizen in the international setting. In his own nation, a citizen is entitled to civil and political rights. On the other hand, a foreigner is not entitled to enjoy political rights of the nation, just civil rights like the right to life and the ability to practise one's faith. every aspect of the state's civic and political existence. The slaves, however, had no such rights and were subject to a variety of political and economic disadvantages. Even women were denied the privileges of citizenship, which were only accorded to "free native-born men." The word "citizen" was employed in the strictest meaning in ancient Greece in this manner. Only those were recognised as citizens who had access to civil and political rights and took part in activities related to people's civic and political life. Similar procedures were used in ancient Rome, when only members of the wealthy Patrician class were granted access to civil and political privileges. The Patricians were the only people who took part in the activities of the state's civil and political life. None of these privileges were extended to the general populace.

DISCUSSION

The phrase "civic virtue," which is derived from the Latin word "virtus," which signified "manliness" in the sense of carrying out military duty, patriotism, and commitment to duty and the law, was demanded of the people.

As absolute governments sought to impose their power over their heterogeneous populations, citizenship in the mediaeval era was equated with state protection. Protecting individual life and property was seen as the primary responsibility of the sovereign by social contract theorists like Hobbes and Locke. Citizenship was seen in a passive manner since the person relied on the state for security.

The French Revolution in 1789 questioned this idea, and in "The Declaration of the Rights of Man and Citizen," the citizen was defined as a free and independent person. The contemporary idea of citizenship is to create a balance between equality and freedom. Affirmative action creates conditions for equality by removing injustices like caste, class, gender, and others.

Citizenship Theories

The following ideas on citizenship have been advanced by academics.

Democratic Theory

This philosophy relies on the idea of individuality and claims that civil rights are the cornerstone of citizenship. Citizenship is a legal status that grants a person certain right and shields him from official intervention.

T. H. Marshall traces the evolution of citizenship in Britain in his 1950 work, "Citizenship and Social Class." He classified citizenship into civil, political, and social components. Civil rights are those required for freedom; political rights encompass the right to participate in politics; and social rights cover the right to economic security and wellbeing. Marshall held that the foundation of civil and political rights is social justice. Civil (18th century), political (19th century), and social (20th century) rights all through various stages of development. In his view, social rights, which stand for "equal social worth," are necessary to sustain civil rights, which confer "equal moral worth" on people. For instance, exercising one's right to free speech has no value if one is uneducated and incapable of saying anything intelligent. While capitalism fosters class disparities, citizenship stands for equality. Marshall gave the government the responsibility of performing welfare duties in order to care for the poor by maintaining a basic quality of life (social security). Marshall followed the real liberal tradition by attempting to lessen inequality rather than trying to abolish it. By advocating for the transfer of resources and services to the most disadvantaged groups in society, John Rawls added to the liberal conception of citizenship. Although liberal citizenship ensures formal legal equality regardless of disparities in terms of caste, class, colour, gender, etc., substantive equality is nevertheless elusive in practice [5], [6].

Conservative Theory

The Republican heritage emphasises citizen engagement as a means of achieving civic self-rule. In Social Contract, Rousseau made the case that laws are only valid when they are co-authored by the public will and therefore free people. Republicans support active engagement in discourse and policymaking because it assures that people are not treated as subjects but as citizens. Republicans desire to be involved in the creation of laws, in contrast to liberals who believe that citizenship is safeguarded by the law. Republicans favour deliberative democracy whereas liberals want representational democracy. Additionally, Republicans contend that citizenship should be seen as a shared civic identity created by a common public culture. Citizens may come together as a group if they have a civic identity that is more important to them than other identities such as race, religion, or ethnicity. Republicans criticise communitarians and worry that local identities will take precedence over civic objectives. However, securing public engagement is a challenging endeavour given the size and complexity of contemporary nation governments.

Free Market Theory

Libertarian citizenship may be attributed to Margaret Thatcher's British Conservative administration in 1979, which prioritised commercial rights above social rights. It was thought that the state couldn't continue to fund its social rights (welfare policy). They contend that rather than governmental redistribution, individuals prefer to pursue their interests and preferences via private action. Citizenship, according to libertarians, is the result of individual freedom of choice and contract. It views market society as the foundation of society and a good example of civic life. The principal proponent of this hypothesis is Robert Nozick. He notices that people use association, market transaction, and private activities to express their values, views, and preferences. Market freedom is valued by libertarians because it promotes "entrepreneurial freedom." They want both the freedom to acquire and hold property and its protection. As a result, protective institutions are required for the preservation of the right to

property, with the state proving to be the most effective of all. Individualism based on the free market is criticized for not providing a strong enough basis for social cohesion.

Theory of Communism

According to communitarians, a person does not exist before the community. They accuse liberals of neglecting people's social nature and putting too much emphasis on the individual. Furthermore, communitarians contend that liberals' emphasis on individual rights has prevented them from placing any value on obligations to one's community. According to Skinner, maximising individual liberty involves serving the public and putting the common good ahead of personal interests. Here, the idea of a citizen is one who actively participates in determining the future course of society via political discussion and decision-making. The essential assumption of this idea is that a citizen should connect with the group to which he belongs, participate in its political life, and help to realise civic qualities like respect for others and the value of public service. Therefore, communitarian citizenship places greater emphasis on collective rights than liberals do, who emphasise individual rights. Critics counter that this paradigm would only work in a tiny, homogeneous community with shared customs.

The discussion around citizenship and diversity is sparked by this. Globalisation has made contemporary countries more widely acknowledged as multicultural, which puts into question the liberal interpretation of citizenship that places the emphasis on the individual. Criticisms contend that certain settings, such as cultural, religious, ethnic, linguistic, etc., should govern citizenship. Equal rights for all people are considered as at odds with the culture and rights of minority groups. Will Kymlicka argued that certain "collective rights" for minority cultures are consistent with liberal democratic principles in his 1995 book "Multicultural Citizenship: A Liberal Theory of Minority Rights." He also argued that standard liberal objections to recognising such rights on grounds of individual freedom, social justice, and national unity can be refuted. Some liberals are concerned that offering preferences to national or ethnic groups undermines democracy since, in their view, democracy demands a common citizenship based on treating persons equally. Many regard it as illiberal to treat individuals differently depending on their membership in a certain group when they want some accommodation. According to Kymlicka, minorities' requests for accommodations genuinely represent their efforts to integrate. For instance, American Orthodox Jews ask for a waiver from the military's dress rules so they may wear yarmulkes. They want the exemption so they may enlist in the army and blend in with everyone else, not because they want to be different [7], [8].

Socialist theory

The rights of citizenship are a byproduct of class strife, according to Marxist theory. A barrier to guaranteeing equality before the law is the existence of economically disadvantaged groups. Because economically strong parts dominate, these sections are unable to exercise their citizenship rights. Marxists contend that the idea of citizenship itself is fictitious since the state would disappear after the revolution. Citizenship is unnecessary in a communist state since there are no political institutions there. However, there have been variations in practise. The words "state" and "citizen" were removed from the Soviet constitution by Lenin, but Stalin brought them back in 1936. There were many rights and obligations for persons specified in this constitution.

Anthony Giddens stated that the 16th century saw the beginning of contemporary democracy and citizenship as the state began to expand its administrative authority to monitor the populace and keep records about them. The state needed the people' participation in the form

of cooperative social ties since it could not accomplish this goal only via the use of force. Giddens refers to this as a "two-way" growth of power since the state increased the opportunity for subordinate organisations to have an impact on the state. He has also stated that since labour movements have influenced modern capitalism, it differs from the capitalism of the 19th century. This has highlighted welfare capitalism, which protects employees' civil rights. He has updated the Marxist view of citizenship and come to the conclusion that citizenship rights may be maintained in a liberal framework.

Diverse Theory

According to this theory, the emergence of the notion of citizenship may be attributed to a wide range of causes. It views the creation of citizenship as a multifaceted and complicated process. As articulated by David Held, it maintains that citizenship refers to a reciprocal connection between a person and their community. This idea holds that each person has certain rights against the community and also owes the community certain obligations, and as a result, the essence of citizenship is found in the life of the community. The pluralist viewpoint emphasises on looking at all forms of prejudice against individuals, whether it be based on gender, ethnicity, religion, wealth, status, profession, or age. So many social movements have been started in the modern world to combat various forms of social prejudice. These include, among others, the feminist movement, the black movement, the movement for religious reform, the workers' movement, the struggle for children's rights, the dalit movement, the adivasi movement, and the ecological movement. According to pluralist philosophy, it is best to examine the issue of citizenship in light of all of these movements.

Feminist Viewpoint

The dominance of males in the civil, political, cultural, economic, and social realms of life has led feminists to claim that women are treated as second-class citizens around the globe. It is clear from the overall pattern that women participate in politics at a lower rate than males do in every nation, and they are also less represented in politics. They have also questioned the division between the home and public spheres, which is used to maintain male supremacy at the expense of women's rights. The women's movement's catchphrase in the 1970s was thus "The Personal is Political." An egalitarian household is a lot more fruitful field for equal citizens than one organised like a school for dictatorship, as J. S. Mill once memorably said. Liberals think constitutional changes that will allow men to participate in home chores would advance gender equality. This is what civic feminism entails. Socialist feminists advocate for further development in areas like free contraception, abortion, women's health facilities, and official acknowledgement of domestic work. Radical feminists encourage women to participate in society as active citizens.

Gandhi's Opinions

Gandhi's thoughts on citizenship emphasized concepts like the common good and participating in society. Gandhi said that coercive authority, which is often used to oppress civilians, is a feature of all governments. He felt that a state shouldn't have centralised authority because of this. Gandhi's idea of citizenship rested on three main pillars: dharma (moral law and responsibility), ahimsa (non-violence in thought and practise), and satya (truth and sincerity). Furthermore, he trusted the person to resist the state's compulsion since he did not trust the state owing to its capacity of force. His ideal state was one that was non-violent, self-governing, and self-sufficient, where the majority rule would triumph with adequate regard for minority rights. He thought that the state represented coercion, uniformity, and violence in a concentrated form. Gandhi also held the view that freedom is indivisible and that one cannot be free while others are under servitude. For this reason, he

referred to the idea of global citizens, in which the whole globe serves as the stage for a person's actions. His advice to "think locally, act globally" implies this. One should be open to ideas from other cultures and recognise that every person's struggle is their own.

The Global Citizenship Concept

The proponents of the concept of global citizenship believe that everyone has certain rights and obligations just by virtue of being a citizen of this planet. Activities like migration and cross-border economic, social, and cultural interchange put the territorially constrained concept of citizenship under jeopardy under globalisation. 'An ethic of concern for the globe' is what Hannah Arendt defines as global citizenship. An individual who is aware of and understands the larger world—and their part in it—is said to be a global citizen, according to Oxfam, an international non-governmental organisation. Immanuel Kant's ideas of world citizenship emphasise personal responsibility for actions that may have negative effects on the environment and they defend compassion for peoples in other places. They encourage people to be involved in their local community and work with others to make our planet more equal, fair, and sustainable. They underline the value of doing things that help society as a whole and admit that there are few possibilities for involvement in joint governance in international society since the concept of global government is still a distant dream. The concept of global citizenship might be criticised because it emphasises passive citizenship more than active citizenship, placing a greater emphasis on obligations to others and loyalty to communities outside of the nation-state. Traditional viewpoints contend that the nation-state is the most prevalent kind of political community and that calls for global citizenship amount to nothing more than a moral admonition. However, in an era of non-traditional security challenges like terrorism, food, water, and energy security, climate change, etc., the concept of global citizenship cannot be completely dismissed. Nation-states must work together to combat these dangers, and within the context of this collaboration, everyone has a role to play in resolving these problems. This is comparable to global citizenship, when individuals consider how they can improve the lives of those who do not reside in their nation, i.e., how they can make the world a better place for everyone to live.

CONCLUSION

In conclusion, the notion of citizenship is one that is dynamic and always changing and has experienced major changes throughout history. Citizenship has evolved from its restricted and constrained early forms to include a wider range of rights, including civil, political, and social elements. Modern democracies now depend heavily on the active involvement of their people in government, highlighting the value of both active and passive participation in political life. A complex tapestry of concepts and discussions around citizenship has been influenced by a variety of theoretical views on citizenship, including democratic, conservative, free-market, communist, diverse, feminist, and Gandhian attitudes. These many viewpoints help to illuminate the concept's intricacies and difficulties, including the state's involvement in citizens' lives as well as concerns of social justice and gender equality. Additionally, the development of global citizenship illustrates how linked our globe is now. The idea of global citizenship emphasizes not just rights but also duties towards tackling global concerns, from climate change to humanitarian disasters, as people become more conscious of their roles in a global society. In essence, a multifaceted approach that takes historical, theoretical, and international aspects into account is needed to comprehend citizenship. Citizenship is a dynamic force that shapes our communities and our obligations as people within them, not a static notion. It is crucial to understand the value of active involvement, inclusion, and a dedication to building a more fair and equitable society for everyone as we negotiate the intricacies of citizenship in the contemporary period.

REFERENCES:

[1]   A. S. Patterson, "Engaging therapeutic citizenship and clientship: Untangling the reasons for therapeutic pacifism among people living with HIV in urban Zambia," *Glob. Public Health*, 2016.

[2]   A. M. Fortier, "Afterword: acts of affective citizenship? Possibilities and limitations," *Citizensh. Stud.*, 2016.

[3]   C. Wang and D. M. Hoffman, "Are WE the world? A critical reflection on selfhood and global citizenship education," *Educ. Policy Anal. Arch.*, 2016.

[4]   M. Nachi, "Transition to democracy in Tunisia: Learning about citizenship in a national and transnational context1," *Soc. Sci. Inf.*, 2016.

[5]   G. Jones, "What Is New about Dutch Populism? Dutch Colonialism, Hierarchical Citizenship and Contemporary Populist Debates and Policies in the Netherlands," *J. Intercult. Stud.*, 2016.

[6]   J. P. Myers, "Charting a democratic course for global citizenship education: Research directions and current challenges," *Educ. Policy Anal. Arch.*, 2016.

[7]   V. Andreotti, "The educational challenges of imagining the world differently," *Canadian Journal of Development Studies*. 2016.

[8]   L. Blackwood, N. Hopkins, and S. Reicher, "From Theorizing Radicalization to Surveillance Practices: Muslims in the Cross Hairs of Scrutiny," *Polit. Psychol.*, 2016.

CHAPTER 10

UNDERSTANDING THE DYNAMICS OF STATE AND CIVIL SOCIETY

Shoaib Mohammed, Associate Professor
Department of ISME, ATLAS SkillTech University, Mumbai, Maharashtra, India
Email Id- shoaib.mohammed@atlasuniversity.edu.in

ABSTRACT:

Political sociology's main concern is how the state interacts with civil society. The three most significant theoretical positions—Classical understanding, Liberal Individualist, and Marxist—have been used in this course to study the fundamental understanding of how state has been defined. Similar to this, contemporary notions of civic society, as expressed in the works of Hegel, Marx, and other thinkers, may be traced back to Roman and Greek philosophers. This unit has also shown how, despite their differences, civil society and the state never function entirely apart from one another. But the things they seek for are different. The development of the state is necessary for the advancement of civil society, and social practises and traditions have an impact on how the state functions. The demands of civil society are increasing, and the state must react. The civic society, however, ought to be diverse and open. One of the most fundamental and significant ideas in political science is the state, which is covered in this subject. Additionally, it clarifies the idea of civic society. This chapter examines the link between the state and civil society as well as the idea of civil society.

KEYWORDS:

Civil Society, Justice, Organization, Political Science, State Guidelines.

INTRODUCTION

Political science places a lot of emphasis on the concept of the state. Political science "begins and ends with state," as Professor Garner put it. The idea of a state and what it includes have developed throughout time. The role of the people has taken precedence over the power of the state. Similar to this, civic society has become one of the most contentious political theory topics. Unquestionably, the contemporary state and the idea of civil society are intertwined. What is the relationship between the state and civil society? is only one of the issues that have arisen as a result. What kind of connection do they have? The parts that follow have addressed these concerns.

Concepts Of State

Political philosophy is centred on the idea of the state. Over the years, the state has been described and recharacterized as a kind of political organisation that dates back to antiquity. Plato and Aristotle's conception of the polis marks the beginning of the idea of a state. The state was a natural, essential, and moral institution for them both. A high standard of morality and a happy living were made possible by the state or polis. Niccolo Machiavelli is credited with coining the modern concept of state, which he described as "the power that has authority over men." What Max Weber considered to be the most logical explanation of state developed from this formulation. A "human community that (successfully) claims the monopoly of the legitimate use of physical force within a given territory" is what Weber meant by a "state [1], [2]."

Classical State Understanding

In all of his writings, Plato argues in favour of an Ideal State. For him, a perfect society with philosopher kings was nothing less than a heavenly institution deserving of admiration and replication. He said that there was an ideal state that could be identified and used to repair a sickly polity and make it into a beautiful creation by describing it as being founded on eternal and unchanging principles. According to Plato, the citizens of the ideal state are divided into three different social classes: rulers, warriors, and people. Thus, the four cardinal qualities of knowledge, bravery, discipline, and justice were present in the ideal state. It would have wisdom because its rulers were intelligent people; courage because its soldiers were courageous; self-discipline because there would be harmony in the social structure because everyone would agree on who should be in charge; and justice because everyone would do their jobs as they were naturally suited to do without interfering with others. A good political society, according to Plato, is one that promotes the general well-being of all of its people. The deep feeling of belonging that its members enjoyed was a key aspect of this civilization. Everyone received a fair share of the advantages; no one was given preference at the cost of others. The philosopher ruler was the ideal kind of monarch since he had no interest in acquiring wealth or power.

Aristotle saw a state as a society that must serve a purpose, and that purpose is for the utmost welfare of all people. Three phases of state formation were described by Aristotle. The first stage included two fundamental urges that played a key role in uniting people. Self-preservation is the other driving force for the union of men and women, together with the reproductive urge. The family is the initial stage in the establishment of a state since it is "first thing to arise" out of these because "family is the association established by nature for the supply of men's everyday wants." The second stage occurred when many households joined forces and groups sought to achieve goals beyond meeting basic requirements. Thus, a village is created, which in its purest form is a gathering of families with shared ancestry. He characterizes the third stage as "when several villages are united in a single complete community, large enough to be nearly self-sufficient, the state comes into existence, initially for the sake of survival and continuing for the sake of good life." According to Aristotle, the state is a natural community, and the good life which can only be found in the state is man's natural purpose. The state is a natural society as a result. Man is a political animal by nature. And he is either a horrible person or above humanity if he lacks a state by nature rather than by accident. Because it represented the apex of social growth, the state was considered by Aristotle to be the greatest form of political union. Insofar as it offered chances for attaining full humanity, the state predated the individual. Individuals acquired their species identification via social association.

Aristotle and Plato both believed that the state and its rules were more than just the result of convention. Given the social nature of people, it was a natural institution for expressing personal wants and goals. For them both, polis represented a comprehensive version of reality. They did not discriminate between the state and society; instead, they saw the polis as an ethical body whose goal was to uphold a decent and contented way of life. Cicero's Republic had the same goal as Plato's Republic in that it gave out a vision of the perfect state. Cicero's ideal state, however, is a commonwealth rather than a polis. According to him, the commonwealth is an association of many individuals who have come to an understanding about justice and a collaboration for the welfare of all. He lists three reasons why the commonwealth was founded. The first reason for this relationship is that man is not a lonely or antisocial creature. Instead, he was created with a disposition that prevents him from choosing to live alone, even in the midst of extreme wealth in every way. Second, the populi

res (common welfare) upon which his state is founded. According to him, the establishment of the state and accomplishing the common good were both made possible by persons acting rationally. People have conquered all temptations to pleasure and comfort because they have such a strong desire to participate in the common good. Third, the group's members must agree on the rules of law that will govern their commonwealth. Cicero recommended monarchy, aristocracy, and democracy as the three possible forms of governance. However, there is a seed of corruption and instability in every type of governance, and this causes it to collapse. The most effective assurance of social stability and corruption-free society is a hybrid system of administration. For the stability and benefit of the political system, Cicero favoured a republican form of government as the ideal illustration of checks and balances [3], [4].

Understanding the liberal individualist

The teachings of the Roman Church have influenced state philosophy since the Middle Ages. There wasn't one strong secular authority in the West after the collapse of the Roman Empire in the fifth century. However, the Catholic Church, a major ecclesiastical force, existed in Rome. The Church arose to fill this power gap and eventually took control of the West. The social life gradually transformed into a religious existence regulated by church rule. The concept of state reemerged in importance in the fifteenth century with the advent of modern Western Europe. Many novel definitions were proposed by different academics. Niccolo Machiavelli was one of the most significant thinkers. Political philosophers up to this point, including Plato, Aristotle, and the Middle Ages, had been preoccupied with the basic issue of the purpose of the state and had seen state power as a vehicle to a loftier, morally-conceived objective. However, Machiavelli had a quite different stance. According to him, the goal of any state should be to maximise its power since power is seen as the ultimate goal of the state. If the state fails in this endeavour, it will be in severe upheaval. As a result, he focused his attention on strategies that would enable him to gain, hold onto, and grow his power. According to his Raison D'Etat (Reason of State) concept, the welfare of the state must come first, then that of its citizens. The state is the ultimate level of human relationship in Machiavelli's view. Even when a person is sacrificed, the state is to be venerated as a god. The preservation of life, upholding law and order, and ensuring the welfare of its citizens are some of the state's core goals and duties. Therefore, the state has to have sufficient resources at its disposal. Machiavelli's state had no connections to the church and was a secular organisation. It had no responsibilities to anything outside of itself and was ethically alone. He believed that a robust and stable state needs the backing of decent laws, religion, and a citizen army.

DISCUSSION

The concept of state varies greatly amongst thinkers. The "war of every man against every man," which Hobbes defined as a perpetual state of conflict in which each person has an inherent claim to everything, disregarding the interests of others, is what Hobbes believed to be the essence of the natural state. The only rules that exist in the state of nature (the laws of nature) are not agreements formed between individuals, but principles based on self-preservation, as memorably put by Hobbes: "solitary, poor, nasty, brutish, and short." For instance, Hobbes claims that the first rule of nature is that everyone should strive for peace, inasmuch as they have any chance of doing so, and that if they cannot, they should seek out and take advantage of all the benefits of conflict. According to him, this unsustainable situation ends when people choose to give up their inherent rights to everything and transfer their sovereignty to a more powerful civic authority, or Leviathan. According to Hobbes, the sovereign has unrestricted power and its decisions are binding. However, this does not imply

that the sovereign has absolute authority; in situations when the sovereign declines to speak, the subjects are still free to behave as they choose. The social compact enables people to leave nature and join civil society, yet nature still poses a danger and will reappear as soon as political authority is lost. Leviathan's dominance, however, makes its dissolution very improbable and only happens when it is unable to defend its citizens.

In contrast, Locke believed that the lack of government, but not the absence of reciprocal duty, best describes the condition of nature. Contrary to Hobbes, Locke believed that people are naturally endowed with these rights (to life, liberty, and property) and that the state of nature could be relatively peaceful. The law of nature, or reason, also teaches "all mankind, who will but consult it, that being all equal and independent, no one ought to harm another in his life, liberty, or possessions." However, people decide to establish a commonwealth (and so abandon the state of nature) in order to set up an impartial authority that can settle their disputes and make amends for wrongs. According to Locke, the rights to life, liberty, and property are inherent freedoms that existed long before civil society was created. The concept of the natural state had a crucial role in Rousseau's political thought. Hobbes' idea of a socially antagonistic state of nature was criticised by him. The state of nature, according to Rousseau, can only refer to a primal condition that existed before socialisation; as a result, it lacks social characteristics like pride, envy, or even fear of others. According to Rousseau, the state of nature is a calm, morally neutral setting where lone people behave in accordance with their primal inclinations and their innate need to survive. But an equally natural feeling of compassion restrains this latter urge. According to Rousseau's theory, which was outlined in his Discourse on the Origin of Inequality (1775), people emerge from the state of nature by become more civilised, or dependant on one another.

Hegel said that "State is the march of God on Earth," suggesting that it is a manifestation of God on earth. The state served as a synthesis between the values regulating civil society and those guiding the family as the third moment of ethical life. In particular, he found in the modern nation-state a reconciliation between the old idea of the state as a moral society and more modern notions of the state that promoted freedom and individuality. The concept of a state is itself divided into three moments: (a) the state's immediate actuality as a self-sufficient organism, or constitutional law; (b) the relationship between states in international law; and (c) the universal idea as mind or spirit that actualizes itself through the course of world history. The state was immortal because it possessed an unwavering sense of reason and a "substantive will" to realise itself via history. Hegel saw the state as the thought realising itself via history, a goal in and of itself [5], [6].

Marxist comprehension

One of the most well-known political science ideas is the Marxist theory of the state. Marxist ideas questioned the fundamental tenets of the liberal state, which needed to be eliminated or destroyed in order for the common people to ever be free. In the Communist Manifesto, Karl Marx and Frederick Engels said that the state is "simply the organised power of one class for oppressing another." The contemporary state's executive is really a committee that oversees the common business of the whole bourgeoisie, the author continues. They believed that the state was not permanent and would soon end. Marx saw all forms of governance, including the state, as bad. It was influenced and determined by its economic foundation and belonged to the category of superstructure. Each mode of production would have its own political structure throughout the course of history, advancing the goals of the economically dominant class. Marx's preferred society was one without classes, states, real democracy, and pure communism, in which the political state vanished.

Neo-Marxists disagree somewhat with the idea that the state serves as a tool for a certain class. They contend that although this notion was especially realistic of Russian Bolshevik society, it cannot be used as a generalisation for the present. They have also contended that, in the name of the proletariat's dictatorship, the state will become even more powerful rather than wither away as prophesied by Marx. Ralph Miliband wrote, "There is one preliminary problem about the state which is very seldom considered, yet which requires attention, if the discussion of its nature and role is to be properly focused," in his seminal book The State in Capitalist Society: The Analysis of the Western System of Power (1973). The fact that "the state" is not a thing and does not, therefore, exist is indicated by this. The term "the state" refers to a collection of specific institutions that together make up its actuality and function as elements of what may be referred to as the state system. According to Miliband, studying the institutions that make up the bourgeois state is crucial if one is to comprehend the true essence of the state. He refers to these organisations as the various components of the state.

Civil Society Concept

Political theory is profoundly rooted in the concept of civic society. Although the concept of civil society is not new, it has gained significance in recent years as a result of global political change, notably with the collapse of the former communist states in Eastern Europe. Furthermore, non-state actors often play a significant role in influencing public policy debates, sometimes assisting the state in developing and enacting legislation, particularly non-governmental organisations and different issue-based movements. Although in classical use civil society was associated with the state, the word "civil society" may be traced back to the writings of Cicero (societascivilis) and other Roman thinkers. In the late 18th century, during the Scottish and Continental Enlightenment, the modern notion of civil society first appeared. Many political philosophers, including John Locke, Thomas Paine, and Hegel, contributed to the development of the idea of civil society as a realm that is parallel to but distinct from the state — a place where individuals freely interact according to their own interests and wants. This new way of thinking was a reflection of the bourgeoisie, the increase of private property, and other shifting economic realities. The American and French revolutions, which reflected the growing public yearning for liberty, also contributed to its development. In the middle of the 19th century, political theorists began to focus more on the social and political effects of the industrial revolution, pushing the concept of civil society to the side. After World War II, it was resurrected in the works of the Marxist thinker Antonio Gramsci, who used it to describe civil society as a unique hub of autonomous political action and a critical front in the fight against tyranny.

In terms of rights, relationships with other people, and interactions with the state, the notion of civil society and the idea of the individual both developed. John Locke and Thomas Hobbes' ideas on civil society are resonant today. Hobbes believes that the state performs the most crucial function since it ensures peace and self-preservation. Only when the state is powerful can civil society develop. With the exception of the sovereign, who was not a party to the initial contract, Hobbes thought it was a fresh argument that the institution of government is born out of a contract between people. He believed that since society and the state are not natural, they need to be justified. Instead, Locke believed that the freedom of individuals, who first established civil society and subsequently the state that defends individual rights, was the most significant part of social existence. In this condition of nature, people follow their emotions rather than their reason. John Locke elaborates on the defence of property interests as the justification for why members of civil society come together to establish a government in The Second Treatise on Government. According to him, legitimate governments are those that have popular support. Locke makes it quite obvious that the state

and civil society are not the same [7], [8]. He made the case that the state is a fiduciary authority that relies on the confidence of the public. He maintained that civil society must take action to stop violations if the state begins behaving tyrannically or recklessly and tries to restrict people's rights. Adam Ferguson and Adam Smith expanded on Locke's ideas. Ferguson defined civil society as a condition of civility because, in political society, civic spirit had deteriorated and the prosperous commercial elites had become subservient to the administrative state. Although the state gave these classes access to the rule of law, it also denied them their fundamental rights. In his book The Wealth of Nations, Adam Smith described the basis for the idea of civil society as being 'economic man' actively seeking 'the necessaries, comforts, and amusements of human existence'. According to Smith, private property, contracts, and 'free' exchanges of work facilitate the formation of civil society, and it is the responsibility of the state to uphold this specific social order. In summary, civil society is seen by Ferguson and Smith as a controlling and socializing force that restrained the unpredictability of man in order to safeguard free markets, individual property rights, and the advancement of capitalism.

Hegel has provided more insight into the dynamic between the state and civil society. Hegel believed that "civil society" reflected a "system of needs" in which each person pursued his or her own interests in accordance with his or her inclinations and abilities. Hegel stated that "the creation of civil society is the achievement of the modern world which has for the first time given all determinations of the Idea their due." He saw three distinct, although interconnected, components of civil society: the system of needs, the administration of justice (protection of person and property), and the need for collaboration and police. Individual endeavours are interconnected by a web of interdependence that is controlled by a set of formal laws Hegel refers to as the "external state," or state founded on necessity and abstract logic. Hegel believed that the partition of society into several classes and estates, each with its own unique viewpoint, interests, and way of life, is what distinguishes civil society from a political society.

These estates the peasants, commerce, and universal class of state functionaries provide the vital connections or mediators between the familial natural society and the state's more impersonal reason. According to Hegel, the state is the greatest and most complete kind of social institution. He refers to civil society as "an expression for the individualist and atomistic atmosphere of middle-class commercial society in which relationships are external, governed by the unseen hand of the economic laws rather by the sub-conscious will of the person." He calls the state "a synthesis, of the thesis of family and the anti-thesis of civil society." According to Hegel's theory, civil society evolves into the state, the pinnacle of spiritual progress. Although civil society comes before the state logically speaking, it ultimately depends on the state for both its survival and existence.

Karl Marx, in contrast to Hegel, was a harsh opponent of the idea of civil society. According to him, the state serves as a political platform for the bourgeois hegemony that already prevails in civil society. Marx argued that because bourgeois society established civil society, it was nothing more than a vehicle for bourgeois interests to be represented. He continued by saying that although political society constituted the "superstructure," civil society served as the "base" for the forces of production and social interactions. In this situation, the dominant class is represented by the state as a "superstructure." Antonio Gramsci, on the other hand, regarded civil society as the hub of autonomous political action and a significant front in the fight against tyranny. The foundation of Gramsci's conception of civil society is the notion that it serves as a battleground for the proper use of state authority. He claimed that civil society is a result of "hegemony," which may be both political and cultural, rather than a

natural condition or an outcome of the industrial society. He separated the civil society from the political society in the superstructure of society. He maintained that via these two components of the super structure, the dominant groups in society exert hegemony through both coercive and intellectual tactics. According to Gramsci, civil society encompasses societal material, intellectual, and cultural interactions. In his opinion, any state, whatever of the sort of government it has, that denies its inhabitants' political and civil rights must prepare for the uprising against exclusions from citizenship and representational institutions. He sees the civil society as an essential component and believes that nations without them are more susceptible than those that do. Gramsci, in contrast to Marx, did not see a connection between civil society and the socioeconomic foundation of the state. He emphasised the crucial contribution that civil society makes to the cultural and ideological capital necessary for the maintenance of capitalism's hegemony and then repeated it using cultural terms. At the same time, the civil society evolved as a venue for hegemonic conflicts and a location where societies could defend themselves against the market and the government. In conclusion, a wide range of political philosophers have developed their own definitions of civil society. According to Hegel, the development of civil society is a prerequisite for the establishment of a state; according to Marx, civil society is the source of the state's power; and according to Gramsci, civil society is the setting in which the state establishes its hegemony in collaboration with the ruling classes.

Arrangement Of The State And Civil Society

Despite their differences, civil society and the state never have completely independent relationships with one another. But the things they seek for are different. A vital authority to uphold the elements of a well-ordered society, such as the rule of law, security, and justice, cannot be taken away from the limited state. A powerful state, on the other hand, is necessary for a robust civil society to develop because of the legitimacy and efficacy of its political institutions, laws, and orders. The growth of an engaged populace may be severely hampered by a weak and unstable state. According to David Held, the state and civil society must become prerequisites for one another. The term "society politically organised" is often used to characterise the state. Humans get together to form a society that satisfies all of their wants. The state meets their specific demand for political organisation by subjecting them to enforceable laws and making the choice to maintain security. While it is true that one is an extension of the other, there must still be certain differences established, a society only qualifies as a state when it is able to carry out these duties under the guidance of an ultimate deciding power.

The unified, formal organisation of the state, which consists of several instruments of authority, primarily the legislative, executive, and judiciary, serves as a defining characteristic. Contrarily, civil society is made up of informal associations of people acting freely in the public good. While civil society lacks any formal or legal power, the state is endowed with ultimate legal authority, or sovereignty. Civil society has no jurisdiction everywhere and is primarily dependent on the state's capacity to inspire and motivate. The state has the authority to exert obligatory jurisdiction over its population and territory. The state is in charge of upholding law and order and safeguarding its population from both internal and foreign threats. The civic society willingly takes on the responsibility of defending the interests of all people. The presence of a state is nearly ubiquitous, and contemporary societies all have some kind of political structure. However, civil society only arises in more developed countries when people are sufficiently aware of their rights, obligations, and shared interests.

It is indisputable that a vibrant, diversified civil society often contributes significantly to the advancement of democracy, notwithstanding a number of differences. It may enforce governmental discipline, guarantee that the concerns of the populace are treated seriously, and promote greater engagement in civic and political life. Some imagine a world almost entirely devoid of governments in which strong non-governmental organisations impose a new, civic order while hesitant, minimalistic nations stay back. A zero-sum game is used to represent the relationship, with a stronger state leading to a weaker civil society and vice versa. If the state has clear authority over the creation and enforcement of policy, civil society organisations can influence state policy far more effectively. Effective non-governmental lobbying activity actually has a tendency to increase state capability rather than decrease it. At best, there is a reciprocal relationship between the state and civil society. It must be integrative in character, with each element advancing the goals of the others. The state is in charge of providing a foundation and a framework for the civil society to operate in. The state and civic society must work together. The development of the state is necessary for the advancement of civil society, and social practises and traditions have an impact on how the state functions. The demands of civil society are increasing, and the state must react. The civic society, however, ought to be diverse and open [9], [10]. In the same way that no state can be envisioned without a civil society, no civil society can acquire legitimacy without a state, the notions of the state and civil society have evolved concurrently.

CONCLUSION

In conclusion, our investigation of the interaction between the state and civil society has shown how intricately these two pillars of political life interact. Political philosophers and theorists have provided a variety of viewpoints throughout history on the nature and function of the state as well as the function of civil society in influencing politics. The importance of the state in promoting justice, peace, and the common good was highlighted in the classical view of the state, as illustrated by Plato and Aristotle.

They considered the state to be a morally defensible organisation that is necessary for human flourishing. Niccol Machiavelli, in contrast, emphasised power and self-preservation while introducing a more practical and secular notion of the state. Individual liberties and rights were seen as the cornerstone of civil society from a liberal individualist viewpoint, which was espoused by authors like John Locke and Adam Smith.

Locke's conception of a social compact and natural rights served as the foundation for contemporary democratic theory, which holds that the agreement of the governed establishes the legitimacy of the state.

REFERENCES:

[1]   M. Hushie, C. N. Omenyo, J. J. Van Den Berg, and M. A. Lally, "State-civil society partnerships for HIV/AIDS treatment and prevention in Ghana: Exploring factors associated with successes and challenges," *BMC Health Serv. Res.*, 2016.

[2]   C. D. Bhatta, "The Interface between the State and Civil Society in Nepal," *Dhaulagiri J. Sociol. Anthropol.*, 2016.

[3]   E. J. Gómez and J. Harris, "Political repression, civil society and the politics of responding to AIDS in the BRICS nations," *Health Policy Plan.*, 2016.

[4]   V. Axyonova and F. Bossuyt, "Mapping the substance of the EU's civil society support in Central Asia: From neo-liberal to state-led civil society," *Communist Post-Communist Stud.*, 2016.

[5]   G. Burrier, "The Developmental State, Civil Society, and Hydroelectric Politics in Brazil," *J. Environ. Dev.*, 2016.

[6]   E. Amri, E. V. Putra, and R. Fernandes, "Pola Hubungan Negara dan Civil Society Patterns State and Civil Society Relations," *J. Kaji. Polit. Dan Masal. Pembang.*, 2016.

[7]   C. Pierobon, "The development of state-civil society relations in Kazakhstan," *Caucaso e Asia Cent.*, 2016.

[8]   A. de Oliveira Santiago, "Environmental Licensing in Brazil: Revisiting the Borders between State and Civil Society," *Encuentro Latinoam.*, 2016.

[9]   N. Funk, "A spectre in Germany: refugees, a 'welcome culture' and an 'integration politics,'" *J. Glob. Ethics*, 2016.

[10]   F. Avelino and J. M. Wittmayer, "Shifting power relations in sustainability transitions: A multi-actor perspective," *J. Environ. Policy Plan.*, 2016.

CHAPTER 11

DEMOCRACY AND ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT: EXPLORING THE COMPLEX RELATIONSHIP

Chetana Dilip Asbe, Associate Professor
Department of ISME, ATLAS SkillTech University, Mumbai, Maharashtra, India
Email Id- chetana.asbe@atlasuniversity.edu.in

ABSTRACT:

This chapter explores the complex linkages between democracy and economic growth. It examines how democracy has changed throughout history, stressing its many variations and contentious nature. The advantages of democracy, such as eliminating tyranny and fostering human progress, are explored with its drawbacks, such as balancing equality and liberty. The chapter further clarifies the idea of economic development by highlighting how political stability, labour force, technology, and natural resources all contribute to economic progress. The dispute over whether democracy and economic growth can coexist or if they must be mutually incompatible forms the core of the unit. While some claim that authoritarian governments prioritize stability and effectiveness above economic progress, others maintain that democracies generate better chances for both economic and cultural improvement. Empirical data on this topic is offered, demonstrating situations in which authoritarianism has stifled economic progress and in which democracy has produced it. In the end, the chapter emphasizes the complex link between democracy and economic growth and calls for a balanced viewpoint that takes into account the particular conditions of each country. This examines the ideas of democracy and economic development in this unit, as well as how they relate to one another. In this chapter, we will define democracy and economic development and examine the relationship between the two.

KEYWORDS:

Decision-Making, Democratic Government, Economic Development, Political Stability.

INTRODUCTION

There is a link between democratic government and economic expansion. While some experts think that they are incompatible with one another, others disagree. This section will investigate both ideas in order to provide further context for the connection between democracy and economic development. Democracy as a notion date back more than 2500 years, to the fifth century BC in Athens. The term "demokratia" is also of Greek origin, as is the word "democracy." It is a fusion of the Greek words "demos," which means "people," and "kratos," which means "power." Democracy, therefore, is the idea that the people themselves run the country, giving it real legitimacy. Given that it is a "contested concept," it is one of the most hotly contested topics in the area of political science. This indicates that even if there is universal agreement on what democracy is, there are still disagreements over how to put it into practise. Because of this, there are several forms of democracy, including direct, representative, and deliberative. The notion that democracy entails popular rule and sovereignty is widely accepted, but there is disagreement regarding how it will be accomplished. However, there are some fundamental inconsistencies in the way democracy is applied. Democracies must deal with issues like how to increase public engagement, strike a balance between equality and liberty, defend the rights of minorities, and prevent the tyranny of the majority, among others.

A democracy offers a lot of benefits over other types of governance. It stops tyrants from taking power, promotes human growth, makes it easier to defend each person's rights and liberties, and may even stop international conflicts since democracies often don't wage war on one another. J. S. Mill outlined three benefits of democratic decision-making above non-democratic ones in his 1861 book Considerations on Representative Government. In the first place, democracy strategically forces decision-makers to consider the interests, views, and rights of the majority of the population, which would not be the case under an authoritarian or aristocratic type of governance. Second, from an epistemological perspective, democracy involves many different points of view, allowing decision-makers to choose the best ones. Third, democracy aids in the development of people' character by encouraging traits like reason, independence, and independent thought. Political leaders are under pressure from the public opinion as a result, and they are unable to continue ignoring it in order to hold onto power [1], [2].

The concept of democracy has advanced significantly from its uninclusive beginnings in ancient Greece. Women, slaves, and foreigners were not included in the Greek democracy, rendering it inherently undemocratic. Even in contemporary democracies like France, Britain, and the US, where certain groups were denied the right to vote while privileged males were granted it, this mentality persisted. In addition to advocating for humankind's popular sovereignty, the French Revolution of 1789 also spoke of liberty, equality, and brotherhood. However, women were denied the ability to vote, and France did not implement adult suffrage for all citizens until 1944. Women were granted the right to vote in the US in 1920 and in Britain in 1928. However, racial prejudice persisted in the US, and African American men and women were not granted the right to vote until 1965. In comparison to Western democracies, India has been more progressive in this area since it implemented universal adult franchise in 1950, the year its constitution came into effect, making it the first democracy in the world to do so from the start. Women first exercised their right to vote in municipal elections in Saudi Arabia in 2015, which is the newest nation to permit women to vote.

The procedural (minimalist) and substantive (maximalist) points of view may both contribute to a thorough understanding of democracy. Simply put, the procedural component is concerned with the methods used to achieve democracy. It makes the case that regularly held competitive elections supported by broad political involvement and adult universal suffrage would result in a democratically chosen government. The procedural view's limitations are addressed by substantive democracy, which contends that social and economic disparities may make it difficult for individuals to participate in the democratic process. It focuses on results, such as socioeconomic equality, rather than goals in order to effectively serve the governed. In a way, it discusses the "common good" as opposed to the advantage of a select few. Through redistributive justice, the rights of marginalised groups like women and the poor are safeguarded, allowing the state to intervene to create the circumstances necessary for their political participation.

The term "democracy" is typically used to refer to "liberal democracy," which denotes a representative form of government in which the ability of elected officials to exercise decision-making authority is constrained by the rule of law and typically restrained by a constitution that places a strong emphasis on defending individual rights and freedoms. A system of internal and external checks on government that is intended to preserve liberty and provide people with protection from the state reflects the country's liberal nature. Its democratic elements are supported by a system of regular, competitive elections that are held

on the grounds of adult suffrage for everyone and political equality. Liberal democracy's defining characteristics are:

governance based on formal, often legal norms and constitution. The constitution guarantees both individual rights and civil liberty. a system of checks and balances and institutional fragmentation. Regular elections that adhere to the one-person, one-vote and universal adult suffrage ideals. Political diversity in the form of party rivalry and electoral choice. a functioning civil society where organised interests and organisations are free from governmental control. a market-based, capitalist, or private business economy.

The latter argument is particularly significant since the economic system and ideology of capitalism are built on private ownership of the means of production and their use for profit. In a capitalist market economy, decisions on investment and use of capital are made by the owners of the means of production on the financial and capital markets, while competition on the markets for goods and services plays a major role in setting prices and determining how things are distributed. In liberal democracies, economic freedom encourages economic development or increases per capita income [3], [4].

Economic Expansion

The process of economic development is how a country's wealth develops through time. It is a growth in the market value of the products and services produced in an economy through time, to use strict economic terminology. Long-term economic growth raises a nation's national income and employment rates, which raises living standards. Here, it is important to distinguish between economic development and growth. People are lifted out of poverty through development, which also gives them jobs and somewhere to live. It also considers sustainability, or how to fulfil the demands of the present without sacrificing the requirements of future generations. On the other side, if concerns of sustainability aren't addressed, economic expansion may result in problems with pollution and traffic. The following is a list of some elements that influence economic growth.

Natural resources - A nation's potential for economic progress will also depend on the availability of its natural resources. For instance, West Asian nations have substantial oil reserves, and by exporting this product, their economic development has increased. Basic organisational and physical structures and facilities that support economic development are known as infrastructure. It will be less expensive and simpler to transport commodities from one location to another in a nation with strong road and rail connection than in one with poor connectivity. Having enough workers is both a difficulty and an opportunity. Economic development is aided by a larger labour force, but it must also be skilled. It lowers expenses while increasing productivity. Investors will avoid investing in an economy that lacks political direction and will flee from nations that lack political stability.

DISCUSSION

Throughout history, there has been a significant correlation and interaction between democracy, economic progress, and growth. In the last fifty years, there has been much discussion on the connection between political democracy and economic prosperity. First, there was discussion about the underdeveloped nations in Asia, Africa, and Latin America in the 1950s and 1960s. These nations made democratising their systems a top priority after gaining independence from colonial control. But eventually the bulk of them—whether it was Pakistan, Myanmar, Indonesia, Taiwan, Singapore, Nigeria, Cuba, etc.—became dictatorships. The demands of prosperity and survival forced them to crush any political opposition and deny their populations' civil and political freedoms. This brought up the

crucial query: Which comes first, democracy or growth? To put it another way, what should be prioritized—providing civil political liberty and rights, democratic freedom and obtaining citizens' approval for governmental actions, or alleviating human suffering under an authoritarian regime? There are two points of view on this matter; one contends that democracy and economic development cannot coexist, and the other that they can.

Economic growth and democracy cannot coexist. Some analysts contend that democracy may be detrimental to economic development. The first lesson is that democracy is not the key to economic progress, according to Robert Barro's pioneering study in this field, which found that "more political rights do not have an effect on growth." According to Judge Posner, tyranny is often best for really impoverished nations. These nations often lack the cultural and institutional foundations for democracy in addition to having basic economies. However, at a greater degree of economic development, democracy would be more effective in promoting economic growth than non-democracy. The lowest degree of democracy is second most conducive to development, followed by the highest level, according to Barro's conclusion. After studying nations from 1950 to 1991, Adam Przeworski and Limongi came to the following conclusion: A democratic country has a per capita income of less $ 1500, the regime has a life of eight years, with $ 1500-3000, it is 18 years, and with $ 6000 and above, it is stable. The majority of stable nations were democratic ones, with a per capita income of at least $9,000. Similar opinions have been expressed by SM Lipset as well. According to him, a country has a greater probability of maintaining democracy the better off it is.

Both democracies and non-democracies may have favourable or unfavourable impacts on economic growth. Three different types of stability—ownership stability (a stable system of property rights), legal stability (the rule of law), and social stability (the absence of social unrest)—are among the most essential, but insufficient, prerequisites for economic success. These circumstances may exist in either a democracy or a non-democracy and might promote economic growth. Even economic growth has the potential to influence whether a country is democratic or autocratic. Any government may be overthrown by economic hardship. According to A, poverty may topple a democratic government. Przeworski and others. Even authoritarian governments are susceptible, as seen by the 2011 Arab Spring that swept across numerous Arab nations.

One viewpoint, which has emerged primarily in the context of East Asian countries, favours economic expansion above democracy. This line of thinking is based on the fact that progress necessitates change, and that some voters are negatively impacted by change. Governments that rely on public support in the next election will thus often steer clear of decisions that would negatively affect a sizable portion of the electorate. For instance, more developed nations than other democracies, like India, are Singapore, post-reform China, and Taiwan. The 'Lee Hypothesis' got its name because Lee Kuan Yew, a former Singaporean prime minister, formulated it. For Lee Kuan Yew, whether a political system raises the quality of life for the vast majority of people is the litmus test for its effectiveness. According to this school, economic rights should come first and political and civic rights should follow second. People would always pick development to liberate themselves from economic hardship and suffering if given the option between political freedom and meeting their necessities. Democracy wouldn't interest them. Furthermore, proponents of the Lee Thesis contend that the development of certain cultures similar to these in the middle east and Asia is not that essential culturally and that liberal political freedoms are a goal and fixation of western civilization. Order and discipline, which promote wealth, are more significant in Asian societies. "I do not believe that democracy necessarily leads to development," said Lee Kuan Yew. I think that more than democracy, a nation has to create discipline. All of the so-called

Asian Tiger economies have operated under varying degrees of democracy and authoritarianism. Another way to say it is that proponents of the Lee thesis place greater value on stability and effectiveness than accountability and openness. Authoritarian regimes are more decisive and effective at executing policy than democratic ones. Development needs both deliberate policy decision and successful policy execution. Additionally, ethnic and regional disputes impede economic progress and are best repressed by a strong, authoritarian state [5], [6].

Economic growth and democracy coexist. According to general consensus, democracy fosters superior prospects for both economic development and cultural advancement than authoritarian governments. Democratic regimes are more successful at producing a wide distribution of benefits (due to the strong tendency of authoritarian regimes to structure economic activity towards "rent-seeking" activities, enrichment of the ruling circle, and widespread corruption). Progressive development requires policy choices that lead to a development pathway that produces a wide distribution of the benefits of growth. Additionally, democratic administrations are less "predatory" and more resistant to corruption and rent-seeking. However, there is disagreement over the links between democracy and economic expansion.

According to academics like Milton Friedman, more rights are beneficial for economic growth. According to other research, democracy fosters economic liberalisation and, over time, results in sustained growth. According to estimations from the World Economic Forum, a nation that converts to democracy over the long term (approximately the next 30 years) sees an increase in GDP per capita of around 20%. These are significant but not improbable impacts, and they imply that the worldwide expansion of democracy during the last 50 years has resulted in an increase of the world GDP of around 6%. Democracies have advantageous benefits on social harmony, private investment, size and capability of the government, and economic changes. These are the avenues via which democracy may spur economic growth.

Amartya Sen, a Nobel Prize winner, has stated that democracy is a need for economic development. The "Lee hypothesis," in his opinion, is not based on any comprehensive statistical analysis across the broad range of facts that are accessible, but rather on occasional empiricism, relying on highly selected and restricted information. "On the basis of highly selected data, it is not possible to establish a general association of this sort. For instance, we cannot really draw the conclusion that authoritarianism is better at fostering economic growth from the high rates of economic growth in Singapore or China, just as we cannot draw the opposite conclusion from the fact that Botswana, the nation with the best economic growth record in Africa, in fact with one of the best records of economic growth in the entire world, has been an oasis of democracy in that continent over the years. Sen continues, "The economic policies and conditions that contributed to the economic success of nations in East Asia are by now relatively well recognised. We need more comprehensive empirical investigations to sort out the claims and counterclaims. There is now widespread agreement on a list of "helpful policies" that includes openness to competition, the use of international markets, public provision of incentives for investment and export, a high level of literacy and schooling, successful land reforms, and other social opportunities that widen participation in the process of economic expansion, despite the fact that different empirical studies have varied in their emphasis.

There is absolutely no reason to conclude that any of these measures is opposed to greater democracy and must be compelled by the authoritarian aspects that just so happened to exist in South Korea, Singapore, or China. Sen has further argued that in the terrible history of famines in the world, no significant famine has ever occurred in any independent and

democratic country with a relatively free press, and that what is needed for generating faster economic growth is, in fact, a friendlier economic climate rather than a harsher political system. "China, despite being economically performing significantly better than India in many ways, still managed (unlike India) to experience a famine, in fact the largest recorded famine in history: Nearly 30 million people perished in the famine of 1958–1961, while poor governmental policies went uncorrected for three full years. The lack of alternative parties in parliament, a free press, and multiparty elections made it impossible to criticise the policies.

Sen makes the case in his book, Development as Freedom, that true development cannot be boiled down to just raising basic incomes or average per capita incomes. Instead, it calls for a collection of interlocking processes that gradually make a wider variety of freedoms exercisable. Because residents under authoritarian regimes do not have liberties, they have a narrow understanding of the broad concepts of progress and economic growth. In a democratic environment, where there are spaces for political and civic liberties that aid in the development of human values and needs, the true meaning of economic progress may be attained. Additionally, it gives birth to a number of institutions that support the protection of human rights and abilities, including legal frameworks, market structures, systems of accountability, and systems of education and health.

Many empirical research has been conducted in the past to look at the connection between democracy and economic growth. The empirical situation, however, is illuminating but not definitive. The statistics provide some hope for the compatibility hypothesis, which holds that democracy has a net beneficial impact on economic growth. However, there are also counter-examples in both directions, including democratic governments with poor development records and authoritarian regimes with strong development records, making the link weak empirically. Political stability, not a specific political entity, is what's important for economic growth. Political instability is a threat since it is reasonable to believe that any political institution will encourage progress as long as it is stable. And as compared to dictatorships, for example, the likelihood of strikes, protests, and riots is far lower in democracies. When a dictatorship's power is under jeopardy, economic growth is dramatically reduced. Similar effects are produced by riots, anti-government protests, and other "socio-political unrest" activities. Workers or large groups of people gather to strike and protest against their opponents, which is the government, whenever the regime is endangered or there are anticipated changes. As a result, the economy suffers. This is less common in democracies because institutions, not people, uphold democracy. Everyone is aware that the government will sometimes change, and although they are aware that they have the right to protest in the same way whenever they see fit, they seldom do so [7], [8].

Democracy does support a long-term sustainable economic development paradigm, but authoritarian nations cannot be categorically ruled out. One might see what transpired in the Soviet Union after the 1917 Russian Revolution. Although the Soviet Union's economy was originally strong, it gradually began to stagnate, and issues with the economy ultimately led to the country's collapse in 1991. In order to promote growth, authoritarian governments also have a propensity to control nature and ignore ecology. The Central Asian environment is vulnerable now as a result of the Soviet Union's extensive usage of the region. The Soviet Union carried out large-scale initiatives including building dams in the region. One example is the disaster surrounding the Aral Sea. China is also headed in a similar path and has built almost 90,000 dams so far, at tremendous expense to the impacted people's human rights and to the environment. Shashi Tharoor correctly put things in perspective while contrasting the development paradigms of China and India. According to him, China's economic growth has occurred at a breakneck pace, but this has resulted in some necks being broken due to the

human costs of development, such as population displacement, farmer eviction from their land, village flooding from dams, mounting pollution, a lack of respect for human rights, and a lack of checks on government abuse of power. The experiences of South Korea, Taiwan, Singapore, and most recently China provide strong anecdotal support for the Lee thesis. However, "one must examine their full record, not just the best performers," in order to assess the consequences of political regimes. In his investigation, C. H. Knutsen found no support for the Lee theory, not even in Asia. No matter the time period examined, he found no evidence of a substantial influence of dictatorship on economic development using data from up to 21 Asian nations.

CONCLUSION

In conclusion, research on democracy and economic growth shows that political and economic factors interact in diverse ways. Democracy, which is founded on the notion of popular sovereignty, has several benefits, including resisting tyranny and promoting personal development. Democracies must contend with concerns of public participation, minority rights, and striking a balance between equality and freedom, thus it is not without its difficulties. On the economic front, development is a multidimensional process impacted by labour, technology, political stability, infrastructure, and natural resources. It is still up for discussion whether democracy and economic progress can coexist or clash. Some contend that authoritarian governments may successfully stimulate economic development by putting stability and effectiveness first. Democracts, on the other hand, contend that their system not only promotes economic growth but also provides a more equitable distribution of benefits and protects against rent-seeking and corruption. Even if it is instructive, empirical data cannot resolve this dispute.

It illustrates situations when authoritarian governments have prevailed although democracies have prospered economically, demonstrating the need of political stability for progress. It is important to recognise that there are many variables at play and that there is a complex link between democracy and economic progress. In the end, the unit promotes a thorough grasp of this connection, acknowledging that each country's own environment, history, and socioeconomic circumstances influence the results. There is still no consensus on whether democracy and economic growth can live peacefully or whether they must be carefully balanced. The delicate interaction between political and economic factors will continue to define countries' fates as they pursue prosperity.

REFERENCES:

[1]   C. Ezeibe, I. Abada, and M. Okeke, "Zoning of Public Offices, Liberal Democracy and Economic Development in Nigeria," *Mediterr. J. Soc. Sci.*, 2016.

[2]   M. M. Prado, M. Schapiro, and D. R. Coutinho, "The Dilemmas of the Developmental State: Democracy and Economic Development in Brazil," *Law Dev. Rev.*, 2016.

[3]   Huu Quyet Nguyen, "Relationship Between Governance and Development: Lessons of the Southeast Asian Nations," *J. US-China Public Adm.*, 2016.

[4]   K. You*, "The roles of political inclusion and democracy in economic development: Insights from Singapore and Botswana," *J. Dev. Areas*, 2016.

[5]   C. Y. Matthes, "The State of Democracy in Poland after 2007: Analyzing the Linkage between Economic Development and Political Participation," *Probl. Post-Communism*, 2016.

[6]   N. V. Baryshnikova, N. T. A. Pham, and M. M. Wihardja, "Does Political and Economic Inequality Affect Institutional Quality?," *Econ. Rec.*, 2016.

[7]   A. Puente-Martínez, S. Ubillos-Landa, E. Echeburúa, and D. Páez-Rovira, "Factores de riesgo asociados a la violencia sufrida por la mujer en la pareja: Una revisión de meta-análisis y estudios recientes," *An. Psicol.*, 2016.

[8]   M. Touchton, "The benefits of balance: Credibility, the rule of law, and investment in latin America," *Lat. Am. Res. Rev.*, 2016.

CHAPTER 12

EXPLORING THE COMPLEX RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN LIBERTY AND CENSORSHIP

Utsav Shroff, Assistant Professor
Department of ISME, ATLAS SkillTech University, Mumbai, Maharashtra, India
Email Id- utsav.shroff@atlasuniversity.edu.in

ABSTRACT:

This lesson examines the complex connection between freedom and censorship by exploring their philosophical underpinnings, historical contexts, and definitions. Since the beginning of time, both people and nations have aspired to achieve liberty, which is often seen as the highest political virtue. There are many different opinions on where liberty ends and organised society begins, yet protecting each person's right to liberty is still seen as being of the utmost importance. Others see censorship as a way of restricting personal liberties and maintaining governmental control, while others consider it as an essential instrument to defend society from false information and hate speech. Determining "reasonable restrictions" on freedom of speech and expression is a hot topic in democracies. By examining issues such as who decides what is "reasonable," how much freedom of expression should be permitted, and when censorship turns into oppression, this unit seeks to analyse the nuances of this argument. It also looks at the options open to people when oppressive censorship violates their rights. This paper examines the ideas of liberty and censorship in this unit, as well as how they relate to one another. This chapter defines freedom and censorship and explores their connections.

KEYWORDS:

Censorship, Freedom, Liberty, Society.

INTRODUCTION

Many people believe that freedom is the most important political virtue, and from the beginning of time, both man and the state have worked to secure their respective portions of freedom. Without freedom, development cannot be made by either the state or the person. History is replete with accounts of conflicts between people and the government about securing and expanding their share of freedom. There is widespread disagreement among political scientists, lawyers, political leaders, and citizens about what the meaning of the concept of liberty itself is and how much freedom is appropriate in an ordered state, despite the fact that almost everyone seems to agree that the individual's right to liberty is significant and that the state should provide unprecedented legal protection for it in order to promote overall development. Since "reasonable restrictions" are seen crucial for the upkeep of social order in a democracy, the state views censorship as a weapon to defend the interests, and in certain circumstances, dignity, of the people against misrepresenting, untrue, banal, or hate speech. Although other academics contend that censorship is a tool the state has developed to limit individual freedom and usage in order to retain control. In all political cultures, censorship exists to varying degrees, and its causes might be political, social, legal, or cultural.

This lesson aims to clarify complex issues including whether restrictions on the right to free speech and expression are necessary in a democratic society. Who will determine what is "reasonable" and how much freedom of speech and expression should be considered to be

allowed? We'll also make an effort to comprehend the conditions under which censorship is acceptable and if it may result in scenarios where parties have competing interests. How much authority does the government have to censor content in the name of the "public good"? How can one tell the difference between limitations that are oppressive in nature and those that are "legally acceptable"? At the conclusion, we would also consider the course of action that should be taken by the people against the government in the event that oppressive censorship results in the violation of rights [1], [2].

Personality Of Liberty

The idea of liberty is nuanced and has evolved through time to imply numerous things. It is often used synonymously with the word "freedom" and is understood to mean the same thing. Although some academics distinguish between "freedom" and "liberty," claiming that the latter refers to political or legal freedom while the former covers a wider range of activities within the scope of the individual's ability to act as they please without the influence of others. The differences between the two have not been covered in this unit, and they have been used interchangeably. The word "liberty" comes from the Latin word "liber," which meaning "without restraints." In this context, liberty refers to the freedom to exercise a decision free from outside interference.

Correctly defining liberty as "the freedom of the individual to express without external hindrances to personality" is G.D.H. Cole. Although McKechnie contends that "Freedom is not the absence of all restraints, but rather the substitution of rational ones for the irrational," perfect liberty cannot exist in a society that is well-ordered. Similar definitions of liberty have been offered by Mahatma Gandhi as well. He said that "liberty does not mean the absence of restraint, but rather that it lies in personality development." Gerald MacCallum contends that freedom is "always from something (an agent or agents), from something, to do, not do, become, or not become something. Thus, it is evident from the aforementioned definitions that liberty is freedom with certain constraints, but it begs the issue of why these limitations exist and whether or not there is any space for full liberty for people in any area.

In his well-known article "Two Concepts of Liberty," written in 1941, Sir Isaiah Berlin gave the solutions to the issues above by distinguishing between positive and negative liberty based on the state's function. Negative liberty refers to the absence of excessive government intrusion. It alludes to a place where a person may act as they like without interference from others. According to Berlin, the response to the query "What is the area within which the subject is concerned?" involves the negative idea of liberty.

A person or group of people is or should be left to accomplish or be what he is capable of doing or becoming, free from outside interference?". According to Berlin, positive liberty aims to provide a response to the query, "What, or who, is the source of control or interference that can determine someone to do, or be, this rather than that"? Positive liberty thus denotes the independence of the "rational self." In line with the "General Will," which was a synthesis of "goodwill" from everyone, according to Rousseau and other idealists, individual freedom is attained by participation in the process by which one's society exerts collective control over its own affairs. Positive liberty thus refers to having control over one's life. Therefore, positive liberty refers to the freedom of the individual to develop his or her self, while negative liberty refers to being left alone. The state should provide supportive environments for self-realization, moral growth, and capacity building in order to promote positive liberty. However, in cases of negative liberty, the state has no role to play since the person should be left alone to pursue his or her aims and ambitions in line with their nationality. Adam Smith, David Ricardo (proponents of laissez faire), John Locke, J.

Bentham, F. A. Hayek, Robert Nozick, and Isaiah Berlin are notable opponents of positive liberty. Positive liberty is primarily supported by T. H. Green, L. T. Hobhouse, Harold Laski, Ernest Barker, and C. B. Macpherson. 'Self-regarding' and 'other-regarding' behaviour were differentiated by J. S. Mill. He maintained that'self-regarding' behaviour shouldn't be interfered with. Amartya Sen, a Nobel winner, has provided a more expansive definition of freedom as the development of human potential. According to Sen in his book, Development as Freedom, "Development may be regarded as a process of enhancing the genuine freedoms that individuals enjoy [3], [4]. He continues, "Focus on human freedoms contrasts with narrower views of development, such as identifying development with the growth of gross national product, or with the rise in personal incomes, or with industrialization, or with technological advancement, or with social modernization."

DISCUSSION

The individualist school of thought is linked to early liberalism. It was believed that individual initiative might advance the struggle against dogma, ignorance, and feudalism. It was predicated on the notion of an independent, logical person. It advocated against any limitations on personal freedom. It promoted political restraint on the subject of arbitrary governmental power. Negative liberty implies the laissez faire economic ideology. On a personal level, it sought freedom from the government and society in personal concerns. According to Thomas Hobbes, liberty is "dependent on the silence of law." In his book Capitalism and Freedom, Milton Friedman makes the case that liberty is the "absence of coercion of a man by his fellowmen." Positive liberty, in contrast to negative liberty, links freedom to society, socioeconomic situations, rights, equality, and justice. According to this new perspective, the focus should be placed on the greater good rather than individual liberty. It saw the state not as an adversary but as a supporter of freedom. Additionally, it held that equality is the cornerstone upon which liberty has a positive connotation and that liberty cannot exist without equality. Negative liberty concentrates and protects private property in the hands of a select few, leaving the less fortunate communities on their own. Therefore, the state should provide favourable circumstances for the growth of marginalised groups. Freedom, in the words of T. H. Green, is "the positive power of doing and enjoying something worth doing or enjoying and that too something which we do or enjoy in common with others," not the lack of restriction. According to Harold Laski, "liberty is eager preservation of that environment in which men have a chance to be their best selves."

J. S. Mill on Freedom

The 1859 essay "On Liberty" by J. S. Mill is recognised as a seminal work in the debates over political freedom. Without liberty, according to Mill, it is impossible for a person to grow, and he goes on to say that society as a whole must also have liberty in order to be happy. According to him, a person should be "left to oneself" and constraint is a bad thing. Freedom of thinking and speech and freedom of action are the two main strands of Mill's defence of liberty. If everyone on Earth, bar one, held the same opinion and there was only one person who held a different opinion, then, according to Mill, "mankind would no more be justified in silencing that one person, than he, if he had the power, would be justified in silencing mankind." He goes on to discuss the dangers of stifling even one person's voice to society and poses the hypothetical question: What if that person's viewpoint is accurate? In such situation, mankind is robbed of the truth and denied the chance to advance. Second, he acknowledges that it's possible that the viewpoint being repressed is incorrect, but even in this scenario, speech is vital since it will confirm the truth that already exists. Finally, he addresses the third possibility and accepts the notion that truth is often "eclectic" and may be both partially true and partially false. He contends that people often base their choices on

ideas they believe to be infallible and ignore any reasonable alternatives to those beliefs. However, Mill believes that free debate is the best way to enhance human knowledge and understanding since it will lead to a more evolved truth and put a stop to mankind's search for the truth. Mill believed that the intellectual stimulation for thinking, debate, and advancement comes from the conflict of ideas fostered by the freedom of speech. He believed that without such freedom, orthodoxy would rule society. In such a society, ideas lack a reasonable basis and beliefs degrade into biases. An individual's ability to choose, as opposed to slavishly adhering to socially acceptable ways of behaviour, conventions, and practises, is a result of their uniqueness. There is no predetermined idea of what is the "right" or "wrong" way to live, and what constitutes "right" decisions varies on the individual [5], [6].

Although Mill advocated for people to have the most freedom possible, he also acknowledged that unrestricted freedom may increase the likelihood of tyranny and lead to despotic behaviour. He categorises all human behaviour into two groups, "self-regarding actions" and "other-regarding actions," as a result. Self-regarding activities are those that solely affect the person conducting them, therefore there should be no interference in this area. Interfering with a person's freedom of action is only permissible in situations when the person is 'harming' others, or where the activity is other-regarding. The "harm principle" effectively guarantees each person's responsibility to the community. As a result, it is clear that although Mill upholds unlimited freedom of speech and expression, he also supports certain restrictions on the "actions" that individuals may perform in order to preserve social order. As these restrictions continue to take the form of different forms of censorship in order to preserve law and order in society, the notion of censorship emerges.

The Concept Of Censorship

The word "censorship" has its roots in the censorship office that was created in Rome in 443 B.C. to control morality and sacramentally cleanse the populace. The word "censorship" as it is used today to describe the process of scrutinising, limiting, and outlawing public activities, statements of opinion, and artistic performances comes from this office. Today, censorship is often seen as a remnant of a less enlightened and far harsher past. Censorship is the suppression or regulation of opinions, open discourse, and information that circulates within a society. According to Ritu Menon, censorship occurs when a piece of art that expresses a viewpoint that deviates from accepted wisdom is taken, destroyed, withheld, criticised, ignored, or otherwise rendered unavailable to its audience. By manipulating the cultural realm, censorship is a technique that the state or society may employ to maintain their position of authority. As cultural hegemony considers certain words or actions to be decent and others indecent and goes on to dominate its meaning and idea, the cultural domain plays a significant part in determining "what is acceptable" in society. In addition to cultural understanding, there are many other potential causes of censorship, such as religion, autocracy, and the market.

The history of censorship begins with religious authorities. Initially, religious philosophy had a major impact on all artistic and literary creations. Works that supported the status quo were considered "good and acceptable," while those that questioned it were considered "blasphemous, obscene, and irrational." The Index LibrorumProhibitorum, a list of forbidden books created by the Roman Catholic Church, has its roots in the fifth century CE and was officially sanctioned long into the twentieth century. The restrictions placed upon Galileo Galilei (1564-1642) in 1633, the famous scientist who had a hard time in Italy as his scientific findings were challenging the widely accepted explanations by the Church, may well have been the most spectacular instance of the silencing of a thinker of note.

The Glorious Revolution and the French Revolution marked a new era in history as people started demanding ideals like liberty, equality and role in the decision-making process. The shift from religious to temporal power worked differently in different cultures. The world witnessed the rise of Nazism in Germany and Fascism in Italy due to high concentration of power resulting in the horrific Second World War. Hitler and Mussolini used engineered language to have control over the minds of the people and curbed all forms of expression which might question their authority and legitimacy. Further, the Soviet Union during the period of Stalin was severely criticized for using censorship over art, literature, movies and other medium of communication. Language under dictators didn't just remain a medium of expression; rather, the state used it to define phrases of approbation and disapproval which had to be accepted by all. Such supervision, in the light of official Communist Party doctrines, was not limited to political discussions or to books and newspapers but seemed to cover all kinds of subjects and all forms of publication, including broadcasts. This led, in effect, to considerable self-censorship by authors seeking to be published in some form.

The advent of government policies of glasnost or "openness" in the late 1980s involved some relaxation of the censorship that marked the greater part of Soviet history. The introduction of neo-liberal policies altered how international affairs were organised. It became fashionable to use words like privatisation and liberalisation to pressure nations into embracing the "magical" notion of a free market economy. Market-driven economies laden with "blitzkrieg advertisements" began shaping and reshaping peoples' political beliefs in addition to their buying power and needs. Election campaigns began to fall under the influence of commercials, which started to twist the definitions of words and use expressions that were taken out of context. The true risk with this kind of covert, cultural, market-based censorship is that there are no overt restrictions placed on the "right to think" and freedom of speech. Instead, it undermines one's "ability" to think for oneself and calls into question the notion of a person being rational as a whole. As a result, the discussion above demonstrates how censorship has always been employed in a variety of ways throughout history to control people's thoughts, retain hegemonic authority, and provide legitimacy to the actions and policies of authorities under the pretext of preserving social order.

The Linkage of Liberty and Censorship

Communication between different groups, the open flow of information, and a place for ongoing discussion and critique are essential for the survival of a free society because they enable the scope of knowledge to broaden and the reinterpretation of accepted reality. In a democracy, the approval of the people is necessary to provide legitimacy to government action, and this is only feasible in the presence of active liberty based on free speech and expression. According to Article 19(1), the right to knowledge is one of the basic rights, and the Supreme Court of India used this rationale as the basis for its decision in the case of Raj Narain v. State of Uttar Pradesh in 1976. It also implies the significance of the press being granted the freedom it deserves by the state as the "fourth pillar" of democracy. The freedom of the press enhances the people' right to knowledge by allowing them to hear all sides of a debate, establish an impartial opinion on the matter, and participate in decision-making.

The state attempts to stifle the free flow of communication throughout time by using a variety of censoring techniques. Starting with Hobbes and Locke, the ongoing struggle between the state and its people for liberty may be understood. Hobbes maintained that people must give up part of their rights in exchange for the state's protection. He thus backed the establishment of a powerful state with a broad range of rights justifying certain limitations placed on people by the state in order to preserve peace and order in society. Being a real liberal, Locke maintained that the role of the state should be limited to that of an arbitrator, monitoring

people' public and private dealings. He defended the liberal stance of people living in a country that protects individual freedom. J. S. Mill opposed censorship and maintained that the only way for human knowledge to grow is by subjecting ideas to challenge in order to distinguish between truth and error. By unilaterally announcing in advance that a certain viewpoint is incorrect or illegal, censorship obstructs this process. Therefore, censorship has a built-in propensity to marginalise truth and the quest of truth while elevating conformity [7], [8].

"The Open Society and its Enemies" from 1945, Karl Popper likewise cautioned against any type of control and stated that any effort to organise or govern society would lead to a diminution in human freedom. He also emphasises how information affects social events and evolves through time in humans. As a result, free people with access to a "open society" shape the future. Isaiah Berlin makes the claim that "enlightened despotism" ultimately results in state monism, making it "one of the most potent and dangerous arguments in the entire history of human thought," which follows a similar line of reasoning. By describing 'the atomization of society' as a key aspect of totalitarianism, Hannah Arendt links totalitarianism to restrictions on freedom. Under this system, all close relationships, such as those formed through family, friendship, labour unions, and religion, were either destroyed or subordinated to the state. The state intended to produce isolated people who were wholly devoted to the state by its constant involvement in all aspects of government and systematic use of fear. Herbert Marcuse's book "Repressive Tolerance" (1965) changed the way the idea of censorship was understood. He stated that a state's absence of censorship regulations does not always ensure that people are exercising their free will. He adds that free speech can only serve the interests of the wealthy elite in a society where the general populace has been brainwashed and subtly managed by those who control the media. He concentrates on the cultural aspect of power control and how it affects peoples' free choice as a result.

Understanding Louis Althusser's theory of state repression is crucial because he distinguishes between the state's repressive and ideological machinery. He says that by the manipulation of information, the ideological machinery, which is a part of society's private spheres including family, school, religion, and the media, creates the society's dominant ideology. Therefore, censorship is a process carried out unintentionally by the private domain itself, in which it is intrinsic, rather than by people or groups. Thus, it can be inferred from the aforementioned considerations that censorship is sometimes utilised by the state via culture, society, media, religion, education, etc. to establish a dominant ideology rather than always being employed directly by the state to retain its control. However, the issue of how the state justifies censorship emerges. Freedoms including freedom of speech and expression, assembly, movement, settlement, and profession are guaranteed by Article 19 of the Indian Constitution, however even though these rights are basic in nature, they are not absolute and are subject to'reasonable' limitations. These limitations may be established in order to defend the nation's integrity, sovereignty, and security, as well as to prevent libel and to uphold morality and decency. Thus, when the idea of full liberty is linked to morality, decency, or, to put it simply, "hate speech," it enters hazardous waters. Hate speech may be defined as communication that is intended to hurt someone by implying their inherent inferiority (such as racist speech) or speech that by its very nature suggests dominance of one group of people over another (such as misogynistic speech). Speech and language have always been incredibly potent tools, and they may sometimes be used to cause violence or offend people's feelings. In his book "Words that Wound" from 1993, Richard Delgado suggested that racist speech causes psychological damage to its targets that results in isolation, shame, and self-hatred. This argument emphasises the need for certain limitations on the right to free speech and expression. Similar to this, Andrea Dworkin and CtherineMackinnan claimed that

sexually explicit communication ought to be restricted since it oppresses women and not only paves the way for violence against them but really is it. They called for the restriction of pornography because it promotes violence and humiliation, which is fundamentally at odds with the idea of equality. Thus, in order to protect individuals from different types of "harm" present in society, censorship may be given legal status in the state constitution. The Indian Constitution's Article 17, which abolishes "untouchability" and outlaws its practise in any form, is the finest illustration of this. Thus, the state employed censorship and restrictions to reestablish social fairness in society. The state now confronts a new dilemma as a result of the internet's development: how to control the online media landscape? Internet-based organisations like civil society, individual bloggers, and citizen journalists are gaining authority away from the government. State media brands dominate the communication landscape in authoritarian nations like China because the state strictly controls the content. The Arab Spring events indicate that the internet may significantly contribute to the overthrow of a government by mobilising people, which has increased official vigilance about digital media [9], [10].

Since there is a complicated link between liberty and censorship, many unanswered concerns arise, such as: Are all forms of liberty absolute? What standards should be used to set limitations? Who should be given the authority to determine whether or not the limitation is reasonable? These are all open-ended questions, and it is difficult, if not impossible, to find a solution that will please every group that exists in society. According to Aristotle, "Man is by nature a social animal" and that in order to exist alone, one must either be a beast or God. Thus, it may be inferred that any kind of freedom that interferes with or obstructs the freedom of another person ought to be limited. To restore the values of real democracy, however, citizens must resist any irrational restrictions that aim to suppress people's ability to think for themselves.

CONCLUSION

The discussion of freedom and censorship in this lesson emphasizes the constant conflict between people's individual liberties and the needs of society. These ideas have a complex relationship that is shown by their history, with liberty serving as both a beloved ideal and a point of dispute. Philosophers like Mill strongly defend the need to preserve free speech and expression, stressing how important it is for society advancement for opposing viewpoints to conflict. Censorship, however, is not an easy topic to address. While technology has the ability to safeguard society, it also has the power to suppress dissent and sway public opinion. The difficulty is in determining what constitutes "reasonable restrictions" on the right to free speech and expression, a process that has become much more difficult in the era of the internet. overnments have unprecedented difficulties in regulating the flow of information in a world where communication has transcended boundaries and conventional media. The internet and digital media have given people more power and given rise to alternative voices, which presents a problem for governments trying to keep control. In the end, the course encourages students to think critically about the precarious balance between freedom and restriction. Although defending the right to free speech is essential for democracy, there are valid worries about the effects of unrestrained speech. Finding the appropriate balance is a never-ending issue that calls for regular discussion, attention to detail, and adherence to the values of democracy and human rights.

REFERENCES:

[1]   T. Bradshaw, "Mill : Freedom of expression and harm in the ' post-truth ' era," *Ethical Sp. Int. J. Communcation Ethics*, 2016.

[2]   N. Cowen, "Millian Liberalism and Extreme Pornography," *Am. J. Pol. Sci.*, 2016.

[3]   L. DeNardis and F. Musiani, "Governance by Infrastructure: Introduction, 'The Turn to Infrastructure in Internet Governance,'" *SSRN Electron. J.*, 2016.

[4]   OCED, "Lessons in censorship: how schools and courts subvert students' First Amendment rights," *Choice Rev. Online*, 2016.

[5]   N. Cohen, "Love, story, law - From the scarlet letter to freedom and privacy," *Law Lit.*, 2016.

[6]   S. Beattie, *Community, Space and Online Censorship: Regulating Pornotopia*. 2016.

[7]   Peterson, "Ethical Aspects of Library and Information Science," in *Encyclopedia of Library and Information Sciences, Third Edition*, 2016.

[8]   H. Jarvinen, "New leaks confirm TiSA proposals that would undermine civil liberties," *EDRI*, 2016.

[9]   P. Carsten and M. Martina, "U.S. says China internet censorship a burden for businesses," *Reuters*, 2016.

[10]   V. Arena, "Popular sovereignty in the late Roman Republic," in *Popular Sovereignty in Historical Perspective*, 2016.

CHAPTER 13

EXPLORING PROTECTIVE DISCRIMINATION AND SOCIAL JUSTICE IN INDIA

Yukti Mitesh Khajanchi, Assistant Professor
ATLAS SkillTech University, Mumbai, Maharashtra, India
Email Id- yukti.khajanchi@atlasuniversity.edu.in

ABSTRACT:

In this article, the idea of protective discrimination is explored within the framework of Indian society, and its historical roots, reasons, and ramifications are examined. Affirmative action, sometimes referred to as positive discrimination or affirmative action, is a deliberate policy adopted by the state to provide marginalised groups preferential treatment based on caste, religion, gender, and geography in order to correct past injustices and inequities. To further social justice and equality, the Indian Constitution has provisions for protected discrimination. This explores the philosophical foundations of protective discrimination, based on the justice as fairness theory of John Rawls as well as other viewpoints. The practical uses of protective discrimination in fields including education, welfare, business, the public sector, and politics are also covered. In the article, protective discrimination is emphasised as a crucial component of India's continuous efforts to reduce socioeconomic inequalities and advance inclusive development. Protective discrimination is a crucial component of India's progress towards becoming a more equal society where social and economic fairness are upheld in the larger context. It emphasises the state of India's commitment to provide equitable opportunities and removing obstacles that have traditionally impeded the advancement of marginalised people. Protective discrimination is ultimately an essential weapon in the effort to create a more fair and equal Indian society where every person, regardless of socioeconomic status or identity, has the opportunity to live a life of dignity and success.

KEYWORDS:

Inequality, Protective Discrimination, Socioeconomic, Social Justice.

INTRODUCTION

All societies have experienced inequality and injustice, and India is no exception. The Indian Constitution's drafters recognised the severity of the issue after the British left the country and chose to enact protected discrimination as a countermeasure to abuses like the caste system. As a result, the Indian Constitution offers a number of institutional routes for the social welfare of underprivileged groups. The purposeful practise of preferential treatment by the state in favour of certain groups of individuals based on caste, religion, gender, and even geographic location is known as protective discrimination. Reservation, reverse discrimination, positive/affirmative action, preferred treatment, and other terms are also used to describe the protective discrimination concept. The general link between equality and justice includes the argument over protective discrimination and the fairness concept. The sections that follow offer discussions of those elements.

Protective Discrimination Ideal

Protective discrimination refers to governmental policies that are specifically created to discriminate against individuals based on predetermined standards in order to advance the interests of the most vulnerable. It is the policy under which individuals from disadvantaged

groups in society who have experienced prejudice in the past or present are given particular benefits. These are affirmative action initiatives the state has made to promote justice and equality for all societal groups. The foundation for analysing the idea of social justice in the Indian context is formed by these clauses taken together. By providing marginalised groups preference in the allocation of important social goods and opportunities, it seeks to lessen the pervasive prejudice or inequality in society. Protecting those who have been historically and socially marginalised and exploited is the main goal of introducing protective discrimination, as is releasing the oppressed groups from the hegemony of the wealthy and resourceful by providing them with numerous opportunities to participate in society as a whole [1], [2].

It's important to grasp the difference between social justice and a general conception of justice in order to comprehend the motivations for positive discrimination. Any generic theory of justice as a discourse, regardless of the current socioeconomic and power relations in a specific society, considers the society as a whole. This is why, despite its assertion of universality, the general theory of justice may not always be useful in the examination of socioculturally unique policies like positive discrimination. Social justice, on the other hand, gets its fundamentals from a certain sociocultural particularity. It is founded on several important social life presumptions that are often inferred either implicitly or explicitly from the real social environment of the culture where the theorization is being applied. As a result, the idea of social justice need not necessarily follow the general theory of justice, and since it is socio-culturally particular, it often does not. Furthermore, since the idea of social justice does not originate in a vacuum, it is certain to clash with the established power structure.

The state should treat all people equally and treat them as equals in the sight of the law. However, a contemporary liberal state has acknowledged the need for and the possibility of treating its inhabitants differently in accordance with their socioeconomic origins. A large portion of a population is deemed eligible for preferential treatment if they are subjected to social practises that are discriminatory and have interfered with their ability to live in dignity and have first access to public resources. Preferential treatment in favour of certain groups should be offered by state agencies in order to correct the situation and make up for the injustices committed against them in the past. Discrimination against the lower castes continues in India despite being outlawed by Article 17 of the constitution in a number of covert or overt forms. Certain firm and audacious steps for the elimination of these social ailments have become necessary in order to reform and regenerate society from these social ills. The following are the justifications for protective discrimination, according to certain academics:

1. Ineffective equality of opportunity does not exist and cannot be created.
2. Being unequal and hence impoverished, ignorant, and socially and culturally backward all have a causal connection.
3. Any method of distribution of commodities and services that results in uneven distribution among the various societal groups would fall short of equality of opportunity and be unjust.
4. One of several ways to address this uneven distribution of goods and services is via protective discrimination, which does not go against the fairness principle.

Without converting vertical disparity into horizontal inequality, democracy loses any significance. At the time of independence, the social and economic divide between the higher and poorer castes was startlingly wide. The leaders of the independence movement realised the political logic of integrating this sizable number of individuals who were ostracised from mainstream society into the political mainstream. They understood that the creation of a broadly rooted, inclusive national movement would not be feasible without the induction and

mobilisation of these individuals. Creating an egalitarian society where "justice, social, economic, and political" prevails and "equality of status and of opportunity" is made accessible to everyone was one of the key goals of the founding fathers of the Indian Constitution. Therefore, it is not unexpected to see that the Indian Constitution's provisions are infused with a "equality" spirit. The constitution explicitly stated that nothing in the document "shall prevent the State from making any special provisions for the advancement of any socially and educationally backward classes of citizens or the Schedules Castes and the Scheduled Tribes" while also guaranteeing the fundamental right of equality of all citizens before the law. The state has the authority to take particular actions to improve and protect the welfare of the underprivileged groups in society. In other words, the policy of positive discrimination, such as reservations, is a crucial component of India's socioeconomic growth and integration process, at least in the near term. Articles 15 and 16 (Right to Equality), 46 (Promotion of Educational and Economic Interests of Scheduled Castes, Scheduled Tribes and Other Weaker Sections), and 340 (Welfare of Other Backward Classes) include some of these laws. Education, welfare, economic activity (such as housing, land grants, etc.), public services, and political representation are the key sectors where the state has implemented this policy of protective discrimination. The Constitution has left it up to the state to decide whether to allow for protected discrimination in all other regards, with the exception of political representation, which must be covered by its provisions [3], [4].

Principle Of Equality

Let's first discuss Rawls' theory of justice, which forms the foundation of the concept of fairness, before going on to understanding it. The definition of justice that John Rawls offers in his book A Theory of Justice is known as justice as fairness. Because they would be acceptable to rational creatures like ourselves in the "original position," according to Rawls, certain moral standards are obligatory upon us. For him, justice is a fair distribution based on a fair process, not a natural rule or anything founded on reason. According to Rawls, not everyone in society has the same knowledge and experiences the same economic and social situations. He makes reference to his concept of the "veil of ignorance" that certain people must endure. This veil isolates them from not just other people but also from themselves—the socially disadvantaged individuals. The least fortunate people in society must also get the respect they deserve, according to justice. He defined justice as the equitable distribution of advantages among all members of society, not in accordance with an individual's deeds but rather in a way that the most vulnerable members of society benefited. According to Rawls, such a benefit distribution is not only just and equitable but also follows the rules of justice. As a result, we might say that fairness is justice in Rawls' eyes. Justice as fairness presupposes a concept of society with a just structure of interdependent freedom and equality. Finding relevant principles that aid in the attainment of liberty and equality is the goal of justice as fairness.

DISCUSSION

These suitable values, which seek liberty and equality, are the outcome of an understanding between the parties involved on their mutual benefits. People quickly understand that they need the same basic things to pursue their conceptions of what is desirable if they are free and equal. The fundamental rights, freedoms, opportunities, money, riches, and self-respect are only a few of these essentials. Justice would thus dictate that all primary products be allocated equally, unless a different distribution would benefit the least favoured group. This idea of justice is concerned with society's fundamental makeup, or more specifically, "society's major political, constitutional, social, and economic institutions and how they fit together to form a consistent scheme of social cooperation over time." According to Rawls,

fairness is the cornerstone of the notion of justice, and he only views justice as a virtue of social institutions, or what he refers to as practises. Justice's guiding principles are thought to provide limitations on how posts and offices may be defined and given rights, obligations, and powers.

The concept of fairness, on the other hand, holds that it is ethically unacceptable to receive free commodities without service or to reap the advantages without paying the expenses when a group of individuals is generating a public good that we benefit from. We owe them a fair portion of the expenses incurred in the creation of that item. In order to provide a foundational knowledge of the allocation of costs and benefits related to the creation of public goods in a just system of cooperation, H.L.A. Hart and subsequently John Rawls developed the concept of fairness. The moral requirement to not free ride as a member of a just system of cooperation, sometimes known as "the duty of fair play," is based on the fairness principle. If some individuals are helping to produce a good for the public, no one should just take use of it without also doing their part to make it. This is a non-consequentialist moral responsibility since the underlying motivation is driven more by the desire to establish a benchmark of fairness to strive towards than it is by a desire to prevent the negative effects of undersupply. The fundamental assumption is that if some of individuals who profit from the public good turn out to be, in a pattern-like manner, those who do nothing for its creation, it would be unfair to those who contribute to its production. It is possible to use the concept to defend various social and political commitments. In fact, it is often used in a variety of applied philosophical contexts, such as social ethics, to promote actions that are typically associated with good governance or to address certain injustices brought on by the globalising economy, etc. Nozick and Flew, two libertarians who disagree with Rawls, dispute his assertion that people who are naturally advantaged have a claim on those who are not. They adhere to the notions of human perfection, merit, and inherent inequity [5], [6].

State Machine Employees: The Elite

From the brief examination of political issues we have conducted so far, a few noteworthy topics arise that will be brought up in the conversation that follows. They primarily result from the division of state authority into several sectors, which may be thought of as its organisational structure. It has previously been stated that the political system in which each sector operates determines the unique interaction between them. say, the internal organisation of a communist state. The staff in these fields raises another question. Despite the fact that it is often referred to as the "machinery of the state," the state is not a machine. The state is made up of a number of institutions run by individuals, whose origins and social environments have a big impact on their core beliefs and attitudes. An important issue in the study of politics is the make-up of the state elite. In The Politics of the Judiciary, J.A.C. Grifith uses earlier research as an example of what the phrase "state elite" means. It demonstrates that, generally speaking, four out of every five full-time professional judges in Britain are descendants of the elite. It is hardly unexpected that Griffith finds "a remarkable consistency of approach in these cases concentrated in a fairly narrow part of the spectrum of political opinion" when addressing "judicial opinion about political cases."

The degree of decisiveness of the character and make-up of the state elite will be addressed from a variety of theoretical perspectives, it must be underlined. Elitist ideas place the most emphasis on this element. According to them, the easiest way to understand a political system's structure is to look at the governing minority's elite, which is in charge of running the government. In this view, the skills and abilities of the leaders determine practically everything. Negative effects will result from poor leadership. Max Weber was quite worried

about the character of Germany's political leadership because of this. He felt that a powerful parliament would provide the necessary training to develop leaders who are ready and capable of taking responsible action. As an alternative, authority would be vested in the bureaucracy, whose education and way of life excluded them from the category of creative leaders. Marxist views would have a different take on the situation. They would place less value on the characteristics of the state elite. Instead, it is argued that the social environment and economic system in which the state system is situated dictate the goals and purposes of state activities considerably more so than the elite. According to this perspective, the structure is more important than the makeup of the state machine's workers. 'Structural' theories often focus on the limitations placed on the government by the social institutions in which it must function. However, the two approaches of interpretation don't always have to conflict. This leads us to our last question, which is about the interaction between the state and society. Marx's claim that the authority of the Bonapartist state was not "suspended mid-air" may be generalized generally to all forms of state systems. Then, several issues start to emerge. How are political leaders impacted by and constrained by the social power structure? How far does the government intervene to maintain and justify, or alternatively, lessen, the social system's inequalities? How autonomous from the state is "civil society" really? According to certain scholars, the term "totalitarianism" refers to a condition in which the state completely controls society and it has no independence at all.

Origin Theories Of Patriarchy

The main explanation explaining the rise of patriarchy, which perpetuates gender inequality, combines social and biological causes.

Traditionalist Position

According to traditionalists, patriarchy is physiologically determinable. Since men and women are born differently, they are given separate roles and responsibilities. Men and women must 'naturally' perform various social roles and responsibilities because of the differences in their biological functions. The traditionalist viewpoint holds that because women have children, being mothers is their main life goal and having children and raising them is their main responsibility. However, research on the hunting and gathering tribes has refuted theories that assert that males are naturally superior and the primary breadwinners in families. Men and women in these communities were very complementary to one another. Numerous tribal tribes have a strong egalitarian worldview in which women are valued equally with males. Numerous people have contested the conventional thesis of male superiority since there is no historical or empirical support for it. Male dominance cannot be supported by this deterministic, biological explanation. It is widely understood that patriarchy is a product of human activity, shaped by historical events. Frederick Engels provided a significant justification for the emergence of patriarchy in his book Origins of the Family, Private Property, and the State published in 1884. The defeat of the female sex throughout history, according to Engels, "began with the private property," and that is when women's subjection started. Class distinctions and women's subjugation both arose historically.

Radical Female Perspective

According to radical feminists, private property came before patriarchy. They contend that rather than between classes, there is an initial and fundamental clash between the sexes. Radical feminists don't think patriarchy is natural and see all women as belonging to a class. However, they argue that biological or psychological differences between men and women may be used to account for gender inequity. According to Shulamith Firestone, the ability of

women to reproduce, inasmuch as this has been controlled by males, is the root of women's oppression. There are two social class systems, according to some radical feminists.

1) The production and consumption relations-based economic class structure, which

2) The reproductive relationships-based sex class system. The sex-based system is to blame for the subjection of women. The term "patriarchy" refers to this second class of class structure, which alludes to the dominance of males over women based on their ownership and control of their reproductive organs. Women are now reliant on males both physically and mentally as a result. Furthermore, according to these feminists, men's valuing of and power derived from their control over women's biology, rather than the biology itself, is what oppresses women [7], [8].

Socialist Opinion

Marxist and radical feminist ideas are combined by socialist feminists. They believe that both points of view may add something, but none is adequate on its own. For them, patriarchy is neither absolute nor constant. They believe that as manufacturing methods have changed historically, so have the conflicts between men and women. They claim that while patriarchy and the economic system and relations of production are connected, they are not only coincidental. Ideology is one factor that influences patriarchy. Just as patriarchy is not just a result of the rise of private property, it also won't go away if private property is outlawed. In their study, they take into account both the relations of reproduction and those of production. The whole field of domestic, familial, and reproductive work was ignored by Marxist theorists. Heidi Hartmann, Maria Mies, and Gerda Lerner are three notable socialist feminists.

Concepts and Theories of Gender

In the early 1970s, gender became a widely accepted notion. It served as an analytical category to distinguish between biological sex differences and the ways in which they influence behaviours and competences that are then classified as either "masculine" or "feminine." A sex/gender differentiation was asserted in order to claim that the real physical or mental impacts of biological difference had been exaggerated in order to uphold a patriarchal system of power and to convince women that they were inherently more suitable for "domestic" duties. Sex, Gender and Society by Ann Oakley, published in 1972, serves as the foundation for future investigation of how gender is constructed. She observes that Western societies seem to be particularly prone to exaggerating gender disparities and contends that the social effectiveness of our current gender roles revolves on the role of the home and mother for women. Interestingly for feminism, Simone de Beauvoir had explored this distinction in The Second Sex two decades earlier with her statement that "One is not born, but rather becomes, a woman." Such distinctions had been made before and were in fact very much the stuff of anthropology, psychoanalysis, and medical research.

Theory of Feminism

In order to comprehend gender inequality, feminist theory focuses on gender politics, power dynamics, and sexuality. Feminist theory devotes a significant portion of its attention to advancing the rights and interests of women while also criticising these social and political connections. Discrimination, stereotypes, objectification (particularly sexual objectification), oppression, and patriarchy are some of the topics covered by feminist thought. Feminism opposes sexism and patriarchy and advocates for social equality for both men and women. A political, cultural, or economic movement focused at giving women equal rights and legal

protection might be referred to as feminism. Feminism is a movement that promotes gender equality for women and works to advance their rights and interests. It also includes political, sociological, and philosophical ideas and philosophies that address problems of gender difference. It wasn't until the 1970s that the phrases "feminism" and "feminist" started to be used often. The first feminist placards appeared in America in the 1840s as a protest against the suffering of women and African-Americans. After these demonstrations, they were granted the right to vote in 1920, although gender equality in society is still not fully achieved. Although feminists oppose a wide range of social concerns, they mostly concentrate on five.

1. Working to increase social equality.
2. Creating a wide range of options for individuals in society: they advocate for human reintegration.
3. Eliminating the gender divide.
4. Completing the sexual assault.
5. Encourage sexual liberation.

Three waves may be identified in the development of feminism. The nineteenth and early twentieth century saw the beginning of the first feminist wave; the 1960s and 1970s saw the second; and the 1990s saw the third. The first wave mostly refers to the nineteenth- and early twentieth-century women's suffrage campaigns, which were primarily focused with women's right to vote. The women's liberation movement, which began in the 1960s and advocated for women's legal and social rights, is referred to as the second wave in terms of its ideologies and practises. Beginning in the 1990s, the third wave of feminism was a continuation of the second wave and a response to what was seen as its shortcomings. The prevalent viewpoints in many facets of Western society, from culture to legislation, have been influenced by feminism. Feminist activists have fought for women's legal rights such as the right to vote, the right to own property, and the right to enter into contracts; for women's right to bodily integrity and autonomy; for the right to an abortion; for the right to a healthy pregnancy; for the protection of women and girls from domestic violence, sexual harassment, and rape; for workplace rights (such as maternity leave and equal pay); and against misogyny and other forms of sexism [9], [10].

Democratic Feminism

Liberal feminism promotes political and judicial reforms to protect the equality of men and women. It is a sort of individualistic feminism that emphasises women's capacity to demonstrate and maintain their equality via their own choices and actions. Liberal feminism focuses its efforts on changing how men and women interact with one another personally. Liberal feminists contend that since all women are capable of claiming their right to equality, change may take place without changing the way society is organised. Liberal feminists place a high priority on issues such as the right to an abortion, the freedom to choose, sexual harassment, voting rights, education, "equal pay for equal work," accessible childcare, access to affordable health care, and raising awareness of the prevalence of domestic and sexual violence against women.

CONCLUSION

In conclusion, the Indian Constitution's protection against discrimination is a serious and intentional attempt to right past wrongs and address pervasive disparities within Indian society. The necessity for preferential treatment to elevate marginalised communities, who have endured prejudice and adversity for ages, is acknowledged by this policy. Protective discrimination has strong moral justifications, such as the lack of effective equality of

opportunity, the connection between inequality and social backwardness, and the need to address unequal distribution of goods and services among societal groups. These arguments support the practice's continued use. Additionally, since protective discrimination aims to guarantee that the most underprivileged people of society benefit from an equal allocation of resources and opportunities, it is consistent with John Rawls' concepts of justice as fairness. Despite great progress in advancing social justice and inclusion due to protective discrimination, difficulties still exist. The proper execution of these rules and dealing with challenges like caste-based politics and exclusion of the creamy layer are continuing concerns.

REFERENCES:

[1]   A. Singh and D. Bansal, "The 'shadow' of right to education for social justice in India: Elucidating barriers and creating opportunities," *Man India*, 2016.

[2]   S. Jain and G. Bhardwaj, "Striving for social justice: understanding gender issues at the workplace in India," *Heal. Psychol. Rep.*, 2016.

[3]   S. A. David, "Social responsiveness of higher education: Access, equity and social justice," *Rupkatha J. Interdiscip. Stud. Humanit.*, 2016.

[4]   P. Sengupta, "How effective is inclusive innovation without participation?," *Geoforum*. 2016.

[5]   B. Mehra and L. Hernandez, "Libraries as agents of human rights protection and social justice on behalf of sexual minorities in India: An action-based manifesto for progressive change," *Adv. Librariansh.*, 2016.

[6]   K. Yenneti and R. Day, "Distributional justice in solar energy implementation in India: The case of Charanka solar park," *J. Rural Stud.*, 2016.

[7]   K. Yenneti, R. Day, and O. Golubchikov, "Spatial justice and the land politics of renewables: Dispossessing vulnerable communities through solar energy mega-projects," *Geoforum*, 2016.

[8]   J. Boylan, A. Brammer, J. Krishnadas, P. Patel, and L. Lingam, "Time for justice, time for change! The place of academic and community partnerships in promoting local and global rights and challenging injustice," *Ethics Soc. Welf.*, 2016.

[9]   M. S. Alam, "Affirmative Actions for Minorities in India: Constrains and Possibilities," *HSE Soc. Educ. Hist.*, 2016.

[10]   J. Copestake *et al.*, "Towards a plural history of microfinance," *Can. J. Dev. Stud.*, 2016.