



**BPYC-106**

**Block 2**

**CONCEPTS-II**

---

## **BLOCK INTRODUCTION**

---

**Block II** “Concepts-II” addresses some of the key concepts that determine the relations between the individual, society and state. Sovereignty, Democracy and State present the discourse on this relation. From the Indian perspective the concept of Swarāj shows the contribution of the Indian civilization to the global social political thought.

**Unit 5** titled “Sovereignty” discusses the meaning and definitions of sovereignty. It talks about the nature of sovereignty and the factors that undermine it.

**Unit 6** titled “State” deals with the concept of State constituting its foundational basis in the social and political philosophy. In doing so it explains various definitions and understandings of ‘State’.

**Unit 7** titled “Democracy” will help the learners in understanding the integral nature and underlying principles of democracy.

**Unit 8** titled “Swaraj” discusses the concept of Swaraj, especially as it appears in Gandhian Philosophy, along with the various dimensions surrounding the usage of the term Swaraj. It also presents a philosophical analysis of the idea of Swaraj with respect to modern political theories and scenario.

---

## UNIT 5      SOVEREIGNTY<sup>10</sup>

---

### Structure

5.0 Objectives

5.1 Introduction

5.2 Definition

5.3 Features of Sovereignty

5.4 Erosion of Sovereignty

5.5 Matters of Concern

5.6 Let Us Sum Up

5.7 Key Words

5.8 Further Reading and References

5.9 Answers to Check Your Progress

---

### 5.0 OBJECTIVES

---

The objectives of the Unit are as follows:

- To understand Sovereignty
- To analyse the nature Sovereignty
- To examine the features that undermine it

---

### 5.1 INTRODUCTION

---

It was in the thirteenth century that the word sovereignty first began to appear in the writing of the French jurist Philippe de Beaumanoir (circa 1250-1296). In his work, Beaumanoir asserted that the king held sovereign authority, thus granting him the right to enact laws governing the entirety

---

<sup>10</sup> Dr. Jeremiah. A. V. Dumai, Former Post-Doctoral Fellow, ICPR, Delhi.

of his realm. This was a significant claim, as it positioned the king as the ultimate legal authority within his domain.

However, Beaumanoir introduced a critical assertion by also declaring that each baron possessed sovereignty over his own barony. This duality presents a complex situation: while the king may be seen as the supreme ruler of the whole kingdom, the fact that individual barons can exercise similar powers within their territories serves to dilute the king's overall authority. If barons are empowered to govern and make laws in their own barony, it limits the king's sovereignty and complicates the hierarchical structure of power. This tension between royal authority and local governance laid important groundwork for the evolution of political thought regarding sovereignty in medieval Europe. Over time, this idea of sovereignty evolved.

One of the most significant figures in the development of the concept of sovereignty, whose ideas continue to resonate through later generations, is the French thinker Jean Bodin (circa 1530-1596). Bodin's contributions to political theory especially on sovereignty were groundbreaking, as he articulated a clear definition of sovereignty as the absolute and perpetual power of a state to govern itself without any interference from external forces. This notion underscored the importance of self-determination for states, underlining that a sovereign authority must operate independently to maintain its legitimacy and effectiveness.

Bodin's argument also emphasized the indivisibility of sovereignty, asserting that sovereignty over a single territory cannot be concurrently held by multiple authorities, say, the religious authority on the one hand and political authority on the other hand. This perspective implies that for a state to function effectively and maintain order, there must be a singular source of ultimate authority. Consequently, one could interpret Bodin's views as a version of political absolutism, as he advocated for the idea that a ruler should wield absolute power. He believed that such concentration of authority was essential for achieving political stability and order within the territory. Bodin's emphasis on a unified sovereign authority reflected his belief that effective governance required clarity and decisiveness, ultimately shaping the way sovereignty has been understood in modern political discourse.

The concept of sovereignty plays a key role in the formation of modern states. Since the thirteenth century, it has become an integral aspect of political governance. However, over time, the

understanding and implications of sovereignty have evolved and adapted to changing political landscapes.

This evolution is particularly evident one compares the works of thinkers like Philippe de Beaumanoir and Jean Bodin. Beaumanoir's definition of sovereignty included the idea that both the king and individual barons held sovereign power within their respective realms, suggesting a more fragmented view of authority. In contrast, Bodin introduced a more unified perspective, arguing for the absolute and indivisible nature of sovereignty, which asserted that only one authority could hold power over a given territory at a time. This idea of Bodin influenced later thinker like Thomas Hobbes as well.

These differing interpretations inform us how the notion of sovereignty has been refined in response to historical contexts, influencing the structure of political authority and the relationship between rulers and the ruled. As the concept continues to adapt, it remains a cornerstone of contemporary political theory and statecraft.

---

## **5.2 DEFINITION**

---

Sovereignty is the ultimate power or authority a state has to govern itself without outside interference. This implies that a sovereign state can make its own law, manages its own economy and control its own territory without any external agent encroaching into its authority. This ensures that a state can maintain its own identity and dignity independently.

---

## **5.3 FORMS OF SOVEREIGNTY**

---

When one speaks of sovereignty, one tends to assume that there is just one order. However, this is not really the case. There are at least three ways, if not more, sovereignty can be understood. The three ways can be framed as Westphalian sovereignty, legal sovereignty and domestic sovereignty. Each of this will be discussed below:

- a. Westphalian sovereignty: Westphalian sovereignty refers to the principle of international order that emerged from the peace of Westphalia in 1648. There are a few key principles that are enshrined in Westphalian sovereignty. First, each state has exclusive authority in its internal affairs like economy, law and similar thing. This is what is called as the principle

of non-intervention. Second, each state is equal under international law despite differences in size, military power or wealth.

- b. Political and legal sovereignty. Political and legal sovereignty occurs when a state is granted recognition as an independent state by another state or many states. Only when such a recognition occurs does other countries would exchange ambassadors with it or admit it to international organisations like United Nations (UN), World Bank etc.
- c. *De facto* sovereignty and *de jure* sovereignty: Political sovereignty and legal sovereignty are intertwined conceptually. However, the concepts of *de facto* sovereignty and *de jure* sovereignty make the relation between two sometimes complex. Sometimes a situation occurs where the one who ought to be obeyed (*de jure* sovereign) is different from the one whose will is obeyed (*de facto* sovereign). *De facto* sovereignty occurs when an entity has the factual ability to exercise sovereignty over a territory without necessarily possessing the legal sovereignty. *De jure* sovereignty occurs when an entity possesses the legal right to exercise sovereignty over a territory without necessarily possessing the factual ability to exercise sovereignty over the same.

**Check your progress I**

**Note:** a) Use the space provided for your answer

b) Check your answers with those provided.

1. What are the two characteristics of Westphalian sovereignty?

.....  
.....  
.....  
.....

2. What is the difference between *de facto* sovereign and *de jure* sovereign?

.....  
.....

---

## 5.4 EROSION OF SOVEREIGNTY

---

The principles of sovereignty have been often been violated throughout history. Time and again powerful states have attempted to influence the domestic policies of a weaker or smaller states. This is a case of violation of Westphalian sovereignty. One of the basic reasons why Westphalian sovereignty is violated is because more often than not international peace and security hinge on the domestic regime and policy of another state. If a neighbouring state is ruled by someone who loves international conquest over international peace, the attempt to influence the regime or its policy cannot be ruled out. This kind of attempt to change the regime or the domestic policy may involve violence or threats.

Sometimes violation of Westphalian sovereignty may occur because the country has voluntarily agreed for that. Many of the European countries have voluntarily chosen to be member of the European Union. EU member states voluntarily agreed to abide by certain decisions made by a majority within the EU, even if an individual state disagrees with them. They have also willingly established institutions like the European Court of Justice, whose decisions are directly applicable in the national courts of member states. This is an instance when an individual state wilfully delegated certain aspect of its sovereignty to a supranational institution.

Another growing factor undermining sovereignty is the rapid advancement of science and technology. The principle of territorial integrity underscored by Westphalian sovereignty is increasingly threatened by these developments. For instance, elections in one country can be subtly influenced by another through social media manipulation or similar tactics. Government websites can be hacked by foreign entities to spread false information to the public. Additionally, unmanned drones can be deployed to ambush, attack, or spy on other nations without any physical intrusion. This shows how technology can threaten the traditional understanding of sovereignty and security.

### **Check your progress II**

**Note:** a) Use the space provided for your answer

b) Check your answers with those provided at the end of the unit

1. What is the main reason why Westphalian sovereignty is being violated today?

.....  
.....  
.....  
.....  
.....

2. How does a sovereign state wilfully give up certain aspect of its sovereignty?

.....  
.....  
.....  
.....  
.....

---

## 5.5 MATTERS OF CONCERN

---

Despite each state taking its sovereignty as a prized item, there are certain matters that must be addressed collectively. In certain situation, not addressing the matter may lead to undermining of the sovereignty of a country, while in certain other situation addressing the matter may lead to ignoring or undermining Westphalian sovereignty in certain way.

As climate change worsens, some countries are at risk of disappearing. As the global temperature gets hotter, the sea level rises, causing small island nations like Tuvalu, Kiribati, and the Maldives to lose land. If this continues without action, these islands could be completely submerged by the sea, leaving the people with no land or home to live on. This would not only be a tragic loss of their cultures and identities but would also create serious problems, like -- where these people would go and how they would rebuild their lives? Would it be possible for them to buy a new piece of land to start a new state? When these countries get submerged, the global community will be responsible for letting these countries disappear. Climate change is a subject that everyone is responsible for.

There are certain countries that are being badly governed. Violence, hunger, disease etc. ravaged these countries and they spill over to neighbouring countries too. The conflict between different parties in Myanmar has a spillover effect in the North eastern region of India and the western region of Thailand. The violence in Somalia affects its neighbouring countries as civilians flee the conflict zone. This puts pressure on resources and infrastructure of the neighbouring country. Somalia based pirates and non-state actors are known to have hijacked ships and carried out attacks on neighbouring countries. Addressing such concern will in some way undermine the sovereignty of the affected country.

---

## **5.6 LET US SUM UP**

---

The concept of sovereignty is fundamental to the formation of modern states. However, the definition or the meaning of sovereignty has not been the same over the centuries. It has undergone modifications, depending on the socio-political context. This is observed in the differing views of thinkers like Philippe de Beaumanoir and Jean Bodin. Beaumanoir recognized shared sovereignty between kings and barons, while Bodin emphasized the absolute and indivisible nature of sovereignty, asserting that only one authority could hold power over a territory.

Throughout history, we have observed the principles of sovereignty been dishonoured or undermined. This happens particularly through the powerful states interfering in the domestic affairs of a smaller states, resulting in the violation of the principle of Westphalian sovereignty. Often time what drives this interference may be because of security concerns especially when the weaker states may be ruled by someone who the more powerful states see as a threat or unfriendly.

However, violation of sovereignty may also occur voluntarily, as seen when European countries join the European Union and agree to abide by collective decisions, thereby delegating aspects of their sovereignty to supranational institutions like the European Court of Justice. This is also seen when various countries agree to join international institution like the United Nation.

Additionally, advancements in science and technology have further eroded sovereignty. Techniques such as social media manipulation, cyberattacks, and drone surveillance enable external influences on a state's internal affairs, challenging traditional notions of territorial integrity. These are challenges of the 21<sup>st</sup> century.

---

## 5.7 KEY WORDS

---

**Westphalian Sovereignty:** Westphalian sovereignty is a principle in international law that states that each state (or a country) is sovereign over its territory and that no other states can infringe on its sovereignty.

**Indivisibility of sovereignty:** The idea that sovereignty over the same territory cannot be held by more than one authority at the same time.

**De jure sovereignty:** *De jure* sovereignty refers to the possession of legal right to exercise sovereignty over a territory.

**De facto sovereignty:** *De facto* sovereignty refers to the factual ability to exercise sovereignty over a territory.

---

## 5.8 Further Reading and References

---

1. Grimm, Dieter. *Sovereignty: The Origin and Future of a Political and Legal Concept*. Translated by Belinda Cooper. Columbia University Press, 2009.
2. Bartelson, Jean. *A Genealogy of Sovereignty*. Cambridge University Press.
3. [Sovereignty in the Modern World \(youtube.com\)](#) (September, 2024).

---

## 5.9 ANSWERS TO CHECK YOUR PROGRESS

---

### Check your progress I

1. The two characteristics of Westphalian sovereignty are: First, that each country has sole control over its own internal matters, such as its economy, legal system, and related areas. Second, every state is considered equal under international law, regardless of differences in size, military strength, or wealth.
2. De facto sovereign and de jure sovereign: A *de facto* sovereign refers to an authority or government that exercises actual control and enforces its rule over a territory or population, regardless of whether it is legally recognized by the international community or not.

A *de jure* sovereign is an authority or government that is legally recognized as the legitimate ruler of a territory or population under international law. Even if it does not exercise actual control or power in practice, it is still considered the rightful sovereign authority based on legal principles.

### **Check your progress II**

1. The main reason why Westphalian sovereignty is violated is whenever a big country felt its security threatened because of the policy pursuit by a smaller country, the former begins to use its military and economic might to intimidate and breach the sovereignty of the smaller country.
2. Sovereign states intentionally give up certain elements of their sovereignty when they choose to join transnational or international organizations such as the European Union or the World Bank. These organizations often require member states to comply with specific policies, necessitating a degree of control over their national governance. This may cover matters related to human rights, economic policy etc.

**Structure**

6.0 Objectives

6.1 Introduction

6.2 Philosophical Arguments underlying the concept of State in different theories: Origin and Meaning in Western and Indian Perspectives

6.3 The Concept of State: Basic Elements and Characteristics

6.4 Let Us Sum Up

6.5 Further Readings and References

6.6 Answers to Check Your Progress

---

**6.0 OBJECTIVES**

---

This unit deals with the concept of State constituting its foundational basis in the social and political philosophy. The term State has been understood and explained in different ways by philosophers and it has evolved as a concept throughout the history. While elucidating the concept, it is important to:

- Understand the underlying philosophical arguments explaining the different definitions, and
  - Understand its basic elements and characteristics.
- 

**6.1 INTRODUCTION**

---

There have been varied forms of associations in the human world and one among such is called the State. The concept of State is about a social as well as political collaboration meant to perform organized administrative functions for the betterment of its people. It involves representatives as

---

<sup>11</sup> Dr Neetika Singh, Assistant Professor of Ethics and Values, Department of English, GLA University, Mathura.

executives and officials who are delegated with responsibilities of serving the people. Though, the State is a governing body yet, it is not limited to the comprised set of bodies like government and bureaucrats. The State is an abstract concept that involves the equation regarding power. State depends on divisions of authority to exercise the power and provide security within the society.

However, it is not simple to define this concept as it has been debated and critically scrutinized by philosophers. There are several questions concerning this topic among philosophers since the days of ancient Greek of the western world and in India, Kautilya's period. Therefore, different explanations have surfaced over the centuries. Let us discuss those meanings and explanations in this unit and the basic characteristics as well.

---

## **6.2 PHILOSOPHICAL ARGUMENTS UNDERLYING THE CONCEPT OF STATE IN DIFFERENT THEORIES: ORIGIN AND MEANING WITHIN WESTERN AND INDIAN PERSPECTIVES**

---

The word "polis" coined by Greek philosophers like Plato and Aristotle was used to refer the city-states which was self-sufficient in terms of its socio-economic needs. By self-sufficient it means that the city-states were internally governed by people who themselves decided on their necessities. However, not everyone was the participants in decision making, for example women were not allowed.

Romans emphasized on the lawful enforcement of the distribution in rights and responsibilities among its people. The Roman system was called *res-republican* which meant commonwealth. But, the systematic fragmentation of duties developed into feudalism with the segregation of class divisions.

Etymologically the term State has been derived from Latin word *status* which means "condition or circumstances". Later the concept of *polis* reflected in English term "Civitas" that signified the welfare if general public.

### **6.2.1. Western Perspective**

In his book *The Prince*, Niccolo Machiavelli used the term "State" for the first time to describe a political authority. This concept gained popularity in sixteenth century and hence the foundation

of the modern-state was laid down. Machiavelli considered that there are certain basic qualities of the ruler that make him suitable for the reign. A ruler must endure strength and courage to become a powerful independent ruler. Machiavelli argued for the monarchy as it maintains single source of power that not only unites the states but also makes it easy to bring reformations if required. Centralization of power ensures that anarchy does not pervade.

Another thinker who was supporter of monarchy but, at the same time criticized such a concept of State that was focused primarily on the notion of force and dominance, was Jean Bodin. In seventeenth century, he gave a concept of State which included morality as the main accompaniment of power. A State is a harmonious relationship shared among families and corporate bodies working together within a common sovereign. A sovereign should not idealize democratic principles which distributes power among nobility and people other than the prince or the ruler. Bodin's ideas influenced other social contract philosophers and liberalism pioneers like Thomas Hobbes, Jean Jacques Rousseau and John Locke.

#### **a) Liberal Theory**

Liberal theories of State arose in response to the feudal systems prevailing before and during sixteenth and seventeenth centuries. Individuals were prioritized with the highlight on their rights and liberty. Rational nature of humans was recognized as a foundational criterion for its capacity to practice free will. To secure rational agency, states were entitled to ensure their well-being by protecting their property.

English philosopher Thomas Hobbes believed that human beings are naturally nasty and brutish, that means they selfishly compete amongst each other to survive well. In his book *Leviathan*, he describes the relevance of State in maintaining the balance of power by cutting down the dangers of mutual destruction in society. State is an institution that preserves the sublimity of social world.

For John Locke social structure is not so gloomy but it still needs a protective political system to institutionalize liberty by enabling an individual's right of "preservation of property" by law. According to him State maintains a standard way of life with liberty as essential part of it. State is a machinery that guarantees protection of personal possessions of its people. Adam Smith mentions that State takes care of the Public Goods.

Later in eighteenth century, Jean Jacques Rousseau criticized individualism and proposed that human beings are social by nature and that is why State must owe its authority to the general will formed by the people. Nation, according to him is sovereign which has to abide by the laws based on the will of the people. State is responsible for creating an environment for the development of morality among people which would contribute to the public welfare.

Classical liberalism changed with time like in sixteenth and seventeenth century, class system was supported to advance capitalist mindset. But further, eighteenth, nineteenth and twentieth century neo-liberalism encouraged welfare functions after receiving criticism from Marxist theories regarding its concept of strong state. Strong state means a political entity that is solely responsible for making decisions for its people without involving them directly into the process. Various philosophers, for example, Utilitarianists like J.S.Mill and Bentham, other thinkers like Lindsay, Laski, Robert Nozick etc., gave concept of state with revisions including democratic factors like elections, subsidies, welfare schemes etc. and hence developed consensus based shared values. Further, more theories were argued by idealists like W.H. Hegel, who criticized liberalism.

#### **b) Idealist Theory**

Wilhelm Freidrich Hegel in nineteenth century also advocated liberty, but unlike John Locke, for the state as a whole rather than just the individual's rights. Similar to J.J. Rousseau's views, he believed that will of people is significant in a State. Universal will which is based on human reason constructs a social background for freedom because it motivates agents to plan conjoint aims which require them to act morally and cease the conflicts to achieve them together. Liberalist viewpoints were also criticized by German philosopher Karl Marx in *Das-Capital*.

#### **c) Marxist Theory**

Karl Marx argued that liberal concept of State pursues centralized form of government which exercises a monopolistic legitimized power within a given territory. State in their theory becomes a form of ruling force used as an "apparatus of oppression" determined by bourgeois or the dominating higher class. Marx considered state as an alienated social entity that forced people to divide into dominant and suppressed classes.

Marx rejected Hegel's idealist notion as well which bestowed godly venture on the concept of state. He blamed capitalist orientation of state to pollute politics and bring in uneven pedestal of

social norms. Thus he advocated for a stateless and classless society that distributes power among public.

#### **d) Other Negative Views**

One of the views about liberal concept of State were made by Charles Tilly, who believed that the liberal concept of State enforces organized crimes by handing power to only a few sources.

Class divisions allowed conflicts among various social elements and thus creating imbalance of power in society and oppression on the unprivileged sections.

### **6.2.2. Indian Perspective**

Indian political and social structure reflects its pluralistic nature. Varied cultures and religions need to thrive together to maintain a harmonious and systematic order in India. The Western concept of State is not found as it is in Indian context. But, if compared, concept of an authority responsible for maintaining order in politics and society can be located.

State, in Indian context, is a political authority to develop a system which balances the *Dharma* or social order. State in ancient Indian social structure upheld kingship and monarchy as the bearer to statehood. Dharmashastras and Baudhayana discuss the organization of statecraft. Epic like Mahabharata describe the concepts like *Danḍanīti* or *Rājasāstra* which show how a state must be run avoiding the chances of domination from power holders. Kautilya mentions many of these theories to finally establish his concept of state. In modern India, M.K. Gandhi and Ambedkar, discussed the concept of State.

#### **a) Kautilya Theory**

In fourth century B.C. Kautilya wrote a text called *Arthashastra* which specifically discusses the notion of State in detail. His book expresses the art of administration in which people have entered due to *Mātsya-Nyāya* or the logic that bigger fishes swallow smaller ones and that is why an authority is required to maintain dharma. People chose kingship as a state to rule over them and maintain peaceful society. Safety and security was the primary goal bestowed on state. According to Kautilya, state is not just an institution that functions mechanically but an organism making people's lives peaceful.

A state as per Kautilya is a divine authority assigned to the king. The ruler is supposed to protect people from threats and further punish the anarchic elements in society. People empower him by paying taxes in the form of grains and merchandise. His theory of state includes seven elements:

1. The Swami, the sovereign King
2. The Mantrin, the ministers
3. The Janapada, the people and the territory
4. The Durga, the fortification
5. The Kosha, the treasury
6. The Sena or the Danda, the army
7. The Mitra, the allies.

The concept of state is strong and powerful which maintains unity, uniformity and solidarity among subjects who get a peaceful, stable and systematic administration.

#### **b) Gandhian Theory**

According to Gandhi, true independence or “Swaraj” in the political order is one in which, the rulers should depend on the will of the people. Gandhi believed that village is a republic or Panchayat having full powers. Gandhi supported a minimal state for serving the people. He explained that non-violent methods should be used for welfare and coercion must be avoided by the state. Gandhi discussed that since, the basic nature of human beings is non-violent, that is why it is the ideal that state must follow to serve its people. Gandhi argued that decentralized form of power in village republic is suitable for people’s autonomy and thus good. Decentralized power can be achieved through democratic processes such as consensus building over policies. Consensus building requires moral conscience that resides within the people. And this type of process establishes self-rule of people liberating individuals of oppression or forceful enactment of policies. However, he accepted that there may be still some form of violence or suppressive measures in lieu of power and therefore, people can oppose it through *Satyagraha* or peaceful demonstration of protest. Gandhi explains constructive programme to be the Poorna Swaraj means complete independence for every single unit i.e. individual without any bias based on race, colour

or creed. Therefore, establishing the 'Kingdom of Truth', which is inclusive of everyone, eliminating all kinds of prejudices. This Ram-rajya, he says, is wholly compatible with interdependence within or without; i.e. people in this Kingdom are though, individually free or self-dependent due to the earning of their own manual bread-labour and working as per their natural disposition yet, are independent of any foreign domination due to practice of the doctrine of Swadeshi making them interdependent on each other and working upon strong bond of mutual-cooperation within a nation.

**c) Dr. B.R. Ambedkar**

Dr. B.R. Ambedkar calls his idea of the State as a 'Qualified State' i.e., a State, which is the provider. Like western notion of liberal State, he envisions a state that Indian State as well, preserves 'equality, liberty and fraternity' and hence build a common national character for the country that otherwise faces issues of casteism, and other discriminatory factors. Ambedkar argues that to establish social justice and encourage development of a society which has its preferences to non-discriminatory mindedness, strong lawful concept of 'State' for the above mentioned purposes can be rendered as a guardian to them.

**Check Your Progress I**

**Note:** a) Use the space given below for your answer.

b) See the end of the unit for tips for your answer.

1) Explain the Liberal theory about the concept of State.

.....  
.....  
.....  
.....  
.....  
.....  
.....

2) Discuss any two Indian perspectives of State.

.....  
.....

.....  
.....  
.....  
.....

---

### **6.3 THE CONCEPT OF STATE: BASIC ELEMENTS AND CHARACTERISTICS**

---

Now that we have discussed various theories of State, let us see its basic elements characteristics in general.

Humans are social beings who politicize associations as per the territorial and sovereign requirements. State is a significant political concept which reflects and affects social conditions effectively. Since human beings have always been working within the parameters of authority, they required it to be organized in a manner that balances out the power underlying it and hence, State as a social and political entity brought into existence.

Within the different historical periods over the years, State has adopted different forms. From monarchs to people, political systems have shifted its center of power throughout the vast time phase. The range of State's nature has varied from authoritative to democratic systems in different times and places. In today's world, a State can be unitary or federal union of several units. In modern world, thinkers like H.J. Laski defined it as a most powerful institution in which government and people claim a territory. Let us find out the constituent parts of the state.

In ancient Greek period, Aristotle explained that State is a union of families and villages, where they all work together for their well-being as a society. But, State is not just an idea that can be restricted to a single meaning or definition. It is an entity that practically impacts society, where it composes a number of groups and associations having control over juristic functioning over the social world. The state is constituted of several elements, which include:

A) General Public,

B) Geographical Boundary or a Sovereign Land (which means it is independent in its political functioning),

C) Administrative and Legal Bodies,

D) Representatives or a form of Government that serves the purpose of lawful enactment of collective will.

Apart from constituted elements, it is important to understand the basic characteristics regarding the main features of the concept of State. Politics depends on deliberative processes to explore the conditions which can be advantageous for managing power relations and minimize domination within the society. The illegitimate exercise of power can occur without explicit orders emanating from identifiable agents and can result from a person's, or a group's or influencing people's preferences and desires. Thus State:

- 1) Structures social life by creating mechanisms to balance out power equations, through which, those who wield power are held accountable to those over whom it is wielded.
- 2) It facilitates necessary deliberative attempts for the overall evolution of the social life of its people.
- 3) It protects the interest of the people and paves way for the social welfare.
- 4) It identifies legitimate exercise of power and enables it by curbing illegitimate ones.
- 5) It enables decision making systems to function effectively.

These characteristics of a state distinguishes it from general public associations and groups that are not political in nature. State is beyond governments, offices, bureaucrats, administrations and social groups etc. because it an entity that underlies all these associations. It is an abstract idea that is practically implemented by these institutions. It is concretized through by the basic elements and characteristics. Forms of governments change but state has remained at the foundation of political and social structures.

## Check Your Progress II

**Note:** a) Use the space given below for your answer.

b) See the end of the unit for tips for your answer.

1) What are the constituent elements of the concept State?

.....

.....

.....

.....

.....

.....

2) What are the basic characteristics of the concept State?

.....

.....

.....

.....

.....

.....

## 6.4 LET US SUM UP

In this unit we have discussed that the concept of State is not a new one but historically originated in ancient Greek period of the western world and finds its roots in even older times of the Indian context. Though Indian and western perspectives are not exactly same, yet they have a few commonalities like State being the powerful authority.

The concept of State has been defined and explained in varied ways by different philosophers in changing times and circumstances. State has existed since long but its basic elements and characteristics have remained same over the years. For example, the most important factor that cannot be eliminated from the idea of State is that, the good of the people must be taken care of by

it. However, it requires separate analysis of what is the meaning of good in relation to the dynamics of people and their necessities.

Social and political, both aspects of human life are intertwined in the concept of State. It cannot be limited to the division of administration or the governing bodies. Instead, it is vast in nature and meaning which includes other concepts like liberty, equality and fraternity. On one hand, State makes laws, abides by them to develop sovereign order and on other, it executes those laws to maintain peace. But it comprises more than those activities as it should also realize that coercion is not the only method.

State must not be a tool to exercise absolute power over ruled but a means to empower them through selected thought out measures. Whether, Liberal, Marxian, Idealists, Kautliyan, Gandhian or Ambedkarite, all these theories indicate at the good of the people, though in different manners and methods. Weak or strong, in all these approaches the State is prioritized as an organizational power system. Such a system is described as necessary to keep unlawful and irrational elements at bay and serve the purpose of keeping good at centre of its functions.

---

## 6.5 FURTHER READINGS AND REFERENCES

---

Ambedkar, B. R. (1981). *Federation Vs. Freedom*, R. K. Tatnis, Bombay.

Barrow, Clyde W. (1993). *Critical Theories of State: Marxist, Neo-Marxist, Post-Marxist*. University of Wisconsin Press. ISBN 0-299-13714-7.

Dharampal. (1962). Dharampal Collected Writings. Volume IV, *Panchayat Raj and India's Polity*, Other India Press Mapusa: Goa, India.

Hobbes, Thomas. (1651). *LEVIATHAN*. Edited by C.B. Macpherson, Penguin Books: England.

Julia, A. (1981). *Introduction to Plato's Republic*, Oxford: Clarendon Press.

Kangle, R.P. (1963). *The Kautilya Arthashastra*, Motilal Banarsdas Pvt. Ltd. New Delhi.

Locke, John. (1980). *Second Treatise of Government*. Edited by C.B. McPherson, Hackett Publishing Company, Indianapolis and Cambridge.

Rousseau, J.J. (1913). *The Social Contract And Discourses By Jean Jacques Rousseau*. Trans. by G.D.H Cole, London: J.M.Dent & Sons Ltd.

Roper, Brian S. (2013) *The Marxist interpretation of democracy*, London: Pluto Press.

Jain, M.P. (1979) *Political Theory: Liberal and Marxian*, Authors Guild Publications, New Delhi.

Kantorowicz, H. (1932). The Concept of the State. *Economica*, 35, 1–21. <https://doi.org/10.2307/2548973>.

---

## 6.6 ANSWERS TO CHECK YOUR PROGRESS EXERCISES

---

### Check your progress I

1) Liberal theories of State arose in response to the feudal systems prevailing before and during sixteenth and seventeenth centuries. Individuals were prioritized with the highlight on their rights and liberty. Rational nature of humans was recognized as a foundational criterion for its capacity to practice free will. To secure rational agency, states were entitled to ensure their well-being by protecting their property. Thomas Hobbes believed that human beings are naturally nasty and brutish, that means they selfishly compete amongst each other to survive well. In his book *Leviathan*, he describes the relevance of State in maintaining the balance of power by cutting down the dangers of mutual destruction in society. State is an institution that preserves the sublimity of social world. For Locke social structure is not so gloomy but it still needs a protective political system to institutionalize liberty by enabling an individual's right of "preservation of property" by law. According to him State maintains a standard way of life with liberty as essential part of it. State is a machinery that guarantees protection of personal possessions of its people. Adam Smith mentions that State takes care of the Public Goods. Rousseau criticized individualism and proposed that human beings are social by nature and that is why State must owe its authority to the general will formed by the people. Nation, according to him is sovereign which has to abide by the laws based on the will of the people. State is responsible for creating an environment for the development of morality among people which would contribute to the public welfare.

Classical liberalism changed with time like in sixteenth and seventeenth century, class system was supported to advance capitalist mindset. But further, eighteenth, nineteenth and twentieth century neo-liberalism encouraged welfare functions after receiving criticism from Marxist theories regarding its concept of strong state. Strong state means a political entity that is solely responsible for making decisions for its people without involving them directly into the process. Various philosophers, for example, Utilitarianists like J.S.Mill and Bentham, other thinkers like Lindsay,

Laski, Robert Nozick etc., gave concept of state with revisions including democratic factors like elections, subsidies, welfare schemes etc. and hence developed consensus based shared values. Further, more theories were argued by idealists like W.H. Hegel, who criticized liberalism.

2) State, in Indian context, is a political authority to develop a system which balances the *Dharma* or social order. State in ancient Indian social structure upheld kingship and monarchy as the bearer to statehood. We will discuss here Kautilya and Gandhian theory of state.

### **a) Kautilya Theory**

In fourth century B.C. Kautilya wrote a text called *Arthashastra* which specifically discusses the notion of State in detail. His book expresses the art of administration in which people have entered due to *Mâtsya-Nyāya* or the logic that bigger fishes swallow smaller ones and that is why an authority is required to maintain dharma. A state as per Kautilya is a divine authority assigned to the king. The ruler is supposed to protect people from threats and further punish the anarchic elements in society. People empower him by paying taxes in the form of grains and merchandise. His theory of state includes seven elements:

1. The Swami, the sovereign King
2. The Mantrin, the ministers
3. The Janapada, the people and the territory
4. The Durga, the fortification
5. The Kosha, the treasury
6. The Sena or the Danda, the army
7. The Mitra, the allies.

The concept of state is strong and powerful which maintains unity, uniformity and solidarity among subjects who get a peaceful, stable and systematic administration.

### **b) Gandhian Theory**

According to Gandhi, true independence or “Swaraj” in the political order is one in which, the rulers should depend on the will of the people. Gandhi supported a minimal state for serving the

people. He explained that non-violent methods should be used for welfare and coercion must be avoided by the state. Gandhi discussed that since, the basic nature of human beings is non-violent, that is why it is the ideal that state must follow to serve its people. Gandhi argued that decentralized form of power in village republic is suitable for people's autonomy and thus good. Decentralized power can be achieved through democratic processes such as consensus building over policies. Consensus building requires moral conscience that resides within the people. And this type of process establishes self-rule of people liberating individuals of oppression or forceful enactment of policies. However, he accepted that there may be still some form of violence or suppressive measures in lieu of power and therefore, people can oppose it through *Satyagraha* or peaceful demonstration of protest. Gandhi explains constructive programme to be the Poorna Swaraj means complete independence for every single unit i.e. individual without any bias based on race, colour or creed. Therefore, establishing the 'Kingdom of Truth', which is inclusive of everyone, eliminating all kinds of prejudices. This Ram-rajya, he says, is wholly compatible with interdependence within or without; i.e. people in this Kingdom are though, individually free or self-dependent due to the earning of their own manual bread-labour and working as per their natural disposition yet, are independent of any foreign domination due to practice of the doctrine of Swadeshi making them interdependent on each other and working upon strong bond of mutual-cooperation within a nation.

### **Check Your Progress II**

- 1) The state is constituted of several elements, which include:
  - A) General Public,
  - B) Geographical Boundary or a Sovereign Land (which means it is independent in its political functioning),
  - C) Administrative and Legal Bodies,
  - D) Representatives or a form of Government that serves the purpose of lawful enactment of collective will.
- 2) i) Structures social life by creating mechanisms to balance out power equations, through

which, those who wield power are held accountable to those over whom it is wielded.

ii) It facilitates necessary deliberative attempts for the overall evolution of the social life of its people.

iii) It protects the interest of the people and paves way for the social welfare.

iv) It identifies legitimate exercise of power and enables it by curbing illegitimate ones.

v) It enables decision making systems to function effectively.

These characteristics of a state distinguishes it from general public associations and groups that are not political in nature. State is beyond governments, offices, bureaucrats, administrations and social groups etc. because it an entity that underlies all these associations.

---

## UNIT 7

## DEMOCRACY<sup>12</sup>

---

### Structure

7.0 Objectives

7.1 Introduction

7.2 Democracy: Conceptual Evolution of its Definition in History

7.3 The Basic Institutional Principles and Ideas constituting Democracy

7.4 Democracy as a Value vs. Democracy as a Mechanism

7.5 Different Types of Democracy

7.6 Let Us Sum Up

7.7 Key Words

7.8 Further Readings and References

7.9 Answers to Check Your Progress

---

## 7.0 OBJECTIVES

---

The main objectives of this unit are:

- Understanding the integral nature and underlying principles of democracy.
- Discussion on democratic ideals that substantiate its practice in various types.

---

## 7.1 INTRODUCTION

---

The International Day of Democracy is celebrated on 15<sup>th</sup> of September since the year 2007. The United Nations General Assembly declared that democratic principles hold universal values which enable people to express themselves freely, and that therefore, democracy should be strengthened and consolidated as a social and political system. This particular day dedicated to democracy celebrates it as a unique organised system of governance, which is relevant even in the

---

<sup>12</sup> Dr. Neetika Singh, Assistant Professor of Ethics and Values, Department of English, GLA University, Mathura.

contemporary times. Amartya Kumar Sen argues that democracy is universally valuable not because it is unanimously consented by every person on earth to be so, but because “people anywhere may have reason to see it as valuable”. (“Democracy as a Universal Value,” in *Journal of Democracy*, 1999)

The term democracy traces its origin to the Greek word *demokratia*. This word consists of two terms *demos* and *kratos*. Together these two terms mean ‘the rule of people’ as opposed to ‘the rule of elites’ and it was therefore the common people which were considered to be the power holders in a democracy. They were ascribed with the authority to partake in the rule-making procedure. Methodically they could either engage directly in the decision-making process, or engage indirectly through the elected representatives. This was a new way to run administration for Greeks because earlier, it was only the king who could make rules.

However, the idea of a democratic system in the Greek city-states was not flawless. On one hand, the Greeks realised that the decision-abiders must be the decision-makers, as this would be helpful for avoiding problems with legislation and implementation; while on the other hand, they did not believe that individuals are equal by birth. Slaves, women and non-natives were systematically excluded from the rule-making process. Thus, the right and the privilege for making rules was reserved for only a few.

Unlike the Greeks, the contemporary democratic systems do not make exclusions on the basis of gender and birth. Over time, several changes were brought in the system, such as women are now voters, slavery is outlawed and non-natives can apply for citizenship under certain legal conditions. The efforts of inclusion have been a gradual and are still ongoing. Nevertheless, achieving these revolutionary changes at the institutional level was not easy or immediate. The struggle to achieve democratic parameters of equality and justice has been a constant battle. The downtrodden, underprivileged, outcastes have endured hardships to find and raise their voices against the odds. Deliberations have been going on in various parts of the world concerning the establishment and promotion of democratic ideals in governance. India, being the largest democracy in the world at present, presents a ripe example for observing and understanding the nuances of these debates.

---

## **7.2 DEMOCRACY: CONCEPTUAL EVOLUTION OF ITS DEFINITION IN HISTORY**

---

Democracy as a concept has evolved throughout historical. In 430 B.C. Pericles, one of the democratic leaders of Athens, associated democracy with toleration. Later, in the book *The Republic*, Plato described it as the government of free people with authority (p. 295), though he also regarded it as an “agreeable anarchic form of society” (p. 294). In his view, people are inconsistent in rational decision making and thus tend to be biased towards their personal preferences. His student and philosopher, Aristotle, believed that democracy grants authority to the majority, at the same time deploring it for being the government by the poor.

Later, new ideas connected with democracy emerged which symbolized changes at the ideological, social, economic, and political levels. Around the seventeenth century i.e., in the medieval period, Protestant-Reformation defended democracy on the assumption of equal rights for all citizens. Further, countries like Britain, France, and America were influenced by the age of revolutionary movements from the late eighteenth till mid nineteenth century.

Britain, the first democracy of the modern world, observed the decline of the empire system. The surge of Industrial-Revolution changed the political discourse of that time in favour of the parliamentary democracy. There were two houses of parliament viz., the House of Commons and the House of Lords, where the former House was constituted by elected representatives. Whereas earlier, the political contests were dominated by the elites, as only property holders and aristocrats were able to participate in elections. Revolutions like Chartism opened the gate for the Reform Act of 1832, which extended the electoral franchise to larger masses of the working class. Gradually, the right to suffrage was given to women after the Civil War in Britain. Thus, each and every citizen was eventually authorized to have the power to vote.

During the Enlightenment period, English philosophers like Thomas Hobbes in *Leviathan* (1651) and John Locke in *Second Treatise of Government* (1781) argued for the political equality of citizens. Both of them discussed that a legitimate government establishes social contract among the people, and that a Civil Law based on such a social contract will bring peace and cooperation in an otherwise conflict-ridden society. Locke’s account was based on an eternal *Law of Nature* governed by the God, according to which, individuals are born equal and must not refrain others from practicing their rights. He developed a theoretical ground for liberal democracy, in which, individuals have the right to resist governmental failures in granting liberty, sovereignty and right to private property.

Thomas Hobbes' social contract theory, however, presupposed that humans by nature are 'brutish' and that is why they cannot sustain together unless they are forcefully united by the State. Though John Locke did not specify violence as a human characteristic, yet he believed in social contract theory that supported a strong single body State with maximum power to ensure liberty and equality among people. The idea of a strong State and government in a democracy is problematic because the common public is not entrusted with the ultimate power of contribute towards the decision-making process.

Therefore, to reduce the centralization of power as suggested by John Locke's theory, French thinker Baron de Montesquieu argued for the separation of powers in a government. Montesquieu provided a detailed treatise on the theory of governance in his work, *In the Spirit of Laws* (1748). According to him, the Legislation, Execution, and Judiciary must function as structurally connected yet independently working bodies so that they do not interfere with each other's decision-making process and do not hold ultimate power to manipulate the public. Division of power was introduced as an idea to build a transparent democratic system, in which, power could not be corrupted. Another French thinker, Jean Jacques Rousseau proposed in *The Social Contract And Discourses* (1913) the idea that direct participation of citizens can be possible through forming a "general-will." This process is a significant way of achieving the common good in democracy, because the power will lie directly in the hands of the people. The Revolution of 1789 in France, inaugurated a much more radical tradition of democracy by expanding its definition to three important terms i.e., Liberty, Equality and Fraternity. The principle of Sovereignty was emphasized to empower people. The 'Declaration of the Rights of Man and Citizen' (1789) proclaimed that people must have access to their freedom to end injustice. In 1946, the fight for universal adult franchise was won.

Although Baron de Montesquieu and Jean Jacques Rousseau identified the issue of incompatibility within the concept of democracy and a strong State, yet they did not stress on the part that the government must be welfare-oriented. Thomas Paine, an American philosopher, who was named as the 'father of welfare state', encouraged the inclusion of this idea in the concept of democracy. He insisted in the *Rights of Man* (1791) that the people must have the right of welfare, which means, enhancing their lives through equal economic opportunities.

Before even the French Revolution took place, The United States of America advanced the 'Declaration of Independence' in 1776 after the Civil War. But slavery was not abandoned until

the nineteenth century and women were not allowed to vote till the twentieth century. Renowned thinker, Benjamin Franklin helped draft the ‘American Declaration of Independence’ (1776) and advocated for the representative form of democracy. American leader Abraham Lincoln who participated in Civil War to abolish slavery became the sixteenth President of the country and declared democracy as a government of the people, by the people, and for the people.

Later in India, during the struggle for Independence, M.K. Gandhi pointed out that the western idea of democracy stresses more on rights rather than duties. He did not discard rights, rather he understood that the rights must be preserved but duties should be given equal weightage. In his view, western theories of democracy were insufficient in bridging the gap between public, power, and the State. He acknowledged that humans have the potential to act selfishly but they are not born with that nature. He explained in *Sarvodaya* that humans are cooperative by nature and can attain the ability of ‘self-restraint’ (1954). This quality enables them to perform their duties and responsibly sustain an equal social and political environment in a country.

Though various concepts of democracy have been given, yet they seemed to be difficult in practice in modern times because of the observed rise in highly populated nations-states. Unanimous decisions became a difficult task in democracy. But, despite criticisms and problems, democracy remains relevant primarily because of its underlying design that vests sovereignty in the people. Due to its inclusivity, irrespective of the gender, race, birth, wealth, caste, creed, religion etc., it is considered to be a highly valuable form of government among other characteristic institutions of modernity. It is manifested through public policies that reflect the will of people. Such a governance involves a collective and continuous endeavor with the aim of common welfare for all.

**Check Your Progress I**

**Note:** a) Use the space provided for your answer.

b) Check your answers with those provided at the end of the unit.

1. What is the definition of Democracy? Explain.

.....  
.....  
.....  
.....

---

## 7.3 THE BASIC INSTITUTIONAL PRINCIPLES AND IDEAS CONSTITUTING DEMOCRACY

---

In democracy, that the political power to choose the government and its policies lies with the public implies that the state should not be an alienated body. Democratic decision-making process creates a scope for people to advance their views and actions regarding the social and political system, where the state has a limited role in social and political governance. However, people cannot practice their power according to whims and subjective inclinations.

The decisions of people and government can be enforced only through laws for the democratic functioning of a nation. Thus, citizens are required to exercise authority within the framework of norms. Accountability towards laws is a basic requirement for both the people and the chosen government in a democracy.

Apparently, the two phrases ‘rule of people’ and ‘rule of law’ seem to be conceptually contradictory to each other but they are not. The rule of law enables people to rule themselves fairly, where nobody can take disadvantage of the other. People are autonomous and sovereign in a democracy, which implies that no one can interfere with another’s rights. All are equal, each citizen deserves to have a say in governance, and laws are necessary to protect every citizen from infringements. Laws ensure that every citizen has freedom to raise their voice and practice the democratic ideals. These principles are part of a group of associated concepts such as follows:

### 7.3.1 Principles considered as the three pillars of democracy

#### 7.3.1.1 Liberty

The Latin word ‘Liber’ means ‘free’. This principle is related to freedom, power, and authority. G.D.H. Cole defines liberty in *Social Theory* (1920) as the atmosphere which empowers citizens to express their personality without the fear of external hindrances. Liberty means practicing one’s agency in a congenially suitable ambience. John Stuart Mill’s *On Liberty* (1859) was the first work that explained the difference between two kinds of liberty viz., “liberty to” act freely and “liberty from” coercion. Later Isaiah Berlin exclusively distinguished between *positive* and *negative liberty* in *Two Concepts of Liberty* (1969). The liberty that renders equal opportunities and rights to the

individuals in a just society is called 'positive' by Isiah Berlin and that which protects them from arbitrary exercise of authority is called 'negative'.

Democratic institutions protect liberty through the individual rights of people. Rights constitute natural, social, ethical and legal principles assuring freedom. They are the entitlements to act or refrain from doing something and the freedom to remain in or avoid a certain state. Rights are divided into two categories: claim and liberty right. Claim right implies that a person, as a law abider, holds immunity from violation of power to act in a certain way. In other words, each person has a duty towards the right holder. Liberty rights provide access to the privilege of performing any chosen act.

### **7.3.1.2 Equality**

The state of being equal means that the public must not face discrimination on any social, political and legal basis in a democracy. It does not assume sameness in every respect among all. They all need not be treated in an exact same manner because people are different. Every citizen deserves dignity and respect equally before the law. They can claim to participate in development of public opinion and exercise their political power equally, given that there is access to possible opportunities.

The substantive moral equality presumes that all humans have the natural capacity of rationality. This argument was supported by Enlightenment period philosophers like Thomas Hobbes in *Leviathan* (1651), John Locke in *The Second Treatise of Government* (1690), Jean Jacques Rousseau in *A Discourse on Inequality* (1755), Immanuel Kant in *Groundwork of the Metaphysics of Morals in Practical Philosophy* (1785). Moral equality is argued to be the very foundation of egalitarianism by Will Kymlicka in *Contemporary Political Philosophy* (1990). The theory of distributive justice is also constructed on presumption of equality in terms of division of properties, goods and services. John Rawls proposes in *Theory of Justice* (1971) that people should be treated with *fairness* based on the ideal of equality. Citizens cannot have control on their race, colour, caste and social status. Therefore, these distributive criteria should not seize the assurance of justice.

### **7.3.1.3 Fraternity** (Latin, *frāternitās* or *frāter*; French, *fraternité*)

This is an ethical and political ideal implying brotherhood, friendship, community or cooperation. Aristotle's in his *Politics* emphasised on friendship and community as an essential constituent for harmonious engagement in politics. People as responsible citizens and representatives in

government need to work together. Hence, fraternity is required for cooperation while legislating, implementing and evaluating the laws. The joint endeavours strengthen the united functioning of a nation. The communitarian dimension of the democratic state and society is retained through fraternity. Carl Cohen, in his work *Democracy* (1971), maintains that fraternity enables people to consciously recognise their common enterprise and thus it is the fundamental ideal of a democratic system.

## **7.3.2 Foundational ideas underlying the concept of democracy**

### **7.3.2.1 Sovereignty**

The French word *souveraineté* traditionally denotes the idea of “a supreme power”. The modern meaning of this term was interpreted by Jean Bodin and Thomas Hobbes who suggested that laws cannot be monopolised by a single person. According to them, the power and authority must lie with a body of individuals. Though they envisioned an absolute sovereignty, today the power is distributed among various authorities and is best considered to be non-absolute. The government in a democracy aims to deconcentrate the power, so that it reaches to the bottom of system (which consists of remote areas and people residing in them). M.K. Gandhi’s political conception of the ‘panchayat system’ also captured such a decentralisation.

Dr. B. R. Ambedkar in his *Annihilation of Caste* (1979) specified internal and external limitations of sovereign authority. The internal one exists within the source of authority itself, that is to say, a sovereign power is not ruled by its laws, but the external limitation includes the scope of revolt against the powerful and thus becomes crucial in democracy because it encourages values of cultivating an equal platform for all regarding participation in governance.

### **7.3.2.2 Autonomy**

The principle of *autonomy* means the right of ‘self-governance’ by having independent control over one’s decisions. The underlying belief is that people are rationally capable of making informed and unforced decisions. Immanuel Kant’s philosophy of rationality (1785) and John Stuart Mill’s (1859) utilitarian liberalism evaluate the relevance of an individual’s autonomy. Jürgen Habermas in “*Three Normative Models of Democracy*” (1994, p. 111) emphasized that individual autonomy can remain protected when other members of society are consulted and hence institutionalization of public deliberation will strengthen the democratic rights of people. M.K. Gandhi in *Sarvodaya* (1954) elucidates that democracy must be a decentralised system in which

people are the architects of the government and its decision-making process. Such a social and political system depends on a moral self-rule of and by the people themselves.

*Freedom* of choices is necessary to practice autonomy in one's actions, i.e., the right to choose between various possible decisions and to express them are crucial aspects of democratic functioning. An example of such autonomous behaviour is exhibited during the elections, when a person X can freely vote for any particular candidate of his/her choice from among the competing contenders.

### **7.3.2.3 Justice**

The idea of justice was considered as one of the cardinal virtues by ancient Greek philosophers like Plato and Aristotle. John Rawls (1971) believed justice to be the first virtue of social institutions. In modern times, a democratic government is regarded as being just if it legislates, implements, and executes equal and fair distribution of the entitlements (including material wealth and ideals like discussed above). A state must not disrespect the law, its abiders, and/or their rights. Justice is intrinsically valuable for democracy especially because people who are entitled to the latter's ideals will not remain sovereigns without the former. Lack of a just government will undermine people's decision-making power in democracy. The Liberal theory of democracy emphasizes on freedom and equality among the people, in which, the government can assist them towards the good way of life but cannot dictate any such conception.

However, there are doubts regarding the freedom-oriented theory of democracy, i.e., if the government follows Rawlsian idea of distributive fairness and heavily taxes rich to balance out wealth among others then isn't it depriving them from the right to live as per their choices? An answer to this query could be that freedom without equality is unjust for the people of a democratic country. The Government in a democracy cannot favour a few and let the others remain suffering economically. But this equality must not be developed forcefully. Instead, the third principle of 'fraternity' encourages people to understand their duty and contribute in building equality for all. M.K. Gandhi proposed in his 'Constructive Programme' (1941) that the theory of trusteeship entails that people are responsible for others and that they assist them in maintaining human dignity within a democratic system.

---

### **Check Your Progress II**

**Note:** a) Use the space provided for your answer.

b) Check your answers with those provided at the end of the unit.

1. What is the difference between the negative and the positive conceptions of liberty in a democracy?

.....  
.....  
.....  
.....

---

## 7.4 DEMOCRACY AS A VALUE VS. DEMOCRACY AS A MECHANISM

---

The concept of democracy has engaged philosophers in debates regarding democracy for decades. An important debate analyses whether the concept of democracy can be viewed as a value or as a procedural mechanism. The question of legitimacy too arises in this context. Do democratic procedures legitimise its value constituting various principles like liberty, equality, and fraternity? Or, are these procedures just the institutionalised medium for implementing electoral practices?

Let us see how procedural mechanisms evolved in democracy. Since the nation states comprise of huge population in modern times and managing the decision-making process can be a difficult task, direct participation of people in the process is not always possible. Therefore, procedural mechanisms in representative system were designed to solve the problem. In such a political arrangement, people are free to vote for and elect their representatives. The representatives are held accountable for the legislative and executive responsibilities on behalf of the people. Moreover, democracy in today's world constitutes mainly representative assemblies to run the administrative business. But people can show dissent and elect someone else if they are not satisfied with their work.

Ian Shapiro in his text *The Moral Foundations of Politics*, discusses that democracy is legitimised when its procedures like regular elections, collection of cumulative data on per capita income and competitions among parties are adequately performed (2003, p.149). Philosophers like him, emphasise on procedural mechanisms that determine the general pattern of successful democracy. Thus, they consider that studying the behavioural and structural approach predominates the

concept of democracy. Based on this type of philosophy, political theorist like Rajni Kothari in *Context of Electoral Change in India General Elections 1967* analysed the data regarding the governmental procedural systems in India after Independence.

However, the mechanism-based concept of democracy ignores the possible unequal power equations within the social and political system of a country. Certain people can secure more power to themselves as compared to others because of their advantages. So, suppose a person A has a political lineage and another person B has no such reference, then A can exercise that advantage to his leverage over the other while competing as a candidate in elections. Therefore, Michel Foucault argues in *Power/knowledge: Selected interviews and other writings* that, power can manipulate the truth in political and social structures (1972-77, p. 133). The people with lesser education, wealth, social status, etc. may be exploited by the powerful. Hence, the principle of equality suffers due to the uneven power equation. Procedural methods presuppose that democracy holds an instrumental value of bringing in features such as a competitive environment among political leaders which minimizes power imbalances in politics.

Contrary to the procedural system, a few thinkers critique the mechanistic explanation of democracy. They believe that although mechanisms assist in conducting democratic procedures, yet democracy is more than the institutional settings of free and fair elections, universal adult franchise, political parties, constitution etc. Democracy is a value that is intrinsically significant because of its strong moral ground. Democracy's chief characteristic that accepts people as capable of making rules and expressing their interests in a fairest manner makes it morally superior to other political systems. Democracy has a constructive role of political participation that keeps governments accountable, responsible and therefore in check. Although, people are entitled to different opinions about the varied meanings of good life, and procedures to achieve it in everybody's interests, yet, they can collectively pursue that goal in democracy. The foreground to achieve such a goal is that all are equal on social and political platforms. Democracy that caters to this principle rather than simply relying on procedural and mechanistic approach is understood to be substantive in nature.

D. Beetham (1993) believed that democracy must be located in the values grounded in social realities. Citizens need to be equal and power must not be concentrated in the hands of few. The decision making process and the mechanisms need to keep these considerations in centre while forming policies. However, this theory which is named as substantive, seems to be an ideal one

that is difficult to achieve in practice. Similarly, communitarians support that democracy has its roots in social foundations. These foundations need to be nurtured by encouraging organic community life. In return these communities strengthen the values of democracy. Charles Taylor in *Degenerations of Democracy* (2022) emphasises the renewal of such communities to develop the scope for ideal like equality.

### Check Your Progress III

**Note:** a) Use the space provided for your answer.

b) Check your answers with those provided at the end of the unit.

1. Do you think democracy is intrinsically valuable? Yes/No, explain why?

.....

.....

.....

.....

---

## 7.5 DIFFERENT TYPES OF DEMOCRACY

---

### 7.5.1 Representative Democracy

A Representative Democracy is an indirect type of democratic government. People elect candidates who represent them on their behalf. It can function within a parliamentary system as well as a presidential system of government. In United Kingdom and India, representative government works in lower house or Lok Sabha respectively. USA has the presidential form of government. Elected officials are designated with a political seat so that they can work for the people. Social contract theorists like Thomas Hobbes and John Locke argued in favour of the representative form of government, whereas Jean Jacques Rousseau critiqued representative government and proposed that ‘general will’ must be generated, so that people are directly involved in decision making. Joseph A. Schumpeter believed that representative democracy is merely a leadership competition rather than being people’s government and hence it is inadequate. The main challenges of this type of government include the possible manipulation of the electorate, that there can be a conflict of interests between the elected representatives and their constituents, as well as the possibility of the concentration of power in the hands of few.

## **7.5.2 Direct Democracy**

The policy initiatives and decisions are made directly by the people in this form of government. The intermediaries like elected representatives are not necessary for political and social delegation of responsibilities. Thinkers like John Stuart Mill, G.D.H. Cole and Jean Jacques Rousseau commended this type of democracy. In India, M.K. Gandhi's theory of Self-Rule or 'Swaraj' explained through his concepts of 'Panchayat System', 'Constructive Programme' and 'Sarvodaya', provided an insight into the practice of direct democracy which stands firmly grounded on two basic moral principles of 'Truth and Non-Violence.'

There are semi-direct democracies as well in which representatives take the charge of administration but people are involved in legislation through 'referendums' and 'initiatives.' There are two types of direct democracies: Participatory and Deliberative.

### **7.5.2.1 Participatory Democracy**

The public participates in the process of polity because this type of government ensures that citizens are directly involved in decision making. Citizens Assembly and conventions are created for an efficient system. John Stuart Mill believes that participation has educative effect on citizens. People are the sovereign and they work collectively. They understand that they are mutually dependent on each other. He supported popular democratic government in which citizens are actively indulged in polity. Joel D. Wolfe states that individuals and groups can realistically achieve their interests while addressing the criticism that there may be self-interested members who have little incentives, skills and knowledge to participate in the decision-making process ("A Defense of Participatory democracy," 1985). Contemporary democratic theorists like Carol Pateman and Benjamin Barber also favour this kind of government.

### **7.5.2.2 Deliberative Democracy**

Deliberative democracy is also called discursive democracy because it adopts the procedure of consensus based decision-making. Apart from voting, deliberation about various issues is prioritized among citizens to practice self-governance. Public consultations with citizens is crucial to keep a check on accountability of political power and its ability for governance. Joseph M. Bessette proposed this form of government in his book *Democracy: The Majority Principle in Republican Government*. Deliberation does not merely mean aggregation of views and

preferences. Deliberation implies that people are autonomous individuals sharing an equal platform to discuss and find solutions to their social and political issues. Aristotle had held that the notion of politics constitutes the deliberative element. Jürgen Habermas emphasised that communicative rationality within the public sphere paves the way for deliberative attempts in governance.

### **7.5.3 Social Democracy**

The concept of democratic socialism has evolved into the idea of social democracy. The aim of this government is to establish socialist values through a democratic political processes. Such values include a well regulated market economy to avoid disparities and unequally divided class system. It is influenced by the socialist theories of Karl Marx and Friedrich Engels, though it is not as radical as them. The principle of equality is fundamental to the social democracy. The Welfare state is supported with the idea of redistribution of wealth and goods among citizens. Social democrats advocate a liberal representative system which delivers justice in the social and political arena. Social democracy is an amalgamation of socialism and democratic viewpoint. The State holds the power to resolve property disputes and reallocate them to underprivileged.

### **7.5.4 Cosmopolitan Democracy**

The word cosmopolitan stands for the transnational identity. Therefore, the political theory which embraces the idea of global governance is called cosmopolitan democracy. It argues that social and political authorities cannot be limited to nation-states having a hierarchical form of authority. This form of government advocates decentralized and confederal governance with democratic values expanded across the world. Supranational organisations, like the European Union, United Nations, World Bank, World Trade etc., respond to the global challenges in economic, social and political terms. Political philosopher Jürgen Habermas and sociologist Ulrich Beck support this type of government. However, Robert Dahl doubts that democracy can possibly be broadened at the global level or be an inclusive mechanism for international organisations.

### **7.5.5 Egalitarian Democracy**

The egalitarian democracy is grounded on three preconditions viz., a) freedoms and rights of the people must be protected equally in all social groups b) the power equation among citizens must

not lose its balance, c) resources must be accessible to individuals equally. Both direct and representative methods can be used to achieve such goals. This form of government asserts that democracy cannot be founded on inequalities inhibiting the exercise of social and political participation. The roots of such a democratic ideal can be traced to John Locke's idea of rights on private property, and Karl Marx's idea of equal social and political opportunities.

**Check Your Progress IV**

**Note:** a) Use the space provided for your answer.

b) Check your answers with those provided at the end of the unit.

1. What are the different types of democracy?

.....

.....

.....

.....

---

**7.6 LET US SUM UP**

---

This unit discussed the conceptual evolution of democracy in the world history. Further, it proceeded to study the theoretical grounds for the development of democracy including the three basic principles and other foundational ideals that constitute it. It examined how democracy is considered to be an effective government for balancing the power equation in the social and political realm. It explored the question of whether democracy is a value or just a mechanism-oriented system. Distinctive types of democracy were briefly taken up for discussion to highlight the depth and versatility of this conception, showing how it has been applied and practiced in different ways all over the world. Democracy appears to be an institutional system prioritizing people's freedom of choices, with the underlying presupposition that the governed understand what is in their best interest and that they must participate in the decision-making process of policy making.

---

**7.7 KEY WORDS**

---

**Equality:** Thriving in an unbiased and non-discriminatory environment.

**Fraternity:** Cooperative endeavours towards the advancement of communal existence.

**Democracy:** The social and political system that enables the governed to participate in governance.

**Liberty:** Exercise of fear-free life.

**Participation:** Involvement in the decision-making process.

**Sovereignty:** Autonomous political agency.

---

## 7.8 FURTHER READINGS AND REFERENCES

---

Ambedkar, B.R. *Annihilation of Caste*. Bombay Government Central Press, 1979.

Aristotle. *Politics*. Translated by Benjamin Jowett, Dover Publication. Inc, 2000. Becker, Carl L. *The Declaration of Independence: A Study in the History of Political Ideas*. New York: Vintage Books, 1979.

Barber, Benjamin R. *Strong Democracy: Participatory Politics*. University of California Press, 2004.

Beck, Ulrich. *Democracy with Enemies*. Polity Press, 1998.

Berlin, Isaiah. *Two Concepts of Liberty*. Oxford University Press, 1969.

Beetham, D. *Auditing Democracy in Britain*. Democratic Audit Paper No.1. Human Rights Centre, University of Essex, Colchester/Charter 88 Trust, 1993.

Bessette, Joseph M. *Deliberative Democracy: The Majority Principle in Republican Government*. In *How Democratic Is the Constitution?*. Edited by Goldwin Robert A., Schambra William A., 102–16, American Enterprise Institute, 1980.

Bodin, Jean. *Six Books of the Commonwealth*. Translated by M.J. Tooley. The Kemp Hall Bindery, 1576.

Cohen, Carl. *Democracy*. University of Georgia Press, 1971.

Cole, G.D.H. *Social Theory*. Fredrick A. Stokes Company, 1920.

Dahl, Robert A. *On Democracy*. Yale University Press, 1998.

Engels, Fredrich. *Collected Works*. International Publishers, 2004.

Foucault, Michel. *Power/knowledge: Selected interviews and other writings*. Edited by Colin Gordon. Translated by Colin Gordon, Leo Marshall, John Mempham, Kate Soper, Pantheon Books, 1972-77.

Gandhi M.K. *Constructive Programme: Its meaning and place*. Navjivan Publishing House, 1941.

Gandhi M.K. *Sarvodaya (The Welfare of All)*. Edited by Bharatan Kumarappa, Navajivan Publishing House, 1954.

Gandhi M.K. *Panchayati Raj*. Compiled by R. K. Prabhu, Navajivan Publishing, 1959.

Gandhi, M.K. *Hind Swaraj*, Sarva Sena Sangh Prakashan, Varanasi, 2014.

Jefferson, Thomas. "Declaration of the Rights of Man and Citizen, 26 August 1789," *Liberty, Equality, Fraternity: Exploring the French Revolution*, <http://revolution.chnm.org/d/295>.

Habermas, Jürgen. "Three Normative Models of Democracy." *Constellations* 1, no.1, 1994 pp. 1-10.

Hobbes Thomas, *LEVIATHAN*, edited with an introduction by C.B. Macpherson, Penguin Books: England, 1651.

Kant, Immanuel. *Groundwork for the metaphysics of morals*. Edited by Mary J. Gregor. Introduction by Allen W. Wood. Oxford University Press, 1785.

Kymlicka, Will. *Contemporary Political Philosophy: An Introduction*. Oxford University Press. 1990.

Locke John, *Second Treatise of Government*, edited, with an Introduction, By C.B. McPherson, Hackett Publishing Company, Indianapolis and Cambridge, 1980.

Marx, Karl. *Capital: A Critique of Political Economy*. Edited by Friedrich Engels. translated by Ben Fowkes and David Fernbach. Penguin, 1976.

*Montesquieu: The Spirit of the Laws*, trans. Anne M. Cohler, Basia Carolyn Miller, and Harold Samuel Stone. Cambridge Texts in the History of Political Thought. Cambridge, 1989.

Mill, John Stuart. *On Liberty*. Cambridge University Press, 1859.

Pateman, Carol. *Participation and Democratic Theory*. Cambridge University Press, 1970.

Robertson, David. *The Penguin Dictionary of Politics*. Penguin, Revised Edition, 2000.

Plato, *The Republic*, trans. Desmond Lee, second edition, Penguin, 1974.

Rawls, John. *A Theory of Justice*. Harvard University Press, 1971.

Rousseau, Jean Jacques and Coleman, Patrick. *A Discourse on Inequality*. Cambridge University Press, 1755.

Rousseau, Jean Jacques. *The Social Contract And Discourses By Jean Jacques Rousseau*, 1913.

Kothari, Rajni *Context of Electoral Change in India General Elections 1967*. Academic Books, First Edition, 1969.

Schumpeter, Joseph. *Capitalism, Socialism and Democracy*. New York: Harper and Row Publishers. 1942.

Sen, Amarta. "Democracy as a Universal Value." *Journal of Democracy*, 1999.

Shapiro, Ian. *The Moral Foundations of Politics*. Yale University, 2003.

Taylor, Charles and Calhoun, Craig. *Degenerations of Democracy* Harvard University Press, 2022.

Wolfe, Joel D. "A Defense of Participatory democracy," *The Review of Politics*, 47(3): 370-389, 1985.

---

## 7.9 ANSWERS TO CHECK YOUR PROGRESS

---

### Check Your Progress I

1. Democracy as a concept has evolved through a rich historical background. Pericles was one of the democratic leaders of Athens, who associated democracy with toleration. Later, in the book *The Republic*, Plato described it as government of free people with authority but he feared that people could be irrational sometimes. His student, Aristotle believed that democracy grants authority to the majority and deplored it for being the government of the poor. Further in the enlightenment period, Thomas Hobbes and John Locke argued that whether poor or rich, people are by nature rational and that is why political equality of citizens must be ensured. However, Montesquieu criticized Hobbes' and Locke's theory as it advocates a powerful State. To ensure fair power distribution within democratic institutes, Montesquieu proposed that there should be division of power in the form of Legislation, Execution and Judiciary. Social contractarian, Jean Jacques Rousseau improved John Locke's theory and proposed that direct participation of citizens can shift the power from the State to the people. Building on the previous theories in Greece and Europe, American President Abraham Lincoln declared democracy as a government of the people, by the people, and for the people. In another part of the world, disagreeing with the European idea of democracy, Indian freedom fighter and thinker M.K. Gandhi emphasized 'self-governance,' where duties are prioritized over rights. Despite the difference, all these theorists from Greece to Europe to Asia, favoured democracy for its foundational definition that vests sovereignty in the people, and inclusivity irrespective of the gender, race, birth, wealth, caste, creed, religion etc. Such a governance involves a collective endeavor with the aim of common welfare for all.

### Check Your Progress II

1. Isiah Berlin exclusively distinguished between *positive* and *negative liberty* in *Two Concepts of Liberty* (1969). According to him, the liberty that renders equal opportunities and rights to the individuals in a just society is called ‘positive.’ The rights that protect them from arbitrary exercise of authority is called ‘negative.’

### **Check Your Progress III**

1. Yes, democracy is a value that is intrinsically significant because of its strong moral grounding. Democracy’s chief characteristic accepts people as capable of making rules and expressing their interests in a fairest manner. This feature makes it morally superior to other political systems. Democracy has a constructive role of political participation that keeps governments accountable, responsible and therefore in check. Although, people are entitled to different opinions about the varied meanings of the good life and the procedures to achieve it in everybody’s interests, yet they can collectively pursue that goal in democracy. The foreground for achieving such a goal is that all are equal on social and political platforms. Democracy, which caters to this principle rather than simply relying on procedural and mechanistic approach, is understood to be substantive in nature.

### **Check Your Progress IV**

1. There are five different types of democracy. They are as follows:

1. Representative Democracy: Indirect form of government in which people elect candidates to represent them on a political platform and make decisions on their behalf.
2. Direct Democracy: A form of government in which the people do not rely on intermediaries for legislation of policies. It has two kinds:
  - a) Participatory Democracy: Public is directly involved in the decision-making process.
  - b) Deliberative Democracy: Public consults collectively to formulate decisions.
3. Social Democracy: Political system that advocates balanced amalgamation of socialist ideas like welfare state, and democratic principles like equality and liberty.
4. Cosmopolitan Democracy: Government that embraces the idea of global or international democratic way of life.
5. Egalitarian Democracy: It ensures that equality is restored in terms of freedom of choice, power equation, and resources.

**Structure**

8.0 Objectives

8.1 Introduction

8.2 Macrocosm and the Microcosm in Relation through Swaraj

8.3 Political Swaraj

8.4 Economic Swaraj

8.5 Social Swaraj

8.6 Let Us Sum Up

8.7 Key Words

8.8 References and Further Reading

8.9 Answers to Check your Progress

---

**8.0 OBJECTIVES**

---

This unit will introduce the students to:

- The concept of Swaraj, particularly the manner in which it was used by M.K Gandhi.
- The unit will also establish the various dimensions of the usage of the term – political, economic, social, moral.
- The philosophical analysis of the term will be done with respect to modern political theory, and comparisons will be made wherever required.

---

**8.1 INTRODUCTION**

---

The term Swaraj/Svaraj draws on Sanskrit roots (swa/sva-self, and raj-rule), and etymologically means self-rule. The meaning of the term in popular usage has often been identified with independence from foreign rule, and the key reason for it is that the term gained wide currency

---

<sup>13</sup> Dr. Shridha Shah, Former Faculty, Department of Philosophy, University of Delhi.

during India's struggle for independence from British rule. However, the term has far deeper and more comprehensive roots than the words independence or freedom connote in the English language, and we shall discuss this in some detail in this unit.

Indian nationalists like Dayanand Saraswati, Dadabhai Naoroji, and Bal Gangadhar Tilak were some of the first political leaders to use this term, in their fight against British colonialism. Like Dayanand Saraswati, Tilak argued that this term has Vedic roots, and is part of India's ancient past. His famous words "Swaraj is my birth right, and I will have it." – marked the first phase of the nationalist discourse in India. Each of these figures had their contribution in formulating the usage of this term in India's quest for freedom from British rule, however, the way M.K. Gandhi articulated and deployed this term, has been unparalleled, not only in political praxis, but also political theory.

Gandhi's use of the term swaraj, not only took account of India's political quest for independence, but also focussed on breaking through the economic and social bondages that characterised India, at that time. Further, swaraj in Gandhi's view not only characterised aspects of the state at the macro level, but also the role of the individual at the micro level. Scholars have argued that Gandhi's use of the term swaraj supplanted the theory of sovereignty as part of modern western political theory, which seeks to place supreme power with the state. In Gandhi's articulation of swaraj, sovereignty ultimately rested with the civil society.

*"I hope to demonstrate that real Swaraj will come not by the acquisition of authority by a few but by the acquisition of the capacity by all to resist authority when abused. In other words, Swaraj is to be attained by educating the masses to a sense of their capacity to regulate and control authority."* (Gandhi, Young India, 29-1-25)

Gandhi presents a radical understanding of the term swaraj. Following him, thinkers and political leaders like K.C. Bhattacharya, Vinoba Bhave, J.P Narayan, etcetera have continued the tradition of reflecting on this term, which not only has relevance for the politics of the Indian subcontinent and the colonised world, but also in terms of global political theory.

---

## **8.2 MACROCOSM AND THE MICROCOSM IN RELATION THROUGH SWARAJ**

---

As mentioned earlier, the term Swaraj etymologically, refers to self-rule. The question that immediately arises is what does this 'self' refer to? Is it the state or its people that are being referred

to here? Or is it the individual self? The answer to the question encompasses all these alternatives and adds more. At the most perfunctory level, swaraj is the democratic rule of a state by its own people, which is how the term was primarily used by the earlier nationalists. Their call for Home-Rule expressed their wish for freedom from foreign rule. Figures like Tilak, distinguished between Swaraj and Suraj (good governance), which means that for them just good governance was not important, it was also a question of who was governing them.

Tilak spoke of swarājya in four ways: as the ruler and ruled belonging to the same country, race, religion; as a well governed rule of law; as a government promoting the well-being of the populace; and a government elected by and accountable to the people. Tilak's concept of swaraj largely focussed on political autonomy, although he did not discount the moral aspects of self-control. His understanding of swaraj was highly influenced by his reading of the *Bhagvad Gitā*. However, as we have already had a glimpse, Gandhi's idea of swaraj had a radically new connotation.

The concept of swaraj, for Gandhi, works with the most basic unit of the self, however, this notion of self is not the Cartesian self, which is solipsistic, and functions only as an atomised individual. Scholars like Ramchandra Gandhi have argued that the Gandhian notion of the self draws from an advaitin understanding of reality i.e., non-duality between self and the other/s. This conception of the self believes in a dialectical relation between the individual, and the larger world and cosmos. Thus, at the most basic level swaraj refers to individual autonomy and self-control, but this would be meaningless without considering the larger interrelatedness of the microcosm and the macrocosm. Unlike the modern liberal understanding of individual rights and autonomy, which is often in conflict with that of the community or society, the individual autonomy that is being spoken of here, would be meaningful and worthwhile only when it harmonises with the good of all, and not that of the majority. The individual self is also to be guarded against any homogenisation or universalising oneness, either through the march of history or reason. The dialectical relation of the individual with their family, community, and nation is essential in establishing a plurality of voices and establishing swaraj.

### **Check Your Progress I**

**Note:** a) Use the space provided for your answer.

b) Check your answers with those provided at the end of the unit.

1. What is the meaning of Swaraj?



part of the Indian vocabulary and discourse, and to convey profound political principles to the masses was remarkable. The term Ramrajya was not meant to indicate a religion, but it was meant to indicate a state where the voice of the poorest would be taken seriously, and the rule was not by force but by truth.

The idea envisioned through political swaraj had a two-pronged approach. The first was in the form of resistance to the centralised authority of the state, and the second was in the form of political participation and a constructive approach to the political. In this context, village panchayats were seen as the most feasible form for political swaraj to exist, as they ensured decentralisation of power, and direct participation by the people in democratic and constructive processes. Gandhi's Constructive Programme (1945) is an important document to consider in this context. It lists issues of key concern with regards to the Indian society of the time and lays out a discussion of how they may be achieved. The insistence at each juncture is not a solution by political force, but a coming together of the civil society in realisation of their interdependence and mutual benefit, which is the key aspect of achieving swaraj. The items listed in the constructive programme are not all inclusive or exhaustive and allow for amendment. In any case, the key issue was that for a polity to be built on the principle of ahimsa, a training in the constructive programme was essential, which would enable the establishment of Poorna Swaraj.

Another key aspect for the establishment of political swaraj was that of praxis, and *Satyagraha* was Gandhi's response to it. Satyagraha, generally referred to as truth-force, was developed as a special form of non-violent political action. It either took the form of civil disobedience or non-cooperation. Mainstream political theories advocate the use of force for maintaining law and order, and to defend against external aggression. Training of the civil society, in the constructive programme and satyagraha, was Gandhi's response to bring the principles of ahimsa in political practice. To be a satyagrahi required consistent practice and it was not a one of participation in protests. The theory of swaraj, in its practice of satyagraha coupled with the constructive programme, envisioned a society based on complete ahimsa that gave every individual freedom, while at the same time ensured that this freedom is borne out of their realisation of the truth of their interdependence on one another.

---

## **8.4 ECONOMIC SWARAJ**

---

Swaraj cannot be meaningful, or for that matter even be practical, if people do not have control over their means of sustenance and livelihood. In this respect economic autonomy is paramount as far as the realisation of swaraj is concerned. It is noteworthy that Dadabhai Naoroji's critique of the British rule in India targeted their economic drain of India's wealth and resources, in his work – *Poverty and Un-British Rule in India* (1902). The masses in India were being exploited by the British rule, and the nation was being drained of its resources for the benefit of the British empire. With Gandhi the issue of economic autonomy is carried further to the modes of production, and a critique of industrialism. Gandhi's critique of the modern western civilisation focussed in large part on the industrial and technological mode of production that came in with the British rule. Gandhi's insistence on the use of *khadi* and the *charkha* were a response to the mechanisation of the manufacture process that not only disenfranchised local manufacturers but also forced consumption of foreign made goods. However, the most significant aspect of the critique was the alienation that it brought about in society. Several scholars looking into Gandhi's critique of the modern political economy have compared it to that of Karl Marx's critique of capitalism. Gandhi's insistence on *swadeshi*, and the boycott of foreign made goods, was not a parochial move. It was meant to provide substance to the call of swaraj, one which would remain an abstract ideal without *swadeshi*. The insistence on spinning the *charkha* by each person was meant to ensure that each person engage in daily bread labour, and to uphold its dignity for each. It was also meant to decentralise the manufacture process and promote the use of locally produced things. This is a significant aspect of realising economic swaraj, and to highlight economic interdependence between neighbouring communities. Some of these issues are only being realised now, in relation to the changing ecological balance and climate change, where insistence on local and sustainable consumption is being promoted. The overarching picture was to develop self-reliant and sustainable village communities and move people away from the clutches of alienating city life. This was not a romanticised picture of village life. Gandhi was fully aware of the squalor and poverty of Indian villages, which is precisely why he considered the practice of the constructive programme equivalent, if not more significant, to the quest for political independence of India.

---

## 8.5 SOCIAL SWARAJ

---

Each society or community has its own set of issues that it needs to tackle. Cultural, ethnic, religious, caste-based diversities, etcetera characterise any society, and have different responses

from each society and community. While we may be able to explain the basis of the origins of these differences, a society based on swaraj is essentially a non-hierarchical society. No amount of political will, or economic equity, can root out social discriminations from a society, when the civil society plays no hand. In the case of India, the removal of untouchability and Hindu Muslim unity were recognised as essential to establishing true swaraj.

Gandhi's significant contribution to social swaraj was his ability to establish social experiments in order to address social issues, without the intervention of the state and its policies, though one may admit that he was not successful in his attempts. Nonetheless, his engagement with these issues highlights the importance of a non-hierarchical civil society, where people despite their differences can identify with a common sense of humanity and truth, through non-violent means.

The issue of Hindu Muslim unity invoked the view that all religions led to the same ultimate truth, and therefore, the view that Hindus and Muslims had completely different customs, origins, etcetera did not hold much sway. If the ultimate truth was the same for all, then the other differences could be mitigated to enable a plural society. Likewise, the malaise of untouchability represented an unforgivable sin in Hindu society, and Gandhi considered that without exorcising it, Hindu society could never be reformed. His insistence was to enable this reform without to come from within, without state intervention, and particularly that of the British state. In both regards, he failed; nonetheless, it is significant to place his attempts in the context of the way in which we have discussed swaraj, so far.

### Check Your Progress II

**Note:** a) Use the space provided for your answer.

b) Check your answers with those provided at the end of the unit.

1. What are the various dimensions of Swaraj?

.....

.....

.....

.....

---

## 8.6 LET US SUM UP

---

Modern western political thought holds the individual, and their selfish interest and survival, as a fundamental assumption of their political theory. Swaraj as we have discussed it so far challenges this basic assumption. The self in swaraj is inherently constituted of the other and cannot thrive by itself. For any community or society to find true freedom living together, it must have a comprehensive conception of the individual in its relationship with others. Swaraj as a concept is not just about a democratic government, but one in which the civil society does not depend on the state for regulating every detail. In fact, the true concept of swaraj allows the establishment of institutions that enable individuals and societies to resist external control, and yet live by the law of non-violence and truth, and their common humanity.

The concept of swaraj is not limited to political thought. It is very significantly tied up with intellectual autonomy. Gandhi's critique of the modern western civilisation is fundamentally, a critique of a way of life and thought that was being spread across the world through colonialism. Philosophers like K.C. Bhattacharya tried to articulate what it would mean to have swaraj in terms of ideas that we pursue, and by way of which we recognise who we really are. The legacy of colonialism is not just about economic and political enslavement, but it is ultimately an enslaving of the mind. It is this enslavement, which was regarded as most pernicious, and therefore swaraj in ideas, which then reflects in our material reality, is what is ultimately the legacy of the pursuit of swaraj.

---

## 8.6 KEY WORDS

---

**Ahimsa:** the law of non-violence; it is meant to express not just the negative connotation of no violence, but a positive sense of compassion at all levels, for all beings, mentally and physically.

**Poorna Swaraj:** demand for complete sovereignty.

**Swadeshi:** a movement which focussed on self-reliance. It was meant to be the substantive aspect of the practice of swaraj.

---

## 8.7 FURTHER READINGS AND REFERENCES

---

Bhattacharya, K.C. (1928) Swaraj In Ideas, accessed <https://doi.org/10.1093/acprof:osobl/9780199769261.003.0007>.

Bilgrami, Akeel (2014) *Gandhi (and Marx)*, in *Secularism, Identity, and Enchantment*, Harvard University Press, USA.

Gandhi, M.K. (2011) *Hind Swaraj*, Navajivan Publishing House, Ahmedabad.

Gandhi, M.K. (2006) *Political and National Life and Affairs*, Vol. 1, ed. V.B. Kher, Navajivan Publishing House, Ahmedabad.

Gandhi, M.K. (1945) *Constructive Programme: Its Meaning and Place*, Navajivan Publishing House, Ahmedabad.

Veeravalli, Anuradha (2014) *Gandhi in Political Theory: Truth, Law and Experiment*, Ashgate, Surrey, England.

Gandhi, Ramchandra (1984) The Svaraj of India, *Indian Philosophical Quarterly*, Vol. XI, No.4, 461-471, Poona.

Parel, Anthony (2006) *Gandhi's Philosophy and the Quest for Harmony*, Cambridge University Press, New Delhi.

UGC MOOC on Indian Political Thought, Lokmanya Tilak: Concept of Swaraj, Module 15.

[https://ugcmoocs.inflibnet.ac.in/assets/uploads/1/64/1944/et/M15\\_Academic%20Script200326111103035858.pdf](https://ugcmoocs.inflibnet.ac.in/assets/uploads/1/64/1944/et/M15_Academic%20Script200326111103035858.pdf)

---

## 8.8 ANSWERS TO CHECK YOUR PROGRESS

---

### Check Your Progress I

1. The term Swaraj draws on Sanskrit roots (swa-self, and raj-rule), and etymologically means self-rule. At the most perfunctory level, swaraj is the democratic rule of a state by its own people, which is how the term was primarily used by the earlier nationalists. However, in later development, particularly with that of Gandhi it came to refer to individual autonomy and self-control, and this autonomy would be meaningless without considering the larger interrelatedness of the microcosm and the macrocosm.

2. According to Tilak, the various ways, in which the idea of Swaraj can be understood, are, a) as the ruler and ruled belonging to the same country, race, religion; b) as a well governed rule of law; c) as a government promoting the well-being of the populace; and d) a government elected by and accountable to the people.

## Check Your Progress II

1. Swaraj is a comprehensive term that covers the moral and spiritual aspects, along with the political, economic, and social dimensions. For any community or society to find true freedom living together, it must have a comprehensive conception of the individual in its relationship with others. Swaraj as a concept is not just about a democratic government, but one in which the civil society does not depend on the state for regulating every detail. It encompasses political autonomy, economic autonomy as well as social autonomy, for each individual in a society, and must be established on the principles of satya and ahimsa.



ignou  
THE PEOPLE'S  
UNIVERSITY