

Major Issues of Global Politics

Carl Mays



MAJOR ISSUES OF GLOBAL POLITICS

MAJOR ISSUES OF GLOBAL POLITICS

Carl Mays



Major Issues of Global Politics
by Carl Mays

Copyright© 2022 BIBLIOTEX

www.bibliotex.com

All rights reserved. No part of this book may be reproduced or used in any manner without the prior written permission of the copyright owner, except for the use brief quotations in a book review.

To request permissions, contact the publisher at info@bibliotex.com

Ebook ISBN: 9781984662507



Published by:

Bibliotex

Canada

Website: www.bibliotex.com

Contents

Chapter 1	Introduction	1
Chapter 2	Fascism.....	47
Chapter 3	Individualism and Communitarianism	61
Chapter 4	State and Globalization.....	103
Chapter 5	Secularism.....	136
Chapter 6	The Evolution of World Politics	151

Chapter 1

Introduction

Gandhism

Gandhi's moral-political ideas can be established in his books since well, letters and editorials in the four weekly journals, which he edited or published at dissimilar times throughout his public life in South Africa and India. These weekly journals were: *Indian Opinion*, *Young India*, *Harijan*, and *Navajivan*. Gandhi's books, few of which were first serialized in his journals, were: *Hind Swaraj*, *Satyagraha in South Africa*, *The Story of My Experiments with Truth*, *Ashram Observances in Action*, *A Guide to Health*, *Discourses on the Gita* and *Constructive Programme*. Gandhi also wrote and published paraphrases and/or translations of Plato's *Apology*, W. Salter's *Ethical Religion*, John Ruskin's *Unto this Last*, Henry David Thoreau's *Principles of Civil Disobedience* and Leo Tolstoy's *Letter to a Hindoo*. Approximately all of Gandhi's scripts, including his numerous speeches, interviews and correspondence, can be established in the 100 volumes of the *Collected Works of Mahatma Gandhi*.

Gandhi's scripts were produced, not in any academic setting, but in the midst of actual political struggles through vast masses of people against racial discriminations, colonialism, economic use, untouchability and communalism. Gandhi led those struggles in South Africa and India. He also campaigned for them throughout many visits to England, where, incidentally, he had studied for and passed the bar-at-law examination. He did few of his script

on his days of silence and fasting and throughout many words of imprisonment in South Africa and India. His well-known book, *Hind Swaraj*, was written on board the ship *Kildonan Castle* throughout a return journey from England to South Africa in November 1909.

Few Powers which Formed Gandhi's Political Idea

For a historical-contextual understanding of Gandhi's moral-political theory, it is necessary to bear in mind that throughout the years from 1905 to 1918, his attitude towards the British imperial organization went by a protracted procedure of change from loyal support to, first, disenchantment and, then, to radical opposition. Few of the measures which contributed to this change in Gandhi's political ideology were: the Partition of Bengal, racial discriminations against Indians in South Africa, the Rowlatt Acts, the Jallianwala Bagh Massacre and the Khilafat issue. The change in Gandhi's political thinking throughout this era was also convinced through the following books, which he read.

Critical Scripts on Contemporary Culture

Throughout this era, Gandhi read the jobs of Tolstoy, Ruskin, Carpenter, Maitland, Salter, R.P.Dutt, Dadabhai Naoroji, etc. Of these, Leo Tolstoy's *The Kingdom of God is within You* and *The Gospel in Brief* and John Ruskin's *Unto This Last* had an extremely great impact on Gandhi. They and to a lesser extent, the scripts of other authors contributed to his becoming disenchanted with contemporary western culture. From these

scripts, Gandhi also derived few normative ideas of an alternative to the individualistic, utilitarian and authoritarian principles on which the imperial/colonial government rested. Gandhi's ideas of swaraj and sarvodaya, meaning self-realization by service to others, were greatly convinced through Tolstoy and Ruskin.

Hindu Religious Philosophy

Gandhi also studied the ***Bhagavad Gita*** and many other holy books of Hinduism, few of which were recommended to him through his Jain mentor, Rajchand Mehta, also described Raychandbhai. These were books on yoga, *advaita vedanta*, Jainism, Buddhism, Samkhya, etc. These books led Gandhi to espouse a set of religiously inspired norms or principles of personal and communal conduct, e.g., the values of *satya*, *ahimsa*, *aparigraha* and *samabhava*. Gandhi saw in them an alternative or corrective to the dominant, contemporary/western values or principles of individualism, utilitarianism and violence. In the *Bhagavad Gita*, for example, he establish an 'infallible guide of conduct.' The hymns of Narsinh Mehta, a saint-poet of the fifteenth century, also instilled in him the value of service to others, especially the poor and the needy. These readings and the aforementioned measures turned Gandhi into a radical opponent of the imperial/colonial government in 1919-20. At a special session of the Indian National Congress held at Calcutta in 1920, Gandhi successfully moved a settlement on non-co-operation against the government. India's goal, he said, is nothing less than *swaraj*.

It was by this procedure of change in his thinking and actions throughout this decisive stage in his life that he urbanized his moral-political theory and practice of *satyagraha*, *swaraj* and *sarvodaya*. Jointly, these seemed to him to be providing an emancipator alternative to the political theory of colonial/imperial modernity. He also whispered that his conception of *swaraj* and *sarvodaya* is an emancipator alternative to illiberal traditionalism since well.

Swaraj: Inward Freedom and Outward Freedom

Through *Swaraj*, Gandhi meant both outward or political freedom and inward or spiritual freedom. In 'outward freedom,' he incorporated national political independence and parliamentary *swaraj*. They are shapes of outward freedom in that they seek to free people from external manage or rule through others, be they foreigners or one's own compatriots.

Through 'inward freedom,' he meant freedom from such inner impediments since ignorance, illusions, selfishness, greed, intolerance and hatred. These impede or obstruct the individual's self-realization or achievement of *moksha*, i.e. the *atman*'s realization of its identity with the *Brahman* or *paramatman*. Hence, he writes: 'Government in excess of self is the truest *Swaraj*; it is synonymous with *moksha* or salvation.' Gandhi made an original contribution, both in theory and in practice, with regard to both these kinds of *swaraj*. He talked of his ideal of *swaraj* since a square, of which the four inseparable faces are:

- Political independence;
- Economic independence;
- Non-violence in social dealings and moral obligations toward others; and
- Truth since *dharma*.
- Gandhi's account deserves quoting:

Let there be no mistake in relation to the concept of *swaraj*. It is complete independence of alien manage and complete economic independence. Therefore at one end, you have political independence, at the other the economic. It has two other ends. One of them is moral and social; the corresponding end is *dharma*, i.e. religion in the highest sense of the word. It contains Hinduism, Islam, Christianity, etc., but is Larger to them all. You may recognize it through the name of Truth that pervades everything and will survive all destruction and all transformation. Moral and social uplift may be recognized through the word we are used to, i.e. non-violence. Let us call this the square of *swaraj*, which will be out of form if any of its angles is untrue. In the language of the Congress, we cannot achieve this political and economic freedom without truth and non-violence, in concrete words without faith in God and hence, moral and social elevation.

Independence and Parliamentary Swaraj

The first component of Gandhi's conception of *swaraj* since outward freedom is national political independence. He made a greater contribution than any other single individual to the

transfer of political authority from the imperial government to the Indian national leadership. He is rightly described the 'Father of the Nation'. While maintaining that national political independence was an essential meaning of his conception of *swaraj*, Gandhi argued that it is only an incomplete or partial meaning or component of it. In his view, a fuller or deeper conception of *swaraj* 'is infinitely greater than and contains independence.' That fuller conception of *swaraj* contains, besides national political independence, the following additional components: a 'parliamentary or democratic *swaraj*' and *swaraj* since self-realization by service to others.

In 1931, Gandhi declared that he was 'wedded to adult suffrage.' On another occasion, he said: 'Swaraj of a people means the sum total of the *swaraj* of individuals.' He elaborated it in the following terms:

Through *Swaraj* I mean the government of India through the consent of the people since ascertained through the main number of the adult population, male or female, native-born or domiciled.... [R]eal *swaraj* will approach not through the acquisition of power through some but through the acquisition of the capability through all to resist power when it is abused. In other terms, *swaraj* is to be obtained through educating the masses to a sense of their capability to regulate and manage power.

What is conveyed in the above passages is a model of what Gandhi described 'parliamentary or democratic *swaraj*,' for the

achievement of which, he devoted a considerable section of his political job. In *Hind Swaraj*, Gandhi had taken a very negative view of the value or role of the organizations of contemporary culture, namely, the parliament, law-courts, the police, the military, machinery, hospitals, railways, etc. These organizations of contemporary culture, he said, were divorced from morality, whereas, through contrast, 'the tendency of Indian culture is to elevate the moral being.' In lay of the organizations of contemporary western culture, he put forward an alternative ideal of 'real house rule ... [namely] self-rule and self-manage' through the individuals in accordance with the spiritual values of truth and non-violence.

Though, within a year of his active involvement in mobilizing the Indian masses into the freedom thrash about, Gandhi made an incomplete revision of his earlier views on the organizations of contemporary culture. That revision was due not only to his active involvement in the freedom thrash about, but also to the criticisms which several political thinkers and political leaders had made of Gandhi's booklet. At any rate, within in relation to the a year of his final return to India from South Africa in 1915, Gandhi came to adopt a rather positive attitude towards the organizations of contemporary life, including the parliament, law-courts, machinery, railways and hospitals. Rather than dismissing them outright since he had done in his *Hind Swaraj*, he now reluctantly incorporated them in what he described his 'pardonable programme for the achievement of parliamentary swaraj.' He said that his *Hind Swaraj* was to be taken, not since 'an effort to go back to the therefore-described ignorant dark

ages', but since an effort to analyze contemporary culture 'in the level of ethics.' He declared that in the name of his ideal swaraj, he would *not* dream, since he had been accused of doing, 'of no railways, no machinery, no army, no navy, no laws and no law courts.' He would rather have them re-structured therefore that they operate 'for the benefit of the people,' and 'not since now for draining the masses arid.' He now viewed 'parliamentary', i.e., 'democratic swaraj' since an extremely necessary and precious component of his conception of comprehensive swaraj.

'Therefore distant since I can see,' he wrote in 1920, 'Swaraj will be a Parliament chosen through the people with the fullest authority in excess of fund, the police, the military, the navy, the courts and the educational organizations.'

Since to the organizational characteristics of 'parliamentary swaraj,' Gandhi preferred it to be a village-based, decentralized set-up, in which all but the lowest stage of government was to be indirectly elected through the immediately lower stage. This decentralized, village-based model of parliamentary/democratic swaraj was not the model that was favored through the Congress and adopted through the Indian Constitution. The Constitution, though, does incorporate few therefore-described Gandhian organizations such since the village panchayats. Moreover, the personal and civil liberties since well since the democratic rights component of the liberal-democratic political philosophy of the Constitution are vital to Gandhi's own moral-political philosophy.

Few Characteristics of Parliamentary Swaraj

In his practical and theoretical job for establishing Parliamentary Swaraj, Gandhi concentrated on endowing it with four characteristics: universal adult franchise, civil liberties, minority rights, and a primary commitment to justice for the poor and the exploited. These, he whispered, are the necessary ingredients of parliamentary swaraj. Gandhi regarded personal and civil liberties to be the 'basis' and 'breath' of Parliamentary Swaraj. In a speech before the all India Congress Committee in September 1940, he said, 'Freedom of speech and pen is the basis of Swaraj'. It is the 'only means', he added, for the non-violent method of attaining swaraj.

The well-known Karachi Settlement of the Congress on Fundamental Rights which was drafted through Jawaharlal Nehru, in consultation with Gandhi, was moved for adoption through Gandhi himself who included several suggestions and revisions made through Gandhi. In fact, Gandhi was the mover of the settlement. The settlement incorporated a mainly impressive list of personal and civil liberties and democratic, political rights.

Regarding the primacy of personal and civil liberties, Gandhi wrote:

Civil liberty constant with the observance of non-violence is the first step towards Swaraj. It is the basis of freedom. And there is no room there for dilution or compromise. It is the water of life. I have never heard of water being diluted.

Now, let us turn to the Minority Rights component of the Gandhian conception of Parliamentary Swaraj. Gandhi was acutely aware of the danger of parliamentary democracy lapsing into majoritarian tyranny in excess of, or intolerance of, minority clusters or societies. While he held resolutely to the procedural, majority rule principle of democratic government, he was equally committed to its other, twin or inseparable principle, namely the principle of the guarantee or defense of fundamental, cultural or religious rights of minority societies. In 1931, he said:

It has been said that Indian Swaraj will be the rule of the majority society, i.e., the Hindus. There could not be a greater mistake than that. If it were to be true, I for one would refuse to call it swaraj and would fight it with all the strength at my command, for, to me *Hind Swaraj* is the rule of all the people, is the rule of justice. Whether under that rule the ministers were Hindus or Mussalmans or Sikhs, and whether the legislatures were exclusively filled through the Hindus or Mussalmans or any other society, they would have to do even-handed justice. And ... no society in India require have any fear of Swaraj being monopolised through any othe.

Gandhi maintained that 'matters of first rate importance' to the religious and cultural life of the minority societies should be kept outside the purview of the democratic, procedural principle of majority rule. Extremely insightfully, he wrote:

Democracy is not a state in which people act like sheep. Under democracy, individual liberty of opinion and action is jealously

guarded. I, so, consider that the minority has a perfect right to act differently from the majority.

The golden rule of conduct ... is mutual toleration, seeing that since suggested, never all think similar and we see *Truth* in fragment and from dissimilar angles of vision. Conscience is not the similar item for all. Whilst, so, it is a good guide for individual conduct, imposition of that conduct upon all will be an insufferable interference with everybody's freedom of conscience.

An extremely special characteristic of Gandhi's conception of parliamentary/democratic swaraj is the justice of its vital organizations, which seeks to promote the welfare of all through giving primacy to the interests of the poor and needy. 'A non-violent organization of government,' he said, 'is clearly impossibility therefore extensive since the wide gulf flanked by the rich and the hungry millions persists.' Let us quote him again:

Economic equality...is the master key to non-violent independence. It means the leveling down of the some rich in whose hands is concentrated the bulk of the nation's wealth, on the one hand and a leveling up of the semi-starved naked millions on the other. A non-violent organization of government is clearly impossibility therefore extensive since the wide gulf flanked by the rich and the hungry millions persists.

Gandhi often spoke of his ideal of swaraj since 'the poor man's swaraj.' At the time of independence in 1947, he advised his countrymen to adopt a preferential come to the poor not merely

at the public-policy stage, but at the personal stage since well. He said:

I will provide you a talisman. Whenever you are in doubt, or when the self becomes too much with you, apply the following test. Recall the side of the poorest and the weakest man whom you may have seen, and inquire yourself if the step you contemplate is going to be of any exploit to him. Will he gain anything through it? Will it restore him to manage in excess of his own life and destiny? In other terms, will it lead to swaraj for the hungry and spiritually starving millions?

Gandhi's conception of social/distributive justice, which he often referred to in words of 'economic excellence,' is rooted in his trusteeship doctrine of property. He whispered that statutory trusteeship is a shape of organizing economic life, which, without depriving the individuals of their legitimate incentives for greater productivity and without depriving the society of the increases in wealth, brings in relation to the a non-violent, equitable sharing of wealth. In March 1946, Gandhi wrote: 'Supposing India becomes a free country tomorrow, all the capitalists will have an opportunity of becoming statutory trustees.' He further stated:

Since for the present owners of wealth, they would have to create their choice flanked by class-war and voluntarily converting themselves into trustees of their wealth. They would be allowed to retain the stewardship of their possessions and to exploit their talent to augment the wealth, not for their own sake but for the sake of the nation and so, without use. The state would regulate

the rate of commission which they would get commensurate with the service rendered and its value to society. Their children would inherit the stewardship only if they proved their fitness for it.

In an article entitled 'Theory of Trusteeship', Gandhi wrote:

I am not ashamed to own that several capitalists are friendly towards me and do not fear me. They know that I desire to end capitalism approximately, if not quite, since much since the mainly advanced socialist or even the communist. But our ways differ, our words differ. My theory of 'trusteeship' is no makeshift, certainly no camouflage. I am confident that it will survive all theories. It has the sanction of philosophy and religion behind it.

Sarvodaya: Swaraj since Self-Realization by Social Service

Let us begin this part through noting that while *swaraj* conveys Gandhi's thought of freedom, *sarvodaya* conveys his thought of equality. We may also note that Gandhi's doctrine of sarvodaya is a corrective to utilitarianism, communism and the doctrines which justify inequalities and exclusions on the foundation of caste, race, color, gender, etc. 'Sarvodaya' is the title, which Gandhi gave to his paraphrase of John Ruskin's *Unto This Last*. In that book, Ruskin gave a moralistic critique of the science of political economy of self-interest. He brought out the role of 'social affection' in our lives. Reading Ruskin brought in relation

to the 'an instantaneous and practical transformation' of Gandhi's life. He learned three lessons from Ruskin's book, namely:

That the good of the individual is contained in the good of all;

That a lawyer's job has the similar value since the barber's in since much since all have the similar right of earning their living from their job; and

That a life of labour, i.e., the life of the tiller of the soil and the handicraftsman is the life worth livelihood. Of these three principles, the first is the largest principle of *sarvodaya*. It is also the source of the other two principles. Gandhi clarified that he had recognized the first principle before reading Ruskin's book, which only served to confirm it and provide it a contemporary articulation. A good trade of Gandhi's ideas on *sarvodaya* were derived, since in the case of *swaraj*, from the holy books of Hinduism. There are many steps in Gandhi's thinking on *sarvodaya*. They are:

Our aim in life is self-realization or *moksha*. Self-realization or *moksha* means identification of the self or *atman* with *Brahman* or God. This needs a discipline or *yoga* of self-purification.

The method of realizing our identification with *Brahman* or, in other terms, the method of finding God is to see God in all his making or manifestation. Love or service of all is the method to self-realization or *moksha* in this world.

Conveying these ideas, Gandhi wrote since follows:

Man's ultimate aim is the realization of God, and all his behaviors, political, social and religious, have to be guided through the ultimate aim of the vision of God... The immediate service of all human beings becomes a necessary section of the Endeavour basically because the only method to discover God is to see Him in His making and be one with it. This can only be done through the service of all.

I am impatient to realize myself, to attain *moksha* in this extremely subsistence. My national service is section of my training for freeing my soul from the bondage of flesh. Therefore measured, my service may be regarded since purely selfish. For me, the road to salvation lies by incessant toil in the service of my country and there by, of humanity.

Gandhi derived several of these ideas from the holy books of Hinduism. In them, he establish a clear enunciation of the value of 'disciplined rule from within,' which he understood to be the 'root meaning' of *swaraj*. He wrote:

The root meaning of *swaraj* is self-rule. *Swaraj* may, so, be rendered since disciplined rule from within.... 'Independence' has no such limitation. Independence may mean license to do since you like. *Swaraj* is positive. Independence is negative.... The term *swaraj* is a sacred term, a Vedic term, meaning self-rule and self-restraint, and not freedom from all restraint which 'independence' often means.

Gandhi interpreted the *Bhagavad Gita* since depicting the futility of war and violence. Besides non-violence and truth, the other principles of morality which the *Gita* teaches are: *tapas, dana and yajna*. He saw a 'gospel of service' in the third chapter of the *Bhagavad Gita*. It taught him to desire the welfare of others. In his *Discourses on the Gita*, he *pointed* out that the Lord or Brahman dwells in all, including 'the lame, the crippled and the afflicted.' On the thought of service to all, Gandhi was also deeply convinced through his parents, the teachings of the Vaishnava saint-poets, especially, Narsinh Mehta, and the scripts of Ruskin and the non-conformist Christians, especially Leo Tolstoy. Gandhi whispered that without self-restraint or self-purification, we could not render moksha-oriented service to others. Refuting the charge that these are ideals for the ascetics, he said that they are meant 'for acceptance through mankind in common.' He wrote:

No worker who has not overcome lust can hope to render any genuine service to the reason of Harijans, communal unity, Khadi, cow-defense or village reconstruction. Great reasons like these cannot be served through intellectual equipment alone; they call for spiritual attempt or soul-force.

Gandhi, the terrain on which the relationship flanked by one's moksharealization and one's disinterested service of all takes lay is the field of politics; namely, the field of 'toil in the service of my country and there through of humanity.' This relationship flanked by moksha-realization and service-centered politics was a consistent theme in Gandhi's scripts and public job.

Appropriately, he concluded his *Autobiography* with the following report:

To see the universal and all-pervading Spirit of Truth side to side, one necessity be able to love the meanest of making since oneself. And a man who aspires after that cannot afford to stay out of any field of life. That is why my devotion to Truth has drawn me into the field of politics; and I can say without the slightest hesitation, and yet in all humility, that those who say that religion has nothing to do with politics do not know what religion means. Identification with everything that lives is impossible without self-purification; without self-purification, the observance of the law of ahimsa necessity remain an empty dream.

In a 'Foreword' he wrote to *Gokhale's Speeches*, Gandhi urged the *sadhus, rishis, munis, maulvis* and priests to become *political sanyasis*. He also described upon political workers to become spiritually and morally occupied. In his 'Last Will and Testament', he recommended the disbanding of the existing Congress system and its flowering into a Lok Sevak Sangh. He wished that its members would, thereby, devote themselves to the remaining tasks of the programme of swaraj and sarvodaya, which he delineated since follows:

India has still to attain social, moral, and economic independence in words of its seven hundred thousand villages since distinguished from its municipalities and cities. Gandhi also stipulated that the *loksevaks* would abjure untouchability

and necessity consider in 'the ideal of inter-communal unity, equal respect and regard for all religions and equality of opportunity and status for all irrespective of race, creed or sex.' Gandhi's moral-political conception of sarvodaya is a corrective both to Western utilitarianism and to the inequalities and exclusions of the traditional caste organization. His critique of utilitarianism can be establish in his Introduction to his *Sarvodaya*, which was his paraphrase of Ruskins's book, *Unto This Last*. Gandhi wrote:

People in the West usually hold that the entire duty of man is to promote the happiness of the majority of mankind, and happiness is supposed to mean only physical happiness and economic prosperity. If the laws of morality are broken in the conquest of this happiness, it does not matter extremely much. Again, since the substance sought to be attained is the happiness of the majority, westerners do not think there is any harm if this is secured through sacrificing a minority. The consequences of this row of thinking are writ big on the side of Europe.

In 1926, Gandhi brought out the variation flanked by utilitarianism and sarvodaya in the following terms:

A votary of ahimsa cannot subscribe to the utilitarian formula. He will strive for the greatest good of all and die in the effort to realize the ideal. He will so be willing to die, therefore that the others may live. He will serve himself with the rest, through himself dying. The greatest good of all inevitably contains the good of the greatest number, and so, he and the utilitarian will

converge in several points in their career, but there does approach a time when they necessity section company, and even job in opposite directions. The utilitarian to be logical will never sacrifice himself. The absolutist will even sacrifice himself.

Satyagraha versus Passive Resistance

Satyagraha is the name of the Gandhian, non-violent method of political action to resist and change untruthful and violent organizations of social or political authority. Throughout 1906-14, Gandhi successfully used such a method of political action to resist the policy of racial discrimination, which the British colonial government of South Africa had adopted against the Indian immigrants. In India, he led several regional satyagraha campaigns, few notable ones being those of Champaran, Ahmedabad, Vaikom, Bardoli and Kheda. He also led a number of all-India satyagraha movements, beginning with the one against the Rowlatt Act in 1919.

Gandhi acknowledged that his theory of satyagraha was convinced too little extent through Henry David Thoreau's scripts. In Thoreau, 'On the Duty of Civil Disobedience', Gandhi establish confirmation of his views on coercive characteristics of state and on the individual's obligation to his own conscience. 'From Thoreau and Ruskin', Gandhi wrote, 'I could discover out arguments in favor of our fight.' Gandhi's initial struggles against racial discriminations in South Africa were called since 'Passive Resistance'. But, he soon establish the English word to be unsatisfactory, partly because it was not intelligible to ordinary

Indians and partly because it did not convey the special feature of his way of political thrash about. Hence, in 1906, he invited the readers of his weekly, *Indian Opinion*, to suggest an alternative name. The best of the suggestions received was *sadagraha*, meaning 'firmness in a good reason.' Gandhi changed it to *satyagraha* since it conveyed his preferred thought of 'truth force' He explained his choice in the following terms:

Truth implies love, and firmness engenders and so serves since a synonym for force. I therefore began to call the Indian movement '*satyagraha*' that is to say, the force which is born to Truth and Love or non-violence, and gave up the exploit of the phrase 'passive resistance.'

Gandhi distinguished flanked by body-force = brute-force = the force of arms from soul force = love force = truth force. He referred to the former since the way of violence, which, he said, is celebrated in and through contemporary culture. Satyagraha, he said, relies on soul-force or truth-force and is suitable to **swaraj**. He wrote:

Satyagraha.... is a way of securing rights through personal suffering; it is the reverse of resistance through arms. When I refuse to do an item that is repugnant to my conscience, I exploit soul-force. For example, the Government of the day has passed a law, which is applicable to me. I do not like it. If through by violence I force the Government to repeal the law, I am employing what may be termed body-force. If I do not obey the law and accept the penalty for its breach, I exploit soul-force. It involves

sacrifice of self. Gandhi, satyagraha was both practically necessary and morally desirable for the Indian Freedom Movement. He said that as the 'English are splendidly armed'; it would take several, several years for the Indians to arm themselves in a matching or effective manner. More than this practical difficulty, Gandhi disapproved of the immorality of the way of violence. He pointed out that 'to arm India on a big level is to Europeanize it' or, in other terms, to continue to be seduced through the morally flawed contemporary European culture. Gandhi, the distinctive characteristics of satyagraha, in comparison with 'passive resistance,' are since follows:

- While the passive resisters harbor hatred toward their adversaries, the satyagrahis view their opponents with love.
- The passive resisters, unlike the satyagrahis, may harass and injure their opponents.
- Satyagrha, unlike passive resistance, can be offered even to one's adjacent and dearest ones.

Passive resistance is a resistance through the weak and helpless, and it does not exclude the exploit of violence, whereas satyagraha is a moral-political action through the strong, and it excludes the exploit of violence. Believing themselves to be weak, the passive resisters would tend to provide up the thrash about at the earliest opportunity. 'On the other hand,' Gandhi wrote, 'if we offer satyagraha believing ourselves to be strong, two clear consequences follow. Fostering the thought of strength, we grow stronger and stronger every day. With the augment in our

strength, our satyagraha too becomes more effective and we would never be casting in relation to for an opportunity to provide it up.'

Few Evaluative Comments on Satyagraha

Regarding Gandhi's theory and praxis of *satyagraha*, many critics uphold that non-violence and self-suffering are impractical ways against violent oppression. The Gandhian method, they method, is 'other-worldly' and 'anti-humanist'. Gandhi maintained that non-violence and self-suffering were 'not for the unworldly, but essentially for the worldly.' He did admit that these principles were extremely hard to practice, but insisted that we require to, and can, stay on moving beside these rows. 'Perfect non-violence whilst you are inhabiting the body, he wrote, 'is only a theory like Euclid's point or straight row, but we have to Endeavour every moment of our lives'. Gandhi rightly maintained that it is desirable and possible to bring in relation to the predominantly non-violent society.

It may still be objected that *satyagraha* demands of the satyagrahis, self-suffering even unto death. It is true that self-suffering is a biggest unit of satyagraha. Though, self-sacrifice is also involved in case of violent resistance. Sacrifice even unto death is, therefore, the general unit in both violent and non-violent resistance against oppression. That is why Gandhi approved of the exploit of satyagraha only in cases of clash in excess of fundamental issues and only after all milder ways of nonviolence have failed. 'I should be deeply distressed,' he wrote

in 1921, 'if on every conceivable occasion every one of us were to be a law unto oneself and to scrutinize in golden levels every action of our future National Assembly. I would surrender my judgment in mainly matters to national representatives.' But when a situation of violent oppression persists even after all milder ways of non-violent resistance have been tried, Gandhi maintained that self-suffering even unto death of the nonviolent fighter for truth is a bigger assertion of individual freedom than is the death in- defeat of the violent resister.

Gandhi has himself given many explanations of the merits of the satyagraha method of political resistance and social transformation, in comparison with the ways of violence. In 1924, reacting to rumors that he was likely to be invited to visit the Soviet Union, Gandhi wrote:

I do not consider in short violent cuts to success. Those Bolshevik friends who are bestowing their attention on me should realize that though much I may sympathies with and admire worthy motives, I am an uncompromising opponent of violent ways even to serve the noblest of reasons. There is so, really no meeting ground flanked by the school of violence and myself.

Two years later, Gandhi gave the following account of the real variation flanked by violent and non-violent ways:

My non-violent resistance is activated resistance on a dissimilar plane. Nonviolent resistance to evil does not mean absence of any resistance whatsoever, but it means not to resist evil with evil

but with good. Resistance so, is transferred to a higher and absolutely effective plane.

Leo Tolstoy's *The Kingdom of God is Within You* exerted a tremendous power on Gandhi's views on the repressive character of the contemporary state and his commitment to non-violent resistance. Gandhi acknowledged that reading Tolstoy made him realize the 'infinite possibilities of universal love' and made him a 'firm believer in ahimsa'. Gandhi and Tolstoy corresponded with each other. In his last letter to Gandhi, Tolstoy acknowledged that his satyagraha movement in South Africa was a new and mainly significant manner of emancipator thrash about through the oppressed. Like Tolstoy, Einstein too has written in deep appreciation of Gandhian satyagraha. In a tribute published in a *festschrift* for Gandhi's seventieth birthday, he wrote:

Gandhi is unique in political history. He has invented an entirely new and humane technique for the liberation thrash about of an oppressed people and accepted it out with the greatest power and devotion. The moral power which he has exercised upon thinking people by the civilized world may be distant more durable than would seem likely in our present age with its exaggeration of brute force. For the job of statesmen is permanent only in therefore distant since they arouse and consolidate the moral forces of their peoples by their personal instance and educating power.

Marxism

Marxism usually refers to the ideas of the German philosopher, Karl Marx. But Marxism does not mean exclusively the ideas of Marx. It contains the ideas of Marx, Friedrich Engels and their supporters, who call themselves Marxists. Therefore, Marxism refers to the body of ideas, which predominantly contains the ideas of Karl Marx. Marxism is a livelihood philosophy. Marxist thinkers are continuously contributing to the philosophy of Marxism. Therefore, it is said that Marx is dead, but Marxism is still alive. The Marxist philosophy lived even before the birth of Karl Marx. This is the cause David McLellan has written three volumes on Marxism, viz., *Marxism before Marx; Idea of Karl Marx* and *Marxism after Marx*. Similarly, the Polish thinker Leszek Kolakowski has authored three volumes on Marxism. The point once again is that Marxism does not mean only the ideas of Karl Marx.

Utopian and Scientific Socialism

Since said earlier, Marxism lived before Marx. These are recognized since the early socialist thinkers. Karl Marx calls them Utopian Socialists. They were utopian, because their diagnosis of the social ills was correct, but their remedy was wrong. It was impracticable, and so, they were described utopian. The world 'utopia' was derived from a novel of Thomas Moore titled, 'Utopia.' It refers to an imaginary island, described Utopia, where a perfect socio-economic- political organization lived. There was no use and people were happy. Few significant utopian

socialist thinkers are Robert Owen, Charles Fourier, Louis Blanc, Saint Simon, Sismondi and Proudhon. Marx calls his socialism since 'Scientific Socialism'. It is scientific, because it offers the economic interpretation of history through by the scientific methodology of dialectical materialism. It explains not only the true reasons of use, but also offers the scientific remedy of revolution and dictatorship of the proletariat to cure the social ills of use. It not only offers scientific causes for class division and also thrash about in society, but also gives for a scientific mechanism to set up a classless and use less society.

Evolutionary and Revolutionary Socialism

Socialism is further divided into evolutionary and revolutionary socialism. Evolutionary socialism does not consider in revolution and wants to attain socialism by peaceful means. Evolutionary Socialists have faith in parliamentary democracy and want to bring social change by the ballot. They eschew violence and therefore, are opposed to a violent revolution. They also do not subscribe to the dictatorship of the proletariat and advocate a peaceful democratic transition from a class divided to a classless society. Fabian Socialism, Guild Socialism, Democratic Socialism are all several kinds of evolutionary socialism.

Revolutionary socialism, on the other hand, believes in class thrash about, revolution and the dictatorship of the proletariat. Social change cannot be peaceful. It has to be violent. A peaceful revolution is a contradiction in words. Revolution is the midwife of social change, and this revolution necessity be violent.

Revolutionary Marxism is usually recognized with the scientific socialism of Karl Marx. Syndicalism is also a kind of revolutionary socialism.

Evolutionary socialism also traces its roots from the ideas of Karl Marx and Engels. They have talked in relation to the withering absent of the state. Exponents of evolutionary socialism have picked up the theory of withering absent of the state, and argued that slowly by peaceful means, social change can be effected and an exploitation less and classless society can be recognized. Though, the critics of evolutionary socialism do not accept this thesis, and argue that the thought of withering absent of the state applies only to the socialist state or the dictatorship of the proletariat and not to the capitalist state. It will never wither absent. It has to be smashed by a violent revolution. So, the logic of evolutionary socialism is flawed.

Vital Principles of Marxism

The vital tenets of Marxism are the following: dialectical materialism, historical materialism, the theory of surplus value, class struggle, revolution, dictatorship of the proletariat and communism.

Dialectical Materialism

Dialectical materialism is the scientific methodology urbanized through Marx and Engels for the interpretation of history. Here, Marx has borrowed heavily from his precursors, particularly, the

German philosopher Hegel. Dialectics is an extremely old methodology, employed to discover truth through exposing contradictions, by a conflict of opposite ideas. Hegel refined it through developing the trilogy of thesis, anti-thesis and synthesis. It is popularly recognized since the *Dialectical Triad*. Progress or development takes lay by the dialectical procedure. At every level of development, it is characterized through contradictions. These contradictions induce further changes, progress, and growth. The thesis is challenged through its anti-thesis. Both include units of truth and falsehood. Truth is permanent, but falsehood is transitory. In the ensuing clash of the thesis and the anti-thesis, the truth remnants, but the false units are destroyed. These false units constitute contradictions. The true units of both the thesis and the anti-thesis are fused jointly in a synthesis. This evolved synthesis throughout the course of time becomes a thesis and therefore, it is again challenged through its opposite anti-thesis, which again results in a synthesis. This procedure of thesis, antithesis, and synthesis continues until the level of perfection is reached. In this evolutionary procedure, a level will approach, when there will be no false units. These will be destroyed at dissimilar levels of development. It will constitute the perfect level and there will be no contradictions and therefore, there will be no further development. The dialectical procedure will approach to an end after arriving at the perfect truth. It is the contradictions, which move the dialectical procedure and a complete elimination of contradictions spots the end of the dialectical procedure itself. For materialism, Marx is highly indebted to the French school of materialism, largely the French materialist thinker Ludwig

Feuerbach. It is the matter, which is the ultimate reality and not the thought. The latter is a reflection of the former. How we earn our bread determines our ideas. It is not the consciousness of men that determines their subsistence but, on the contrary, it is their social subsistence that determines their consciousness. Marx has observed that 'Hegel's dialectics was standing on its head and I have put it on its feet'. Hegel has urbanized dialectical idealism. For him, it is the thought, which ultimately matters. Thought lies in the foundation or the sub-building, which determines everything in the superstructure. Society, polity, economy are in this superstructure which is formed through the prevalent dominant ideas of the age. Ultimately it is the thought, which matters, and the other things are only its reflection. Marx replaced thought with matter. According to Marx, the material or the economic forces are in the substructure and the thought is a section of the superstructure. Thought is the reflection of material forces. The economic forces determine the thought and not vice versa. Therefore, Marx has reversed the location of thought and matter. This is the cause that he claims that 'in Hegel it was upside down and I have corrected it'.

The foundation or the substructure consists of the forces of manufacture and the dealings of manufacture. These two jointly constitute the manner of manufacture. When there is a change in the forces of manufacture because of growth in technology, it brings changes in the dealings of manufacture. Therefore, a change in the manner of manufacture brings a corresponding change in the superstructure. Society, polity, religion, morals,

values, norms, etc. are a section of the superstructure and formed through the manner of manufacture.

Historical Materialism

Historical materialism is the application of dialectical materialism to the interpretation of history. It is the economic interpretation of world history through applying the Marxian methodology of dialectical materialism. The world history has been divided into four levels: primitive communism, the slavery organization, feudalism and capitalism. Primitive communism refers to the earliest section of human history. It was a property less, exploitation less, classless and stateless society. Means of manufacture were backward, because technology was undeveloped. The society owned the means of manufacture. They were not under private ownership and therefore there was no use. Stone made hunting weapons, the fishing net and hooks were the means of manufacture. The whole society owned these. Manufacture was limited and meant for self-consumption. There was no surplus manufacture and therefore there was no private property. As there was no private property, there was no use. As there was no use, there was no class division. As there was no class division, there was no class thrash about. As there was no class thrash about, there was no state. It was, therefore, a communist society, but of a primitive kind. However life was hard, it was characterized through the absence of use, clash and thrash about. Technology is not static; it evolves continuously. Technical growth results in the improvement of manufacture. This leads to surplus manufacture, which results in the

emergence of private property. Means of manufacture are now not under the society, but private ownership. Society is, therefore, divided into property owning and property less classes. Through virtue of the ownership of the means of manufacture, the property owning class exploits the property less class. Class division in society and use lead to class thrash about. As there is class thrash about, the dominant class that is the property owning class creates an organization described the state to suppress the dissent of the dependent class that is the property less class. Therefore, the state is a class instrument and a coercive organization. It protects the interests of its creator that is the property owning class.

In the beginning, this society is divided into masters and slaves. Masters are the haves and the slaves are the have notes. The slaves carry out the entire manufacture job. The masters live on the labour of slaves. They use the slaves and whenever the slaves resent, the state comes to the rescue of the masters. Therefore, the state serves the interests of the master class. It uses its coercive powers to suppress the voice of the slaves. The slave organization is succeeded through feudalism. Technical growth leads to changes in the means of manufacture and this brings in relation to the corresponding changes in the dealings of manufacture and the superstructure. The slave organization is replaced through the feudal manner of manufacture and it is reflected in the society, polity, morality and the value organization. The division of society into feudal lords and peasants characterizes feudalism. The feudal lords own the means of manufacture, that is land, but the peasants carry out

the manufacture job. Through virtue of ownership of the land, the feudal lords get a vast share of the produce without doing anything. Therefore, the feudal lords are like parasites, which thrive on the labour of peasants. Feudal lords use the peasants and if the peasants ever resist their use, their resistance is ruthlessly crushed through the state, which protects and serves the interests of the feudal lords. The peasants are a dependent and exploited class, whereas the lords are a dominant and exploiting class.

Capitalism succeeds feudalism. Technical growth continues and therefore there is change in the forces of manufacture, which leads to a mismatch flanked by the forces of manufacture and the dealings of manufacture, which is resolved by a bourgeois revolution. Therefore the contradiction flanked by the forces of manufacture and the dealings of manufacture is resolved. The feudal manner of manufacture is replaced through the capitalist manner of manufacture. Division of society into the bourgeois and the proletariat class characterizes capitalism. The bourgeois class owns the means of manufacture, but the proletariat class carries out the manufacture. Proletariats are the industrial workers. They sell their labour in lieu of meager wages. It is usually an existence wage, which is enough only to support them and their families, therefore that an uninterrupted supply of labour force can be maintained. Manufacture is not for consumption through the self, but for profit. The desire to maximize profit leads to a reduction in wages and a rise in working hours. This further deteriorates the lot of the working class, which is eventually pushed into a situation, where it has

nothing to loose except for its chains. This paves the method for the proletariat revolution.

Theory of Surplus Value

Marx has urbanized the theory of surplus value to explain the use in the capitalist society. Here, Marx was convinced through the theories of classical economists. He subscribed to the labour theory of value. The value of a commodity is determined through the amount of labour consumed in its manufacture. Labour is also a commodity. It can be bought and sold like other commodities. Out of the four factors of manufacture, labour is the mainly basic. In its absence, the other factors of manufacture are useless. Land, capital and system are the other factors of manufacture. It is the application of labour to these factors of manufacture, which makes them productive. In the absence of labour, they are sterile.

If a wage is paid in proportion to the amount of value created through a laborer, then there is no use, But this is not the case in capitalism. Labour is unique in the sense that it creates more value than is required for its maintenance. The variation flanked by the value created through the worker and the value paid to the worker, since wages, constitute the surplus value and the profit of the capitalist. For example, if a worker has created a value of say Rs. 25,000 in a month and has been paid Rs. 15,000 since wages, then the remaining Rs. 10,000 will constitute the profit of the capitalist. Therefore, the worker always creates more value than he is actually paid. This surplus value created through the

worker is the profit of the bourgeois, which has been defended through the classical economist, because it leads to capital accumulation, which is invested further in new industries and enterprises and leads to development and prosperity. For the Marxists, it is the use of the workers, which has to be abolished.

With the development of capitalism and the rise in competition, the wages of the workers continue to fall and reach the level of existence stage. Existence wage is the minimum possible wage; beyond this the wage cannot be reduced. It is the minimum possible wage for the subsistence and perpetuation of the labour force. Therefore, cut throat competition in capitalism leads to deterioration of the lot of the proletariat. This intensifies class thrash about and eventually leads to revolution.

Class Thrash about

According to Marx, the history of all hitherto existing society has been the history of class thrash about. Except for the primitive communist level, all historical ages have been characterized through the antagonism flanked by the dominant and dependent classes or the haves and the have notes. This antagonism is caused through class contradictions; it is the result of use through the property owning class of the property less class. During history, there have been two contending classes in every epoch. In the slavery organization, they were the masters and the slaves, in feudalism, the feudal lords and the peasants and in capitalism, the bourgeois and the proletariat. The masters, the feudal lords and the bourgeois are the owners of the means of

manufacture. Though, it is the slaves, the peasants and the proletariat, who carry out manufacture, but their produce is taken absent through their exploiters and in return, they are given presently sufficient for their subsistence. Through virtue of the ownership of the means of manufacture, the property owning class exploits the property less class. This is the largest source and reason of class thrash about. The interests of the contending classes are irreconcilable. No compromise or rapprochement is possible flanked by the contending classes. The inherent contradictions of contending classes of every epoch can be resolved only by the annihilation of the exploiting classes.

Revolution

Class thrash about paves the method for revolution. Class thrash about is imperceptible, but revolution is perceptible. Intensification of class thrash about prepares the ground for revolution. Class thrash about is an extensive drawn affair, but revolution is short, swift and violent. In the terms of Marx, 'revolution is the indispensable mid-wife of social change'. Transition from one historical level to another occurs by revolution. Feudal revolution brought an end to the slavery organization; the bourgeois revolution ended feudalism and the proletariat revolution will bring an end to capitalism. Therefore, any epoch creation social change is always brought in relation to the through a revolution. Revolution occurs when there is incompatibility flanked by the means or forces of manufacture and the dealings of manufacture. To resolve this incompatibility, revolution occurs, which brings corresponding changes in the

dealings of manufacture and the superstructure to create it compatible with the forces or means of manufacture. Technical growth brings changes in the means of manufacture. The handbill provides you a society with the feudal lord, and the steam-mill, a society with the industrial capitalist.

Proletarian revolution will be the last revolution in the annals of history. Revolution occurs to resolve contradictions. Therefore revolution will not take lay, if there is no contradiction in society. After the proletarian revolution, there will not be any further revolution, because there will be no contradiction. Though, revolution will take lay only when the forces of manufacture have fully matured. Revolution cannot be advanced or postponed. It will happen when the forces of manufacture have matured and do not match the dealings of manufacture. Revolution brings an end to this mismatch. The sequence and direction of social development cannot be changed. No level can overleap other level. No level can be short-circuited. Primitive communism will lead to the slavery organization, the slavery organization to feudalism and feudalism to capitalism. Dictatorship of the proletariat or socialism will succeed capitalism, which is the penultimate level of social development. Dictatorship of the proletariat will eventually lead to the establishment of communism. With the proletarian revolution, revolution itself will approach to an end.

Dictatorship of the Proletariat

The proletariat revolution will lead to the establishment of the dictatorship of the proletariat. It is also recognized since the *socialist state*. The state tools created through the bourgeois to oppress the proletariat will be taken in excess of through the proletariat themselves. Now, the table will be turned and the proletariat will exploit the state tools against the bourgeois. The bourgeois will attempt to level a counter-revolution to restore the old organization and therefore, the coercive organizations of the state are needed to restrain the bourgeois.

The state has always been the instrument of oppression. The dominant class to oppress the dependent class has created the state. It is a class instrument. The state protects and serves the interests of its creator, which is the property owning class. This class has always been in a minority, whether it is the masters or the feudal lords or the capitalists. Therefore, a minority has been oppressing a majority viz., the slaves or the peasants or the proletariat by the coercive organs of the state. Under the dictatorship of the proletariat, for the first time the state comes under manage of the majority. Now, for the first time, the state's coercive tools is used through the majority against the minority.

According to Marx, all states have been dictatorships and therefore the socialist state is no exception. It is also a dictatorship. The state has always been used through one class to suppress the other class. In the socialist state, the proletariat class will exploit the coercive organs of the state such since the

army, the police, prison, judicial organization etc., against the bourgeois class. Marx argues that if democracy means the rule of the majority, then the proletariat state is the mainly democratic state, because for the first time in the annals of history, authority comes into the hands of the majority. Before the proletariat state, authority has always been in the hands of the minority. Therefore if majority rule is the criterion, then only the proletariat state can be described a democratic state.

Communism

Under the livelihood care of the dictatorship of the proletariat, the socialist state will blossom forth into communism. Socialism is a transitory level. It will pave the method for the eventual emergence of communism. Which is stable and permanent? This will be the stage of social development. After the establishment of communism, there will be no further social change. The dialectical procedure will approach to an end. A perfect, rational social organization will be recognized, free from antagonisms and contradictions. There will be no class contradictions and therefore, no class thrash about. In fact communism will be a classless, stateless, private property less and exploitation less society.

In a communist society, there will be no private property in the shape of private ownership of the means of manufacture. The means of manufacture will be under the ownership of the society. Cooperation and not cutthroat competition will be the foundation of communist society. Manufacture will be for consumption and

not to earn profit. Profit motive will be replaced through social requires. As there will be no private property, there will be no use. As there will be no use, there will be no class division, no property owning and property less class, no haves and have notes or no dominant and dependent class. As there is no class division, there is no class thrash about and therefore no require of the state. This is the cause why a communist society will be a classless and stateless society.

State is the instrument of use. It is a class instrument and a result of class division in society. As there is only one class of workers in communism and no other class to suppress or oppress, there will not be any require of the state. It will become redundant in a communist society. It will be relegated to the museum. The state, though, will not be smashed; it will slowly wither absent. Communist society will be governed through the Louise Blanc principle of 'from each according to his capability to each according to his require'. There will be no lay for parasites. He who will not job will not eat also. There will be only one class of workers. The whole society will be converted into the working class. There will be no lay for use. It will be an egalitarian society. There will be harmonious connection in the middle of the people.

Theory of Alienation

There have been two separate phases in the Marxist philosophy. *Economic and Philosophic Manuscripts of 1844*, present the human side of Marxism. In the *Manuscripts*, capitalism has been

analyzed without reference to class antagonism, class thrash about and violent revolution. Here, the evil powers of capitalism have been explained by alienation and loss of identity and freedom. These views of Marx have been recognized with a younger Marx. There occurs an epistemological break in Marx's philosophy with the script of *Communist Manifesto* in 1848. The later Marx is recognized since mature Marx, who urbanized the theory of scientific socialism. Marx's earlier ideas were exposed only in 1932, with the publication of the *Manuscripts*.

The theory of alienation is a significant Marxian concept. The Hungarian Marxist George Lukas had urbanized the theory of alienation entirely on his own even before the publication of *Manuscripts* in 1932. Though, the concept of alienation became popular only after the publication of the *Manuscripts*. Marx has recognized four stages of alienation. Firstly, man is alienated from his own product and from his job procedure, because the worker plays no section in deciding what to produce and how to produce it. Secondly, man is alienated from nature. His job does not provide him a sense of satisfaction since a creative worker. Under mechanization, job tends to become increasingly reutilized and monotonous. Thirdly, man is alienated from other men. The competitive character of the capitalist organization forces everyone to live at someone else's expense and divides society into antagonistic classes. Lastly, man is alienated from himself. The realm of must dominates his life and reduces him to the stage of an animal subsistence, leaving no time for a taste of literature, art, and cultural heritage. The capitalist organization subordinates all human faculties and qualities to the

circumstances created through the private ownership of capital and property. The capitalist himself, no less than the worker, becomes a slave of the tyrannical rule of money.

Theory of Freedom

Since a humanist philosophy, Marxism is primarily a philosophy of human freedom. Freedom consists not only in securing material satisfaction of human requires, but also in removing the circumstances of dehumanization, estrangement and alienation. The capitalist organization is characterized through must since opposed to freedom. Must refers to the circumstances under which the inevitable laws of nature govern the life of man. These laws of nature exist self-governing of man's will. Man can acquire scientific knowledge of these laws, but cannot change them at his will. Freedom does not consist in an escape from must. Freedom lies in the knowledge of these laws of nature and the capability to create these laws job towards the definite end of the emancipation of human society.

Therefore, a sound knowledge of the productive forces operating behind the capitalist organization and a programme to create these forces job toward human ends were essential instruments of human freedom. Only a programme of socialist revolution would accomplish humanity's leap from the kingdom of must to the kingdom of freedom. The emancipation of human society and the realization of true freedom is possible only with the abolition of capitalism and the establishment of communism.

A Critical Appraisal and an Overview

Marxism has been subjected to severe criticism. It has simplified the class division of society into two classes, the haves and the have notes. This is distant from the reality. Society is extremely intricate and is divided into numerous clusters. There is no clear cut division of classes since envisaged through Marxism. Moreover, there exists a vast transitional class. Marxian thinkers predicted that with the advancement of capitalism, the transitional class would disappear and merge with the proletariat class. But this has not happened therefore distant and there is no possibility of it ever happening. In fact, the reverse has happened; the transitional class has strengthened its location and increased its mass. Marxists also predicted the narrowing of the capitalist class. Here again, presently the opposite has happened. Instead of shrinking, the foundation of the capitalist class has been enlarged. Marx predicted the accumulation of capital, but there has been the dispersal of capital. The condition of the proletariat class has not deteriorated since predicted through Marx. Therefore, the actual working of the capitalist organization has proved the Marxist theory of classes to be wrong.

Marxists had predicted that the inherent contradictions of capitalism would lead to its collapse. But this has not happened therefore distant. No advanced capitalist organization has collapsed. Capitalism has proved its resilience. It is the socialist organization, which has collapsed in several sections of the world. Capitalism has the tremendous capability of version. This

is the largest cause for its subsistence. Marx failed to assess capitalism correctly. According to Marx, the proletarian revolution will happen only when capitalism has matured. There is no chance of the proletarian revolution occurring and succeeding in a backward feudal society. But this is exactly, what has happened in reality.

Revolution has taken lay only in feudal civilizations such since Russia, China, Vietnam, Cuba etc. This was the largest issue of debate flanked by two factions of Russian Marxists, the Mensheviks led through Plekhanov and the Bolsheviks led through Lenin. Ultimately, the Bolsheviks prevailed in excess of the Mensheviks, but the latter were closer to classical Marxist teachings. According to Marx, his teachings can lessen the birth pangs, but cannot short route the several levels of social development. Though, Lenin and Trotsky in Russia and Mao in China recognized communism in a feudal society without going by the procedure of first establishing capitalism. To resolve this obvious contradiction, Trotsky urbanized the 'theory of Permanent Revolution'. He fused the bourgeois revolution with the proletarian revolution in his theory. These two revolutions can happen simultaneously in the view of Trotsky. However this looks to be a more practical view, it does not confirm to the vital Marxian principles.

The Marxian theory of economic determinism has been severely criticized. It is not only the economic factor, but other factors also that are equally significant in bringing in relation to the social change. If economy determines polity, society, morality,

value organization etc., then economy itself is formed through these. It is a *two* method procedure. Economic forces are not immune to the powers of polity, society, civilization, religion, values, norms etc. If the foundation or the substructure forms the superstructure, then the superstructure also forms the substructure. Therefore, the theory of economic determinism cannot be carried. Later Marxist thinkers like Gramsci carried the significant role of the superstructure.

The Marxian concepts of the dictatorship of the proletariat and communism suffer from many flaws. After the proletarian revolution, the proletariat will seize the state tools from the bourgeois. With the establishment of communism, the state will become redundant and will slowly wither absent. This has not happened. In socialist society, the state In fact became all-powerful. Instead of weakening, the state has consolidated its location and there is no possibility of its fading absent. The Marxian dream of a stateless society will never be realized. The state will continue to play a leading role in a socialist and communist society and there is no possibility of it ever being relegated to the museum.

The socialist state wherever it has been recognized, has either been overthrown or discredited. Wherever, it is still surviving, it has been compelled to introduce wide-ranging changes, which do not confirm to the teachings of classical Marxism. The collapse of communism in Eastern Europe, disintegration of the Soviet Union and economic reforms in China have led thinkers like Francis Fukuyama to write the obituary of Marxism. Fukuyama in his

well-known book *End of History* proclaims the triumph of capitalism in excess of communism in the post-cold war world. With the victory of capitalism in excess of communism, history has approach to an end. Here, Fukuyama talks of history in the Hegelean sense. After capitalism, there will be no further economic and political development. Capitalism is the mainly rational and perfect organization. It is the mainly perfect ideology and philosophy. Therefore ideological and philosophical development comes to an end with the emergence of capitalism. Its largest challenger communism has been defeated and this further proves its claim that it is the best possible social, economic and political organization ever evolved through humanity.

It is extremely hard to accept the thesis propounded through Fukuyama. The importance of Marxism lies in two meadows. Firstly, it has been used since a tool for social analysis. Secondly, it provides a voice to the voiceless. It is the philosophy of the poor, the oppressed and the suppressed people. If the contribution of Marxism is analyzed in these two meadows, since suggested, reach the conclusion that it is still relevant and has not become redundant since claimed through the liberal critics. Marxism since a come of social analysis is still relevant since it was in the past. Its importance since a way of social analysis will never diminish, irrespective of whether the socialist state survives or not.

Marxism since an ideology has definitely lost its edge, but it has not become completely redundant. Since extensive since use will

continue, people will be oppressed and suppressed, Marxism will remain relevant. Marxism since a philosophy of the exploited and the oppressed will continue to inspire the masses to strive for their emancipation. Therefore there is no question of its defeat and irrelevance. In fact the organizations, which have collapsed, were not organized on classical Marxian principles. They were a variant of Marxism-Leninism and Stalinism. Therefore it is the Leninist-Stalinist organizations, which have collapsed in Europe and elsewhere and not classical Marxism. Marxism since a come will continue to be used through scholars for social analysis and the exploited-oppressed people will continue to espouse Marxist philosophy for their emancipation. Here, Marxism will never become irrelevant. It will always give an alternative philosophy to liberalism. Marxism will also act since an effective check on the excesses of liberalism. It will mitigate the rigors of the capitalist organization.

Chapter 2

Fascism

Common Explanations and Characteristics of Fascism

Fascism has been interpreted in multiple methods. A favorite Marxist location is to explain it since a violent, dictatorial instrument of monopoly fund capital, which appeared in the shape of brutal attack on workers, rights in an era of intensification of class thrash about and acute crisis in the capitalist economy. Another interpretation views fascism since the product of cultural and moral breakdown in the aftermath of brutality and savagery of World War I.

Oswald Spengler wrote his *Decline of the West in 1918* and argued that Western culture, characterized through industrialism had reached an era of decline in the 20th century. Spengler attacked the rational strains of modernity in order to celebrate the 'Philosophy of Life' since an alternative. Wilhelm Reich, a neo-psycho analyst, in his *Size Psychology of Fascism* explains Fascism since a result of extreme neurotic or pathological impulses that place dormant in the patriarchal family set-up. Another liberal interpretation traces fascism since a product of size society where traditional solid identities based on kinship, religion, craft and guild and residence break down and a new amorphous size-society is created. Few others relate it to a unique expression of transitional-class radicalism against

monopoly business homes' profit-motive. Lastly, it has been seen since a shape of Bonapartism or an autonomous authoritarian state led through a charismatic leader self-governing of any specific class-interests or class-power.

Fascism appeared since a radical movement based on the rejection of liberalism, democracy and Marxist socialism. Though, it differed from the conservative authoritarian clusters. The conservative right invoked traditional legitimacies based on the church, the monarchy, kinship etc. whereas the Fascists wanted a radical institutional change and mobilized people in the name of *Organic Nationalism*, a belief in the harmonious collectivity of nation privileged in excess of all other shapes of human-identification. Since in the human body, the structural connection of the several organs or sections of the body to each other only serves to describe and delimit their roles; therefore in the organic view of the fascist state, the state since the embodiment of national will takes precedence in excess of the identities and rights of the individuals. This view also accounts for the deep-rooted hostility of fascism to inter-nationalism and to systems and movements based on inter-nationalism such since communism, freemasonry, the League of Nations and to the multi-national Jewish society. In common, Fascism symbolized the rejection of political civilization inherited from Enlightenment and its ideas such since rationalist materialism, the philosophy of individualism and pluralism. The fascist opposition to the democratic-bourgeois organizations and values did not rule out their exploit of size, constitutional and plebiscite shapes of politics, but they made exploit of these democratic organizations

only to wreck them from inside and in order to undermine their value. Fascism was opposed, in all its shapes, to the notion of democracy based on respect for pluralism, individual autonomy and the subsistence of civil and political liberties.

The size- mobilization of fascists was based on the pattern of militarization of politics. They made exploit of military insignia and terminology in their mobilization. Since military-systems are based on unity of command and order and perfect subordination of rank and file to the higher command, therefore the fascist systems had their quasi-sacred figure of the leader-the Duce in Italy and the Fuhrer in Germany whose will was supreme in all matters.

A party militia was often used to reinforce the sense of nationalism and wipe out opposition to their dictatorships. The extreme stress on the masculine principle or male-dominance in the fascist ideology and the exaltation of youth were also related to this militarization of politics. Another important characteristic of fascism was the system of few type of regulated, class-collaborationist, integrated national-economic building. The thought of corporatism since a society of people free from class-clash appeared in reaction to the development of individualism and the new centralizing states. It was a residue of the feudal ideology of mystical 'society' of personal ties. But slowly it acquired a contemporary, class-collaborationist shape. The ideology of societal corporatism whispered in giving full autonomy to the corporations, but fascist ideology accentuated

state corporatism or the complete subordination of corporations to the requires and requirement of the fascist state.

Ideological Strands of Fascism

At the ideological stage, there was no single unifying thought that guided the fascist movement and state. Fascism appeared from heterogeneous borrowings from several ideas. The vital ingredient of fascism was a type of synthesis of organic nationalism and anti-Marxist ideas. The power of Sorel's philosophy of action based on intuition, power and élan was also discernible in the pattern of fascist size-mobilization. The fascists also tried to apply Darwin's ideas to the growth of society. They whispered that people in any society compete for subsistence and only larger individuals, clusters and races succeed. This belief directly fed into the anti-Jewish politics or anti-semitism practiced largely under German fascism, but also elsewhere. Such application of Darwin's ideas in the realm of society came to be recognized since 'Social Darwinism'. Adolph Hitler's autobiographical report in *Mein Kampf* made out an explicit case for the application of such Social-Darwinist racial ideas. In this book, Hitler characterized parliamentary democracy since a sin against 'the vital aristocratic principle of nature' and depicted all human civilization since the exclusive product of the creative Aryan race and condemned the Jewish society since inferior and lacking in creativity. The size-extermination of millions of Jews grew out of this insanity of Nazi ideology in Germany where totally impersonal bureaucratic 'extermination' of a people classified since a species of inferior inhuman was put

into practice. The political theorist Carl Schmitt wrote his critiques of parliamentary democracy in the 1920s arguing for a plebiscitary dictatorship. The Philosopher Martin Heidegger attacked Western modernity for its technical violence and for a contempt of being. In several methods, these philosophies of the right were to become justifications for the Fascist and Nazi regimes in the 1930s.

Fascism in Italy appeared since the convergence of three dissimilar trends. The radical Syndicalist Confederation of Deal Unions split in 1914 in excess of the issue of Italian participation in war. The Syndicalists had whispered in the 'self-emancipation' of the 'producers' by regulation at factory stage. The workers associations or syndicates would replace the state at a suitable time and these would act since the instruments of self-government. Now the right wing syndicalists moved towards extreme nationalism. They called nations in class words, i.e., since 'plutocratic' or having colonies or 'proletarians' or 'have not' nations without colonies. Italy was called since a proletarian nation. The Futurists who rejected traditional norms and existing organizations and exalted 'violence', and who were fascinated through speed, authority, motors and machines or all the contemporary technical possibilities, contributed a second biggest ideological factor. Mussolini's 'socialistic' views and ideas on 'national revolution' was the third biggest ideological strand of Italian fascism. This heterogeneity of ideas beside with regional political exigencies was responsible for variations in the shape of the fascist movement and state.

Social Bases of Fascism

Since suggested, define the nature of political and institutional forces that helped in the growth of the fascist movement and state and continued it.

War, Diplomacy and Nationalism

World War I provided the sociological and psychological circumstances for the crystallization of the fascist state. It revealed the capability of nationalism in the mobilization of masses and economic possessions. It further demonstrated the importance of unity of command, of power, and moral mobilization and propaganda in the service of the contemporary state. After the war, fascism appeared since a vision of a coherent and reunited people, mobilized on the foundation of an entire communal liturgy of songs and torch- light procession, highlighting the cult of physical force, violence and brutality.

At the Versailles, the victorious Allied powers tried to extract the words of defeat from Germany. Severe reparations were imposed on Germany. Germany's military might was reduced to 100,000 men. Germany also suffered in words of territorial possessions including loss of its colonies. Discontent in excess of the severity of the Allies' peace words and conflicts and squabbles in excess of the newly drawn frontiers contained seeds of future conflicts. There was no mechanism to adjudicate rival claims and resolve conflicts. The League of Nations lacked the executive powers to impose peaceful solutions. Hitler was ready to exploit military

force to achieve union with Austria and to get enough 'livelihood legroom' for the German people. Italian fascism claimed colonies for a 'proletarian' Italy. Japanese militarists demanded an 'equitable sharing of world possessions' and were willing to favor a military action to achieve their aim. Nationalism, war and diplomacy forced individuals and clusters within national boundaries to take faces. It also made it possible to restrict the public democratic legroom. Any person or group could be recognized since the 'national enemy' or 'traitors' and wiped out for not owing allegiance or loyalty to the fascist 'national' state. Earlier defeat was attributed to the betrayal of these units in the fascist propaganda.

The Economic Crisis of 1929

World War I resulted in size destruction, of possessions both physical and human, and hence, productive capacities of civilizations involved in it. Reconstruction and 'recovery' in Europe after the war was financed through US loans. The procedure went on smoothly till a crisis began in the US in excess of the rapid drop in agriculture prices. Since the world agriculture manufacture began to rise with 'recovery' in Europe, North American agriculture was hit through a rapid drop in the prices and several faced bankruptcies. Soon the stock markets in America were affected in October 1929. Since a result of the global integration of the markets, the crash affected all the economies. Plantations, farms and factories closed down throwing millions out of occupations and restricting output.

The Industrialists who had taken advances and loans from banks and financial organizations establish it hard to repay. Several banks and financial organizations started facing bankruptcies. With millions out of occupations and factories, there was no demand for goods and services since the purchasing authority of the people deteriorated. The economies showed no sign of recovery. In such conditions, re-militarization advocated through fascist leaders created occupations not only in the armies, but also in the armament industries. Since this stimulated a demand for goods and services, the fascist programme appealed to people in crises-ridden times-especially when it also satisfied their 'national pride'.

The Political Mobilization for Fascism

The initial programme of fascists in Italy, launched since 'Fasci Di Combattimento' described for the installation of a republic and reflected demands for radical democratic and socialistic reforms including confiscation of vast war-time profits of capitalists, the suppression of large joint-stock companies and land for landless peasants. These leftist units of the programme were dropped in 1920 and only an emotive mixture of strident patriotism, justification of war, a concern for national greatness and aversion to the socialist party were retained. The development of fascist squads, with the support and connivance of state officials and army was directly connected to actual or perceived threats of the left. The support of the traditional conservative elites such as army officers, bureaucrats, and businessmen was utilized and left its imprint on the fascist party

and state. In order to achieve a broader mobilization of people, the military kind militia, semi-military propaganda kind systems and regimented fascist deal unions were also created. The Party and its grand Council controlled all these systems.

Similarly, chauvinist sentiment and popular radical demands in Germany were used through Hitler's fascist system, the German National Socialist Worker's Party in order to gain size political support. It described for a greater Germany with land and colonies, the annulment of the treaty of Versailles, nationalization of large monopoly business, profit distribution in large enterprises, the abolition of unearned incomes and agrarian reforms. German fascism capitalized on the rising unease created through the Great Depression of 1929 and its impact on the German economy. They made exploit of the political instability of the Weimer republic, whose own constitution was used since an instrument to subvert it from within. All these factors created circumstances for the rise of the Nazi Party, the system of German fascism. It had a scrupulous appeal for those patriotic Germans whose national pride had been hurt through the defeat of Germany in World War I and its subsequent humiliation at Versailles.

The Question of Hegemony and Coercion

The German fascist state associated with the Fuhrer Adolph Hitler earned for itself the distinction of being the mainly barbaric and destructive regime that used industrial techniques for the execution of intended size murder and genocide. The

secret state police office, or 'Gestapo' since it came to be recognized in Germany was created in 1933 under the Prussian Interior Ministry, and rapidly attained autonomy from the provincial government. From 1934, Heinrich Himmler became the head of this nation-wide fascist organ of terror. Its Prussian part was headed through Reinhard Heydrich, who was also in charge of the SD, a party intelligence system affiliated to the dreaded SS, with a nation-wide network of informers. It became the internal disciplinary executive of the German fascist state. Such systems of terror acquired the complete authority of life and death in excess of every German. Any opposition to the fascist state was ruthlessly suppressed. Absolute authority was concentrated in the hands of the Fuhrer. The exploit of a rational bureaucratic mechanism in order to exterminate the gypsies, Jews and political opponents by concentration camps is a familiar characteristic of the fascist state. Similarly, in Italy, Spain and other fascist regimes, every effort was made to dismantle democratic organizations of the civil society and replace them with institutionalized dictatorships based on the personal command of the dictators. All this necessitated more and more regimentation of the civil society. Few scholars even characterize fascism since a 'totalitarian state' or a state, which acquires day-to-day manage in excess of the life of its citizens. But despite the dictatorial rule, fascism made exploit of sure consent-structure experiments. At the ideological stage, exploit of nationalist sentiments and even anti-Semitism had a popular sanction behind it. Separately from this, few new ways were also tried. The fascist state in Italy created the Opera Nazionale Dopolavoro in 1925. Its largest concern was the system of leisure

time for the working people. It ran a vast network of regional clubs and recreational facilities with libraries, bars, billiard halls and sport grounds. The Dopolavoro circles arranged concerts, plays, films illustrates, and organized picnics and provided cheap summer holidays for children. Through the 1930s, there were in relation to the 20,000 such circles in Italy. Moreover, although the Syndical Law of 1926 brought labour under the manage of the state in the interest of manufacture and confirmed the fascist deal unions in their monopoly of negotiations with employers and banned strikes, the fascist state also introduced few welfare schemes for the workers in the 1930s. Family allowances were given in 1934, mainly to compensate for the loss of income resulting from the imposition of a forty-hour week. Insurance against sickness and accident was included into wage agreements, and later in the 1930s, Christmas bonus and holiday pay were introduced. All such events were meant to set up legitimacy of the state that had abolished civil liberties and democratic rights. Compared to Italy, German labour was more tightly regimented under the Nazi regime.

State and Society under Fascism

The fascist state appeared since the institutionalization of personal dictatorship. In Italy, all opposition parties and systems were banned in October 1926. The Public Safety Law made the security of the state take precedence in excess of personal liberties. The Fascist Party itself was bureaucratized and syndicalism ideas were suppressed within the party. Several industrialists from North Italy including the owner of Fiat

Company, Giovanni Oienyale, had financed Mussolini's fascist system. Private capital was a beneficiary of the fascist manage of labour. The 'Corporate State' was formally created in 1934 with 22 combined corporations of employers and employees, but they lacked the real authority to take economic decisions. State intervention in the economic life of the Italian nation was marginal in the early section of fascist regime. The Great Depression and require to fulfill imperialist ambitions, especially in the Mediterranean Sea and Africa for its aggressive nationalist-militarist project led to an increased state intervention in the economic life. The basis of the Institute for Industrial Reconstruction in the 1930s reflected this trend of economic regulation in the service of contemporary warfare. Though, even in 1940, IRI possessed only in relation to the 17.8% of the total capital assets of Italian industry. The state, in scrupulous, focused on the development of chemical, electrical and machine industries and gave impetus to modernization by electrification of railways and telephone and radio industry. Though, compared to Germany, investments in military-manufacture were low despite the regime's rhetoric of Italy 'being in a permanent state of war'. Moreover, despite early radical denouncements of the monopoly capitalist class, the fascist state helped in cartelization, i.e., making of big industrial federations.

Mussolini also tried to appease the Church. Big grants were made for the repair of war-damaged churches. In 1923, religious education was made compulsory in all secondary schools. The Roman question was finally settled in 1929. The Lateran Pacts were signed with the Church, giving virtual manage of religious-

education to the Church and the Pope's right to govern the Vatican was established. The Church's largest place system, Catholic Action, was guaranteed freedom provided it stayed out of politics.

The personal absolutism and party's manage of social life was more stringent in Germany. In Italy, large business, industry, fund, army and professional bureaucracy retained a big degree of autonomy and fascism came to authority on the foundation of a tacit compromise with these recognized organizations and elites. In Germany, the Enabling Act became the legal foundation for Hitler's dictatorship. Legislative authority was transferred to the executive. The bureaucracy was purged of politically undesirable and 'non-Aryan' units. The federal character of the state was destroyed. The vital constitutional rights were suppressed. The 'rule of law' was transformed into the 'rule of leader'. The extra-legal notion of the Fuhrer, to whom bureaucracy and the army swore 'unconditional obedience', assumed crucial importance in the administrative functioning and signified burial of constitutionalism. The will of the leader became the foundation for the legitimacy of law. The independence of the judiciary was totally destroyed. Furthermore, the press was totally controlled. Liberal and Jewish-owned newspapers and the Socialist Press were forced to secure down.

Any kind of literature, and art that was establish antithetical to the fascist perception was banned. The cultural life of citizens by propaganda and education became one of the chief goals of the Nazi regime. All education was transformed in accordance with

fascist ideals. Text- books were re-written. Jews were forbidden to teach and racial theories of 'Aryan- German' master race supremacy became a section of the curricula.

The fascist state in Germany also attempted to achieve a complete regimentation of labour. 'Trustees' appointed through the owners fixed wages. A labour front was created in October 1934. It operated not since a deal union, but since a propaganda machine, and incorporated employers and professionals since members. Its stated aim was the maximization of job, and the fascists controlled it. The fascist state's attitude to women was based on ultra-conservative patriarchal sentiments. The social role of women was defined through the slogan of 'Kids, Kitchen and Church'.

The mainly oppressive characteristic of fascism in Germany was a systematic persecution of Jews. The ideology of Nazi party in Germany was informed through a strong hatred of the Jews and an intense obsession with the maintenance of the Aryan purity of the German Master race. The Jews were stereotyped since inferior, racially impure and a source of all ills of Germany. They were deprived of citizenship, spaces in the universities and management. Their businesses were attacked. They were subjected to all sorts of unprecedented discrimination. Later on, millions of them were sent to concentration camps and massacred throughout World War II. Italian fascism in contrast, lacked any systematic policy of racial anti-semitism, at least, up to 1937. Though, in November 1938, under the power of the Nazis, racial anti-Jews laws were also passed in Italy.

Chapter 3

Individualism and Communitarianism

Individualist versus Communitarian Location

In responding to this question, individualists and communitarians hold dissimilar and apparently conflicting locations. While the individualists see political reality since being formed through decisions and actions of free and rights-bearing individuals, communitarians emphasize the connection flanked by the person and the society and see this connection to be the foundation of politics. This debate may then be characterized since one flanked by those who favor individual rights and autonomy and those who emphasize the bonds of society in political life.

Relevance in the Indian Context

The debate flanked by individualism and communitarianism is particularly relevant to the Indian context. The Indian Constitution deviates from the traditional liberal framework, which guarantees individual rights and ignores the rights of society membership. It endorses and accepts the twin ideals of individual autonomy and society membership. The Constitution contains both the guarantee of individual civil rights and liberties and the principle of equal respect for all societies. A

revise of the debate flanked by individualism and communitarianism is, so, also significant for understanding few of the questions and issues in modern Indian political theory and practice.

It would be helpful to note that there are dissimilar diversities of individualism and communitarianism. In this element, we shall revise few of the key arguments and themes contained in these theoretical locations. We begin with an introduction to the meaning and origin of liberal individualism. We then go on to understand few of the largest arguments of individualistic perspective, namely, the conception of self and understanding of the nature and functions of the state. This is followed through an introduction to the communitarian critique of liberal individualism. We, then, analyze the locations held through communitarians on the conception of the person and the nature and functions of the state.

Meaning and Growth of Individualism

Individualism is one of the many theories of connection flanked by the citizen and the state and of the proper scope of state behaviors. Other theories of this connection, which oppose the theory of individualism are socialism, sarvodaya, fascism and communitarianism, which since suggested, revise later in this element. What distinguishes individualism from these other theories is its emphasis on the individual since the primary element in political and social theory. Few of the largest advocates of individualism have been Adam Smith, David

Ricardo, Herbert Spencer and more recently, F.A. Hayek and Robert Nozick. In India, Mahadeo Govind Ranade and the Swatantra Party largely supported the individualistic view.

Atomism and Methodological Individualism

The concept of individualism is one of the largest characteristics of liberal political idea, the other characteristics being universalism, egalitarianism, secularism and the isolation flanked by the public and the private. The thought of individualism covers a wide diversity of ideas, attitudes and doctrines. At the heart of these ideas and doctrines is the systematic according of primacy to the individual in excess of any social group, society or communal. The individual is regarded since an end in itself while political, economic and social organizations are measured since a mere means to that end. This thought of individualism is described 'Atomism'—a view of society constituted through individuals for fulfillment of ends, which are primarily individualistic and which exist antecedently or prior to any scrupulous shape of social life. Individualism also refers to the doctrine in relation to the centrality of individual to any political theory or social account. This doctrine is described 'Methodological Individualism' – a doctrine that asserts that no account in social science or history can be fundamental unless based upon facts and characteristics of individuals, their properties, goals, beliefs and actions. In other terms, social wholes or the aggregate pattern of behavior necessity always be explained in words of the individual. More importantly, the theory of individualism relates to the principle of laissez-faire—

French phrase that means 'leave alone' or 'allow to do'. The principle of laissez faire is a principle of economic individualism and is a section of the broader theory of connection flanked by the state and the citizen. It was the battle cry of tradesmen, moneylenders and little manufacturers of 18th century France and England, who felt constrained through the controls and regulations of the mercantilist state. The mercantilist state was characterized through a great trade of state intervention in the economy. In contrast, economic laissez-faire stood for the policy of non-intervention or minimal intervention through state in the economic sphere. The economy, it was felt, should be left to operate in accordance with the demand and supply mechanism of the market. Laissez-faire or economic individualism, in other terms, stands for limited government and free deal.

Views of Contractualists including John Rawls

Individualism is essentially a contemporary phenomenon that began to take form in the 17th century in the scripts of Hobbes and Locke. As the times of Hobbes and Locke, liberal political theory has made it its primary purpose to explore the connection flanked by the individual and the state. All individuals have inalienable rights. Government derives its powers from the consent of those who are to be governed. This consent is expressed through and recognized on the foundation of a social contract flanked by the governed and those who govern. The distinctive characteristic of the individualistic location, though, is the claim that the parties to the social contract are essentially people acting since individuals, and not since representatives of

a cultural or communal group. Hobbes, Locke and Rousseau spoke of a number of men establishing the state by a social contract and were explicit in relation to the eliminating associations and clusters intermediate flanked by the individual and the state. In fact, Rousseau maintained that if the Common Will is to be truly expressed, it is essential that there are no subsidiary clusters within the state. The mainly recent biggest exponent of the contractarian point of view, John Rawls, similarly assumes that the parties in the 'Original Location' who job out the principles of justice are individuals who speak for themselves. Moreover, the justice that they speak of is only for individuals. While Rawls does illustrate little concern for social classes, he does not raise the question of whether society/clusters should be measured since entities with claims to justice.

Views of Utilitarians

Emphasis on the individual is not confined to the social contract perspective in liberal political idea. In speaking of the greatest happiness of the greatest number, utilitarians such since Jeremy Bentham and J.S.Mill also had individuals in mind. In fact, in his job *On Liberty*, Mill accentuated the liberty of the individual and require of the state to keep out of private concerns. Similarly, those who speak of the consent of the governed usually take it since an obvious assumption that the consent is to approach from individuals. Further, the theories of democracy which trade with the concept of one man-one vote, one vote-one value and majority rule clearly have individuals in mind. Individualism has

guided much of contemporary liberal political idea. Though, the theory of individualism is not universally carried or is free of criticism. Political theory today is deeply divided in relation to the connection flanked by the state and the citizen since well since in relation to the proper scope of state behaviors. Since suggested, analyze few of the biggest assumptions in relation to the liberal individualism, which have approach under attack from communitarianism.

The Individualist Conception of the Self

Central to the theory of individualism is its conception or understanding of the self. In fact, individualism builds its understanding of dealings flanked by the state and the citizen since well since the proper scope of state behaviors on the foundation of its conception of the self. Since suggested, revise the individualist conception of the self or person.

In the individualist view, people are free, rational and capable of self-determination. People are rational in that they are the best judges of their interest. They are capable of self-determination; that is, they are capable of determining their own conception of good life. A person's conception of good life is his set of beliefs and values in relation to the how he should lead his life and in relation to the makes life worthwhile. People are free in the sense that they possess the skill since well since the right to question their participation in existing social practices and to opt out of them, should these practices no longer remain worthwhile. Individuals, in other terms, are free to question and reject or

study any scrupulous social relation. We, since individuals, have the skill to detach ourselves or step back from any scrupulous social practice and question whether we want to continue pursuing it or not. No scrupulous task or end is set for us through society; no end is exempt from a possible revision or rejection through the self. A person's goals, aims and ends are always things that he chooses to attach himself to and so, detach himself from, when they are no longer worthy of such attachment. A person is, therefore, related to his ends, goals through an exercise of will. Rawls expresses this argument in the following phrase:

'The self is prior to the ends, which are affirmed through it'.

In the individualist view then, individual freedom of choice is needed precisely to discover out what is precious in life, to shape, analyze and study our beliefs and values. People necessarily have necessary possessions and liberties needed to live their lives in accordance with their beliefs and values without being penalized. They necessarily also have cultural circumstances necessary to acquire an awareness of dissimilar views in relation to the good life and to acquire a skill to analyze these views intelligently. On the foundation of the conception of the individual since free, rational and capable of self-determination, individualists develop their theory in relation to the connection flanked by the citizen and the state and of the nature and functions of the state.

The Individualist Theory of the Nature and Functions of the State

The individualist theory of the nature and functions of the state is based on its conception of the self since free, rational and self-determining. As individuals are free, rational and capable of self-determination, their interests are better promoted through letting them choose for themselves what sort of life they want to lead. Individual interests are harmed through attempts through the state to enforce a scrupulous view of good life. In the individualist view, the conception of the self since free, rational and self-determining necessarily needs a conception of the state since neutral and minimalist. The primary value in the political order for individualism necessity, then, be the neutrality of the state. In fact, a distinctive characteristic of liberal individualism is its emphasis on the state since a neutral and minimal political power.

A neutral state may be defined since a state, which does not favor, protect, promote or contrarily, discriminate against or penalize any scrupulous individual conception of good. Rather, such a state gives a neutral framework within which dissimilar and potentially conflicting conceptions of good can be pursued. It is committed to tolerating dissimilar views and conceptions of good life held through its citizens. In other terms, the neutral state does not enforce a scrupulous conception of good life. Instead it stays out of the peoples' decisions concerning the best method to lead their lives, thereby leaving each individual free to pursue his/her own conception of good or method of life.

Functions of State and Government

What are the legitimate functions of state and government? In the individualistic view, people have their natural or pre-political freedom. Government arises out of the consent of the governed. State is not a natural entity; rather, it is an artificial but necessary construct. State, in fact, is defined since a necessary evil. As it is a necessary evil, the government that rules the least is measured the best. The functions and role of state are, so, limited to guarantee and defense of individual rights and freedom. In other terms, the role of state is minimal and limited to the maintenance of law and order and the provision of security to its citizens, beyond which they should be left free. The state should interfere in the liberty of citizens only to prevent one individual from unnecessarily interfering in the liberty of others.

In the individualist view, a state that defines its duties beyond that of security and the defense of individual rights restricts freedom and the self-determination of its citizens. Individualism, therefore, sees an inverse relation flanked by the expansion of state behaviors and the enlargement of the sphere of individual rights and freedom. The individualist conception of self, its understanding of connection flanked by the state and the citizen and the proper scope of state behaviors have been criticized through a number of theoretical perspectives, few of which are fascism, sarvodaya, communism and feminism. Though the mainly profound critique of the individualist perspective is established in the theory of communitarianism.

Communitarianism

As the 1980s, the theory of liberal individualism has established its mainly distinctive and intensive challenge and critique in what has been labeled since communitarianism. The word *communitarian* was first elicited through Michael Sandel in his job *Liberalism and the Limits of Justice* in which he urbanized a critique of the liberal individualist foundations of John Rawls's theory of liberal justice. Few of the other communitarian critics of liberal individualism are Alisdair MacIntyre, Michael Walzer and Charles Taylor. These communitarian thinkers are highly inspired through Hegel and Rousseau.

Communitarians are first and foremost concerned with society. Two or more people constitute a society when they share a general conception of good and see this good since partly constitutive of their identity or selves. Such a 'constitutive society' may be a secure friendship, family connection, neighborhood or even a comprehensive political society. Communitarians insist that each of us since individuals develops our identity, talents and pursuit in life only in the context of a society. We are through nature social beings. As the society determines and forms the individual nature, political life necessity start with a concern for the society, and not the individual. In other terms, the locus of philosophical concern in reflecting on the ideal and the presently state necessity be the society and not the individual. The largest fault of liberal individualism according to communitarian thinkers, is then that it is mistakenly and irreparably individualistic. The liberal

conception of the connection flanked by the individual and the state is unduly limited since well since misrepresentative of the true nature of society. In the communitarian view, it is not sufficient to think in words of a two-stage connection; with the individual at one stage and the state at the other. Clusters and societies inhabit an intermediate location flanked by the individual and the state and should be incorporated in the middle of the types of rights-and duty-bearing elements whose inter-relationships are explored. Through emphasizing rights and freedom of individuals in excess of society, liberal individualism neglects the importance of society membership and identity to social and political life. It ignores the extent to which the society/society in which people live forms who they are and the values they have.

Although communitarian critics focus on dissimilar characteristics of liberal individualism, it is possible to identify few of the largest themes and arguments, such since the critique of the liberal-individualist conception of self and its understanding of the nature and functions of the state.

The Communitarian Critique of the Individualist Conception of the Self

A great trade of communitarian idea has presented itself in words of an explicit reference to and a rejection of the individualistic conception of self. The common form of this communitarian claim is that individualistic political theory takes us to be too far/distinct from our social ends and conceptions of the good in a

method that basically fails to correspond to the method in which we actually relate to these ends.

Two Largest Limitations of Individualism

Communitarians point to two largest limitations of the liberal individualist understanding of the self since detached and distinct from social ends: first, it devalues, discounts and downgrades the importance of the society; and second, it presupposes a defective conception of the relation flanked by the self and its ends. Concerning the first criticism, communitarianism challenges liberal individualism for downgrading and discounting the importance of the society and more specifically, for ignoring the extent to which it is the society or the society which people live in that form who they are and the values they have.

Individualism understands people to be self-enough outside of society and not in require of any society context in order to develop and exercise their capacities for self-determination. In other terms, individualism does not recognize the importance of society membership in shaping a good life for the individual. Communitarians argue that the liberal picture of individuals picking and choosing their conceptions of the good is facile. Sandel and MacIntyre argue that Rawls exaggerates our capability to stand back from and question our social roles and views the self since 'unencumbered'. On the contrary, communitarians argue that the self is 'embedded' in existing social practices. For communitarianism, though, the society is a

fundamental and an irreplaceable ingredient in the good life of the person. Though resilient and self-governing people may be human subsistence outside social and society life is unthinkable. People are not Robinson Crusoes able to live in complete and permanent separation. Rather individuals are constituted, and their identity formed, through the society to which they belong. We, since human beings, are essentially members of a family, religion, tribe, race and nation. Since such, rather than being far from social and society ends and values, we have a history and are placed in specific social conditions. The attachments and the moral engagements from these society membership determines 'who we are' and form 'the values we have'. Communitarians, therefore, criticize liberal individualism for producing a scrupulous conception of self, which is divorced from the social reality that constitutes it.

Since for the second criticism, communitarianism criticizes individualism for holding a mistaken or a false understanding of the connection flanked by the individual self and its ends. Individualism understands 'the self to be prior to its ends' in the sense that individuals reserve the right to question, study and reject their mainly deeply held convictions in relation to the nature of good life, if these are establish to be no longer worth pursuing.

To accept this understanding of self is to see oneself since disembodied, unencumbered and distribution a voluntary connection with one's social ends and attachments. They oppose this voluntaristic picture of the connection flanked by the self

and its ends assumed through individualism. This picture ignores the method we are embedded or located and partially constituted through social roles and society membership.

Criticizing the individualist conception of the self, communitarians inquire whether we can really step back from scrupulous values that we have and change them for new ones, or are we rather made the extremely people that we are through the values that we endorse therefore that detachment is impossible? Human beings, they argue, are essentially social beings. Since such, we neither choose nor reject our social and society ends and attachments; rather we discover them. We are neither free nor standing at an aloofness from our social and society ends; instead, we discover ourselves situated/ located in them. For example, we do not choose our family, caste or nation; we discover ourselves situated in them. We, then, determine our conception of the good and ends given our lay, location and situation in a family, religion and nation. We are never free from all social roles and society identities. Our membership of social clusters and societies determine and constitute our identity and understanding of good life. We cannot always stand back and opt out of social dealings and society membership. Our social dealings and roles, or at least few necessity be taken since given. As these goals are constitutive of me since a person, they have to be taken since given in deciding what to do with my life; the question of good in my life can only be a question of how best to interpret their meaning. It makes no sense to say that they have no value for me, as there is no 'me' standing behind them, no self

prior to their ends or constitutive attachments. The self is constituted through and not prior to its ends'.

In this method, communitarians denounce the historical, asocial and disembodied conception of the person establish in individualism. This conception overlooks the method in which it is the type of society in which people live that affect their understanding, both of themselves and of how they should lead their lives. A precious life, they argue, is one that is filled with commitments and dealings. And what makes them commitments is precisely that they are not the sort of things that people can question every day.

The Communitarian Critique of the Thought of State Neutrality

The other largest focus of communitarian critique of liberal individualism is the latter's understanding of the nature and functions of the state. Liberal individualists characterize the state since a minimal and neutral political power, whose functions are limited to defense of individual rights and maintenance of law and order. As individuals are free, rational and capable of self-determination, the primary value in political order ought to be neutrality of the state. A neutral state is one that is not committed to any scrupulous conception of the good, and remnants equidistant from and tolerant of all conceptions of the good. Communitarians oppose this relationship flanked by individual self-determination and state neutrality. The view that the state should be value-neutral and individuals should be free

to create their own choices stems from an atomistic belief that autonomy is protected only when judgments in relation to the good life are taken out of political realm and made on an individual foundation. Rejecting such 'atomism', communitarians argue that, in reality, individual judgments need distribution of experiences, provide and take of communal deliberation and communal evaluation of shared practices. In other terms, individual choices in relation to the good life can only be exercised in a scrupulous sort of society and not a cultural marketplace guided through freedom and neutrality, of the kind guaranteed through liberal individualism.

The communitarian perspective, so, argues for abandonment of liberal neutrality in favor of politics of the general good. Communitarians conceive of the general good since a substantive conception of good life that defines the society method of life. Rather than being neutral to dissimilar individual conceptions of good life, the general good gives standards through which individual preferences and values are evaluated. In other terms, the general good shapes the foundation on which individual conceptions of good are ranked, and the weight given to an individual's conception depends on how much it conforms or contributes to the general good.

In the communitarian view then, a presently state is not one that remnants neutral towards all individual conceptions of good. Rather, a presently state is one which encourages its citizens to adopt conceptions of good that conform to the general good, while discouraging conceptions of good that clash with it. The nature of

the state should not be neutral or minimalist; rather it ought to play a role in guiding its citizens in leading a good life. Hence, while liberal individualism encourages each person to describe and seek his own 'good', communitarianism believes that a political building has a significant role to play in defining and in helping people seek the 'good'.

Further, communitarians argue that the general good is required not only for guiding people's decisions in relation to the good life, but also for establishing a presently and legitimate political society. According to Taylor, the thought of the general good is required to enable citizens to accept the demands of justice demanded through a welfare state. At the heart of the theory of justice in a welfare state is the claim that the privileged ought to sacrifice a portion of their rights and rewards for the sake of others. For example, in a liberal capitalist society, the propertied classes are required to sacrifice few of their property for the benefit of the non-propertied and for sustaining a presently society. According to Taylor, though, the demand for such a sacrifice, in an individualistic society would look improper since citizens would be required to sacrifice their rights for the sake of those with whom they share no society identity or general method of life. If we are distanced from a society or a shared method of life, we would necessarily be unwilling to shoulder the burdens of liberal justice. In the communitarian view then, justice is rooted in a society whose primary bond is the shared understanding of the good of both man and society.

Disadvantaged And Affirmative Action

Justifications for Affirmative Action

Since Oliver Wendell Holmes said, 'There is no greater inequality than the equal treatment of unequals.' Here, arises require for such positive discrimination which would create humanity more humane and progressive. Aristotle in his *Nichomchean Ethics* wrote, justice is equality, since all men consider it to be quite separately from any argument. Indeed, in Greek, the term equality means justice. To be presently is to be equal and to be unjust is to be unequal.

According to Aristotle, equality means that things that are similar should be treated similar and things that are unlike should be treated unlike. Injustice arises when equals are treated unequally and also when unequals are treated equally. Affirmative action becomes essential in righting societal inequities. It is based on the 'principle of redress'; that undeserved inequalities call for rectification. As inequalities of birth are undeserved, these inequalities are to be somehow compensated for. According to Rawls, therefore, in order to treat all persons equally and to give genuine equality of opportunity, society necessity provide more attention to those born into or placed in less favorable social locations. Affirmative action was recognized since a section of society's efforts to address continuing troubles of discrimination; the empirical proof presented in the preceding pages designates that it has had a

somewhat positive impact on remedying the effects of discrimination. Whether such discrimination still exists today, is a central unit of any analysis of affirmative action.

Proof of Continuing Discrimination

There has been an undeniable human progress in several areas. Nevertheless, the proof is overwhelming that the troubles affirmative action seeks to address are widespread. To take the instance of the U.S. society, where the concept of affirmative action appeared, the marked differences in the economic status of the blacks and the whites, and flanked by men and women, clearly have social and economic reasons in addition to common discrimination.

One respected way to isolate the prevalence of discrimination is to exploit random testing, in which individuals compete for the similar occupation, apartment, or few other goal. For instance, the Fair Employment Council of Greater Washington, Inc. mannered a series of tests flanked by 1990 and 1992. The tests revealed that the Blacks were treated significantly worse than the equally qualified Whites of the time. Similarly, researchers with the National Bureau of Economic Research sent comparably matched resumes of men and women to the restaurants in Philadelphia. In high priced eateries, men were more than twice since likely to receive an interview call and five times since likely to receive an occupation offer since compared to the women testers.

The Justice Department had maneuvered a same testing to uncover housing discrimination. These tests also revealed that the Whites are more likely than the Blacks to be shown apartment elements, while the Blacks with equal credentials are told that nothing is accessible. As the testing began, the Justice Department brought in excess of 20 federal suits resulting in resolutions totaling more than \$1.5 million. A recent revise through the Glass Ceiling Commission, a body recognized under President Bush and legislatively sponsored through Senator Dole, accounted that:

White males continue to hold 97 percent of senior administration locations in Fortune 1000 industrial and Fortune 500 service industries. Only 0.6 percent of senior managers are African-Americans, 0.3 percent are Asians and 0.4 percent are Hispanic.

African-Americans hold only 2.5 percent of top occupations in the private sector and African-American men with professional degrees earn only 79 percent of the amount earned through their white counterparts. Comparably located African-American women earn only 60 percent of the amount earned through the white males.

Women hold only 3 to 5 percent of senior stage administration locations—there are only two women CEOs in Fortune 1000 companies.

The fears and prejudices of lower-rung white male executives were listed since a principal barrier to the advancement of women and minorities. The statement also establish that, crossways the board, men advance more rapidly than women.

The unemployment rate for African-Americans was more than twice that of the Whites in 1994. The median income for black males working full-time, full year in 1992 was 30 percent less than that of the white males. Hispanics fared only modestly better in each category. In 1993, Black and Hispanic men were half as likely as white men to be managers or professionals.

In 1992, in excess of 50 percent of African-American children under 6 and 44 percent of Hispanic children existed under the poverty stage, while only 14.4 percent of white children did therefore. The overall poverty rates were 33.3 percent for African-Americans, 29.3 percent for Hispanics and 11.6 percent for Whites.

Black employment remains fragile—in an economic downturn, black unemployment leads the downward spiral. For instance, in the 1981-82 recessions, black employment dropped through 9.1 percent while white employment fell through 1.6 percent. Hispanic unemployment is also much more cyclical than unemployment for the white Americans.

Unequal access to education plays a significant role in creating and perpetuating economic disparities. In 1993, less than 3 percent of college graduates were unemployed; but whereas 22.6 percent of the Whites had college degrees, only 12.2 percent of African-Americans and 9.0 percent of Hispanics had such a degree.

The 1990 census reflected that 2.4 percent of the nation's businesses were owned through the Blacks. Approximately 85

percent of these black owned businesses had no employees. Even within educational categories, the economic status of minorities and women fall short. The standard woman with a master's degree earns the similar amount since the standard man with an associate degree.

These gaps in, arguably, the mainly urbanized society in the world today amply justify require for a constructive programme, therefore that rampant inequality and injustice in society could be fought with vigor and commitment.

Theoretical Issues

Given the seriousness of the problem, approximately all thinkers from Liberals to Libertarians and Marxists to Social Democrats have tried to address the issue in their own method. There is a common agreement in the middle of them that equality of individual conditions is impossibility. John Rawls makes a substantial case for reducing inequalities since he concedes that, if inequalities benefit everybody through drawing out socially useful talents and energies, then they would be acceptable to all.

Libertarians, on the other hand, are clear in their minds that equality in individual conditions is not even desirable, for it would thwart incentives and development. They do talk in relation to the equality of opportunity and equality before the law, but equality in the sense commonly understood is clearly undesirable for them. The argument is that an equal world is inimical to development and incentives. The rapid economic

advance that we have approach to anticipate looks in a big measure to be a result of unequal conditions. Karl Marx's view on equality turns out to be rather indifferent towards the thought of equality of individual conditions, in the sense of equal sharing of commodities and income. He would rather prefer to eliminate class distinctions, therefore that oppression and use may be eliminated and all social and political inequality arising from them would disappear through itself. In the first stage of communism, he envisages inequality emerging from the equal right to labour, but in the final level of communism, he envisaged a world where equality in the sense of sharing of goods or income would cease to have a meaning. Social Democrats and Fabians are in favor of a substantial measure of equality, but they do not want to do absent with the vital framework of free market capitalism, believing that few shape of inequality is not only desirable for the purpose of extensive word development, but is also a section of the natural order of things.

In addition to their concept of equality and its relevance for human development, their views in relation to the ensuring justice are also enlightening, however since has been noted, everybody will have a dissimilar conception of justice like the concept of equality. In the Rawlsian scheme of things, the conception of justice ensures that the societal dispensation is intended in such a method that it improves the condition of the least advantaged members of society. In fact, Rawlsian justice is geared exclusively towards improving the lot of the worst off members of society. Rawls talks of ensuring equality of opportunity, because it ensures that the fate of the people is

determined through their choices and not through their conditions. 'My aim is to regulate inequalities that affect people's life chances and not the inequalities that arise from people's life choices', which are an individual's own responsibility. Rawls seeks to ensure a scheme of things that Prof Dworkin calls 'endowment insensitive and ambition sensitive' dispensation. An organization is presently if it takes care of the redressed of undeserved inequalities and as the inequalities of birth are undeserved, these inequalities are somehow to be compensated for.

Libertarian thinkers like Hayek and Friedman have recognized the difficulty of ensuring equality of individual conditions, but at the similar time, they have argued for the elimination of moral and political inequality. They have centered their discussion on ensuring 'equality of opportunity and equality before the law'. The presupposition is that this ensures justice and enhances individual freedom. The principle of 'equality of opportunity' is that every person has an equal chance to do what he wishes and has the capability to do. For Marx, a presently organization is one, wherein all class distinctions have been abolished. It is not necessarily an organization where equality prevails, for equality which is fundamentally a bourgeois thought, has no lay in the report of working class demands and objectives. As the state is an instrument, used through the dominant class to suppress and use the dependant class, the state in the hands of the Proletariat shall be the medium to be used against bourgeois and other reactionary and counter-revolutionary forces for affecting a radical redistribution of possessions.

Social democrats are in favor of ensuring an organization, wherein a substantial measure of equality is guaranteed without doing absent with the vital framework of market capitalism. Those who specifically addressed the question also feel require for a positive action for alleviating the sufferings of the disadvantaged group since a necessary step for social growth.

R.H Tawney is strongly in favor of substantial redistribution and in scrupulous, public provision for education, for all children to create them capable of freedom and more capable of fulfilling their personal differences and enlargement of personal liberties. Joining the stream of such thinkers, Amartya Sen emphasizes this characteristic in his advocacy of 'Vital Capacity Equality'. He says that 'Individual claims are not to be assessed in words of the possessions or primary goods persons respectively hold, but in words of the freedom they enjoy to choose flanked by dissimilar methods of livelihood therefore that they can have cause to value public action to improve nutritional intake, life expectancy and reduce morbidity and infant mortality therefore since to enhance individuals capabilities.' Adopting predictive postures, Mr. Edley explores the potential shapes that affirmative action could take in the future. This theorist presents three models of affirmative action: First, there is the 'color blind vision' of affirmative action. This adaptation would entail race-based events since a remedy only for people who could prove they are direct 'victims of discrete acts of discrimination.'

The second adaptation of affirmative action would be described the 'opportunity and antidiscrimination' adaptation. It would

seek to give equal opportunity for minorities, but would not need equal results. This adaptation acknowledges that the harms of racism make 'economic and social disparities in the middle of races.' This adaptation of affirmative action would seek to correct these harms. Finally, a third adaptation would be described 'remediation plus inclusion.' This adaptation is the 'preferred' come of the thinker and essentially suggests that variety alone constitutes 'a compelling state interest.'

These models provide incite for a neo-world order which is likely to accommodate plurality since an instrument of progression instead of use. Require for a neo-theoretical framework could be understood from the information that the discriminatory attitude has become more subtle, subconscious and sophisticated; therefore it has to be addressed at that stage. This could not be understood in words of sheer inequalities, which present too simplistic a perception of the disadvantaged. There are three key units where affirmative action programmes have an edge in excess of the traditional notion of positive equality.

First, affirmative action programmes are pro-active, including policies and processes for ensuring a diverse applicant pool. Affirmative action does not mean quotas for hiring and promotion, which are in fact illegal. Nor does it necessarily mean preferential hiring. The goal is to assemble, in a self-conscious and active method that can counteract the effects of subtle bias, a diverse pool of fully qualified candidates for hiring or promotion. Second, the mainly general characteristic of affirmative action programmes is the emphasis on recordkeeping

and identification of accurate availability statistics therefore that systems can accurately gauge their progress toward their variety goals. The subtle procedure of underlying discrimination can be recognized and is accessible under the structured circumstances of the laboratory. Though, in organizational decision-creation, in which the controlled circumstances of an experiment are rarely possible, modern bias presents a substantial challenge to the equitable treatment of members of disadvantaged clusters. Not only are the perpetrators of bias often unaware of their motives, research has demonstrated that the victims of discrimination may also not recognize that they have been personally discriminated against. Systematic monitoring of disparities beside consensually carried dimensions can reveal the cumulative effects of modern shapes of bias that are more apparent than the impact that can be determined in any scrupulous case.

Third, affirmative action policies are outcome-based; issues of intentionality are not central. Demonstrating intentionality, which is typically a biggest issue of concern for equal employment opportunity programmes, is problematic because of modern shapes of bias. These biases commonly happen unintentionally. To put it in a more simplified manner, in excess of the past 25 years social psychologists have recognized and documented the subtle nature of modern shapes of bias. In contrast to the direct and easily discernible traditional shapes, modern biases are expressed, often unintentionally, in indirect and rationalizable methods. Because of the subtle nature of modern bias, passive equal opportunity employment policies may not ensure a fair and unbiased treatment of traditionally

disadvantaged clusters. Policies intended to protect disadvantaged individuals and clusters from one kind of discrimination based on overt anti-out-group actions may be ineffective for addressing biased treatment based on in-group favoritism that may characterize aversive racism. In contrast, affirmative action, with its focus on documenting and responding to disparities at the aggregate stage and its emphasis on outcomes rather than intention, addresses few of the particularly problematic characteristics of subtle biases that permit disparities to persist despite people's good intentions.

Affirmative Action: A Global Perspective

However the concept originated in the United States, yet it had an important appeal beyond its borders. While affirmative action laws in the USA are a result of confusing mixtures of case law, statutory law and executive orders, spaces such since India, Malaysia, Namibia and South Africa have written affirmative action into their constitutions. In Malaysia and India, affirmative action receives strong support from the government since a means to normalize opportunities for minorities that have endured years of racial oppression.

Affirmative Action in India

India has been practicing affirmative action in its essence, longer and more aggressively than any other lay in the world. However conservative opponents of the USA based affirmative action routinely misstate its nature through referring to it since set

asides and quotas, in India quotas are the rule. They have been applied widely in the educational and the employment arena as the 1950s for deprived members of the caste organization, such since the untouchables. For instance, in India's parliament, the 'outcaste' and other indigenous tribes are guaranteed a number of seats numerically proportional to their demographic representation.

It is with the lofty aim of alleviating the sufferings of the underprivileged and exploited parts of Indian society and for reconstruction and transformation of a hierarchical society emphasizing inequality into a contemporary egalitarian society based on individual attainment and equal opportunity for all that the protective discrimination programme was devised under the Indian Constitution. Though, this ideal of egalitarianism did not approach in relation to the in a day or two; rather it was the culmination of an extensive procedure of change in the traditional pattern of a medieval caste ridden society. These changes were, in fact, the culmination of an extensive drawn procedure of transformation in the traditional patterns of a caste-ridden society. Two factors worked since catalysts in the procedure; the indigenous reforms and western powers.

The founding fathers of the Indian Constitution were aware of the prevailing miserable and appalling circumstances of backward clusters who had remained distant behind and segregated from the national and social mainstream and had sustained to be socially oppressed and economically exploited for centuries due to several kinds of disabilities. These handicaps, resulting from

societal arrangements such since caste buildings and group suppressions, constitutionally authorized preferences and protective discrimination, created a lot of confusion and conflicts leading to heated debates, court cases, street violence and social unrest.

India, the major democratic organization of the world, with a thousand million plus population and a mind-boggling diversity, an organization which boasts of more than 5000 years of history and sustained culture and a hoary past, has been experimenting with protective discrimination programmes on an unprecedented diversity. Reservations in occupations, educational organizations, legislatures and in regional independent organizations, bigger recognized since *Panchayati Raj* organizations for scheduled castes, scheduled tribes, other backward classes and now women has been a grand experiment through any average. It may also be noted that scheduled castes, scheduled tribes and other backward classes are an entire cluster of thousands of castes spread in excess of the length and breadth of the country. Though, it has succeeded to little extent in achieving the target it had set before itself 57 years ago.

Affirmative Action in Malaysia

However India has the oldest affirmative action programme, Malaysia's implementation is measured the mainly successful. Malaysia has achieved success without require for quotas, where 'Malay majority has now become carried since the norm in education and government employment.' The Malaysian

organization has created a virtual re-sharing of wealth where several Malays, previously having only a 1% stake in the Malaysian economy in 1969 now have more than a 20% stake. In comparable USA words, this would be like distributing all the shares of stock traded on the New York Stock Swap to black people in proportion to their representation in the USA population.

Affirmative Action in Namibia and South Africa

Namibia and South Africa have recently rewritten their constitutions and have same organizations, however they have borrowed affirmative action language from the USA laws. For instance, South Africa's Constitution basically contains the following language: 'Affirmative Action is allowed.' It is also pointed out, though, that affirmative action programmes abroad are not completely devoid of trouble. In India, several of the upper caste members are beginning to create same argument to those of the USA conservatives and Malaysia's organization is vulnerable to corruption. It is significant to know here that the applicability of the affirmative action concept is much broader than in the USA.

Affirmative Action in the United States of America

Despite the subsistence of equal defense clause under the 14th amendment, racial discrimination had sustained in the USA up to the mid 20th century. Though, this discrepancy flanked by its ideals and its treatment of the Black people began to be corrected

approximately the 1950s and mainly notably, in 1954. The United States Supreme Court came out strongly against the segregation of the blacks in schools. The first step since reflected in the decisions of the courts and civil rights laws of the Congress merely removed the legal and quasi-legal shapes of racial discrimination. These actions while not producing true equality or even opportunity socially dictated the next step; a positive exploit of governmental authority to make the possibility of real equality. The decision in Brown overturning Plessey foretold that all publicly enforced, sponsored or supported racial discrimination was beyond the pale, that equal defense was not a bounty, but a birthright.

A decade after Brown, the Congress joined the movement to eliminate segregation through enacting the Civil Rights Act in 1964, which prohibited in common words discrimination against any person on the grounds of race, color or ethnic origin regarding any programme or action getting federal funds. These attempts have been viewed since mandating affirmative action programmes by racial classification. The decision of the United States Supreme Court in the **Allan Bakke** case and the debates that took lay in its wake have further re-enforced the constitutionality of the affirmative action programme in the USA.

Though, the heated debates, judicial pronouncements and academic and philosophical discussions in the United States are referred to and indeed, they are helpful in understanding several an intricate and complicated issue of India's protective action programme, which is distant more hard to handle in view of

India's varied and several hued civilizations. Reference may be made to Justice Krishna Iyer's pronouncements in the **Thomas Decision** that repairing the handicaps of the Blacks in America was comparable to the troubles of repairing the handicaps of the Harijans in India. Similarly, Justice Iyer referred to **Schlesinger v. Ballard Case** since illustrative of the high judicial punch in understanding the classificatory clue to the promotion of employment of equality. In fact, the USA Supreme Court upheld a classification in favor of a female naval officer through applying the rational foundation test in this case, which was much like the reasonable foundation classification being employed through the Indian Supreme Court right as the Gopalan and Champakam Dorairajan cases.

A rider may be added here lest the context be forgotten that however, the affirmative action programme for historical injustices in India is roughly comparable with the remedial events being adopted in the USA for the Blacks and Negroes, but the context of 'historical injustices' is absolutely dissimilar in India from that in the United States of America and the plight of Blacks is dissimilar in several compliments from the plight of Scheduled Castes and Scheduled Tribes in India. The dynamics of civilizational context are absolutely dissimilar in India.

Affirmative Action in France

A term in relation to the French constitutional scheme of protective discrimination would not be out of lay here. The French equivalent of the affirmative action programme in the

United States or in India is the concept of *Fraternity*, which is directed towards helping the poor and the disadvantaged members of society. The declaration of 1793 in Article 21 states that public assistance is a sacred debt. Society owes its subsistence to those who are unable to job. The Girondin proposal for rights contained the report that equality consists in everyone being able to enjoy the similar rights. However the organization of equality that has been followed in the Fifth Republic has served the French mentality since well, peculiar and contradictory since it is, though the type of lay equality enjoys in the American and the Indian organization is unlikely to be achieved in the French organization, either in socio-political debates or constitutional litigation in Conseil Constitutionnel.

Critique of the Concept

Several people are opposed to affirmative action because they consider it violates a sense of fairness. This is a result of the 'Presently World Phenomenon'. Stanley Coren unambiguously denounces the concept with equal vigor and force. People tend to feel that the world is, with some bumps here and there, pretty much a fair lay, where people usually get what they deserve and deserve what they get. This notion of a presently world results from our training since children that good is rewarded and evil is punished. A natural conclusion can be drawn from this type of reasoning: Those who are rewarded necessity be good, and those who suffer necessity deserve their fate. In row with these gestures, the following points are raised against affirmative action and positive discrimination:

Merit Argument

The Meritorian principle dictates that social goods should be allotted on the foundation of one's merit or skill, whether natural or acquired. Leaving aside the common intricacies in the application of the principle in such matters since admission to the organizations of higher education or appointment to the state's services, it envisages that the candidates are selected on the foundation of their individual merit, i.e., their skill in words of attainment of sure grades or spots in an objective test, usually a test of intelligence plus knowledge held for that purpose. Supporters of this principle claim that it assures best justice in therefore distant since it allocates the rewards or goods on the foundation of an objective criterion having nothing to do with such personal features of an individual such since his birth, race, color, sex, caste etc.

This principle assures the selection of the mainly able persons from amongst a big number for the limited goods or opportunities accessible for sharing. It also assures a strong society and its overall progress, since distant since it gives a stimulus for difficult job and the growth of Larger mental and physical capacities. At the outset, it seems to be a weighty argument but a closer examination reveals its weaknesses. The notion of merit itself is subjective. What is merit after all? Merit has no fixed or definite meaning free from variations. It is nothing but a criterion to achieve few pre-determined social objective or value or to satisfy a sure perceived social require. It does not manage the objective value or require, but is controlled through them.

Prof. Dworkin does not say that merit is unimportant; the thrust of his argument is that merit itself can be defined in such a method since to create method for scrupulous types of persons in view of social demands and requirements. It is indeed determined in words of perceived social objectives, values or requires and is bound to change with the changes in the latter. In the terms of Justice Krishna Aiyar of the Indian Supreme Court, 'The extremely orientation of our selection procedure is distorted and those like the candidates from the scheduled castes and scheduled tribes who, from their birth, have a traumatic understanding of India have, in one sense, more capacity than those who have existed under affluent conditions and are callous to the human lot of the sorrowing masses. Elitists, whose sympathies with the masses have dehydrated up, are from the standards of the Indian people least appropriate to run government and least meritorious to handle state business, if we envision a service state in which the millions are the consumers... Sensitized heart and a vibrant head, tuned to the tears of the people, will speedily quicken the growth requires of the country and a sincere dedication and intellectual integrity....not degrees of Oxford or Cambridge, Harvard or Standford or same Indian organizations are the biggest components of merit or suitability.'

The thrust of the entire argument is that the concept of efficiency should be related to our developmental requires and irrelevance or inadequacy of the existing test organization to determine efficiency should be discovered.

Rights Argument

Articulation of the affirmative action is also criticized on the ground that it is a violation of the theory of rights. It is usually argued that affirmative action in favor of one group is discriminatory against others who are denied the similar benefits, and this is itself a denial of equality, which is the right of every individual since an individual and not since a member of any group and so, cannot be denied to him basically because he is labeled since a member of an advanced group etc. because another individual is labeled since belonging to a backward group. Every citizen has a constitutional right that he is not made to suffer disadvantages, at least in a competition for any public benefit, because the race or religion or sector area or other natural or artificial group of which he is a member is the substance of prejudice or contempt.

Prof Andre Beteille, in an incisive article on 'Distributive Justice and Institutional Well Being' articulates a critique of the 'group rights' argument. He argues that at a deeper stage, the caste organization has changed fundamentally. The moral claims of castes in excess of their individual members have weakened at all stages of society, and especially in the urban transitional class where the battle in excess of benign discrimination is being fought. It will be safe to say that no caste today has the moral power to enforce on its transitional class members any of its traditional sanctions. Having freed themselves from the moral power of their caste, such individuals are now able to exploit it instrumentally for economic and political advantages. He further

argues that it is hard to see how the thought that castes and societies have rights to proportionate shares in public employment can be made compatible with the working of a contemporary society committed to economic growth and liberal democracy. It is true that caste continues to operate in several spheres of social life; but it does not do therefore any longer since a matter of right. The sustained subsistence of caste is one item; its legitimacy is a dissimilar item altogether. The effort to invest the caste organization with legitimacy through claiming that its constituent elements have rights and entitlements is bound to be defeated in the end; but in the meantime it can reason enormous harm to society and its organizations. The persistent exploit of the language of rights in public debates for and against reservations is bound to lead to an augment in the consciousness of caste, and in that method to defeat the vital objective of affirmative action which is to reduce and not augment caste consciousness. All parties to the debate say that they wish to dismantle the building of caste. Though, caste is not a material edifice that can be physically dismantled and destroyed. It exists all in the consciousness of people, in their deep sense of divisions and isolation on one hand and of rank and inequality on the other.

Prof. M.P. Singh attempts an account through saying that sure castes have been uniformly excluded for thousands of years from goods and opportunities, which they would have certainly desired basically because they belonged to that caste. It is true that no classification based on birth should ordinarily be supported since today sure castes and backwardness are identical. For instance,

scheduled castes and tribes are descriptive of backwardness and nothing else. For thousands of years, they have been treated since untouchables and denied the right of association with other members of society. They have suffered all types of indignities and disabilities not since individuals, but since members of a group or caste and that entitles them to special treatment since members of a group without violence to the right of equality of the non-members. The individual's right to equality in this situation is given due recognition in therefore distant since the members of the group can compete in the middle of themselves for the limited goods accessible for sharing or allocation.

This leaves us in a peculiar situation; if the caste criterion is used for providing protective discrimination, caste divisions are enhanced and identity based on class or caste rows is underlined. Further, on the other hand, if caste identities are overlooked in public employment and for admission in educational organizations of higher studying, they are deprived off an opportunity to overcome their disabilities caused due to use and deprivations of hundreds of years. The solution seems to be lying somewhere in flanked by—the golden mean. Flexibility is the essence in the design and application of policies to redress disparities that have arisen because of several reasons.

Efficiency Argument

It is implicit in the thought of positive discrimination that a less meritorious person is preferred to another who is more meritorious. The supporters of this argument stress on the point

that if for redressing grievances of the past, we undermine the efficiency of public organizations, we would be doing unimaginable harm to the generations to approach. Though, the proponents of this argument should also understand that through segregating some parts from public legroom could do more harm than the quest for efficiency, which they seek to achieve at the cost of social fragmentation.

Balkanization Argument

It has been noted that positive discrimination underlines class, caste and race differences and enhances social divisions, which are already acute in the Indian sociopolitical organization and in the United States of America. Affirmative programmes tend to consolidate a caste ridden and racially conscious society already divided into racial and ethnic clusters, each entitled since a group to few proportionate shares of possessions, careers or opportunities.

In India, due to the history of partition and the resulting massacre of approximately one million people, the argument that positive discrimination tends to divide people revives the history of the tragedy of partition. The communal virus, which started with the Ramsay Mc Donald award, culminated in the partition of the subcontinent and the generation of issues which remain unresolved to this day. Even the history of positive discrimination has not been a smooth one. Now, the economically weaker parts amongst the forwards too are challenging reservations. Demands through Christians and Muslims for

reservations, however subdued now, are being made. That turns the entire concept of positive discrimination into a political tool, seeking to perpetuate the policy of reservations and dividing the people rather than encouraging them to stand on their own and compete in a world of quality. All this leads to an acute type of anxiety in relation to the integrity of the country.

The proponents of positive discrimination respond to this kind of argument through terming it since a displaced argument trying to discredit the affirmative action programme. Their argument is that failure on the implementation front should not be the cause to discard the policy itself. Prof. Dworkin responding to the argument of balkanization in the American context, dispels the fear that affirmative action programmes are intended to produce a balkanized America, divided into racial and ethnic sub-nations. They exploit strong events to uplift the weaker and the deprived or else they will fail, but their ultimate goal is to lessen and not augment the importance of race in American social and professional life.

Prof. Dworkin writes, 'American society is currently a racially conscious society; this is the inevitable and apparent consequence of a history of slavery, repression and prejudice. Black men and women, boys and girls, are not free to choose for themselves in what roles or since members of which social group others will characterize them. They are black, and no other characteristic of personality or allegiance or ambition will therefore thoroughly power how they will be perceived and treated through others, and the range and character of the lives

that will be open to them. The tiny number of black doctors and other professionals is both a consequence and a continuing reason of American racial consciousness... The immediate goal is to augment the number of members of sure races in these professions. But their extensive word goal is to reduce the degree to which American society is overall a racially conscious society.'

Chapter 4

State and Globalization

Globalization and its Context

For our clarity, some sounding words like globalization and globalize necessity be classified. The word globalization refers to a procedure, where since globalize is a word which refers to a set of ideas, values, practices which seek to uphold the goals of what has been taking form in the name of globalization today. In a nutshell, globalize means an ideology or a framework of justification for globalization. It is also significant to dispel few of the misperceptions of globalization of the present day. In few quarters, globalization is understood in a generic sense that globalization has been in subsistence since a thought and a practice as the time immemorial. This understanding lacks a proper historical sense, since it does not recognize the specificity of globalization in the present context. Globalization emerges out of an intricate historical procedure engendered through the logic of capitalist expansion. It seeks to thrive on a specific type of political and cultural habitation at the global stage. It has brought in relation to the profound changes at stages ranging from global, national, and local to regional. It has changed the world radically throughout a decade or two.

It implies homogenization of values and cultures at the cultural stage. And it subscribes to a global political order seeking to marginalize or cut short the sovereign authority of the nation-state in the political sense of the word. Paradoxically,

globalization also celebrates variety and fragmentation at the regional stage. Universal at the global and fragmentation at the regional since a feature characteristic makes globalization since homogenous since contradictory.

There are two apparently contradictory trends that can be discerned in the present globalizing world. First, states look to be giving up sovereignty in their rush to sign local trading and political agreements. Second, clusters are agitating for greater sovereignty within existing states, intent on few measure of independence. Is the world becoming more integrated or is it becoming more fragmented? Are we becoming more international or more regional? The answer, in all cases, is manifestly yes. The North American Free Deal Agreement, the single European market and the newly emerging multilateral agency, the World Deal System (WTO) are all steps towards greater integration. The international economy's move towards globalize is inexorable. Consumerist capitalism requires ever-expanding markets and ever more efficient methods of producing and distributing goods and services. Transnational companies are becoming increasingly adept at finding methods of circumventing national borders in their search for cheap labour, and efficient sourcing of raw and processed materials.

Similarly, ethnic, caste, class, gender, tribals and ecological clusters in South Asia or in other regions of the world have been struggling for greater autonomy within the existing states. The regional assertions have truly become a global phenomenon. Culturally, the thought of national identity for individuals or

clusters is fast eroding in favour of fortification of ethnic, local, caste and religious identities.

Dimensions of Globalization

Economic Globalization

What does globalization mean today? In the current context, economically speaking, it means the homogenization of prices, products, wages, rates of interest and profits to become the similar all in excess of. Under the pretext of free markets, transparency and flexibility, the therefore-described 'electronic herd' moves huge amounts of capital in and out of countries to the political and economic advantage of the western countries wishing to draw foreign capital and gain the benefit of today's and tomorrow's technology.

Political Globalization

In political words, globalization means reordering of the nation-states in a manner that adheres to global integration. The sovereignty of nation-states is expected to be subsequent to that of the global order. A global state order is supposed to be the desired goal. Marginalization of the nation-state is the major challenge in the procedure of globalization of the world.

The globalization of the world is upheld in an intricate organization of laws and regulations. The regulatory regimes of the IMF, the World Bank and the other international fund organizations, the GATT and the WTO are fast emerging since a

new world government for enforcing uniform policies, obligations, and conditionality approximately the world. These organizations are critical in perfecting this organization, which the individual nation-states are to abide through. Another significant political dimension of the procedure is that national governments are being constantly pressed to alter their own laws therefore since to create them more compatible with the emerging organization of global governance. The objections of the weak nation-states to the regulatory regimes of organizations such since the IMF, the World Bank or the WTO, seldom matter.

Globalization and Civilization

Another biggest region in understanding the procedure of globalization is civilization. Globalization, in its fundamental sense, also means universalization of values. Universalization of values necessity be understood at variance with universal values. Universalization of values presupposes that there is a sure type of global order towards which all the values, practices and customs of varied nations, regions and localities necessity be molded. Globalization seeks to build upon absolute homogenization of values and cultures. Cultural globalization constantly seeks to integrate regional and national cultures with global civilization largely dominated through the West. When we seem at cultural globalization in relationship with economic globalization, it becomes clear that the expansion of the capitalist market hinges on the integration of regional markets facilitated through the global transformation of regional cultures.

Anthony Giddens, a renowned sociologist observes that the organizational groups in words of world capitalism, industrialization and contemporary nation-states universalize global networks and also produce time-legroom distancing that makes the regional-global interface an intricate problem. 'Globalization can, then, be defined since intensification of world wide social dealings which link far localities in such a method that regional happenings are formed through measures, several miles absent and vice-versa'.

Globalization, since a cultural expression, refers to compression of the world and the intensification of consciousness of the world since an entire. The rise of information age necessity be seen since concomitant to the culturalization procedure crossways the globe. All the dimensions of globalization are aptly characterized – *'material exchanges localize; political exchanges internationalize and symbolic exchanges globalize'*.

Nation-State and Sovereignty

It is significant to understand the foundation of political empowerment of the nation-state in the contemporary age, and to reflect on its relatively brief history. The nation-state is called since citizens and government which operate within geographically separate borders. To warrant the hyphen, the nation-state needs a self-conscious belief on the section of its citizens that the communal has an authority greater than the mere agglomeration of a given country's population. The nation-state symbolizes the citizen, provides him a sense of belonging to

a coherent entire. It needs the marriage of civil management and self-conscious patriotism. The nation-state embodies the hopes and aspirations of its citizens, who owe it allegiance.

Definition and Meaning of the State

There is a great trade of agreement amongst social scientists since to how the state should be defined. A composite definition would contain three units. First, the state is a set of organizations; these are manned through the state's own personnel. The state's mainly significant organization is that of the means of violence and coercion. Second, these organizations are at the centre of a geographically- surrounded territory, usually referred to since a society; crucially, the state seems inwards to its national society and outwards to superior civilizations in which it necessity create its method; its behaviour in one region can often only be explained through its behaviors in the other. Third, the state monopolizes rule creation within its territory; what we call since sovereignty. This tends towards the making of a general political civilization shared through all citizens.

Sovereignty

The state's exclusive claim to create laws/rule-creation authority is often referred to since sovereignty. The concept of sovereignty has been a key thought in the development of the contemporary world and the all powerful nation-state. Initially, it was purely the state's power to exercise legal violence in order to uphold

order. But slowly, the sovereign nation-states assumed more legitimate claims in excess of the exclusive power within its territorial boundaries through adding concepts like social justice. Therefore, citizens have urbanized expectations from their nation-states' skill to resolve their troubles. Objectivity in the exercise of power lends legitimacy to the acts of the nation-state. The state is autonomous and sovereign, and carries a universal image in a given national society.

Sovereignty Under Threat

Though, the nation-state enters into a crisis in the late twentieth century with the advent of globalization since the nation-state's skill to act independently has been strained through the external forces at the global stage and internal forces at the regional stage. It questioned the extremely validity of the meta-narratives of their subsistence like the nation-state. Nation-states are through the forces of global integration and regional fragmentation.

The mainly significant structuring of connection in peoples' lives has been their connection with the nation-state. The nation, the people who have hitherto had a privileged link to the state, has this no longer, because states are neither able to negotiate with global forces on their own, nor capable of forging a sense of unity in the middle of their citizens who choose to live by exclusive identities. The third world countries feel this more intensely, because the skill of the state on both the fronts is more prominent. Citizens are seeking new shapes of system, which

involve asserting their identities in dissimilar methods. The effects are manifold. Regional societies, seeking a greater share of possessions, will sometimes see that their interests lie in underpinning nation states, at other times in subverting them. International systems will seek greater legitimacy, and one method is to be certain that the sponsoring countries have legitimacy of their own.

The recent phenomenon of world summits has been a case in point to explain how the regional societies are seeking to become trans-border entities. The Vienna Summit of Human Rights Clusters, the Beijing Summit of Women Clusters, the Rio Summit of Ecological Clusters, Durban Summit against Racism or the World Social Forum (WSF) are all mobilizing regional societies crossways nations on the rows of ethnic, caste, gender, ecological issues. They raise questions of social justice beyond the preview of nation-states and connect them with global procedures. For example, the track record of human rights within a country should be good sufficient to deserve a loan, aid or grant from any global lending agency or donor agency, since human rights records figure since a crucial issue in international lending transactions. This explains how the nation-state is coming under pressure from both the domestic and the global forces.

Globalization, State and the MNCs

The global integration is mainly visible in the spheres of manufacture, fund and commerce. Multi-National Corporations, operating beyond national boundaries, increasingly power global

economy. Unlike the factory-centered manufacture of Fordism which was harbored on protectionist policies of nation states, the present global financial operations, what are characterized since 'post-fordism', are controlled through the MNCs. With the breakdown of the earlier international organization and the subsequent global acceptance of neo-liberal thinking based on deregulation, privatization, and liberalization, there has been a virtual proliferation of MNCs in the last three decades.

Globalization of modern vintage is mainly visible and pronounced in the media and on the economic front. An important and rising segment of a rising number of national economies is receiving integrated into the global market. Financial markets and capital flows are able to soar above international boundaries and bypass sovereign state controls at will. International deal accounts for 20 percent of the global output and is estimated to be worth \$5 trillions per annum. Cross border transactions, FDIs and MNCs are rising in importance in determining the economic destiny of nations and are for the mainly section, not amenable to state manage. The top five hundred international companies are responsible for a vast and rising share of global manufacture. The sectoral sharing of the top 500 corporations in the year 2000 reveals a motivating trend. The maximum number of corporations belong to the banking and financial sectors. This clearly illustrates the rising clout of international banks and financial organizations since well since the phenomenal rise of fund capital in recent years. The rationale of the MNCs entering the fund sector is obvious, since quick profits could be reaped from speculative investments in global financial markets rather

than creation extensive-word investments in the economy. In words of the number of MNCs, petroleum refining, automobiles, telecommunications, food and drug stores, and electronic industries follow banks.

The rising economic power through the MNCs has recognized corporate rule on a global level. However the MNCs may not completely erode the sovereignty of nation-states since is idea in few quarters, it is certainly shaping the policy options before these states, particularly in the developing and the underdeveloped countries. The MNCs still need the state to create decisions for their entry into these nations. The state has to give facilities and ensure political, social and economic continuity for smooth transactions of these MNCs in these nations. On their own, they neither have the authority nor the competence to mould the global economy in their favor. Rather, the MNCs seek the support of nation-states and international governmental systems to form the modern global economy.

Globalization, State and Regionalism

The political corollary of this evident shift towards economic liberalism is proving distant more complicated. If the hallmark of the late 1980s was the turn to the market, in politics it was the revival of nationalist tensions on a grand level and the weakness of organizations charged with handling the world economy. Few efforts have been made to make new political buildings that transcend national borders. The European Union (EU) instituted a single market within its twelve member countries at the end of

1992. In addition, it is struggling to make a political and monetary union with the underpinning of economic cooperation. Distant Eastern governments are discussing plans that would augment political cooperation within the area, in row with rising economic ties. The US, its Free Deal Agreement with Canada and Mexico already in lay, is now ready to extend the FTA concept to South America since well.

Nearer house, since we know from the experience of the SAARC countries in recent times, South Asia Free Deal Agreement has been a compelling exercise on the section of these countries, in spite of differences flanked by them and more particularly, the animosity flanked by Pakistan and India. SAFTA is a step towards a monetary union of South Asia. The information that the possibility of a monetary union of the countries has been measured seriously in the SAARC summit of January, 2004 at Islamabad, designates what direction SAARC seeks to move. Such trading links will be followed through attempts to fashion a political unit. Efforts to introduce such liberal tenets during much of the urbanized and the developing world have made it easier for local economic bodies to emerge elsewhere. These local bodies can be seen since the embryo of a multinational political correlative to the increasingly global economy.

Globalization and its Dualism

Why is globalization encountering therefore much resistance from several interest clusters? Foremost in the middle of them are the environmentalists, labour leaders, cultural traditionalists,

religious leaders of dissimilar persuasions, and non-governmental systems. In spite of this rising resistance, under the leadership of the West and its economic authority, globalization is proceeding at a relentless pace. Globalization involves the mainly fundamental centralized restructuring of socio-economic and political dealings as the industrial revolution. Yet the profound implications of these changes have rarely been discovered to serious public scrutiny or debate. Despite the big level global reordering of the world, neither the world leaders, nor the educational organizations, nor the size media have made any credible attempt to define what is being formulated, or even to explore the multidimensionality of its effects, particularly on the developing countries.

In excess of the last decade, we have witnessed a series of unforeseen measures: end of the Cold War; ambitious market reforms in what were formerly intended economies; and acceleration of the procedure of economic integration in Western Europe, North America and East Asia and the increased exploit of protectionist events through mainly biggest traders. Its vital principle revolves approximately the absolute primacy of exponential economic development and an unregulated free market, with require for free deal to stimulate development. Free deal breaks down the barriers to import substitution that tend to promote economic self-sufficiency. It favors export-import-oriented economies with their accelerated privatization of public enterprises, and an aggressive promotion of consumerism, which when combined with global growth, correctly reflects a Western vision. Furthermore, this guiding principle of the new

international economic building also assumes that all countries – even those whose cultures are since diverse since Egypt, India, China, Indonesia, Japan, Kenya, Sweden and Brazil to name some, necessity now line their growing boats in unison. The net result of this procedure is the unleashing of powerful forces that foster the development of a Western cultural uniformity in products and services. Economic globalization will lay continuous pressure on developing nations to abandon regional customs and dismantle programmes geared to developing more self-enough economies.

A good instance of this type of pressure from the West has been happening in Bangladesh. In Bangladesh, banking has been privatized and the country is now permitting direct foreign investment in the insurance sector. Banks which were earlier nationalized for the explicit purpose of helping the needy and the rural sector, have been on the wane. It has become perilous for developing countries to uncritically embrace globalization. Its negative consequences are seldom mentioned. Instead, lack of economic growth is typically blamed on bad government, corruption and cronyism. A blind acceptance of the ideology of globalization is unacceptable, naïve and downright dangerous from the point of view of the developing countries.

Division of the World into Two Camps

The procedure of globalization tends to divide the world into two camps. The West argues that the benefits of globalization are inclusive and benefit both the urbanized and the underdeveloped

nations. The developing countries tend to view globalization with much more skepticism, if not with abject cynicism. Let us take a look at their respective locations on globalization. The Western claims for the benefits of globalization are that it:

Gives considerable capital investment for both institutional and individual growth.

Gives increased employment opportunities to citizens of developing countries.

Increases the possibilities of improving the well-being of the masses by education.

Stimulates infrastructure growth, such as roads, authority plants and contemporary electronic communications and

Involves technology distribution through advanced nations to developing ones at no cost to the developing countries.

This procedure will eventually lead to equalizing working circumstances, standards, attitudes and values globally. In contrast, developing nations argue that globalization is delivering substantially less than has been promised. According to them:

Globalization has recapitalized the developing countries through taking out more money in profits than what has been invested in these countries;

Rather than bringing in more investment capital, several MNCs resort to borrowing from regional creditors, therefore depleting scarce capital possessions that might have been used through indigenous business;

The promise of benefits from new technologies is more likely to disappoint in the extensive run because the dependence it creates stifles innovation in the developing countries;

With globalization and multinational corporations comes a slick, polished brand of advertising that encourages consumerism and the importation of luxury goods. Success in marketing the products and services of MNCs tends to reduce domestic investments that are basic to domestic economic development.

Under globalization, MNCs can counter mercantilist restrictions on deal through establishing subsidiaries abroad. In effect, it allows them to bypass deal barriers, and continue manufacture and collecting profits at the expense of the developing countries.

Since of now, there seems to be small scope for any radical alternatives to the emerging world capitalism. With the emergence of multilateral organizations like the World Deal System, every country has virtually been dragged into the world economy and is slowly opening its economy. Countries such since Mexico, which a decade ago relied on state manage and ownership, are privatizing heavily; Thailand is balancing its budget; Peru is lowering tariffs. Therefore also the countries in the South Asia area, which however started off a small late in the early nineties, have been increasingly going the liberalization

method and opening up their economies. Twentieth-century economic liberalism champions private ownership, a reduced role for the state in business, fewer deal barriers, lower taxes, and a common reliance on the market since the mainly efficient distributor of possessions in a given economy.

The problem in understanding globalization lies in its dualism that governs the present world order. If globalization refers to a unified world, it is also equally true that the world is increasingly divided into two unequal sections- the rich and the poor nations, in which the more advanced western nations are taking advantage of the therefore described free deal and the openness advocated through the new global order. The porous ness of national boundaries is working in favor of the advanced nations. This iniquitous world order has dissimilar implications for dissimilar nations. Many serious studies point that the issues of inequality and justice are going to be the mainly significant concerns of the emerging global order. Globalization affects nation-states adversely, particularly, in the third world, in economic, political and cultural words. Dominated through the West, the international market provides small scope to the southern countries to negotiate with the words of deal. However MNCs have trans-border operations, their interests are still tied up with their parent countries, often the advanced western countries. The MNCs are not therefore multinational in their interests.

With the coming of the information age, the world has further shrunk into what Marshall McLuhan calls the *Global Village*,

where national boundaries become more porous in political and cultural words. Therefore, it brings more anxieties and concrete worries in relation to the political and cultural onslaughts through the West on the more vulnerable third world nations. The global economic order combined with the New Information Order is likely to strengthen the nation-state in advanced countries and weaken the state in the third world. This dualism and contradiction are going to characterize the nation-state in the emerging global order.

An Appraisal

The comparative decline of the nation-state's sovereignty in the sphere of global economy is creating a democratic deficit, largely in the third world countries where the expectations of the state are extremely high and the state capacities are low. The citizens continue to hold their national governments accountable on issues in excess of which the states have no autonomous manage. The strong sense of allegiance to the nation-state borne through its citizens, and urbanized by the anti-colonial struggles, has not yet weakened in row with the decline of the autonomy of national governments. Despite the advent of the 'global village', individuals therefore distant feel small allegiance to emerging supranational bodies such since the European Union. It is all the more distant fetching to anticipate the belongingness of the citizens in the South to such supranational bodies. Similarly, it is hard to imagine the emerging identities within a nation to command the citizen's loyalty since wholesomely since the state. Yet one can see that the democratic deficit in the third world is

going to make tensions on a much higher level. Globalization puts more severe strains on the third world state on economic, political and cultural fronts than the West, given its iniquitous order.

Neither the nation nor the state is in relation to the disappear since a result of global procedures. For a start, there are no substitute buildings that can perform all the functions traditionally associated with the nation-state. At the similar time, people are not prepared to provide up a state-centered nationalism altogether, because nationalism is historically embedded and culturally experienced. Even if they are prepared to provide up, it is only to divide their loyalties increasingly on the rows of multiple identities. Yet, it can not be understood since the disintegration of the state for identities can not be a substitute for the nation-state. Patterns of allegiance are shifting, and multiple loyalties will be the inevitable result. Certainly, however the nation-state does not disappear, it may not remain the method it has been. The shapes and manners of the citizens' allegiance to it change.

Development

The thought of growth is commonly understood since a procedure of economic development and changes or improvements in the lives of people. If one were to inquire people what the mainly regularly mentioned units would in all probability pertain to economic organizations and indicators of economic development, viz., industrialization, technical advancement, urbanization,

augment in wealth and standards of livelihood, etc. It is quite likely that 'westernization' would also recur in mainly responses, if not explicitly, then in all probability since a reference point for comparison. The identification of growth with features associated with the 'west' or the 'contemporary' is, though, not basically a matter of general perception. The association has roots in the history of the thought of growth itself. It is this association which has contributed towards shaping the dominant understanding of the word, and has also generated contradictions, conflicts and debates approximately the thought in the past many years. We can, so, begin our understanding of the concept through recognizing that the thought of growth took form in a specific historical context and has evolved in excess of time.

Human society has always experienced change and moved from easy to intricate shapes of social and political system and economic behaviors. The thought of growth pertains to a specific shape of economic development and social and political buildings. This thought took form in the contemporary era in the context of the breakdown of feudal socio-economic buildings and the development of capitalism. We shall analyze the development of the thought since it appeared in contemporary Europe and spread since a guiding principle determining relationships in the middle of peoples and nations. We shall also see how this connotation had significant socio-economic and political ramifications for the rest of the world.

Modernity and Growth

Rise of Capitalism: Genesis of Growth

The concept of growth is seen since having appeared with the rise of capitalism. Before the rise of capitalism, there lived agricultural civilizations regulated through feudal dealings. Society was hierarchical and one's status of birth determined one's location in the social hierarchy. Feudal property dealings place less emphasis on profit and were guided primarily through self-sufficiency, sustenance and reciprocity. The rise of capitalism with its emphasis on economic development, manufacture output, profit, freedom of deal etc, provided the material circumstances within which the thought of growth started taking form.

Enlightenment Custom

Simultaneously, the intellectual custom of the time, the 'Enlightenment Custom' since it is usually referred to, redefined the notion of the individual. The individual, within the new intellectual custom, came to be idea of since having the faculty of cause, and possessing the capability to take rational decisions. The fate of this thinking individual was no longer ordained through divine forces, nor was the individual bound so, to remain confined to the relationships which were prescribed through feudal society. This rational individual, skeptical of the slow and relatively stagnant socioeconomic relationships, since well since

the hierarchical foundation of social and political system, struggled to break free.

Capitalism based on the principle of free enterprise and profit, fed ideas of progress and growth. With the emphasis on spectacular material progress and profit creation, it was only logical that feudal relationships were undermined, and simultaneously, the corresponding buildings of rule, dismantled. This dismantling achieved only after a prolonged political thrash about for individual freedom, and autonomy from existing feudal organizations, also gave rise to political ideals of liberty, freedom and a liberal notion of democracy. In its birth alongside capitalism, though, the thought of growth was primarily recognized with progress, and the first formulations of growth since progress were establish in the jobs of classical political economists like David Ricardo and Adam Smith.

Views of Jorge Larrain on Growth

Jorge Larrain points out that the concept of growth is not only closely bound up with the development of capitalism, each stage of capitalism can be seen since having a specific set of notions in relation to the growth. Larrain sees capitalism since having urbanized in three largest levels from 1700 and specifies the corresponding theories of growth for each stage. These three levels are:

- Age of Competitive Capitalism,
- Age of Imperialism and

- Late Capitalism.

The Age of Competitive Capitalism

The age of competitive capitalism was marked through the struggles of the new industrial bourgeoisie to free themselves from the last vestiges of feudalism and to gain political authority. This was also the time when capitalism, from its emergence in Britain, started expanding all in excess of the world in search of markets. Karl Marx points out that in its first levels of growth, industrial capital sought to close a market through force i.e., by the colonial organization. Classical political economy, represented through Adam Smith and David Ricardo, whispered that capitalism was the absolute or the perfect shape of manufacture, i.e., it could give the mainly conducive circumstances for development. They whispered that international deal was significant for rising productivity. The absoluteness and clash-free conceptualization of capitalism was, though, subjected to review when working class struggles appeared. It was in the context of these struggles that Karl Marx and Friedrich Engels presented their critique of capitalism. They saw in the working class struggles a manifestation of the inner contradictions in capitalism and the possibility of its demise and replacement through a more advanced manner of manufacture.

The Age of Imperialism

The second level or the age of imperialism was marked through monopolistic manage of the market through vast corporations,

the export of capital from industrial centers to the margin, the latter's manage of both raw material manufacture and capital accumulation and, the firm entrenchment of capitalism since the predominant manner of manufacture. The neo-classical theory of growth gained primacy throughout this level. It worked with the assurance that the capitalist manner of manufacture had strong roots and an inherent power to sustain itself. Neo-classical theorists measured the market since perfect, and remained concerned with the procedures which continued it i.e., the microeconomics of ascertaining what was to be produced, how much, and at what price. The Marxists in the meantime sought to enlarge their traditional critique of capitalism. Rosa Luxemburg, Bukharin, Hilferding and Lenin, while believing that the inherent features of capitalism contributed to growth, also accommodated the colonized countries in their framework. They emphasized that since extensive since the colonial bond was not broken, the growth of colonized countries would remain arrested. In the context of the series of depressions which culminated in the economic crisis in 1930, the neo-classical theory, was shaken through the idea of John Meynard Keynes who advocated that state intervention was required to ameliorate the effects of depression.

The Level of Late Capitalism

The level of late capitalism began in 1945 and can be seen since divided into two phases, the earlier ending in 1966 and the later stage continuing till 1980. This level was marked through the manufacture of contemporary consumer goods and till 1966, the

era was characterized through economic expansion and growing profits. The era was also important for the procedure of decolonization, and the emergence of newly self-governing countries all in excess of the world, and the subsequent introduction of issues of social progress and economic growth on the agenda of the latter. In this context *modernization theories* sought to explain the procedure of growth since the transition from the traditional society to the contemporary or industrial society. Historically, the transition occurred first in urbanized civilizations and the others were expected to follow the similar patterns of changes.

The Marxist theories in this stage attempted to understand and explain the causes for underdevelopment in newly self-governing countries even after the rupture of colonial bonds. Therefore, the theory of imperialism explored the internal effects of the introduction of capitalism in third world civilizations. Paul Baran argues that in these countries, imperialist powers enter into alliance with the regional oligarchies and since a result basic economic possessions are partly siphoned off to the metropolis and partly squandered in luxury consumption, preventing accumulation and growth. Imperialist countries, the theories propose, are simply opposed to the industrialization of underdeveloped countries and attempt to uphold the old ruling class in authority. Through 1966 the level of late capitalism enters a new stage, marked through the slowing down of economic development and a falling rate of profit. In this stage, the *neo-liberals* launched an attack on the Keynesian policies,

accusing the state of excessive intervention and slowing down development by heavy taxation to support welfare policies.

In Latin American countries, the *theories of dependency* were skeptical in relation to the liberating role of national bourgeoisies and proposed that the procedures of industrialization in the third world are the vehicles of imperialist penetration and generate a dependence on transnational companies. Ander Gunder Frank in scrupulous, questioned the Marxist and liberal theories, both of which claimed that capitalism was a manner of manufacture able to promote growth everywhere. Frank rejected this thought and maintained that capitalism is to be blamed for the continuous underdevelopment of Latin American countries as the sixteenth century. Frank conceives of capitalism since a world organization within which the metropolitan centers control to expropriate the economic surpluses from satellite countries by the mechanism of the international market, therefore producing growth in the former and underdevelopment in the latter. Third world countries are underdeveloped because they are dependent within the world capitalist organization. Hence, growth can only happen when a country breaks out of the organization through means of a socialist revolution.

The growth theories, which arose in the 1970s, illustrate the power of Frank, especially Samir Amin and A.Emmanuel's *Theory of Unequal Swap* and I.Wallerstein's *World Organization theory*. For Wallerstein, all the states within the world organization could not develop simultaneously through definition because the organization functions through virtue of having an unequal

center and peripheral regions. A motivating characteristic, which Wallerstein adds, is that the role of being a peripheral or a semi-peripheral nation is not fixed. Center countries and peripheral countries could become semi peripheral and therefore on. What remnants definite, though, is the unequal nature of the world organization.

Redefining Growth

At the time when scholars in the West were trying to affirm the potential for growth in capitalism, or in the case of Marxist theorists, looking at both the dynamism and contradictions within capitalism, few strands of idea started to redefine the concept of growth.

Radical Critique of Growth

A more radical critique of growth started emerging in the 1970s. This critique started from the vital assumption that growth in its current usage is inextricably associated with capitalist growth and expansion. Capitalist expansion has historically resulted in the concentration of wealth in some nations and poverty for others. This critique took cognizance of the notion of growth, which recognized it solely with capitalist growth, and the principle that there is a single path to growth to be followed through all.

Scholars like Arturo Escobar, Wolfgang Sachs and Gustavo Esteva point out that the association of 'growth' in the dominant

orthodoxy with development and modernization, remained an influential ideology of nation structure in the newly self-governing countries after the Second World War. During the post-war era the meanings and purposes of growth since understood in these countries could not break free from the notion of growth since it had appeared in Europe in the 16th century. Wolfgang Sachs shows this lucidly when, script in the early 1990s, he says that the last forty years can be described the 'age of growth'. Like a towering lighthouse guiding sailors towards the coast, growth was *the* thought which oriented the emerging nations in their journey since sovereign nations after they had been freed from colonial subordination. This quest for growth through the new nations, though, did nothing to liberate them from the hierarchy of the world order, brought in relation to the and continued through the logic of capital. After independence the thought of growth therefore sustained to mean growth therefore since to fit into a world capitalist economy.

Rise of the USA and the Issue of Growth

It is important so, that soon after independence, mainly of these nations, which embarked on the course of growth, came to be labeled since 'underdeveloped'. Through the end of World War II, the United States assumed a formidable centrality in the world. To create its location explicit and binding, the United States laid down in precise words its connection of power and benevolence, with the new nations. Gustavo Esteva points out that with this pronouncement of Truman's policy, a big size of humanity, and the formerly colonized countries were put under a blanket label

of 'underdeveloped'. The label not only condemned the newly self-governing countries to a new subjection, it affirmed the continuation of a hierarchy's world organization resting on the edifice of capitalist growth.

Emergence of the Third World and the Concept of Growth

With the 1970s, the Third World appeared since an important political block, which preferred to steer clear of allegiance to any ideological block and subscribing to neither the capitalist, nor the socialist path of growth. The new social movements, which appeared all in excess of, the world, began questioning the existing policies of growth, seeking a more plural path of growth, where the requires and aspirations of regional regions could be taken into explanation. The new social movements, e.g., the habitation, workers, women's movements etc., sought to attract attention to the manner in which existing growth patterns resulted in the marginalization of big parts of population, or incorporated the several parts of the population in an unequal method. The existing frameworks of growth were contested.

Democratization of growth patterns were sought at two stages:

Within countries and In the middle of countries in order to promote a more egalitarian economic and political order, where past historical predominance of nations could be checked and the growth of each nation and each person could be achieved.

Vital Requires Come

The 'vital requires' come to growth is so, to give opportunities for the full physical, mental and social growth of the individual. Vital requires, so, incorporated 'require for self-determination, self-reliance, political freedom and security, participation in decision-creation, national and cultural identity, and a sense of purpose in life and job'. The definition of vital human requires sheltered five largest areas: vital goods for family consumption; vital services; participation in decision creation; the fulfillment of vital human rights; and productive employment.

Growth within the Neo-liberal Framework

In the 1980s, growth, both since a procedure and since a goal, came to be framed in words of the prevailing neo-liberal ideas. These ideas proposed that economic freedom, free markets, private-sector initiatives and the cutting absent of regulations would give the circumstances and incentives for unleashing entrepreneurial energies, rejecting thereby the ideas of the 1960s and 1970s which saw a key role for the state in scheduling, sharing and the provision of vital human requires. This thinking in relation to the growth reasserted the 'primacy of economic development', rather than social growth or the elimination of poverty, arguing that in the extensive run development would take care of poverty. Through the end of the 1980s, though, it became evident that the withdrawal of the state from social growth and distributive role, had imposed heavy costs on the

poor with respect to increases in vital food prices since well since medical and educational services.

Right to Growth

In the meantime, the *right to growth*, was adopted through the Common Assembly of the United Nations on 4th December, 1986. This right not only included the extremely essence of human rights, it provided a rich starting ground for a new quest of human rights, which would shape the foundation for an egalitarian world order. The right to growth encapsulates the right to self determination and sovereignty, and asserts that all rights, civil, political, economic, social and cultural, are equally significant and should be promoted and protected equally. It also brings in the significant supposition that international peace and security are essential units for the establishment of circumstances conducive to the right to growth. While asserting require for equality of opportunity, the mainly important contribution of the declaration is its emphasis on the human person since the source and subject of rights. The individual was the central subject of the growth procedure, and growth policy should create him the largest participant and the largest beneficiary.

The following center ideas which constitute the right to growth, signify few radical shifts in the thought of growth:

The declaration makes the right to growth in effect the right of all human persons, everywhere, and of humanity since an entire, to realize their potential.

It asserts the certainty of the human person since the source and subject of rights.

It aims at the constitution of a presently human society through remapping the trajectories of growth.

Underlying the Declaration is also the notion of duty of all human beings, to thrash about to make and uphold circumstances where authentic human, social and civilization growth is possible.

It is simultaneously then, the duty of the state to give the circumstances in which the human person is able to exercise his/her rights and duties

World Growth Statement 1991

Traces of this comprehensive view of growth can be seen in the *World Growth Statement 1991*. The *Statement* defined growth since both 'economic growth' constituting a sustainable augment in livelihood standards that encompass material consumption, education, health and habitation defense, and in a broader sense since including other significant and related attributes since well, like equality of opportunity, political freedom and civil liberties. The overall goal of growth was so seen since rising the

economic, political, and civil rights of the people crossways gender, ethnic clusters, religions, races, regions, and countries.

In the discussion therefore distant, we have seen that the definition of growth has no longer remained narrowly focused on economic development. It has been enlarged to contain social and human growth. It has also incorporated in its scope a notion of growth, which is a product of, and also seeks to set up democracy by popular participation. This notion of growth has establish its mainly comprehensive theoretical articulation in Amartya Sen's formulation of 'growth since freedom'.

Amartya Sen on Growth

For Sen, expansion of freedom is viewed since both the *primary end* and the *principal goal* of growth. Growth needs, so, the removal of biggest sources of unfreedom i.e., poverty, tyranny, poor economic opportunities, systematic social deprivation, neglect of public facilities, intolerance or over activity of repressive states. Amartya Sen also opposes the thought that political freedoms require to be postponed until socio-economic growth has been achieved. He argues that political freedoms and such other freedoms, such since the freedom from disease and ignorance are essential components of growth. Sen specifies five categories of 'instrumental freedoms' which jointly promote growth. These 'instrumental freedoms' are:

Political freedoms: which enable people to participate in forming government and influencing its policies,

Economic facilities: which constitute the opportunities for people to exploit possessions,

Social opportunities: which refer to the arrangements within society for health care and education, which facilitate participation in political and economic life,

Transparency guarantees: these guarantees refer to circumstances of public trust achieved by transparency in public affairs,

Protective security: this instrumental freedom gives social safety and security which prevents people from becoming poor and destitute.

Chapter 5

Secularism

Understanding the Indian Require for and Debates in Relation to the Secularism

To understand these, let us start through asking: how best to understand the Indian require for, and debates in relation to the secularism. It is obvious that secularism since a concept, principal and a set of practices appeared first in a dissimilar historical context viz., in the West. It is only in the last 100 years, more therefore in the 50 years i.e. as the adoption of the Constitution in 1950, that secularism has become a topic of debate in Indian society. And in the last 10-15 years it has also become a matter of serious disputes and contentions. In the case of India, because she joined late in the history of growth of contemporary ideas and their actualization, we have to inquire two kinds of questions. These are: why do we require secularism? What can be the relevant shape of secularism for India? And, this first question has become significant because there is a part of people in India, both in the middle of intellectuals and political activists, who consider and argue that we can do without secularism.

Their argument goes like this: our customs are pluralistic and flexible and can so, be a bigger source of toleration; it is a resource with us in our own history. We do not so, need imposing

secularism, an alien concept, on our society. While we all agree that our customs are plural and flexible, we need to understand that the view that secularism is unnecessary in India is deeply mistaken, because these plural customs cannot sustain democracy under the present conditions.

Western Context of Secularism

It is significant to go into the origins of secularism or the western context. This method we can have a picture of historical differences, which can then suggest a possible range of answers to these questions. There are things or conditions in the history of Europe, out of which two principles of understanding emerge in relation to the thought of the secular. Europe saw, during the transitional ages and right up to the transitional of the 17th century, a biggest thrash about flanked by the Roman Catholic Church and the states of the time for supremacy. This clash for supremacy flanked by these two biggest organizations, both, highly organized and powerful, has approach to be recognized since the 'Church vs. the State' controversy. Then, from the transitional of the 16th century with the rise of Protestantism, there came in relation to the intolerant debate flanked by the Roman Catholic Church and the Protestant sects. This urbanized into a biggest war flanked by the two in the early 17th century and was fought out for 30 extensive years, killing and maiming millions of people all in excess of Europe. This was recognized since the '30 Years War' or the 'Sectarian War', which ended with the Treaty of Westphalia where a Modus Vivandi was arrived at flanked by the two warring clusters. This Modus Vivandi

gradually, in excess of time, grew into a principle of political order and got disseminated in the middle of the political class. Secularism came to be the principle which enunciated isolation flanked by the State and the Church.

The other item of importance was the transformation of religion into a personal matter, which then, went on to reinforce the isolation principle. Within the Protestant movement, several churches were emerging, each with its own separate doctrine and emphases. It came to be carried that nobody ought to interfere in relation to the church one chose to belong to. Belief was to be a matter of one's conscience, something personal and private to the individual. The principle of putting church/religion on one face and state/politics on the other, jointly with the principle of conscience since a matter private to the individual person, became the foundation of the rise of secularism since a doctrine. In other terms, religion was to be kept out of public affairs and policy creation, which were to be the exclusive domain of politics and the state.

It is obvious that one cannot attract any direct lesson from the western experience because India never had a church or a powerful organized state. The Maurya or the Mughal empires were episodic, that is, such a state was not a continuous attendance. The thought of conflict flanked by the church and the state is so, alien to Indian Culture. Our context and historical heritage are extremely dissimilar. Therefore, *require* for and the circuit of secularism have to be also necessarily dissimilar. But the

importance of the principle of conscience, in a dissimilar method however, could not be denied.

Historical Sociology of the Require for Secularism in India

Our secularism is primarily directed against two evils; first, the religious strife flanked by dissimilar religious societies and its extreme shapes like communal violence and riots; and, secondly, the danger of religious societies overwhelming the state, each with its own view of 'good life' since valid for others, too. Both arose since a problem in the second half of the 19th century. Sometimes, these become disproportionately significant and at other times recede into insignificance. Why did this occur? The answer will provide us the historical sociology of how the require arose for secularism in India. After India came under colonial rule, two changes closely linked to each other, took lay in the Indian society. One pertained to the type of structural changes that came in relation to the other to the method our social life was organized. Both had distant reaching consequences.

Structural Changes: Modernization and its Consequences

The first had to do with modernization – bourgeois property, long deal, industry, urban life, capital accumulation, contemporary education, etc. Colonial modernization was deeply exploitative, creating uneven divisions flanked by regions and societies, but nevertheless, leading to the economic integration of the country,

uniform administrative manage and a rising cultural harmonization by codification of traditions and their applications crossways dissimilar sections. This had some significant consequences. It was creating greater and greater parallel flanked by India and the global structural circumstances. It also led to the procedure of *individuation*, that is, persons bound within societies gradually becoming *individuals*. These two growths jointly, then, became the foundation of new mental capacities. To take one example, receptivity to ideas from anywhere in the world appeared. We all are aware of how ideas of equality, rights, dignity of person and therefore on, became a cherished possession of the people in India since much since they were to others anywhere else in the world. It is shown in the growth of printing, the rising importance and popularity of newspapers, periodicals and books in the life our society. Issues were raised and hotly debated. There was a proliferation of discussion not only at the stage of the elite, but at dissimilar popular stages. Nobody then divided the ideas into those, which were of foreign origin and those which were of Indian origin. They debated these ideas since new and of interest and relevance to the Indian society. It looked since if everybody is talking to everybody else in excitement. Since a result of this, secondly, extremely big number of persons, bound earlier within societies of ritual status or religious beliefs, were let loose from these prior bonds.

This is how, what we call today 'masses,' were created; people of a new type. Several implications flowed out of this. Masses were presently not an undifferentiated pool of people. It took several structural shapes like the formation of new classes, viz., the

capitalist and the workers, contemporary landlords and the farmers and property less agricultural labour; professional clusters like lawyers and accountants and doctors and therefore on. This has had a lasting impact on the social fabric of life in India. It is not that the old approach, pre-contemporary societies like *jatis* or little religious clusters did not survive but their internal shape was deeply altered. These got differentiated in words of income and skills, unlike earlier. New interests appeared within these societies which jostled with one another. Earlier, the societies existed face through face without competition and enjoyed a great trade of regional autonomy in how they existed. That regional autonomy began to lose ground and today it is lost.

Changes in the System of Social Life

There also took lay, on a big level, efforts at redrawing the society boundaries and efforts at unifying them to confront the perceived onslaught of the contemporary world and in the similar procedure, to gain benefits for the societies. Resistance to modernity and bargaining for its advantages were and are, paradoxically, two faces of the similar coin. The outcome of both these changes: society was no more the loosely held variety, livelihood, and section unreflectively, through itself. It now faced its alternative, the singular other, modernity. To handle this threat and to defend itself, several of the numerous societies, each related to the superior customs in dissimilar methods also posed diverse notions of the social good. Not only did each of these notions of good competed with one another, but also the

conception of good entailed in modernity and which was clouded through the colonial depredations.

This was the source of enormous strain on the inherited capacities of people to handle interpersonal, intra-society and inter-society dealings. This happened in excess of and above the new competition generated through the establishment of colonial economy and management beside with the thrash about for share in authority in the new social arrangement, taking form then. The situation required interlocutors for swap of opinions and ideas and the adjudication of diverging interests and diverse notions of good flanked by these extremely differently positioned worlds. Successful mediation required either people placed outside the numerous societies or those who could think beyond the limits of these societies, each of which was receiving more and more unified since well since assertive. Old approach dialogue, since used to take lay flanked by nearest societies enjoying regional autonomy, would no more do flanked by people, now more and more far from one another and challenging things from the world, which was unfamiliar to old kind of transactions. All this was to sap the traditionally built-in possessions including those of tolerance and mutual perseverance. Agreements or understanding reached through those, claiming to symbolize these differently positioned worlds, always proved to be fragile and unlasting. In other terms, dialogical deals by the efforts of interlocutors have the character, especially in situations of social transition, of being provisional. This is a situation in which old approach dialogue flanked by the nearest societies does not job and the interlocutors become unequal to the task required. So, something

other than all these communally based competing notions of good was required; a value and a mechanism at the similar time, to intercede in the side of the competing notions of good since well since interests were also needed. Compulsions from within this situation triggered require for what is now described the 'Secular Doctrine of Governance'. It was required in excess of and above everything, to seek a manner of doing things in the public life in a method therefore that the competing, and often irreconcilable, conceptions of good do not vitiate every situation of public interactions in the middle of the people. Few method of being secular, a principle of being outside of and at an aloofness from these competing notions of good, was require generated from within the alterations taking form at the extremely several intersections of society. One can so, argue that the principle of secularism is an internally propelled *emergence* and therefore becomes an *attendance*, irrespective of our choice.

It is now clear that require for secularism arose within and out of the changes in the internal social dealings and constitutive characteristics, which create up Indian society. If a require for a new principle or a value or a concept, whether it be secularism or rights or equality or whatever, arises within a society, then it should be obvious that the concept or the principle is neither alien nor can it be looked at since an imposition. In a world sure principles or values and the concepts by which these are expressed do tend to develop roots in civilizations like ours. This is because of their internal requires even if originating in the West.

Suitable Adaptation of Secularism for India

Such being the case, we should also be clear that ours is not a settled society like France or Germany etc., we are in a middle level and so, the meaning of or what type of secularism we shall get will also be dictated through the specific characteristics of this level. Here, the social buildings and belief and norms of the old society, however still present, are rapidly changing or giving method to new characteristics. Let us take two examples. In our marriage organization, the circle of endogamy is fast expanding and gradually, in several instances, the unit of choice is entering. People may no longer want to be governed entirely through old, religious traditions or rituals. They may want defense for what they desire. To provide another instance, we do not want, any more, to be ruled through the decisions of our caste panchayats. We, instead, prefer to be ruled through the elected panchayat. People may not want to be overwhelmed through caste and ritual status, since can occur in the working of the old caste panchayats.

If we stay both these and such others in mind, it becomes clear that these are situations where numerous new kinds of conflicts and social demands emerge. What one wants to stress here is that all the situations of transitions are also the ones where new conflicts abound and these conflicts are flanked by the old and the new or the confusions and uncertainties generated through these. Old methods of doing things, of resolving conflicts based on customary notions, will not do since these became inadequate or irrelevant because these were meant to handle little, recurring

conflicts flanked by regional societies livelihood nearest to one another. There is no simple application of these on levels since big since in contemporary politics. Such is the situation prevailing under circumstances of transition. Now, given the ever-changing character of conflicts, it is never sufficient to have merely principles and mechanisms. What is needed is a creative working out of policies and initiatives to meet the ever-changing newness of the clash situations flanked by religions and ethnic societies and flanked by dissenters from within these societies. The last may take up locations against their own societies.

Secularism, under such circumstances of shifting confliction communal equations, needs cautious and flexible application. It is no panacea in the sense that it cannot do without sensibly idea out social and economic policies or administrative events. But there is no other substitute, since we have seen in the case of customs and traditions, principle to act in these situations. We can, so, say that this is a *hard situation*, but not that it is an *impossible principle* or that we cannot realize a secular society in India. If we stay this distinction in mind viz. flanked by 'the hard' and 'the impossible', then we can bigger understand that secularism takes a zigzag circuit by the setbacks to its applications in India.

Having approach this distant, let us inquire: what should secularism mean for India? In other terms, what is a suitable adaptation for us? Within their recognized domains, they function self-governing of directions from the other. In America, this came to be recognized since the 'wall of isolation'. This now

is usually seen in the West since the universal model of secularism. Can this adaptation of secularism be the suitable model for India?

Culture Differences

In trying to understand this, let us stay the following things in mind. One, no two cultural belts or societies are similar. Culture in contemporary India is extremely dissimilar from what it is in the West or what it was when secularism since a principle arose. But there is more in India, which goes to create it unique, extremely dissimilar, *and sui generis*. Let us seem at this briefly, because this will have a bearing on how we conceive secularism. The boundaries of religion in Hinduism, or what made it socially recognizable since a separate religion, have never been dogma or enjoined belief, even however few powerful beliefs are consistently held, like Karma or Moksha or Varna. What made Hinduism recognizably separate were a set of ritually prescribed practices, *enjoined* on members differentially in words of *Varna* or caste and *Jati* rank. These practices were deeply embedded in social buildings and marked out that scrupulous social building through their sheer attendance. Since suggested, not go into the details but mention only some which are directly relevant for the issue under discussion. Notions of purity and pollution, untouchability, regulation of social aloofness flanked by human beings in words of caste, right to temple entry or drawal of water from wells and several others like these are based on religious scriptures or therefore it is whispered. These were extensively practiced in India and have distant from disappeared in the

present times. We still read news of torture being inflicted on people of lower castes for breaking these ritual rules or on women, who go out of bounds from the limits prescribed through the custom.

Western Isolation Unworkable in India

Given these characteristics, 'isolation' since practiced in the West, will basically not be feasible in India; may well be impossibility. In creation democracy actual, every manner of institutional isolation has to be informed through sure normative concerns, values that underlie that isolation. India *seeks to ensure equality* flanked by individuals and make circumstances that *guarantee the dignity of person*. These are foremost in the middle of several others that our Constitution talks about. Now seem at this. The exclusion of Dalits from temples or village wells is qualitatively not of the similar type since that of Blacks in America from same things. In our case, it enjoyed a scriptural i.e. religious sanction. Such is not the case with the Blacks in America. If the American state legislates to outlaw such practices, it does not become a matter of interference in religion, whereas in India, when the state legislates to outlaw such practices of untouchability or enhance the status of women, several people consider, and strongly therefore, that the state is interfering in religious matters. Several reforms of the Hindu laws have been viewed in this manner.

Several of these practices are in clash with the normative requirement of the Indian Constitution that every Indian

irrespective of caste or creed or gender be treated since equal and ensure dignity to all persons. This aim, cannot be ensured and/or realized without legislating several a practice, viewed since section of religion, since illegal. The 'wall of isolation' flanked by the state and the church or politics and religion, since in the American Constitution, is out of contention. It basically will not job in the case of India. And that is why, we described it an impossible ideal. Several people discover secularism impossible for India because they, beside with Donald Smith – the first significant commentator on Indian secularism – job implicitly with such a conception of secularism.

Isolation Principle: Reworking Required in the Indian Context

If it is now possible to concede that *few intervention, strictly regulated according to neutral principles* is necessary, then we can say that isolation since a foundation of secular state in India has to be a re-worked adaptation of the western principle. Implanting western notions uncritically will not do. Dissimilar circumstances, with their specific difficulties, demand creative application. Blind adherence to the western principles or the easy rejection of the tested models and practices is not the answer.

We have a difficult situation at hand. We have to guarantee that the several values of the Constitution, which we all cherish, have to be actualized in our social life. Secondly, democracy needs that we all become *citizens*, because, without citizenship, democracy is not realizable. We so, need *interventions* in matters

which, in our context, are taken to be religious. But, from the other face, we need few shape or degree of *isolation*, because citizenship is not realizable without few shape of a secular ideal. Citizenship calls for, at its minimum, two circumstances; viz. people with guaranteed or entrenched rights and that persons be defined independently of religious values of any scrupulous society. The ideas of treating the *worth of the individual* independently of religion is a secular ideal and of utmost importance in the Indian context. Any other consideration in treating the worth of the individual other than being human is offensive to democracy. We have dignity and worth basically because we are human, and not because we are human plus Hindu, or Muslim, or Christian, or Sikh. It may be true that several of us derive a lot of meaning from our religions as that makes for a 'good' life. Secularism is an arid principle; it is not meant for higher meanings. Since a arid principle, it is meant to in excess of see that conflicts flanked by these higher meanings and beliefs do not become matters of public contention and that they are kept out of political life and policy creation at any stage of state action.

In the Indian situation, politics and religion should be like strangers approach side to side and not like in America, where they are barred from seeing each other through a 'wall' that stands flanked by them. But since they remain strangers, they do not become intimate. What secularism in India demands is the absence of intimacy flanked by the two, as that happens in communal politics whether of Hindutva, represented through the Sangh Parivar, or of the Muslim League or the Akali Dal and

therefore on. The superior and more widespread the religious group, the greater the danger it poses to the country's integrity. We necessity seem at the danger of communal forces in India in this perspective, given to us through our own history of religious strifes. Require for secularism is crucial, if we want to live our every day life in a civil manner. And every day life is significant.

Chapter 6

The Evolution of World Politics

Defining the field

World politics names both the discipline that studies the political and economical patterns of the world and the field that is being studied. At the centre of that field are the different processes of political globalization in relation to questions of social power.

The discipline studies the relationships between cities, nation-states, shell-states, multinational corporations, non-governmental organizations and international organizations. Current areas of discussion include national and ethnic conflict regulation, democracy and the politics of national self-determination, globalization and its relationship to democracy, conflict and peace studies, comparative politics, political economy, and the international political economy of the environment. One important area of world politics is contestation in the world political sphere over legitimacy.

It can be argued that world politics should be distinguished from the field of international politics, which seeks to understand political relations between nation-states, and thus has a narrower scope. Similarly, international relations, which seeks to understand general economic and political relations between nation-states, is a narrower field than world politics. Beginning in the late nineteenth century, several groups extended the definition of the political community beyond nation-states to

include much, if not all, of humanity. These "internationalists" include Marxists, human rights advocates, environmentalists, peace activists, feminists, and dalits. This was the general direction of thinking on world politics, though the term was not used as such.

Today, the practices of world politics are defined by values: norms of human rights, ideas of human development, and beliefs such as Internationalism or cosmopolitanism about how we should relate to each. Over the last couple of decades cosmopolitanism has become one of the key contested ideologies of world politics:

Cosmopolitanism can be defined as a world politics that, firstly, projects a sociality of common political engagement among all human beings across the globe, and, secondly, suggests that this sociality should be either ethically or organizationally privileged over other forms of sociality.

Debates

The intensification of globalization led some writers to suggest that states were no longer relevant to world politics. This view has been subject to debate:

On the other hand, other commentators have been arguing that states have remained essential to world politics. They have facilitated globalizing processes and projects; not been eclipsed by them. They have been rejuvenated because, among other reasons, they are still the primary providers of (military) security

in the world arena; they are still the paramount loci for articulating the voices of (procedurally democratic) national communities, and for ordering their interactions with similar polities; and finally, they are indispensable to relations of (unequal) economic exchange insofar as they legitimize and enforce the world legal frameworks that enable globalization in the first place.

Global administrative law

Global administrative law is an emerging field that is based upon a dual insight: that much of what is usually termed “global governance” can be accurately characterized as administrative action; and that increasingly such action is itself being regulated by administrative law-type principles, rules and mechanisms – in particular those relating to participation, transparency, accountability and review. GAL, then, refers to the structures, procedures and normative standards for regulatory decision-making including transparency, participation, and review, and the rule-governed mechanisms for implementing these standards, that are applicable to formal intergovernmental regulatory bodies; to informal intergovernmental regulatory networks; to regulatory decisions of national governments where these are part of or constrained by an international intergovernmental regime; and to hybrid public-private or private transnational bodies. The focus of this field is not the specific content of substantive rules, but rather the operation of existing or possible principles, procedural rules and reviewing and other mechanisms

relating to accountability, transparency, participation, and assurance of legality in global governance.

Today almost all human activity is subject to some form of global regulation. Goods and activities that are beyond the effective control of any one State are regulated at the global level. Global regulatory regimes cover a vast array of different subject-areas, including forest preservation, the control of fishing, water regulation, environmental protection, arms control, food safety and standardization, financial and accounting standards, internet governance, pharmaceuticals regulation, intellectual property protection, refugee protection, coffee and cocoa standards, labour standards, antitrust regulation, to name but a very few. This increase in the number and scope of regulatory regimes has been matched by the huge growth of international organizations: nowadays over 2,000 intergovernmental organizations (IGO) and around 40,000 Non-governmental organizations (NGO) are operating worldwide.

There are, of course, great differences among the various different types of regulatory regimes. Some merely provide a framework for State action, whereas others establish guidelines addressed to domestic administrative agencies, and others still impact directly upon national civil society actors. Some regulatory regimes create their own implementation mechanisms, while others rely on national or regional authorities for this task. To settle disputes, some regulatory regimes have established judicial (or quasi-judicial) bodies, or refer to those of different regimes; while others resort to “softer” forms, such as

negotiation. Within this framework, the traditional mechanisms based on State consent as expressed through treaties or custom are simply no longer capable of accounting for all global activities.

A new regulatory space is emerging, distinct from that of inter-State relations, transcending the sphere of influence of both international law and domestic administrative law: this can be defined as the global administrative space. IOs have become much more than instruments of the governments of their Member States; rather, they set their own norms and regulate their field of activity; they generate and follow their own, particular legal proceedings; and they can grant participatory rights to subjects, both public and private, affected by their activities. Ultimately, they have emerged as genuine global public administrations. In other words, the structures, procedures and normative standards for regulatory decision-making applicable to global institutions (including transparency, participation, and review), and the rule-governed mechanisms for implementing these standards are coming to form a specific field of legal theory and practice: that of global administrative law. The main focus of this emerging field is not the particular content of substantive rules generated by global regulatory institutions, but rather the actual or potential application of principles, procedural rules and reviewing and other mechanisms relating to accountability, transparency, participation, and the rule of law in global governance.

Asia Council

The Asia Council is a pan-Asian organization constituted in 2016 to serve as a continent wide forum to address Asia's key challenges and foster cooperation among countries of Asia. The council has its headquarters in Tokyo and regional directorates in Doha, Chengdu and Bangkok.

Organization

The Asia Council operates through the council headquarters in Tokyo, three regional directorates and country offices.

Administrative Divisions

The Asia Council is organized into three administrative divisions. The East Asia division has its regional directorate in Tokyo, the South Asia & South East Asia division has its regional directorate in Bangkok and the West Asia & Central Asia division has its regional directorate in Doha.

Countries

The Asia Council covers 48 countries and 6 dependent territories.

Forums

The Asia Council has seven forums. Each forum is mandated to deliberate on a defined area relating Asia. The forum is attended by decision makers and experts.

- Forum on Biodiversity
- Forum for Asian Economic Cooperation
- Forum on Energy Security
- Forum on Climate Change
- Forum for Inter-cultural Dialogue
- Forum on Counter-terror Strategies

Fellowships

The Asia Council fellowship provides financial grant to students from Asian countries to study for a graduate degree in world's top universities.

Global Leaders Fellowship

The Asia Council Global Leaders Fellowship is an international graduate fellowship scheme which supports students with exceptional leadership qualities from 48 countries and 6 dependent territories of Asia to undertake graduate studies at some of world's top universities in United States and United Kingdom.

Asia Fellowship

The Asia Fellowship is an international graduate fellowship scheme which supports students with exceptional leadership qualities from 48 countries and 6 dependent territories of Asia to undertake graduate studies at Asia's top universities.

Einstein Fellowship

The Asia Council Einstein Fellowship is an international fellowship scheme which supports students with exceptional leadership qualities from 48 countries and 6 dependent territories of Asia to undertake study for a degree at Tokyo Institute of Technology, Nanyang Technological University, KAIST, Hong Kong University of Science and Technology, and Tsinghua University.

Reports and Publications

The council's research and publishing division produces several reports on Asia including the Asia Security Report and Asia Statistical Report.

Asian Review

The Asian Review is a journal published by the Asia Council. It covers political, economic and strategic review of the continent.

Events

Asia Roundtable: The Asia Roundtable is an international conference held by the Asia Council outside Asia. The meeting discusses in detail a single issue that is geopolitically significant for the Asian region. The conference is attended by regional leaders and policy experts.

Asia Security Dialogue: The Asia Security Dialogue is a bi-annual meeting held by the Asia Council on most pressing security issues relating Asia.

Democratic globalization

Democratic globalisation is a social movement towards an institutional system of global democracy. This would, in their view, bypass nation-states, corporate oligopolies, ideological NGOs, cults and mafias. One of its most prolific proponents is the British political thinker David Held. In the last decade he published a dozen books regarding the spread of democracy from territorially defined nation states to a system of global governance that encapsulates the entire world. For some, democratic mundialisation is a variant of democratic globalisation stressing the need for the direct election of world leaders and members of global institutions by citizens worldwide; for others, it is just another name for democratic globalisation.

These proponents state that democratic globalisation's purpose is to:

Expand globalisation and make people closer and more united. This expansion should differ from economic globalization and "make people closer, more united and protected"; because of a variety of opinions and proposals it is still unclear what this would mean in practice and how it could be realized.

Have it reach all fields of activity and knowledge, including governmental and economic, since the economic one is crucial to develop the well-being of world citizens; and

Give world citizens democratic access and a say in those global activities. For example, presidential voting for United Nations Secretary-General by citizens and direct election of members of a United Nations Parliamentary Assembly.

Supporters of the democratic globalization movement draw a distinction between their movement and the one most popularly known as the 'anti-globalization' movement, claiming that their movement avoids ideological agenda about economics and social matters. Democratic globalization supporters state that the choice of political orientations should be left to the world citizens, via their participation in world democratic institutions. Some proponents in the "anti-globalization movement" do not necessarily disagree with this position. For example, George Monbiot, normally associated with the anti-globalization movement (who prefers the term Global Justice Movement) in his work *Age of Consent* has proposed similar democratic reforms of most major global institutions, suggesting direct democratic

elections of such bodies, and suggests a form of "world government."

Background

Democratic globalization supports the extension of political democratization to economic and financial globalization. It is based upon an idea that free international transactions benefit the global society as a whole. They believe in financially open economies, where the government and central bank must be transparent in order to retain the confidence of the markets, since transparency spells doom for autocratic regimes. They promote democracy that makes leaders more accountable to the citizenry through the removal of restrictions on such transactions.

Social movements

The democratic globalization movement started to get public attention when New York Times reported its demonstration to contest a World Trade Organization (WTO) in Seattle, Washington, November 1999. This gathering was to criticize unfair trade and undemocratic globalization of the WTO, World Bank, World Economic Forum (WEF), the International Monetary Fund. Its primary tactics were public rallies, street theater and civil disobedience.

Democratic globalization, proponents claim, would be reached by creating democratic global institutions and changing

international organizations (which are currently intergovernmental institutions controlled by the nation-states), into global ones controlled by world citizens. The movement suggests to do it gradually by building a limited number of democratic global institutions in charge of a few crucial fields of common interest. Its long-term goal is that these institutions federate later into a full-fledged democratic world government.

Global democracy

Thus, it supports the International Campaign for the Establishment of a United Nations Parliamentary Assembly, that would allow for participation of member nations' legislators and, eventually, direct election of United Nations (UN) parliament members by citizens worldwide.

Difference to anti-globalization

Some supporters of the democratic globalization movement draw a distinction between their movement and the one most popularly known as the 'anti-globalization' movement, claiming that their movement avoids ideological agenda about economics and social matters although, in practice, it is often difficult to distinguish between the two camps. Democratic globalization supporters state that the choice of political orientations should be left to the world citizens, via their participation in world democratic institutions and direct vote for world presidents. Some supporters of the "anti-globalization movement" do not necessarily disagree with this position. For example, George

Monbiot, normally associated with the anti-globalization movement (who prefers the term Global Justice Movement) in his work *Age of Consent* has proposed similar democratic reforms of most major global institutions, suggesting direct democratic elections of such bodies by citizens, and suggests a form of "federal world government".

Procedure

Democratic globalization, proponents claim, would be reached by creating democratic global institutions and changing international organizations (which are currently intergovernmental institutions controlled by the nation-states), into global ones controlled by voting by the citizens. The movement suggests to do it gradually by building a limited number of democratic global institutions in charge of a few crucial fields of common interest. Its long-term goal is that these institutions federate later into a full-fledged democratic world government.

They propose the creation of world services for citizens, like world civil protection and prevention (from natural hazards) services.

Proponents

The concept of democratic globalization has supporters from all fields. Many of the campaigns and initiatives for global

democracy, such as the UNPA campaign, list quotes by and names of their supporters on their websites.

Academics

Some of the most prolific proponents are the British political thinker David Held and the Italian political theorist Daniele Archibugi. In the last decade they published several books regarding the spread of democracy from territorially defined nation states to a system of global governance that encapsulates the entire planet. Richard Falk has developed the idea from an international law perspective, Ulrich Beck from a sociological approach and Jürgen Habermas has elaborate the normative principles.

Politicians

In 2003 Bob Brown, the leader of the Australian Green Party, has tabled a move for global democracy in the Australian Senate: "I move: That the Senate supports global democracy based on the principle of 'one person, one vote, one value'; and supports the vision of a global parliament which empowers all the world's people equally to decide on matters of international significance."

The current President of Bolivia Evo Morales and the Bolivian UN Ambassador Pablo Solón Romero have demanded a democratisation of the UN on many occasions. For example, Evo Morales at the United Nations, May 7, 2010: "The response to global warming is global democracy for life and for the Mother

Earth.. ... we have two paths: to save capitalism, or to save life and Mother Earth.”

Graham Watson (Member of the European Parliament and former leader of the Alliance of Liberals and Democrats for Europe) and Jo Leinen (Member of the European Parliament) are strong supporter of global democracy. They were among those presenting the “Brussels Declaration on Global Democracy” on February 23, 2010, at an event inside the European Parliament.

The appeals of the campaign for a United Nations Parliamentary Assembly has already been endorsed by more than 700 parliamentarians from more than 90 countries.

List of prominent figures

Garry Davis (Peace activist who created the first "World Passport)

Albert Einstein ("The moral authority of the UN would be considerable enhanced if the delegates were elected directly by the people.")

George Monbiot ("A world parliament allows the poor to speak for themselves")

Emma Thompson

Desmond Tutu ("We must strive for a global democracy, in which not only the rich and the powerful have a say, but which treats everyone, everywhere with dignity and respect.")

Peter Ustinov (President of the World Federalist Movement from 1991 to 2004)

Abhay K ("The mass availability of internet-connected mobile phones paves the way for planetary consciousness and global democracy.")

Global apartheid

Global apartheid is a term used to mean minority rule in international decision-making. The term comes from apartheid, the system of governmental that ruled South Africa until 27 April 1994 when people of all races were able to vote as equals for the first time.

The concept of global apartheid has been developed by many researchers, including Titus Alexander, Bruno Amoroso, Patrick Bond, Gernot Kohler, Arjun Makhijani, Ali Mazuri, Vandana Shiva, Anthony Richmond, Joseph Nevins, Muhammed Asadi, Gustav Fridolin, and many others.

Origin and use

The first use of the term may have been by Gernot Koehler in a 1978 Working Paper for the World Order Models Project. In 1995 Koehler develop this in *The Three Meanings of Global Apartheid: Empirical, Normative, Existential*.

Its best known use was by Thabo Mbeki, then-President of South Africa, in a 2002 speech, drawing comparisons of the status of

the world's people, economy, and access to natural resources to the apartheid era. Mbeki got the term from Titus Alexander, initiator of Charter 99, a campaign for global democracy, who was also present at the UN Millennium Summit and gave him a copy of *Unravelling Global Apartheid*.

Concept

Minority rule in global governance is based on national sovereignty rather than racial identity, but in many other respects the history and structures of apartheid South Africa can be seen as a microcosm of the world. Following the Great Depression in the 1930s and the Second World War, the United States and United Kingdom used their political power to create systems of economic management and protection to mitigate the worst effects of free trade and neutralise the competing appeals of communism and national socialism. In South Africa *civilized labour* policies restricted public employment to whites, reserved skilled jobs for whites and controlled the movement of non-whites through a system of pass laws. In the West, escalating tariff barriers reserved manufacturing work for Europeans and Americans while immigration laws controlled the movement of immigrants seeking work.

At a political level, the West still dominates global decision-making through minority control of the central banking system (Bank of International Settlements), IMF, World Bank, Security Council and other institutions of global governance. The G8 represent less than 15% of world population, yet have over 60%

of its income. 80% of the permanent members of the UN Security Council represent white Western states, 60% from Europe. The West has veto power in the World Bank, IMF and WTO and regulates global monetary policy through the Bank of International Settlements (BIS). By tradition, the head of the World Bank is always a US citizen, nominated by the US President, and the IMF is a European. Although the rest of the world now has a majority in many international institutions, it does not have the political power to reject decisions by the Western minority.

In *The Clash of Civilizations and the Remaking of World Order*, Samuel P. Huntington describes how "the United States together with Britain and France make the crucial decisions on political and security issues; the United States together with Germany and Japan make the crucial decisions on economic issues." Huntington quoted Jeffrey R Bennett to claim that Western nations:

- own and operate the international banking system
- control all hard currencies
- are the world's principle customer
- provide the majority of the world's finished goods
- dominate international capital markets
- exert considerable moral leadership within many societies
- are capable of massive military intervention
- control the sea lanes

Huntington presents a 'framework, a paradigm, for viewing global politics' to protect "Western civilization". He argues that other civilizations threaten the West through immigration, cultural differences, growing economic strength and potential military power. 'If North America and Europe renew their moral life, build on their cultural commonality, and develop close forms of economic and political integration to supplement their security collaboration in NATO, they could generate a third Euroamerican phase of Western affluence and political influence. Meaningful political integration would in some measure counter the relative decline in the West's share of the world's people, economic product, and military capabilities and revive the power of the West in the eyes of the leaders of other civilizations.' However, this 'depends overwhelmingly on whether the United States reaffirms its identity as a Western nation and defines its global role as the leader of Western civilization.'

Alexander identifies numerous *pillars of global apartheid* including:

- veto power by the Western minority in the UN Security Council
- voting powers in the IMF and World Bank
- dominance of the World Trade Organisation through effective veto power and 'weight of trade' rather than formal voting power
- one-sided rules of trade, which give privileged protection to Western agriculture and other interests while opening markets in the Majority World

- protection of 'hard currency' through the central banking system through the Bank of International Settlements
- immigration controls which manage the flow of labour to meet the needs of Western economies
- use of aid and investment to control elites in the Majority World through reward and punishment
- support for coups or military intervention in countries which defy Western dominance

International decision-making has a legacy of inequality which some authors have compared to historical apartheid in South Africa.

World governance/Global governance

Global governance or world governance is a movement towards political cooperation among transnational actors, aimed at negotiating responses to problems that affect more than one state or region. Institutions of global governance—the United Nations, the International Criminal Court, the World Bank, etc.—tend to have limited or demarcated power to enforce compliance. The modern question of world governance exists in the context of globalization and globalizing regimes of power: politically, economically and culturally. In response to the acceleration of worldwide interdependence, both between human societies and between humankind and the biosphere, the term "global governance" may name the process of designating laws, rules, or regulations intended for a global scale.

Global governance is not a singular system. There is no "world government" but the many different regimes of global *governance* do have commonalities:

While the contemporary system of global political relations is not integrated, the relation between the various regimes of global governance is not insignificant, and the system does have a common dominant organizational form. The dominant mode of organization today is bureaucratic rational – regularized, codified and rational. It is common to all modern regimes of political power and frames the transition from classical sovereignty to what David Held describes as the second regime of sovereignty – liberal international sovereignty.

Definition

The term world governance is broadly used to designate all regulations intended for organization and centralization of human societies on a global scale. The Forum for a new World Governance defines world governance simply as "collective management of the planet".

Traditionally, *government* has been associated with "governing," or with political authority, institutions, and, ultimately, control. *Governance* denotes a process through which institutions coordinate and control independent social relations, and that have the ability to enforce, by force, their decisions. However, authors like James Rosenau have also used "governance" to denote the regulation of interdependent relations in the absence

of an overarching political authority, such as in the international system. Some now speak of the development of "global public policy".

Adil Najam, a scholar on the subject at the Pardee School of Global Studies, Boston University has defined global governance simply as "the management of global processes in the absence of global government." According to Thomas G. Weiss, director of the Ralph Bunche Institute for International Studies at the Graduate Center (CUNY) and editor (2000–05) of the journal *Global Governance: A Review of Multilateralism and International Organizations*, "'Global governance'—which can be good, bad, or indifferent—refers to concrete cooperative problem-solving arrangements, many of which increasingly involve not only the United Nations of states but also 'other UNs,' namely international secretariats and other non-state actors." In other words, global governance refers to the way in which global affairs are managed.

The definition is flexible in scope, applying to general subjects such as global security and order or to specific documents and agreements such as the World Health Organization's Code on the Marketing of Breast Milk Substitutes. The definition applies whether the participation is bilateral (e.g. an agreement to regulate usage of a river flowing in two countries), function-specific (e.g. a commodity agreement), regional (e.g. the Treaty of Tlatelolco), or global (e.g. the Non-Proliferation Treaty). These "cooperative problem-solving arrangements" may be formal, taking the shape of laws or formally constituted institutions for a

variety of actors (such as state authorities, intergovernmental organizations (IGOs), non-governmental organizations (NGOs), private sector entities, other civil society actors, and individuals) to manage collective affairs. They may also be informal (as in the case of practices or guidelines) or ad hoc entities (as in the case of coalitions).

However, a single organization may take the nominal lead on an issue, for example the World Trade Organization (WTO) in world trade affairs. Therefore, global governance is thought to be an international process of consensus-forming which generates guidelines and agreements that affect national governments and international corporations. Examples of such consensus would include WHO policies on health issues.

In short, global governance may be defined as "the complex of formal and informal institutions, mechanisms, relationships, and processes between and among states, markets, citizens and organizations, both inter- and non-governmental, through which collective interests on the global plane are articulated, Duties, obligations and privileges are established, and differences are mediated through educated professionals."

Titus Alexander, author of *Unravelling Global Apartheid, an Overview of World Politics*, has described the current institutions of global governance as a system of global apartheid, with numerous parallels with minority rule in the formal and informal structures of South Africa before 1991.

Usage

The dissolution of the Soviet Union in 1991 marked the end of a long period of international history based on a policy of balance of powers. Since this historic event, the planet has entered a phase of geostrategic breakdown. The national-security model, for example, while still in place for most governments, is gradually giving way to an emerging collective conscience that extends beyond the restricted framework it represents.

The post-Cold War world of the 1990s saw a new paradigm emerge based on a number of issues:

The growing idea of globalization as a significant theme and the subsequent weakening of nation-states, points to a prospect of transferring to a global level of regulatory instruments. Upon the model that regulation was no longer working effectively at the national or regional levels.

An intensification of environmental concerns, which received multilateral endorsement at the Earth Summit. The Summit issues, relating to the climate and biodiversity, symbolized a new approach that was soon to be expressed conceptually by the term Global Commons.

The emergence of conflicts over standards: trade and the environment, trade and property rights, trade and public health. These conflicts continued the traditional debate over the social effects of macroeconomic stabilization policies, and raised the question of arbitration among equally legitimate objectives in a

compartmentalized governance system where the major areas of interdependence are each entrusted to a specialized international institution. Although often limited in scope, these conflicts are nevertheless symbolically powerful, as they raise the question of the principles and institutions of arbitration.

An increased questioning of international standards and institutions by developing countries, which, having entered the global economy, find it hard to accept that industrialized countries hold onto power and give preference to their own interests. The challenge also comes from civil society, which considers that the international governance system has become the real seat of power and which rejects both its principles and procedures. Although these two lines of criticism often have conflicting beliefs and goals, they have been known to join in order to oppose the dominance of developed countries and major institutions, as demonstrated symbolically by the failure of the World Trade Organization Ministerial Conference of 1999.

Technique

Global governance can be roughly divided into four stages:

- agenda-setting;
- policymaking,
- implementation and enforcement, and
- evaluation, monitoring, and adjudication.

World authorities including international organizations and corporations achieve deference to their agenda through different means. Authority can derive from institutional status, expertise, moral authority, capacity, or perceived competence.

Themes

In its initial phase, world governance was able to draw on themes inherited from geopolitics and the theory of international relations, such as peace, defense, geostrategy, diplomatic relations, and trade relations. But as globalization progresses and the number of interdependences increases, the global level is also highly relevant to a far wider range of subjects. Following are a number of examples.

Environmental governance and managing the planet

"The crisis brought about by the accelerated pace and the probably irreversible character of the effect of human activities on nature requires collective answers from governments and citizens. Nature ignores political and social barriers, and the global dimension of the crisis cancels the effects of any action initiated unilaterally by state governments or sectoral institutions, however powerful they may be. Climate change, ocean and air pollution, nuclear risks and those related to genetic manipulation, the reduction and extinction of resources and biodiversity, and above all a development model that remains largely unquestioned globally are all among the various manifestations of this accelerated and probably irreversible

effect. This effect is the factor, in the framework of globalization, that most challenges a system of states competing with each other to the exclusion of all others: among the different fields of global governance, environmental management is the most wanting in urgent answers to the crisis in the form of collective actions by the whole of the human community. At the same time, these actions should help to model and strengthen the progressive building of this community."

Proposals in this area have discussed the issue of how collective environmental action is possible. Many multilateral, environment-related agreements have been forged in the past 30 years, but their implementation remains difficult. There is also some discussion on the possibility of setting up an international organization that would centralize all the issues related to international environmental protection, such as the proposed World Environment Organization (WEO). The United Nations Environment Program (UNEP) could play this role, but it is a small-scale organization with a limited mandate. The question has given rise to two opposite views: the European Union, especially France and Germany, along with a number of NGOs, is in favor of creating a WEO; the United Kingdom, the USA, and most developing countries prefer opting for voluntary initiatives.

The International Institute for Sustainable Development proposes a "reform agenda" for global environmental governance. The main argument is that there seems to exist an unspoken but powerful consensus on the essential objectives of a system of global environmental governance. These goals would require top-quality

leadership, a strong environmental policy based on knowledge, effective cohesion and coordination, good management of the institutions constituting the environmental governance system, and spreading environmental concerns and actions to other areas of international policy and action.

A World Environment Organisation

The focus of environmental issues shifted to climate change from 1992 onwards. Due to the transboundary nature of climate change, various calls have been made for a World Environment Organisation (WEO) (sometimes referred to as a Global Environment Organisation) to tackle this global problem on a global scale. At present, a single worldwide governing body with the powers to develop and enforce environmental policy does not exist. The idea for the creation of a WEO was discussed thirty years ago but is receiving fresh attention in the light of arguably disappointing outcomes from recent, 'environmental mega-conferences' (e.g. Rio Summit and Earth Summit 2002).

Current global environmental governance

International environmental organisations do exist. The United Nations Environmental Programme (UNEP), created in 1972, coordinates the environmental activity of countries in the UN. UNEP and similar international environmental organisations are seen as not up to the task. They are criticised as being institutionally weak, fragmented, lacking in standing and providing non-optimal environmental protection. It has been

stated that the current decentralised, poorly funded and strictly intergovernmental regime for global environmental issues is sub-standard. However, the creation of a WEO may threaten to undermine some of the more effective aspects of contemporary global environmental governance; notably its fragmented nature, from which flexibility stems. This also allows responses to be more effective and links to be forged across different domains. Even though the environment and climate change are framed as global issues, Levin states that 'it is precisely at this level that government institutions are least effective and trust most delicate' while Oberthur and Gehring argue that it would offer little more than institutional restructuring for its own sake.

A World Environment Organisation and the World Trade Organisation

Many proposals for the creation of a WEO have emerged from the trade and environment debate. It has been argued that instead of creating a WEO to safeguard the environment, environmental issues should be directly incorporated into the World Trade Organisation (WTO). The WTO has "had success in integrating trade agreements and opening up markets because it is able to apply legal pressure to nation states and resolve disputes". Greece and Germany are currently in discussion about the possibility of solar energy being used to repay some of Greece's debt after their economy crashed in 2010. This exchange of resources, if it is accepted, is an example of increased international cooperation and an instance where the WTO could embrace energy trade agreements. If the future holds similar

trade agreements, then an environmental branch of the WTO would surely be necessary. However critics of a WTO/WEO arrangement say that this would neither concentrate on more directly addressing underlying market failures, nor greatly improve rule-making.

The creation of a new agency, whether it be linked to the WTO or not, has now been endorsed by Renato Ruggiero, the former head of the World Trade Organization (WTO), as well as by the new WTO director-designate, Supachai Panitchpakdi. The debate over a global institutional framework for environmental issues will undoubtedly rumble on but at present there is little support for any one proposal.

Governance of the economy and of globalization

The 2008 financial crisis may have undermined faith that laissez-faire capitalism will correct all serious financial malfunctioning on its own, as well as belief in the presumed independence of the economy from politics. It has been stated that, lacking in transparency and far from democratic, international financial institutions may be incapable of handling financial collapses. There are many who believe free-market capitalism may be incapable of forming the economic policy of a stable society, as it has been theorised that it can exacerbate inequalities.

Nonetheless, the debate on the potential failings of the system has led the academic world to seek solutions. According to Tubiana and Severino, "refocusing the doctrine of international

cooperation on the concept of public goods offers the possibility... of breaking the deadlock in international negotiations on development, with the perception of shared interests breathing new life into an international solidarity that is running out of steam."

Joseph Stiglitz argues that a number of global public goods should be produced and supplied to the populations, but are not, and that a number of global externalities should be taken into consideration, but are not. On the other hand, he contends, the international stage is often used to find solutions to completely unrelated problems under the protection of opacity and secrecy, which would be impossible in a national democratic framework.

On the subject of international trade, Susan George states that "... in a rational world, it would be possible to construct a trading system serving the needs of people in both North and South.... Under such a system, crushing third world debt and the devastating structural adjustment policies applied by the World Bank and the IMF would have been unthinkable, although the system would not have abolished capitalism."

Political and institutional governance

Building a responsible world governance that would make it possible to adapt the political organization of society to globalization implies establishing a democratic political legitimacy at every level: local, national, regional and global.

Obtaining this legitimacy requires rethinking and reforming, all at the same time:

- the fuzzy maze of various international organizations, instituted mostly in the wake of World War II; what is needed is a system of international organizations with greater resources and a greater intervention capacity, more transparent, fairer, and more democratic;
- the Westphalian system, the very nature of states along with the role they play with regard to the other institutions, and their relations to each other; states will have to share part of their sovereignty with institutions and bodies at other territorial levels, and all will have to begin a major process to deepen democracy and make their organization more responsible;
- the meaning of citizen sovereignty in the different government systems and the role of citizens as political protagonists; there is a need to rethink the meaning of political representation and participation and to sow the seeds of a radical change of consciousness that will make it possible to move in the direction of a situation in which citizens, in practice, will play the leading role at every scale.

The political aspect of world governance is discussed in greater detail in the section Problems of World Governance and Principles of Governance

Governance of peace, security, and conflict resolution

Armed conflicts have changed in form and intensity since the Berlin wall came down in 1989. The events of 9/11, the wars in Afghanistan and in Iraq, and repeated terrorist attacks all show that conflicts can repercuss well beyond the belligerents directly involved. The major powers and especially the United States, have used war as a means of resolving conflicts and may well continue to do so. If many in the United States believe that fundamentalist Muslim networks are likely to continue to launch attacks, in Europe nationalist movements have proved to be the most persistent terrorist threat. The Global War on Terrorism arguably presents a form of emerging global governance in the sphere of security with the United States leading cooperation among the Western states, non-Western nations and international institutions. Beyer argues that participation in this form of 'hegemonic governance' is caused both by a shared identity and ideology with the US, as well as cost-benefit considerations. Pesawar school attack 2014 is a big challenge to us. Militants from the Pakistani Taliban have attacked an army-run school in Peshawar, killing 141 people, 132 of them children, the military say.

At the same time, civil wars continue to break out across the world, particularly in areas where civil and human rights are not respected, such as Central and Eastern Africa and the Middle East. These and other regions remain deeply entrenched in permanent crises, hampered by authoritarian regimes, many of

them being supported by the United States, reducing entire swathes of the population to wretched living conditions. The wars and conflicts we are faced with have a variety of causes: economic inequality, social conflict, religious sectarianism, Western imperialism, colonial legacies, disputes over territory and over control of basic resources such as water or land. They are all illustrations a deep-rooted crisis of world governance.

The resulting bellicose climate imbues international relations with competitive nationalism and contributes, in rich and poor countries alike, to increasing military budgets, siphoning off huge sums of public money to the benefit of the arms industry and military-oriented scientific innovation, hence fueling global insecurity. Of these enormous sums, a fraction would be enough to provide a permanent solution for the basic needs of the planet's population hence practically eliminating the causes of war and terrorism.

Andrée Michel argues that the arms race is not only proceeding with greater vigor, it is the surest means for Western countries to maintain their hegemony over countries of the South. Following the break-up of the Eastern bloc countries, she maintains, a strategy for the manipulation of the masses was set up with a permanent invention of an enemy (currently incarnated by Iraq, Iran, Libya, Syria, and North Korea) and by kindling fear and hate of others to justify perpetuating the Military-industrial complex and arms sales. The author also recalls that the "Big Five" at the UN who have the veto right are responsible for 85% of arms sales around the world.

Proposals for the governance of peace, security, and conflict resolution begin by addressing prevention of the causes of conflicts, whether economic, social, religious, political, or territorial. This requires assigning more resources to improving people's living conditions—health, accommodation, food, and work—and to education, including education in the values of peace, social justice, and unity and diversity as two sides of the same coin representing the global village.

Resources for peace could be obtained by regulating, or even reducing military budgets, which have done nothing but rise in the past recent years. This process could go hand in hand with plans for global disarmament and the conversion of arms industries, applied proportionally to all countries, including the major powers. Unfortunately, the warlike climate of the last decade has served to relegate all plans for global disarmament, even in civil-society debates, and to pigeonhole them as a long-term goal or even a Utopian vision. This is definitely a setback for the cause of peace and for humankind, but it is far from being a permanent obstacle.

International institutions also have a role to play in resolving armed conflicts. Small international rapid deployment units could intervene in these with an exclusive mandate granted by a reformed and democratic United Nations system or by relevant regional authorities such as the European Union. These units could be formed specifically for each conflict, using armies from several countries as was the case when the UNIFIL was reinforced during the 2006 Lebanon War. On the other hand, no national

army would be authorized to intervene unilaterally outside its territory without a UN or regional mandate.

Another issue that is worth addressing concerns the legitimate conditions for the use of force and conduct during war. Jean-René Bachelet offers an answer with the conceptualization of a military ethics corresponding to the need for a "principle of humanity." The author defines this principle as follows: "All human beings, whatever their race, nationality, gender, age, opinion, or religion, belong to one same humanity, and every individual has an inalienable right to respect for his life, integrity, and dignity."

Governance of science, education, information, and communications

The World Trade Organization's (WTO) agenda of liberalizing public goods and services are related to culture, science, education, health, living organisms, information, and communication. This plan has been only partially offset by the alter-globalization movement, starting with the events that took place at the 1999 Seattle meeting, and on a totally different and probably far more influential scale in the medium and long term, by the astounding explosion of collaborative practices on the Internet. However, lacking political and widespread citizen support as well as sufficient resources, civil society has not so far been able to develop and disseminate alternative plans for society as a whole on a global scale, even though plenty of proposals and initiatives have been developed, some more

successful than others, to build a fairer, more responsible, and more solidarity-based world in all of these areas.

Above all, each country tries to impose their values and collective preferences within international institutions such like WTO or UNESCO, particularly in the Medias sector. This is an excellent opportunity to promote their soft power, for instance with the promotion of the cinema

As far as science is concerned, "[r]esearch increasingly bows to the needs of financial markets, turning competence and knowledge into commodities, making employment flexible and informal, and establishing contracts based on goals and profits for the benefit of private interests in compliance with the competition principle. The directions that research has taken in the past two decades and the changes it has undergone have drastically removed it from its initial mission (producing competence and knowledge, maintaining independence) with no questioning of its current and future missions. Despite the progress, or perhaps even as its consequence, humankind continues to face critical problems: poverty and hunger are yet to be vanquished, nuclear arms are proliferating, environmental disasters are on the rise, social injustice is growing, and so on.

Neoliberal commercialization of the commons favors the interests of pharmaceutical companies instead of the patients', of food-processing companies instead of the farmers' and consumers'. Public research policies have done nothing but support this process of economic profitability, where research results are

increasingly judged by the financial markets. The system of systematically patenting knowledge and living organisms is thus being imposed throughout the planet through the 1994 WTO agreements on intellectual property. Research in many areas is now being directed by private companies."

On the global level, "[i]nstitutions dominating a specific sector also, at every level, present the risk of reliance on technical bodies that use their own references and deliberate in an isolated environment. This process can be observed with the 'community of patents' that promotes the patenting of living organisms, as well as with authorities controlling nuclear energy. This inward-looking approach is all the more dangerous that communities of experts are, in all complex technical and legal spheres, increasingly dominated by the major economic organizations that finance research and development."

On the other hand, several innovative experiments have emerged in the sphere of science, such as: conscience clauses and citizens' panels as a tool for democratizing the production system: science shops and community-based research. Politically committed scientists are also increasingly organizing at the global level.

As far as education is concerned, the effect of commoditization can be seen in the serious tightening of education budgets, which affects the quality of general education as a public service. The Global Future Online report reminds us that "... at the half-way point towards 2015 (*author's note: the deadline for the Millennium*

Goals), the gaps are daunting: 80 million children (44 million of them girls) are out of school, with marginalized groups (26 million disabled and 30 million conflict-affected children) continuing to be excluded. And while universal access is critical, it must be coupled with improved learning outcomes—in particular, children achieving the basic literacy, numeracy and life skills essential for poverty reduction."

In addition to making the current educational system available universally, there is also a call to improve the system and adapt it to the speed of changes in a complex and unpredictable world. On this point, Edgar Morin asserts that we must "[r]ethink our way of organizing knowledge. This means breaking down the traditional barriers between disciplines and designing new ways to reconnect that which has been torn apart." The UNESCO report drawn up by Morin contains "seven principles for education of the future": detecting the error and illusion that have always parasitized the human spirit and human behavior; making knowledge relevant, i.e. a way of thinking that makes distinctions and connections; teaching the human condition; teaching terrestrial identity; facing human and scientific uncertainties and teaching strategies to deal with them; teaching understanding of the self and of others, and an ethics for humankind.

The exponential growth of new technologies, the Internet in particular, has gone hand in hand with the development over the last decade of a global community producing and exchanging goods. This development is permanently altering the shape of the

entertainment, publishing, and music and media industries, among others. It is also influencing the social behavior of increasing numbers of people, along with the way in which institutions, businesses, and civil society are organized. Peer-to-peer communities and collective knowledge-building projects such as Wikipedia have involved millions of users around the world. There are even more innovative initiatives, such as alternatives to private copyright such as Creative Commons, cyber democracy practices, and a real possibility of developing them on the sectoral, regional, and global levels.

Regional views

Regional players, whether regional conglomerates such as Mercosur and the European Union, or major countries seen as key regional players such as China, the United States, and India, are taking a growing interest in world governance. Examples of discussion of this issue can be found in the works of: Martina Timmermann *et al.*, *Institutionalizing Northeast Asia: Regional Steps toward Global Governance*; Douglas Lewis, *Global Governance and the Quest for Justice - Volume I: International and Regional Organizations*; Olav Schram Stokke, "Examining the Consequences of International Regimes," which discusses Northern, or Arctic region building in the context of international relations; Jeffery Hart and Joan Edelman Spero, "Globalization and Global Governance in the 21st Century," which discusses the push of countries such as Mexico, Brazil, India, China, Taiwan, and South Korea, "important regional players" seeking "a seat at the table of global decision-making"; Dr. Frank Altemöller,

“International Trade: Challenges for Regional and Global Governance: A comparison between Regional Integration Models in Eastern Europe and Africa – and the role of the WTO”, and many others.

Interdependence among countries and regions hardly being refutable today, regional integration is increasingly seen not only as a process in itself, but also in its relation to the rest of the world, sometimes turning questions like "What can the world bring to my country or region?" into "What can my country or region bring to the rest of the world?" Following are a few examples of how regional players are dealing with these questions.

Africa

Often seen as a problem to be solved rather than a people or region with an opinion to express on international policy, Africans and Africa draw on a philosophical tradition of community and social solidarity that can serve as inspiration to the rest of the world and contribute to building world governance. One example is given by Sabelo J. Ndlovu-Gatheni when he reminds us of the relevance of the Ubuntu concept, which stresses the interdependence of human beings.

African civil society has thus begun to draw up proposals for governance of the continent, which factor in all of the dimensions: local, African, and global. Examples include proposals by the network "Dialogues sur la gouvernance en

Afrique" for "the construction of a local legitimate governance," state reform "capable of meeting the continent's development challenges," and "effective regional governance to put an end to Africa's marginalization."

United States

Foreign-policy proposals announced by President Barack Obama include restoring the Global Poverty Act, which aims to contribute to meeting the UN Millennium Development Goals to reduce by half the world population living on less than a dollar a day by 2015. Foreign aid is expected to double to 50 billion dollars. The money will be used to help build educated and healthy communities, reduce poverty and improve the population's health.

In terms of international institutions, The White House Web site advocates reform of the World Bank and the IMF, without going into any detail.

Below are further points in the Obama-Biden plan for foreign policy directly related to world governance:

- strengthening of the nuclear non-proliferation treaty;
- global de-nuclearization in several stages including stepping up cooperation with Russia to significantly reduce stocks of nuclear arms in both countries;
- revision of the culture of secrecy: institution of a National Declassification Center to make

declassification secure but routine, efficient, and cost-effective;

- increase in global funds for AIDS, TB and malaria. Eradication of malaria-related deaths by 2015 by making medicines and mosquito nets far more widely available;
- increase in aid for children and maternal health as well as access to reproductive health-care programs;
- creation of a 2-billion-dollar global fund for education. Increased funds for providing access to drinking water and sanitation;
- other similarly large-scale measures covering agriculture, small- and medium-sized enterprises and support for a model of international trade that fosters job creation and improves the quality of life in poor countries;
- in terms of energy and global warming, Obama advocates a) an 80% reduction of greenhouse-gas emissions by 2050 b) investing 150 billion dollars in alternative energies over the next 10 years and c) creating a Global Energy Forum capable of initiating a new generation of climate protocols.