

MODERN POLITICAL THEORY

M.A. Political Science,

Semester-II Paper- I



Prof. V. Venkateswarlu

M.A., M.P.S., M.S.W., M.Phil., Ph.D.

Centre for Distance Education

Acharya Nagarjuna University

Nagarjuna Nagar 522 510

Ph: 0863-2346222, 2346208

0863- 2346259 (Study Material)

Website www.anucde.info

E-mail: anucdedirector@gmail.com

First Edition: 2022

Reprint:

No. of Copies

M.A. :Modern Political Theory

Acharya Nagarjuna University

This book is exclusively prepared for the use of students of M.A Political Science Centre for Distance Education, Acharya Nagarjuna University and this book is mean for limited circulation only

Published by

Prof. V. Venkateswarlu

Director

Centre for Distance Education

Acharya Nagarjuna University

Nagarjuna Nagar-522510

Printed at

FOREWORD

Since its establishment in 1976, Acharya Nagarjuna University has been forging ahead in the path of progress and dynamism, offering a variety of courses and research contributions. I am extremely happy that by gaining 'A+' grade from the NAAC in the year 2024, Acharya Nagarjuna University is offering educational opportunities at the UG, PG levels apart from research degrees to students from over 221 affiliated colleges spread over the two districts of Guntur and Prakasam.

The University has also started the Centre for Distance Education in 2003-04 with the aim of taking higher education to the door step of all the sectors of the society. The centre will be a great help to those who cannot join in colleges, those who cannot afford the exorbitant fees as regular students, and even to housewives desirous of pursuing higher studies. Acharya Nagarjuna University has started offering B.Sc., B.A., B.B.A., and B.Com courses at the Degree level and M.A., M.Com., M.Sc., M.B.A., and L.L.M., courses at the PG level from the academic year 2003-2004 onwards.

To facilitate easier understanding by students studying through the distance mode, these self-instruction materials have been prepared by eminent and experienced teachers. The lessons have been drafted with great care and expertise in the stipulated time by these teachers. Constructive ideas and scholarly suggestions are welcome from students and teachers involved respectively. Such ideas will be incorporated for the greater efficacy of this distance mode of education. For clarification of doubts and feedback, weekly classes and contact classes will be arranged at the UG and PG levels respectively.

It is my aim that students getting higher education through the Centre for Distance Education should improve their qualification, have better employment opportunities and in turn be part of country's progress. It is my fond desire that in the years to come, the Centre for Distance Education will go from strength to strength in the form of new courses and by catering to larger number of people. My congratulations to all the Directors, Academic Coordinators, Editors and Lesson-writers of the Centre who have helped in these endeavors.

Prof. K. Gangadhara Rao

**M.Tech., Ph.D.,
Vice-Chancellor I/c
Acharya Nagarjuna University**

M.A. POLITICAL SCIENCE AND M.A. PUBLICADMINISTRATION

SEMESTER - II

**(COMMON FOR BOTH M.A. POLITICAL SCIENCE AND
M.A. PUBLIC MINISTRATION
WITH EFFECT FROM THE ACADEMIC YEAR 2017.18)**

201PO21PAPER I: MODERN POLITICAL THEORY

UNIT-I

NATURE OF POLITICAL THEORY

1. The conceptual distinction between Normative and Empirical Political theory as two distinctive areas of Political Enquiry.
2. Behaviouralist Foundations of Empirical Political Theory.
3. The Study of Texts in Context.

UNIT- II

THEORIES OF JUSTICE

1. An Egalitarian Theory of Justice: John Rawls
2. Libertarian Conception of Rights: Robert Nozick
3. Neo Liberal Conception of Justice: Friedrich Hayek

UNIT - III

CONTEMPORARY POLITICAL THEORY

1. Multiculturalism: Will Kymlicka, Bhikhu Parekh
2. Legitimation Crisis of the Modern State: Jurgen Habermas.
3. End of History: A defense of liberal Democracy: Francis Fukuyama

UNIT - IV

SOCIALISTTHEORY

1. Civil Society, Hegemony, Passive Revolution: Antonio Gramsci
2. A critical analysis of Soviet Socialism: Alec Nove
3. Market Socialism: David Miller

RECOMMENDED BOOKS:

1. David Held: Political Theory and the Modern State.
2. Andrew Heywood: Political Theory: An Introduction.
3. Will Kymlicka: Contemporary Political Philosophy: An Introduction.
4. David Miller: Principles of Social Justice
5. Francis Fukuyama: The End of History and the last Man.
6. S.P. Verma: Modern Political Theory.
7. Michael Walzer, Spheres of Justice.
8. Amy Gutman, Multiculturalism.
9. Jurgen Habermas, Legitimation Crisis.
10. Bhikhu Parekh, Rethinking Multiculturalism

CONTENTS

SL.NO	TITELS	PAGE NO.
1	Conceptual distinction between Normative and	6-12
2	EmpiricalPolitical Theory - Behaviouralist Foundations	13-20
3	Study of Contextual Concepts	21-26
4	(1921 - 2003)	27-34
5	Robert Nozick - Libertarian Theory of Rights	35-41
6	F. A. Hayek (1899 - 1992)	42-46
7	Multiculturalism - Will Kymlicka, Bhikhu Parekh	47-52
8	F Legitimation Crisis of the Modern State - Jürgen Habermas	53-58
9	End of History - A Defense of Liberal Democracy - Francis Fukuyama	59-64
10	Antonio Gramsci	65-72
11	Market Socialism - David Miller	73-79

Lesson - 1

Conceptual distinction between Normative and Empirical Political Theory as Two Distinctive Areas of Political Enquiry

Structure of the Lesson:

1.0. Objective

1.1. Study of Political Science - Introduction

1.2. Study of Political Science - Normative Approach (or) Theory

1.3. Normative Approach - Values

1.4. Normative Approach - Concept of Nation-State

1.5. (Empirical Approach) () (Theory)

1.6. Empiricism - Meaning

1.7. Empiricism - Types

1.8. Differences between Normative Approach and Empirical Approach

1.9. Conclusion

1.10. Sample Examination Questions

1.11. References

1.0. Objective:

Through the study of this lesson, it will be useful to understand how the normative approach discusses the subjects of political science study based on values, and similarly, how empiricism studies political systems and problems related to practical social and cultural changes, rather than values.

1.1. Study of Political Science - Introduction:

The study of political science has focused solely on the state and its main organ, the government. This study analyzes the relationships between prominent approaches among the

four approaches described by Robert Dahl in political analysis. Robert Dahl suggested four approaches that aid in political analysis. They are:

1. (Normative Approach)
2. Empirical Approach
3. Policy Approach
4. Conceptual Approach

Among these four approaches, the normative approach describes future events, while the empirical approach helps analyze current situations.

1.2. Study of Political Science - Normative Approach (or) Theory:

The normative approach can be considered the oldest approach in the study of political science. This approach took shape in the writings of ancient Greek political philosophers. Greek philosophers considered the state a moral institution and focused more on its moral aspects. Although the normative approach is traditional, it is widely used in the study of political theories in modern times. Currently, the normative approach is used in the study of topics such as voting behavior, public participation, problems of minority and majority groups, etc.

Philosophers have explained the nature of the normative approach (or) theory differently. R.C. Macridis described the normative approach as an explanatory approach. H. Ball suggested that the normative approach shows a strong interest in values and institutions. According to David Easton, the normative approach is useful for the study of values, laws, and institutions. This approach also helps in identifying the necessary source for understanding a political problem.

1.3. Normative Approach - Values:

The normative approach places the highest importance and interest on values. The normative approach attempted to transform political science into a moral science. The normative approach shows a strong interest in the study of standards as well as the study of moral values. According to this approach, standards are more permanent and clearer than values. Through the study of standards, one can understand the relationship between social values and individual values. The normative approach undertakes the analysis of values and standards that help in choosing alternatives in the political process. The normative approach explains that when an individual recognizes the benefit derived from values, they can understand what values mean in the eyes of others.

1.4. Normative Approach - Concept of Nation-State:

Theorists following the normative approach chose the entire society as the subject of their analysis. They prioritized studying the nation-state because the nation-state was considered a moral institution that supports human existence.

Although the normative approach strengthened the metaphysical tendency, many political scientists following the normative approach proposed several assumptions. The main assumption they proposed is that from every value, an opposing value emerges. Every individual has a cultural personality. The thoughts of individuals within a society are the source of every event that occurs in that society. Change in a society is a conflict that arises between conflicting values within that society. It arises from conflicts that occur between different groups with opposing views. Therefore, for every value in society, there is another opposing value. Similarly, humans are cultural beings. Their experiences are the basis for social events. Finally, this approach proposed understanding the social, political, and economic changes and progress occurring in developing countries based on the values within those societies.

1.5. (Empirical Approach) () (Theory):

Empiricism is an ancient Western argument. Greek philosophers used empiricism in the construction of their theories. Aristotle, a Greek philosopher, was a famous empiricist. According to Aristotle, reality is clear. It is visible to the eyes. Aristotle conducted his political analysis through empirical research. However, Aristotle argued that morality and practical knowledge should go hand in hand.

After Aristotle, Rousseau and Bentham developed their theories following the empirical approach. Bentham's utilitarianism is a prototype of empiricism, while in modern times, political philosophers such as Lords, Bertrand Russell, and Karl Marx developed their theories and ideas based on their experiences.

1.6. Empiricism - Meaning:

Experience is the source of knowledge. The empirical basis refers to the scientific study of political behavior, according to Avery Leiserson. V.V. Dyke stated that empiricism is closely intertwined with political realities and their exploration. As Almond and Powell noted, empiricism studies political systems and problems related to social stabilization, cultural, and social change. In Dyke's opinion, empiricism emphasizes what is, rather than what should be. This means that empiricism gives more importance to descriptive study than to the study of values.

1.7. Empiricism - Types:

Robert Dahl is a prominent modern political scientist who supported empiricism. Dahl divided empiricists into two categories:

1. Empirical Theorists
2. Plural Empirical Theorists.

According to Dahl, the analyses of these theorists revolve around two issues:

1. Is political analysis neutrality possible?
2. Can political analysis be neutral?

Empiricists argue that individuals' practical behavior towards politics can be observed without involving values. A practically correct decision may not be correct from a value perspective. Realities can be subjected to empirical testing, but values cannot be subjected to any test. Values are entirely subjective. However, realities are not only visible but also testable.

Plural empiricists analyze that in the study of political science, values and realities are so closely intertwined that it is very difficult to separate them. According to their argument, any political theory will have an evaluation of the validity of factual propositions, as well as the moral nature of political events, processes, and systems mentioned in that theory. Therefore, they argued that it is not reasonable to consider political science as completely objective.

Despite the differences between the two approaches, Robert Dahl stated that there is some consensus between them. Both approaches stated that it is not possible to completely remove values from empirical studies. Both approaches have consensus on some points:

In social sciences and natural sciences, the values and interests of the researcher influence the selection of their research topics.

The basis of importance and utility cannot be established solely on the basis of empirical knowledge.

Before undertaking an impartial analysis of politics, one must accept the values of reality.

Some assumptions must be accepted before undertaking empirical research.

It is not possible to completely remove the partial views of researchers in social sciences, as in natural sciences.

In political science, empiricism attempts to identify, explain, and predict the probabilistic, functional, and causal relationships between events, individuals, and institutions. As Robert Dahl

stated, empiricism in political science subjects theories and generalizations to rigorous testing through careful observation, classification, and measurement. Therefore, this empirical political analysis has a scientific approach.

1.8. Differences between Normative Approach and Empirical Approach:

Different approaches emerged in different periods related to the study of political science. These approaches can be broadly classified into two types:

(Normative Approach)

(Empirical Approach)

These two approaches are clearly distinguished based on the importance they give to facts differently from values, or to values differently from facts.

- Although these two approaches fundamentally differ in some aspects, these differences are not very severe. As Robert Dahl suggested, these two approaches have broad consensus on many issues. Both agree that it is impossible to separate values from experimental studies. Both approaches have equal interest in the following aspects:
 - In social sciences and progressive sciences, both theorists agree that the observer's own interests and benefits influence the selection of subjects.
- E In the field of research, there is always a need for some value for the researcher to determine what is more important than other aspects.
- E Any experimental research needs to accept certain assumptions and evidences related to the aspects before it begins.
- E Unlike research related to natural sciences, it is not possible to completely remove the partial views of researchers in social sciences. In natural sciences, it is possible to easily test the results related to research due to the availability of constructive methods, which helps in correcting these errors.
- The debate between these two approaches is only about whether political science should be objective or not. Robert Dahl named the empiricists who advocate for objectivity in political science as two types:
 - E Normative approaches have no evidence.
 - E By striving for objectivity and impartiality, normative approaches have adopted a new and complex language. For this, normative approaches and traditional theorists' views on subject-related aspects are being discussed.

- E Similarly, normative approaches believe that scientific knowledge should be expanded by incorporating all decisions related to values. Philosophers like Jacques and Maritain also follow this approach.
- Finally, it is necessary to examine two more criticisms made by empiricists regarding normative approaches. They are:
- E It has been criticized that normative approaches waste time in research that is not important and not related to human goals.
- E In shaping objectivity and impartiality, normative approaches had to create a new and complex special language. For this, normative approaches have answered that they are discussing subject-related aspects and the views of traditional theorists.

Political systems, types, change, revolution, control, war, peace, equality, inequalities, and similar problems were attracted by the traditional political philosophers' perspective, and they had the opportunity to discuss them extensively.

1.9. Conclusion:

Many empiricists criticized the statements related to normative theory and values as meaningless, ancient, and theoretical, and they criticized normative approaches. It was argued that political science should be objective and impartial, and that it is not necessary to disregard values in shaping such a description. Many normative approaches, like Brecht, accepted the formulas proposed in his scientific value-related relative theory. According to this theory, values are very important for scientific knowledge. Brecht believed that an ethical approach and scientific methods are necessary.

1.10. Sample Examination Questions:

Essay Type Questions:

1. Discuss the normative approach in political science.
2. Explain the empirical approach in political science.
3. Discuss the differences between normative and empirical approaches.

1.11. References:

1. Robert Dahl - Modern Political Analysis.
2. Modern Political Theory - S.P. Verma.
3. Political Science - A Conceptual Analysis - Van Dyke.

Lesson - 2

Behavioralist Foundations of Empirical Political Theory

Lesson Structure:

2.0. Objective

2.1. Introduction

2.2. Development of New Approaches

2.3. Behaviouralism - Empirical Approach

2.3.1. Behaviouralism - Nature and Meaning of Behaviouralism

2.3.2. Behavioural Theory, Behaviouralism

2.3.2.1. Behavioural Theory

2.3.2.2. Behaviouralism

2.4. Empiricism, Behaviouralism

2.4.1. Characteristics of Behaviouralism

2.4.1.1. Regularities

2.4.1.2. Verifications

2.4.1.3. Techniques

2.4.1.4. Quantification

2.4.1.5. Values

2.4.1.6. Systematization

2.4.1.7. Pure Science

2.4.1.8. Integration

2.4.2. Impact of Behaviouralism on Political Science

2.5. Conclusion

2.6. Sample Examination Questions

2.7. References

2.0. Objective:

Through the study of this lesson, you will understand what behaviouralism is, how it applied its research methods and scientific knowledge to political science, and how the aspects of behaviouralism were helpful in giving prominence to the empirical approach in political science and how it formed its theoretical foundations.

2.1. Introduction:

Behaviouralism is prominent in the history of political science. This behaviouralism has brought about great changes in the scope, nature, and methods of political science. The decision of modern scientists to formulate their decisions based on direct and indirect human behavior observation indicates the beginning of behavioral study. This perspective is modern. After the Second World War, American political scientists brought a new perspective, behavioralism, into circulation.

Initially, behavioralists did not have a clear idea about this movement. Their main objective was to oppose the traditional approach, and gradually, behavioralism was accepted as a new method in discovering and developing new realities, and in formulating new processes in a systematic way. The behavioral movement in political science can be observed in three distinct phases.

1. Before the Second World War, in the decade starting from 1920 and ending by 1930, the widespread use of empirical and quantitative methods can be observed.
2. In the second decade, by 1950, behavioralists expanded their activities to both perfect and imperfect fields. After that, they began to achieve special expertise in various subjects.
3. In the decade starting in 1960, behavioralists separated themselves as theoretical behavioralists and practical behavioralists.

2.2. Development of New Approaches:

The new approach called behaviouralism mainly developed in the United States of America and gradually grew, attracting the attention of political scientists worldwide. Charles Merriam, Harold Lasswell, David Truman, Simon, Almond, and others brought behaviouralism into circulation. Let's examine the development of the behavioural movement.

1. Until now, the study of political science was intertwined with the historical method. Political scientists used to study systems like states, parliaments, kings, and ministries only from a historical perspective. Even though historical study of systems was given

prominence, some political philosophers also made efforts to analyze the trends in governments along with concepts like universalism and rights. Such a traditional study existed since the time of Socrates, but it gained prominence in the 19th century. Gradually, scholars began to discuss the behavior of political institutions. With the establishment of the American Political Science Association in 1903, a newness began to enter the methods of political science study. Compared to the past century, in the beginning of the 20th century, political science gained more information. The progress achieved in the scientific field at the beginning of the 20th century greatly influenced political science. Primarily, the research methods of biology and human sciences greatly benefited political science. It was thought that by studying social sciences and human life, following the methods of social science study would be beneficial for political science.

The introduction of behavioralists led to the identification of new methods and necessary subjects for researchers. Until then, political science researchers used only traditional methods. Scholars like Lord Bryce only formulated theories with an internal perspective. Behavioralists began to use better methods and analytical tools. The newness that emerged in political science with the entry of behavioralists is called the behavioral approach. Great changes occurred in the nature of political science. With the adoption of new methods, tools, and procedures, political science gained a new life. Unlike in the past, political institutions were no longer considered the main subject for analysis. The study of political contexts and the observation of individuals' behaviors began to gain importance.

2. From 1906, the publication of the American Political Science Review is considered a significant event in the emergence of behavioralism. It can be said that the essays published in this journal created a new perspective. In 1908, the British writer Graham Wallas, in his book "Human Nature in Politics," explained the importance and priority of psychological science in political behavior. Graham Wallas believed that humans are not merely rational beings, and that self-interest acts as a guide for all their political activities. He emphasized the need to understand how humans behave in political situations to comprehend the political process.
3. Arthur Bentley and Charles Merriam are prominent among those who laid the foundations for the behavioral trend in political science. In Arthur Bentley's book "The Process of Government," he emphasized the need to study the importance of the roles of groups, parties, elections, and public opinion in the political process.

2.3. Behaviouralism - Empirical Approach:

Charles Merriam is considered the father of behavioral political science. His book 'Primary Elections', published in 1908, was the first major book related to the empirical approach. In an essay published in the 'American Political Science Review' in 1921, Merriam wished that political scientists should pay more attention to the results of research methods being followed in social, psychological, geographical, anthropological, biological, and statistical sciences. He expressed strong dissatisfaction with the methods being followed in the study of political science. In the American Political Science Association itself, a committee was formed on political science research with the objective of improving research methods. In 1925, Merriam, while presiding over the American Political Science Association, urged that political behavior should be considered a research subject.

Many political philosophers are associated with the rise of behavioralism in political science. Many of them, especially American scholars, were dissatisfied with the traditional political science approach. Their view was that political science should be transformed into an empirical science by following new research methods. Efforts were made to make political science scientific through empiricism.

2.3.1. Behaviouralism - Nature and Meaning of Behaviouralism:

Many writers have tried to define the term "behavioralism." However, they failed to give a uniform meaning to this concept. This concept is multifaceted, including revolution, cultural evolution, mental state, perspective, and trend. We can understand that the main subject of "behavioralism" is "behavior." Behavioralism considers behavior as a subject related to new study and thus formulates all decisions. Robert A. Dahl explained behavioralism as a mental state. In a seminar held at Chicago University in 1951, David Truman defined behavioralism in this way: "The actions and reactions of individuals and groups participating in the political process, the internal human actions, can be included in political behavior."

In the view of behavioralists, two primary issues are important for true research. They are:

1. For research to be scientific, the specific evidences used in the research must be verifiable as empirical.
2. Research on political behavior should be based on empirical methods. Empiricism without theoretical basis becomes ineffective. Speculations that do not stand up to empirical tests are useless. In the study of political behavior, the scientific understanding of political processes should be the main goal.

How individuals behave in society should not be a research subject. The primary values in individuals' behavior should be accepted as the main research subject. The personal values of the researcher also greatly influence the selection of the research subject. Political science gives

more importance to the description of main characteristics than to a specific definition of behavioralism.

2.3.2. Behavioural Theory, Behaviouralism:

Those who study modern political theory often fail to distinguish between the two terms: behavioral theory and behavioralism. This leads to confusion and wrong decisions. Therefore, it is important to understand the difference between these two.

2.3.2.1. Behavioural Theory:

Behavioral theory is related to mental science. It is based on desires, thoughts, and preferences. If it is not based on research, this theory is not scientific.

2.3.2.2. Behaviouralism:

Behavioralism has scientific theory and research as its basis. It is a specific movement in political science. This approach is used as a method in analyzing and explaining political realities.

2.4. Empiricism, Behaviouralism:

Empiricism is an old approach, while behavioralism is a new approach. The emergence of behavioralism is Graham Wallas's work. However, it can be observed in his "Human Nature in Politics."

Behavioralists explained the importance of research methods in social sciences and research in natural sciences. In the study of empiricism, historical and cultural studies and analysis are also intertwined.

2.4.1. Characteristics of Behaviouralism:

David Easton, in his "Essay on the Current Meaning of Behaviouralism," pointed out some key formulas related to the concept of behavioralism. He considered these formulas as fundamental propositions for the development and formation of the behavioral movement. In Easton's description, the following characteristics are prominent:

They are:

2.4.1.1. Regularities:

Behavioralists believe that there are regularities and uniformities in individuals' political behavior that can be identified. They say that by generalizing such things, either through

formulating theories or through indicating political events, there is an opportunity to explain them. Although political behavior cannot always be of the same type, in some situations, people behave in the same way in many contexts. For example, we can take voting behavior. In elections, people vote for one person or one party, which is known to all of us. When such voting behavior is observed with social, economic, caste, religious, and professional aspects, we can observe that there is uniformity in their behavior.

2.4.1.2. Verifications:

In the view of behavioralists, for science to be complete, only propositions tested empirically must exist. All evidence related to this must be based on observation. It must be tested to determine whether the observations are accurate or not, and re-testing must occur.

2.4.1.3. Techniques:

Behavioralists emphasized the need to adopt correct techniques in collecting and explaining subjects. These behavioralists believe that researchers should have self-knowledge about their techniques. For this, they suggested using modern techniques such as various analyses and mathematical models. The information obtained through these techniques should be highly reliable and acceptable to scientists, and these techniques should be continuously refined and improved.

2.4.1.4. Quantification:

Behavioral branches believe that accurate results will come if political life is not only described by qualitative decisions but also by quantitative data collection. They said that complex political behaviors should be explained with accurate data rather than qualitative opinions.

Quantification should be done like other social sciences, based on the scope of social information, and political science should also be quantified.

2.4.1.5. Values:

In the opinion of behavioralists, there is a difference between moral values and empirical descriptions. Realities and values are two distinct subjects. Both can be studied separately in analysis, but they cannot be studied together. Concepts like democracy, equality, freedom, and supreme sacred values are ideas. But their realities cannot be proved in a scientific method. The scientific study of politics must be done, but moral questions should not arise in it. Research must be conducted with utmost objectivity for values through developed research methods.

2.4.1.6. Systematization:

Behavioralists aspired for research in political science to follow a systematic approach. Research should occur in a theoretical perspective and theoretical guidance. This means that theory and research, whether obtained or not, should be parts with close relationships with systematic knowledge. Research should be as detailed as theory. The concept of systematization is that theory and action should have a close relationship.

2.4.1.7. Pure Science:

Behavioralists said that political science should be completely like a scientific science. The knowledge gained from the understanding of behavioral theory helps in solving life problems. Therefore, theory should be only for theory, and it should not be useful for practical application.

2.4.1.8. Integration:

Behavioralists gave more importance to the interdisciplinary approach and accepted political science as a special science. In their opinion, political science is one of the social sciences. Therefore, political science should achieve integration with other social sciences. Although there are barriers between various social sciences, to understand the political behavior of living humans, it is necessary to observe them with a broad perspective. Therefore, if we observe all these in the study of political behavior, accurate results will come.

2.4.2. Impact of Behaviouralism on Political Science:

Behavioralism provided practical methods, tools, and research methods to political science, which helped political science become complete. It helped to understand human primary motivations, needs, and desires more clearly. Political philosophers, due to this behavioralism, gained independent existence and showed interest in stable living systems politically. Behavioralists want political science to be progressive and useful to humanity, rather than like physical science. From the form of political philosophy in ancient times, it has changed into modern political science, and there is an opportunity for it to take the form of political science in the future.

2.5. Conclusion:

We should not decide that behavioralism is meaningless. By suggesting that there should be harmony between different branches of knowledge, behavioralism has determined a new path for political science. Through new methods and empirical processes, behavioralism has brought

political science closer. In this way, behavioralism has expanded the scope of political science study.

2.6. Sample Examination Questions:

I. Essay Type Questions:

1. Discuss the behavioral approach.
2. Explain the characteristics of behavioralism.
3. Write an essay on behavioralism - empiricism.

II. Short Answer Questions:

1. Briefly explain the development of new approaches.
2. Briefly write about the empirical approach.

2.7. References:

1. David Easton "Introduction: The Current Meaning of Behaviouralism".
2. Robert.A. Dahl. "The Behavioural Approach in Political Science".
3. Heinz Eulau. "Behaviouralism in Political Science-Translation".

Lesson - 3

THE STUDY OF TEXTS IN CONTEXT

Lesson Structure:

3.0. Objective

3.1. Introduction

3.2. Study of Various Political Concepts

3.2.1. Study of Various Traditional Concepts

3.2.1.1. Philosophical Method

3.2.1.2. Historical Concepts and their Study

3.2.1.3. Study of Legal Concepts

3.2.1.4. Study of Institutional Concepts

3.2.2. Study of Modern Political Concepts

3.2.2.1. Study of Social Concepts

3.2.2.2. Study of Psychological Analyses

3.2.3. Study of Economic Concepts

3.2.4. Study of Behavioral Concepts

3.2.5. Study of Marxist Concepts

3.2.6. Study of Authoritarian Concepts

3.2.7. Study of Feminist Ideology

3.2.8. Straussian Ideology

3.2.9. Postmodernism

3.0. Objective:

Through the study of this lesson, students will meaningfully understand various ideologies related to political science and gain critical knowledge about political science.

3.1. Introduction:

Researchers and students studying political science should repeatedly read various works related to the science, understand the read concepts, and evaluate what role those concepts played in social construction. Similarly, studying various concepts, political issues, and theories provides an opportunity to understand the ideas of philosophers from different periods. Students studying political science should study political texts, examine the criticisms that arise from them, and form their own opinions. There are different ways to understand different languages. In the study of political science, not only the explanation of words but also understanding the meaning of ancient concepts is necessary. This is because theoretical interpretations and criticisms cannot prevent misunderstandings arising from wrong explanations. This is because there is no understanding without explanation.

3.2. Study of Various Political Concepts:

Political science can be described as a combination of traditional and scientific or modern approaches. Traditional approaches are highly speculative and prescriptive, and modern approaches are more empirical and scientific in nature. Therefore, their study provides an opportunity for political science researchers and students to critically examine concepts and theories from different periods.

3.2.1. Study of Various Traditional Concepts:

The study of traditional concepts helps researchers and students understand and study various ancient concepts and the periods in which they held importance in the study of political science. They are:

3.2.1.1. Philosophical Method:

This is the oldest method related to the study of political science. It is also called speculative, metaphysical, or ethical method. The study of the state, government, and human political behavior is intricately linked with the desire to achieve specific goals, ethics, or truths. Here, the discipline is closer to the moral world. Since this method gives more importance to values and ethics, its concepts in the real world have faced criticism as being merely speculative and unrealistic. Through the study of these concepts, we can understand the importance of ethics and values in the study of political science.

3.2.1.2. Historical Concepts and their Study:

These concepts bring to light past events and theories and identify the origins and development of political institutions. It attempts to study the role of individuals and their intentions, past successes and failures, and their impact on the future. The help of historical

events and concepts is very essential in understanding the problems in today's political systems. Moreover, it focuses on the antecedents of events that occurred in a specific period. The main objective of historical concept is to explain how institutions were in the past, how they should be in the present, and how they will be in the future. Sabine stated that the greatness of political science lies in explaining the past and predicting the future. Lord Bryce criticized the historical perspective, saying that it often leads astray due to unrealistic comparisons. Barker opined that in this method, the researcher has the opportunity to add their own emotions and mental prejudices. Nevertheless, the fact that the study of historical concepts is beneficial must be accepted.

3.2.1.3. Study of Legal Concepts:

In the study of political science, importance must also be given to legal processes and legal institutions. Legal matters and matters related to laws should be recognized not only as matters related to law but also as political matters, and they should be studied. According to the authors who supported this, the primary duty of the state is to maintain peace and order in society. Therefore, political science should consider and study legal matters as an inseparable part. Cicero and Dicey argued that the state has legal personality, and therefore political science should be considered as the science of legal standards. Therefore, they believed that political science must study matters related to the legal process. These authors stated that people's legal knowledge and their obedience to laws serve as a basis for predicting their political behavior. According to the author Jellinek, "An organized society is not merely a socio-political phenomenon. It is a combination of government laws, statutes, rights, and responsibilities, so understanding the origin and development of the state requires understanding matters related to laws."

3.2.1.4. Study of Institutional Concepts:

Institutional concepts argue that political science should prioritize the study of political structures such as government, legislature, executive, judiciary, political parties, interest groups, etc. These can be identified in the writings of ancient philosophers like Bryce and Finer. Modern writers like Truman included pressure groups, bureaucracy, media, etc., in the structures that political science should study. In this way, importance was given to the study of structures in political science. However, institutional concepts were criticized as being narrow. There is no mention of international political organizations, which play a prominent role in modern times, in these concepts.

3.2.2. Study of Modern Political Concepts:

Due to the shortcomings in traditional political analysis, the need arose for scientific political analysis. Modern political concepts involve the use of many experimental scientific

methods such as new scientific theories, simulation methods, mathematical approaches, and communication theories. Therefore, the study of modern political concepts is essential. Let's examine some of them.

3.2.2.1. Study of Social Concepts:

These concepts emphasize understanding the social context to explain the political behavior of members of society. Humans living in the state are considered social beings, and politics is understood through social factors. But according to critics, giving too much importance to the social context affects the autonomy of the discipline.

3.2.2.2. Study of Psychological Analyses:

This method is related to psychological analysis and was popularized by Sigmund Freud. He argued that a person's actions and desires are driven by unconscious fears. This method studies and explains political and social institutions through psychological laws. Psychological analysis of political leaders reveals important knowledge about politics. However, this method ignores social, legal, and economic factors in the study of politics.

3.2.3. Study of Economic Concepts:

Since the production and distribution of goods are controlled by the state, economic matters also concern political theorists. This method emphasizes the role of the state in controlling economic matters and argued that economic affairs are closely intertwined with the state's political process. Similarly, it tends to connect and understand the political and economic lives of individuals. However, this method considers only economic factors and ignores other important factors such as social and psychological factors.

3.2.4. Study of Behavioral Concepts:

This argument focuses on political behavior and studies human attitudes and preferences in political activities. Therefore, the study of politics shifted its focus from formalism and normativism to the study of political behavior. However, critics argued that this method is based on a false notion of scientific methods.

3.2.5. Study of Marxist Concepts:

Marxist concepts fundamentally differ from other modern concepts. It perceives the state as an inevitable consequence of class antagonisms. It assumes that there is a continuous interaction between political and economic forces and that it is not possible to separate one from the other. However, this method gives necessary importance to economic factors and ignores

other important factors. Marxists view all theories as ideological masks. But they did not explain why their theory should be an exception. Marxist explanations are also prescriptive and deterministic. They see ideological deceptions everywhere.

3.2.6. Study of Authoritarian Concepts:

The rise of fascism and communism inspired research on the philosophical roots of modern authoritarianism. Once the roots began to be seen, they appeared everywhere. For example, Plato's philosophical king, Machiavelli's cruel prince, Hobbes's omnipotent sovereign, and Rousseau's all-wise legislator all appear as precursors to 20th-century authoritarian rulers.

3.2.7. Study of Feminist Ideology:

This feminist ideology gained strength in the 1960s through the efforts of feminists like Mary Wollstonecraft, Emma Goldman, Bentham, Mill, and Engels, who strongly advocated for equality for women.

3.2.8. Straussian Ideology:

This ideology emerged from the researches of Leo Strauss, who attempted to identify the eternal truth of politics in the writings of Plato and other ancient and pre-modern thinkers. These powerful writings were debated in rumors not found in the list of modern liberal thinkers. Strauss expressed regret that systematic foundations were weakening in the context of the violent winds of fanaticism. His experiences as a Jewish refugee from Nazi Germany kept his thoughts in context.

After pointing out the crisis, Strauss and his followers attempted to identify the roots and ascertain the flaws of liberalism, relativism, historicism, and scientism. Solutions must be found by carefully re-reading and understanding the true meaning of texts from the earlier era.

3.2.9. Postmodernism:

Postmodernism emerged from the failures of grand narratives. It is very different. It is a broad perspective shared by different thinkers. Postmodernism emphasizes the irrational and incomprehensible nature of the world and resists every attempt to find unity. It dismissed the idea of progress as merely the progress of one group in dominating others.

One version of this approach, originating from Foucault, examines the ways in which humans are generalized. That is, it made them willingly participate in their own subjugation. This involves re-reading texts from a present perspective and rearranging and changing them according to new analyses. Persistence in the uncertainty of explanations is the most pessimistic attitude that does not develop our knowledge. But it is more dangerous. It legitimizes but at least fails to recognize propaganda and falsehood.

3.3. Conclusion:

No single method is sufficient to obtain the answers we desire. Many methods are best in the range of questions we ask that do not bother us. In adopting this pluralistic approach, intellectual, political, and linguistic contexts must be kept in mind. It must also be remembered that texts take on a life of their own after they are published. Focusing only on what the author intended in a particular text is not always useful, ignoring what other thinkers have said about the concepts.

Explanatory questions are problem-based. We often resort to texts to clarify doubts. These doubts can arise from anywhere. But their explanatory solutions must be supported by rigorous scholarly standards. The explanation between concepts and its two or more interpretations is triangular. Historical works can be kept alive through criticisms and revisions.

3.4. Sample Examination Questions:

I. Essay Type Questions:

1. Write an essay on various political concepts?
2. Explain the importance of modern political studies?

II. Short Answer Questions:

1. Briefly write about traditional concepts?
2. Explain historical concepts?

3.5. References:

1. Terence Ball: "Reappraising Political Theory".
2. Tony Burns "Interpreting and appropriating texts in the history of political thought.
3. Suinner, Quention - "Meaning and Understanding in the History of Ideas".

Lesson - 4

John Rawls (1921-2003)

Table of Contents:

4.0. Objective

4.1. Introduction

4.2. Necessity of Theory of Justice

4.3. Rawls' Principles of Justice

4.4. Political System - Nature - Functions

4.5. Civic Duties - Responsibilities

4.6. Summary

4.7. Sample Questions

4.7. Recommended Readings

4.0. Objective:

After reading this section, you will learn the following:

- a) Limitations of Liberal Utilitarian Theory
- b) Why the theory of justice is necessary for social coexistence
- c) Rawls' Theory of Justice
- d) Rawls' views on the functions and responsibilities of the state system.

4.1. Introduction:

John Rawls, the philosopher who has had the most influence on Anglo-American political philosophy over the last half-century, is the author of "A Theory of Justice," published in 1971. John Rawls is a great man who has received praise from intellectuals worldwide for his theory of justice over the past 50 years. The extensive discussion among philosophers and other social scientists over the last half-century on the ideas expressed in "A Theory of Justice" indicates the uniqueness of the book. Rawls' main contribution and service was to propose an alternative ethical theory different from utilitarianism, which was dominant in political

philosophy. From a political perspective, analysts believe that his theory of justice provided a justifiable basis for liberalism and democracy in modern times.

Justice is the most important of the fundamental concepts of political philosophy. From Plato to Sidgwick (19th Century Cambridge University Moral Philosopher), it has been interpreted. The concept of justice is the basis for the discussion of whether a social structure is reasonable or not, depending on the principles of justice on which it is based. However, in the first decade of the 20th century, after philosophy declared its scientific goal to be merely clarifying concepts, philosophy lost the tradition of asking fundamental questions related to human life and giving various answers to them. As a result, political science, which is very close to philosophy, was in danger of losing its direction and, in that process, its existence. In this context, the essays written by John Rawls, and subsequently "A Theory of Justice" written in 1971 as a continuation of those essays, had such an impact that philosophy was forced to redefine its areas of study, thereby leading to a renewed discussion on the fundamental concepts of political science. Rawls' theory of justice helped analyze the reasonableness of the fundamental structural principles of Western societies.

4.2. Necessity of Theory of Justice:

As moral beings, humans often make judgments about their life activities, social traditions, and institutions. In Rawls' view, these human judgments are the subject of study for the philosopher. By analyzing these human judgments, the philosopher can examine human capacity and thereby estimate what prescriptive principles of justice humans are following. The philosopher's duty is to analyze decisions made with discretion in situations of capacity, opportunity, and the desire to make correct decisions, rather than decisions made hastily, in fear, or without self-confidence, and the principles of justice that guide those decisions, and thereby discover a theory of justice. However, decisions made by humans after careful thought may in many cases be contrary to other decisions they make, or different from the principles of justice they wish to follow. Therefore, Rawls' intention is that by formulating a clear theory of justice, the philosopher can establish some universal standards as a basis for their decisions, thereby reducing the gap between their practice and thought. Therefore, in Rawls' view, the duty of a theory of justice is to explain and analyze human judgments about justice and injustice at a philosophical level.

Rawls' theory of justice not only analyzes various concepts but also makes many formulations at an empirical level about human nature and society. Rawls explains human moral nature by examining the human capacity to act justly, and also considering his other capacities. Rawls not only explains other theories of justice but also explains how his theory of justice is consistent with decisions made by humans in a state of reflective equilibrium. Rawls' writing style

resembles Socrates' dialectical method. That is, he engages in a dialogue between his own opinions and the opinions of his book's readers, asking them to test whether their judgments are consistent with his principles of justice, and finally explains how agreement between their judgments and his principles of justice is possible.

In any society, harmony and conflict coexist among people. Any person feels that they can achieve a better life through harmony and cooperation than through a solitary life. Similarly, since every person tries to get a larger share of the results of that cooperation than others, there is also conflict among people. Therefore, every society needs to establish some universal distribution rules. These distribution rules are social rules of justice. Citizens in those societies can discuss the good and bad of the social institutions and traditions organized in those societies in the light of these social principles of justice. Legal rights, duties, social and economic opportunities, property, capacity, etc., which are the results of social coexistence, must therefore be distributed among citizens according to the social principles of justice. In any society, when the members of that society consider something beneficial, it needs to be distributed among them, and the need arises to formulate principles of justice consistent with that. Therefore, the principles of justice related to distribution in social coexistence must be considered as the fundamental rules related to the structure of that social system. The social positions of various individuals in a society and their life opportunities are determined by how that society is organized. Moreover, their initial life opportunities, their life goals, desires, and self-concepts are all determined based on their social positions. Therefore, various theories of justice are formulated to explain how inequalities are justified in any society where they are institutionalized. However, in Rawls' view, he considers agreements freely and impartially formed by individuals as the basis for justice. Agreements formed by individuals in the market are not freely formed because the socio-economic background conditions that determine the market system influence those decisions. Therefore, only when those background conditions are considered just, are the distributions of income and property among individuals in the market determined to be in accordance with the principles of justice. However, when it comes to the basis on which these principles of justice should be formulated, Rawls proposes that they should be subject to three limitations. Firstly, these principles of justice should be applicable to everyone. Moreover, these principles of justice should possess all the characteristics that resolve conflicting claims and should be acceptable to everyone as practicable ultimate principles. The second characteristic is that these principles of justice should not only be moral principles but also be capable of being chosen selflessly. In Rawls' view, to think morally means to be able to think impartially, overcoming one's personal likes and dislikes. That is, the individual should be able to come to impartial decisions, overcoming opinions and decisions based on their social position.

The third characteristic is that since these principles of justice govern human relationships, some fundamental facts about human nature must be known to everyone. Rawls proposes that every person tries to achieve their interests rationally, that what they desire is available only in limited quantities, and that they have different perspectives on what constitutes a good life. However, Rawls declares that everyone agrees that they want some fundamental things such as rights, freedoms, opportunities, power, income, property, and self-respect.

Rawls proposes his principles of justice, which are based on the ideas of Locke, Kant, and Rousseau, and explains how they are consistent with people's thoughts. He explains how the group of people who accepted his principles of justice, overcoming their veil of ignorance in various situations, will follow those principles of justice in those situations. Rawls' intention is that in the first situation, they will form a constitution, and his first principle of justice will be the basis for that constitution. In the second situation, they will form laws, and these laws will be based on his second principle. In the third situation, these laws will be implemented by judges and administrators in specific situations. In this situation, the veil of ignorance is completely removed.

In a just political system, the legislative body, which has the authority to form laws for a certain period through universal suffrage, has the authority to form laws. The decisions of this legislative body are based on the decisions of the majority representatives. Therefore, their decisions do not violate the freedom of the people, and the rights related to freedom in the state are protected. In a political system, information related to political matters should be equally available to everyone. People should have the opportunity to form their own alternative methods. If some people try to make decisions based on their personal power and self-interest in the process of political discussion and forming laws, political freedom loses its value. Therefore, if people's freedom is to be protected, it is possible only when property is distributed in an extensive manner, and through achieving those meanings, it is possible for them to participate in them.

According to Rawls' second principle, the government should provide correct and equal opportunities to everyone. That is, the government should bring educational and cultural opportunities to everyone. The government should try to ensure that the backward classes in that society benefit more. This means that the government should try to ensure that everyone gets at least some income. This is because the capitalist economic system does not distribute income keeping human needs in mind. Therefore, the government should try to ensure that at least some income is distributed to the backward classes. If the government can ensure that at least some income is distributed to the backward classes, their basic needs and self-respect will be protected. Therefore, Rawls' opinion is that the rest of the distribution should be decided by the market.

Rawls also proposes four important virtues that are important in the freedom he proposes. They are:

1. Political freedom, i.e., the right to vote. The right to vote in elections, freedom of expression, and freedom of assembly.
2. Freedom of conscience, i.e., freedom to think and to have one's own preferred beliefs.
3. Freedom to own personal property.
4. Freedom from arbitrary arrest without legal process.

4.3. Rawls' Principles of Justice:

Rawls' intention is that every person should be able to achieve the values they have determined for themselves as a free person. Similarly, in any society, social and economic inequalities are justified only when they are more beneficial to the backward classes in that society. That is, they are justified only when every person in that society has equal opportunities to enter jobs and positions through those inequalities. In a word, if jobs and positions are to be entered by competing, it is not enough to have only formal freedom. Equal opportunities must be provided through correct equal opportunities, and through them, they must be able to enter them.

In the process of explaining his principles of justice, Rawls takes the ideal method followed by Hobbes, Locke, and Kant as a basis and explains how the principles of justice he proposes are naturally consistent with people's thoughts. He explains how the group of people who accepted his principles of justice, overcoming their veil of ignorance in various situations, will apply those principles of justice to specific situations. In the first situation, they will form a constitution, and Rawls' intention is that his first principle of justice will be the basis for that constitution. In the second situation, they will form laws, and Rawls believes that these laws will be based on his second principle. In the third situation, these laws will be implemented by judges and administrators in specific situations. In this situation, the veil of ignorance is completely removed.

In a just political system, the legislative body, which has the authority to form laws for a certain period through universal suffrage, has the authority to form laws. The decisions of this legislative body are based on the decisions of the majority representatives. Therefore, their decisions do not violate the freedom of the people, and the rights related to freedom in the state are protected. In a political system, information related to political matters should be equally available. People should have the opportunity to form their own alternative methods. If some people try to make decisions based on their personal power and self-interest in the process of political discussion and forming laws, political freedom loses its value. Therefore, if people's

freedom is to be protected, it is possible only when property is distributed in an extensive manner, and through achieving those meanings, it is possible for them to participate in them.

According to Rawls' second principle, the government should provide correct and equal opportunities to everyone. That is, the government should bring educational and cultural opportunities to everyone. The government should try to ensure that the backward classes in that society benefit more. This means that the government should try to ensure that everyone gets at least some income. This is because the capitalist economic system does not distribute income keeping human needs in mind. Therefore, the government should try to ensure that at least some income is distributed to the backward classes. If the government can ensure that at least some income is distributed to the backward classes, their basic needs and self-respect will be protected. Therefore, Rawls' opinion is that the rest of the distribution should be decided by the market.

Rawls also proposes four important virtues that are important in the freedom he proposes. They are:

1. Political freedom, i.e., the right to vote. The right to vote in elections, freedom of expression, and freedom of assembly.
2. Freedom of conscience, i.e., freedom to think and to have one's own preferred beliefs.
3. Freedom to own personal property.
4. Freedom from arbitrary arrest without legal process.

4.4. Political System - Nature - Functions:

1. Rawls says that social justice will come into practice through the government imposing taxes on the income of the rich and distributing many benefits to the common people, without the prices of goods being entirely decided by the market.
2. Individual freedoms will be achieved only when there is complete employment and individuals have the necessary opportunities to choose their professions.
3. If the aspirations of the backward classes and the poor in society are to be fulfilled, the government should try to ensure that everyone gets at least some income. This is because the capitalist economic system does not distribute income keeping human needs in mind. Therefore, the government should try to ensure that at least some income is distributed to the backward classes. If the government can ensure that at least some income is distributed to the backward classes, their basic needs and self-respect will be protected. Therefore, Rawls' opinion is that the rest of the distribution should be decided by the market.

4. If the government can rectify economic inequalities, other political and educational opportunities will also be distributed equally. Therefore, the government should impose taxes on property distribution, inheritance, and other such things to ensure that equal opportunities are available to everyone.

4.5. Civic Duties - Responsibilities:

Rawls' intention is that people do not have any political duties. Those in government positions can be called political duties based on their positions. But citizenship is not a position, so citizens do not have duties. Helping others, following the decisions of just institutions, etc., can be called civic duties. Similarly, in a just society, government laws and regulations may not be just in some situations, and citizens may not respect them. However, in a just society, if the government's laws and regulations give an opportunity for civil disobedience and rebellion, then only citizens can participate in the government.

Rawls' principles of justice have created a new foundation for the theory of liberalism. Although liberalism talks about individual development, it failed to explain the opportunities for it to become practical. Liberalism defined freedom in a limited sense, that is, the ability to act without external control over individual decisions. However, it failed to grasp the relationship between social opportunities and the individualization of freedom. Similarly, liberalism has expressed unclear opinions on the relationship between ethical values and political values. Identifying these weaknesses in liberalism, he explained through his principles of justice how they can be overcome within the framework of liberal ideology. He tried to prove that freedom is based on human moral nature, and that a person's self-respect and sense of his own worth have a natural connection with the concept of freedom. It is not correct to say that humans live only to satisfy physical needs.

4.6. Summary:

Rawls is the person who said that other psychological needs such as self-respect and compassion for fellow human beings are also fundamental to social cooperation. He clarified that individual development is intertwined with the development of other individuals with whom he lives. In that way, he explained how concepts like freedom and equality can be reconciled through the concept of justice, and through his theory of justice.

4.7. Sample Questions:

1. Explain Rawls' theory of justice.
2. Rawls' opinion on civic duties.
3. Political system - nature.

4. Rawls' principles of justice.

4.8. Recommended Readings:

1. John Rawls, *A Theory of Justice*, Clarendon Press, Oxford, 1972.
2. Samuel Freeman (ed): *The Cambridge Companion to Rawls*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 2003.
3. Bhikhu Parekh: *Contemporary Political Thinkers*, Martin Robertson, Oxford, 1982.

Lesson – 5

LIBERTARIAN CONCEPTION OF RIGHTS - ROBERT NOZICK

Lesson Structure:

5.0. Objective

5.1. Robert Nozick - Specialties

5.2. Libertarianism

5.3. Individual Rights

5.4. Theory of Just Property Rights

5.4.1. Principle of Acquisition

5.4.2. Principle of Transfer

5.4.3. Rectification of Injustice

5.5. Conception of Rights - From Anarchism to State

5.5.1. Protective Associations

5.5.2. Invisible Hand Explanation

5.6. Argument for the Minimal State

5.7. Criticisms of Nozick's Libertarianism

5.8. Conclusion

5.9. Sample Examination Questions

5.10. References

5.0. Objective:

Through the study of this lesson, the student will understand Robert Nozick's philosophical background. Primarily, the objective of this lesson is to explain to the student the analytical aspects such as Nozick's critical study of libertarianism, the theory of rights, the analysis of action principles, and the establishment of a minimal state for the protection of rights.

5.1. Robert Nozick - Specialities:

Robert Nozick was born in 1938 in Brooklyn, New York, into a Jewish family. He was known as a distinguished philosopher who conducted research on metaphysics, epistemology, decision theory, political philosophy, and value theory. Robert Nozick was an analytical philosopher. He tried to explain the complex issues he chose meaningfully and to provide a justifiable alternative to traditional philosophy. He believed that a specific theory is not necessarily the goal of philosophy to refute critics. Nozick thought of philosophy as a non-exhaustive inquiry to establish connections between ideas and to explain how subjects should be. Nozick also used many subjects from outside philosophy to enhance his scholarship. For example, he drew interdisciplinary subjects from economics, probabilistic science, and ethical psychology and applied them in his empirical studies.

Regarding political philosophy, Nozick can be called a perfect libertarian. Briefly, he said that individuals own themselves. He emphasized the idea that individuals have rights over their property. In Nozick's view, protecting individuals and their private property are important values. In this way, Robert Nozick's ideology was analyzed. He passed away in 2002 due to a rare disease.

5.2. Libertarianism:

Robert Nozick is a prominent philosopher who, in the 20th century, supported individualism and the limited state and provided a philosophical basis for it. In the days when the winds of collectivism and socialism were blowing strongly, Nozick subjected both to severe criticism. He argued that anarchism, collectivism, and socialism are not good alternatives. Nozick asserted that a limited state that only enforces contracts, prevents coercion, theft, and fraud is just. And he said that the principle of justice and the principle of distribution cannot be protected at the same time. This is because protecting justice means that property rights remain unlimited. Similarly, the principle of distribution questions property rights. It acts contrary to the principle of justice. This leads to the violation of fundamental rights. Therefore, he stated that the state should not interfere in individual matters and should not violate justice in the name of equality. He proposed "retributive justice." According to this, it is important for the state to prevent interference in our sphere of justice by limiting the government machinery established for conflicting purposes.

In his famous book "Anarchy, State, and Utopia," Robert Nozick explained his political ideas. He explained why a limited state is necessary as an answer to the fundamental questions of anarchists, who have no state. Moreover, he also explained how the state concepts of collectivism and socialism are unjustified. He believed that these two theories - collectivism and

socialism - support the extensive state, and because of this, individuals' rights are not protected, so it is not justifiable.

5.3. Individual Rights:

Robert Nozick began his book "Anarchy, State, and Utopia" with the argument "Individuals have rights." He admitted that he had no proper arguments or proofs to say that humans have individual rights, but he explained that he would try to find reasons why individuals have rights and why they strive to have rights. Similarly, he explained that having a libertarian concept means that the individual indicates that they are acting freely.

Nozick believed that there are reasons why individuals have rights, even if he did not have a strong philosophical argument for it. He tried to prove that every individual has a special value, and from that idea, individuals have rights. He explained that the individual rights that individuals have determine some ethical limitations on what they can do. According to Nozick's argument, "An individual can meaningfully understand their existence only by adopting a rational way of life." Through this, Nozick's argument is that only individuals who have the ability to think rationally have a meaningful existence.

5.4. Theory of Just Property Rights:

In "Anarchy, State, and Utopia," published in 1974, Nozick proposed some principles of justice. Nozick proposed three principles to determine who has just ownership over property and resources.

5.4.1. Principle of Acquisition:

Whatever resources in society are initially owned by someone, that private property is just.

5.4.2. Principle of Transfer:

Property that is justly acquired through free transfer, sale, or gift is just. Moreover, it also leads to a just distribution of resources.

5.4.3. Rectification of Injustice:

To determine just property rights, he refuted unjust acquisitions that occurred in the past by paying compensation. Similarly, he stated that others should also be given adequate resources.

Based on these principles of action, Nozick provided his own method of proof. This revolves around the concept of self-ownership. This is Nozick's primary principle of libertarianism.

5.5. Conception of Rights - From Anarchism to State:

Anarchists believed that the state is not necessary for humans to live as complete beings, and that the establishment of the state harms human freedom and rights, and that the state is an evil force. They believed that establishing a state system of all kinds, i.e., a real state, would not lead to a good human condition. Nozick carefully examined the questions that anarchists raised. As a result of the anarchist argument, a fundamental question arose in political theory: Should the state exist at all? As an answer to this, Nozick proposed the concept of a minimal state.

Nozick began his analysis with social contract theories, primarily the social contract theory proposed by Locke.

Nozick rejected Locke's argument that a political system emerges as a result of understanding the shortcomings in the natural system. He explained that when individuals try to enforce their rights, collecting compensation for damages from others, conflicts arise. In such a situation, there are no clear ways for individuals to resolve disputes. Therefore, individuals do not have the opportunity to enforce their rights in a natural system. That is, if a person violates another person's rights, and then the remaining people, even if they are stronger than him, cannot punish him or collect compensation for damages. As an answer to this, Nozick proposed some propositions.

5.5.1. Protective Associations:

From the anarchist situation in the natural system, mutual protective associations will emerge. The work of these associations is to enforce individuals' rights, to prevent attacks on others, to prevent attacks from other groups, and to punish those who violate individual rights. For some time, society will form special groups to carry out these peace and security measures. In a region, there is initially an opportunity for strong protective associations to emerge. Conflicts can also arise between these strong protective associations. To achieve coordination in the activities of these protective associations and to protect the rights of all citizens in that region, a dominant protective association will emerge. In Nozick's words, "Overcoming the anarchist situation, humans will form groups among themselves and form mutual protective associations. Division of labor, market relations, and the principle of voluntary cooperation will combine to lead to a limited state."

5.5.2. Invisible Hand Explanation:

The primary form of the state is not created by an individual or a group with a specific purpose. Even in the primary state, there is a method and a process. However, it is not created by an individual or a group. To explain this, Nozick used Adam Smith's concept of the "invisible hand." According to Smith, every individual acts with the intention of developing their own nature. For that, they cooperate with others and continue their activities. However, in this process, the overall social good does not arise from that. Nozick also thought in that way. Nozick believed that the emergence of a dominant protective association is extremely satisfying as an invisible hand explanation.

These protective associations are more powerful than the limited state. Nozick believed that in the process of protective associations transforming into a limited state, at least one more intermediate social formation must have occurred. He called this the "ultra-minimal state." This ultra-minimal state has the authority to use force over individuals in society. That is, when mistakes occur, it has the authority to decide that it is a mistake, to correct that mistake, and to take corrective action to prevent damage.

According to this, the ultra-minimal state will emerge from the natural system without anyone's rights being violated. Due to its inherent authority, it is not considered unjust to use it over individuals. Ethically, it grows in acceptable ways. In the invisible hand process, it takes shape. It does not indicate a situation where anyone has special rights, and one person's rights are not available to another.

In this context, Nozick explains some of the aspirations that individuals ethically form for themselves. Every individual has a special existence. No one will accept an ethical theory that forces an individual to sacrifice their interests for the overall social good. Based on this premise, Nozick said that individuals will form a bond that one individual should not attack another individual. He said that it is not correct to say that humans live only to satisfy physical needs, but that other psychological needs such as self-respect and compassion for fellow human beings are also fundamental to social cooperation. He clarified that individual development is intertwined with the development of other individuals with whom he lives. In that way, he explained how concepts like freedom and equality can be reconciled through the concept of justice, and through his theory of justice.

5.6. Argument for the Minimal State:

Nozick explained in detail the necessity of the minimal state emerging from the anarchist situation. Nozick also explained why these minimal state limits should not be crossed. He refuted

the arguments that said that a more extensive state than the minimal state is necessary. He said that the arguments that brought forward distributive justice and Marxism have no justification.

Nozick believed that there are many shortcomings in the various theories of justice that exist in the world. (Distributive justice, rights justice, etc., are examples here.) He rejected the rules that distributive justice proposes. He pointed out another reason why some people spend and some people make payments in society. He said that if individuals' rights are violated in the natural system, and then the state comes into existence, the state should give protection to individuals. That is, the state's action to correct the past violation of an individual's rights should be considered. This will lead to general peace in society. In a way, Nozick also explained that the second principle that Rawls proposed is explained in a different form. It was said that the state should provide compensation for injustices. However, he did not believe that the state should implement the redistribution of income and wealth in a society through a specific method. He said that the state should not impose any method on the people for the distribution of property and income.

5.7 Robert Nozick - Libertarian Theory of Rights

Nozick believed that the utopian state imagined by earlier philosophers could be realized only in a minimal state.

After the publication of his book 'Anarchy, State, and Utopia', Nozick abandoned research related to political philosophy. Socrates Puzzles stated that Nozick had no interest in defending his libertarian views in political theory from critics by writing "Son of Anarchy, State and Utopia." However, in 'The Examined Life', he suggested that Nozick had moved away from libertarianism. He later stated that he did not intend to create his own alternative to libertarianism and was only pointing out what he considered the main failure of the theory.

5.8. Conclusion:

Thus, Robert Nozick, through his book 'Anarchy, State, and Utopia', explained libertarianism, emphasizing individual rights and the importance of legal rights. Similarly, he criticized Rawls' principles of justice and proposed some principles of justice. While explaining the importance of rights, he also analyzed who should take responsibility for protecting rights and what kind of state emergence would protect rights without infringement. Similarly, a limited state was supported over an unlimited state. In this way, Robert Nozick explained his libertarian concepts.

5.9 Sample Examination Questions:

I. Essay Type Questions:

1. Write an essay on Nozick's libertarianism?
2. Write an essay on the concept of rights - "From Anarchism towards the State"?

II. Short Answer Questions:

1. Explain the theory of just property rights?
2. Write about the invisible hand explanation?

5.10. References:

1. Robert Nozick - Anarchy, State, and Utopia
2. Nozick - Philosophical Explanations
3. Nozick - Socratic Puzzles
4. Nozick - Examined Life
5. D. Murray - Nozick's Autonomy and Compensation

Lesson - 6

F. A. Hayek (1899 - 1992)

Table of Contents:

6.0 Objective

6.1. Introduction

6.2. Criticism of Socialism

6.3. Freedom and Law in a Free Society

6.4. Criticism of the Concept of Social Justice in the Welfare State

6.5. Explanation of Liberalism and Democratic Concepts

6.6. Summary

6.7 Recommended Readings

6.0. Objective:

After reading this section, you will learn the following:

- a) Understand the main points of liberal ideology and their uniqueness.
- b) Explain how socialism and welfare state governance are detrimental to liberal values.
- c) Explain how liberalism, democracy, and free market systems are mutually complementary.

6.1. Introduction:

Until the first five or six decades of this century, socialism, welfareism, and democratic ideologies widely influenced the intelligentsia and the populace in Western countries. These ideologies sought to achieve political goals such as liberty, equality, and social justice. Marxism declared the dictatorship of the proletariat, and welfare states declared the rule of majority representatives as means to achieve these goals. It was believed that these goals would be achieved through planned development and distribution. Based on these ideologies, in the Soviet Union and Eastern European countries, the means of production were removed from individual ownership and brought under state control, and the state extensively intervened in the economy based on economic planning strategies. Similarly, in other Western European countries, the state intervened in the economy through distribution with the aim of achieving democratic goals such as social justice and equal opportunities for all. However, by the 1970s, a significant decline in economic development was clearly visible in both the Soviet Union and other Eastern European

countries, and doubts began to arise about the argument that the aforementioned political goals could be achieved by the state. In this context, Hayek's criticism of these ideologies, made since 1940 through his book 'The Road to Serfdom', gradually became a major topic of discussion in European countries. Hayek's ideas are unique in stating that individual freedom and rights, the foundations of traditional liberal ideology, can only be realized in a free capitalist competitive world without state control, and that these freedoms will not be protected in socialist and welfare states. Hayek was a person who made sharp criticisms of welfareism and socialism even when they were attracting the populace and intelligentsia worldwide in the 1940s and 50s. With the widespread public acceptance of political criticism against welfareism in the 1970s and 80s, Hayek's proposed ideas are currently a major topic of discussion.

In Eastern European countries, a significant decline in economic development was clearly visible, and doubts began to arise about the argument that the aforementioned political goals could be achieved by the state. In this context, Hayek's criticism of these ideologies, made since 1940 through his book 'The Road to Serfdom', gradually became a major topic of discussion in European countries. Hayek's ideas are unique in stating that individual freedom and rights, the foundations of traditional liberal ideology, can only be realized in a free capitalist competitive world without state control, and that these freedoms will not be protected in socialist and welfare states. Hayek was a person who made sharp criticisms of welfareism and socialism even when they were attracting the populace and intelligentsia worldwide in the 1940s and 50s. With the widespread public acceptance of political criticism against welfareism in the 1970s and 80s, Hayek's proposed ideas are currently a major topic of discussion.

6.2 Criticism of Socialism:

In 'The Road to Serfdom' (1944) and 'The Fatal Conceit, The Errors of Socialism' (1988), Hayek explained how the socialist system inevitably moves towards dictatorship. In modern societies, millions or billions of individuals independently perceive information related to production costs, consumer desires, and product prices. It is impossible for a state-owned organization to collect all the information gathered by these billions of people according to their life goals and make macroeconomic decisions for the entire system accordingly. This means that in socialist states, there is a possibility of a gap between the decisions made by the government planning agency for the entire system and the decisions made by individuals alone. Therefore, when the government makes decisions related to production and distribution based on its authority, rather than reasonably according to the aspirations of the people, productivity gradually decreases because production factors (Labour, Capital, etc.) are not utilized according to their maximum values. Therefore, Hayek's view is that the planned decisions made by the state in socialist systems only create an illusion that the needs of the people will be met more extensively.

6.3 Justice and Law in a Free Society:

According to Hayek's theory of justice in a free market economy, laws should be formulated without involvement in specific human goals. Hayek states that there is a fundamental difference between society and an organization. A few individuals form an organization to achieve their common goals, so the individuals working in that organization formulate some rules for the ease of its management. However, he says that in developed human societies, there are no specific political goals or objectives that apply to the entire society, but each individual tries to achieve their life goals through those organizations freely. As a consequence, he says that a spontaneous order forms in the entire society without human intention. In this free society, there is nothing specifically called "collective welfare" agreed upon by all, but collective welfare here means helping each individual to enhance their own welfare. Hayek calls this the Rule of Law. These rules, defined at an abstract level and forming an order, create an opportunity for individuals to freely achieve their life decisions.

Therefore, in Hayek's view, justice does not mean achieving specific social welfare or achieving coordination between different groups in society. Justice, in his view, merely means creating a framework of universal rules (A framework of Rules or Rule of Law) that allows every individual to independently achieve their personal welfare. Therefore, in a free market system, some individuals being in poverty or unemployed should not be considered as systemic outcomes but as results of the personal characteristics of those individuals. Therefore, he says that even if the natural distribution of property, income, and goods and services in a free market system leads to inequalities in that society, that distribution should be considered reasonable, because no individual or government has any involvement in it, and it should be considered merely the result of decisions made by thousands or millions of individuals.

6.4 Criticism of the Concept of Social Justice in the Welfare State:

Many theories of justice have proposed that in free market societies, social justice should be defined based on merit and need, and that the distribution of property, income, and goods and services in those societies according to these principles of justice is just. However, Hayek argues that it is difficult to assess merit or need without involvement in the market, and that there is no consensus on these distribution principles in those societies. He believes that even if distribution is to occur based on merit or need, it is difficult to achieve consensus on the basis for estimating this merit or need. Moreover, he argues that the responsibility for this distribution would ultimately have to be given to the government, and when the government makes this distribution according to its will, individual freedom will be violated. He says that the government distributing in this way will have two negative consequences. First: while the main characteristic

of the market system is to freely achieve diverse life goals, distributing economic resources based on merit or need is contrary to freedom by forcefully imposing and accepting a certain perspective of justice on everyone in that society. Second: those to whom this distribution responsibility is given, especially government officials, have the opportunity to misuse their special authority for their own benefit. Whenever the government assumes this distribution responsibility, interest groups in those societies define social justice according to their own interests and bring pressure on the government, thereby each group tries to get a larger share in the distribution. Whenever the pressure from interest groups on the government increases, the government makes arbitrary decisions, consequently facing a governability crisis. When government decisions are perceived to be favorable to one interest group, other groups unite, ultimately leading to government instability. Therefore, in Hayek's view, if social justice is defined based on merit or need and government income, goods, and services are distributed accordingly, it can ultimately lead to government authoritarianism, as well as government instability. Therefore, in Hayek's view, the state in liberal societies should stay away from competing principles of justice. Similarly, in a free market system, when the government creates a framework of abstract laws that allows every individual to make independent decisions with freedom, and tries not to make any distribution in that system, the freedom of individuals in those societies expands. Hayek argues that this concept of social justice is the cause of Marxist socialist ideology and welfareism, and that institutionalizing this concept is the cause of problems such as government authoritarianism, instability, economic recession, and inflation in Western societies.

6.5 Explanation of Liberalism and Democratic Concepts:

Hayek clarified the meanings of these concepts by stating that liberalism is a political theory that explains how law should be, and democracy is a theory that explains how law should be formed. He says that the argument that everyone should have equal participation in formulating the law when everyone is equal before the law is the root of the combination of liberal and democratic ideas. Liberalism primarily thinks about how to control the government's regulatory powers. Hayek argues that if liberalism defines the goals and scope of government, then democracy is the method that explains how to form the government within that scope, and that democracy does not have the characteristic of dictating government goals, and should not have it. Hayek argues that democracy means the rule of the majority, but giving unlimited powers to the government in the sense of popular sovereignty is not correct. When mutually conflicting arguments in society compete to be declared as government decisions, and when it comes to which argument should be taken as the final decision, majority rule was accepted as a "decision-making method" to declare opinions supported by the majority of people as government decisions, but democracy is not majority rule with uncontrolled unlimited powers,

Hayek argues. Hayek argues that in a democratic system, people make some decisions keeping their immediate needs in mind, and they want those decisions to be declared as government decisions, but when those decisions are likely to harm their long-term interests, people change their opinions again. Therefore, in democratic countries, people can overcome opinions formed by keeping their immediate needs in mind only when the intelligentsia influences public opinion by keeping people's long-term interests in mind. That is why democracy is considered a forum for discussion of different views. By providing constitutional and legal protection for freedom of expression and other freedoms, majority rule can be prevented from becoming authoritarian rule. Therefore, for majority rule not to become authoritarian rule, universal laws are necessary to dictate the decisions of the majority, and when decisions of majority representatives are made within the scope of those laws, individual freedom will be protected, otherwise, if there are no universal laws to control the rule of majority representatives, democracy will conflict with individual freedom. If democracy is defined as the rule of the majority representatives without any control, Hayek unequivocally declared that he is not a democrat. Therefore, civil liberties depend on laws that control state powers. Citizens can develop their abilities according to their life goals only when those laws are defined in the form of civil rights.

That is why democracy becomes an ideal instrument for expanding civil liberties only when liberal ideology has constitutional goals.

6.6 Summary:

Hayek can be recognized as the intellectual who re-articulated the interrelationship between individual freedom, law, state, democracy, and the free market system in the light of traditional liberal ideology, against welfare and socialist theories. He explained how welfareism harms liberal values such as individual freedom, property rights, and the market system. He also explained how democracy, if not controlled by liberalism and constitutionalism, moves towards welfareism. He clarified the inherent contradiction between the value of social justice, which is the basis of welfareism, and other liberal values such as individual freedom and the limited state. He argues that liberal values such as freedom, rights, and needs can be achieved to the maximum extent only in a free market system, and not in any other system.

6.7 Recommended Readings:

1. F.A. Hayek, *The Constitution of Liberty*, Routledge and Kegan Paul, London, 1960.
2. F.A. Hayek, *Law, Legislation and Liberty* Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1976 (Vol. I, II, III)
3. Norman P. Barry, *Hayek's Social and Economic Philosophy*, Macmillan, London, 1979.
4. John Gray, *Hayek of liberty*, Basil Blackwell, Oxford, 1984.

Lesson - 7

MULTICULTURALISM - WILL KYMLICKA, BHIKHU PAREKH

Lesson Structure:

- 7.0. Objective
- 7.1. Multiculturalism - Meaning
- 7.2. Concepts of Culture in Contemporary Political Theory
 - 7.2.1. Symbolic Concept
 - 7.2.2. Normative Concept
 - 7.2.3. Social Concept
 - 7.2.4. Economic / Rational Choice
 - 7.2.5. Anti-Essentialism and Cosmopolitanism of Culture
- 7.3. Concept of Multiculturalism
- 7.4. Kymlicka's Multicultural Liberalism
- 7.5. Rethinking Multiculturalism - Bhikhu Parekh
- 7.6. Conclusion
- 7.7. Sample Examination Questions
- 7.8. References

7.0. Objective:

Through the study of this lesson, you will understand the importance of culture for the meaningful existence of society and how cultural values should be protected, thereby studying multiculturalism. This lesson will be useful for extensively understanding the concepts of Will Kymlicka and Bhikhu Parekh, prominent figures and philosophers in multicultural studies.

7.1. Multiculturalism - Meaning:

Cultural diversity has existed in societies for a long time. Ancient Greece had various small regions with different clothes, traditions, dialects, and identities. For example, Aetolia, Doris, Aciras. In the Ottoman Empire, Muslims were the majority. However, there were also

Christians, Jews, Arabs, and other religious groups. In the 21st century, societies are culturally diverse. Most countries have a mixture of people from various ethnic, linguistic backgrounds, religious affiliations, etc. Contemporary political theorists have promoted this phenomenon of the coexistence of diverse cultures in a single geographical space as multiculturalism. That is, one of the meanings of multiculturalism is the coexistence of diverse cultures.

However, the term 'multiculturalism' has not only been used to describe a culturally diverse society but also to refer to a type of policy aimed at protecting cultural diversity. Although multiculturalism is a phenomenon with a long history, and historically there have been countries that adopted multicultural policies like the Ottoman Empire, the systematic study of multiculturalism only developed in the late 20th century. It began to receive special attention, especially from liberal philosophers. Canadian philosophers initially devoted more time to these studies. But in the 21st century, it is a widespread topic in contemporary political philosophy. Before multiculturalism became a topic in political philosophy, much of the literature in this area focused on issues related to the fair distribution of resources. In contrast, the topic of multiculturalism in political philosophy highlights the idea that cultural identities are also systematic, and policies should take these identities into account.

To understand the discussion of multiculturalism in contemporary political philosophy, there are four main aspects to consider. These are the meaning of the concept of 'culture', the discussion about justice between cultural groups, and the discussion about the practical implications of multicultural practices.

7.2. Concepts of Culture in Contemporary Political Theory:

Multiculturalism is a theory about culture and its value. Therefore, to understand what multiculturalism means, it is very essential to clarify the meaning of culture. This section describes five main concepts of culture in contemporary political philosophy.

1. Symbolic Concept
2. Normative Concept
3. Social Concept
4. Economic / Rational Choice
5. Anti-Essentialist Cosmopolitanism of Culture

As Festenstein pointed out, these are not competing concepts of culture. Here, everyone chooses a different set of necessary and sufficient conditions for the correct application of the predicate. In contrast, all these concepts of culture, although in slightly different ways, imply that culture has individual identity. Therefore, it is possible to support them simultaneously.

7.2.1. Symbolic Concept:

The symbolic concept of culture became very popular in the 1960s and has its roots in classic social anthropology. Social anthropologists like Margaret Mead and Levi-Strauss considered culture as a set of social systems, symbols, representations, and practices held by a specific group. Therefore, from this perspective, culture is defined as the structures of an ideal system. Differently put, according to this perspective, culture should be understood as a symbolic system, a means of communication that represents the world. This type of communication is based on theoretical principles such as symbols, underlying structures, and beliefs. Parekh is one of the philosophers who accepts this type of cultural perspective.

7.2.2. Normative Concept:

The normative concept of culture is generally adopted by communitarians. From this perspective, culture is important because it provides beliefs, norms, and moral reasons that motivate individuals to act. Therefore, a person is in part composed of their moral commitments. Their practical identity is shaped by these moral commitments. However, their reasons for taking action are motivated by their moral commitments. In other words, according to the normative concept of culture, the term 'culture' refers to a distinctive and practical identity of a group of individuals. and the beliefs and commitments that exist. Thus, strong values and commitments arise from culture.

7.2.3. Social Concept:

The social concept of culture is primarily a concept used by Canadian philosopher Kymlicka. To understand this, it is helpful to consider the sources of diversity in contemporary societies and their two types of diversity. Kymlicka's propositions have two types of diversity: polyethnic minorities and national minorities.

To indicate the diversity that arises as a result of immigration, Kymlicka uses the term polyethnic. Polyethnic minorities are generally ethnic groups. In Kymlicka's view, national minorities are a group in society with a social culture and fewer members than the majority. Therefore, national minority refers to a social culture with fewer members than the majority.

7.2.4. Economic / Rational Choice:

Rational choice is a theory intended to explain and estimate social behavior. From a rational choice perspective, individuals behave with self-interest when they consider their priorities and available information. Self-interest means that individuals maximize what they

value. In other words, human behavior is goal-oriented. That is, individuals behave according to their priorities. According to the rational choice perspective, available information strongly influences behavior.

7.2.5. Anti-Essentialism and Cosmopolitanism:

Some political theorists strongly criticized the above-mentioned cultural concepts. Some of them criticized the semiotic, normative, and social concepts related to culture. They argued that these concepts are the main opinions of culture that incorrectly explain social reality. However, as Festenstein pointed out, these criticisms are sometimes incorrect. That is, these concepts related to culture are not necessarily correct.

7.3. Concept of Multiculturalism:

Generally, in contemporary political philosophy, the concept of multiculturalism is defined in two ways. Sometimes the term "multiculturalism" is used as a descriptive concept. In other times, it is defined as a method to respond to cultural diversity. In the following section, multiculturalism will be explained as a descriptive concept. What is meant by using the term "multiculturalism" as a method will be explained.

7.4. Kymlicka's Multicultural Liberalism:

Kymlicka believed that group rights are appropriate and that they promote the liberal values of freedom and equality. As a result, Kymlicka provides arguments related to group rights, freedom, and equality. His argument based on freedom is strongly intertwined with his thoughts related to social culture. In Kymlicka's view, social cultures are important because individuals have the opportunity to self-actualize with meaningful life methods, and these cultures provide the necessary social conditions for this.

Kymlicka's argument is that social cultures promote the liberal value of self-actualization, and therefore they should be protected. They will promote these values. Because individuals' own cultures provide the necessary foundation for individuals to make free choices. Consequently, if liberals are committed to this value, they will be committed to protecting social cultures. In Kymlicka's view, the context of choice is not only for culture but also provided through one's own culture. Therefore, according to this perspective, whether from Quebec or Catalonia, it provides the context of choice for social culture. Similarly, it provides the context of choice for the social culture of Sikhs in India.

Kymlicka's three arguments based on equality for protecting group rights are based on different logic. The first argument begins by noting that the state has an inevitable bias in its

cultural nature, and that it is impossible for it to remain completely neutral. Kymlicka argues that government decisions inevitably promote a specific cultural identity. Consequently, individuals who do not accept the culture promoted by the state will be at a disadvantage.

In Kymlicka's view, individuals can rectify these inequalities through providing necessary and appropriate paths to continue their culture through group rights. The argument for self-actualization applies only to national minorities. This argument based on equality refers to national minorities and polyethnic groups. The inequalities between majorities and national minorities can take many forms. However, Kymlicka's preferred example is language rights inequalities. From his perspective, national linguistic minorities like Quebec and Catalonia will be disadvantaged if they do not have the right to have their national languages and their own institutions. Christian and Muslim religious discussions are an example of inequalities between majorities and polyethnic groups.

Kymlicka's second argument based on equality is that the state is committed to promoting various cultures in a context where everyone in society should have it. However, this argument does not aim at majorities. It aims at minorities, and it does not indicate the need for majorities. Instead, it indicates how culture generally improves individuals' lives through providing more options.

What is the third argument? According to Kymlicka, liberals should honor historical agreements. In Kymlicka's view, in the beginning of the 21st century, many rights held by minority cultures are the result of historical agreements. If the state is to treat individuals belonging to various cultures equally, it must honor these agreements.

7.5. Rethinking Multiculturalism - Bhikhu Parekh:

"Rethinking Multiculturalism" is a non-fiction book written by British political theorist Bhikhu Parekh. It describes multiculturalism in the modern era of political theory and political practice. This was formed based on Parekh's experience regarding multiculturalism in British society and in other countries worldwide. Parekh's book presents many aspects. Primarily, multicultural political theories.

Culture is the primary importance of human life, and humans create beliefs or perspectives. In addition, they create subtly different opinions and beliefs.

In this context, Parekh considered multiculturalism as a value. This is not correct in the British environment. Parekh, while preventing the disregard for diversity, also pointed out the problems that arise from diversity. In his analysis of culture, he opined that culture changes to a great extent, and Parekh was influenced by Charles Taylor's essay on multiculturalism. Like

Taylor, Parekh also focuses on many aspects related to multicultural values, such as education, division, and gender values. Parekh criticized Eurocentric thinkers and

Parekh's opinion is that social justice is based on the equal distribution of political and economic power between minorities and majorities.

Parekh searched for liberalism as a special paradigm for Western political philosophy. Having only one path to live a good life leads to the division of individuals in a multicultural society. Individuals with their own culture will violate power relations. Instead, culture is established through past experiences. Later, in his studies, Parekh also proposed racial division. Rethinking multiculturalism, cultural diversity, and political theory have been examined by many political and cultural writers. Despite clarifying some criticisms, Parekh's views on multiculturalism, and his attempt to remain impartial and objective, have been generally well-received. Dora Kolodziej praised it as an interdisciplinary approach to solving problems. This is a recognition of Parekh's method of examining and solving problems from two perspectives.

7.6. Conclusion:

Thus, to understand the roots related to multiculturalism, it was necessary to understand the meaning of cultural concepts, and by studying various concepts related to multiculturalism, Will Kymlicka's multicultural liberal ideology was critically examined, and the discussion related to multiculturalism was moved forward. Similarly, by adapting cultural diversity to social values, the understanding of multiculturalism was extensively done.

7.7. Sample Examination Questions:

I. Essay Type Questions:

1. Write an essay on multiculturalism?
2. Explain Kymlicka's views on multiculturalism?

II. Short Answer Questions:

1. Briefly explain Bhikhu Parekh's views on multiculturalism?

7.8. References:

1. Kymlicka - Multicultural Citizenship - A Liberal Theory of Minority Rights.
2. Kymlicka - Multicultural Odysseys - A New Theory from the Wars.
3. Bhikhu Parekh - Rethinking Multiculturalism.
4. K. Appiah - The Ethics of Identity.

Lesson - 8

LEGITIMATION CRISIS OF THE MODERN STATE - JÜRGEN HABERMAS

Lesson Structure:

- 8.0. Objective
- 8.1. Legitimation Crisis - Introduction
- 8.2. Legitimation
- 8.3. Legitimation and Stability
- 8.4. Legitimation Theories
 - 8.4.1. Aristotle
 - 8.4.2. Jean-Jacques Rousseau
 - 8.4.3. Max Weber
 - 8.4.4. Mark C. Suchman
- 8.5. Source of Legitimation Crisis
 - 8.5.1. Definition of Crisis
 - 8.5.2. Social Formations
 - 8.5.3. Various Social Formations - Crises
- 8.6. Legitimation Crisis Theories
- 8.7. Conclusion
- 8.8. Sample Examination Questions
- 8.9. References

Legitimation Crisis of the Modern State - Jürgen Habermas

8.0. Objective:

Through the study of this lesson, you will be able to understand Jürgen Habermas's explanation of the legitimation crisis in detail. In this, you will primarily understand what the legitimation crisis means. This lesson will help you to know precisely what the legitimation theories are, in what periods they were explained, and how Habermas analyzed the legitimation crises.

8.1. Legitimation Crisis - Introduction:

The legitimation crisis indicates a crisis of faith in the rules of governance, institutions, or leadership. This term was first introduced in 1973 by German social scientist and philosopher Jürgen Habermas. Jürgen Habermas expanded this concept. With the legitimation crisis, an institution or state lacks the capacity to carry out its ultimate goals or to establish or implement appropriate decisions. This term is not only applicable to the political sphere but also refers to institutional and organizational decisions. Although there is no consensus among social scientists when arguing that there is a legitimation crisis, the main way to measure the legitimation crisis is to take into account the public's dissatisfaction with the institution. Jürgen Habermas extensively discussed the legitimation crisis in his book "Legitimation Crisis".

8.2. Legitimation:

Related to political theory, when the people living in a state use political authority with proper obedience, it is considered legitimate. Although this term has been present in the political sphere for a long time, this term is frequently referred to by political leaders and institutions and the political systems they create, as social, philosophical, and psychological sciences also have legitimation. In other words, leaders' and institutions' social directives can be seen as legitimate or illegitimate. When political leaders are immersed in the legitimation process, they follow legitimation for themselves or for another institution.

8.3. Legitimation and Stability:

It is now clear that the legitimation of a political system is intertwined with political stability. Before showing stability, individuals first determine the legitimation of a political system or authority. These two concepts, legitimation and stability, are again intertwined with the foundation of a political system. If the people think that the foundation of a political system is not legitimate, they can reasonably reject obedience and can also support the obedience shown in the past.

For individuals in the state to have duties related to the state or to support them, the reason is political instability. Because the political system stands on individuals showing obedience. Therefore, stability cannot be separated from obedience and legitimation. Although this has been used ethically by many idealist philosophers for a long time, obedience or legitimation refers to a political term. As a political term, legitimation refers to why people are committed to a specific political system and why they do not have obedience to the system. Today's liberal political thinkers emphasize the significant importance of both the legitimation and stability of a political system. If people are dissatisfied with their work and other aspects, they will not be willing to display the burden that leads to the collapse of the system.

8.4. Legitimation Theories:

8.4.1. Aristotle:

The roots of legitimation came from ancient Greek thought. Aristotle primarily studied aspects related to government stability. When he argued that the legitimation of government is based on the state's legitimacy and consensus, he pointed out that political stability is based on legitimation. In his book "Politics," Aristotle argued for ways to distribute positions in states, and he stated that if positions are distributed based on merit, the government will be stable. When injustice occurs in distribution, the government becomes unstable. Aristotle's legitimation is based on consensus and public utility.

8.4.2. Jean-Jacques Rousseau:

Rousseau discussed legitimation in detail in his book "The Social Contract." He stated that the legitimation of government is based on the "general will" of its members. He said that decisions made by individuals to achieve the common good of all citizens, contrary to personal interests, are the general will. According to him, individuals who express the general will enter civil society with consensus, but for political legitimation, the voluntary participation of citizens in supporting state laws is necessary. Therefore, in Rousseau's view, governance that has gained public support is legitimate, and he opined that authoritarianism and dictatorship are illegitimate.

8.4.3. Max Weber:

According to Weber, political governance is legitimate when citizens have faith in their system. In his book "The Theory of Social and Economic Organization," he extensively discussed the concept of legitimation. In his view, legitimation is primarily traditional. Because it is "establishment and custom." Weber pointed out the significant limitations of legitimation in continuing government rule. He identified that the power of the people, and habits, play a major role in maintaining the power of governance. In addition, he stated that sometimes legitimation is intertwined with the key administrative staff who implement the directives of governance.

8.4.4. Mark C. Suchman:

In his book "Managing Legitimacy: Strategic and Institutional Approaches," Suchman defined legitimation as "a generalized perception or assumption that the actions of an entity are desirable, proper, or appropriate within some socially constructed system of norms, values, beliefs, and definitions." Legitimation is given socially, and legitimation is self-contained from those who follow it personally. However, it is based on a collective class. The actions of an

institution can deviate from specific personal interests. Suchman mentioned three types of legitimation:

1. Moral Legitimation
2. Ethical Legitimation
3. Cognitive Legitimation

8.5. Source of Legitimation Crisis:

German social scientist and philosopher Jürgen Habermas first used the term "legitimation crisis." He discussed this in his book "Legitimation Crisis." The legitimation crisis is a crisis of recognition. It arises due to a loss of faith in governing institutions. This happens even when they have the authority to rule legitimately. In a legitimation crisis, the rulers' moral values and their established role fail to prove that they are fulfilling their role.

8.5.1. Definition of Crisis:

Crisis is a problem that arises due to conflicting motivations of sub-systems in a self-contained system. According to Habermas, the definition of crisis in social sciences is often based on the formulas of system theory. Whatever it is, one must understand a crisis in two ways: objective and subjective. However, it is difficult to accept traditional methods like connection theory or action theory (governance theory).

The difference between social unification and systemic unification helps to identify the crisis and its objective and subjective parts. Habermas's term "life-world" refers to social analysis. This is a term adopted from Alfred Schutz's writings. It is also combined with the rules and values created by society and a foundation of consensus. System integration as an alternative refers to the decision-makers of society. This indicates their decisions, rationalization, and formulas of measurement and control. As Habermas pointed out, the characteristic of systems.

8.5.2. Social Formations:

Habermas states that there are three sub-systems in the social system: economic, political, and socio-cultural systems. In a society, the type of social formation is determined by the sub-system that holds creative prominence. Four types of social formations can describe a social system in a powerful way: primitive, traditional, capitalist, and post-capitalist social formations. Among these, primitive society refers to the remaining one-class-based society. The formula of institutional integration of a social system indicates when crises occur, and what kind of crisis is prominent in each type of social system.

8.5.3. Various Social Formations - Crises:

8.5.3.1. Primitive Social Formations have institutional aspirations related to kinship. Age and gender roles have institutional formulas in these societies. In these formations, crises arise from external factors that weaken family and tribal identities. Because there are no such opposing necessities from the formula of this institution.

8.5.3.2. Traditional Social Formations have institutional formulas in the form of class dominance and political rule. Legitimation is necessary for this because creative sub-systems are used for systemic or social unification. In these formations, crises continue to arise from internal contradictions between obligations that cannot be clearly fulfilled and demands for support, and from social production that is dedicated to specific rights. Consequently, traditional social formations continue to arise from steering problems. These create problems for system integration and also lead society into problems of recognition.

8.5.3.3. Liberal Capitalist System "The relationship between workers and capital in the bourgeois legal system and the relationship between capital and labor" has institutional formulas. In these social formations, one class

The political anonymization of governance, as a result of which the socially dominant class will no longer rule, will have to convince its principle. Habermas argued that unrestricted communication is essential for social progress because the analysis and criticism of bourgeois society is a way to "unmask" these theories and make the bourgeoisie confront the contradiction between theory and reality. Its society's crises in the liberal capitalist system arise from unresolved economic steering problems. As a result, markets drive social structure not only through the use of money and power but also through ideology. Nevertheless, they appear as anonymous and non-political institutions.

8.5.4. Advanced capitalism in the process of economic concentration has an institutional principle. This social structure exists when the capitalist model is deeply integrated into society and develops extensively over a long period. The crisis tendencies of advanced capitalism arise from three subsystems: economic crises from the economic system, rationality and legitimation crises from the political system, and motivation crises from the socio-cultural system.

8.6. Legitimation Crisis Tendencies:

The political subsystem of the social world requires the input of collective obedience to produce output, which includes legitimate administrative decisions implemented by the state. A rationality crisis is "an output crisis that arises when the state fails to meet the demands of the economic system." A legitimation crisis is "an input crisis that arises when the legitimation system fails to maintain the required level of collective obedience." This is a crisis of

recognition. In this, the role of the governing apparatus is also involved in failing to establish regulatory structures at the required level for the entire system. Consequently, the state loses the support of the people when voters hold its administration accountable. This loss of public trust is one of the many characteristics of a legitimization crisis. These include issues such as policy inefficiency and loss of institutional will.

8.7. Conclusion:

When a leader loses legitimacy, the people do not trust the leader to maintain the social contract. Without a social contract, people's natural rights such as life, liberty, and property are at risk. Therefore, ending a legitimization crisis is generally beneficial for both the people and the leaders. There are many ways to end a legitimization crisis. However, there is currently no unified theory regarding the best method. Although the leader can be replaced, as seen in many of the examples mentioned above, and the legitimization crisis has been effectively ended, this section focuses on the conflict resolution of the crisis. In this situation, the leader who was striving for legitimacy before the crisis regains legitimacy.

As seen, and even if the legitimization crisis was effectively ended, this section focuses on the conflict resolution of the crisis. In this situation, the leader who was striving for legitimacy before the crisis regains legitimacy.

8.8. Sample Examination Questions:

I. Essay Type Questions:

1. Write an essay on legitimization theories?
2. Discuss the legitimization crisis in detail?

II. Short Answer Questions:

1. Briefly explain the legitimization crisis?

8.9. References:

1. Habermas: "Legitimation Crisis".
2. Daniel Yankelovich: "The Crisis of Moral Legitimacy".
3. G.C. Homans: Social Behavior: Its Elementary Forms.
4. Peter Fabien: Political Legitimacy.

END OF HISTORY - A DEFENSE OF LIBERAL DEMOCRACY - FRANCIS FUKUYAMA

Lesson Structure:

9.0. Objective

9.1. End of History - Introduction

9.2. End of History - Origin of the Term

9.3. Postmodernism - End of History

9.4. Francis Fukuyama

9.5. The End of History and the Last Man

9.6. Fukuyama's End of History - Liberal Democracy

9.7. Arguments in favor of Fukuyama's Theory

9.8. Criticisms of the Theory

9.9. Political Decay

9.10. Post-Mortem Future

9.11. The Split between Democracy and Capitalism

9.12. Conclusion

9.13. Sample Examination Questions

9.14. References

9.0. Objective:

Through the study of this lesson, you will critically understand Fukuyama's concept of the end of history and what importance liberal democracy holds in postmodern society.

9.1. End of History - Introduction:

The end of history is a political and philosophical concept. It hypothesized that a specific political, economic, or social system would develop. It encompasses the socio-cultural evolution of humanity and the final form of human government. Various authors, including Thomas More (Utopia), Georg Wilhelm Friedrich Hegel, Karl Marx, Vladimir Solovyov, Alexandre Kojève,

and Francis Fukuyama in his 1992 book, have argued that a specific system is "the end of history."

The concept of the end of history differs from the ideas of the end of the world expressed in various religions. It may predict the complete destruction of the earth or life on earth and the end of humanity. The end of history, instead, proposes a state where human life continues indefinitely in the future without any major changes in society, governance, or economics.

9.2. End of History - Origin of the Term:

The term "end of history" was first used by the French philosopher and mathematician Antoine Augustin Cournot in 1961 to "indicate the end of historical dynamism with the perfection of civil society." Arnold Gehlen adopted it in 1951. Also, Hegel played a significant role in the formal development of the idea of "the end of history." However, Hegel discussed this idea vaguely. The objective of Hegel's philosophy on history is to show that history is a process of realizing reason, for which he did not specify a definite end point. Hegel believed that history would necessarily show reason in its development over time. On the other hand, history also has the task of developing reason over time. So the realization of history is something one can observe, but also an active work.

9.3. Postmodernism - End of History:

The idea of "the end of history" suggested that nothing more would happen. Instead, the concept of the end of history was explained by the historian "Keith Jenkins" in the postmodern sense as follows: "The peculiar ways of historicizing the past (conceptualized in modernist, linear, and primarily object-based forms) have now come to the end of their productive life. The all-encompassing 'experiment of modernity' goes into our postmodern condition."

9.4. Francis Fukuyama:

The name generally associated with the concept of the end of history in contemporary discourse is Francis Fukuyama. Fukuyama brought this term back into prominence with his essay 'The End of History', published in 1989, a few months before the fall of the Berlin Wall. He further explained and expanded this concept of the end of history in his 1992 book 'The End of History and the Last Man'. Fukuyama reconstructed the ideologies of Hegel and Marx. The essay centered around the idea that since fascism and communism, which were major competitors in society, faced defeats, liberal democracy and market economies should no longer be serious competitors.

In his theory, Fukuyama distinguished between the material or real world and the hypothetical world. Liberalism has proven successful in the realm of ideas. That is, even though successful liberal democracy and market economy are not yet established everywhere, he opined

that there are no ideological competitors to these systems. This means that any fundamental contradiction in human life can operate within the context of modern liberalism and does not require an alternative political-economic structure to resolve it. Now history has reached its end. Fukuyama believed that international relations would primarily be concerned with economic matters and no longer with politics or strategy, thereby reducing the possibility of large-scale international violent conflict.

9.5. The End of History and the Last Man:

'The End of History and the Last Man' is a political philosophy book written by American political scientist Francis Fukuyama in 1992. It argued that the Cold War, which occurred after the dissolution of the Soviet Union, was due to the supremacy of Western liberal democracy. Not only a specific period of post-war history had passed, but history had also reached its end. Fukuyama explained human history as a linear progression from one socio-economic era to another, based on the ideologies of fascism and communism.

9.6. Fukuyama's End of History - Liberal Democracy:

Fukuyama argued that history should be considered an evolutionary process. He also stated that the end of history should be seen as an evolutionary process. From this perspective, liberal democracy is the final form of government in all countries. According to Fukuyama, since the French Revolution, liberal democracy has repeatedly proven to be fundamentally a better system than any alternatives. So there will be no progress from it to an alternative system. Fukuyama stated that future events would stop. However, some argue that even if authoritarianism returns in the future, democracy will become more prevalent in the long run. Fukuyama stated that American-style democracy is the only correct political system. He argued that all countries must necessarily follow this particular method of government. His argument is that in the future, governments will mostly have the structures of parliamentary democracy.

Even if authoritarianism returns, some argue that democracy will become more prevalent in the long run. Fukuyama stated that American-style democracy is the only correct political system. He argued that all countries must necessarily follow this particular method of government. His argument is that in the future, governments will mostly have the structures of parliamentary democracy.

9.7. Arguments in favor of Fukuyama's Theory:

An argument in favor of Fukuyama's theory is the democratic peace theory. It argues that mature democracies rarely or never go to war with each other. This theory has faced criticism. The arguments are mostly based on conflicting definitions of "war" and "mature democracy." The difficulty in evaluating the theory is that democracy has only recently emerged as a

widespread global phenomenon in human history. This makes it difficult to generalize about it. Other major empirical evidence also includes the prevention of interstate wars in countries that have transitioned from military dictatorships to liberal democracies in South America, Southeast Asia, and Eastern Europe. According to many studies, due to the end of the Cold War and the increasing number of liberal democratic states, the overall conditions of war, revolutionary war conditions, and the number of refugees and displaced persons have suddenly declined.

9.8. Criticisms of the Theory:

Radical Islam, Tribalism, and the Clash of Civilizations:

Various Western commentators have described the theory of 'The End of History' as flawed because it did not adequately consider the power of ethnic loyalty and religious fundamentalism in response to the spread of liberal democracy, with the specific example of "Islamic fundamentalism." Radical Islam is the most powerful among these. He used the term "Jihad" to refer to the competing forces of tribalism and religious fundamentalism, with a special focus on Islamic fundamentalism. Samuel P. Huntington, in 1993, as a direct response to 'The End of History', expanded his essay "The Clash of Civilizations" in the book "The Clash of Civilizations and the Remaking of World Order." In this essay, Huntington argued that the temporary contradiction between ideologies would be replaced by an ancient conflict between civilizations. The dominant civilization determines the form of human government.

After the attacks of September 11, 2001, "The End of History" was cited by some commentators as a symbol of the Western world's innocence and unnecessary optimism during the 1990s. The end of the Cold War was also thought to signal an end. A few weeks after the major global conflict attacks, Fareed Zakaria called these events "the end of history."

Fukuyama briefly discussed radical Islam in his work. He argued that Islam is not an imperialist power like Stalinism and Fascism. Fukuyama pointed out the economic and political difficulties faced by Iran and Saudi Arabia and argued that such states are primarily unstable. They will either democratize or disintegrate within Muslim society.

In an interview with *Walter Journal* in October 2001, Fukuyama responded to criticisms of his theory after the September 11 attacks, stating, "Ultimately, I believe my own opinions," and declared his support for his theory. He explained that by "the end of history," he meant "the evolution of the human political system towards a liberal democratic West."

9.9. Political Decay:

Fukuyama also warned about "political decay," which affects even established democracies like the United States. In this, corruption and freedom erode economic

opportunities. Nevertheless, he expressed his continued belief that "the power of the democratic ideal is immense."

9.10. Post-Mortem Future:

Fukuyama also stated that his theory is incomplete. But for a different reason, "there is no end to history without the end of modern technology." Fukuyama predicted that humanity's control over its own evolution would have a terrible impact on liberal democracy.

9.11. The Split between Democracy and Capitalism:

Slovenian philosopher Slavoj Žižek argued that Fukuyama's idea that we have reached the end of history is not entirely true, and Žižek suggested that liberal democracy is tied to capitalism. However, the success of capitalism in authoritarian countries like China and Singapore shows that the relationship between capitalism and democracy has broken down. The problems created by the success of capitalism and neoliberal policies, such as wealth inequalities and environmental risks, have led to opposition to elected governments in many countries. As a result, liberal democracy has struggled greatly to overcome many problems caused by the free market economy.

9.12. Conclusion:

Fukuyama concluded that the end of history is a tragic time because the potential for ideological struggles where people were willing to risk their lives is now "replaced by economic calculation, the endless solution of technical problems, environmental concerns, and opportunities." This does not mean that modern liberal democracy is believed to be a perfect political system. He does not believe that another political structure can provide the wealth and individual freedoms that liberal democracy can.

9.13. Sample Examination Questions:

I. Essay Type Questions:

1. Discuss Fukuyama's end of history - a defense of liberal democracy in detail?
2. Discuss the arguments for and against Fukuyama's theory?

II. Short Answer Questions:

1. Briefly discuss the criticisms of Fukuyama's theory?

9.14. References:

1. J.J. Clarke - "The End of History".

2. Fukuyama - "The End of History - The National Interest".
3. Fukuyama - "The End of History - 20 Years Later".

Lesson - 10

Antonio Gramsci Table of Contents

10.0 Objective

10.1 Biography

10.2 Factory Councils

10.3 Concept of Hegemony

10.3.1 Bourgeois Hegemony

10.3.2 Alliances in the Working Class - Historical Bloc

10.4 Civil Society

10.5 Intellectuals

10.6 Political Party

10.7 Passive Revolution

10.8 Summary

10.9 Sample Questions

10.10 Recommended Readings

10.0 Objective:

The objective of this lesson is to explain the main concepts proposed by Gramsci. In this lesson, we will learn Gramsci's views on topics such as factory councils, the concept of hegemony, and intellectuals.

10.1 Biography:

Gramsci was born in 1891 on the island of Sardinia in Southern Italy. His father was a government employee. After his father was imprisoned on charges of misusing government funds, Gramsci's family fell into financial ruin. The seven children had to survive on the money their mother earned as a tailor's laborer. The family experienced dire poverty. Gramsci, born with a spinal disease, started carrying goods at the age of eight for a living. In 1904, after his father returned from prison, he went back to school. In 1908, he passed the lower school examination and in 1908 went to his elder brother in Cagliari to complete his schooling. In 1911, he obtained

a scholarship for poor students and joined Turin University. He became acquainted with the communist movement and started writing articles for socialist newspapers.

He had to stop his studies in 1915 due to severe illness. Between 1916 and 1919, Gramsci wrote countless articles and earned the reputation of an "invincible political commentator." In 1924, Gramsci was elected to the Italian Parliament while still outside Italy. He was elected General Secretary of the Communist Party. In 1926, he was arrested and sent to prison. He suffered from severe illness in prison. He was released on April 11, 1937, in a condition where he could not even move. But on April 25, his brain's blood vessels ruptured, and he passed away on April 27. During his long prison life, he wrote over 3000 pages of essays. These 3000 pages contained theoretical actions related to many subjects. These are called "Prison Notebooks." Gramsci's political theory is found in these 33 Prison Notebooks. Those who recognize Gramsci as a theorist give great importance to these Prison Notebooks. Gramsci's ideas can be divided and studied under the headings: 1) Factory Councils 2) Concept of Hegemony 3) Civil Society 4) Intellectuals 5) Political Party 6) Passive Revolution.

10.2 Factory Councils:

The main element in Gramsci's ideology is the structure and management of factory councils. The objective of the movement was to develop radical working-class democracy in opposition to bourgeois democracy. In every factory, representatives were elected from each section of labor, such as physical labor, clerical work, and technical experts, at a rate of one representative per 15 workers. Other laborers living in those wards, such as street sweepers, taxi drivers, narrators, etc., were included in the ward councils. In this way, an attempt was made to build a legitimate and disciplined platform for the entire working class living in the ward where the laborers resided. The objectives of these ward councils were as follows:

1. To discuss in detail and practically the transformation to be brought about in the factory system.
2. To enhance the class consciousness of the workers, who are the true producers.
3. To explain the theoretical and practical methods necessary to take the means of production into their own hands and to reorganize production relations.
4. To explain the working-class culture necessary after achieving a socialist society.
5. To spread consciousness among laborers regarding rights and duties.
6. To empower the working class to conduct class struggle with a critical perspective from the grassroots against bourgeois institutions and bourgeois ideas.

7. To introduce a radical political program in place of the 'economism' in the trade union movement and to bring about a change in the working-class perspective.

Factory councils should reorganize the production process designed by industrialists for capitalist interests to suit the interests of the workers. Workers in every factory should be trained in a miniature version of how factory management would be in socialism. However, this process should not be imposed on the workers from outside.

Gramsci believed that the working class should achieve a legitimate and disciplined platform through the determination of the production process, and that the people should try to achieve a legitimate and disciplined platform. Political and experiential aspects should be used as guiding principles in the factory councils. Finally, Gramsci believed that the people should participate in these processes, and that theoretical understanding, determination, and the preparation of new scientific methods should be developed.

Councils should be completely democratic. Gramsci believed that the leadership in the councils should not try to impose democracy in the factory. By implementing democratic methods in the councils, every worker will be able to reflect on their abilities and areas of work, and problems. He believed that factory councils would be generally successful in creating awareness, working on problems, and changing one person's mind to another.

Gramsci noted that the main importance of the councils is not only in taking over authority in the factory, but also in expressing new relationships, new production relationships, and the self-conscious characteristics of the bourgeois class, and in working as centers that support the bourgeois authority. Many commentators have called them "transformative instruments." They are instruments that make suggestions for internal and external changes in capitalist institutions. They are instruments that study the present by achieving unity between theory and action. Gramsci believed that factory councils would be a good example for the "War of Position" that he spoke of as happening in society.

Gramsci pointed out two main reasons why factory councils lost their political momentum. The first reason is the self-defeating nature of the socialist and trade union leadership that had taken over the working-class movement. The second reason is the inability to establish a unified front with the southern intellectuals and other democratic forces. In such a situation, Gramsci believed that the bourgeois class was able to use its authority to maintain the bourgeois class's traditional system, economic sector, and state, and that a new historical force did not emerge to challenge it.

10.3 Concept of Hegemony

Many people believe that this is a very key aspect in Gramsci's ideology. Gramsci tried to prove himself as a great Marxist theorist, and he was happy that his proposed idea made Marxism more complete. Marx and Lenin gave great importance to this idea. Lenin made some writings on this idea between 1905 and 1917. However, if Lenin used this term in the sense of "control" in the Russian context, the anarchists translated it as "domination." Let's examine what Marx and Lenin explained about the concept of hegemony and what Gramsci said.

"Instead of power being based on mere force, it is based on the consent of society, and the ideological influence that makes power legitimate." Gramsci called this hegemony. In other words, in society, power

10.3.1 Bourgeois Hegemony

It is understood that it will continue only through the use of force, and that ideology will continue indefinitely as a foundation when it is established. Gramsci explained that in the exercise of authority, force, violence, and also political, legal, cultural, mental, and ideological aspects play a key role.

Taking the example of Jacobinism in the French Revolution, Gramsci answered the question of how the bourgeois class maintains its authority as follows: "Jacobins not only overthrew the bourgeois government but also established the bourgeois class as the leading class and did some other work. They established the bourgeois state. They established the bourgeois class as a national dominant class. In other words, they established a permanent foundation for the new state and established a self-contained modern French nation."

Gramsci believed that political struggle is not merely a conflict between classes, but that conflicting relationships are intertwined in it. Along with authority, the theoretical apparatus that can establish national consensus is a key aspect of the concept of hegemony. By forming alliances with many classes, and by making that alliance acceptable to the people, and by establishing a theoretical, social, and fundamental basis for that alliance, it is necessary. Gramsci argued that even if an alliance is formed only between some classes, only by showing that alliance as a national alliance and gaining the consent of all people, hegemony can be achieved.

Describing the crisis that occurred in Italy in the 1930s, Gramsci wrote as follows: "Because socialists failed to establish democratic alliances, fascism was able to grow by facing the bourgeois authority in all aspects and adapting it to its advantage." Gramsci argued. The revolutionary movement that came forward did not try to gain or break the bourgeois authority. It did not try to establish ethical, political, and cultural values in a way that was not accepted by society. "From this perspective, it is not wrong to say that socialists also worked within the

bourgeois framework. Because of the failure to gain authority from socialists, capitalism was able to adapt to its advantage." Gramsci opined.

Gramsci's Italy was a country that developed very unevenly. It seemed that there were many differences between industrially developed Northern Italy and the agricultural Southern region. The working class had an extensive rural base. Moreover, the North primarily had a conservative nature. Religious leaders and teachers, and the Roman Catholic Church, which had the consent of the extensive 'army', had a strong influence on the workers and laborers. In addition, there were extremely few intellectuals in the working-class leadership.

10.3.2 Alliances in the Working Class - Historical Bloc:

In this unequal development, in the context of ideology, Gramsci argued that communists needed to achieve an alliance between the southern intellectuals and the northern industrial workers to challenge the bourgeois class in Italy:

To consolidate the capitalist system and the bourgeois state, the working class needs to form an appropriate alliance to unify the majority of the working people. To that extent, it becomes the leadership, and the dominant class. In Italy, in the context of the existing unequal class relations, the victory of the working class depends on achieving the consent of the people.

If this is to happen, the working class must overcome its own economic interests and think. Gramsci called these interests "corporatism." He believed that this was the main reason for the failure of the trade union mentality in politics. He said that if necessary, the working class must make some sacrifices to form an alliance with the northern and southern intellectuals.

Gramsci noted that the leadership class in the alliance, when it overcomes its own economic interests and takes into account the struggles of other people, will be able to establish its own dominant position. "The class that seeks to achieve hegemony must be able to develop its total national power and its comprehensive distribution as a motor force." "The working class must prepare itself to achieve hegemony." These are very important phrases by Gramsci.

His objective was not to abandon the idea of socialism for the sake of the oppressed people, but to bring forward the idea of a majority-based democratic front at the same time. In the concept of working-class control, he stated that the aspect of not excluding other classes is important, and instead, Gramsci believed that the working class should try to have a democratic front with other major classes in society, such as the middle class and agricultural workers. Gramsci believed that in this social observation, there are three stages. The first is economic corporatism. In this stage, the interests related to various groups hold prominence. The second stage is political corporatism. In this stage, there is an economic self-awareness related to class interests. The third stage is hegemony. In this stage, the theoretical struggle to achieve unity

between economic, political, and intellectual goals holds prominence. In this stage, the leadership class will have to reconcile its own interests with other groups and classes, Gramsci believed.

10.4 Civil Society

The state is a tool in the hands of the ruling class. Gramsci agreed with Marx's view that the past society is a historical force. He argued that to understand the past society, one must look beyond economic aspects. In Gramsci's view, we can identify two main theories in the above. One is past society. This is a collection of active aspects that we normally deal with as 'personal' (private). The second is 'political society' or the state.

These two theories have a relationship where one side, the total society, operates through the 'hegemony' of the dominant class, and the other side, the state, operates through 'direct domination' or 'command'.

In Gramsci's view, bourgeois hegemony is not only centralized in the bourgeois state. In reality, civil society is the stable foundation for bourgeois hegemony. Gramsci indicated that the state operates in two ways. One is domination. That is, physical force and imposition. The second is consent. This operates through institutions that recognize personal life, and through ideology. Institutions with extensive diversity, and institutions that have no connection with politics, also form civil society. For example, schools, families, religions, trade unions, political parties, media, etc., are examples of these institutions, and common sense logic is also part of civil society. That is, indirectly, all these sectors are also part of the political order.

10.5 Intellectuals

Even if these institutions appear to be outside the state's purview and operate independently, in reality, all these together form civil society. Primarily, the dominant class's leadership operates within these civil society institutions. It achieves consent for its authority. Any government, even if it is an extremely authoritarian government, needs to achieve the consent and legitimacy of civil society for some reason, and thereby gain authority. This is not possible for governments that have not done so.

Gramsci accepted the common meaning of the word "intellectuals." "Those who perform the role of organizers in all sectors of society." Gramsci's view of intellectuals. They act as those who provide a counter-hegemony to a traditional ideology, as administrators, as decision-makers, as leaders. Gramsci argued that these intellectuals play a role in achieving, implementing, and reproducing hegemony.

In history, modern traditional classes always form new organizers/intellectuals. They gain recognition as active intellectuals, providing their views and aspirations, not based on their

profession or occupation, but based on their active relationship with the class. For example, capitalists, along with their activities, also bring forward intellectuals who can provide ethicality and legitimacy to their authority. These intellectuals include industrial, technical experts, managers, political economists, and those who support modern culture, governance, and science.

Intellectuals, or organizers, are not found only in parties or universities. They also operate in every sector related to human beings. However, to create intellectuals, one must develop an intellectual force in every individual in some way. However, those who create theories do not only create theories in the intellectual world. In their daily life, their determined

The work and daily experiences should be the basis for their intellect. In Gramsci's words, "In ordinary practical activity, a part is physical, and in the intellectual world, it is a constant new creation that leads to a physical and intellectual (muscular-nervous) force that guides new knowledge."

Describing the characteristic of intellectuals, he said:

"Intellectual work is not merely linguistic skill. It is only a part of it. It contains passion and emotion. That is, in modern intellectual real life, it must behave as a creator, as an organizer, as a permanent guide. In that way, from a technical perspective, it grows into a technical science. It develops humanistic knowledge historically. If there is no such knowledge, that intellectual will remain only as a 'skilled person': 'a decision-maker' (skilled, political decision-maker both) 'a worker'." It is very difficult to develop intellectuals. There are many problems in it. But if a new one is to come into an authoritarian system and stand, this work is essential.

The class that wants to establish its hegemony must theoretically accept some concepts among traditional intellectuals and integrate them into itself. To the extent that that class can develop its own active intellectuals, to that extent it can integrate traditional intellectuals into itself.

10.6 Political Party

Gramsci's views on the political party were described in his prison writings in the chapter "Modern Prince." In Gramsci's writings, opinions expressed on "political party" are unclear. In some opinions, Gramsci's party concept is different from the party concept proposed by Lenin. According to them, in Gramsci's political party model, without centralized directives of the vanguard party, it is a challenging force for working-class conscious revolutionary activity. However, in the opinion of the Italian Communist Party leader Togliatti, Gramsci's view on the political party and Lenin's proposed view are the same.

Those who have deeply studied Gramsci's views believe that both opinions are reasonable. In the period of factory councils from 1919 to 1920, Gramsci believed that for working-class self-rule, and for grassroots public conscious discussion, there should be some institutional forms. In

the years 1921 to 1924, after the council movement failed, Gramsci supported the concept of centralized party formation and theoretical vanguardism. After that, as Gramsci's life progressed, some changes came in his views. Gramsci's opinions on the political party are described below.

1. In major historical movements, and in daily struggles, making ethical political movements easy is the duty of the political party.
2. To awaken people's consciousness creatively and to unify the nation is the duty of the party.
3. The party is the force that can establish political rationality that can lay the foundations for the working-class state.
4. There are three sections in the party. They are 1) Ordinary members who are separate. 2) A cohesive and systematic section. 3) A section between these two. By establishing the relationship between the remaining two sections, this section gives them a form.

10.7 Passive Revolution

They also call this the "revolutionized revolution." Any one class or some classes want social change and strive for it. If they achieve the desired change due to unexpected failures or other reasons, it is a revolution. If the desired change in society does not come due to unexpected failures or other reasons, and the class forces change themselves to suit that situation, it is a passive revolution. In other words, experiencing the result of the revolution and changing the production relations to suit oneself is the loss of intellectuals who are ignorant in this process. Gramsci explained the concept of "passive revolution" by giving many examples from contemporary European history.

10.8 Summary:

Antonio Gramsci is a person who worked to make Marxism more complete, even though he lived only for 46 years. He was able to show diversity in action and intellectual property. In Gramsci's proposed concept, the all-encompassing view is the concept of hegemony. In the process of the working class taking authority into its hands,

10.9 Sample Questions:

1. Explain Gramsci's service to Marxist theory.
2. Write Gramsci's views on factory councils, hegemony, and political parties.

10.10 Recommended Readings:

1. James Joll, Gramsci.
2. Sujatha, Antonio Gramsci, Life, Krishna.

Lesson - 11

MARKET SOCIALISM - DAVID MILLER

Lesson Structure:

- 11.0. Objective
- 11.1. David Miller - Specialities
- 11.2. Market Socialism - Introduction
- 11.3. Scientific Socialism - Criticism
 - 11.3.1. Scientific Socialism
 - 11.3.2. Procedural Justice
 - 11.3.3. Market Neutrality
 - 11.3.4. Philanthropy and Consensus
- 11.4. Market Protection
 - 11.4.1. Consumer Sovereignty
 - 11.4.2. Pumping Action
 - 11.4.3. No Copy
 - 11.4.4. Rationalization and Consensus
- 11.5. From Political to Democratic Socialism
- 11.6. Market Socialism
 - 11.6.1. Market Representation
 - 11.6.2. Market Socialist Perspective
 - 11.6.3. Market Protection
 - 11.6.4. Market Socialism - Feasibility
 - 11.6.5. Limitations
- 11.7. Conclusion

11.8. Sample Examination Questions

11.9. References

11.0. Objective:

Through the study of this lesson, you will understand market socialism, i.e., political analyses intertwined with the economic system, and the criticisms of market systems to reduce social inequalities, and you will learn about the issues that help market systems to achieve greater social welfare.

11.1. David Miller - Specialities:

David Leslie Miller was born in Drakon in 1946. He is an Anglo-political theorist. Miller worked as a Professor of Political Theory at Oxford University and as an Official Fellow at Nuffield College, Oxford. He received his D.Phil. from Cambridge University and his D.Phil. from Oxford University. His writings primarily focus on social justice, nationality, pluralism, and national identity. Miller is renowned as a prominent individual who supported pluralism.

David Miller advocates for associative social justice in his social justice theories. He argued that justice is not a one-sided issue. His theories are contrary to those of Rawls and other similar theorists.

David Miller's main book is "Social Justice."

11.2. Market Socialism - Introduction:

Market socialism is an alternative to the scientific socialist theory and the market analysis of many socialist thinkers. It aims to combine the efficiency and utility of the market and resources with greater democracy and equal distribution of resources. Cooperative institutions are efficient in conducting production. They have to create appropriate investments to provide the necessary support for their foundations.

Market socialism initially provides a criticism of scientific socialist theory and market capitalism. The second part protects market criticisms. Users generally note that their own investment is a better way to achieve optimal performance. The third part develops the model of socialist state. It covers political and institutional aspects such as the concept of pluralism, the concept of national society, and the limitations on the state in the majority rule.

11.3. Scientific Socialism - Criticism:

In this, first, market capitalism and many scientific socialist arguments are opposed.

The idea of social justice has been defended against many libertarian objections.

11.3.3. Market Neutrality:

Liberals often state that the state should be neutral between a good life and individual conceptions, and they use this argument to protect economic markets. Neutrality refers to the reasons given to institutions and policies or their effects. The opinion supported here is that institutional design is neutral. In capitalist institutions, cooperative institutions competing in the market face difficulties in raising adequate capital due to a lack of incentives faced by their members. If they are to achieve neutrality, market equilibrium can only be achieved through government institutions that support non-commodity-based concepts.

11.3.4. Philanthropy and Welfare:

Liberals argued that philanthropic concern for the poor should be provided through private voluntary organizations rather than through the welfare state. However, philanthropy is a complex concept. It is still an open question whether it is directed at satisfying priorities or meeting needs. Private voluntary organizations provide assistance to others only as long as they receive cooperation from some others. Similarly, welfare states provide assistance to people as a way to alleviate their suffering without relying on others. Therefore, accepting the welfare state was considered more appropriate for society than voluntary organizations.

11.4. Market Protection:

This section defends markets against socialist criticisms. It is shown here that consumers are generally the best judges of their own welfare, that people are entitled to their market receipts, that exploitation is not an inherent characteristic of market transactions, and that alienation can be overcome if the market is subject to political control. Some aspects related to market protection have been mentioned.

11.4.1. Consumer Sovereignty:

Economic markets are often defended on the grounds that they are the most effective mechanism we have to satisfy consumer desires. But this market protection can be reduced if markets frequently generate desires. This study explores various ways in which people's desires are not correct from the perspective of their welfare, and that political intervention attempts to prevent this will not be successful. The argument that production should respond to needs rather than desires is also considered.

Market Socialism - David Miller

Attempts to intervene will not be successful. The argument that production should respond to needs rather than desires is also considered.

11.4.2. Distributive Justice:

Some egalitarians, such as G.A. Cohen, have questioned whether a market economy can produce outcomes consistent with standards of distributive justice. Similarly, it was proposed that markets should control production but not distribution. They rely on moral incentives to motivate producers. But this seems unrealistic. Instead, the question arises whether a properly designed market can provide the income people desire, as measured by their productive contribution. The concept of 'Economic Desert' has been elaborated by considering various challenges to this proposition.

11.4.3. Exploitation:

Marx understood exploitation in terms of the unilateral transfer of value, from the perspective of how exploitation occurs in the establishment of markets where other individuals benefit. Steiner and Roemer understood it in terms of price exchange made against the background of an unjust distribution of resources. Contrary to these views, it has been argued that exploitative transactions are exchanges that occur at equilibrium prices. Due to information asymmetry and bargaining power, this perspective on exploitation allows one to understand why capitalism is inherently exploitative. However, in market socialism, exploitation occurs only under specific conditions.

11.4.4. Alienation and Welfare:

Socialists attacked market economies for creating personal relationships rather than religious ones. Taking Marx's theory of alienation as a primary reference, it explores various potential sources of alienation, separating resources specific to the market. Nevertheless, Marx praised capitalism for freeing individuals from the social inequalities experienced in pre-capitalist societies. In market socialism, economic relations have a dual role. If production equipment and competitiveness are at one level, human cooperation and plans are at a second level. Through these, alienation can be overcome.

11.5. The Politics of Democratic Socialism:

This section analyzes the model of the socialist state. It elucidates aspects such as the ideas of national society as the basis of citizenship, politics as a form of dialogue among citizens, the integration of people with different cultures and minorities into a single community, and the justification of constitutional limitations on majority rule. We can see these in this section. Some aspects are examined here accordingly.

The ideas of national society, politics as a form of dialogue among citizens, the integration of people with different cultures and minorities into a single community, and the

justification of constitutional limitations on majority rule, as explained in previous studies, are elucidated. We can see these in this section. Some aspects are examined here accordingly.

11.6. Market Socialism:

Market socialism is an economic system in which the means of production are not owned privately or centrally planned. They are mediated solely by the market. In this system, the means of production are owned by both the state and the people. Therefore, there is a cooperative distribution system here. The market structure determines how distributed profits are to be distributed. Profits are distributed as wages to employees, as benefits to society, and as social dividends to the general public.

11.6.1. Resistance to Change:

Neoliberalism's resistance to change has extended not only to the economic sector but also to electoral politics, education, and the media, which influence public perception. Capital globalization has resulted in the weakening of national and state ruling classes. Market socialist principles have been pushed aside due to actions such as limiting the electoral system's ability to influence change, the failure of the left to identify another alternative outside the ruling and political classes, the decline of labor movements, and the traditional working class losing its existence, which caused socialist movements to lose their influence. With current austerity policies and rising unemployment, it is a good time to revive market socialist principles. Although such policies have some disadvantages, they also have some advantages.

11.6.2. Market Socialist Perspective:

According to British political scientists Julian Le Grand and David Miller, market socialism preserves the market mechanism while socializing capital ownership. The key tenet of this social democratic approach is that markets not only increase efficiency but also freedom and democracy, making them politically attractive.

'Social ownership' is defined in many ways. A group of individuals is most favorable to ownership. Employees defined capitalism as a situation where they do not own their own production equipment and businesses.

Organizations have the right to use and profit from their assets in many variations. However, investment systems hold capital and make strategic management decisions. However, every business has a democratic form, and one of them is under employee control. Companies that are not clearly in public responsibility are socialized as a result of the market socialism strategy. Currently, banking, energy, and rail transport industries are examples of this.

To restore growth and employment, economic reforms can be implemented within the capitalist framework. This allows for the introduction of innovative plans that increase public control.

11.6.3. Market Protection:

When sharing property, this approach largely retains the appeal of market capitalism and reduces clear socialist flaws. This proposition benefits from the subtle spread of socialist ethics in retaining the current market links of productive companies.

James Anchor, an American economist, established this line of thought. He emphasized how 'practical market socialism' reduces inequality while maintaining the current consumer culture. He recognized that some investors, whether current or former entrepreneurs, have a legal right to profit as a reward for their efforts. However, the vast majority of capital wealth is an illegitimate reward related to inheritance and financial capital market speculation. Such incomes are economically necessary but not morally necessary. In his opinion, all established large business enterprises should be publicly owned.

11.6.4. Market Socialism - Feasibility:

Profits or bankruptcies continue as a result of market competition. Market socialism aims to increase the level of equality in the allocation of capital assets. The income from capital assets and its unequal distribution is the moral responsibility of the government. Many individuals, including political philosopher Christopher Pierson, believe that the feasibility of 'market socialism' will lose the scope and purity of the socialist agenda. The economy can be socialized and implemented, resulting in an artificial society.

11.6.5. Limitations:

When viewed as an ultimate goal, market socialism has many shortcomings. The capitalist ideals of competitiveness and profitability are still in force, and the socialist characteristics brought about by social ownership may be defeated. Such programs may be a type of democratic capitalism with socialist overloads. Many on the left have rejected levels of inequality. Market socialists are likely to simplify their plans for a hybrid economic structure. Autonomous businesses seeking market efficiency will need incentives, and their success will be measured in terms of profit. This will not only lead to inequalities but also threaten socialist values. Even in the case of public ownership, market forces cause economic instability. The rich benefit at the expense of the poor.

The market must also be understood in the context of the global capitalist economy. This complicates the implementation of market socialism country by country. The national state loses its economic coordination powers. Even if compensation is paid, if nationalization is faced, international organizations will not hand over ownership of their assets to the state.

11.7. Conclusion:

Market socialism explores contemporary prominence as a political ideal. Miller's market socialism questions whether the benefits offered by market socialism are actually the benefits people desire or if it indicates needs that are contradictory in practice.

11.8. Sample Examination Questions:

I. Essay Type Questions:

1. Write an essay on David Miller's market socialism?
2. Critically analyze libertarian philosophy?

II. Short Answer Questions:

1. Briefly explain market protection?
2. Briefly write about the market socialist perspective?

11.9. References:

1. David Miller "Market, State, Community - The Theoretical Foundations of Market Socialism".
2. N. Scott Arnold - "Market Socialism".
3. John. O. Neill - 'Socialism, Associations and the Market'.
4. David Miller - "Our Incomplete Discussion About Market Socialism".

Time: Three hours

201PO21

M.A (Political Science) DEGREE EXAMINATION

Second Semester

Paper I - MODERN POLITICAL THEORY

Answer ALL questions

Maximum: 70 marks

(4×15=60)

1. (a) Explain the empirical traditions to study political science.

Or

(b) Explain the basic features of normative political theory.

2. (a) Discuss Hayek's views on social progress

Or

(b) Explain Rawls' theory of justice.

3. (a) Elucidate the reasons for the decline of democratic institutions in developing countries.

Or

(b) How Francis Fukuyama defined liberal democracy as an end of History?

4. (a) How Alec Nove explained the failure of socialism in the Soviet Union?

Or

(b) How Gramsci explained the concept of Hegemony and passive revolution.

5. Answer any TWO of the following:

(a) Market socialism

(b) Theory of justice

(c) Robert Nozick's conception of Rights.

(d) Civil society.