

CONTEMPORARY POLITICAL THOUGHT

MA [POLITICALSCIENCE]

Second Semester

(CDOE-POL-101-DE-52010)



INSTITUTE
OF DISTANCE
EDUCATION **IDE**
Rajiv Gandhi University

RAJIVGANDHIUNIVERSITY

Arunachal Pradesh, India-791112

List of Contributor:

1. Dr. TabangMibang

Professor

Department of Political Science

Rajiv Gandhi University

2. Dr. Nyajum Lollen

Assistant Professor

Centre for Distance and Online Education

Rajiv Gandhi University

3. Dr. Lokpa Tamang

Assistant Professor

Department of Political Science

Rajiv Gandhi University

SYLLABI-BOOK MAPPING TABLE

Unit	Content
1	Critical Theory: Herbert Marcuse
2	Liberalism: FA Von Hayek, John Rawls
3	Neo Marxism: Antonio Gramsci
4	Post Structuralism and Post Modernism: Michel Foucault

CONTENTS

UNIT 1 CRITICAL THEORY: Herbert Marcuse

Structure

- 1.0 Introduction**
- 1.1 Unit Objectives**
- 1.2 Herbert Marcuse**
- 1.3 The New Left and Radical Politics**
- 1.4 Marcuse and Positivism**
- 1.5 Marcuse's Early Heideggerian Marxism**
- 1.6 Marcuse and Capitalism**
- 1.7 Critical Theory of Society**
- 1.8 Summary**
- 1.9 Key Terms**
- 1.10 Answers to 'Check Your Progress'**
- 1.11 Questions and Exercises**
- 1.12 Further Reading**

UNIT 2

LIBERALISM: Friedrich August Von Hayek, John Rawls

- 2.0 Introduction**
- 2.1 Unit Objectives**
- 2.2 F.A. von Hayek**
- 2.3 Hayek and Neo-liberalism**
- 2.4 Hayek on Democracy**
- 2.5 Hayek on Freedom and Liberty**
- 2.6 Hayek on Social Justice**
- 2.7 Hayek and Conservatism**
- 2.8 Liberal Perspective-Rawls' Theory of Justice**

- 2.8.1 Development of the Normative Perspectives**
- 2.8.2 Origin of Justice**
- 2.8.3 Kinds of Justice**
- 2.8.4 Categories of Justice: Social, Economic and Political**
- 2.8.5 Marxist Theory of Justice**
- 2.8.6 Relation of Justice with Liberty, Equality and Fraternity**
- 2.8.7 Formation of Justice with Special Reference to Rawls Theory of**

Justice

- 2.9 Feminist and Subaltern Perspectives of Justice**
- 2.10 Rawls and Deliberative Democracy**
- 2.11 Rawls and Political Liberty**
- 2.12 Summary**
- 2.13 Key Terms**
- 2.14 Answers to 'Check Your Progress'**
- 2.15 Questions and Exercises**
- 2.16 Further Reading**

UNIT 3

NEO MARXISM: Antonio Gramsci

Structure

- 3.0 Introduction**
- 3.1 Unit Objectives**
- 3.2 Life Sketch of Gramsci**
- 3.3 Gramsci and Civil Society**
- 3.4 Gramsci on Hegemony**
 - 3.4.1 Roots of Hegemony**
 - 3.4.2 Ideological Hegemony**
- 3.5 Gramscian Revolution**
- 3.6 Summary**
- 3.7 Key Terms**

3.8 Answers to 'Check Your Progress'

3.9 Questions and Exercises

3.10 Further Reading

UNIT 4

POST-STRUCTURALISM AND POST-MODERNISM: Michel Foucault

Structure

4.0 Introduction

4.1 Unit Objectives

4.2 Michel Foucault

4.2.1 Life Sketch

4.2.2 Major Works

4.3 Discipline and Democracy

4.4 Power

4.5 Government and the Self

4.6 Critical Analysis of Michel Foucault's Contribution and Concepts

4.7 Let Us Sum Up

4.8 Key Words

4.9 Answers to Questions in Check Your Learning

4.10 Short Questions

4.11 Long Questions

4.12 Further reading

UNIT 1

CRITICAL THEORY: Herbert Marcuse

Structure

- 1.0 Introduction
- 1.1 Unit Objectives
- 1.2 Herbert Marcuse
- 1.3 The New Left and Radical Politics
- 1.4 Marcuse and Positivism
- 1.5 Marcuse's Early Heideggerian Marxism
- 1.6 Marcuse and Capitalism
- 1.7 Critical Theory of Society
- 1.8 Summary
- 1.9 Key Terms
- 1.10 Answers to 'Check Your Progress'
- 1.11 Questions and Exercises
- 1.12 Further Reading

1.0 INTRODUCTION

Herbert Marcuse was a leading twentieth century New Left philosopher in the United States and a follower of Karl Marx. Marcuse's writing reflected discontent with modern society and technology and their 'destructive' influences, as well as the necessity of revolution. Herbert Marcuse co-founded the Frankfurt Institute for Social Research with Theodore Adorno and Max Horkheimer. The members of the Institute have been credited for the development of a model of Critical Theory, a type of Marxism influenced by psychoanalysis and existentialism, and their influential aesthetic theories and critiques of capitalist culture. Marcuse was involved in the Institute's many interdisciplinary projects, identifying in particular with critical social theory, and maintained a close relationship with the other members of the Institute throughout his life. In this unit you will learn about the life of Herbert Marcuse and also about his philosophy.

1.1 UNIT OBJECTIVES

After going through this unit, you will be able to:

- Discuss the life and times of Herbert Marcuse
- Describe the new left and radical politics
- Explain the idea of Positivism of Marc use
- Discuss Heideggerian Marxism and Marcuse's interest in Capitalism
- Analyse the basic ideas of critical theory of society of Marcuse and its relationship between philosophy, social theory and cultural criticism

1.2 HERBERT MARCUSE

Life Sketch

Herbert Marcuse is an internationally renowned philosopher. He was also a member of the Frankfurt School. He was famous as a social activist and a theorist. Marcuse has been remembered as one of the most influential social critical theorists inspiring the radical political movements in the 1960s and 1970s. Herbert Marcuse was born on 19 July 1898, in a Jewish family. His father was Carl Marcuse and mother was Gertrud Kreslawsky. He was the eldest son of a Berlin Merchant. At the age of six, Marcuse entered an exclusive Berlin Vorschule, or preparatory school. He moved to the prominent Mommsen Gymnasium in Berlin at the age of nine. He studied in Kaiserin Augusta Gymnasium in the fashionable Charlottenburg suburb at the age of eleven. Marcuse received a privileged bourgeois education and biographical accounts indicate that he was a voracious reader of German classics and world literature from an early age. He also became deeply involved with modernism in arts and a wide range of literature and poetry.

Marcuse was famously known as a German philosopher, sociologist and political theorist. He was deeply associated with the Frankfurt School of critical theory. Marcuse was a famous figure in the Frankfurt based Institute for Social Research which later came to be

known as the Frankfurt School. He joined the Frankfurt School in 1932. He was also a co-founder of the 'Frankfurt School of Marxist Sociology' with Max Horkheimer and T.W. Adorno. In 1916, during the First World War, he joined the German Army, but his main job was to work in horse stables in Berlin. He then became a member of a Soldiers Council that participated in the aborted socialist Spartacist uprising. He completed his Ph.D. thesis at the University of Freiburg in 1922 on German Expressionism. After completing his Ph.D. he moved back to Berlin, where he worked in the publishing sector. In 1924 he married Sophie Wertheim, who was a mathematician.

He became a member of the Social Democratic Party during his student years. After completing his studies he worked as a bookseller in Berlin. He published his first article in 1928 and returned to Freiburg in the same year to study with Edmund Husserl and write a Habilitation with Martin Heidegger. He published his book *Hegel's Ontology and Theory of Historicity* in the year 1932. This study was written mainly in the context of the Hegel renaissance. At that time renaissance was taking place in Europe with an emphasis on Hegel's ontology of life and history, idealist theory of spirit and dialectic.

In 1933, Marcuse joined the Institute for Social Research based in Frankfurt. He went into exile with other members of Frankfurt school. They first moved to Geneva and later to the United States. Unlike some other members of the Frankfurt school, Marcuse did not return to Germany after the war.

In 1933, Marcuse published his first major review of *Marx's Economic and Philosophical Manuscripts of 1844*. In this review, he revised the interpretation of Marxism, based on the early works of Marx. This review helped the world to see that Marcuse was becoming one of the most promising theorists of his generation.

In 1934, Marcuse took citizenship of United States. He never contemplated returning to Germany but remained one of the major theorists to remain associated with the Frankfurt School for a long time, along with other philosophers such as Max Horkheimer and Theodor W. Adorno, etc. In 1941, Marcuse published the most famous book which was based on a

dialectical study of G.W.F. Hegel and Karl Marx on the book of *Reason and Revolution*. During the Second World War, Marcuse worked for the United States Office of War Information (OWI) on anti-Nazi propaganda projects. In 1943, he got transferred to another office which was a part of Central Intelligence Agency and the office was known as the Office of Strategic Services (OSS). He worked as a researcher in the Office of Strategic Services. His research work is based on the Nazi Germany and denazification. Marcuse was an employee of the central European section till 1951. He was given this job by the US Department of State. After remaining in government service for a long time, Marcuse became a faculty in Brandeis University. Before joining the University he' spent four years doing part- time academic work. He retired from the University as a faculty after the death of his first wife in 1951.

In the late 1960s and 1970s after his studies, Marcuse became a prominent theorist of the New Left. He was also involved with the student's movements which had increased at that time in countries like Germany, France and USA. In 1943 and 1950, Marcuse wrote his book *Soviet Marxism*. He was known as the 'Father of the New Left'. His best known works are *Eros and Civilization* which was published in 1958 and *One-Dimensional Man* which was published in 1964.

Marcuse's belief in Marxist ideology and scholarship inspired many radical intellectuals and political activists in USA. Marcuse was a leading thinker of the new left and also called the Guru of student movement.

In 1952 Marcuse began his career in a different way and became a tutor of political theorist in Columbia University. Later on he also joined as a tutor in Harvard University and also at Brandeis University till 1965. He taught philosophy and politics in those universities. Later on he went to the University of California at San Diego as a tutor. After joining the university he was associated with people likes the famous political sociologist Barrington Moore, Jr. and political philosopher Robert Paul Wolff. He was also a friend of C. Wright Mills, a sociology professor, in Columbia University. He was one of the founder members of the New Left movement.

Marcuse continued to identify himself as a Marxist, socialist and a Hegelian in the post war period. At that time he was known as the most explicitly political and left-wing member of the Frankfurt School. Marcuse's critiques of capitalist society resonated with the concerns of the student movement in the 1960s. His work heavily influenced the intellectual discourse on popular culture. He was always involved in many conferences and meetings in US and Europe in the late 1960s and 1970s. Marcuse became a close friend and inspirer of the French philosopher Andre Gorz. Marcuse also defended the East German dissident Rudolf Bahro who was arrested at that time. He was very much influenced by Rudolf Bahro's theories of 'change from within'. Jesuit Fr. James Chevedden made a written complaint to the Superior General of the Jesuit Order, Peter-Hans Kolvenbach, regarding the promotion of the ideology of the Marxist philosopher, Herbert Marcuse at the 1998 California Jesuit Province Social Pastoral Conference.

Herbert Marcuse married three times in his life. He has married to his first wife who was a mathematician in the year 1901. Her name was Sophie Wertman. Marcuse married Inge Neumann in 1910 after the death of his first wife. She was the widow of his close friend Franz Neumann. His third wife was Erica Sherover. Marcuse died after he suffered from a stroke during a visit to Germany on 29 July, 1979. His ashes were rediscovered in 2003 in United States and after that the ashes were buried in Berlin.

1.3 THE NEW LEFT AND RADICAL POLITICS

Many famous radical scholars and activists such as Norman O. Brown, Angela Davis, Kathy Acker, Abbie Hoffman, Rudi Dutschke, and Robert M. Young, were influenced by Herbert Marcuse. Among those who criticized Marcuse from the left were Marxist humanist Raya Dunayevskaya and fellow German Emigre Paul Mattick. They mainly criticized Marcuse on the subject of *One-Dimensional Man*. They also gave their views about Marxist critique Noam Chomsky, who knew and liked Marcuse 'but thought very little of his work'. Marcuse in his essay of 1965 on *Repressive Tolerance* claimed that capitalist democracies can have totalitarian aspects. For this he has been criticized by many conservatives of that time. Marcuse argues that genuine tolerance does not permit support for 'repression' and for doing

so ensures that marginalized voices will remain unheard. He characterizes tolerance of repressive speech as 'inauthentic'. Instead of this, he advocates a different thing which is called a form of tolerance that is intolerant of right wing political movements which he described as:

'Liberating tolerance, then, would mean intolerance against movements from the Right and toleration of movements from the Left'.

Marcuse said that 'surely, no government can be expected to foster its own subversion, but in a democracy such a right is vested in the people. This means that the ways should not be blocked on which a subversive majority could develop, and if they are blocked by organized repression and indoctrination, their reopening may require apparently undemocratic means. They would include the withdrawal of toleration of speech and assembly from groups and movements which promote aggressive policies, armament, chauvinism, discrimination on the grounds of race and religion, or which oppose the extension of public services, social security, medical care, etc'.

Marcuse later expressed his radical ideas through three books. The books are:

- *An Essay on Liberation* in 1969 which was mainly on celebrating liberation movements such as those in Vietnam, which inspired many radicals at that period.
- Again in 1972 he wrote *Counterrevolution and Revolt*, which argues that the hopes of the people in 1960s were facing a counter revolution from the right wing. His teaching contract was not renewed by Brandeis in 1965 and after that Marcuse decided to devote the rest of his life teaching, writing and giving lectures around the world. His initiative and efforts brought him attention from the media, which claimed that he openly advocated violence, although he often clarified that only 'violence of defense' could be appropriate, not 'violence of aggression'. He continued to believe and promote Marxian theory. He always supported student movements and for this he shared his ideas with some of his students.

- He published his final work *The Aesthetic Dimension* in 1979 on the role of high art in the process of what he termed as 'emancipation' from society.

In fact, Marcuse's major works which were mentioned earlier such as *Eros and Civilization*, *One-Dimensional Man*, *An Essay on Liberation*, and *Counterrevolution and Revolt* mediated aesthetics with critical philosophy and social theory and a project of radical political critique and transformation. Thus, Marcuse was never an aesthetic, but rather saw art as a crucial phenomenon that helped to reveal the vicissitudes of contemporary society and that could help in the transformation of an oppressive world while inspiring the construction of a better one and promoting human liberation. Moreover, despite their limitations, Marcuse's continual reflections on utopia and liberation and the role of art in aiding social change contain many important insights. Much great art does have the potential of emancipation, and Marcuse's works help to reflect on how Cultural Revolution can help promote social change. In a difficult historical period, Marcuse had the courage and vision to project alternative possibilities in which a happier and freer life could be envisaged.

In Marcuse's view, the New Left provided important emphasis on the subjective conditions of radical social change and sought new and more humane values, institutions and ways of life. It embodied the best features of previous socialist and anarchist traditions that it concretized in social struggles such as the anti-war, feminist, ecological communal and countercultural movements. In Marcuse's view, this change was the demand for total revolution that distinguished the New Left and its championing of freedom, social justice and democracy in every sphere of life. Marcuse's work in the subject of philosophy and social theory generated many controversy and problems. Most of his studies and his work are highly tendentious and frequently sectarian. Marcuse was in favour of contemporary capitalist societies and spoke in defense of radical social change.

Marcuse specifically pointed to the risk involved in the demand for scientific study of society and politics. He argued that when the language of social science attempts to conform to the language of natural science, it tends to lend support to the status quo. In this

context, scientific terminology is sought to be defined in terms of such operations and behaviour that are capable of observation' and 'measurement. This is not giving any scope for critical version in the scientific language. For example, when people's participation is sought to be estimated on the basis of the numbers of voters who turn up at elections, we do not question whether the prevailing electoral system conforms to the true spirit of democracy. When the people adopt this method of study, then social science no longer remains an instrument of social inquiry but becomes an instrument of social control. The move towards New Left by Robert Nisbet and Herbert Marcuse is a long journey for the alienated individual to take in search of a state and the society in which he can live a life of creative happiness within himself, of love and friendship with his fellowman and peace, harmony with nature. But the search further appeared to have been vain and futile.

Marcuse embodied many political thoughts about the New Left in his own thoughts and politics. At that time a younger generation of political activists or the students looked up to a white haired German refugee in his mid 1960s for theoretical and political guidance. The Third World countries were disgusted by the excessive affluence of the advanced industrial societies and the violence of neo-imperialist interventions. The people of that generation found theoretical and political inspiration and also support in Marcuse 's writings through which they could produce a New Left movement. Marcuse in turn tirelessly criticized 'advanced industrial society,' of USA which was based on imperialism, racism, sexism, environmental destruction and the forms of oppression and domination that he perceived as growing in intensity and scope.

In particular, it can be said that Marcuse's identification with the New Left will be discussed in the contemporary era and his attempt to sharpen his critique of the current society and to project radical alternatives. The younger generation of that time finds theoretical and political guidance and also insight into the life and work of Herbert Marcuse. Marcuse attempted to articulate the theory and practice of a New Left during that period. He also tried to influence a widespread social protest among the people. Marcuse believes that the rise of New Left is used for the vision of a free, liberated individual in a non-repressive society.

In Marcuse's view, the New Left is a specially advanced political force. He gives his views on this because this was instrumental in drawing political struggle into the realm of non-material needs and the physiological dimension. Hence, after adopting the new left ideology the new or the younger generation got involved in an emergent anti-corporate globalization. They had tried to bring worldwide peace and social justice movement in the making which may find theoretical and political guidance in the Marcusean texts. In the New Left ideology, Marcuse found concrete referents for his dialectical categories of contradiction, negation and the Great Refusal. The New Left activists were influenced by the famous philosopher. They found a teacher, defender and also a great spokesperson in Marcuse.

Marcuse and Students' Revolution

Marcuse always thought that the students are the future and agents to bring changes in the society. Because of this he associated himself with student revolutions in early sixties. The students' revolutions were mainly expected to change not merely institutions but also human attitudes, instincts, goals and values. His support for the revolts of the students was based on the hope that they would become an integral part of the struggle for freedom later waged by 'the subversive majority. Marcuse was totally clear that the students' movements itself is not revolutionary but believed that it was certainly a revolutionary expression and a possible prelude to revolutionary

action. He supported the students' revolts because he believed that the students voicing their criticism of the society will soon take place as political and social forces in the society and then this protest will increase, and progressively acquire power which will bring radical change. His support for the students was therefore part of an effort:

- To create revolutionary mentality among the youth.
- To prepare them for leadership in the coming revolution against society.

In order to get over the existing forms of consciousness, which have rendered man as a one dimensional creature, Marcuse has evolved the concept of negative thinking.

He advocates the same for the students also. He says that unless the student learns to think in the opposite direction he/she will be inclined to place the facts into the predominate framework of values. He further believes that it is a matter of natural right, for the minorities oppressed by the society to use extra legal means against it, when legal means prove inadequate. Marcuse thus called for change by adopting extreme ways such as violence. But with the exception of encouraging the students and revolts in the American university, he has not done anything to introduce new strategies through which revolution could be organized further or the stages through which revolution can take place.

Marcuse tries to elaborate his ideas on:

- The existing situation
- The goal to be achieved
- The methods to be adopted for achieving it

His disgust for the contemporary society was as intense as ever 'we all feel, we experience, we have it in our bones, that the society is getting increasingly repressive, destructive of the human and natural capabilities to be free, to determine one's own life, to shape one's own life without exploiting others'. The most disappointing part of the philosophy of Marcuse however, is the enunciation of means. In a situation in which the working class is highly qualified salaried employees, technicians and specialists occupying a decisive position in the material processes of productions cannot be expected to provide any solid mass base for a revolution, democratic persuasion is not likely to carry us far. For this, Marcuse advocates not a large centralized and coordinated movement, but local and regional political action against specific grievances. According to him the specific grievances are mainly, riots, ghetto rebellions and so on. In his views the rising mass movements of that period lacked in political consciousness and depended more on the people. The movements were also depended on the political guidance and directions by militant leading minorities parties.

Marcuse was not in favour of setting up of political parties for this. He never envisaged any political party. He was always in favour of overt organizations, concentrated in small groups around local activities. He also supported the small groups which were highly flexible and autonomous and could take decisions without any delay. He also believed in small contesting and competing groups which can be activated at many points at the same time, such as a kind of political guerilla force which always acts for bringing peace in a disturbed area.

1.4 MARCUSE AND POSITIVISM

The development of positivist theory derived from a debate within European intellectual circles over the basis of human realities and the challenging of dominant discourses which espoused a view that made sense of the world through the power of God. As positivism was famous among the scholars of that period the members of Frankfurt school argued about positivism and they said that it may be seen as:

'amalgam of diverse traditions ... While the history of these traditions is complex and cluttered with detours and qualifications, each of them has supported the goal of developing forms of social enquiry patterned after the natural sciences and based on the methodological tenets of sense observation and qualification'.

Herbert Marcuse in his most famous book the *One Dimensional Man* sees positivism as an ideology, concentrating only on the observable. It rejects philosophical concepts such as justice, democracy and fulfillment. According to Marcuse the use of 'positivism' will focus on the work of the early French sociologist Henri de Saint- Simon. Herbert Marcuse defines positivism in his own words as partly encompassing 'the orientation of cognitive thought to the physical sciences as a model of certainty and exactness' and 'the belief that progress in knowledge depends on this orientation'. This type of affirmation attempts to assimilate intersectionality into models of certainty and exactness. In this way, the category works to facilitate the ideological presumptions of social scientific methodologies, particularly their

claim to get at the truth of reality.

Marcuse also described about positivism that, 'Positivism finds in the society the medium for realization and validation of its concepts'. He also said that positivism is the harmony between theory and practice and also between truth and facts. He also said that the people are doing this, whether they are conscious of it or not. Marcuse wrote that 'Paying respect to the prevailing variety of meanings and usages, to the power and common sense of ordinary speech'. He said that we should be more aware of whatever is coming our way so that we can say our everyday speech, regardless of whether it's at home or while discussing a topic in the classroom, we shouldn't take everyone's views for granted. Marcuse explains that, 'ordinary language reveals speaking as it does'. Regardless of our language, the context of our speech and our personal experience that has brought sense to each word, thought and whatever we speak is a philosophy in itself.

Marcuse discussed positivism and its philosophy, which tends to be compared to empiricism. Positivism was designed to solve philosophical problems, which had arisen as a result of scientific development. Positivism is basically empiricism brought to extreme logical consequences. All in all there are different philosophies and ways to study human language, but Marcuse points out how all is taken for granted. As mentioned earlier the debate on positivism mainly emerged from the European academic tradition. The most frequent critiques of positivism derived from the members of Frankfurt school, particularly seen in the work of Herbert Marcuse, Jurgan Habermas, Theodor Adorno, Max Horkheimer, etc. The influence of Fascism and forced emigration had a profound impact on members of the Frankfurt school and strengthened their acute feeling that oppression and injustice characterized the world.

The debate surrounding positivism can be seen in its widest sense as a dispute over the legitimation of contesting bodies of knowledge. The debate is concerned with validity of research, methodology and knowledge and in particular the validity of scientific methodologies as appropriate frameworks through which to understand human society. Friedman analysis unveils the critical nature of positivism. The members

of Frankfurt school have challenged the way in which knowledge is legitimated and in particular, the way in which knowledge is situated in false dualisms which dissolves the tension between potentialities and actuality. The knowledge within a positivist paradigm is defined in terms of conceptions of science and conflicts and the knowledge in a society remains an inadequate paradigm for the analysis of human society. Positivism as a framework is based fundamentally on an assumption that facts may be measured objectively to ascertain universal truths about the world.

Marcuse's Concept of One-Dimensional Man

Herbert Marcuse as a young man was a member of the German Spartacist movement, a left wing revolutionary splinter group crushed by the Berlin government in 1919. He later became a Hegelian philosopher. His theory of one-dimensional man has mainly provided critical perspectives on contemporary capitalist and state communist societies. This theory has also given his notion of the great refusal which makes him a renowned theorist of revolutionary change and also liberation from the affluent society. During the period of 1960s to 1970s he became one of the most influential intellectuals in the United States.

Herbert Marcuse claimed to be a Marxist and gave brilliant analysis of the problem of freedom in contemporary western society. The orthodox Marxist as well as anti-Marxist has insisted on a scientific and economic interpretation of Marxism. In contrast, Marcuse, like other neo Marxists, underlined subjective, critical and humanist dimension of Marxism. He rejected Soviet Marxism by saying that it was a distorted version of Marxism and sought to revive the original, humanist interpretation of Marxism as a tool of analysis as well as an instrument of social change. In his *One Dimensional Man* which was published in 1964, Marcuse dwelled on the theme of alienation in contemporary Western Society. He gave a penetrating criticism of capitalism as regards its impact on human freedom. According to him, capitalism exercises monopolistic control not only on production and distribution, it also creates the desire and demands for commodities through a clever manipulation of the mass media. The result is widespread craze for consumer goods which develops into a distorted second nature of an individual. The consumer capitalism renders the oppressed sections

insensitive to their original discontent, by stimulating their trivial, material desires which can be easily satisfied. Under the spell of gratification of these trivial desires, the genuine importance of freedom disappears. Against this the alienated human beings become unaware of their alienation. Under these circumstances, they should first be awakened to realize their condition of alienation in order to arouse their urge for freedom.

In his another book *Eros and Civilization* in 1966, Marcuse has given a blue print of society where alienation will be removed and freedom will be restored. The democratic community will be the place where work will become play, and the necessary labour will be organized in harmony with liberated and authentic individual needs. The discontinuance of repressive performance will eliminate surplus repression and will thus help to free the person from alienated labour. After that, Marcuse concludes with an optimistic need and said that the western society has already evolved a technology which is geared to meet most of the human needs. It is sufficient to enable a man to live in freedom and dignity. Once they understand the necessary conditions of freedom, they can transcend the era of violence and anarchy and that will bring a new society where freedom will reign supreme. Marcuse's 'view' concerning the possibility of happiness has been criticized on many grounds. Some critics believe that human needs are endless and the gap between aspiration and achievement will never allow human beings to attain happiness. Then the question arises as to who would bring about revolution? In this regard Marcuse had no faith in the revolutionary potential of a proletariat. He made his hopes on the marginal elite of the unbrainwashed students and radically dispossessed members of the poorest classes. Some critics also argue that after denying the revolutionary potential of the proletariat Marcuse loses his claim to be a Marxist.

1.5 MARCUSE'S EARLY 'HEIDEGGERIAN MARXISM'

The Nazi's takeover made the political situation worsen in Germany. After Nazi's rule in Germany, in 1927, Marcuse read a much discussed book by Husserl who was a former assistant and successor of Martin Heidegger. In the famous book *Being and Time*, Husserl has

made phenomenological method into a remarkably delicate instrument. This is mainly for investigating the most basic human experiences and their commitments. After reading this book Marcuse made a great change in his life. The book had given a way out of the dead to Marcuse and also brought an end of traditional Marxism. This also shows a way forward to a new concept of revolution. After that Marcuse returned to Freiburg to take up his studies again. The intention of enter the German university system as a professional philosopher. To understand Marcuse's thoughts, it is necessary to explain the phenomenology briefly in both its original Husserlian and its Heideggerian versions.

Marcuse wrote a series of essays during his stay in Freiburg. These essays explored the possibility of synthesizing Marxism and Heidegger's fundamental ontology. In 1928, Marcuse became Heidegger's assistant. The series of essays written by Marcuse was drawn critically on Heidegger's thought and that also attempted to synthesize it with Marxism. Marcuse's writing bring fundamental objection which was mainly concerned with Heidegger's basic concept of the world. Heidegger had attempted to uncover ultimate structures of the world. Later in his book he raised them to a higher plane by identifying specific worlds with national communities of meaning and carriers of tradition.

The early interest in Heidegger followed Marcuse's demand for 'concrete philosophy', which, he declared in 1928. Marcuse's interest in concrete philosophy was against the neo- Kantianism of the mainstream. This has also made a change against both the revisionist and orthodox Marxist. Though later on, Marcuse quickly distanced himself and his ideas from the views of Heidegger. This step was taken by him because Heidegger believes and supports Nazism. Later it was suggested by many thinkers such as the most famous member of Frankfurt School Jurgen Habermas that for understanding Marcuse's ideas, ideology and thinking it is essential to give credit and appreciation of his early Heideggerian influence in his ideas.

Marcuse always believes that Heidegger was the greatest teacher and thinker. Marcuse collected a series of lectures and notes and kept it as archives starting from the late 1920s until he left Freiburg in 1933. The collected documents give clear picture and the intensity of his

interest in Heidegger's philosophy and his devotion to his lectures. But Marcuse was highly disappointed with Heidegger's political affiliations with National Socialism. He completed his Dissertation on Hegel's Ontology and the Theory of Historicity. He decided to leave Freiburg mainly to join the Institute for Social Research which was located in Frankfurt. The institute decided to open branch offices which Marcuse joined later at Geneva and then at the Columbia University.

It can be seen that from his very sketchy description of Heidegger's complex theory why he came to be known as existentialist. Like other philosophers such as Kierkegaard and Nietzsche, Heidegger promised philosophical insight into the most fundamental problems of personal life. Marcuse wrote at that time about Heidegger's work that it seemed to the people to be a turning point in the history of philosophy. He said that the turning point for the people was the bourgeois philosophy that transcended from within and also opened the way to a new concrete science. Marcuse applied this concrete science for understanding the passivity of the working class in the revolutionary situation. Marcuse also said that the idea of authenticity suggested a way of completing Marxism. This will happen by bringing a new theory of revolutionary consciousness among the people. He also gave his views that the traditional Marxism had failed because it relied on the motivating force of economic self-interest. It is misunderstood that the revolutions do not happen for simple economic reasons. After going through many ideologies Marcuse had a far more powerful instrument for mainly analysing the radical act in which individuals exist through transforming their world.

Marcuse published a series of essays that drew critically on Heidegger's thought and attempted to synthesize it with Marxism. Marcuse's fundamental objection for Heidegger philosophy was mainly concerned with his basic concept of the world. Heidegger in his philosophy had attempted to uncover ultimate structures of the world which has left the particulars of specific worlds to the side as sociological details. In the later parts of his book, Heidegger referred to the details that he raised it to a higher plane by identifying specific worlds with national communities of meaning and carriers of tradition. Marcuse argued that in doing this, Heidegger covered the divisions within communities. Indeed, from a Marxist

standpoint, the class divisions are ultimately more significant than nationality. It was seen that modern capitalism destroys tradition and it replaces it with a society which is based on self-interest. The authenticity in this situation becomes a matter of seizing the historical moment along with one's class in the affirmation of human possibilities against the routines of the existing society. While working with Heidegger, Marcuse decided to write a second thesis on Hegel which would qualify him to teach in the German university.

Marcuse's thesis was published in 1932. This thesis was based on remarkably rich and complex interpretation of Hegel which was strongly influenced by Heidegger's writing. But it was also different from Heidegger's ideas which were based on addressing the issue of history which is primarily in terms of Hegelian and Marxist notions of labour as the human power to produce worlds. It is seen that in Hegel's text labour is portrayed as loosely and symbolically related to actual work. Labour means the act of negating the given reality in the creation of objects or institutions that reflect various aspects of human reality. But despite the vagueness of Hegel's reference to labour, Marx made the most of it and saw in him an important predecessor. Marcuse appreciated Marx's takeover on Hegel but later he gives it a Heideggerian twist. An initial analysis of the tool used forms the background of the notion of being in the world. The world created by labour is in fact the Heideggerian world of experience awaiting and preparing the authentic act of the human subject.

Marcuse's interpretation of the ideology of Hegel was also influenced by Heidegger's theory of history. Heidegger's theory established the central significance of time in the constitution of the world. He has referred to a future that gives order and meaning to the present. Heidegger at that time worked out his theory of temporality in relation to individual human being. In his theory he had not explained clearly how history is constituted at the collective level. For Marx and Hegel the future is a collective project that emerges from tensions in the society that they reflect on different projects borne by different social groups. The progressive projects realize the potentials of the present that helps to develop human capacities. This notion of became the basis for Marcuse's theory which was described as two dimensions of society. The dimension of everyday facts and the dimension of transcending possibilities lead to higher stages of historical and human development. With this

reinterpretation, Marcuse prepared his new concept of revolution. This interpretation of Hegel came close to Marx's early unpublished writings. In 1932, an unknown text emerged from the archives which were based on the Economic and Philosophical Manuscripts and showed a revolutionized image of Marx.

In 1844, Marx had argued that capitalism was not simply an economic system for the society and that capitalism alienated workers from their basic nature as creatures capable of building a world through labour for fulfilling their needs and powers but the world did not belong to them. Instead it belonged to the capitalist perverting their whole existence into a debased struggle for survival. Marx in his writing attacked the destruction of the 'human essence' in an economic system that reduces the worker to nothing but into an abstract capacity for 'labour power'. He says that it was abstract because in the early factory system labour was measured solely in quantitative units of time and was stripped of all qualities of skill and creativity. Related to this text, Marcuse discovered about Marx's writing spoke of contemporary crisis of modernity as a whole. Marcuse also found similarities to his own writings rather than creative interpretations of Heidegger and Hegel.

Marx makes surprising claims that distinguish his concept of nature from that of the natural sciences and he brings it closer to the phenomenological concept of experience which Marcuse had gone through during his studies. Marcuse did not have to stretch the point in treating Marx's affirmation of the unity of human being and nature as an intentional correlation of subject and object, a kind of being in the world. What is more essential is that Marx grants this experiential unity a supreme ontological significance that is same like Husserl and Heidegger's views. But unlike these phenomenologist's, Marx's version of being in the world has a radical historical character. Marcuse argues that the objectification of human faculties through labour under socialism which creates a humanized nature in which an individual can feel that he is finally at home. Marcuse emphasized these aspects of the Manuscripts and the early work of Marx and it brought to the culmination and turning point of his own phenomenological education.

Marcuse, is not only the root of Heidegger's failure, it explains why his so

called mistake in allying himself with the Nazis is not just a mistake but is also the betrayal of the philosophy. Marcuse's self-interpretation has been seconded by numerous scholars who can see Marcuse's interest in Heidegger as a recovery of the subjective dimension of Marxism. One can see the evident enthusiasm in his review of Marx's Manuscripts of 1844 in *New Sources on the Foundation of Historical Materialism*. It is argued that Marcuse could allay his reservations about Heidegger to further distance himself, since this active, sensuous subjectivity could be found within Marxism itself.

1.6 MARCUSE AND CAPITALISM

Like Marx, Marcuse also accepts the Hegelian dialectic and uses this to reinterpret society. But he differs from Marx in as much as he believes in dialectical idealism, which would lead to the dictatorship of the intelligentsia, and not in dialectical materialism, which had led Marx to the theory of dictatorship of the proletariat. Marcuse differs from many political theorists such as Erich Fromm, David Riesman, Hannah Ardent, Erik H. Erikson, and C. Wright. Mills and all those writers who had deplored the human condition in contemporary industrialized society and had directly or indirectly suggested a return to the preindustrial age. Marcuse believed in industrialization and all its material benefits, but he thought that the time has come when we have to move, not towards preindustrial age but forward into a post industrial age. This is mainly to fulfil the objective of happiness of a particular individual not his performance. Marcuse differs both from Marx and Hegel, neither of whom had given much thought to the happiness of the individual. He has also shown a strong empirical insight into the critical analysis of the contemporary capitalism.

Marcuse argues that the performance principle was good when the industrial civilization was being built up and the life of the individual worker was both sustained and improved by increase in productivity, but now it has less or no relevance in present period. The individual has now obtained so much control over nature that the productivity has expanded to such a large extent, that it is no longer necessary for individuals to keep working throughout their lives. Marcuse argues that in the age of affluence in which we are living, production should be treated as a by- product of labour and the 'performance principle' should

be replaced by the 'pleasure principle'. With scarcity having been conquered and the society having achieved maturity, the time has come to build up a non-repressive civilization, a civilization in which the individual can give expression to his creative and contemplative impulses and build up a higher form of culture based on harmony between individual and nature. According to Marcuse, by the capitalistic desire for profit which gives expression to what he calls 'surplus repression' he attributes it to the desire of a few individuals to control distribution and thereby to dominate other individuals. According to Marcuse, the surplus repression can certainly be eliminated by eliminating scarcity and liberating individual from the clutches of the performance principle, which has so far dominated human thought. It is the capitalists who make individuals work more than necessary, and also under the fear that if he knew that his basic needs could be satisfied even by working for a short period, he would not work and will keep his personality under complete suppression. A certain amount of repression is an unavoidable part of civilization but the greed of the capitalist leads him to inflict the surplus and unnecessary repression of the individual. He said that presently the main work for the society is to eliminate the surplus repression.

Marcuse is not particularly impressed by Marxism as it operates in the Soviet Union. He described it as a 'repressive, puritan morality rationalized on the basis of scarcity and external threats' and says it has merely led to new forms of repression. The Soviet Marxism mainly tried to obey all its ideologies which converted it to bring up a new ideology. Both capitalism and communism are Δ thus equally destructive of human personality. An individual in all its social systems continually faces defeat and frustration in search for happiness. For this Marcuse has put all the blame on the pattern of consciousness which has taken the modern individual under their grip, which he brings in his theory of *One Dimensional Man*. The changes in consumption patterns and in the structure of the labour force, along with institution of the welfare state, have so much domesticated the working class and the labour movement that the classical Marxist doctrine of class conflict has become inapplicable in modern society. Modern industrial society has made man the victim of a specific ideology, and the irony of it, is that he is completely unaware of it. Marcuse's dismay at the failure or unwillingness to seize the productive capacities unleashed by capitalism and put them towards

more humane purposes than those to which they were and currently are being put. Marcuse says that the conditions for transformation were for individuals present in the same conditions that also gives individuals so much reason for despair.

As mentioned earlier Marcuse was the follower of Marx. Marcuse's analysis of capitalism derives partially from one of Karl Marx's main concepts. The concepts are objectification, under which capitalism becomes Alienation. Marx wrote his views about capitalism and said that capitalism was exploiting human beings. This is happening by producing objects and the labourers becoming alienated which ultimately dehumanized human beings to become functional objects. After going through this concept, Marcuse took this belief from Karl Marx and expanded it further in his own views. He argued that capitalism and industrialization pushed labourers so much that they thought themselves to be an extension to what they were producing. At the beginning of *One-Dimensional Man*, Marcuse writes, 'The people recognize themselves in their commodities, they find their soul in their automobile, split-level home and kitchen equipment'. This means that in capitalism, human beings become extensions of the commodities that they buy and thus makes commodities extensions of individual's minds and bodies. In capitalism Marcuse also argued that the affluent technological societies were totally controlled and manipulated. Under capitalism the societies are based on mass production and mass distribution.

The modern capitalism has created needs that are false and false consciousness which is locked one dimensional man into one dimensional society. The mechanism which ties an individual to the society has changed and the social control is part of the new needs which it has produced. Most important of all is that the pressure of consumers has led total integration of the working class into a capitalism system. In capitalism the political parties and the trade unions has become fully bureaucratized and the power of negative thinking or critical reflection has rapidly declined. The working class or the labour class is no longer potentially subversive and is capable of bringing revolutionary changes in the society. As a result of this, rather than looking at workers as the revolutionary group, Marcuse moved forward and pinned his faith in an alliance between radical intellectuals and groups which were not still integrated into one dimensional society. They were the socially marginalized, the

substratum of the outcasts and outsiders, the exploited and persecuted, the unemployed and the unemployable individuals of the society. These were the people whose standard of living demanded the end of intolerable conditions and institutions and whose resistance to one dimensional society could not be diverted by the system. The involvement of these people in the revolution is extraordinary even if their consciousness was not so strong.

According to Marcuse, revolution allows the necessary development of a subversive majority which can seek out the objective truth for itself. He does not ever hesitate in suggesting the leaders to adopt the subversive majority, which will determine to bring about a revolution or if organized repression is blocked then they can take recourse to undemocratic means. In other words Marcuse is in favour of encouraging all leftist movements and tolerating and encouraging violence directed against rightist movements.

Major contribution of Herbert Marcuse to the contemporary political thought is his analysis of how the mass media keeps on churning one dimensional thought which is systematically digested by man and the repetitive self-validating assumptions behind it are accepted by him as self-evident truths. The working class has become completely disorganized towards the established society and that it is no longer the same as Marx thought earlier that the main antagonistic force is a capitalist society. In the words of Marcuse, 'the tangible source of exploitation disappears behind the facade of objective rationality, hatred and frustration are deprived of their specific target and the technological veil conceals the reproduction of inequality and enslavement.

Marcuse believed at that period, in the industrial society, a new kind of slavery had come into existence. He said that this is a type of slavery which is determined neither by obedience nor by hardness of labour but by the status of being a mere instrument and the reduction of man to the status of a thing. He said that this is a pure form of servitude, to exist as an instrument or as a thing. The labourer, shorn of all revolutionary attitudes, no longer poses a threat to advanced society. He said that neither partial nationalization nor extended participation of labour in management and profit would by themselves alter this system of

domination, as long as labour itself remains a prop and an affirmative force.

Herbert Marcuse believes in a new kind of society and a new kind of man. He also believes that they are both desirable and attainable. He considers that in a non-repressive civilization, a civilization in which nature will be experienced primarily as contemplation, violent and explosive attempts will cease, and individuals will be actively engaged in display of the free manifestation of potentialities. He also believes that all laws are self-given by the individuals', individuals are free from discrimination by men and by institutions, and there is no surplus repression. This society will make optimum use of science and technology and minimize the need for human labour. The new type of individual emerging from this new form of society will make rational and scientific use of resources for the ultimate happiness of everyone. Marcuse said that when this mature society is established will bring an objective truth which can be discovered only in learning and comprehending that which can be done for the sake of improving mankind.

1.7 CRITICAL THEORY OF SOCIETY

The term critical theory itself was only established in 1937, after the majority of the institute members had already immigrated to the United States following the triumph of Hitler. This concept was initially a type of code which, while differentiating its adherents from prevailing forms of orthodoxy, tended to veil their radical commitments in an environment that was hostile to anything which was remotely associated with Marxism. But this term was stuck and soon used to encompass and define general theory of contemporary society that was associated with many political thinkers such as Max Horkheimer, Herbert Marcuse, Friedrich Pollock, etc. Marcuse developed a model for critical social theory when he was a member of the Institute of Social Research. He created a theory of the new stage of state and monopoly of capitalism. In his critical theory he described about the relationships between philosophy, social theory and cultural criticism. He also provided an analysis of critical theory and also criticized the German fascism. He was closely associated with the institute and also worked whole heartedly with other critical theorists.

As mentioned earlier Marcuse is identified with a group of German thinkers who were known as member of the Frankfurt School. These thinkers were associated with ideas at one time or another with the Institute for Social Research that was founded at the University of Frankfurt in 1924. In this school Marcuse was one of the member and the other prominent members were Max Horkheimer and Theodor Adorno. After some time, Walter Benjamin was recognized as another important member of this institute. The Frankfurt School belonged to one of the main components of the early twentieth century trend called 'Western Marxism'. This is the time period when the Western European thinkers were heavily influenced by Marx. This is seen in the interpretation of Marx's work which differed notably from the version propagated in the Soviet Union. The members of Frankfurt School defined their own unique version of Western Marxism during the 1930s. The members were in exile from Nazi critical theory of bourgeois-capitalist society in its transition to fascism. Accordingly, Marcuse set out to develop a theory of bourgeois culture that would reveal how it helped to serve ideological mystifying functions for the bourgeoisie by reproducing the social relations of industrial capitalism. Further, he set out to show how the different aspects of bourgeois culture helped to prepare the way for fascism and had certain continuities and differences with the fascist culture. Thus one aspect of the critical theory of art is to delineate how it serves to advance oppression and domination. But for Marcuse, critical theory also depicts the positive emancipatory and utopian features of cultural phenomena that can advance the cause of human liberation, helping to create a freer and happier life. Accordingly, Marcuse also explicated the utopian and emancipatory features of bourgeois culture that could help create a better society and thus serve the interests of emancipation and radical social transformation - a project that Marcuse would be committed to for decades to come.

A critical theory of art is thus a dialectical one, criticizing negative features and articulating positive ones. It analyses art within specific social formations and develops utopian notions of art and liberation that show that art can have emancipatory potential and effects within specific social conjunctures. Accordingly, Marcuse's key analyses of art articulate defining and constitutive contradictions, ambiguities, and ambivalences of art; thus it is a mistake to read him as an idealist aestheticist or reductive oncologist of art for he always

historicizes his analyses and stresses contradictions and ambivalences. For example, Marcuse's 1937 study 'The Affirmative Character of Culture' focused on the dialectics of We stem art in particular during the era of German fascism; later he reflected on the potentials of art and the aesthetic dimension, first in the context of a repressive conformist society in the US in the 1950s and early 1960s, and then in the context of world revolution in the later 1960s and 1970s followed by a global counterrevolution and a retreat of the Left.

Marcuse's reflections on art, however utopian, are grounded in very specific historical environments and are part of a critical theory of society, providing analysis of a given society and aiming at radical social transformation. Thus, Marcuse's reflections on art are grounded in critical social theory and politics, and while art is a quasi-autonomous dimension for him, it is deeply involved in the vicissitudes of society and history. Marcuse has a transcendental ontology of art, since reflections on art and aesthetics for him from the time of his work with the Institute for Social Research in the 1930s are always bound up with a specific historical conjuncture and imbricates in critical social theory and radical politics.

Marcuse continued to believe that the two reasons for which the country is facing threat will not change until the end of his life and he said that the two were inseparable. But later he remembered about the third element in critical theory, which was not yet discussed. This aspect of critical theory was shared by Horkheimer and Marcuse. Although this element was strongly supported by Marcuse they named this as the utopian spirit which was from the beginning a main element in critical theory and also believe as the moral basis for this theory. The meaning of utopia is described as both no place and good place. Utopia is the term which has the oldest traditions of thought in the modern west. The idea of utopia or the word originated and emerged in a seminar entitled *Utopia*, which was written by the English statesman and philosopher Thomas More in 1516. This term is used almost for the next three hundred years. Many books have been written by using a similar term and also appeared envisioning a more perfect society.

There was a great change in the utopian tradition when industrialism came into existence in the nineteenth century. Till the nineteenth century, the political economy of the good society was usually described by utopian writers. Before industrialism came into existence, the political economy was described as a form of communitarian agrarianism, which was described as a farm based economy with progressive social relations. At that time according to the utopian writers the good society means equality of possessions and work obligations, peaceful relations with neighbours, universal education, satisfying craft labour and also more equal gender relations. The country has some exceptions, like they have very few rich societies but they all made their provisions for fulfilling the basic needs. In this the main point is that they were more just, more humane and more enlightened. But after industrialism entered in the society for the first time the individuals felt that the future society could be far richer to bring the described society by the utopian writers because industrialism will free the individuals from the curses of earlier times, which was on endless and backbreaking labour. These above mentioned themes found their way into that part of the tradition of social criticism that promoted an explicit vision of socialism or communism.

Karl Marx clearly predicted the utopian speculations but he was skeptical of ethically inspired depictions of the future. At that time he believed that as most of the other utopian writers were trying to show not only the need to transcend the unjust society in the name of something better, but also the ways to accomplish that goal. Later he argued that for the existing society a lot more was required which was a far more exact account of how the prevailing society functioned. This could be necessary because the secret of the future society depends on its present function. Marx argued that according to Hegelian thought, once the individuals can understand the precise nature of the changes which come in a society and that the capitalist industrial society is forced upon its predecessors then only it would be possible to understand the forces which are growing within. These types of changes were mentioned as the free-market relations and the commodity form of production. This will put an impact on human labour, the factory system, sweeping together diverse populations into larger collectivities, the collapse of older social class formations into just two polarized classes, capitalist and proletariat. The last and final impact will be the existential foundations of the

revolutionary character of the proletariat and the class that would abolish itself in the process of unseating the capitalists from power. This will also give more impact on the society by making the class that will unlike all its other predecessors, would not re-establish political domination among other individuals that is to serve its own interests in future but that would gradually try to bring an end to all class system in human history.

During the exile period Horkheimer wrote about the critical theory by describing that 'one thing which this way of thinking has in common with fantasy is that an image of the future which springs indeed from a deep understanding of the present determines men's thoughts and actions even in periods when the course of events seems to be leading far away from such a future and seems to justify every reaction except belief in fulfillment. But in regard to the essential kind of change at which critical theory aims, there can be no corresponding concrete perception of it until it actually comes about. Marcuse also linked the idea of utopia to the human capacity for fantasy'. Horkheimer also expressed his views in his book on *Philosophy and Critical Theory* where he refers to the famous set of three questions. These three questions were also raised by another philosopher like Kant who had posed at the end of his *Critique of Pure Reason*. The three questions were described as 'What can I know? What should I do? and What may I hope? After going through these questions Marcuse comments that the critical theory is not the depiction of a future world, although the response of fantasy to such a challenge might not be as absurd as we are led to believe. If fantasy was set free to answer the fundamental philosophical questions asked by Kant then all of sociology would be terrified at their utopian character. And then also the answers will be that fantasy will be very close to the truth ... or it would determine the position of man on the basis of what he really can be tomorrow or in the future.

'During writing all these Horkheimer and Marcuse knew that they would have had the reality of their own circumstances which were in their mind. These two philosophers were among those who had fled for their lives from a regime that would have arrested, tortured, and killed them either for their thoughts or for their ethnicity, or both. As the power of fascism reduced from his own country, Marcuse reduced critical theory to its barest

essentials. Marcuse replied to the question on, 'What may I hope?' This pointed less to internal bliss and inner freedom than to the fulfillment of needs and wants. In a country where such type of future is a real possibility, fantasy is important in the task of holding the goal continuously. Marcuse never wavered in his adherence to this standpoint. Marcuse had total faith in fantasy which was closely connected to beliefs about art that existed in his critical theory. He survived with the disappointments that led his closest colleague, Max Horkheimer, to abandon it at the end of the Second World War.

The heroic period of the Frankfurt School was over as the Institute for Social Research was eventually re-established at the University of Frankfurt in 1951. The gap between Marcuse and his former colleagues is evident in discussions held in 1947 as to when and how to restart the Institute's main publication which was the Journal of Social Research. This publication was closed during their period of exile. After a long discussion Marcuse drafted a programmatic document referring to this text for Horkheimer in which he proposed that the theory must be adjusted to current circumstances and become more closely tied to practice. This theory will help for explorations of how the dream of the individuals for having a better future might be realized. This untitled document given by Marcuse also argues that after the war the world of nations is split into two divisions such as neo fascist and Soviet camps. He said that the remaining group of democratic liberal will be crushed between the two groups. Further, he said that it remains true to the vision that a society of free persons can only result from the actions of a revolutionary working class. This will happen because the society alone has the real power to abolish the existing relations of production and the entire apparatus that goes with it.

The document given by Marcuse also acknowledges that the working class of the time is not ready to play this role because its own needs and perceptions have become habituated to the structures of the existing capitalist society. Thus the traditional class antagonisms are frozen in place, and one cannot imagine any longer the possibility of a revolutionary consciousness arising spontaneously in the working class. This though was also shown by Marx and also had assumed in his writings. Therefore, Marcuse draws the logic as a conclusion that all this has confirmed the correctness of

the Leninist conception of the vanguard party as the subject of the revolution. Marcuse's project was nowhere at that point of time when his colleagues felt that this kind of analysis and a programme of studies was of no use. After four years when Horkheimer returned to Frankfurt institute Marcuse never received from him a firm offer of employment at the Institute and the University of Frankfurt. Marcuse crossed fifty years and till that time he had no permanent job. He hoped to get a call from his old institute to rejoin his old colleague. He did not receive any call from the institute and later he reluctantly accepted the offer of a faculty position at Brandeis University in 1954. After teaching in the Brandeis University he moved to the University of California which was in San Diego, in 1965. He spent his whole academic career in various universities of United States.

In his life time Marcuse does not appear to see the difficulties inherent in his hopes for autonomy and the unity of subject and object. He never tried to prove that rational freedom would be conducive to happiness or otherwise desirable. However, he is sensitive to charges that he is utopian in his dreams of moral, communistic men rationally controlling the world and achieving fulfillment. He responds to various charges put on him by channeling discussion in two directions. These two directions are:

- Firstly, he says that the vision of perpetual pleasure is made to seem Utopian by the painful reality of work and the common sense knowledge that man will have to toil all his days to make "a living. He does not look into other arguments which could be based on the nature of the appetites themselves, arguments epitomized by Plato's comparison of the intemperate life to an effort to keep a leaky jar filled. He probably would answer such objections by saying that the jar could be kept filled by adjusting the rate of influx to the rate of draining and that the only significant question then would be how much work would be necessary to keep the two rates equal.
- Secondly, Marcuse sees no reason at all to doubt that people could subject the world to fore sight if they wished but he does admit that human wickedness is a barrier to rationality and communism. As a Freudian, he conceives of

this problem as that of man's aggressiveness and he knows that Freud considered aggressiveness an indestructible feature of human nature. This led Freud to attack the ideal of a moral, collective existence in which ill will and hostility would disappear among men as an untenable illusion. Marcuse, naturally, does not agree. He maintains that neither aggressiveness nor the necessities of work are insurmountable obstacles to freedom. He thinks that both problems have been solved in principle and that they only appear insoluble today because common sense has not awakened to the genuine possibility of a new reality.

Some of the political thinkers described the work of Herbert Marcuse such as, Lukes who goes wrong by failing to situate Marcuse's work as a whole within the problematic of Marxism and critical theory, while Reitz correctly grounds much of Marcuse's work in his Marxism and critical theory, but argues that there are moments of an idealist aesthetics and ontology of art in contradiction to Marcuse's more sociological and political takes on art. The idealist, utopian, and ontological moments of Marcuse's analysis should be read in the framework of the critical theory of society that informed his work from the 1930s until his death.

ACTIVITY

Compare views of Marcuse with that of Karl Marx.

Did You Know?

Marcuse published his final work *The Aesthetic Dimension* in 1979 on the role of high art in the process of what he termed 'emancipation' from bourgeois society.

1.8 SUMMARY

In this unit, you have learnt that:

- Herbert Marcuse's engagement with art and aesthetic theory was a major concern of his work that generated many important contributions to aesthetics, cultural studies and critical social theory.
- In his dialectical vision, critical theory was to delineate both forms of domination and oppression and possibilities of hope and liberation.
- For Herbert Marcuse, culture and arts played an important role in shaping forces of domination, as well as generating possibilities of liberation.
- Marcuse's work is part of a historical and dialectical tradition of critical theory that is to be appropriated, worked through, developed and taken up in new directions and with new positions and ideas in evolving historical situations which was seen in the case of Marc use's own work.
- Marcuse described or imagined for advanced industrial society as an all encompassing system of repression that subdued argument and debate, and also absorbed opposition. As mentioned earlier his hopes rested not with the proletariat, but with the marginalized groups such as students, ethnic minorities, women and the countries of the third world.
- It is clearly stated that, Marcuse was a great a thinker and activist which was also accepted by his colleagues in the Frankfurt School because like them he never gave up from his own thoughts and ideas.
- Marcuse struggled for more than thirty years, but he never ceased reinterpreting and reconfiguring the critical theory of society.
- By adopting the critical theory of society Marcuse had a single aim in his mind to track the obscure path to the socialist utopia through the latest transformations in capitalist societies in an era marked by an astonishing rise in material wealth.

1.9 KEY TERMS

- Heideggerian Marxism:** The term which was earlier adopted by Herbert Marcuse. This is a philosophy which Heidegger has written about Marxism at that time
- Critical Theory:** According to Herbert Marcuse critical theory is mainly to concern with human happiness, and the conviction that it can be attained only through a transformation of the material conditions of existence
- Denazification:** Social process of removing Nazis from official positions and giving up any allegiance to Nazism
- Vicissitudes:** A change of circumstances or fortune
- Empiricism:** The view that experience, especially of the senses, is the only source of knowledge
- Phenomenological:** A philosophy or method of inquiry based on the premise that reality consists of objects and events as they are perceived
- Ontologist:** One who studies the philosophical study of the nature of being

1.10 ANSWERS TO 'CHECK YOUR PROGRESS'

1. Fill in the blanks:
 - (a) 1898
 - (b) theorist
2. Marcuse's best known works are *Eros and Civilization* which was published in 1958 and *One-Dimensional Man* which was published in 1964.
3. His support for the revolts of the students was based on the hope that they would become an integral part of the struggle for freedom later waged by the subversive majority. Marcuse was totally clear that the students' movements itself was not revolutionary but believed that it was certainly a revolutionary expression and a possible prelude to revolutionary action. He supported the students' revolts because he believed that the students voicing their criticism of the society will soon take place as political and social forces in the society and then this protest will increase, and progressively acquire power which will bring

radical change.

4.Fill in the blanks:

(a) Observable

(b) Scientific development

5.*One Dimensional Man* was published in 1964.

6.In his book *Eros and Civilization* in 1966, Marcuse has given a blue print of society where alienation will be removed and freedom will be restored. The democratic community will be the place where work will become play, and the necessary labour will be organized in harmony with liberated and authentic individual needs.

7.State whether true or false:

(a) True

(b) False

(c) False

(d) True

(e) False

(f) true

1.11 QUESTIONS AND EXERCISES

Short-Answer Questions

- 1.What do you understand by positivism?
- 2.Why Marcuse was called as the guru of student revolution?
- 3.Write a brief note on the life of Herbert Marcuse.

Long-Answer Questions

1. Describe Marcuse's most famous book *One Dimensional Man*.
- 2.Discuss Marcuse *Critical Theory of Society*,
3. Marcuse continued to maintain throughout his life that Heidegger was the greatest teacher and thinker that he had ever encountered. Explain why?

1.12 FURTHER READING

Herbert Marcuse. 1998. *Technology, War and Fascism*. London: Routledge.

Alain Martineau. 1986. *Herbert Marcuse's Utopia*. Montreal: Harvest House.

Balme, D.M.Aristotle. 2002. *Historia Animalium*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Coleman, Janet. 2000. *A History of Political Thought*. New Delhi: Wiley- Blackwell.

Grube, G.M.A, C.D.C., Reeve. 1992. *Plato: Republic*. Indianapolis: Hackett Pub. Co.

Grube, G.M.A, 1980. *Plato's Thought*. Cambridge: Hackett Pub Co Inc.

Miller, David, Janet Coleman, William Connolly et.al. 1991. *The Blackwell Encyclopedia of Political Thought*. New Delhi: Wiley-Blackwell.

Shields, Christopher. Aristotle. 2007. New York: Routledge.

Strauss, Leo, and Joseph Cropsey. 1987. *A History of Political Philosophy*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Wolff, Jonathan. 2006. *An Introduction to Political Philosophy*. New Delhi: Oxford University Press.

UNIT 2

LIBERALISM: Friedrich August Von Hayek, John Rawls

Structure

- 2.0 Introduction
- 2.1 Unit Objectives
- 2.2 F.A. von Hayek
- 2.3 Hayek and Neo-liberalism
- 2.4 Hayek on Democracy
- 2.5 Hayek on Freedom and Liberty
- 2.6 Hayek on Social Justice
- 2.7 Hayek and Conservatism
- 2.8 Liberal Perspective-Rawls' Theory of Justice
 - 2.8.1 Development of the Normative Perspectives
 - 2.8.2 Origin of Justice
 - 2.8.3 Kinds of Justice
 - 2.8.4 Categories of Justice: Social, Economic and Political
 - 2.8.5 Marxist Theory of Justice
 - 2.8.6 Relation of Justice with Liberty, Equality and Fraternity
 - 2.8.7 Formation of Justice with Special Reference to Rawls Theory of Justice
- 2.9 Feminist and Subaltern Perspectives of Justice
- 2.10 Rawls and Deliberative Democracy
- 2.11 Rawls and Political Liberty
- 2.12 Summary
- 2.13 Key Terms
- 2.14 Answers to 'Check Your Progress'
- 2.15 Questions and Exercises
- 2.16 Further Reading

2.0 INTRODUCTION

This unit explores the intersection of economic liberty and social order by examining the intellectual legacy of Friedrich Hayek alongside the foundational concept of justice. As a "Renaissance man" of the twentieth century and a central figure of the Austrian School, Hayek's work in economics and political philosophy emphasizes that true social stability emerges not from government planning, but from individual freedom. This freedom, however, operates within the framework of "justice"—a term rooted in the Latin *jungere*, meaning to bind or tie together. By tracing justice from its classical origins in Aristotelian thought and Roman law to the modern debates sparked by John Rawls and Marxist theory, this unit will analyze how different societies attempt to balance the distribution of rights, duties, and rewards to create a fair and functioning order.

2.1 UNIT OBJECTIVES

After going through this unit, you will be able to:

- Discuss the life and times of E. A. von Hayek
- Explain neo-liberalism of Hayek
- Discuss Hayek's belief in democracy and the democratic system
- State the importance of liberty and freedom for human beings according to Hayek
- Describe Hayek's views on social justice
- Describe the normative concepts of justice
- List the sources and kinds of justice
- Explain social, economic and political justice
- State the Marxist theory of justice
- Analyse the relation of justice with liberty, equality and fraternity
- Discuss the formation of justice with special reference to Rawls' theory of justice

2.2 F.A. VON HAYEK - LIFE SKETCH

Life Sketch

Friedrich August von Hayek was born in Vienna on 8 May 1899 to a distinguished family of Viennese intellectuals. He was the son of August von Hayek, a doctor in the municipal health service. Hayek's grandfathers were prominent academics working in the fields of statistics and biology. After 1919, titles of nobility were banned by law in Austria, and the 'von Hayek' family became simply the Hayek family. Hence, after 1919, Hayek's legal name became 'Friedrich Hayek', not 'Friedrich von Hayek'. He was the eldest son amongst three. His paternal line had been raised to the ranks of the Bohemian nobility for its services to the state. Similarly, a generation before his maternal forebears had also been raised to the lower noble rank.

In 1917, Hayek joined the artillery regiment of the Austro Hungarian Army and fought from the Italian side. He was a spotter in an aeroplane. During the war, Hayek damaged his left ear that left him with a hearing defect. He honoured for bravery. Hayek survived the 1918 flu pandemic during this time.

Hayek was second cousin to the philosopher Ludwig Wittgenstein from his mother's side. As a result of their relationship, Hayek became the first reader of Wittgenstein's *Tractatus Logico Philosophicus* when the book was published in German edition in 1921. Hayek had met Wittgenstein only on few occasions. He said that Wittgenstein's philosophy and his methods of analysis had a huge influence on his life and thought. Hayek recalled a discussion of philosophy with Wittgenstein in his later years when both were officers during the First World War. After the death of Wittgenstein, Hayek wanted to write the biography of Wittgenstein and worked on collecting his family materials. On his father's suggestion, Hayek read the genetic and evolutionary works of Hugo de Vries and the philosophical works of Ludwig Feuerbach.

In school Hayek was impressed by the lectures on Aristotle's ethics. He was influenced by these lectures which helped him in his writings later.

In October 1921, Hayek met Ludwig von Mises, a very important person in his life. At that time Mises was a financial adviser at the Chamber of Commerce. Mises was known as a famous and respected economist at that time. He had written a book *The Theory of Money and Credit* which was published in 1912. In his book he described how government expansion of money and credit caused inflation. At that time Hayek was searching for a job and Mises helped him to get one. He started his job with a salary of 5,000 old kronen per month. After nine months his salary increased to a million old kronen per month. This happened after an effort was made to maintain the purchasing power amidst Austria's post war inflation.

Later, Hayek decided to pursue an academic career, determined to help avoid the mistakes that had led to the war. Hayek said about his experience in his own words, 'The decisive influence was really World War I. It's bound to draw your attention to the problems of political organization'. He vowed to work for a better world. He studied in the University of Vienna and earned doctorate degrees in law and political science in 1921 and 1923 respectively. Hayek joined the University at the age of 19 just after the First World War. The University of Vienna was one of the three best places in the world to study economics followed by Stockholm and Cambridge in England. First he joined as a student of law, but was interested to study economics and psychology. Therefore, later he also studied other subjects like philosophy, psychology and economics. In February 1931, Hayek had arrived in England to deliver a series of lectures at the London School of Economics. Hayek met Helen Berta Maria von Fritsch at Abrechnungsamt, a secretary at the civil service office where Hayek worked. Hayek liked her and they decided to get married. They got married in the summer of 1926. They had two children named Christina Maria Felicitas and Lorenz Josef Heinrich. After his marriage Hayek decided to continue his studies. As at that time the University of Vienna was closed for sometime Hayek studied in Constantin von Monakow's Institute of Brain Anatomy, where Hayek spent much of his time staining brain cells. Hayek's time in Monakow's lab, and his deep interest in the work of Ernst Mach, inspired Hayek's first intellectual project which was eventually published as *The Sensory Order* in 1952. It located connective learning at the physical and neurological levels, rejecting the 'sense data' associationism of the empiricists and logical positivists. Hayek presented his work in a private seminar that he had created with Herbert Furth called the Geistkreis. He divorced Helen in

July 1950 and married Helene Bitterlich just a few weeks later. Hayek moved to Arkansas in order to take advantage of permissive divorce laws. Hayek did not believe in religion and he was an agnostic.

During his years at the University of Vienna, Carl Menger's work on the explanatory strategy of social science and Friedrich von Wieser's commanding presence in the classroom left a lasting impression on Hayek. After his examinations, on Wieser's recommendation Hayek was hired by Ludwig von Mises as a specialist for the Austrian government working on the legal and economic details of the Treaty of Saint Germain. He worked as a research assistant to Prof. Jeremiah Jenks of New York University between 1923 and 1924. His work was to compile data on macroeconomics of American economy and the operations of the U. S. Federal Reserve.

In 1962, Hayek got a call from the University of Freiburg to join the faculty of economics and to teach economic policy which he accepted. He did not acquire the chairmanship which was in the hands of a former faculty Eucken. He mainly wanted to join the university to be a part of an unforgettable heritage of Walter Eucken. Hayek became the president of Walter Eucken Institute which was founded in 1954 and later became the honorary president of the institute.

Hayek was an academician who taught at the London School of Economics and the Universities of Chicago, Freiburg and Salzburg. Hayek was awarded the Nobel Prize for economics in 1974. After he got his Nobel Prize his interest in Austrian school got suddenly revived. As an exponent of Austrian school, he was a firm believer in individualism and market order, and an implacable critic of socialism.

After Hayek came back to Austria, Mises helped him to join the Institute for Business Cycle Research where he became the first director. In the beginning, Hayek started the institute without any official staff and later on the institute was funded by the Rockefeller Foundation. Later in Central Europe the institute was recognized as a leading centre for the study of economics. Hayek and the institute primarily prepared studies on

economic conditions in Austria and central Europe for the League of Nations. Hayek moved to London in September 1931. Oskar Morgenstern took over as the director of the institute and he remained in this position till the Nazi annexation of Austria. In 1938, the Institute ceased to operate as an independent organization.

Lionel Robbins, the economics professor of London School of Economics, impressed by Hayek's work on the causes of economic depressions invited him to his university to deliver guest lectures and later Hayek joined the institute as a full time professor. Hayek was introduced as an English speaking economist who believed that a depression was the consequence of a prior inflation of money and credit. Hayek was an academician at the London School of Economics till 1949. At that time he published many important writings that established his international stature as one of the leading economists of his time. During this period he became the greatest challenge to the emerging New Economics of Keynes. He published many books such as *Prices and Production* and *Monetary Theory and the Trade Cycle*. He has also published a series of articles which were reprinted in 1939. His articles were reprinted under the title *Profits, Interest and Investment* and *The Pure Theory of Capital*. Hayek in his theory of business cycle argued that business cycles had their origin in the mismanagement of the monetary system. He also wrote a lengthy two part review of Keynes's Treatise on Money for the journal called *Economica*. In this review, Hayek explained his theory and emerged as a critique of Keynes's work. It was in this period, when Hayek applied his thinking about central planning to current politics.

The famous book, *Road of Serfdom* written in 1944, was a pioneering work that attacked economic interventionism. In this book he has warned of the danger of tyranny that inevitably results from government control of economic decision making through central planning. In the book his message was clear and he said that the systems like Nazism and fascism were not the only threats to liberty. Many people read this book and know about his ideas. The later works of Hayek were: *The Constitution of Liberty* written in 1960, and *Law, Legislation and Liberty* written in 1979 developed themes in political philosophy. His writings had considerable impact on the emergent New Right. Hayek was specialist in business cycle theory which was recognized as his early work on industrial

fluctuations and modern information theorists. Hayek's work is also famous for his writings on political philosophy, legal theory and psychology. He was a widely influential person in Austria because he has given importance on spontaneous order and his work on complex systems. The famous scholars and philosophers have given special credit to Hayek's other works which were on technical economics, particularly on capital and the business cycle, which were citing a tension between some of Hayek's and Mises's views on the social order. In mid-1970s, Hayek himself attended the conference which was organized at the Institute for Humane Studies. He continued his writing and wrote a book on *The Fatal Conceit* at the age of 89.

He died on 23 March 1992, at the age of 92 in Freiburg, Germany. He was living there since he left Chicago in 1961. His funeral was conducted by Father Johannes Schasching and was attended by hundreds of people. Hayek was buried in Neustift, a cemetery overlooking the Vienna Woods.

2.3 HAYEK AND NEOLIBERALISM

Friedrich A. von Hayek is undoubtedly one of the most significant liberal thinkers of the past century. He was also known as the most important classical liberal political economist of the twentieth century. Hayek comes across as a more conservative type of neoliberal who while approximating at many places a utilitarian argument in favour of neo liberalism and bases his political thought on an idea of natural law. In Hayek's theory it is the notion of a 'spontaneous order' of social life, which is better than any kind of artificially created order when it comes to securing individual liberty and well being.

One could more easily identify, however, some of the common varieties of liberalism and liberal thought. One frequently encountered distinction between classical and modern types of liberalism. Classical liberalism is associated with earlier liberals such as the already mentioned famous political philosophers John Locke and Adam Smith. In addition, he names Alexis de Tocqueville from the nineteenth century, and Friedrich von Hayek from the twentieth century, as belonging to the tradition of classical liberalism.

Adam Smith, the famous economist of twentieth century, defined liberal tradition as minimal concept of the state and Hayek has given the continuity and support to this liberal tradition. The liberal tradition's special contribution refers to the radical criticism which is towards the idea of social justice. According to him this concept is a disguise to protect corporate interests from the middle class. This concept promotes the elimination of public, social and economic interventions. According to Adam Smith, the minimal state is a way to escape from the power of the middle class that controls the democratic process and this will give the aim of obtaining redistribution of wealth through the public treasury. He has mentioned this programme mainly to eliminate ruling, to privatize, to decrease the amount's of programmes to fight unemployment, which would help to eliminate subsidies to housing and also to control the rents, to reduce the expenditures in social security and finally to limit the power of trade unions. He said that the state must not ensure any type of redistribution which will further serve the criteria of social justice.

He has tried to provide a legal framework which will give guarantees for elementary rules of exchange. He also suggested the elimination of the nationalization of the currency and also the privatization of national central banks to submit the monetary production to the world market. This statement was given by him in 1967. At that time this stand showed that it offered different tonalities of socialism. His position was an attempt to provide different perspectives to the radicalism which is embedded in his liberalism. For this Hayek has given an example, which refers to the creation of a minimal income, but the proposal should be seen as a rehabilitation of the British law for indigents and not for a peculiarity of a so called Hayekian type of socialism.

Hayek has developed the theory based on his belief and shared by all the liberals. The liberal who shared and supported this theory was from the classics and also included other scholars who favoured the Austrian thesis. According to Adam Smith's Theory, the symbol of invisible hand ensures a proper relation between offer and demand in various markets. This perfectly illustrates the common believe which many people try to demonstrate by using different theories. The different theories are the general equilibrium of Walras, spontaneous

order in the market or catalaxy according to Austrian school which was developed by Pareto. These theories are natural; it is not something the individuals want and is not planned in the market or anywhere else.

The Hayekian concept on the economy is used to justify the criticism for interventionism which was shown as a generator of imbalances and problems of cataplexy. Hayek considers that the Keynesians transform the state into an economic director. It is clear that the political philosophy of Hayek is very close to the thesis which was developed by John Locke. According to Hayek the state defends the natural right of the property and it is also limited by individualist clauses which was in its nature a hypothetical founding of the contract.

According to him the law is transformed into a protecting instrument which was a spontaneous order in the market. This was basically important to defend economic liberalism. The democratic ideas helped in provoking Hayek's statements. According to Hayek, democracy does not constitute an infallible political system: it is essentially a means, a utility procedure to safeguard internal peace and also individual freedom. He also said that it is preferable to have a non-democratic regime than a planning democracy. He preferred the non-democratic regime because it could guarantee the natural order of the market towards the society. Hayek thought that this is a mixture of liberalism and conservatism. This was an initiative to give importance against unlimited democracy which leads to unavoidable totalitarian democracy.

Although Hayek was trained as a technical economist, his main work and interest was extended well beyond the discipline of economics. In fact, the most productive reading of Hayek's work is as an interconnected research programme of 'political economy' that overlaps the disciplines of economics, politics and law. As Gordon described in his notes, that Hayek's writings on these matters or disciplines are unequalled in profundity, historical scholarship and current relevance.

Hayek was passionate towards people who were mainly from the medium

classes and who were holding control on the democratic regimes. In his words he said that there is some truth in the formula of fascism and National Socialism which are in its nature a sort of medium level class socialism. He was afraid that this concept was poor since the right reaction could not be seen in the society. Hayek was always in favour of the minimum income for individuals although it was only in the interest of those who are pretending to be protected. Hayek had rejected the idea of social justice which had a special notion on justice that is the liberal aspect while he remained a conservative.

Classical liberalism is associated with the belief that the state ought to be minimal. It means that practically everything except armed forces, law enforcement and other non-excludable goods ought to be left to the free dealings of its citizens and the organizations as they freely choose to establish and take part in it. The state where classical liberalism is adopted is sometimes described as night watchman state. This was the sole purpose of the minimal state which is to uphold the most fundamental aspects of public order. Some of the scholars who wrote about classical liberalism, such as John Locke, say that the state is a teely established association between individuals. The members of this association have a justified cause for rebellion if the state seizes more power than what has been originally ceded to it by its citizens. Classical liberalism has the tendency to favour laissez faire economic policies which portrayed as leading proponents of neo-liberalism. Later the classical liberals of twentieth century such as Hayek are however hardly distinguishable from the libertarians. Even if some of the economist of Austrian school insists on describing themselves as a proponent of classical liberalism then also at the same time accusing mainstream liberals of advocating 'a programme that only in details differ from the totalitarianism of the socialists'. The Liberal egalitarians always share the traditional liberal views that have various legitimate goals and ideals and also have commercial freedom which is merely one of these goals. The liberal egalitarianism is a word which indicates that liberal egalitarians would like to see equality as well as liberty which places them alongside other modem liberals. The liberal egalitarianism is politically towards the left of classical liberals and libertarians alike.

In his writings Hayek comes across as a more conservative type of neoliberal. His political thoughts were based on the idea of natural law which was based on his utilitarian arguments in

favour of neoliberalism. Hayek's main theory is based on the notion which is in a spontaneous order. He discussed about the social life in a society, which is better than any kind of artificially created order when it comes to the rights of individual liberty and their well beings.

Hayek's radical ideas are mainly against his attacks on economic interventionism which is not easy to understand unless an individual cannot go back to the historical period of the post war time. He said that the drafting of a new version of liberalism always belongs to a total criticism of Keynesianism. As already mentioned earlier, Hayek was inspired by the economic thinking of Mises, and in his thinking he rejects Marxism and also economic intervention in the capitalist societies. He also supports the ideas of Mises of criticizing the possibility of planning the economic system in a society because its complexity is opposed to any rational estimate. If it is seen properly then Hayek's thinking on third democratic and social way is similar to Roosevelt's new deal and British labourite. This thinking explains the marginalization of ultra liberals which was seen in the fifties especially within the most powerful organizations which are based on anti-communist.

Hayek was known as the critique of socialism. His criticism on competition had effectively undermined the legitimacy of liberal institutions among the people in a society and also especially among the intellectual scholars. According to Hayek, liberalism imparted a healthy suspicion of any argument that demanded restrictions on the competitive market of the society. The competitive market system was criticized and the socialist theory had swept away the liberal restrictions against the special pleading and opened the door for interests groups emerged in the society which were demanding protection from competition under the socialist planning system.

Hayek has also given another important aspect in his book *The Road to Serfdom*. He said that the liberal propositions such as economic freedom and political freedom are always linked with each other. He argued that the economic control does not control the society in a pure sense. He said in his words that:

'A sector of human life which can be separated from the rest; it is the control of the means for all ends. And whoever has some control of the means must also determine which ends are to be served, which values are to be rated higher and which lower in short, what men should believe and strive for. Central planning means that the economic problem is to be solved by the community instead of by the individual; but this involves that it must be the community, or rather its representatives, who must decide the relative importance of the different needs. '

Hayek has shown that the government is unable to engage in the economic calculation and for that the result was a failure and it was unable to achieve the ultimate target which was desired by the central planner in a society. When the society faced this type of problem Hayek asked the government official to implement another potential option which was to adopt liberal economic policies. Hayek argued that as already the liberalism has criticized the socialists of that period, the government officials were going to face sufficient interventions in the ongoing system and for this they have to take a reverse course to adopt liberal economic policies. For this he said that, the government officials should expect more interventions to correct the past failure. This is the basis for the arguments which is known as slippery slope where some initial intervention increase its future interventions and it attempts to bring remedy to the past failures.

He said that even the liberal socialists are opposed by collectivists in their desire to plan the economy. He also said that they must establish the institution of discretionary planning and grant authority to the planners to exercise their political power in order to accomplish the task which was assigned to them. The task for planning an economic system for the society is very complex and for this it required proper planners who must have unlimited discretion.

Many scholars thought that Hayek holds a radically individualistic view of man, but the judgment given by him was premature. As later on it is clear that, Hayek goes far in emphasizing individual's dependence on the society and their need to understand individual's

actions in a social relationship. He said that individuals always experience other persons in their concreteness and individuality but they never detach from their qualities as a social being. For this Hayek understands that an individual is a deliberate concept derived from social man and the social context of human life. Hayek wanted to establish that freedom is essential for individuals to fulfill all their needs and also to face the arbitrary coercion by the government. It is said that the involvement of human beings in society and their membership in a particular community also raise vital issue of coercion and for this Hayek says that by defining freedom, he wants to defer consideration of above mentioned issues which he will achieve by abstracting the social and communal relations of a human being. Hayek's insistence on the social character of human life helps him to understand the liberal tradition and his own place in society. Hayek forcefully rejects the rationalist understanding of the individual and the society which was identified as the original and primary aspect of liberalism by many renowned scholars. Hayek has characterized the rationalist theory which was same as the ideas of John Locke and also some aspect of Bentham's utilitarianism. According to rationalists the idea of natural liberty mainly insists on freedom which is the birthright of each individual. They cannot conceive of anything for serving a human purpose that has not been consciously designed.

In Hayek's opinion these types of teaching is dangerous for the individuals. The individuals will fail to recognize the limits of the reason and also the social dimension of liberty. Hayek has tried to draw an anti-rationalist or empiricist evolutionary principles to make his own liberal principles. These aspects grew out of English common laws, Scottish 'moral philosophy and the reflections of parliamentarians such as the famous Edmund Burke. This exposition helped Hayek to get an opportunity to bring out the social side of human life. The anti-rationalist did not favour that human beings are born free or freedom is man's birth right. They said that human beings lived in the society from the beginning and the society was build around the family. According to their understanding civilization was not the outcome of rational design and freedom could develop only after the civilization was under control and check.

When Hayek refers or talks about 'classical liberalism,' he means the form in the

nineteenth century, after the anti-rationalism of thinkers such' as Hume, Adam Smith and Burke became widely influential. Hayek's main aim was to recover and restate classical liberalism as thus understood. Besides, emphasizing on the social dimension of human life, the classical liberalism also developed ideas about markets. This concept is already given by Adam Smith and other evolutionists. Therefore classical liberalism or neo liberalism did not envision uncontrolled individualism or complete laissez faire which was a doctrine that belongs to the French rationalist tradition. This was never defended or discussed by any of the English classical economists.

2.4 HAYEK ON DEMOCRACY

Hayek regarded democracy as the best and practical form of government as long as the majority of the community is committed to individual liberty, the Rule of Law and limited government. Democracy is not primarily a way of life but are procedures for organizing and operating a government. There are no particular and set ends or beliefs that are essential to a democratic rule. By conceding that the majority of a community may follow any set of core beliefs, Hayek is left with no basis for opposing totalitarian democracies on democratic grounds.

Before discussing democracy, Hayek has sought to clarify the relation between the two doctrines such as democracy and liberalism by pointing the fact that they are already concerned with different issues. The term liberalism is concerned with the function of government, particularly with the limitation of all its powers. On the other hand, democracy is concerned with the question as to who is direct government. If the issues were divided into two questions such as -What government should do and what are the limits of a government? Second, how government should be organized? At this time liberalists will focus their attention towards the first question but the advocates of democracy will focus on the second one. This shows that the two aspects are different from each other and they neglecting some aspects about the governmental procedure in each sphere.

Hayek tried to reconcile liberalism and democracy into one in his famous book *The Constitution of Liberty*. The problem about the concept of liberalism in this book

is shown as human liberty or freedom and how this will protect and extend by setting limits to the governmental system. On the other hand democracy as described by many theorists is often practiced to subordinate liberty for the search of equality. Hayek says that the democratic government can be established in different ways. He is quite unclear about the ideas and arrangement in the beginning. He said that the idea of majority rule presupposes some collectivity within which this rule will take place. He said that any group can be the decision making authority for the majority of members but it is not necessary that every group is important for the political life. Hayek has adopted different ways to identify politically relevant groups such as state, country, and society but he has given importance to community. Hayek assigns most of the power to the community and has also given an important role in the political life. He explains in his own words that the authority of democratic decision rests on it being made by the majority in a community whose members are together by common beliefs. The community is created by those members who accept some common principles in their life. Hayek always insisted that the majority rule must depend on the community's common beliefs or their principles. The majority rule cannot override them and for this reason it is essential that the majority rulers submit their common principles to the community. The main point in this given by Hayek is that the power of the majority rule is limited and they don't have any legitimate power in their hands.

According to Hayek, dependence towards the community raises two problems which are important. First, in what sense does the majority of a community make the important decision in a democratic system? Second, does this process make any difference to the beliefs of a community? For these questions Rousseau the famous philosopher insists that a community must retain all the lawmaking power in its hands and they should not give this power to anyone else. They can only distribute or delegate the power of government or the executive power. Like Rousseau, Hayek has also differentiated between lawmaking and governing power of a state. He also praised Rousseau because he has given a clear understanding that the laws must be general in form for every human being. Hayek is always critical in his views which include his insistence that the law is an act of will by the community. But most of the majoritarian believe that the conception of democracy offers still another way to understand the majority rule. Unlike Rousseau, these conceptions give

legislative power to the representative legislature which holds that the elected representatives should enact the specific policies which will be supported by the majority of a community. The law will be prepared by the people's representatives but the law's direction is determined by the majority of people's opinion in the community.

In Hayek's case it is essential to know that whether he is talking about majority rule by the community or by the legislative body of the government. If it will be seen that in a liberal and a democratic form of government the decisions for the state is taken by the majority. Hayek accepted this procedure but in his description he did not mention about the level or levels at which the majority rule should take place. Hayek mainly thought that the formation of majority opinion will be created in the community itself and the majority rule will guide or direct various actions of the government. He had complete understanding that the majority opinion in the community is always binding on the government. In ancient times the liberal tradition had identified many alternative forms of government but Hayek has followed the liberal tradition in these respects. He classifies the governments mainly according to their limited or arbitrary forms which help to bring the form of rule into second position. He also said that for him it is not essential that who is governing the state but what is the responsibility of the government towards the state is the main concern. According to Hayek, a limited government is one which always uses the coercive power and it is constrained by general rules that are well established and also effective. For defining arbitrary government Hayek says that it is the state where political rule are not constrained by law. The arbitrary government in all its form always endangered the liberty of the people in a state. Hayek has his own views about majority rule and he says that it will be consistent with the community's common beliefs or principles, but in the beginning he leaves the content of those beliefs and principles. If we will take this stand point of Hayek then if the community believes in these aspects then it is clear that democracy is consistent with fascism or with totalitarian democracy. It certainly is consistent with socialism because the opinion of the community decides what every individual shall receive and the same authority has the power to decide what they shall do to receive those things. This shows that the community is detaching democracy from its main principles and that it would lead to oppression. Hayek offers two ways to solve this problem. The first solution is that the majority decisions should take the form of general rule. For understanding

this, he says that though democracy constraints individuals or human beings only through the means of general rules of its own making it has the power to control the power of coercion. It is dangerous for the democratic form to go beyond the ends to achieve something else because this will extend the discretionary power of the administrators. For this he says that the individuals have little fear for any general laws which the majority may pass in the state but the individuals have many reasons to fear the rulers because he may be given the charge to implement its directions. Hayek says that under this solution an individual has a way for constraining government by general rules or laws for protecting freedom despite the opinions or beliefs that are retained by the community and voiced by the majority. The second solution is to encourage those beliefs or opinions that are favourable towards liberty. An individual may profoundly respect the convention that the majority view should prevail in collective action but this may not mean that one should not make any effort to alter it. Hayek has given a long view on how opinions are formed in democratic communities and especially how the ideas of the political philosophers or scholars influence the public opinion in the long run. He says that making democracy safe for the liberty or freedom is primarily an important task. According to him, democratic government has yet to learn that in order to be just it may be guided in its action by general principles. Hayek has mentioned these principles through his teaching in his book the *Rule of Law and Limited Government*. Again *The Constitution of Liberty* which is an educational enterprise, Hayek designed to shape belief and opinion in a democratic age. Hayek is much more supportive to democracy in his book on *The Constitution of Liberty* and also in *Law, Legislation and Liberty*. In the previous one he attributes democracy's excesses mostly to the lack of understanding towards the solution on education. But later Hayek believed that democracy had changed into unlimited or arbitrary government. This is mainly turned into some kind of a game in which the government tries to maintain majority coalition by fulfilling the demands of huge number of people for their interest. This made him develop institutional means for limiting the majority rule, which he incorporated into a model constitution.

2.5 HAYEK ON FREEDOM AND LIBERTY

Hayek starts by defining the State of liberty or freedom in his famous book *The Constitution of Liberty*. He said in his own words that 'we are concerned in this book with that condition of men in which coercion of some by others is reduced as much as is possible in society'. F.A. Hayek argued that a man possesses liberty or freedom when he is not subjected to coercion by the arbitrary will of another. According to him this is the essence of individual freedom which should not be confused with any other meaning of freedom. Hayek's understanding on freedom mainly belongs to individual human beings.

There are many reasons why Hayek thinks that freedom is mainly concerned with individuals. The reasons are mentioned below:

- Human beings are able to choose, think and act. This is because an individual is primarily applicable to think about the concept of freedom. Hayek realized that human beings raise difficult questions about the individual's own capacity to choose anything on his own without any difficulties. But for defining the concept of freedom, it suffices to consider only external impediments to action as they might arise not from nature, but from other human beings.
- Hayek also gives his views that freedom must be defined by always referring to individuals. He believes that he is rediscovering the earlier understanding of freedom when he defines it as the state in which a man is not just involved as subject to coercion by the arbitrary will of another or others.

After going through Hayek's views on freedom it can be said that this definition resembles the earliest distinction between slaves and free men which was defined by the ancient philosophers. The earlier political thinkers have also been affirmed by the best modern proponents of liberty, who insist on a free private sphere. Hayek defined freedom by giving clear rules and also which was protected from arbitrary coercion, through which the individual can fulfill his own aims by not violating the freedom of others. Hayek admits that in the

society he is trying to pursue a negative view of freedom among individuals but this will only help to give a positive view of freedom. This will show positive character through the use of freedom that all individuals can exercise further.

- A society cannot exist and also cannot act freely without giving freedom or liberty to the individuals. For this Hayek argues his views on this concept and says that for having a free society the exercise of freedom is essential for all. Hayek accepts that freedom has acquired meanings that are quite different from the one which he refers earlier. Hayek says that individual freedom should not be similar to political freedom. He said that by exercising freedom individuals are able to understand their rights towards government. They can participate in the governmental process such as in legislation or for controlling the administrative system. He also said that the popular consent and participation won't necessarily secure individual freedom and may work against it.

Hayek also describes that individual freedom is not to be understood as exercising freely or choosing someone's day-to-day life. In defining a condition of freedom, the question is whether others can impose their will. Hayek insists on his thought that liberty and responsibility cannot be separated. The term liberty requires that the individual 'must bear the consequences of his actions' . The individual cannot exercise liberty without having responsibility and the individuals would be able to learn from their experiences and enjoy personal growth. Moreover, a free society will not function or maintain itself unless the individuals exercise the rights which occupy the position that results from his action and accept it as the repercussion of his own action. Scientific determinism teaches, however, that actions result not from one's own free choice, but from circumstances beyond one's control and many believe that this scientific teaching has destroyed the basis for individual responsibility.

Hayek particularly sought to contrast individual freedom with three other meanings of freedom - political freedom, inner freedom and freedom as power.

- Firstly, the political freedom denotes participation of men in the choice of their government, in the process of legislation and also in the control of administration. This is not similar to individual freedom. Thus in this regard, Hayek argues that a non-democratic order may be permissive and a democratic order may be restrictive. Hence, the political freedom is neither necessary nor a sufficient condition of freedom.
- Secondly, the inner freedom denotes the extent to which a person is guided in his action but his own considered will rather than by momentary impulse or circumstance. It stands opposed not to coercion by others but to moral weakness or the influence of passing emotions. Hence it is different from individual freedom.
- Thirdly, freedom as power signifies the power to satisfy our wishes, or the extent of the choice of alternatives open to us. There is a vital difference between non interference with another's act and a person's effective power to act. A person may be able to do what he may not lawfully do, or unable to do what nobody is trying to prevent him from doing. Hence, freedom as power should not be confused with individual freedom.

Hayek insists on preserving the original meaning of the word 'freedom', enhancing its value by closely restricting its application. He argues that the cardinal value of liberty should not be exploited by collectivists to justify large amounts of state interventions. If liberty is viewed as power, there is no end to the number of legislative measures which can be justified as extending the range of choice of persons or their effective power to do whatever they may wish. The result could be the destruction of individual liberty in the name of a spurious notion of liberty. Hayek is not denying that the limited provision by government of skills and opportunities is desirable. He is only saying that such type of enabling activities should not be represented as promoting freedom.

According to Hayek, freedom in short can be described as, 'freedom from constraints of the state'. Hayek defines and defends -liberalism as a doctrine which emphasizes the

minimization of the coercive powers of government. He argues that the state should positively promote competition, and should undertake non-coercive service functions, as the market mechanism does not provide for all needs. The state should ensure minimum income to each individual or family, but should not make market itself an instrument of distributive justice. Dwelling on the antithesis between liberty and equality, Hayek argues that individuals differ greatly in their skills and abilities and this natural tendency towards inequality can be countered only by the authoritarian suppression of individual talents and aspirations. Thus Hayek observes freedom as:

'From the fact that people are very different it follows that, if we treat them equally, the result must be inequality in their actual position, and that the only way to place them in an equal position that would be to treat them differently. The equality before the law which freedom requires leads to material inequality. The desire for making people more alike in their condition cannot be accepted in a free society as a justification for further and discriminatory coercion.'

In a nutshell, Hayek's argument against equality is based on two premises. In the first place, he assumes that liberty exists in the absence of coercion in the sphere of individual activity by other individuals or the state. Secondly, he observes that individuals differ in their talents and skills and their equality before the law is bound to create inequality in their actual position in terms of their material status. Hence, any attempt to create material equality among different individuals is bound to involve coercion which would deprive them of their freedom.

Hayek's concern for freedom is so profound that he never tends to ignore the claim of equal freedom for all individuals. He recognizes the value of individual freedom not so much from the standpoint of the individual as from that of society. For Hayek, acquisition and use of new knowledge is the key to social progress. An individual makes his contribution to progress through the cumulative growth of knowledge. 'If there were omniscient men ... there would be little case for liberty ... Liberty is essential in order to leave room for the unforeseeable and unpredictable. 'The larger the sum total of human knowledge, the smaller

the share each individual can absorb. Nobody is competent enough to pronounce a final word about human affairs. Submission to another's will is therefore disastrous. The value of any particular freedom is not to be judged by counting heads. The importance of freedom to do a particular thing has nothing to do with the number of people who want to do it. It is quite possible that the freedom vital to social progress may not be widely sought. Hayek therefore asserts that it is better that some should be free than none and many should have full freedom than having limited freedom. Thus according to Hayek, the cake of freedom is not to be divided on the basis of equal share for all, but it can be divided on the basis of each individual's contribution towards progress. It is difficult to ascertain each individual's entitlement to different amounts of freedom. Hayek's conclusions are not consistent with his own assumptions. He begins his view by taking individuals as an end and ends up with reducing them to a means.

F.A. Hayek argued that individual differences in skills and abilities under the conditions of equality before the law result in equalities of income and wealth. If we try to remove these inequalities by forcing an authoritarian rule, it is bound to destroy the freedom of individual's. Hayek values freedom as an instrument of social progress. He argues that while extending the scope of freedom, we should not ask how many persons will be benefited by it, but how much progress will be made possible.

Hayek has summarized a legal framework for liberty. He says that laws should be rules rather than the process of command which will help to dictate people what they must do. In Hayek's view the foundation for securing each individual a known range within which the individual can decide on his actions enables him to make the fullest use of his knowledge in the society. Again he says the laws should be general for the people and the government who can apply them easily. He said that this is not the procedure to prevent the bad laws in the society but if the laws are applied in full force on the people, then there will be less chance of facing or creating any problem. Hayek identifies liberty with western civilization. But by the mid-nineteenth century the western civilization started losing faith on the principles of liberty.

Various writings of Hayek highlights one or another proximate of danger to western liberty mainly on the central planning, demands for social justice and excesses of majority rule but the ultimate danger is the loss of faith and self-confidence among the individuals of the society. Hayek is especially harsh in his indictment of western intellectuals who have long been disillusioned with their own civilization, disapproving its achievements and got drawn towards utopianism. They turned away from western terms or principles just as other people of the world were looking to the western countries for guidance. It is said that the Western countries are continuing on the path of progress and it must renew its understanding about liberty and the value of the liberty is essential for both the society and individuals. Later on Hayek identified the basic principles of liberty and reaffirmed them in words which were suitable for the people of that period. Hayek recognized that the mission that was in his mind must go beyond economics and historical inquiry. The existing situation requires attention to the principles that claims universal validity. It calls for an ultimate justification or justification of fundamental values. The economics and historical inquiry can certainly illuminate questions of liberty but there was no single discipline which has a comprehensiveness and normative force that required to put liberty on a sound footing. This is a proper work which is mentioned in the political philosophy. The book *The Constitution of Liberty* has a comprehensive restatement of the basic principles of philosophy of freedom.

Hayek has discussed the term freedom or liberty in three main parts:

- The value of freedom
- Freedom and the law
- Freedom in the welfare state

In the first part he explains about the endeavours that show why individuals want liberty and what it does. In the second part he explains the institutions that the western people have developed to secure individual liberty and in the third part tries to test this ideal of liberty by applying its principles such as critical economic and social

issues. Hayek introduces several concepts in his introduction to the term liberty and freedom that turn out to be much more important. In his book *The Constitution of Liberty*, Hayek has described about liberty and freedom where he says that people are concerned with various conditions of individuals in which coercion of some is reduced as much as is possible in the society. He said that some of the people must be protected from coercion and the others should restrain. The question has already occurred in the book that by what means the coercion in the society should be reduced and how much of it will necessarily remain in a society.

In Hayek's views, freedom belongs to the individuals of the society. He has given many reasons as to why he begins from the individual. First, the human being or the individual is the person who chooses, thinks and also acts. Hayek acknowledges that human agency raises difficult questions about an individual's capacity to choose or to resolve freely. But for defining the freedom it suffices to consider only external impediments to action as they might not rise from the nature, but only from the human beings. Second, freedom must be defined by giving reference to the individuals. He defined freedom as that the state in which a man is not subject to coercion by the arbitrary will of another or others. This definition goes back to the history where the distinction between the slaves and the free man was defined. This has been affirmed by the best modern proponents of liberty who insist on free private sphere which was defined by clear rules and also protected from the arbitrary coercion. This is the way in which the individual may pursue his own aims so long as his actions do not violate the freedom of others in the society. Hayek thinks that he is proposing a negative freedom for the individuals in the society but he also insists that such type of freedom further takes on a positive role depending on how it is used by individuals in a society. Thirdly, a free society cannot be seen if the individuals are not free for this Hayek argues that freedom is necessary for all individuals. At that time some collectivist argued that social or political freedom is essential which excludes individual freedom but Hayek clearly rejects any effort to exclude individual freedom from the political freedom. He said that freedom has its own meaning in a society. Individual freedom should not be confused with political freedom. Any popular consent and participation

will not surely secure individual freedom and also may work against it.

Hayek insists that liberty and responsibility cannot be separated from each other. When people get liberty then they should be aware of the consequences of their actions. This will only happen when the individual will be responsible. So it is said that individuals who are not able to learn from their experiences also cannot enjoy their personal growth. So a free society will not be able to function or maintain itself unless its members think that each individual should occupy the right position in the society. Hayek supports the term determinism altogether. He said that the conception of responsibility rests on a determinist view. This is the view that follows actions from the internal causes such as emotion and also- habit. This raises a question of inner freedom or whether the internal causes remove actions of their voluntary character. Hayek does not pursue this question further because he is concerned about the determinist teaching that focus on the external causes of actions rather than the internal ones. This form of determinism is mentioned in the subject of Physics during the period of nineteenth century. In that it is described that the actions and mental operations are necessarily determined by the external actions. Hayek did not try to show that this term is false but he only said that it is practically wrong. It will bring conflict between people when they will know that they have to follow some rules. So Hayek says that no one knows whether the free choice is possible in the society or whether praise or blame can make a difference. Finally it is said that individual freedom is not to be identified with the power to overcome obstacles. The idea of 'liberty that is translated as power' is easily in demand for power or wealth, as opposed to freedom from coercion.

Hayek admits that his definition of freedom is incomplete without defining coercion. He thus defined various ways of coercion, but the main question is that why it is desirable for the individual to have a sphere of freedom in which coercion is reduced to a minimum extent? Hayek insists that the state of coercion is required to prevent the private persons from forcing each other. By knowing this it does not mean that all private coercion can be eliminated. For this Hayek has given an example that coercion are of different kinds such as psychological pressures to give into the demands of another often occurs in private relationships that an individual enters into voluntarily,

but for the state to regulate such type of choices would involve even greater coercion like if people are to be free to choose their associates, then the coercion that can be seen from the voluntary association cannot describe the concern of the government. The state always controls coercion under different forms of government but in a free society the government cannot exercise the coercive power freely, they will face restrictions. They make predictable general rules that could be applied equally to all individuals in the society including those individuals who make them and also enforce such type of laws. At that time coercion by the state is indispensable to freedom but Hayek wants to reduce the need for it to a minimum level. This can be possible only in the place where individual can be expected to conform voluntarily to the traditional rules of conduct and particularly to follow the common moral rules. The moral rules can be evolved as distinct from unnatural constructed ones which should be regarded with reverence and also held as a matter of sincere belief. Hayek follows all the great champions who have given their views on freedom outside the rationalistic school which emphasizes that freedom has never worked without deeply ingrained moral beliefs. The question is if conformity to moral rules is truly voluntary or it is simply produced by different kind of compulsion that is imposed by the state. Hayek explains that an individual conforms to moral rules which come from habit, but the social pressure to do this type of rules is often powerful. According to J. S. Mill, the famous political philosopher conformity is the most pressing contemporary threat to freedom which is greater than the threat which is occurring from state coercion. Hayek is less concerned than Mill for protecting the private conduct which is from the pressure of opinion or disapproval. But Mill is strongly against moral coercion which has probably overstated the case of liberty.

Hayek feels that a free society can function successfully only if the individuals are in some measure guided by some common values. This is the reason for which Hayek is willing for society to exert pressure on individuals to conform to some moral rules. However, he does not want pressure that interferes with the individual's freedom of choice. He said that it is essential to give space to other people which means every individual has his own scale of values which we should respect even if we don't approve his views. This is essential in a society where people believe in freedom and not be the ultimate

judge of another person's values or restrict them from pursuing anything which they want so long as he does not disobey freedom of others. The society which fails to recognize these principles don't have respect for the dignity of individuals and they don't have any knowledge about freedom.

If we discuss about liberty then Hayek discusses about this concept and clearly rejects positive side of liberty on the basis that there is not much connection between being free to do something and having the power or ability to do something. The confusion of which, he says, 'inevitably leads to the identification of liberty with wealth' and supports 'a demand for the redistribution of wealth.' Hayek attempts to draw a dividing line between illegitimate coercion and 'the conditions or terms on which our fellow men are willing to render us specific services or benefits'.

Many people have argued that the rigid conceptual distinction between positive and negative liberty does not bear any scrutiny and also not necessary to become entangled in the intricacies of that debate. Hayek has already argued the coercive enforcement of property rights that constrains freedom of those who are excluded from the use of private resources is in a way entirely consistent with his negative conception of liberty. An individual is not permitted to use possessions of others without taking consent. The extent one's freedom of action is constrained by the existing structure of property rights. Hayek says that this sort of restriction on someone's freedom of action is justified as by separating private sphere where people are free to act for their personal purposes and the enforcement of property rights enables society to maximize the use of local knowledge. An individual cannot coherently claim on the Hayekian grounds that the private exercise of the incidents of property and the contract is constitutive of liberty because this would define the concept of liberty in strict terms. To avoid this type of charge Hayek should agree that property rights are justified by values other than negative liberty itself. This thinking does not provide any basis for rejecting and redistributing the income for legitimate public purposes on the ground that it violates the economic liberty of the people who are giving tax in the society. This thinking does not provide any principal basis for rejecting and redistributing the

income for legitimate public purposes on the ground that it violates the economic liberty of the people who are giving tax in the society.

2.6 HAYEK ON SOCIAL JUSTICE

F.A. Hayek was a champion of freedom that enables the talents to flourish and thereby promote progress. He placed liberty of freedom above every other political ideal, like equality and justice. He particularly attacked the concept of social justice as an unrealizable principle.

In his later work *Law, Legislation and Liberty: The Mirage of Social Justice*, Hayek argued that the idea of social justice itself is irrelevant. Justice is the characteristic of human conduct, and not of a society. If freedom is curtailed to promote equality, the disputes over the distribution of life's goods are bound to give rise to conflict and controversy. Search for justice is simply a matter of procedure designed to promote freedom. Justice requires that each individual should get maximum opportunity to serve his interest according to his own understanding.

Hayek maintained that society has only limited resources which are not enough to satisfy everybody's needs. If we try to adopt the policy of social justice, the bureaucracy responsible for the implementation of that policy would assume the power of arbitrary distribution of those resources. This will harm the individual freedom. Again, diverse interest groups will start demanding a large share of these resources in order to serve their self-interest. Stronger interest groups will be able to corner the larger share. So the incompetent sections of society will be able to grab an undue share of social wealth. As a result, competent people will suffer. They will be discouraged from giving their best to society. This trend will impoverish society.

Hayek was keen to promote excellence in society. He was not worried about the plight of the poor and the unlucky. His way of thinking resembled the railways' policy on trains running late. When many trains are running late, the railways would try that the trains which are not very late should run on time, and those which are very

late could be allowed to be further late. The emphasis is on reducing the number of late running trains even if some trains become very, very late. Hayek would wish that the distinguished members of society should maintain and enhance their excellence even if the poor become poorer. Hayek not only rejects social justice, his philosophy also militates against the spirit of humanitarianism.

Hayek's message is clear about the concept of liberty. He said that 'let us strive for achieving high levels of excellence in the chosen few rather than marginal improvement in the majority of mediocres.' In his views, the question of social justice should not come in the way of individual prosperity. Hayek declared social justice to be a mirage, hence an unrealizable principle. Liberty alone is the principle worth pursuing. Hayek wants to solve the problem of individual liberty within the market system although he conceded that the state should provide for some public services outside the market system. But he has not made it clear as to wherefrom these services will be provided without diverting some resources from the market system. By separating liberty from social justice, Hayek has undermined foundations of liberty itself.

Hayek argued that the idea of social justice is baseless. He said that justice is in fact a characteristic of human conduct and it cannot be just or unjust. If liberty is curtailed in the interest of equality, it would lead to widespread tension and dispute on the question of unjust distribution of life's goods. Pursuit of justice is a matter of procedure. Its objective is to promote freedom. It should provide for maximum opportunity to each individual to serve his self-interest according to his own knowledge and wisdom. The exponents of procedural justice are F.A. Hayek, Herbert Spencer, Robert Nozick and John Rawls. All the philosophers sought to accommodate the requirements of substantive justice or social justice in his well drawn scheme of procedural justice. Procedural justice rejects all discriminations between human beings on ground of caste, class, sex, race, religion, language and culture.

Hayek understands that the term social justice usually refers to the deliberate doling out of economic rewards from the government. He says that some pattern of

remuneration is based on the assessment of the performance or the needs of individuals or the groups by any specific authority which can be possessing of the power to enforce it. Hayek's basic contention is that any such type of conception of justice must be wholly changed. By knowing this claim Hayek readily acknowledges that it is one which by its very nature cannot be proved. Instead he said that this assertion can only be issued as a challenge which will make it necessary for others who can reflect on the proper meaning of the words that they use. It is already mentioned that Hayek was identified as the classical liberal and he also followed the same traditions. His position on distributive justice is distinctive as he does not contend as classical liberals or libertarians. He said that the distributive pattern that emerges from the series of voluntary market and their exchanges is necessarily different provided that it occurs in the absence of fraud. Hayek does not believe that the interferences with voluntary exchanges are justifiable as it is merely an effort to realize the goal. However it is essential that Hayek has taken a great pain to insist that there is no necessary connection between the outcome of successful market and moral merits which is based on hard work, skill, etc. He argues that positive economic grounds give serious attempts to achieve any pre-determined pattern of income through state sponsored redistribution which will invariably have disastrous moral, political and economic consequences.

Hayek defends the term libertarianism in the name of liberty. Libertarianism upholds that system where capable and resourceful members of society should face no obstruction in their way to advancement. They need not be concerned with poverty and misfortune of others. The rich should not even be taxed to provide welfare of the poor. Libertarianism upholds procedural justice which stands for converting all social relations into market relations. It interprets equality as equal subjection of all members of society to common rules and regulations. In its view, the function of the state is confined to ensuring that nobody harms others' interests by force or fraud. When the members of the society are made to follow the reasonable procedure, its consequences should be acceptable to all.

2.7 HAYEK AND CONSERVATISM

Before describing Hayek's views on conservatism it is essential to understand the term conservative which is mainly used to describe both political tradition and also the attitude of mind of an individual. It is said that the person who supports the left wings can be described as conservative if he or she exhibits a reluctance to accept any change or to move with new ideas. Some of the examples are the trade union movement in Britain and especially its leadership which was for a long time described as conservative. The group is called conservative even though they fight to secure the election of collectivists in the government. But if we describe Hayek in this sense then he himself was not a conservative. His own outlook about this term is much more serious. On the other side, it is characterized by the curiosity of intellectuals and the readiness to be inspired by some of the new ideas. Some of the people have faced challenges in their mid-eighties which Hayek has taken on and also displayed the same enthusiasm for intellectual excitement. In 1980s and 1990s Hayek received more attention because this was the period when conservative governments took power in countries like USA, UK and Canada. In 1979 Margaret Thatcher won the general election in United Kingdom and appointed Keith Joseph as secretary of state for industry which was an effort to redirect the economic strategy of the parliament. At that time Keith Joseph was the director of the Hayekian Centre for Policy Studies. Hayek has given his views about conservatism in his book on *Why I Am Not a Conservative* in which he criticizes conservatism for its inability to adopt changes or offer positive political programmes and that conservatism is only good as what it conserves. He believed that conservatism stands still whereas liberalism embraces the free market as it wants to go somewhere else. As mentioned earlier Hayek identified himself as a classical liberal but at that time in USA it had become almost impossible to use the term liberal in its original definition and for this people used the term libertarian in its place. Hayek found another term called 'singular unattractive' and also offered the term 'old whig' which he took from Edmund Burk. Later on he said that he was becoming a Burkean Whig. But if we see, the term whiggery as a political doctrine had very little attraction towards political economy. His essay has served as an inspiration to many liberal thinking economists who were wishing to distinguish themselves from conservative thinkers such as James M. Buchanan. He has also written an essay on *Why I Too Not a Conservative:*

The Normative Vision of Classical Liberalism.

Hayek mentioned a common term for the whole world, that is, neo liberalism. In 2010 a British scholar called Samule Brittan said that Hayek's famous book *The Constitution of Liberty* is the most comprehensive book where the moderate free market philosophy promotes neoliberals. Again Brittan says that although another philosopher Raymond Plant is against Hayek's views, but he mentioned that in the book Hayek has done more thorough and fair minded analysis.

The question arises as to why Hayek is a conservative? For this British policy analyst Madsen Pirie believes that Hayek has made mistakes by looking at the conservative outlook of nature in a wrong way. Pirie says that conservatives are not reluctant in bringing change, but Hayek likes to bring change and wanted change to be imposed on the social order of the people and also on the authority who thinks that they know how to run things in a better way. This will help to allow the market to function smoothly and also give freedom to everyone to create an atmosphere to bring about change and development. Pirie says that this is an imagination that both Hayek and the conservatives share between each other.

It is essential to draw the, distinction between the' conservative nature as a personality trait and the political tradition which can bear the same name. This can happen because Hayek avoids the former which he can accommodate within the latter. It all happens because Hayek has his own desire to move towards a free society that fits well with the society which the conservatives prefer. In this type of society the outcome is the product of actions by its members rather than the rules that was imposed by the leaders. At that time Hayek might have been influenced by the fact that some of the parties who called themselves conservatives appeared to have strong hold in the central planning and for this they didn't try to restore the naturalness of the society.

In Europe Hayek said that the conservatives have already accepted a large part of the collectivist doctrine. He cited the advocates of middle way who had not compromised

with socialism and also didn't have their own goals.

Hayek has supported Winston Churchill and Mrs. Thatcher who tried to restore their administration without adopting the natural principles of socialism. For this Hayek said that this was the natural tendency of conservatives to sustain naturalness against the violations of designers when it is present and to restore them when it is lost. He also pointed out that follies and abuses are not better for having been established in the principle of any policy for a long time period.

Hayek has supported Winston Churchill's words when he said that the individuals need free and varied society where there is space for everyone and they can lead happy lives. Again he said that individuals are fundamentally opposed to all types of systems which are rigid in its nature. Churchill recognized freedom which is the essential need for every individual and for this Hayek got attracted towards Churchill's views. Later Hayek said that the people should use their common sense and make their choices which are open to them during the phase of problems which they face in their lives. This above mentioned view of Hayek was similar to the understanding of Churchill about the people of the society.

Hayek denied that he was a conservative because the conservatives do not want any change in the society and want to keep everything in a similar way but Hayek wanted to bring change in the society. The conservatives don't have any political views but Hayek wanted to move towards free society. Conservatives do not approve freedom or liberty for the individuals in the society. For this Hayek said that conservatism is legitimate, probably necessary and certainly a widespread attitude of the opposition that could bring drastic change in the society.

Hayek was clear about his rejection for conservatism. He stuck on the point of differences and also minimized the areas of cooperation and contact. Although conservatives find themselves in dangerous situation from time to time among those people who need to be part of free society, for this Hayek argues that this is just a clash of situation. This is the combined opposition to socialism which brings them together as allies. Hayek points out that

the distinction between liberty and conservatism is not clear for the people of USA but it is sharply seen in Europe even when both of them are working together against further advancement of collectivism. Hayek wants to slow the process of change but the others want to move the process in a different direction. Hayek described conservatives as a group who are moving helplessly in the wake of progress towards socialism. He also gives the remark that as the socialists took a long time to be able to pull harder, the conservatives also have followed that path rather than following the path of liberals.

Hayek has criticized the thoughts of conservatives and their practices but by taking insistence on the limits of reason, the force of tradition and the need to recover the old principles one should think that Hayek is the supporter of conservative thoughts. This notion is exploded by Hayek's postscript which denies conservatism in uncertain terms.

The postscript summarizes some main points which are mentioned in the work of Hayek. This was framed to highlight the disagreement of Hayek to the term of conservatism. However it is also discussed that if the postscript is only the summary of Hayek's main work then it would not have become highly readable and discussed in the famous book *The Constitution of Liberty*. Postscript in the book is properly framed so as to criticize the term conservatism. By doing this, Hayek thought that this part of the book will be more controversial and lots of people will love to read this section. Another question also arises that - Why Hayek was separated from conservatism? At that period he was already supporting the conservative party of Britain and also European nations and he mentioned that they have many free market ideas and also favoured the government. They give privileges to the people of that country. The conservatives are the parties who always tried to compromise with socialism and also stole its thunders. They have accommodated the collectivist group rather than resisting them. So Hayek supposed that the true conservatism is the enemy of liberty rather than a friend. So as he was a defender of liberty Hayek wanted to bring a gap between his position and his ideas about conservatives. At that time USA had a conservative party which was not so strong and also they didn't have a major socialist party. In Hayek's views the Americans always cherished their original constitution and were not believers of

conservatives because they were the supporters of liberty that the constitution symbolizes. In USA the term conservatism was widely used by the people after the Second World War. This term was used to oppose the liberalism system in America which was fully supported by Franklin D. Roosevelt in his New Deal. He was the supporter of the principles and policies of liberalism. In 1950s a movement took place by the burgeoning conservatives. They had taken inspiration from diverse thinkers and writers who had defended individual freedom and had limited government in various ways. This movement was a coalition of people who were traditionalists and libertarians or can be called humanists; people who were worried about the moral and religious decline and also advocated free market economics and wished to control the power of government in the country. The libertarian groups were highly influenced by Hayek's writings and later on he was classified as libertarian conservative. Hayek didn't want to identify himself as a conservative in libertarian sense or any way. So in his writings on postscript Hayek has given specific objections about historical conservatism and also shown how it is different from true liberalism. Conservatism follows the principles or goals in which there were many problems. These are mentioned below:

- It is unable to offer an alternative form of development.
- It fears that new ideas can affect thinking and for this they prevented various innovations.
- It is fond of authority and for this they willingly use it to make individuals traditional so as to accept the values, goals, morals and religious beliefs.
- It raises the authority of supernatural sources of knowledge when the reasons fail to assign special privileges to individuals whom the authority recognize as superior and uses the state to preserve the social hierarchy.
- It also distrusts the democratic form of government and blames for the evils which already exist in the country.
- It has also some more problems which have sufficient knowledge of economics and also see that the spontaneous forces of adjustment which can be counted to produce the beneficial order that shows growth in the future as they have already had in the past.

- It is stridently nationalistic and endorses imperialistic missions to civilize other people in the society.

But true liberalism can be described as:

- The contrast which is guided by principles and by theory of social order.
- It welcomes and adopts new ideas in the society and also invests authority in the law.
- It also favours the rule of law over the rule of men.
- It is tolerant of moral and cultural diversity and therefore makes it possible for many people with different values coexist peacefully in the society.
- It acknowledges individual's unavoidable ignorance and also explanations that invoke the supernatural power.
- It regards democratic form of government as the least evil form of government.
- It is willing to let the market work because it assumes that the economics acts as the self-regulating forces of the market and will somehow bring about the required adjustment to the new ideas which are seen in the society from time to time.
- The outlook of liberalism is cosmopolitan rather than nationalistic.

For this Hayek wants to identify himself as the party of liberty or the party of life. The party of liberty was mainly used in the eighteenth century and it did not have any relation with the political party which Hayek was supporting. Its main aim was to promote freedom by influencing various opinions and also helping in formulating ideas that would help to govern society in future. In 1940s and 1950s Hayek worked really hard to promote liberal movement in Europe which can be called the rebirth of the movement. He also gave advice to the scholars to stand for the highest ideals and also keep themselves free from the political disputes which were occurring at that time. He said that the devotion to the liberal ideas should protect them from the risk of becoming involved in party passions.

Hayek as a political philosopher supported the party of liberty which was the

only kind of party that he held positively. He wanted to give an opinion by defending the general principles in different ways. The party leaders tried to organize people for various actions and this was the task which required them to down play differences of principle among the followers and also to aim for different values which were politically possible at that moment. The politicians and the political philosophers think in different ways. The politicians always need a short-term result but the political philosopher always understands the far reaching adjustments in the institutions or policies which are possible only through a change in the public opinion. Hayek has taken a long view in both 1950s and 1960s and also stuck mainly to the philosopher's task of clarifying the basic principles. For this, Hayek and many scholars who supported liberalism had contributed vastly to the developments in 1970s which was the period of transformation of conservatism movement in USA.

Hayek was confused about the party of liberty and also did not have any idea about this term. He has ruled out the name of conservative. The term liberal is historical but the term no longer famous in England in nineteenth century and also in USA the meaning is the opposite in its true sense. The term libertarian seemed unattractive to Hayek as it carries too much of flavour of a manufactured term and also of substitute. Hayek has tried to find out a word which can explain the party of life, the party that always favours free growth and spontaneous evolution. He has taken an indication from the English Whigs whose ideals inspired the liberal movements in both Europe and America. Finally, he concludes that whiggism 'is historically the right name for the ideas in which he believes. In mid-nineteenth century Whig Parties in both USA and UK had been discredited. But it is said that Hayek's knowledge about the evolution of ideas have made him aware about his own unrepentant Old Whig with the stress on the old ideas. Whiggism was the name which was the only name for the ideals that has consistently opposed all arbitrary powers. Hayek did not know that it was the right thing to revive the name of practical politics but this is not the main concern as a political philosopher. The party of liberty or the party of life which Hayek wanted to revive is a famous movement and also the ideas which may develop in future affect the political affairs. This is a political party which would give it an altogether different character. It is clear that Hayek's rejection about the label conservative arises from his interest for bringing change in

the society rather than the more difficult attitudes which can be characterized by the people who are involved in conservative politics. Hayek's views can be clear once the distinction between these two is established. Hayek might occupy the position later which stresses on freedom and choice. But these ideas always played a very important role in the conservative political history. This can be seen in the thinking of Churchill who wanted to choose between two ways of life. The two ways are between individual liberty and state domination and another is between the concentration of ownership in the hands of the state and the extension of a property owning democracy.

ACTIVITY

Find out about John Maynard Keynes and compare his philosophy with Hayek's philosophy.

DID YOU KNOW

Along with Milton Friedman, George Stigler, and others, Hayek formed the Mont Pelerin Society so that classical liberals could meet every two years and give each other moral support in what appeared to be a losing cause.

2.8 LIBERAL PERSPECTIVE- Rawls' Theory of Justice

John Rawls was born in Baltimore, Maryland, in 1921. He received his degree in philosophy from Princeton in 1943. He joined the army after graduating from college and saw combat in the Pacific during the Second World War. After his discharge from the military, Rawls returned to Princeton, where he received his doctorate in philosophy in 1949. In the same year, he married Margaret Fox. Rawls spent 1950-1952 as an instructor at Princeton and 1952-1953 on a Fulbright Fellowship at Oxford. After his return to the United States, Rawls joined the philosophy department at Cornell. He moved to the Massachusetts Institute of Technology in 1960 and eventually to Harvard in 1962. Rawls remained a member of the Harvard faculty until he retired in 1991. He taught and published in retirement until ill health made it impossible for him to continue working. He died on 24 November, 2002.

The normative idea of justice has a significance of its own in the realm of political theory in view of the fact that among the proper ends of state, it has been given a high place at all times. However, the difficulty of offering a precise definition of this term lies in the fact that different individuals hold different ideas and views about justice from time to time. The result is that as Arnold Brecht says, justice has become like 'a barrel with several bottoms.'

Like few other basic concepts of political science, the term 'justice' is very broad and vague. Generally the term 'Justice' is used in two senses. On the one hand, it means faithful realization of existing law as against any arbitrary dealing. On the other hand, it means the ideal element in law—a thing to which a good law should aspire for. In the latter sense, the idea of justice is more related to morality than law. It is presumed to be a set of values which is higher than law. It is presumed to be a set of values which is higher than and superior to that which is embodied in law. The idea of justice is better realized today than in earlier times.

The word 'justice' has been derived from the Latin word *jungere* which means 'joining' or 'fitting together'. It otherwise means a bond or tie. Justice implies a system wherein all individuals and institutions are related to each other. To quote Barker.

Justice is a joining or fitting together not only of persons, but also of principles. It joins and knits together the claims of the principle of liberty with those of the principle of equality, and both with those the principle of fraternity or cooperation; it adjust them to one another in a right order of their relations.

'Let right be done' is the motto of justice. It is often defined as 'charity in conformance with wisdom.' Justice can be realized by the destruction of arbitrary or discriminatory social order. It is generally used in the sense of fairness, equality and impartially. It implies doing one's own work and not meddling with that of others. Bryce writes, 'Justice is the reconciler and synthesizer of political values; it is their

union in an adjusted and integrated whole.'

To quote J.S. Mill, 'Justice is the name for certain classes of moral values, which concern the essentials of human well-being more clearly and are, therefore, of more absolute obligations, than any other rules for the guidance of life'.

According to Benn and Peters, 'To act justly, then, is to treat all men alike except where there are relevant differences between them'. R. Pound says, 'Justice is the ideal relationship based upon reasonable expectation and maximum free individual self-assertion. It is antithetic to authority and encroachment. '

Thus, a precise definition of the term 'justice' is linked with the problem of reconciling its normative with its empirical connotations. While in the normative sense, it means the idea of joining or fitting, the idea of a bound or a tie, in an empirical context, it has its relation with the concept of positive law with the result that law and justice become sister-concepts. It is owing to this reason that the fundamental purpose of law is said to be the quest for justice with 'is to be administered without passion as when it (passion) comes to the door, justice flies out of window.' (C.K. Allen) Viewed in this sense, justice means 'the fulfilment of the legitimate expectations of individual under the existing laws and ensuring him the benefits promised therein and to afford him protection against any violation of his rights.' Justice has also relationship with liberty and equality. Thus, Justice has relationship with law, rights, liberty and equality. The various definitions highlight the six following aspects or characteristics of justice.

- Justice is concerned with moral values and virtues in society.
- Justice is related to law and courts which are set to get justice.
- The aim of justice is to protect rights of the people.
- Justice is related to liberty and equality.
- Virtue or truth is the basis of justice.
- Justice promotes peace, good will and harmonious relations in society.

2.8.1 Development of the Normative Perspectives

Plato, the famous Greek political philosopher of early times, had given a theory of justice. According to him, justice is 'giving to every man his due.' Further, Platonic justice refers to the determination to concentrate on one's own sphere of duty and not to interfere with the sphere of others. It therefore resides in the heart of every citizen who performs his/her duty in the appointed place. Thus justice is something internal and not external. In short, 'the justice of the State is the citizen's sense of duty of his station. The idea of justice enunciated by Plato does not satisfy a modern man. As Barker observes, 'He (Plato) does not start from the conception of a legal society based on legal rights and he does not conceive justice as a system for the maintenance and correlation of such rights. He starts from the conception of an ethical society based on the moral duty of discharge of specific functions and he conceives justice as the spirit by which men are animated in the fulfillment of that duty'. He linked justice with morality and viewed it as an ideal to be attained in any society. Aristotle spoke of 'distributive justice' and 'corrective justice'. The Renaissance and Reformation Movements actually put emphasis on the realization of justice. The American War of Independence and the French Revolution gave a revolutionary flavour to the idea of justice. With the spread of democratic values, mankind is moving close to achieve the ideals of justice. It should be regarded as the primary social as well as political value. Emphasizing on the importance of justice, Barker writes, 'First, justice and then the rules of liberty, equality and fraternity which follow on, and form justice. '

2.8.2 Origin of Justice

The origin of justice and the origin of law have many similarities. Justice, like law, has various sources. However, Barker says that there are only four sources of justice namely, religion, nature, economics and ethics (morality). In addition to these sources, we may add three more sources, i.e., customs, law and judicial interpretations. These sources may be described in brief as follows:

- **Religion:** Religion prescribes the standard of behaviour and ideal relationship

of the individuals and groups. It deals with eternal law and divine law which may be regarded as a source of justice.

- **Nature:** Natural law and natural rights are viewed as a source of justice. They say that men should be free and be treated as equal with each other. Everything should be guided by reason.
- **Economics:** According to Marx, the origin of justice lies in economics. Economic equality should be the basis of justice.
- **Ethics:** Ethics or morality is also a source of justice. It implies a sense of right and wrong from which justice originates. It is a good source of justice.
- **Customs:** Customs also regulate the life of the people. Justice is often a product of customs.
- **Law:** Law is the will of the nation as formulated by a definite process. It is main source of justice. Law and justice are interrelated.
- **Judicial interpretation:** Judiciary interprets law and administers justice. Justice is what it finally pronounces. Thus, judicial decisions and interpretations are a source of justice. These are various sources of justice.

2.8.3 Kinds of Justice

Justice may be of the following kinds:

- **Social justice:** It implies giving everybody his due in society. It also means the absence of any inequality on the basis of caste, creed, colour, etc. Any form of discrimination in a society goes against social justice.
- **Natural justice:** Natural justice has come from the idea of natural law. Man by nature is a social animal. It is his natural instinct which compels him to stay with others. His dealing with others should be just. He should do to others what he expects from others.
- **Legal justice:** Justice is realized through the eyes of law. In the eyes of law, all should be equal and nobody should be above it. Law should not discriminate

one class against the other. Justice is mostly realized through the legal system of the State.

- **Economic justice:** Economic justice is a modern concept. It is the result of the growth of socialism in recent times. It means that there should be no economic disparity in society. It also implies abolition of unemployment, poverty, inequality, etc. It stands against any form of economic exploitation.
- **Administrative justice:** Administrative justice is a type of justice which is generally administered by administrative courts. Such courts are generally found in France and other continental countries. Administrative tribunals in other countries also deal with such justice.
- **Distributive justice:** Aristotle maintains a distinction between 'distributive justice' and 'corrective justice.' According to him distributive justice means each and every individual in a society should be given an opportunity to develop his inherent potentialities. In the distribution of those material resources which conduce to the self-development of individuals in a society, all persons should have equal considerations and chances.
- **Political justice:** Political justice refers to the participation of people in political affairs. Each citizen should participate in elections without fear or favour. He has a right to criticize the government.
- **Corrective justice:** Where redress is made to a wrong done to an individual, it is known as corrective justice. It provides relief to an affected person. Justice has both negative and positive aspects. Corrective justice speaks of the negative aspect of justice. Provision of equal opportunity and reduction of inequality indicate the positive aspect of justice.

Thus, justice as a society is realized by distribution of arbitrary social order. There is a distinction between justice and morality. Justice is a check on the external action of man. Morality is a check on the internal action of man.

2.8.4 Categories of Justice: Social, Economic and Political

Although justice can be broadly classified into various types, in actual situation, social, economic and political justice have assumed greater importance in modern society. One of the objectives as stated in the preamble of the Constitution of India is to achieve 'Justice: Social, Economic and Political.' Hence a detailed discussion of these three types of justice is given below.

Social justice

Social inequality exists in all human societies. Social justice refers to socially ordained arrangement for removing all inequalities and affording equal opportunity to all individuals in social affairs and also in economic activities. G.D.H. Cole defines it as 'a way of life ensuring equality in status and opportunities in all aspects of social life of the individuals.' The following are the main characteristics of social justice:

- (a) Social justice makes individual equal in the society, irrespective of caste, creed, religion, sex, colour and birth.
- (b) It prevents the privileged section of society from exploiting the weaker section of the society.
- (c) It removes existing inequality and seeks to achieve equitable distribution of wealth of society.
- (d) It removes the tears from the eyes of the poor and seeks to provide basic minimum to them.

It is an instrument of social change. It seeks to reorganize the society on the basis of new social order and democratic values. Law tries to achieve social justice.

The Preamble to our Constitution declares the objectives to ensure: (a) Justice - social, economic and political (b) Liberty of thought, expression, belief, faith and worship, (c) Equality of status and of opportunity and to promote among them all, (d) Fraternity assuring the dignity of individual and unity of the nation. The Constitution also abolishes

untouchability, prohibits discrimination, ensures equal opportunity, prevents exploitation and assures the right to education, and assistance in cases of unemployment, old age, sickness, disablement and undesirable want. It ensures equal wages for men and women and abolishes titles. The good objective of our Constitution is to achieve social justice at an earliest possible time. When justice prevails in all the spheres of the society, normally we say that social justice is established. According to K. Subba Rao, the former Chief Justice of India, 'The expression 'social justice' has a limited as well as a wide meaning. In its limited sense, it means the ratification of injustice in personal relations of the people. In its larger sense, it seeks to remove the imbalances in the political, social and economic life of the people. Social justice is to be understood in the latter sense. As the three activities are interconnected, there cannot be social justice even in its limited sense, unless the society progresses in all directions. In short, social justice helps to bring about a just society.'

Political justice:

Political justice means absence of privilege and inequalities in political participation. It is the essence of political equality. It is 'conformity to the community's sense to rights in political activities. It requires certain objective conditions for its realization: (a) Each adult citizen must be given fair chance to exercise his right to vote. (b) Elections must be free, fair and periodic. (c) Rule of law, as opposed to arbitrary will of men, is the foundation of political justice. (d) Freedom of speech, of assembly, of petition and criticism and oppositions to government are essential for political justice. (e) An independent and impartial judiciary is necessary for guaranteeing equal political rights to people, (f) Free press and strong public opinion are necessary safeguards against arbitrary exercise of power, (g) Political justice is possible in a liberal democratic society which limits authority and guarantees liberty to individuals. (h) If national independence is not there, political justice cannot be realized.

Justice and Law:

Although justice is realized through the legal system of the state, there is difference between justice and law. Law seeks to give justice, but it is not justice itself. Law is made by a definite legislature. Justice is not made by anybody,

rather it aims at securing a few ideals in society-Law can be criticised. Law may be defective. Justice is neither criticised nor defective. In spite of these differences, law aims at securing social justice. Administration of justice is done by legislation. Justice is therefore, based on the legal system of a country. Administration of justice is important in the State. That is why legal justice is regarded as blind fold. It does not create discrimination. It is impartial and impersonal also. The symbol of judicial system is a scale which indicates an idea of impartiality of legal system. Hence justice cannot be separated from law. Law and justice go hand to hand.

2.8.5 Marxist Theory of Justice

Economic justice is well explained by Marx. Marxism maintains that private property and the capitalist economic system which is based on it are unjust and irrational. The Marxist notion of justice is that it is related to social values of society which are determined by its mode of production. Private property is unjustified in a capitalist economic system as it is based on exploitation and injustice. In a socialist society, private property is considered to be unjust and unnecessary. Thus, property is viewed by Marx as contrary to social justice because of its exploitative nature. In a socialist society, private property is unjustified. Marxism views the whole issue depending on the means of production and economic system. Therefore, justice, from Marxist view, is related to the doctrine of class war. According to the Marxists, the state is an instrument of exploitation and oppression by one class over another and hence systems of law and justice are originally bound up with it. According to this view, the laws are needed by the bourgeois class to keep itself in power. Communism views that private property is contrary to equality, liberty and social justice. It leads to the division of society into classes and the exploitation of the majority of people. Its abolition is a precondition for the achievement of justice under the communist system. The courts and the judiciary in a communist country are 'committed' to implement the ideology of scientific socialism as explained by Marx. While the liberal interpretation of justice is quite flexible that places judiciary in a 'free position', the Marxist notion desires its 'committed' form. The result is that while the former is too flexible, the latter is very

rigid. Further, while the former is necessarily connected with the premises of what is popularly known as the rule of law, the latter constitutes a fragrant violation of the same.

According to Sitalvad, 'Economic justice is the provision of equal opportunities to the citizens to acquire wealth and use it for their living. It is applied to those persons who are disabled or old or unemployed and therefore, not in a position to acquire wealth should be helped by society to live.' Following are the important elements of economic justice:

1. The bare necessities of all the citizens should be provided by the State.
2. Every individual should be given the adequate source of livelihood. Adequate wages for their work should be given.
3. Under special circumstances, poor citizens have the right to get government aid. The State should protect the old, unemployed and the poor economically,
4. The men and women should get equal wages for equal work.

2.8.6 Relation of Justice with Liberty, Equality and Fraternity

Justice is also linked with liberty, equality and fraternity. Since the days of the French Revolution, the slogan of 'Liberty, Equality and Fraternity' has come into much use in political literature. Liberty means not only absence of restraints, but also presence of opportunities. Equality generally means that whatever conditions are guaranteed to one, in the form of rights, should also be granted to others. Fraternity implies 'co-operation' and a sense of unity and feeling of people for common cause. Justice is connected with these three principles. Barker rightly observe: 'Justice is synthesis and the balance, holding together all the three and holding them all in equilibrium. '

2.8.7 Formation of Justice with Special Reference to Rawls' Theory of Justice

John Rawls was an American philosopher and a prominent figure in moral and political philosophy. His significant work, *A Theory of Justice*, in 1971 contributed in bringing

about a revival in the academic study of political philosophy. His work received serious attention from the economists, legal scholars, political scientists, sociologists and theologians because it crossed the disciplinary lines. Rawls is in fact known among the modern political philosophers for being frequently cited by the courts of law in the United States and referred to by the practising politicians in the United States and United Kingdom. In his work, *A Theory of Justice*, Rawls attempts to re-establish liberty and justice in a principled way, presenting an account of 'justice as fairness'.

Different political theories offer different pictures of what would be a really just social order. Two of these theories are, the utilitarian theory, and theory of justice - as fairness by John Rawls. The utilitarian theory asserts that the social order in which the largest number of people can have the highest satisfaction of their utility is just. But from its very early days, critics have found great difficulties with utilitarianism. In this backdrop, Rawls' theory has offered an alternative to utilitarianism. Rawls' book, *Theory of Justice* gives a final interpretation of the concept.

To discuss Rawls' theory of justice, his method of approaching moral problems must be mentioned first, which is in the contractarian tradition of social philosophy. -But at the same time, Rawls' method entails that the conclusions of moral reasoning be always checked and readjusted against intuitive moral notions and this contrasts with others in the contractarian tradition, who maintain that the rules of justice are those that would be agreed to in a hypothetical setting.

Justice as fairness is given to people who are neither great humanitarians nor extremely self-centred. Human beings, according to Rawls, are both rational and reasonable. Because of their rationality, human beings have certain ends that they want to achieve but human beings are reasonable as far as they are happy to attain these ends together if they can in accordance with the mutually acceptable regulative principles. But since the needs and aspirations of human beings are varied, how can they find principles that are acceptable to everybody? Rawls gives a model of a fair situation that can help human beings in making such a choice and he also believes that the two principles of justice would be very attractive.

Rawls supports a principle of equal basic liberties and thus protects the familiar liberal freedom of conscience, association, expression and the like. But human beings also need to know that whatever is their station in society, liberties must represent meaningful options for them.

Example: Formal guarantees of political voice and freedom of assembly have very little value to the pathetically poor and marginalized in the society. It is also a non-viable desire to demand to have the same effective opportunities in life. Achieving such a demand would definitely offend the very liberties that are supposedly being equalized.

Human beings, nonetheless, want to make sure that they get the fair value of their liberties. Irrespective of where they stand in society, they want life to be worth living, with sufficient effective freedom to chase personal goals. Thus they would be forced to affirm a second principle that requires fair equality of opportunity in combination with the famous principle of difference. The latter helps to ensure that those who possess comparable talents and motivation, stand roughly the same chances, and social inequalities help those who are less privileged. According to Rawls, these principles of justice are applicable to the 'basic structure' of fundamental social institutions (courts, markets, the constitution, etc.)

Rawls further argued that these principles should be lexically ordered, giving more priority to basic liberties than the more equality-oriented demands of the second principle. Moral and political philosophers have debated on this topic. Finally, Rawls claimed that his approach was applicable to a 'well-ordered society designed to advance the good of its members and effectively regulated by a public conception of justice'. Accordingly, he interpreted justice as fairness and contributory to 'ideal theory'. However, answers have been sought to questions such as 'what does justice as fairness dictate?' Is it useful? What about 'partial compliance' under the 'non-ideal theory'?

Does Rawls's theory address the issue of action to be taken in case of societies already characterized by profound injustice, deep distrust, material deprivation and the like? In his

book, *A Theory of Justice*, published in 1971 and revised in 1975 and 1999, John Rawls tried to provide a solution to the problem of distributive justice by making use of a variant of the familiar device of the social contract. The theory that resulted was 'Justice as Fairness' from which Rawls derives the principles of justice: the liberty principle and the difference principle.

In his later works, Rawls concentrated on the question of stability, seeking answers to questions such as 'Could a society, which is ordered by the two principles of justice endure? The answer can be found in a collection of lectures titled *Political Liberalism*. In this collection, Rawls introduces readers to the concept of an overlapping consensus or agreement on justice as fairness between citizens following different religious and philosophical views (or conceptions of the good). The collection has also introduced the concept of public reason - the common reason of all citizens.

2.9 Feminist and Subaltern Perspectives of Justice

1. Feministic theory of justice

The concept of feministic theory of justice is being treated as a political ideology. It is closely associated with women's studies and women's movement in various parts of the world. India is also no exception. In the initial years after independence, women's liberation was not recognized in the politics or in the society of the country. In this context we have to remember there exists a thin but clear line of difference between feminism and women's politics. For a long time, there was an accepted belief that all kinds of women's activities should belong to the 'private' domain of the individual and family. But with a gradual change in attitude, women's issues have started receiving a great attention and a new awareness started to develop.

Feminism as a modern political ideology developed in Europe and in the United States in the 1960s and percolated in several parts of the world. In the USA feminism and women's studies developed side by side along with ethnic and African-American movements and studies. Broadly defined, feminism as a political ideology can be

identified as:

- (i) An effort to make women a self-conscious category
- (ii) A force to generate a rational sensible attitude towards women
- (iii) An approach to view the women in their own positions
- (iv) An approach to view the women through their own perspectives

Feminism had its roots in 18th century Europe. The major thrust of this ideology was centred on the demands of equality, liberty and universal suffrage. This was in tune with the ideas of European liberalism. Publication of *The Vindication of the Rights of Women*, (1792) by Mary Wollstonecraft can be considered a watershed of the feminist movement. In India under the colonial influence and as a part of the 19th century reform movement the feminist ideas began to spread. During the pre-independence period feminist questions revolved around some major issues like the spread of education, prohibition of child marriage, abolition of Sati system, widow remarriage, etc. However, analysis of women's question in colonial India was limited in its scope and approach as it was concerned with upper caste Hindu women of the society only. Actually, it encompassed the colonial elite experienced in colonial modernity.

Mahatma Phule was perhaps the first to relate the caste question with women's issues along with the problems of the widows who are the most marginal of the women within the upper caste society. In 1848, he opened a school for the untouchables. Girls and widows from the upper caste were punished for illicit sexual relations. Being childless, Phule was under extreme pressure to take a second wife. But instead of doing this, he and his wife Savitribai took a revolutionary stand in those days by adopting a baby born to a Brahmin widow. He believed that, 'the upper caste women faced the impossible burden of maintaining caste purity in their person. So, the problems faced by upper caste women were no less oppressive than the expropriation of manual and sexual labour experienced by the lower caste women'. The limited nature of gender issues in the colonial period has been analyzed in detail by eminent social scientist Partha Chatterjee, who considers that the gender offered a means for working through the contradictions of colonial modernity.

In the 19th century, there developed another concept of womanhood simultaneously with national identity. According to noted social scientist Chakravarti, 'The nation's identity lay in the culture and more specifically in its womanhood. In the changed political and social environment, the image of womanhood was more important than the reality. 'Drawing the coinage of Eric Hobsbawm she said that during the 19th century there was' an invention of tradition'. The *sahadharmini* model incorporating the notion of spirituality with a combination of Gargi-Maitreyi-Sita-Savitri and Lakshmi Bai model became the central theme of womanhood. To Chakravarti, 'Nationalism itself came to occupy the place that religion had done before; it was a permitted area for women's participation. In this model of womanhood, there was no difference between the perceptions of progressives and of conservatives'. She further said, 'The twentieth century has continued to reproduce, in essentiality, the same kind of womanhood that the nineteenth century has so carefully and successfully constructed as an enduring legacy'. This kind of constructed womanhood reflected a kind of allied value system with emphasis on caste morality and concept of purity. An idea of extremely fragile feminine moral vulnerability was inherent in this concept. These models womanhood, in turn, reinforced with Hinduized forms of veiling outward modesty for women, were particularly important for emerging dominant peasant castes like Marathas, Jats and Rajputs in the 19th century. These newly hegemonic upper and middle caste peasant groups generated some of the most repressive cultures for women even in the contemporary period. We can say that growth of militant Hindu womanhood, which became very visible since the last decades of the 19th century, owes its origins to this period. The Rashtrasevika Samity, the mother wing of militant Hindu women founded in 1936 with an intention to keep the women 'tied to fan interests and ideology while spicing their lives with the excitement of a limited but important public identity.'

It is found that since the late 19th century, the issue of female emancipation somehow disappeared from the public agenda. To a great extent this was because of a trend of objectifying femininity for nationalist and revivalist purposes. In other words, feminist issues became subservient to nationalist and revivalist agenda. Partha Chatterjee in his article 'The Nation and its Women' has explained the reasons for this departure. To him, 'the reason lies in the inner domain of sovereignty, far removed

from the arena of political contest with the colonial state. This inner domain of national culture was constituted in the light of the discovery of 'tradition'. By assuming a position of sympathy with the bonded and oppressed womanhood of India, the colonial mind was able to transform this figure of the Indian woman into a sign of the inherently oppressive nature of the entire cultural tradition of a country. The reason why the issue of 'female emancipation' seems to disappear from the public agenda of nationalist agitation in the late 19th century is not because it was overtaken by the more emotive issues concerning political power. Rather, the reason lies in the refusal of nationalism to make the women's question an issue of political negotiation with the colonial state.

In other words, following the simpler words of Uma Chakravarti we can say, 'as the women's issues were no longer compatible with more deified forms Hindu tradition and Hindu womanhood since the 1890s we noted a disappearance of women's issues from the agenda of nationalist politics.' Thus, in the colonial period nationalist solution to women's question was largely hazy and it was more an attempt to reformulate the notion of an alternative patriarchy with a benevolent facade. At the same time, it was very limited in its span and failed to touch the majority of the women and the problems of their everyday existence. Neither it was a venture to pose any challenge to the patriarchal edicts nor did it contribute to the true emancipation of the colonized elite women. Contrarily, the attempt of nationalism to project women as a homogeneous community developed a notion that their interests are well protected in the hands of gentlemen nationalists alone. This not only developed a false notion of femininity.

Whereas, at the same time we must remember that the nationalist period cannot be considered as a totally wasted period for the growth of feminist concerns in the country. The importance of the historical possibilities ushered in during this period cannot be overlooked. We must here acknowledge the contributions of women like Rasasundari, Kailashbasini, Kundamala and many others who dared to express their alternative visions despite the existence of an extremely strong and modernized patriarchal control.

After independence, some kind of apathy and quietness prevailed for nearly three decades on feminist issues. Though the Constitution prohibited any kind of discrimination on grounds of sex, no serious attempt was made to promote feminist causes. There was a belief during the Nehruvian period of political compromise that egalitarianism, democracy, secularism and socialistic pattern of modernization will eliminate all social evils including caste, religious fundamentalism and discrimination against women. Since the seventies of the last century began a spread of feminist ideas with a revival of women's questions and problems at its core only. Several factors contributed to the growth of feminism during this period. According to Neera Desai and Maitreyi Krishnaraj, 'Women have been looked upon either as victims of social practices or targets for development as in the post-independence period, but never as participants in development'. Contrarily, 'women's position was worsening in practically every sphere with the exception of some gains in education and employment for middle class women' and at the same time, 'the declining value of women was surfacing in almost every aspect of life. This naturally developed a sense of discontent among a sensible section of the society who felt the need to review the situation'. In this context in 1971 the Committee on the Status of Women in India (CSWI) was set up to review the status of women. This committee was set up as per UN recommendations and it placed its report in the Parliament in 1973 and that was published in 1974 with the title 'Toward Equality'. The report revealed that women of every category and social group only face inequality in their respective positions. This report of sex inequality can be considered as the watershed of feminist ideas and movements in the country in modern times. Since 1975 both in academics and in administration a serious change crept in. From this time women's study, to some extent, provides the theoretical basis for the women's movement and socio-political context of 'gender politics'. According to Kumud Sharma, noted feminist theoretician, 'Women are attempting to remove themselves from the footnotes and appendices of academic discourse to the main text. The emergence and growth of women's studies in India reflects women's conscious engagement in the politics of knowledge. To her, it becomes evident that gender is useful to social scientists as an analytical category in the same way as caste, class and ethnicity. Attention to gender leads not only to an understanding of the multiple

roles that women fill in society but also to an awareness of the social processes which constrain or enhance their potentialities; and it leads us to provide reasons for women's oppression and subordination in various systems and subsystems and to take note of women's responses to these systems.

Feminist issues and feminism at large are being considered as part of human rights issue and the democratic agenda. Evolution of feminism in this period was characterized by a major ideological regarding the issue of autonomy. To quote Bandana Chatterjee, 'It involved both structural autonomy from other political organizations and ideological autonomy in relation to other issues in Indian socio-political system. Structural autonomy refers to the inter-relationship between political parties on the one hand and women's movement and organizations on the other. As feminism in the real sense of the term does not imply substitution of male exclusiveness with female exclusiveness feminism in India has adopted a dual approach. On the one hand, it focuses on gender issues including women's rights with emphasis on health, morality, nutrition, equality, security and obviously empowerment, while the question of ideological autonomy is much more a complicated issue. In this regard, a number of women's groups and NGOs started surfacing, which are in a position to critique both the state and political parties. Feminist organizations gained an access to the language of feminism, in particular.

Parallel to this, several socio-economic and ecological issues also affect the functioning of feminist groups. Thus, feminists participate in different movements of the backward castes and peasants; they also play significant roles in the tribal and ethnic movement. In several ecological movements also women's groups and participants play key roles. During the 70s and 80s, enormous activism was noted on the part of the feminist groups. As a result, almost all political parties came up with separate women's wings. Though, in practice, all the parties attach least priority to the women's issues on their agenda.

The issue of violence of different forms entered into the feminist movement

and thought process and became a major concern since the 1980s. Apart from governmental and NGO levels, several other voluntary associations and movements also placed adequate importance on the issue of violence. For instance, Shetkari movement of Sharad Joshi by perceiving violence as a primary factor in historical development and relating it to the women's issues contributed to this trend. It viewed women's and men's liberation in the awakening of women's power. In November 1986, it organized one of the largest gatherings of peasant women. From the very beginning, Shetkari Sangathan has been active in the implementation of its political ideal of decentralization and balanced village-centric development.

The feministic issues gained wide political currencies along with different ethnic, caste, class and other interest groups quest for state attention.

In the late 1970s and early 1980s Chipko became a major environmental and social movement in the northern India, which is commonly cited worldwide as a primary example of successful grass roots activism. Centering this movement there developed a trend of eco-feminism in India. According to Maria Mies and Vandana Shiva, eco-feminism asserts the special strength and integrity of every living thing. To them, 'it is a woman identified movement and we believe we have a special work to do in these imperiled times. It believes that the devastation of earth and her beings by the corporate warriors, and the threat of nuclear weapons by the military powers; as feminist concerns. It is the masculine mentality depending upon the multiple systems of dominance and state power which denies women's right to their own bodies and own sexuality. Thus, eco-feminism is essentially based on the women-nature connection. However, the eco-feminist school of thought is not ready to consider women as a passive victim of male violence alone; it considers women, particularly rural women as embedded in nature and active participants of development.

Women or *prakriti* seeks to nurture and maintain the harmony and diversity of the natural forests as a life source. It is the duty of the women to recover the nature

from the grips of men and alien industrial culture. Following the arguments of Shiva, beginning of commercialization signals the death of nature, which is for the women, 'simultaneously a beginning of their marginalization, devaluation, displacement and ultimate dispensability'(Shiva; 1988:41-42). She makes it clear that this death is triggered by the arrival of the masculine, reductionist, industrial, colonizing forces of Western culture. She categorically emphasizes on the fact that masculinization of females is clearly undesirable. The twin ends of eco-feminism are liberation of nature from ceaseless exploitation and women from limitless marginalization. The spread of eco-feminism in India is receiving prominence with the spread of liberalization and globalization at a rapid scale. More and more different feminist groups and organizations are subscribing to these ideals as women everywhere are the greatest victims of industrial' modernization and liberalization. The forces of globalization are affecting the social, economic, psychological and physical conditions of the women in an extremely negative way. Thus, resistance to the process should also emanate from the wombs of feminism itself. Eco-feminism is a method, which combines ecological and feminist movement with social justice, political democracy and reformation of agriculture.

Since the 1990s, the growth of exultant feminism based on religious fundamentalist line has caused a lot of tension for the women of the country in general and feminist issues in particular. The *Hindutvabadi* militant feminists draw their inspiration from the nationalist icon of Bharatrnata, based on the concepts of *virangana* and *lakshmi*.

The feminist ideology of liberation challenges the notions of women's status and domination within the family and elsewhere in the society. This approach towards emancipation pushes women to question on inconvenient issues and to take painful risks whereas the ideology of Hindutva focuses on women with absolutely short-term but attractive issues. The fundamentalist feminist organizations have succeeded in appropriating some concepts of western radical feminist thought in an inverted way for achieving the goals of fundamentalism and in this way they are creating a 'feminist space' within fundamentalist agenda. For instance, radical feminist thinking perceives all male as

potential rapists, while fundamentalist women's organizations preach the idea that all male belonging to other religious communities as potential rapists. Indian middle class tradition with Victorian legacy forbids public discussion on sexuality but fundamentalist agenda by focusing on the issue of female sexuality as a threatened subject and posing it in contrast to 'other community-male sexuality' have tried to create a space for the development of fundamentalist feminism. It appears that by providing strong defense of Hindu tradition and ideology, occasionally it deals with publicly visible issues like dowry.

To end the discussion on the different trends of feminism in India we find that contemporary feminist movement emerged here in the late 1970s and early 1980s. During this period, a large number of autonomous feminist groups evolved to raise their voices against the prevailing sex-based discrimination in a dispersed way without the support of any centralized organization. This is obviously very natural for a class-based multi-cultural society like India where women can never be identified as a homogeneous category. The political ideology and the language of the movement were largely leftist than liberal. This ushered in a new atmosphere of cultural radicalism.

One of the first steps of this movement was the attempt to break silence and to expose different categories of humiliation, atrocities, tortures and individual as well as collective assault which women have to face in their daily existence. Gradually, the movement started critiquing family, government and the larger society along with their protest against the growing power of state machineries. Gendered violence, including rape, dowry murder, and other forms of domestic and public violence are also included in the feminist agenda. But since the 1990s the new visibility of the women in the right-wing movement is confounding and appropriating the issues of contemporary feminism.

2. Subaltern view of justice

The term 'Subaltern' refers to the class of lower strata in the society. They are peasants, women, and petty workers. Since time immemorial, this group has been marginalized and has

been cut-off from the national mainstream. They have been named as subaltern groups. These groups have been victimized on the basis of their own political, economic and cultural identity. It is a real threat to the Indian democracy. These groups from the very beginning have been continuously dominated by the upper class in the society. They do not have space to use their resources at their free will. They have been thrown out from the society and are economically, politically down trodden. They are not considered as full citizens due to the cultural, political and economic gap. As per the fundamental rights of the citizen, billions are classified as citizen by birth and maintain social, economic, political and cultural dignity. These subaltern sections have no recognition acknowledged for them in the society. Justice is not authoritatively allocated to them. These subaltern groups have been named as peasant groups, local tribal and inferior rank of women. These groups are living in jungles and slums. They have been deprived by the upper caste group. They are not only subject to physical but also subject to the question of breaking down of bonding of full citizenship. They have been far away from education, acquisition of skills; acquisition of justice or recognition of their own rights. Economic, political, social and cultural participation of these groups with the mainstream of society have been denied for ages. The subaltern group claims that justice should be provided to them and adequate resources should be allocated for them for their upliftment along with national development.

2.10 RAWLS AND DELIBERATIVE DEMOCRACY

Rawls's deliberative democracy theory is based on liberal political, thought. He believed that deliberative only needs to apply to problems that are of a constitutional nature or have political importance. This restriction allows citizens who are involved in constitutional or governmental matters to be included in political deliberations like judges in courts of law, political candidates, or government officials. Rawls's deliberative democracy theory therefore encourages passive form of citizenship which allows citizens to participate or exercise political power during government elections.

Rawls articulates his theory of deliberative democracy when he tries to answer the question, 'what would a reasonably just constitutional democracy be like under reasonably favourable historical conditions?' (Rawls, 1999, p. 11) He labels this ideal as a 'realistic utopia' and argues that a deliberative democracy and a well-ordered constitutional democracy are one and the same thing.

'Here I am concerned only with a well-ordered constitutional democracy a term I used at the outset- understood also as a deliberative democracy. The definitive idea for deliberative democracy is the idea of deliberation itself. When citizens deliberate, they exchange views and debate their supporting reasons concerning public political questions. They suppose that their political opinions may be revised by discussion with other citizens; and therefore these opinions are not simply a fixed outcome of their existing private or non-political interests. It is at this point that public reason is crucial, for it characterizes such citizens' reasoning concerning constitutional essentials and matters of basic justice. '

The three elements that form the core of Rawls's theory are:

- The idea of public reason, which establishes a common principle for deliberation.
- A constitutional framework that establishes the necessary regulatory institutions.
- A general acceptance of the idea of public reason, establishes a foundation of commonality within pluralistic societies.
- According to Rawls, three more conditions are required to assure deliberative democracy.
- The funding of elections must be public.
- There should be allowances made for orderly and public deliberation of the issues under consideration which should not depend on funding that could taint the deliberation, whether public or private.
- The public should be educated in the basic processes and procedures of constitutional democracy and at the same time have access to information on

problems requiring political deliberation.

By arguing that a deliberative democracy is an ideal constitutional democracy, Rawls adopts a liberal view for his deliberative democracy theory and establishes structures and institutions that can be used by citizens who are rational individuals.

2.11 RAWLS AND POLITICAL LIBERTY

On the question of stability, Rawls' later work contended-is it possible that a society ordered by the two principles of justice endure? His answer to this question is traced in a collection of lectures titled 'Political Liberalism'. In this, he introduced the idea of an overlapping consensus or agreement on justice as fairness between citizens who hold different religious and philosophical views or conceptions of the good. Further, 'Political Liberalism' also introduced the idea of public reason - the common rationale of all citizens. This is, in a sense, a right understanding for the betterment of society for all practical purposes. Again, Rawls addressed the most pressing criticism fabricated in '*A Theory of Justice*' :..... the criticism that the principles of justice were simply an alternative systematic conception of justice that was understandably not better to utilitarianism or for that matter any other comprehensive theory. From the point of view of critics, 'justice as fairness' is merely a different comprehensive and rational doctrine that happens to be compatible with other rational doctrines. For them, it did not distinguish between a moral and a comprehensive theory that catered to the problem of justice and a political conception of justice that people with conflicting yet logical, religious or metaphysical views would accept to regulate the intrinsic unit of society. The distinction of Rawls' accounts and the earlier ones on liberalism is that it requires reaching a point of consensus without appealing to anyone metaphysical source. Thus, the idea of 'political liberalism' goes against the views of social contractarians like John Locke or John Stuart Mill, who promote a more robust cultural and metaphysical liberal consensus regardless of the 'deep' religious or metaphysical values that the parties appreciate. This outcome is underlined as an 'overlapping consensus' due to often conflicting and different accounts of nature, morality, etc. These tend to 'overlap' with each other regarding the issue of better rules applicable to humanity. Rawls further brought changes in

the principles of justice, which are as follows:

1. Each person has an equal claim to a fully adequate scheme of equal basic rights and liberties, which scheme is compatible with a similar scheme for all; [and in this scheme the equal political liberties, and only those liberties, are to be guaranteed their fair value.
2. Social and economic inequalities are to satisfy two conditions: first they must be attached to offices and positions open to all under conditions of fair and equal opportunity; and second, they must be to the greatest benefit of the least advantaged members of society.

These principles are subtly modified from those in *A Theory of Justice*. The first principle now reads 'equal claim' in place of 'equal right', and also replaces the phrase 'system of basic liberties' with a fully adequate scheme of equal basic rights and liberties.

ACTIVITY

Write an essay on the growth and impact of feminism in India.

DID YOU KNOW?

As a college student Rawls wrote an intensely religious senior thesis (*Bl*) and had considered studying for priesthood. Yet Rawls lost his Christian faith as an infantryman in World War II on seeing the capriciousness of death in combat and learning of the horrors of the Holocaust.

2.12 SUMMARY

In this unit, you have learnt that:

- Hayek is undoubtedly known as the eminent economist in modern Austria. He was more successful than anyone else for spreading Austrian ideas throughout the

English speaking world. He was totally committed towards freedom.

- Hayek said that the individuals must be allowed to make choices and the overall outcome must be the result of their decisions.
- He always supported and believed that individuals should do their own planning and also be free to do that.
- He differentiated between liberalism and conservatism that must not be hidden in USA and it was also possible to defend individual liberty by defending the long established institutions.
- He has made clear in his writing about the majority rule as an end but merely it mentioned as means or it can be said that the least evil of those form of government from which an individual has to choose.
- Hayek believes that the conservatives mislead themselves when they blame the evils of democracy. The main problem is the unlimited government and no one is qualified to have unlimited power.
- He has also said that both democracy and unlimited government are connected with each other. It is not the democracy but the unlimited government which is objectionable. So it is essential that people should learn to control the scope of majority rule or any other form of government.
- As a scholar Hayek has differentiated between conservatism and liberalism. Conservatives feels that the new ideas can pursue change in the society but conservatism fears new ideas because it has no distinctive principals of its own to oppose them.
- According to Hayek the work of a political philosopher is to influence public opinion. They don't have to organize people for any action in the government. The political philosopher will do all these if he is not concerned about the possibility of political action at that time.
- He consistently defends the general principles which are always same in every governmental system.
- Hayek is regarded as the foremost contemporary exponents of the liberal traditions. Thus it has been observed that Hayek constructs a coherent and

powerful case for liberty for exercising equal power of which in our present century it is really difficult to find.

- The final failure of Hayek's system and his ideas neither was the classical liberals who can afford neither to neglect the normative political theory nor is to ignore the questions in epistemology and metaphysics in which such type of theory unavoidably occupied. He has given the intellectual thoughts during which his views were described about the social justice which were formed. So it was clearly understandable that Hayek is overriding the concern which was to shore up the moral and also produce theoretical foundations of the market process.
- Hayek freely allows individuals to consistently embrace a morally defensible principle of distributive justice that will bring satisfaction to the material conditions which was necessary for the meaningful exercise of individual liberty.
- It can be said that Hayek was known as the famous political philosopher and economist. That is the period when people supported conservative and socialist form of government and at that time he was the philosopher or scholar who discussed freedom and liberty for the individuals. He was the scholar who fought for democratic form of government. He said that democracy is the best and practicable form of government, so long as a majority of the community is committed to individual liberty, the rule of law and limited government.
- Hayek was also famously known as the supporter of neo-liberalism who always thought about the people of the society.
- The word 'justice' is obtained from the Latin words *jungere* (to bind, to tie together) and *jus* (a bond or tie).
- Justice, as a bonding and joining idea, serves to systematize people together into a right or fair order of relationships by allocating to each person his or her due share of rights and duties, rewards and punishments.
- The normative idea of justice has a significance of its own in the realm of political theory in view of the fact that among the proper ends of state, it has

been given a high place at all times.

- 'Let right be done' is the motto of justice. It is often defined as 'charity in conformance with wisdom.' Justice can be realized by the destruction of arbitrary or discriminatory social order. It is generally used in the sense-of fairness, equality and impartially.

The various definitions highlight the following six aspects or characteristics of justice:

- Justice is concerned with moral values and virtues in society
 - Justice is related to law and courts which are set to get justice
 - The aim of justice is to protect rights of the people
 - Justice is related to liberty and equality
 - Virtue or truth is the basis of justice
 - Justice promotes peace, good will and harmonious relations in society
-
- From the historical and normative development perspective, the idea of justice is better realized today than in earlier times.
 - Platonic justice refers to the determination to concentrate on one's own sphere of duty and not to interfere with the sphere of others. It therefore resides in the heart of every citizen who performs his/her duty in the appointed place.
 - Barker says that there are only four sources of justice, namely religion, nature, economics and ethics (morality). In addition to these sources, we may add three more sources, i.e., customs, law and judicial interpretations.
 - The different kinds of justice-include social, natural, legal, economic, administrative and distributive.
 - Social justice refers to socially ordained arrangement for removing all inequalities and affording equal opportunity to all individuals in social affairs and also in economic activities.
 - Political justice means absence of privilege and inequalities in political participation.
 - The Marxist notion of justice is that it is related to social values of the society

which are determined by its mode of production.

- Broadly defined, feminism as a political ideology can be identified as: (i) an effort to make women self-conscious (ii) a force to generate a rational and sensible attitude towards women; (iii) an approach to view women in their own positions; and (iv) an approach to view the women through their own perspectives.
- In this context in 1971, the Committee on the Status of Women in India (CSWI) was set up to review the status of women. This committee was set up as per UN recommendations and it placed its report in the Parliament in 1973 and that was published in 1974 with the title, Toward Equality.
- In the late 1970s and early 1980s Chipko became a major environmental and social movement in the northern India, which is commonly, cited worldwide as a primary example of successful grass roots activism.
- The feminist ideology of liberation challenges notions of women's status and domination within the family and elsewhere in the society. This approach towards emancipation pushes women to question on inconvenient issues and to take painful risks.

2.13 KEY TERMS

Classical liberalism: Classical liberalism is associated with the belief that the state ought to be minimal. It means that practically everything except armed forces, law enforcement and other non-excludable goods ought to be left to the free dealings of its citizens and the organizations they freely choose to establish and take part in it

Night Watchman state: The state where classical liberalism is adopted is sometime described as night watchman state

Neoliberalism: A moderate form of liberalism that modifies its traditional government policies, as on labor unions and taxes

Burkean Whig: Burkean Whig means who supports the term singular unattractive and also offered the term old whig which he was given by Edmund Burk. This

term was adopted by Hayek so he was also called a member of Burkean Whig

Whiggism: Whiggism was the name which was the only name for the ideals that consistently opposed all arbitrary powers

Ethics: Implies a sense of right and ItVfong from which justice originates

Social Justice: Providing equality irrespective of caste, creed, colour, etc.

Administrative Justice: A type of justice which is generally administered by administrative courts

Social Justice: Socially ordained arrangement for removing all inequalities and affording equal opportunity to all individuals in social affairs and also in economic activities

Fraternity: Any group or class of persons having common purposes, interests, etc.

Political Justice: Absence of privilege and inequalities in political participation

Chipko Movement: It is a major environmental and social movement of 1970s and 1980s in Northern India, with focus on grass root activism

Subaltern: The class of lower strata in the society

2.14 ANSWERS TO 'CHECK YOUR PROGRESS'

1. Fill in the blanks:
 - (a) Vienna
 - (b) Ludwig Wittgenstein
 - (c) The Constitution of Liberty
2. Hayek started the Institute for Business Cycle Research after he returned to Austria.
3. The famous book, *Road of Serfdom* written in 1944, was a pioneering work that attacked economic interventionism. In this book he has warned of the danger of tyranny that inevitably results from government control of economic decision making through central planning. In the book his message was clear and he said

that the systems like Nazism and fascism were not the only threats to liberty.

4. *The Constitution of Liberty*

5. Hayek regarded democracy as the best and practical form of government, so long as a majority of the community is committed to individual liberty, the Rule of Law and limited government. Democracy is not primarily a way of life, but a set of procedures for organizing and operating government. There are no inherent substantive ends or core beliefs that are essential to democratic rule. By conceding that the majority of a community may embrace any set of core beliefs that it chooses, Hayek is left with no basis for opposing totalitarian democracies on democratic grounds.

6. Liberty or freedom

7. Hayek has discussed the term freedom or liberty in three main parts: <l

- The value of freedom
- Freedom and the law
- Freedom in the welfare state

8. The reasons are:

- Human beings are able to choose, think and act.
- Society cannot exist and also cannot act freely without giving freedom or liberty to the individuals.

9. The six aspects or characteristics of justice are: (i) Justice is concerned with moral values and virtues in society; (ii) Justice is related to law and courts which are set to get justice; (iii) The aim of justice is to protect rights of the people; (iv) Justice is related to liberty and equality; (v) Virtue or truth is the basis of justice; and (vi) Justice promotes peace, good will and harmonious relations in society.

10. The usual sources of justice include:

- (i) Religion, (ii) Nature, (iii) Economics, (iv) Ethics, (v) Customs, (vi) Law, and (vii) Judicial interpretation.

11. Justice may be of the following types:

- (i) Social justice, (ii) Natural justice, (iii) Legal justice, (iv) Economic justice,

- (v) Administrative justice, (vi) Distributive Justice, (vii) Political Justice, and (viii) Corrective Justice.
12. Marxist theory of justice includes the following elements:
(1) The bare necessities of all the citizens should be provided by the state. (2) Every individual should be given the adequate source of livelihood. Adequate wages for their work should be given. (3) Under special circumstances, poor citizens have the right to get government aid. The state should protect the old, unemployed and the poor economically, (4) Men and women should get equal wages for equal work.
13. Feminism, as a political ideology can be identified as:
(i) an effort to make women a self-conscious category; (ii) a force to generate a rational sensible attitude towards women; (iii) an approach to view the women in their own positions; and (iv) an approach to view the women through their own perspectives.
14. The Committee on the Status of Women in India (CSWI) was set up to review the status of women.
15. The subaltern approach focuses on the justice associated with lower strata of the society, namely peasants, women, and petty workers.

2.15 QUESTIONS AND EXERCISES

Short-Answer Questions

1. Who was F.A. von Hayek and what is he known for?
2. List the names of some of the books written by Hayek.
3. What do you understand by conservatism?
4. Hayek argued that the idea of social justice is baseless. Explain why.
5. What is classical liberalism?
6. Write a note on the origins of justice.
7. List the types of justice and briefly explain each of them.

8. Explain Feministic theory of justice.
9. What are the different categories of justice?

Long-Answer Questions

1. Write a brief note on the life sketch of F.A. von Hayek.
2. Describe about Hayek's most famous book *The Constitutional Liberty*.
3. Discuss the reasons for which Hayek supported Freedom and Liberty.
4. Why has Hayek differentiated between liberalism and democracy? Describe in your own words.
5. Discuss the terms conservatism and true liberalism.
6. Explain in detail Rawls' theory of justice.
7. Explain the feminist theory of justice.
8. Analyse critically the subaltern view of justice.
9. Write a short note on Rawls.

2.16 FURTHER READING

Hayek, Friedrich. 1988. *The Collected Works of F. A. Hayek*, ed. w. w. Bartley and others. Chicago Press.

Hayek, Friedrich. 2010. *Studies on the Abuse and Decline of Reason: Text and Documents* edited by Bruce Caldwell. University of Chicago Press.

Germino, Dante L. 1976. *Beyond Ideology: The Revival of Political Theory*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Miller, David. 1987. *The Blackwell Encyclopedia of Political Thought*. Oxford: Oxford Blackwell.

Varma, S.P. 2008. *Modern Political Theory*. New Delhi: Vikas Publishing House Pvt. Ltd.

Freeman, Samuel, ed. 2003. *The Cambridge Companion to Rawls*. Cambridge, UK:

Cambridge University Press.

Rawls, John. 1971. *A Theory of Justice*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1999.

Rawls, John. 1993. *Political Liberalism*. New York: Columbia University Press. Rawls, John. 1999. *The Law of Peoples*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

UNIT 3

NEO MARXISM: Antonio Gramsci

Structure

- 3.0 Introduction
- 3.1 Unit Objectives
- 3.2 Life Sketch of Gramsci
- 3.3 Gramsci and Civil Society
- 3.4 Gramsci on Hegemony
 - 3.4.1 Roots of Hegemony
 - 3.4.2 Ideological Hegemony
- 3.5 Gramscian Revolution
- 3.6 Summary
- 3.7 Key Terms
- 3.8 Answers to 'Check Your Progress'
- 3.9 Questions and Exercises
- 3.10 Further Reading

3.0 INTRODUCTION

Antonio Gramsci was an Italian Marxist and also a socialist theorist. He was a leading Marxist thinker. Gramsci used the term *hegemony* to denote the predominance of one social class over others. This represents not only political and economic control, but also the ability of the dominant class to project its own way of seeing the world so that those who are subordinated by it accept it as 'common sense' and 'natural'. In this unit you will learn about the life of Antonio Gramsci and also about his political philosophy.

3.1 UNIT OBJECTIVES

After going through this unit, you will be able to:

- Discuss the life and times of Antonio Gramsci
- Explain Gramsci's views on state and civil society
- Discuss Gramsci's views on hegemony and how he used the term to denote the predominance of one social class over others.

3.2 LIFE SKETCH OF GRAMSCI

Antonio Gramsci was born on 22 January 1891 in the town of Ales, an island in Sardinia, which was one of the poorest regions of Italy. He was the fourth of seven children born to Francesco Gramsci and Giuseppina Marcias. His relationship with his father was never very close, but he had a strong affection and love for his mother, whose resilience, gift of story-telling and pungent humour made a lasting impression on him. Of his six siblings, Antonio enjoyed a mutual interest in literature with his younger sister Teresina, and seems to have always felt a spiritual kinship with his two brothers, Gennaro, the oldest of the Gramsci children, and Carlo, the youngest. Gennaro's early embrace of socialism contributed significantly to Antonio's political development

Antonio Gramsci's father's name was Francesco and mother's name was Giuseppina. His father was a minor public official who worked as a land registrar and his mother belonged to a local landowning family. His father had faced many financial problems and also had difficulties with the police. So as a family they were always forced to move from one village to another in Sardinia City. Finally the family settled in a village called Ghilarza. Gramsci's father was associated with politics but was unsuccessful in the parliamentary election which was held in 1897. In that period corruption and local disputes played a major role in Sardinian politics and Gramsci's father laid himself open to reprisal. When Gramsci was a small child his father was arrested and sentenced to five years of imprisonment on embezzlement charges because of which Gramsci and his family had to face a lot of problems. One to financial problems Gramsci was taken out from his school at the age of eleven. After some elementary education Gramsci started working in an office. He worked as a tax officer in Ghilarza to help his family. After that he had worked in many casual jobs until his father's release from the

prison in 1904.

Gramsci continued his studies privately during that period. When his father was not at home the family lived in utter poverty. During this time Gramsci suffered physical deformity and developed a hunchback. Because of his ill health Gramsci was plagued by various internal disorders throughout his life. He later wrote that the doctors had given up on him and until about 1914 his mother kept a small coffin and little dress which he would wear after his death. His sickliness and the visibility of his disorder in health left Gramsci particularly in vulnerable condition to the harshness of village life and made him an introvert.

Gramsci's personality would resurface at regular intervals throughout his life. Gramsci described himself as a worm inside a cocoon that was unable to unwind itself. After his father was released from prison their financial conditions improved and again he went to school for completing his education.

At the age of 17, Gramsci and his elder brother moved to Cagliari which was the capital of the island. Gramsci completed his secondary school in Cagliari where he was studying with his elder brother Gennaro. His brother was a soldier who believed in socialist thinking. Because of this he was known as the militant socialist in his mainland. In 1911 he won a scholarship and joined the university which was situated in Turin. Gramsci was in Turin at the time when it was called the red capital of Italy. It was the home to the most advanced industry in the country and above all it was described as the motor manufacturer. During the period of the First World War almost 30 per cent of the population was industrial workers and despite this almost 10 per cent of the populations were in army. Turin was on the brink of witnessing countless demonstrations and general strikes for the next twenty years and later in 1919 there began a movement for the occupation of the factories and also setting up of factory councils. Gramsci encountered all these upheavals when he went to Turin for his higher studies which invariably affected his thinking for the rest of his life.

When Gramsci was in the University of Turin he had come in contact with the thoughts of famous people like Antoni Labriola, Giovanni Gentile, Rodolfo Mondolfo and

Benedetto Croce. Benedetto Croce was the most famous and a highly respectable intellectual in Italy of his time. These thinkers promoted the thought of Hegelian Marxism and for which Antoni Labriola had given the name as a philosophy of praxis. But Gramsci had later used this term to escape the prison censors. His relationship with this phrase was mainly to develop the current thought which was ambiguous throughout his life. Gramsci's writings were famous from his study period and in 1914 onwards he started writing for the socialist newspaper *Grido del Popolo*. His writings made him famous and he gained his position as a notable journalist. He was an articulated and prolific writer of political theory. He also proved a formidable commentator and his writings were based on all aspects of Turin's social and political life.

Lots of problems were taking place in Cagliari relating to working class movement and many people lost their lives due to this unrest. At the time Gramsci reached Cagliari for his studies his elder brother Gennaro was the secretary of the local socialist party. After reaching Cagliari Gramsci met a friend called Raffa Garzia who was also his teacher at that school. His friend Garzia was also involved in the movement and commissioned articles from the students for the newspaper called *Sardinian Nationalist*. Gramsci was also influenced by the thoughts of radical socialist Gaetano Salvemini. He argued against the exploitation of the Mezzogiorno group in the northern side.

Gramsci met Julka Schucht in Russia who was a violinist and also a member of the Russian Communist Party. Eventually he married her and had two sons named Delio and Giuliano. Gramsci joined the socialist party in 1913 by becoming the general secretary of the newly formed Italian Communist Party in 1921. Although he was elected as a member of parliament, he was imprisoned by Mussolini in 1926. On 9 November 1926, the fascist government enacted a new wave of emergency laws that were taken as an alleged attempt on Mussolini's life.

As mentioned earlier, Gramsci was the supporter of socialist thoughts and this increased further by reading pamphlets which were sent from Sardinia by his elder brother. His political thought was enlarged by his experiences at the university and also in his new city

where his family was staying. At that time Gramsci had the work to mainly develop and organize political activities. He became the first Marxist theorist to work with the problems and also deal with them. He had to also deal with the revolutionary changes which were taking place in the twentieth century of Western European society and was the first to identify the importance of the struggle against the Bourgeois values such as ideological and cultural struggle.

Gramsci's stress on informal education was mainly based on three aspects. Firstly, his exposition of the notion of hegemony provides a way to understand the context in which the informal educators can easily function and have the possibility to criticize and transform. Secondly, his concern was essential for the role of organic intellectuals which helped the people to understand about the place and also informal educators. Lastly, his interest in schooling and also in more traditional forms of education system points towards the need to dismiss more traditional forms. Gramsci enrolled as the faculty of letters. He met Angelo Tasca and other people in Turin University with whom he shared struggles first in the Italian Socialist party and also after the split that took place in January 1921.

Gramsci was a great academic scholar who became an active member of the Socialist Party. In 1915 he also started a journalistic career that made him one of the most feared and critical voices in Italy of that period. His writings in the Turin edition called *Avanti* were widely read by many people. He used to talk to the workers in Turin during his stay in the university. He discussed many topics such as novels of Romain Rolland with whom he felt great affinity, The Paris Commune, the French and Italian Revolutions and also the writings of Karl Marx.

It was done at that time when the war dragged on and the Italian intervention had become a bloody reality. At that time Gramsci had taken an undecided stand but he knew that the basic position was that the Italian socialists should use these interventions as an occasion which turned Italian national's sentiments in a revolutionary way rather than towards chauvinist direction. During 1917 and 1918 he began to predict that the need of integration was essential between political and economic actions with cultural work. This took the form of

a proletarian cultural association in Turin. In October 1917, the outbreak of the Bolshevik revolution further stirred his revolution and a reminder of the war. After few years Gramsci identified himself closely although not entirely with the methods and aims of the Russian Revolution.

In 1919 Gramsci made contact with other scholars such as Angelo Tasca, Umberto Terracini and Togliatti. They started a periodical called *The New Order: A weekly Review of Socialist Culture* which within a few days became an influential periodical and later on a bi monthly periodical for almost five years. This periodical was famous among the radicals and also with the revolutionary left in Italy. The review of the periodicals gave much attention to political and literary thinking of the people in Europe, USSR and also in United States of America. At that time Gramsci devoted most of his time for the development of the factory council movement for next few years. He was known as the militant journalist and sided with the communist minority within the PSI at the Party's Livorno Congress. He became the member of PCI's Central Committee but did not play any significant role for several years. He was among the most prescient representatives of the Italian left at the inception of the fascist movement. Many occasions predicted that unless the unified action taken against the rise of Mussolini's movement, Italian Democracy and also Italian socialism would suffer a disastrous defeat.

The period between 1921 and 1926 is called the 'year of iron and fire' and Gramsci called them more eventful and productive. In 1924 Gramsci lived in Moscow as an Italian delegate to the Communist International election mainly to the Chamber of Deputies and also his assumption of the position of general secretary of the PCI.

Gramsci was arrested on 8 November 1926 in Rome. This was done mainly in accordance with a series of exceptional laws which enacted by the fascist dominated Italian legislature who committed to solitary confinement at the Regina Coeli prison. He was in jail for almost 10 years with lots of physical and psychic pain. He faced a stroke that killed him which shows that he was not treated properly in the prison. He died in 1937 at the Quisisana hospital in Rome at the age of 46 years. His ashes are buried in the protestant Cemetery of

Rome. His book *Notebooks*, written in 1929 to 1935, tried to counterbalance the emphasis within orthodox Marxism on scientific determinism by stressing the importance of the political and intellectual struggle. Although proponents of Euro communism have claimed him as an influence, he remained throughout his life a Leninist and a revolutionary.

Gramsci's life in the prison was also full with many intellectual achievements which were recorded ~ his book *Notebooks*. He kept many of his writings in various cells that later saw the light of the day after the Second World War and extraordinary letters were discovered which he wrote from the prison to his friends and also to the family members. He wrote almost 500 letters from the prison. The important letters which were significant were written to his sister-in-law, Tania Schucht from the prison. She was the person who was most intimately and unceasingly involved in his prison life because she resided in Rome for many years and also was in a position to provide him not only her thoughts but also feelings in the form of letters. She also provided clothes, food and medicines which he needed to survive in prison. He spent his last two years of life in Rome. His economic friend Piero Sraffa used his own personal funds and also many professional contacts to provide necessary books and periodicals for Gramsci in the prison. He had a very sharp memory for writing the famous book *Notebooks* but it is also the truth, that without Sraffa's assistance and Tania's help he wouldn't have been able to write this famous book. By 1950s, his prison writings attracted and also increased interest towards the host countries. His critical commentary was also famous at that time. Because of this his writings were famous among the western and the third world countries. Some of his terminology was most famous among the followers of left and the most important and essential term which he used was hegemony. He had used this word in his writings and also applied to the twin task for understanding the reasons which were underlying both successes and failures of socialism on a global scale. He had also used the word hegemony for a feasible programme and for the realization of a socialist vision within the existing conditions that prevailed in the world. At that time the conditions were the rise and success of fascism and also disorder on the left side that had ensued as a result of that success. Terms such as organic intellectual, national popular and also historical block which even if not created by Gramsci was acquired in such a way that it had radically new and original implications in the realm of political philosophy.

During the trial period Gramsci's prosecutor said that it is essential to stop this brain from functioning for twenty years. After that he received an immediate sentence of five years in jail on the island of Ustica. In the same year he received a very long prison sentence of twenty years. In prison his health deteriorated. In 1932, a project planned mainly for exchanging political prisoners which also included Gramsci between Italy and Soviet Union failed. But in 1934 he gained a conditional freedom on his health grounds after visiting hospitals in Civitavecchia, Formia and also Rome.

After Gramsci's death in an interview of archbishop Luigi de Magistris who was the former head of the Apostolic Penitentiary of the Holy See stated that during Gramsci's final illness he returned to faith of his infancy and also died taking the sacraments. However to the Italian State documents on Gramsci's death show that no religious official was sent for or received by Gramsci.

3.3 GRAMSCI AND CIVIL SOCIETY

In the history of political thought the concept of civil society is quite old. However over a period of time this concept has undergone a considerable change. Originally the terms civil society and political society were used as conterminous. Thus the term civil society was applied synonymously with state. But under the complex conditions of present day society it is necessary to recognize the distinctive feature of civil society.

Antonio Gramsci was an Italian Marxist who sought to distinguish civil society from political society in the context of his analysis of capitalist society. Conventional Marxist theory had held that economic mode of production of any society constituted its base while the legal and political structure and various expressions of its social consciousness including religion, morals, social customs and practices constituted its superstructure. It believed that the character of the superstructure was determined by the prevailing character of its base. During the course of social development the changes in the base led to corresponding changes in the superstructure. So it focused on changes in the base; the superstructure was not regarded to

deserve an independent analysis.

Gramsci did not accept this position. He suggested that the superstructure of contemporary western society had attained some degree of autonomy; hence its analysis was also necessary.

Gramsci particularly focused on the structures of domination in the culture of the capitalist society. He identified two levels of this super structure.

- Political society or state which resorts to coercion to maintain its domination. The whole organization of government including police, judiciary, prison, etc. comes within its purview. The structures associated with this part of superstructure are called structure of coercion .
- Civil society which resorts to obtaining consent of the citizens to maintain its domination. This part of superstructure is closer to the base and is relatively autonomous. The structures associated with this part are called structures of legitimation.

Gramsci pays special importance to this part of the superstructure. According to Gramsci, the institutions of civil society family, school and church familiarize the citizens with the rules of behaviour and teach them to show natural respect to the authority of the ruling classes. These structures led legitimacy to the rule of capitalist class so that even injustice involved in this rule would carry the impression of justice. That is why these are called structures of legitimation. They enable the capitalist society to function in such a manner that the ruling classes seem to be ruling with the consent of the people. When the power is apparently exercised with the consent of its subject, it is called hegemony.

Gramsci points out that the structures of legitimation within the capitalist society tend to prevent any challenge to its authority. Capitalist society largely depends on the efficiency of these structures for its stability. It is only when civil society fails to prevent dissent that political society is required ~ make use of its structures of coercion including police, courts

and prisons.

This analysis leads us to the conclusion that the strategy of communist movement should not be confined to the overthrow of the capitalist class but it should make a dent in the value system that sustains the capitalist rule. This value system is likely to persist through the institutions of civil society even under socialist mode of production. Fresh efforts will have to be made to transform the culture of that society by inculcating socialist values in the mind of the people. According to Gramsci it would be futile to hope that true socialism would automatically grow from the ashes of capitalism.

Gramsci tried to convince the Marxist that they should emerge from the spell of economics and continue their ideological warfare in the field of culture, art, literature and philosophical debates. The revolutionaries must infiltrate the autonomous institutions of civil society and create a new mass consciousness informed by the socialist value system.

Gramsci was primarily a humanist. He was opposed to any type of tyranny. He did not want to use revolution in order to set up a coercive state, but wanted to democratize all institutions. In fact he sought to replace the state by regulated society where all decisions would be made through consensus and not by means of coercion.

Gramsci followed Marx and tried to develop his theory of state which takes into account the reality of civil society. His main proposition is that one cannot understand the state without understanding the civil society. He says that the state should be understood as not only the apparatus of government but also the private apparatus of hegemony or civil society. Building on the Marxian notion of the state, Gramsci makes a distinction between the state as a political organization and the state as government. The integral state keeps reproducing itself in the practices of everyday life through activities situated in civil society. It is hegemony which provides moral and intellectual leadership to practices in civil society. Hegemony, for Gramsci, works for both for the dominant as well as the subaltern class in civil society. According to Gramsci each class must hegemonise social relations in society before seizing power.

Gramsci enriched the concept of civil society to a great extent. Retaining Marx's idea of class war, he focused as much on war as on class. He understood politics as a kind of war and used metaphors from military warfare to explain its many processes. But unlike in military warfare, in politics the battles are not limited to the use of sheer force. Although force is used as well, the battle in the field of ideas is most important. Civil Society for Gramsci is a space where this battle for the control of ideas takes place. According to him the dominance of the ruling classes is not maintained solely on the basis of their control of the coercive apparatus of the state, namely the police and the army. They also need to acquire a dominant intellectual and moral leadership in civil society.

In Gramsci's view, exploitative class relations of capitalist society have to be made to appear right and proper in order to establish legitimacy of the ruling exploitative class. In other words, the ruling classes need to create a false perception among the working classes of their own social situation. Since human beings define themselves in terms of ideals and values, the ruling classes need to control those institutions where ideas, ideals and values are formed. This function according to Gramsci's conception is performed by the various institutions of civil society. These civil society institutions are churches, parties, trade unions, universities, the press, publishing houses and voluntary associations of all kinds. By disseminating the ideology of the dominant class the institutions ensure its cultural and moral supremacy over the subordinate classes. In this way the ruling class obtains the consent of the latter of their own subordination.

The theory of-hegemony given by Gramsci is tied to his conception of the capitalist state. Gramsci does not understand the term state in the narrow sense of the government. He has done a division between state and economy. The political society was the arena of the political institutions and also legal constitutional control. The civil societies commonly seen as the private or non-state sphere mediates between the state and the economy. But Gramsci stressed on the division which is purely conceptual and in reality often overlap. Gramsci claims that the capitalist state rules through the force with consent such as political society is the realm of force and civil society in the area of consent. Gramsci said that under modern capitalism the bourgeoisie can maintain its economic control by making certain demands

which was made by trade unions and also by mass political parties within the civil society that would be met by the political sphere. Thus it can be said that the bourgeoisie engages in a passive revolution which was going beyond its immediate economic interests and also allowing the forms of hegemony to change: Gramsci said that the movements such as reformism and fascism as well as the scientific management was also the assembly line methods of Frederick Taylor and Henry Ford.

Machiavelli in his writing 'The Modem Prince' argues that the revolutionary party is the force that will allow the working class mainly to develop the organic intellectuals and also an alternative hegemony within the civil society. Gramsci has given a description about the complex nature of modern civil society which means war of position. This was carried out by the revolutionaries through political agitation, trade unions, advancement of proletarian culture and also other ways to create an opposing civil society. This was necessary because of the war of maneuver which means a direct revolution. This was in order to have a successful revolution without any danger for a counter revolution or degeneration. Despite many claims, Gramsci rejects the state of worship which results from identifying the political society with civil society which was mainly done by the Fascists and Jacobins. Gramsci believes that the proletariats have always done historical task that was mainly to create a regulated society and also mainly to define the withering away of the state for the full development of civil societies and the ability to regulate itself.

Gramsci defined civil society as the vast range of institutions which were also super structural in nature. Gramsci also argues that the state provides an important mechanism for connecting the civil society with economy but also in another way civil society becomes a more encompassing term. Gramsci has given the widest term of definition on civil society of an ensemble of organisms that are commonly called private. It is therefore described as a matter of individual behaviour, tastes and values as it is the matter of regulated institutions. This is the model which was clearly known as the superstructure which is far removed from Marx's assertion and also it is the set of institutions which transmit a monolithic bourgeois ideology. The civil society has many definitions as it includes the legal apparatus but it also includes other things such as children parties, shopping trips and going on holidays.

As everyone knows that the civil society is involved with the everyday life so it's very difficult to recognize and also have some connection with the operations of power. Thus civil society overlaps significantly with Gramsci's category of common sense. For example gardening and also among other things home ownership, family life and nationality contains certain wisdom about the world and are functional modern capitalism. The civil society can be expressed in terms of other social divisions such as gender, age, etc. rather than the class. So it is precisely in this private sphere that the ruling values seem to be more natural and also unchangeable. The outcome of this is mainly for the transformative politics which could thoroughly enter this sphere in both successful and durable way. The civil society therefore absolutely acknowledges that there are issues in circulation which were different than the class. So it can be said that the earlier version of the concept of civil society as was defined is only useful for sustaining an unequal society. For this Gramsci argues that a complex and well articulated civil society would be necessary even after a major disruption.

3.4 GRAMSCI ON HEGEMONY

Hegemony is in its simplest sense use the ascendancy or domination of one element of a system over others. In Marxist theory the term is used in a more technical and specific sense. In the writings of Antonio Gramsci, hegemony refers to the ability of a dominant class to exercise power by winning the consent of those it subjugates as an alternative to the use of coercion. As a non-coercive form of class rule, hegemony is typically understood as a cultural or ideological process that operates through the dissemination of bourgeois values and beliefs throughout the society. However it also has a political and economic dimension: consent can be manipulated by pay increases or by political or social reform.

The most influential twentieth century exponent of this view was Antonio Gramsci. Gramsci drew attention to the degree to which the class system is upheld not simply by unequal economic and political power, but also by bourgeois hegemony. This consists of the spiritual and cultural supremacy of the ruling class, brought about through the spread of bourgeois values and beliefs via civil society: the media, the churches, youth movements,

trade unions and so forth. What makes this process so insidious is that it extends beyond formal learning and education into the very common sense of the age. The significance of Gramsci's analysis is that, order for socialism to be achieved a battle of ideas has to be waged through which proletarian principles, values and theories displace or at least challenge bourgeois ideas.

Gramsci used the term hegemony to describe all the process through which the dominant class attained this intellectual and moral leadership. Through the concept of hegemony he also emphasized that the ruling classes rely more on the institutions and civil society than those of the state for obtaining the consent of the subordinated. The coercive apparatus of the state is used only where spontaneous consent has failed. The concept of hegemony has a strategic importance in Gramsci's own political practice. He argued that in order to properly fight the revolutionary battle for the working classes and peasantry, communist parties in different countries need to contest the hegemony of the ruling classes in civil society.

Gramsci admired the Bolshevik revolution of Russia as a victory of the will power over economic conditions. He also warned that this strategy would not be suitable under the conditions prevailing in the western society where the working class had come to accept the existing arrangements. He set aside certain assumptions of classical Marxism and produced a new analysis of the bourgeois state. Previously the term hegemony was described and also used by the famous Marxists such as Vladimir Ilyich Lenin. He used this term to symbolize the political leadership of the working class for the democratic revolution. After that Gramsci greatly expanded this concept for developing a sharp analysis for the ruling capitalist class and so for the bourgeoisie which establishes and maintains its control in the society. The orthodox Marxism always predicted that the socialist revolution was inevitable for the capitalist societies. This type of revolution was not famous in the advanced nations by early twentieth century. The concept capitalism seemed even more fixed than ever. So according to Gramsci, capitalism was suggested and maintained through ideology and not just through violence, political and economic coercion. At that time the bourgeoisie developed a hegemonic culture which mainly propagated its own values and norms. This was mainly done so that the

bourgeoisie become the common sense of values for all. The people who were in the working class identified their own good with the good of the bourgeoisie class who helped them to maintain the status quo rather than for revolting.

He said that the bourgeois class had the values which represented natural and normal values for the society and this was only for the working class which needed to develop a culture of its own. Lenin who was famous for his Leftist thought held that the culture was ancillary to political objectives but for Gramsci it was fundamental for the attainment of power that had cultural hegemony which was essential to achieve first. In his view a class in a society cannot dominate the modern conditions without advancing its own economic interests. This was neither dominated through force nor coercion. So this can be said that it must have intellectual and moral leadership and also make compromises and alliances through variety of forces. Gramsci calls this union of social forces 'historic blocs' a term taken from the famous philosopher Georges Sorel. This bloc forms mainly on the basis of consent for making a certain social order which produces and also reproduces the hegemony of the dominant class. This was mainly done through a nexus of institutions, social relations and also their ideas. For this Gramsci developed a theory which emphasized on the importance of the political and ideological superstructure which was mainly for maintaining and fracturing relations of the economic base. Gramsci thought that the bourgeois had cultural values which were tied to popular culture and religion and also his analysis of hegemonic culture. In Gramsci's writing it has been seen that he was strongly impressed by the influence of Roman Catholicism. They had taken to prevent an excessive gap which was developing between the religion of the learned and also among less educated people. Gramsci thinks that Marxism was like marriage which was purely an intellectual critique for religion found in renaissance humanism. He also said that the elements of reformation had appealed to all the people in the society. Gramsci also thought that Marxism could replace religion only if it met people's spiritual needs. Gramsci thought that the hegemonic dominance will ultimately rely on a consented coercion. He thought that the term crisis of authority and the masks of consent will slip away by revealing the first of the force.

The term hegemony is more sensitive and a critical term and therefore this was more

useful than the term domination. The term domination fails to acknowledge active role during the operation of power for the lower class people. Gramsci had defined the term hegemony through a series of distinctions between different moments which was within the hegemonic process. As Gramsci thought to define the term in various ways it isolates his earlier notes mainly on coercion and consent, domination and leadership, common sense and good sense and also limited and expansive. So the term hegemony can show how these details which were given by Gramsci could be build into a nuanced conception mainly for political and cultural authority. The term hegemony has been very prominent and also applicable in Gramsci's writings which were vastly used by many political philosophers in the humanities and social sciences.

3.4.1 Roots of Hegemony

Gramsci used to argue that the term hegemony is essential for making deep division which is mainly made for the order to form a genuinely popular and national organization which can defeat fascism and also achieve a transformation of society. However, this is the alliance which is not simply described as a federation of factions which carry an equal weight. He said that the industrial working class can lead their allies mainly through the ideological means and they also provide the centre for any progressive movements. So in this simplest way he described the term hegemony to the people of that time. Gramsci was not the originator of the term hegemony as this term was famous from the Russian socialist movement and also given fresh description about this term by Lenin. Gramsci knew about this term in Moscow when there was a debate going on about this term. Lenin never used the term hegemony openly in a society but Gramsci claimed that Lenin was the philosopher who described the concept and also the fact of the term hegemony at that period. By saying this Gramsci mainly thought about the three things which are mentioned below:

- Lenin understood that the revolution would not happen simply by adopting a response from developing contradictions which is emerging within the economy. So he gave proper consideration to the front of the cultural struggle.
- Lenin developed the idea that the bourgeoisie has committed towards the struggle

for hegemony as its opposition party people were attempting to lead the working class through its control of ideas and also the institutions. Lenin in his writing said that the working class spontaneously gravitates towards socialism which nevertheless is a bourgeois ideology. The bourgeois ideology was widely known by the masses and for this it spontaneously imposes itself on the working class after knowing the fact that Russia did not appreciate the western democracies that can try to develop the civil societies because of which such nations could be disseminated and also embedded.

- Lenin also argued that the revolutionary party should not adopt the economic struggle of the industrial working class but should support the struggles which were taking place during that period against the groups and classes who suffered a lot. He also said that it is only possible to understand the oppression of the working class by understanding the connection between all the classes and divisions and also the state and government which was the main area of the interrelations between all the classes in the society.

Gramsci was a follower of Lenin so we can say that he is a Leninist to some extent. But if we describe it particularly then it can be seen that the political party at that time had a major role of educating the allied groups and also to make strong leadership for the working class. In many ways Gramsci writes that the parties decide between the interests of their own group and also for other groups mainly for securing the development of the group which they represent with the consent and also through the assistance of the allied groups. But Gramsci did not follow those ideas about hegemony which were given by Lenin. Gramsci's work was mainly a political tool for the construction of a revolutionary and popular coalition. This was also a tool of historical and cultural analysis that enabled the people to evaluate those strategies. In the past they also tried to frame different groups and attempted to form the hegemonic blocs. So the understanding of the term hegemony by Gramsci was also influenced by both native and international people. He also added that his own and unique understanding about the term mainly joined many thinkers of that period and they also understood the term with the intellectual point of view.

3.4.2 Ideological Hegemony

Gramsci in his book *Prison Notebooks*, written between 1929-35, emphasized the degree to which capitalism was maintained not merely by economic domination, but also by political and cultural factors, and he called this the ideological hegemony. He accepted the description of capitalism put forward by Marx earlier and also accepted that the struggle between the ruling class and the subordinate working class was the main driving force which moved towards the society at that time. People did not accept the traditional Marxist view. The traditional Marxist mainly believed how the ruling class ruled at that time. Gramsci made a great contribution towards modern thought by his ideology. The term ideology was mainly seen as a simple system of ideas and also beliefs. But the term was closely tied with the concept of power and also the definition which was given by another philosopher called Anthony Giddens. He has given the definition which was the easiest way to understand the general people. According to Giddens the term ideology was defined as the shared ideas or beliefs which serve to justify the interests of the dominant groups. He also said that the relationship to power is mainly to legitimize the differential power that the groups hold. This is mainly to distort the real situation that the people find themselves within it. It is said that the traditional Marxist theory of power was one sided and was based on the role of force and coercion as the basis for the ruling class for domination. This was mainly reinforced by Lenin during the success of Russian Revolution in 1917 and the people also believed on the wording of Lenin. During that time Gramsci felt that there was something missing and that may be the understanding of the subtle but pervasive forms of ideological control and manipulation which affected all the repressive structures.

Gramsci identified two different forms of political control such as:

- The domination which referred the direct physical coercion by the police and the armed forces.
- The hegemony which referred to both ideological control and more crucially consent.

He also, assumed that no regime, how authoritarian it might be, could sustain itself through the organized state power and also the armed forces. If we think about the long

process then it had to have some popular support and also legitimacy in order to maintain the stability. Gramsci thought that Hegemony meant the permeation throughout the society of an entire system of values, attitudes, beliefs and morality that effected the status quo in power relations. So hegemony in this sense might be defined as an organized principle that is diffused by the process of socialization which is focused in every area of social life. It can also be said to an extent that this prevailing consciousness is internalized by the population which becomes the part of the common sense so that the culture, philosophy and the morality of the ruling class comes to appear as the natural order of things. As according to Marx, the basic division of society is mainly the base represented by the economic structure and a superstructure represented by institutions and beliefs prevalent in society and accepted by many Marxists followers. Gramsci took this belief a step further and he divided the superstructure into those institutions that were overtly coercive and also those that were not. The coercive ones are basically those which were the public institutions such as the governments, armed forces, police and the legal system. He also said that the state or political society and the non-coercive ones were those he regarded as civil society. To some extent schools come into both the categories. As we all know that the parts of school life are quite clearly coercive but some others are not like the hidden curriculum of the school. So for this, Gramsci said that the society was made up of the relations of production, the state or the political society and the civil society. Gramsci's analysis about the society went much further than the Marxist theory which provides a clear understanding of why the European working class had failed totally to develop the revolutionary consciousness after the First World War and had instead moved towards reformism. This can be understood through some example such as tinkering with the system rather than working towards overthrowing the system from its existing place. It was a very subtle theory of power and went a long way to explain how the ruling class ruled during that period. So if the hegemony of ruling capitalist class resulted from an ideological bond between the rulers and the ruled then what will be the strategy which was needed by the employed persons? The answers to these questions were mainly those who wished to break that ideological bond and had to build up a counter hegemony for the ruling class. They had to see the structural changes as part of the same struggle. It is mentioned that the labour process was the main class struggle but it was the ideological struggle that had to be addressed. Workers should be allowed questioning their political and economic masters for

right to rule. It was the popular consensus in the civil society that had to be challenged and this can be seen as a role for the informal education. It's said that overcoming popular consensus is not easy. At that period there were many complaints raised about the ways things were run and people looked for improvements and reforms. But the basic belief and also the value system underpinning in the society were seen as general applicability in the class structure of the society. The Marxist may have seen that the people in the society are always asking for bigger role in the society or higher responsibility in the government sector. For this Gramsci used the term hegemony as a tool for analysing the historical and political issues of the society. As we have already seen that Gramsci used this term in many ways and it also changed according to time and relations to his subject: Before his arrest he wrote that some aspects of the Southern question are unambiguous about the nature of hegemony. Again he said that the working class becomes a leading and dominant class to the extent that it succeeds in creating a system of class alliances. So this alliance allows it to mobilize the majority of the working population against capitalism and the bourgeois state. As the struggle which rose in Italy was mainly because of historical development in the society it did not have any proper impact on the economic inequality. It is essential to understand properly the working class movement issues which were culturally important to the peasants mainly because it would help to lead the other groups within the working population of Italy. Gramsci had identified the two issues based on the role of Catholic Church. It was within the matter where the peasantry experienced their oppression the most and also the industrial proletariat. So the hegemonic group should recreate themselves rather than dominate their junior partners. This was not a question of speaking in favour of desires of other groups in order to gather their votes or for selecting certain issues mainly to appeal to a broader constituency. A hegemonic group or class who truly believe in the concept really make large parts of its subalterns in the whole world and also make its own. So the leading group will change as it narrows factionalism. To get the leadership it is necessary for the workers to stop thinking about themselves. They must think of themselves as a worker associated with a class which mainly aims to lead the peasants and also intellectuals.

The broad definition of leadership has a number of issues. They are:

Firstly, it grants a leading group the power to make choices and also act collectively. The people in leading groups are mainly granted a good degree of clarity on seeing a situation

as it is. They should not be impaired by structural constraints or by the ideology.

Secondly, engage with the subaltern groups which means treating in a serious manner those practices and values which are meaningful to them but which are also by no means necessarily progressive. As we have already seen earlier that Gramsci identified the Catholic Church as a main institution and also set some ideas that exert forces over the everyday lives of the Peasantry. Despite his own skepticism Gramsci did not see the church as automatically reactionary. In his socialist career Gramsci rejected a mindless anti-clericalism and also fostered the links with the church activists as recognizing that most of the Italians were believers. Similarly, the 'Aspects of the Southern Question' makes the point that the church in Italy was itself divided along the regional lines. In the south the priests mainly acted as a layer of feudal oppression as they were themselves middle class landlords of that period. But in the North the church often fulfilled a totally different role. This was mainly for providing a form of democratic and also ethical and spiritual opposition towards the state. So the question arises that whether any political formations presently hold together any uneasy bedfellows and also analyse the strategies that are deployed to maintain such alliances. So for this we can see an example from United Kingdom where there was a coalition called antiwar which was formed around 2003 during the invasion of Iraq and also which temporarily together with the united secular leftist with many other Muslim people. This was mainly for the perception that the Islamic membership of the alliance compromised the Left's commitments towards the women and gay rights which was the biggest contest among the coalitions. They argued that the Muslim social conservatism should not prevent any collaboration among the hostility to the war.

Thirdly, the question must raise that to what extent the subalterns were incorporated into the worldview of a dominant group. What if the ruling group is forced to grant too many economic or ideological concessions to those it leads? What if a subaltern group develops the necessary agency to lead a hegemonic struggle itself and also to challenge the authority of a fundamental group such as the proletariat or the bourgeoisie? If these types of things were to happen then above the long war of position the leading group will be moved out of all recognitions. For example, if we take the socialist politics which exists presently. This typically involves a broad coalition of the Left that involved among others feminists, gay right

campaigners, peace activists, representatives of the ethnic groups and also the environmentalist. But if we will think of maintaining the primacy of class among these various interests then it is far from straight forward. So the socialism begins to look like just only one alternative position among many people or which can be defined precisely as a rainbow alliance of equal interest. So moreover the political groups or the parties never face downwards or seen as oppressed group. So if we can say that in their electoral appeals to the business and middle class voters the American democrats and the British Labour Party have been accused of taking on board the perspectives of those whom they sought to hegemonise. They also go from the hegemonic bloc to being a bloc that is hegemonised by the multinational capitalism and also the middle class conservatism. So it can be observed that the attempt by one region is to lead to another region unanticipated hegemonic consequences. The subaltern regions exerts the hegemonic pressures of their own. Gramsci has no conclusive answer about how the fundamental groups can limit the hegemonic activities of those which seeks to lead and also restrict the expansiveness of its hegemony. The inability which would fully theorize this problem is given by one of Gramsci's rare resorts towards economism. He said that such sacrifices and also such a compromise cannot touch the essential that is the function which is exercised by the leading group in the economic activity. Despite all these typical productiveness the porosity of a hegemonic bloc for the demands of others provides a cause of optimism. The ruling class which asked for consent and also cannot give any voice towards the aspirations of those people in whose name it rules will not survive indefinitely. For this Gramsci argued that within the hegemonic process the subaltern must pass from being a thing to being a historical person or a protagonist which is a powerful counter towards mass culture. This was the position where the subalterns were ideologically dominated by their leaders in the society. So this shows a sign of democratic process by Gramsci and for this he argues that a hegemonizing group must accept challenges to its leadership. So Gramsci writes that the active and the direct consent means the participation of all who are living in society even if it produces a disintegration or an apparent tumult. The issue of subaltern people's aspiration mainly focuses towards the people and is described as a process without an end. In order to maintain its power, a leading group must be constantly alert towards the volatile demands of the subalterns and also to the shifting context which is within it that exerts its authority. So Gramsci said that the social group has to exercise the leadership before it wins power but even

when this power is won it must continue to lead the society. Hegemony is not simply a question of meanings and values. It also takes the economic, material and also legal political forms. So the ruling power ensures that its subordinates have enough to eat and for this they are paid and also have adequate access to healthcare, childcare and holidays which has gone a long way in winning their hearts and also minds. This is seen as the parliamentary democracy which appears to grant subordinate people who have a good degree of legal political autonomy by granting them various rights and also by allowing them to vote to change their government and also to stand for elections on their own. Therefore Terry Eagleton said that the people are supposed to believe that they govern themselves. For this it is arguable that other forms of society also foster such an illusion. But Eagleton brings the attention of people towards the institutional dimension of hegemony. Within the ideological operation of hegemony the organizations also contribute towards the dissemination of meaning and values. The final point which was raised about Gramsci's conception of hegemony mainly concerns the question of force. This is the hegemonic group that cannot be assimilated into its cultural and also into the political project. Again he writes that while the hegemonic group leads coalition groups it also dominates the antagonistic groups.

3.5 GRAMSCI ON REVOLUTION

At that period the powerful Turin movement took place and Gramsci came in contact with the people involved in that movement. In 1913 he joined the Socialist party and engaged more in the work of the party. Gramsci gave up his studies in November 1915 and joined the editorial board of the paper of the Socialist Party. He wrote the editorial section which was published daily in the name of *Avanti*. In these few years he was active as a militant. The Russian Revolution in 1917 shook the foundation of European Social Democracy. Gramsci's involvement in politics was totally different from the most famous political philosopher of that period such as Lenin and Bolsheviks despite the strategic and tactical tasks of Italy and Russia were almost the same. By the time Gramsci became a powerful revolutionary in 1915 the Bolsheviks had gone through the experience of one revolution and also counter revolution. This was the process which clearly formulated their positions on the revolutionary party and also the agrarian question. The implications of these positions were mainly to avoid the lefts to

enter the Socialist Party till 1921. By 1915, Lenin understood the reasons for the collapse of the International in the face of the imperialist war and felt a need for a complete political break within it. As already mentioned Gramsci's own learning process about politics is different from Lenin. This was specifically the Italianized version of Marxism which found its way to Gramsci through different works such as Croce, Labriola and Gentile. These are the figures which Gramsci turned to as a remedy to the weaknesses that he perceived in the practice and theory of the right wing mainly in the Second International event of Socialist party. Gramsci felt that the passivity and the fatalism of this trend was itself related to an original historical Materialism which was described by Marx and Engels. Gramsci considered that Marx was the critic of political economy as found in the famous book *Kapital* which was in fact mechanical materialism that ignored the role and power of the subjective factor mainly to become conscious of its own exploitation and also rise up to overthrow a system which was based on economic conditions. Thus, Gramsci saw materialism of Marxism as deficient and in need of a return to Hegel which was advocated by Croce. He said that in order to inject a dose of idealism and provide an adequate account of subjectivity political factor in the revolutionary politics.

The approach of Lenin and Trotsky towards the problem of Russian Revolution was totally different to this issue. In 1899 Lenin and Narodniks argued against Marx's mechanistic interpretation on political economy which mainly led towards the conclusion that the backwardness of Russia's internal market meant that the development of the capitalism in Russia could be avoided. In early 1905 Trotsky described in his theory of permanent revolution that the Russian capitalism had to be understood in context of the uneven and also combined development of capitalism on the world scale. Capitalism rapidly increases because of the alliance with the European and especially the French capitalism and also the Tsarist Autocracy which was also overseen. Precisely because of this both Lenin and Trotsky contested the legal Marxist view which insisted that because of this development the leadership of the bourgeois revolution against the Tsar fell to the Russian bourgeoisies. They proved that the weakness of an indigenous Russian bourgeoisie and also the social weight of the Russian proletariat combined to guarantee that the former would bloc with recreation which was against the working class. This happened when they faced with a real fight to force

through the bourgeois democratic demands. But for Gramsci the revolution in the backward Italy had to be carried through despite its belief on social relations through an act of will. But for Lenin and Trotsky the revolution in backward Russia would occur precisely because of the contradictions in the material fabric of Russian capitalism. The flaws seen in Gramsci's methodological grasp of Marxism betrayed a real weakness in his grasp about historical materialism. In 1920 for some time Gramsci was propelled towards the positions of the revolutionary Comintern which was significant of these weaknesses that became obscured. The full significance about the issue was totally revealed in the book of *Prison Notebooks* during his discussion about civil society and also the state. Gramsci welcomed the Russian revolution as a proletarian act ... which was the result in a socialist regime. He regarded it as a confirmation of his views on Marxism. He considered it a revolution against **Das Kapital** and the same thing he saw in the Bolshevik's work. The Bolsheviks said that this was the continuation of Italian and the German idealist thought and also is seen in Marx which contaminated the positivist and also naturalistic incrustations.

There was an attack on Marxism in the methodological terms but Gramsci's real target was the Menshevik strategy which believed that there was a fatal necessity for the bourgeoisies to be formed in Russia mainly for the capitalist era to open before the proletariat that might demand their own revolution. Gramsci saw a kind of leader in Lenin who could force the pace of history by an act to organize the will rather than someone who could give a conscious expression about the social contradictions in the Russian Society.

As the crisis of revolution increased in Italy after the Russian Revolution, Gramsci had the chance to reflect further on different lessons that could be learned from Lenin. In August 1917, a strike started by the workers in Turin which led an insurrection against the local state was supported throughout the whole Piedmont region. Five hundred people died and almost two thousand people faced casualties in this strike but the Turin workers refused to quit the strike. Again the working class movement developed in an unprecedented manner during the year 1919 to 1920. These are the years when the Socialist Party grew from a membership of 81,000 to 216,000. The trade union federation members also increased from 32,000 to 2.3 million which was between the period of 1914 to 1920. Again in April 1919, Gramsci with

others established the paper called *L'Ordine Nuovo*. This paper was mainly to use the 'growing movement. In June the same year he wrote about the state of workers and that this state not did pop up by magic: the Bolsheviks worked for eight months to spread and also make their slogans. All powers to the Soviets were already known to the Russian workers during the period of 1905. In October 1919, the Socialist party affiliated to the Comintern in the following month fought a general election on a programme which called for the dictatorship of the proletariat. The party won the largest bloc of seats in the new parliament. In early 1920, the Socialist Party went on to win the control mainly over half of the municipal councils. The Italian workers were seeking the path of revolution without asking any question. In 1920s the struggle in the factories had risen to a higher level mainly with the formation of the Internal Commissions which enabled the workers to control all the aspects of the factory.

In 1920s throughout the summer almost half a million workers were involved in the commissions and councils. Gramsci grasped what was at stake and said that under the capitalists the factory was a miniature state that was ruled by a despotic board. After the workers took over this despotic power in the factories was smashed and the right to choose passed into the hands of the working class. Every factory that had industrial executives became an illegal state, a proletarian republic living from day-to-day, awaiting the outcome of the events. But this was the challenge as is how to direct the outcome of the events, and how to turn dual power in the factories into a challenge for the national state power. Here Gramsci's weaknesses on the party question were cruelly exposed.

The leadership in Serrati was certainly guilty of refusing to take responsibility for organizing the working class through the party to prepare for the seizure of state power. But Gramsci had always failed to strive for a revolutionary communist party. Even if after the affiliation to the Comintern, Gramsci was reluctant to fight the Turati reformist wing which was up to the point of expulsions. Gramsci did not even share the Brodiga's grasp of the need to organize to fight the factional views on the national level within the Socialist Party. It is a fact that Harman in his Phamplets stated the failings of the party and also about Gramsci with a remark that when it came to valuing the role of Marxist intervention in the class struggle his own activity in 1919- 1920 and also in 1924-1926 was a shining example of such type of intervention.

Lenin and Trotsky were much stronger on the failings of all sections in the Socialist Party. About the socialist party Trotsky said that the party carried on agitation mainly in favour of Soviet Russia. The Italian working class and also the mass took this issue seriously and entered the road of open revolutionary struggle. But precisely at the moment when the party should have drawn all the practical and political conclusions from its own agitation became scared of its responsibility and also shied away, leaving the rear of the proletariat group unprotected. After that Lenin was equally harsh and said, 'did a single communist show his mettle when the workers seized the factories in Italy?' The answer was 'no' at the time there was as yet no communism in Italy.

In 1924 Gramsci wrote in his own words that 'in 1919-1920 the people of Italy made extremely serious mistakes which was ultimately paying for today. They are afraid for being called upstarts and careerists. They did not form a faction and organize this throughout Italy. The people are not ready to give the Turin councils which was an autonomous directive centre that could have exercised an immense influence throughout the country mainly for fear of a split in the unions and also of being prematurely expelled from the Socialist Party.' He also said that it was the quality of self-criticism. They don't feel anything which was closely connected personally to the events and also how costly the mistakes proved. This was the quality possessed by all great revolutionists that enabled Gramsci to turn to the Comintern.

In his revolutionary conception of society a new body of organic intellectuals, emerging from the rising class would work to ease out those progressive elements that contained within the classes for the common sense. The boundaries of classes may be shifted but the role of intellectuals as a key of cultural intermediaries has not. These types of issues were extensively publicized by the websites and studio experts but later they were disorganized. In that period the network controllers, programme producers and also website designers were the newly forms of intellectual group which were within the greatly expanded sphere of the communication industry. Therefore, Gramsci draws a distinction between the kind of revolutionary action that was same in Russian Revolution and also the kind which was needed in other countries. In Russia the political superstructure was very poorly developed and later on slowly there was very little in the way of intermediaries between the Tsarist regime

and also the revolutionary opponents. The Bolsheviks did not have to win over these intermediaries and they could therefore concentrate their efforts in taking the control of the state. Gramsci gave the name of 'war of manoeuvre' for this all out frontal attack but it was mindful of how the western front had become bogged down during the fighting of the First World War. So fort he argues that such sudden transformation and the lighting victories are very rarely seen in the state. Most of the revolutions have to proceed through a war of position which was fought over a long period in the superstructure in which the meaning and the values become the object of struggle. The western capitalist nations have predicted that there must be serious oppositions for their rule and for this Gramsci argues for organized struggle. In the undeveloped societies there was an absence of intermediaries, modern capitalist regimes that have developed a strong woven network of practices and also institutions which guard against the internal disintegration that make the revolution a political and also psychological impossibility. There were many points which can be made for the differentiation between the war of manoeuvre and the war of position. The first one, the war of manoeuvre, mainly concerns the relationship between the ideological struggle and the armed revolution. Gramsci's usage of the distinction is somewhat contradictory. Gramsci argues that the war of position is needed to prepare the ground which before an assault can be made on the capitalist society. But on the other hand again he said that the war of position has decisively superseded the frontal attack. So the second description about the war of position may make Gramsci's work useful for the political movements which renounced the revolutionary violence. This thought also threatens to align the war of position with reformism which was precisely the tendency that prompted Gramsci's break with the Socialist Party. In 1992, Ransome said the persuasive cases that the people should think about are two strategies for operating in combination with each other. At some points longer preparation is needed to shape the superstructure before a decisive action can be taken. At other times, however the frontal attack is only the precursor towards the war of position.

Whether through this type of coercive or through symbolic means Gramsci proposes that the crisis can be resolved in favour of a ruling social group. However this type of resolution is unlikely to be permanent or satisfactory. So Gramsci's one axiom that was drawn from Marx is the social formation that cannot disappear while its productive forces still found

room for further movements in future. This was a declining ruling class that impedes the development of these productive forces which was a failure to which Gramsci gives the name of 'passive revolution'. For Gramsci, the Risorgimento was the key example of a passive revolution. So during and after the unification the Italian bourgeoisie had the opportunity to construct a genuine national popular class after responding to their aspirations. For this they constructed a minority political class that was based on the Moderate Party which gradually absorbed and transformed the leadership of the radical Action Party. These bourgeois elite wrote that Gramsci was characterized by his aversion to any intervention of the popular masses in the state life and towards any organic reform which would substitute hegemony for its crude dictatorial dominance. The truly popular mandate for its rule was therefore susceptible to a series of crises that was culminating in the rise of fascism. Gramsci sees a fundamental connection between the periods of transformation and Mussolini's rise to power since both are revolution from above which was rather than hegemonic projects. In both the state forced into a high level of intervention does not rely on the active participation and also consent of the people. Therefore it would not be possible to have a socialist or a social democratic passive revolution that was described by Gramsci when he pointed out towards Franklin D. Roosevelt's New Deal as another manifestation of the phenomenon. The remaining part is a suspicion of the state as a vehicle for coercion which presently the people might wish to think more reflexively about the connections between the people and the state. Given the concerted neoliberal assault that has taken place on the western welfare states over the past three decades seems questionable to represent the state as a vehicle for the interests of the ruling class. The people should take seriously Gramsci's proposition that the radical change without the democratic participation simply reproduces the authoritarian and patronizing assumptions that was about the relationship between leaders and led.

In 1848, the Paris Commune ushered in a qualitatively new phase of the historical development despite the defeat of both the sides. The previous fragile equilibrium of the class forces and their superstructures were thrown into crisis which was progressive expansively of the bourgeois project which had encountered its organic crisis. The crisis was organic by nature in the sense that it placed the very foundations of the bourgeois hegemony. According to the Traditional Marxist, it was the moment when bourgeoisie's claims about the universality

were revealed to be in the service of the particularist interests. This was defined as the accumulation of capital in the hands of the ruling class.

The working classes mainly revolted and their refusal was subsumed pacifically into the expensive state of the bourgeoisie. Their demands were always different and instead of the political forms which were adequate to their own emergent class project, sought to elevate and also educate but whatever they did was always on their own terms. Dr. Frankenstein who was a bourgeois had unwittingly called forth his own namesis. This is the Gramsci's version of the Communist Manifesto which was the thesis of the bourgeoisie where they brought forward their own gravedigger though once again Gramsci said that the stresses alongside is traditionally emphasized on the economic dimensions and also the political determinants of this process. It was the crisis of the entire social formation as both was based on the economic content and political form. So in certain sense the logic of historical development of the previous period went into the reverse and that was a traumatic return to a primal scene. Gramsci argued that this process comes to a halt and also the conception of the State was a pure forced return towards the state. The bourgeois class is saturated and also it not only expands but also starts to disintegrate. It not only does not assimilate the new elements but it loses part of itself. Then after that they began a period of passive revolution. In the early 1930, Gramsci appropriated the concept of passive revolution from Vincenzo Cuoco. The political context of this appropriation is significant and for this it is the same period when he polemicised against the implicit economism of the comintern. These types of revolutionary fantasies of those years were particularly related to the struggle against fascism in Italy. During a discussion in the prison with his other inmates or the party members, Gramsci insisted that it was always necessary to be more political to understand the historical foundations of fascism and also to outline a realistic political programme that could be the mass forces against the regime. Gramsci's proposal was mainly for a constituent assembly which could help to provide the Communist Party with the political space that was necessary to rebuild its forces for an assault on the bourgeois state. The seeming pessimism of this proposal can lead to his isolation among the other political prisoners amid acrimonious accusation. Gramsci said that judging the balance of forces that conducted a tactical retreat to his famous book *Notebooks* in order to furnish his position with the political arguments was

necessary to justify his untimely meditations. Therefore the concept of passive revolution was originally used by Cuoco to describe the Neapolitan revolution which happened in 1799. From this Gramsci transformed the concept in the first instance mainly to provide an analysis of the distinctive features of the Italian revolution. Later on it soon became clear that Gramsci used the concept which could have had a more general significance and could be used to indicate the modernity. This was also taken by other States such as the Jacobin Moment which distinguished the experience of the French revolution. In the third moment he also extended the concept to signify pacifying and incorporating nature that was assumed by the bourgeois hegemony in the revolution of the imperialism. This happened particularly in the Western European nations but with the determinant effects that was upon the colonial periphery. The passive revolution thus came to denote the hegemonic project for an entire historical period of that era. At that period according to Domenico Losurdo, in 1848 and till 1871 a phase of passive revolution began with the defeat of the workers and also the popular classes was identifiable neither with the counterrevolution nor with the political and ideological fall of the dominant class. So the category of passive revolution is a section which was used in the famous book written by Gramsci the *Prison of Notebooks* in order to denote the persistent capacity of the initiative of the bourgeoisie which succeeded even during the historical phase in which it ceased to be a properly revolutionary class. This class was mainly to produce the socio-political transformations which were sometime significant for conserving the power properly in its own hands, the initiative and the hegemony and also leaving the working classes in their conditions.

If the bourgeois project was able to continue then it was to deliver real progress. At the same time, it actively sought to deny other classes the opportunity to assume the initiative for producing the stagnation and also widespread loss of faith during the progress. Modernity was caught in an Arnoldian twilight where it was mentioned that the wandering between two worlds, one was dead and the other was powerless to be born. So the full development of Gramsci's concept of passive revolution always provides an example of the capacity of the Marxist tradition for both productive engagements with non-Marxist thought and also critical self-renewal. Therefore, both the moments are integrated in Gramsci's dialectical analysis. Initially appropriating the concept of passive revolution from outside the Marxist tradition, he

deployed this for the study of historical cases and also for testing and modifying it in accordance with the findings of his own research. In the third moment Gramsci assumed that his new concept was against theoretical criteria of the critique of the political economy that were foundational for the materialist conception of history. So finally Gramsci supplemented these criteria with another equally foundational concept of praxis as their necessary corollary or the lens that allowed them to be read in a new and politically enabling way. The Marxist traditions are subjected to an act of imminent critique. Perhaps it can be more importantly, held by returning to the concept of praxis as the self-critique of Marxism itself. So Gramsci proposes that a conception of Marxism that is neither an attempted synthesis of competing doctrines nor one theory which was ranged alongside others. So Gramsci's vision of Marxism insists upon its constitution a political moment which was capable of explaining the historical emergence of all ideologies. It is precisely described in the sense that in terms of making the possibilities for the social and political transformation that are immanent to the existing forms of thought was comprehensible. The historical materialist interdisciplinary research programme still has its continuation in the present period.

ACTIVITY

Compare Gramsci with Karl Marx.

DID YOU KNOW?

Gramsci wrote more than 30 notebooks and 3000 pages of history and analysis during his imprisonment. Although written unsystematically, the *Prison Notebooks* are considered a highly original contribution to 20th century political theory.

3.6 SUMMARY

In this unit, you have learnt that:

- Antonio Gramsci was the famous philosopher of Italy who has mentioned the theories which were useful at that period.

- Gramsci made the distinction between the state and civil society which must be maintained in order to prevent authoritarianism.
- Gramsci also provided the basis for a historical materialist that was described as interdisciplinary research programme.
- Gramsci provides the fertile tools and also the concepts for research into the macro or metanarratives of modernity and modernization.
- He proposes that the particular interpretation of the foundational concepts of historical materialism breaks with various determinists of deformations of Marx's thought. At the same time Marx's thought was only insisting upon the integrity of his theory which was a tradition of thought that was capable of the renewal through self-criticism.
- Gramsci also said that the hegemony is moral and also intellectual in its leadership nature which treats the aspirations and also views of subaltern class people as an active element within the political and cultural programme of the hegemonising bloc.
- Gramsci's conception of hegemony always revolves around the maintenance of the fundamental groups and also around the mechanism by which the subaltern groups accepts the leadership of another group.
- The idea of power described as hegemony was also influenced by many debates about the civil society.
- Many philosophers have criticized the civil society that was described by Gramsci but the way civil society was narrowly conceived in liberal democratic thought was reduced to an associational domain.
- The goal of civil society was for strengthening the development of policy that can be pursued either in the neoliberal sense for building the civic institutions to complement the states and also the markets. This can also be seen in the Gramscian description about building the civic capacities to think differently and also challenge the assumptions and the norms that can be articulated in the new ideas and visions.
- Gramsci's writings about education were not always easy to understand. In fact that was described as quite confusing during that period. Many times these writings were used by the philosophers in a wrong way or were misinterpreted.
- Lastly it was clear that Gramsci was the most famous philosopher who described

civil society and also the political society for the people of Italy. He suffered a lot in his childhood period but still was interested in political processes of Italy. He had worked a lot for changing the situation of people in the society. The most important work of Gramsci was the description about the term hegemony which was later on used by many other philosophers in their writings.

3.7 KEY TERMS

Political Society: Gramsci described the term political society as the arena of the political institutions and legal constitutional control.

Hegemony: Hegemony is in its simplest sense the ascendancy or domination of one element of a system over others. In Marxist theory the term is used in a more technical and specific sense. According to Antonio Gramsci the term hegemony refers to the ability of a dominant class to exercise power by winning the consent of those it subjugates as an alternative to the use of coercion.

Ideological hegemony: Gramsci in his book Prison Notebooks emphasised the degree to which capitalism was maintained not merely by economic domination, but also by political and cultural factors, and he called this ideological hegemony

3.8 ANSWERS TO 'CHECK YOUR PROGRESS'

1. Fill in the blanks:

- (a) Ales
- (b) Cagliari
- (c) Julka Schucht
- (d) The New Order: A weekly Review of Socialist Culture
- (e) 46
- (f) revolutionary

2: Fill in the blanks:

- (a) Marxist
- (b) State

- (c) Class
 - (d) The Modern Prince
3. State whether True or False:
- (a) False
 - (b) True
 - (c) True
 - (d) False
 - (e) False

3.9 QUESTIONS AND EXERCISES

Short-Answer Questions

1. Write a brief note on the life of Antonio Gramsci.
2. State Gramsci's views on revolution.
3. Describe Gramsci's views on hegemony.
4. Why has Gramsci used the term hegemony in that period?

Long-Answer Questions

1. Discuss Gramsci's views on civil society. Why did he give more importance to this in that period?
2. What is Gramsci's criticism regarding the subaltern classes?
3. How has Gramsci differentiated between civil society and political society?
4. Describe the term hegemony and economism.

3. 10 FURTHER READING

- Balme, D.M. Aristotle. 2002. *Historia Animalium*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Coleman, Janet. 2000. *A History of Political Thought*. New Delhi: Wiley-Blackwell.
- Grube, G.M.A, C.D.C., Reeve. 1992. *Plato.Republic*. Indianapolis: Hackett Pub Co. Grube, G.M.A, 1980. *Plato's Thought*. Cambridge: Hackett Pub Co Inc.
- Miller, David, Janet Coleman, William Connolly et.al. 1991. *The Blackwell Encyclopedia of Political Thought*. New Delhi: Wiley-Blackwell.
- Shields, Christopher. *Aristotle*. 2007. New York: Routledge.
- Strauss, Leo, and Joseph Cropsey. 1987. *A History of Political Philosophy*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Wolff, Jonathan. 2006. *An Introduction to Political Philosophy*. New Delhi: Oxford University Press.

UNIT 4

POST-STRUCTURALISM AND POST-MODERNISM: Michel Foucault

Structure

4.0 Introduction

4.1 Unit Objectives

4.2 Michel Foucault

4.2.1 Life Sketch

4.2.2 Major Works

4.3 Discipline and Democracy

4.4 Power

4.5 Government and the Self

4.6 Critical Analysis of Michel Foucault's Contribution and Concepts

4.7 Let Us Sum Up

4.8 Key Words

4.9 Answers to Questions in Check Your Learning

4.10 Short Questions

4.11 Long Questions

4.12 Further reading

4.0 Introduction

The second half of the twentieth century witnessed major transformations in philosophy, social theory, literature, and political thought. Traditional theories that claimed to explain society through universal truths, fixed structures, and objective knowledge began to face serious criticism. In this intellectual context, two important approaches emerged: Post-Structuralism and Post-Modernism. These approaches challenged earlier assumptions about truth, reason, identity, language, power, and knowledge. Among the thinkers associated with these developments, Michel Foucault occupies a central place. His writings transformed the study of politics, sociology, history, philosophy, and cultural studies.

To understand Foucault's contribution, it is first necessary to understand the meaning of structuralism, post-structuralism, and post-modernism. Structuralism emerged mainly in Europe during the mid-twentieth century. Influenced by linguistics, especially the work of Ferdinand de Saussure, structuralists argued that human culture, language, and society operate through underlying structures. According to structuralists, meaning is not created individually but through systems of relationships. Human behavior, language, myths, and institutions are shaped by deeper structures that determine how people think and act.

Structuralist thinkers believed that society could be studied scientifically by identifying these hidden structures. Thinkers such as Claude Lévi-Strauss in anthropology and Louis Althusser in Marxism attempted to explain human society through systematic and stable structures. Structuralism therefore emphasized order, system, and objectivity.

However, by the late 1960s and 1970s, many scholars began to criticize structuralism for being too rigid and deterministic. They argued that structuralism ignored human agency, historical change, contradictions, and the unstable nature of meaning. This criticism gave rise to post-structuralism. Post-structuralism does not completely reject structuralism but questions its assumptions. It argues that meaning is never fixed, stable, or final. Language, identity, truth, and social reality are constantly changing and shaped by power relations.

Michel Foucault became one of the most influential post-structuralist thinkers because he challenged traditional ideas about truth, knowledge, and power. Unlike earlier thinkers who viewed knowledge as neutral and objective, Foucault argued that knowledge is always connected with power. According to him, every society creates systems of knowledge that define what is considered true, normal, or acceptable. These systems are not neutral; they serve particular forms of power and control.

For example, Foucault studied how societies define madness, crime, sexuality, and normal behavior. He argued that these categories are not natural or universal but historically constructed. Institutions such as prisons, schools, hospitals, and mental asylums create forms of discipline that shape human behavior. Thus, power is not only exercised through governments and laws but also through everyday institutions and practices.

Closely related to post-structuralism is post-modernism. Post-modernism refers to a broader intellectual and cultural movement that rejects grand theories and universal explanations. Post-modern thinkers criticize the Enlightenment belief that reason, science, and progress will necessarily lead to human freedom and development. Instead, they emphasize fragmentation, diversity, plurality, and the instability of meaning.

One of the major features of post-modernism is skepticism toward what Jean-François Lyotard called “meta-narratives” or grand narratives. These are large theories such as liberalism, Marxism, nationalism, or religion that claim to explain the whole of society and history. Post-modernists argue that no single theory can fully explain human experience because reality is complex, fragmented, and constantly changing.

Although Foucault did not personally describe himself as a post-modernist, his ideas strongly influenced post-modern thought. His rejection of universal truths, his critique of institutions, and his analysis of power and discourse became central themes in post-modernism. Foucault argued that what societies consider “truth” is produced through discourse. Discourse refers to systems of ideas, language, and practices that shape how people think and behave. Through discourse, power operates by defining what is normal and abnormal, rational and irrational, acceptable and unacceptable.

According to George Ritzer, Foucault’s work represents a major shift in social theory because it moves away from economic or class-based explanations toward an analysis of power embedded in institutions and knowledge systems. Similarly, Barry Smart argues that Foucault changed the understanding of power by showing that power is not merely repressive but also productive. It creates identities, knowledge, and social practices.

One of the most important aspects of Foucault’s thought is his rejection of the traditional view that power is located only in the state or ruling class. Instead, he argues that power exists everywhere because it is embedded in social relationships. Teachers, doctors, prison officials, psychiatrists, and administrators all participate in networks of power. In this sense, power is decentralized and operates through discipline and surveillance rather than only through force.

Foucault's famous concept of "disciplinary power" explains how modern societies control individuals through subtle forms of observation and normalization. In modern institutions such as schools, factories, prisons, and hospitals, individuals are constantly observed, examined, and evaluated. This creates self-discipline, where people regulate their own behavior according to social expectations. Foucault illustrates this idea through the metaphor of the Panopticon, a prison design proposed by Jeremy Bentham, where prisoners behave properly because they believe they are always being watched.

Another important contribution of Foucault is his method of "genealogy." Rather than studying history as a linear process of progress, Foucault examines how systems of knowledge and power develop over time. His genealogical method reveals that many social categories and institutions that appear natural are actually historical constructions shaped by power relations.

Foucault's ideas have had a profound influence on political science, sociology, gender studies, cultural studies, international relations, and literary criticism. Feminist scholars used his analysis of power to examine the control of women's bodies and identities. Post-colonial thinkers applied his ideas to understand how colonial powers created knowledge about colonized societies. Scholars of governance and public administration also use Foucault's ideas to analyze surveillance, discipline, and state control in modern societies.

At the same time, Foucault's theories have also faced criticism. Some scholars argue that his concept of power leaves little room for resistance or human freedom. Others criticize him for rejecting universal values such as justice, equality, and human rights. Thinkers such as Jürgen Habermas argue that Foucault's rejection of universal reason weakens the possibility of democratic dialogue and moral criticism.

Despite these criticisms, Foucault remains one of the most influential thinkers of contemporary political and social theory. His work challenged conventional understandings of politics by showing that power operates not only through governments and laws but also through knowledge, discourse, institutions, and everyday practices. Through his analysis of discipline, power, and governmentality, Foucault transformed the study of modern society and opened new ways of understanding politics and human behavior.

Thus, post-structuralism and post-modernism represent important intellectual movements that question fixed truths, universal theories, and centralized authority. Foucault's contribution to these traditions lies in his analysis of the relationship between power and knowledge, his critique of institutions, and his understanding of how modern societies discipline and govern individuals. His work continues to remain highly relevant in understanding contemporary issues such as surveillance, identity, governance, media, and democracy.

4.1 Unit Objectives

After studying this unit, students will be able to:

- Understand the meaning and main features of post-structuralism and post-modernism
- Explain the intellectual background of Michel Foucault's political thought
- Analyze Foucault's critique of truth, knowledge, and universal theories
- Understand the relationship between power and knowledge in Foucault's theory
- Examine Foucault's contribution to the study of discipline, governance, and the self
- Evaluate the relevance and criticism of Foucault's ideas in contemporary political theory
- Apply Foucault's concepts to modern institutions such as prisons, schools, hospitals, and media

4.2 Michel Foucault

Michel Foucault is regarded as one of the most influential political and social thinkers of the twentieth century. His ideas transformed the study of power, knowledge, institutions, discourse, governance, sexuality, punishment, and identity. Although he was trained in philosophy, his writings crossed disciplinary boundaries and deeply influenced political science, sociology, history, anthropology, cultural studies, gender studies, and literary criticism. Foucault's work is closely associated with post-structuralism and post-modernism because he questioned universal truths, stable identities, and fixed structures of knowledge. Unlike traditional political thinkers who focused mainly on the state, law, sovereignty, and

formal political institutions, Foucault examined how power operates in everyday life through institutions such as prisons, schools, hospitals, armies, and mental asylums. He argued that power is not simply concentrated in the hands of rulers or governments. Instead, power exists in all social relationships and functions through systems of knowledge, discipline, and surveillance. This new understanding of power made Foucault one of the most original thinkers of modern political theory. Foucault's importance lies in his rejection of the traditional assumption that knowledge is neutral and objective. According to him, every society produces systems of knowledge that define what is considered true, normal, moral, or scientific. These "truths" are not independent of power. Rather, power and knowledge are closely connected. This idea is often summarized in his famous concept of "power/knowledge." Foucault argued that those who control knowledge also influence how society functions. Thus, knowledge becomes a tool of regulation and control.

One of the central concerns of Foucault was the relationship between modern institutions and human behavior. In works such as *Discipline and Punish*, he examined how modern societies create disciplined individuals through surveillance, examination, and normalization. Unlike earlier systems that relied mainly on physical punishment, modern societies control people through subtle forms of observation and self-discipline. Individuals begin to monitor and regulate their own behavior because they feel constantly watched. Foucault explained this idea through the example of the Panopticon, a prison model proposed by Jeremy Bentham. In the Panopticon, prisoners cannot know when they are being observed, so they behave as if they are always under surveillance. For Foucault, this model symbolizes modern society, where discipline operates through schools, hospitals, workplaces, and administrative systems.

Another major contribution of Foucault is his method of "genealogy." Instead of studying history as a story of continuous progress, Foucault investigated how systems of knowledge and institutions emerged historically. He showed that concepts such as madness, criminality, sexuality, and normality are not timeless truths but social constructions shaped by historical power relations. His genealogical approach challenged traditional historical methods and opened new ways of analyzing society. Foucault's writings also contributed significantly to the understanding of modern governance. In his later works, he introduced the concept of

“governmentality,” which refers to the techniques and practices through which populations are governed. Government, according to Foucault, is not limited to the state. It includes various institutions, experts, and practices that guide human conduct. This concept became highly influential in political science and public administration because it expanded the meaning of governance beyond formal political institutions.

According to Barry Smart in Michel Foucault (1985), Foucault revolutionized social theory by demonstrating that power is not merely repressive but also productive. Power does not only prohibit and punish; it also creates identities, knowledge, categories, and social practices. This insight changed the way scholars understand politics and society. Similarly, Paul Rabinow, editor of *The Foucault Reader* (1984), argues that Foucault’s work provides a new understanding of modernity by showing how human beings become subjects through systems of power and knowledge. Rabinow emphasizes that Foucault’s studies reveal the hidden mechanisms through which modern societies regulate individuals. Gilles Deleuze in his book *Foucault* (1986) describes Foucault as a thinker who transformed philosophy by connecting knowledge, power, and subjectivity. According to Deleuze, Foucault’s originality lies in his ability to reveal the invisible networks of power operating within society. Foucault’s influence can also be seen in feminist theory. Feminist scholars used his ideas to examine how women’s bodies and identities are shaped by medical, social, and cultural discourses. Judith Butler, influenced by Foucault, argued that gender identities are socially constructed through repeated social practices and norms. Similarly, post-colonial scholars applied Foucault’s theories to analyze how colonial powers created systems of knowledge about colonized societies in order to dominate them.

Despite his enormous influence, Foucault’s ideas have also faced criticism. One major critic is Jürgen Habermas. In *The Philosophical Discourse of Modernity* (1985), Habermas argues that Foucault’s rejection of universal reason and truth weakens the possibility of moral criticism and democratic dialogue. According to Habermas, if all truth is connected to power, then it becomes difficult to defend universal principles such as justice, democracy, or human rights. Another criticism comes from Marxist scholars who argue that Foucault pays insufficient attention to economic structures and class relations. Traditional Marxists believe that economic exploitation and capitalism are central to understanding power, whereas

Foucault focuses more on discourse, institutions, and micro-level relations of power. Critics claim that this approach underestimates the role of class struggle and economic inequality.

Some scholars also criticize Foucault for presenting power as so widespread and pervasive that resistance becomes difficult. If power exists everywhere, critics ask, then how can individuals challenge or escape it? Foucault responded by arguing that wherever there is power, there is also resistance. Power relations are never completely fixed or total.

Despite these criticisms, Foucault remains highly relevant in contemporary times. In the twenty-first century, societies are increasingly shaped by surveillance technologies, digital monitoring, data collection, and administrative control. Governments, corporations, and digital platforms collect information about individuals on an unprecedented scale. Foucault's analysis of surveillance and disciplinary power helps explain these developments. Modern societies often function through systems of monitoring, evaluation, and normalization, just as Foucault described decades earlier.

For example, CCTV cameras, biometric identification, social media algorithms, online tracking, and digital databases create new forms of surveillance. Individuals often regulate their own behavior because they know they may be observed. Foucault's concept of the Panopticon is therefore widely used to understand digital surveillance and contemporary governance.

Foucault's ideas are also relevant in understanding education systems, healthcare, prisons, mental health institutions, and media culture. His analysis shows how institutions shape human identities and define what is normal or acceptable. In debates on gender, sexuality, identity politics, and minority rights, Foucault's critique of fixed identities continues to influence contemporary scholarship.

According to Nikolas Rose in *Powers of Freedom* (1999), Foucault's work remains important because it explains how modern liberal democracies govern individuals not only through laws but also through psychological, medical, and administrative practices. Rose argues that contemporary governance increasingly operates by shaping individual choices and

behaviors. Similarly, David Garland in *Punishment and Modern Society* (1990) notes that Foucault transformed the study of punishment by showing that prisons are not merely institutions of confinement but mechanisms for producing disciplined and obedient citizens.

Thus, Foucault's importance in contemporary political theory lies in his ability to uncover hidden structures of power operating within everyday life. He challenged conventional understandings of politics by demonstrating that power is not limited to governments or laws but is embedded in institutions, discourses, and social practices. His work opened new directions in the study of governance, identity, surveillance, and resistance. Although controversial and often difficult, Foucault's theories continue to inspire debates across disciplines. His analysis of power, discipline, and governmentality remains essential for understanding modern societies characterized by surveillance, regulation, and the production of knowledge. Through his innovative methods and critical approach, Michel Foucault established himself as one of the most influential thinkers of contemporary political and social thought.

4.2.1 Life Sketch

Michel Foucault was born on 15 October 1926 in the city of Poitiers in western France. He was born into a prosperous and respected middle-class family. His father, Paul Foucault, was a successful surgeon, and his mother, Anne Malapert, also came from a medical family. The family expected Michel to continue the medical profession, but from an early age he showed greater interest in history, philosophy, and literature. Foucault grew up in an intellectually disciplined yet emotionally complex environment. His father was known to be strict and authoritarian, and this family atmosphere may have influenced Foucault's later interest in authority, discipline, and power relations. As a child, he was intelligent but introverted and often felt socially isolated. His early education took place in Poitiers. During his childhood, France experienced the turbulence of the Second World War and the Nazi occupation. These political and social conditions deeply affected French intellectual life and shaped the thinking of many later philosophers, including Foucault. The experience of

authoritarianism, war, and political instability contributed to broader intellectual debates about power, freedom, and human nature.

Foucault later moved to Paris for higher education and entered the prestigious *École Normale Supérieure* in 1946. This institution was one of the leading centers of intellectual life in France and produced many influential philosophers and scholars. Life at the institution was highly competitive and demanding. Foucault faced emotional difficulties and periods of depression during these years. However, he excelled academically and developed strong interests in philosophy, psychology, and history. At the *École Normale Supérieure*, Foucault studied the works of philosophers such as Georg Wilhelm Friedrich Hegel, Karl Marx, Friedrich Nietzsche, and Martin Heidegger. Among these thinkers, Nietzsche had a particularly deep influence on him. Nietzsche's critique of truth, morality, and power strongly shaped Foucault's later ideas. During this period, Foucault also became interested in psychology and psychiatry. He studied mental illness and worked in psychiatric institutions, experiences that later influenced his first major book, *Madness and Civilization*. His interest in mental institutions led him to question how societies define normality and abnormality.

Foucault completed degrees in philosophy and psychology and later taught in several institutions. In the 1950s, he worked in universities and cultural institutions in countries such as Sweden, Poland, and Germany. These international experiences exposed him to different political systems and intellectual traditions. One important phase of his career began in the 1960s when he returned to France and published major scholarly works. His book *Madness and Civilization* (1961) brought him recognition as an original intellectual. Later works such as *The Birth of the Clinic* (1963) and *The Order of Things* (1966) established his reputation internationally.

The political atmosphere of the late 1960s also influenced Foucault deeply. The student protests and worker movements of May 1968 in France challenged traditional authority and social institutions. Foucault became increasingly engaged with political activism, especially issues related to prisons, policing, and human rights. In 1970, Foucault was appointed to the prestigious *Collège de France*, where he held the chair in the "History of

Systems of Thought.” This position confirmed his status as one of France’s leading intellectuals. His lectures at the Collège de France attracted scholars from around the world and became highly influential in contemporary theory. Throughout the 1970s and 1980s, Foucault continued to publish important works on prisons, sexuality, governance, and ethics. He also participated in political movements concerning prison reform and civil liberties. Unlike many traditional academics, Foucault combined intellectual work with social activism. In his later years, Foucault became increasingly interested in ethics and the relationship between government and the self. He studied ancient Greek and Roman ideas about self-care and ethical conduct. This represented a shift from his earlier focus on institutions toward questions of subjectivity and personal transformation.

Foucault’s personal life also influenced his thought. As a gay man living in a period when homosexuality faced social discrimination, he experienced marginalization and social control firsthand. His writings on sexuality challenged traditional moral and medical attitudes and became influential in gender and queer studies.

Foucault died on 25 June 1984 in Paris at the age of 57. He was one of the first prominent French intellectuals to die from complications related to AIDS. His death marked the end of an extraordinary intellectual career, but his influence continued to grow after his passing.

Today, Michel Foucault is remembered as a thinker who transformed modern social and political theory. His life experiences, intellectual struggles, and engagement with institutions deeply shaped his understanding of power, knowledge, discipline, and identity. His writings continue to influence debates across philosophy, political science, sociology, cultural studies, and contemporary governance.

4.2.2 Major Works

The following are the major works of Michel Foucault arranged in chronological order along with their central themes and concepts:

1. *Madness and Civilization* (1961)

Examines how societies historically defined and treated madness. Introduces the relationship between knowledge, institutions, and exclusion.

2. *The Birth of the Clinic* (1963)

It studies the development of modern medicine and medical institutions. Focuses on medical observation and the “medical gaze.”

3. *The Order of Things* (1966)

It explores the structure of knowledge in different historical periods. Introduces the concept of “episteme.”

4. *The Archaeology of Knowledge* (1969)

It explains Foucault’s archaeological method for studying discourse and systems of thought.

5. *Discipline and Punish* (1975)

It analyzes prisons, punishment, surveillance, and disciplinary power. Discusses the Panopticon and modern discipline

6. *The History of Sexuality, Volume I* (1976)

It examines sexuality, power, and discourse. Introduces the concept of “biopower”

7. *The History of Sexuality, Volume II: The Use of Pleasure* (1984)

Studies ethics, self-control, and sexuality in ancient Greece

8. *The History of Sexuality, Volume III: The Care of the Self* (1984)

Focuses on ethics, self-government, and the formation of the self in classical antiquity

These works collectively explain Foucault’s major concepts such as discourse, discipline, surveillance, power/knowledge, biopower, governmentality, and the self.

Check Your Progress

1. *Why Michel Foucault is considered an important post-structuralist thinker?*
2. *Explain Foucault’s concept of “power/knowledge.”*
3. *What is meant by disciplinary power in Foucault’s theory?*
4. *Mention two major criticisms of Foucault’s political thought.*
5. *Why are Foucault’s ideas relevant in the contemporary digital age?*

4.3 Discipline and Democracy

One of the most important contributions of Michel Foucault to political and social theory is his analysis of discipline and its relationship with modern society. Foucault argued that modern democratic societies are not governed only through laws, constitutions, elections, and political institutions. They are also governed through systems of discipline that shape human behavior, regulate conduct, and create obedient citizens. His ideas on discipline are mainly discussed in his famous work *Discipline and Punish: The Birth of the Prison* (1975). Foucault's analysis of discipline is important because it changes the traditional understanding of power and democracy. Classical political thinkers usually focused on visible forms of political authority such as kings, governments, courts, and police. Foucault, however, examined the hidden and everyday forms of power operating in schools, prisons, hospitals, armies, factories, and offices. According to him, modern societies control people not only through force or punishment but also through discipline, surveillance, examination, and normalization.

To understand Foucault's theory, it is necessary to first understand the meaning of discipline. In ordinary language, discipline usually means obedience, order, or proper behavior. For Foucault, discipline is much more than that. Discipline is a system of control that trains individuals to behave in certain ways. It produces "docile bodies," meaning individuals who are useful, obedient, productive, and easy to control. Discipline does not simply punish wrongdoing; it shapes behavior in advance so that people regulate themselves according to social expectations. Foucault argues that before the modern period, punishment was often public and violent. Kings and rulers demonstrated their authority through brutal punishments such as torture, execution, and physical violence. These punishments were meant to display the power of the ruler. In *Discipline and Punish*, Foucault begins by describing the public execution of Damiens in eighteenth-century France. This example shows how punishment was once physical and spectacular.

However, according to Foucault, modern societies gradually moved away from public torture toward more subtle methods of control. Instead of punishing the body directly, modern institutions aim to control the mind, behavior, and habits of individuals. Punishment became

less visible but more widespread and systematic. This transformation marks the rise of disciplinary power.

Foucault explains that discipline works through several techniques. One important technique is surveillance. Modern institutions constantly observe and monitor individuals. Students are watched in classrooms, workers are supervised in factories, patients are monitored in hospitals, and prisoners are observed in prisons. This constant observation encourages individuals to behave according to expected norms. People discipline themselves because they know they may be watched at any time. The best example of surveillance, according to Foucault, is the Panopticon designed by Jeremy Bentham. The Panopticon was a prison design in which prisoners could always be seen by a guard located in a central tower, but prisoners could not know whether the guard was actually watching them. Because prisoners believed they might always be observed, they disciplined their own behavior. For Foucault, the Panopticon became a symbol of modern society. He argued that modern democratic societies increasingly function like a Panopticon. Surveillance exists everywhere in schools, hospitals, workplaces, military institutions, and even public spaces. Individuals internalize discipline and begin to control themselves. Thus, power becomes more effective because people obey voluntarily rather than through direct force.

Another important feature of discipline is normalization. Modern societies create standards of “normal” behavior, appearance, intelligence, health, and morality. Individuals who fit these norms are considered acceptable, while those who deviate are seen as abnormal or problematic. Institutions such as schools, hospitals, psychiatric clinics, and prisons help define and enforce these norms.

For example, schools evaluate students through examinations, grades, attendance, and behavior records. Students learn not only academic subjects but also punctuality, obedience, discipline, and competition. In this way, schools produce disciplined citizens who can function efficiently in society. Similarly, hospitals define standards of normal health, while psychiatric institutions define standards of mental normality.

Foucault emphasizes that discipline works through examination. Examination combines surveillance and judgment. Through tests, records, files, reports, and assessments,

institutions collect information about individuals. This knowledge allows institutions to classify, compare, and regulate people. Examinations therefore become tools of power. According to Foucault, knowledge and power are closely connected. Institutions produce knowledge about individuals in order to control them more effectively. For example, prisons produce knowledge about criminals, hospitals produce knowledge about patients, and schools produce knowledge about students. This connection between knowledge and control is central to Foucault's idea of "power/knowledge." Foucault's theory of discipline also changes the traditional understanding of democracy. Democracy is generally associated with freedom, equality, participation, and rights. However, Foucault argues that democratic societies also contain systems of discipline and surveillance. Modern democracies do not rely mainly on violence or open repression; instead, they govern through subtle techniques that shape individual behavior. This does not mean that democracy and dictatorship are identical. Rather, Foucault shows that even democratic societies exercise forms of control. Citizens may appear free, but their behavior is often regulated through institutions, norms, and surveillance systems. Modern democracies require disciplined citizens who obey laws, follow social rules, and contribute productively to society.

According to Barry Smart in Michel Foucault (1985), Foucault's analysis reveals that modern power is productive rather than merely repressive. Power creates disciplined individuals, social norms, and institutional practices. It shapes human behavior instead of simply forbidding actions.

Similarly, David Garland in *Punishment and Modern Society* (1990) argues that Foucault transformed the understanding of punishment by showing that prisons are not only places of confinement but institutions for producing disciplined and obedient citizens. Garland notes that discipline extends beyond prisons into the wider structure of society.

An important aspect of Foucault's theory is that discipline is decentralized. Traditional political theories often viewed power as something possessed by the state or ruling class. Foucault, however, argues that power operates through networks and relationships. Teachers, doctors, prison officials, administrators, psychologists, and managers all participate in disciplinary systems. Thus, power exists throughout society rather than being concentrated in

one institution. Foucault also explains that discipline is closely linked with the development of modern capitalism and industrial society. Factories require disciplined workers who are punctual, efficient, and obedient. Schools train future workers by teaching discipline and routine. Military institutions train soldiers through strict discipline and regulation. Thus, disciplinary power supports economic and administrative efficiency.

Another important concept connected with discipline is biopower. Foucault introduced this term in *The History of Sexuality, Volume I* (1976). Biopower refers to the regulation of populations through policies related to health, sexuality, birth rates, sanitation, and public welfare. Modern states not only control individuals but also manage populations through statistics, medical systems, and administrative policies.

For example, governments conduct censuses, maintain health records, regulate vaccination programs, and promote family planning policies. These practices aim to improve and regulate the population. According to Foucault, this represents a new form of political power focused on managing life itself. Foucault's ideas became especially important in understanding contemporary surveillance systems. In modern societies, surveillance extends beyond traditional institutions into digital technologies. CCTV cameras, biometric systems, online monitoring, social media tracking, and data collection create new forms of observation and control. Scholars often use Foucault's Panopticon to explain digital surveillance in the twenty-first century.

For instance, individuals today often modify their behavior because they know they may be observed online or recorded through digital systems. Social media users regulate what they post, employees adapt to workplace monitoring software, and citizens are tracked through digital databases. These practices reflect the continuing relevance of Foucault's theory of discipline.

Foucault's ideas have also influenced education studies, gender studies, criminology, sociology, and media studies. Feminist scholars used his theory to examine how women's

bodies are disciplined through beauty standards, medical practices, and social expectations. Cultural theorists applied his ideas to study media regulation and identity formation.

Despite its influence, Foucault's theory of discipline has faced criticism. Some scholars argue that he exaggerates the power of institutions and leaves little space for human freedom or resistance. Critics claim that individuals are not simply passive victims of disciplinary systems; they can resist, challenge, and transform social norms.

Jürgen Habermas criticized Foucault for focusing too much on domination and failing to provide a clear basis for democracy, ethics, or human rights. According to Habermas, Foucault's theory makes it difficult to distinguish between legitimate and illegitimate forms of power.

Marxist scholars also criticize Foucault for paying insufficient attention to class and economic inequality. They argue that capitalism and class exploitation remain central to understanding modern society, whereas Foucault focuses mainly on institutions and discourse. However, defenders of Foucault argue that his theory does not deny resistance. Foucault himself stated that "where there is power, there is resistance." People may resist discipline through protests, alternative identities, social movements, and everyday acts of defiance. His work therefore encourages critical awareness of how institutions shape human behavior.

Another criticism is that Foucault presents democracy too negatively. Some scholars argue that democratic institutions also provide rights, freedoms, and opportunities for participation, not merely systems of control. Nevertheless, Foucault's aim was not to reject democracy entirely but to reveal the hidden mechanisms of power operating within democratic societies.

In contemporary times, Foucault's analysis remains highly relevant. Modern societies increasingly rely on surveillance technologies, administrative systems, and institutional regulation. Schools monitor students through digital systems, workplaces track employee productivity, governments collect biometric data, and social media platforms gather personal

information. Foucault's ideas help explain how these systems influence behavior and create disciplined citizens.

The COVID-19 pandemic also demonstrated the relevance of Foucault's theory. Governments around the world introduced lockdowns, health monitoring, vaccination programs, travel restrictions, and digital tracking systems. These measures reflected forms of biopower and population management similar to those described by Foucault.

Thus, Foucault's concept of discipline provides a powerful framework for understanding modern democracy and governance. He shows that power operates not only through laws and political institutions but also through everyday practices of surveillance, normalization, and examination. Modern democracies depend on disciplined citizens, and institutions play a central role in shaping human behavior.

Foucault's theory of discipline and democracy transformed modern political thought by revealing the hidden forms of power operating within society. Through institutions such as schools, prisons, hospitals, and workplaces, modern societies produce disciplined and obedient individuals. Discipline works through surveillance, normalization, and examination rather than direct violence. Although his theory has been criticized for underestimating freedom and resistance, it remains one of the most influential analyses of modern power and governance. In an age of digital surveillance and administrative control, Foucault's insights continue to provide valuable tools for understanding the relationship between discipline, democracy, and modern society.

4.4 Power

The concept of power occupies a central place in the political and social thought of Michel Foucault. In fact, Foucault is widely regarded as one of the most important modern thinkers on power because he fundamentally changed the way scholars understand its nature and operation. Before Foucault, political theory generally viewed power in a traditional manner. Power was usually understood as something possessed by the state, rulers, governments, or dominant classes. It was often associated with sovereignty, law, coercion, and

authority. Classical political thinkers focused mainly on questions such as: Who rules? Who has authority? How is political power exercised by the state?

Foucault challenged this traditional understanding. According to him, power is not simply something owned by rulers or governments. Power is not limited to parliaments, police, courts, or armies. Instead, power exists everywhere because it is embedded in all social relationships. It operates through institutions, language, knowledge, customs, social practices, and even everyday interactions. Thus, Foucault transformed the study of power from a narrow political issue into a broad social and cultural phenomenon.

Foucault's understanding of power developed gradually through several of his works, especially *Madness and Civilization* (1961), *The Birth of the Clinic* (1963), *Discipline and Punish* (1975), and *The History of Sexuality, Volume I* (1976). In these works, he examined how modern societies create systems of discipline, surveillance, normalization, and regulation that shape human behavior.

One of Foucault's most famous arguments is that power and knowledge are closely connected. This relationship is often summarized through the phrase "knowledge is power." Although the phrase itself was earlier associated with Francis Bacon, Foucault gave it a new and deeper meaning. According to Foucault, knowledge is never neutral or independent. Every system of knowledge is connected with power relations. Similarly, power produces knowledge in order to regulate and control society more effectively. Foucault uses the term power/knowledge to explain this relationship. He argues that those who produce knowledge also shape social reality. For example, doctors define what is healthy or unhealthy, psychiatrists define what is normal or abnormal, teachers define intelligence and success, and legal systems define criminality. These definitions influence how society treats individuals. Thus, knowledge becomes a mechanism of social control.

In *The Birth of the Clinic*, Foucault studies the rise of modern medicine and hospitals. He explains how medical institutions developed systems of observation and classification that allowed doctors to exercise authority over patients. Medical knowledge was not merely

scientific; it also created relationships of power between doctors and patients. The “medical gaze,” as Foucault called it, allowed institutions to observe, classify, and regulate human bodies. Similarly, in *Madness and Civilization*, Foucault examines how societies historically defined madness. He argues that madness is not simply a medical condition but also a social category created by institutions and experts. Mental hospitals isolated and controlled individuals who were considered abnormal. Thus, psychiatric knowledge became connected with institutional power.

This analysis demonstrates Foucault’s broader point that knowledge is socially constructed and historically shaped. Truth is not universal or eternal; rather, societies create “regimes of truth” that define what is accepted as true or normal. According to Foucault, every society has systems that determine who can speak, what can be said, and what counts as valid knowledge. These systems are maintained through power relations.

Paul Rabinowin, the *Foucault Reader* (1984) explains that Foucault’s theory of power/knowledge reveals how institutions shape human beings by producing knowledge about them. Rabinow argues that modern societies control individuals not only through laws and force but also through expert knowledge and administrative practices. Likewise, Barry Smart in *Michel Foucault* (1985) notes that Foucault transformed political theory by showing that power is productive rather than merely repressive. Traditional theories viewed power mainly as negative or coercive. Foucault, however, argues that power also creates knowledge, identities, social categories, and patterns of behavior.

According to Foucault, power does not only repress individuals; it also produces them. Modern societies create disciplined citizens, obedient workers, productive students, healthy populations, and socially acceptable identities. Thus, power shapes human beings rather than simply controlling them from outside. One important feature of Foucault’s theory is that power is decentralized. Unlike Marxist theories that often focus on class domination or state power, Foucault argues that power exists throughout society. Teachers exercise power in classrooms, doctors exercise power in hospitals, managers exercise power in workplaces, and

parents exercise power in families. Power operates through countless relationships and institutions.

Foucault therefore rejects the idea that power belongs only to one group or institution. Instead, power circulates through networks. Individuals are not merely victims of power; they also participate in power relations. For example, teachers are controlled by educational systems even while they control students. Thus, power is relational rather than one-sided. Another major contribution of Foucault is his distinction between sovereign power and disciplinary power. Sovereign power refers to traditional political authority exercised by kings or states through laws, punishment, and coercion. In earlier societies, rulers displayed their power openly through public punishments and executions.

However, Foucault argues that modern societies increasingly rely on disciplinary power rather than sovereign power. Disciplinary power works through surveillance, observation, examination, and normalization. Instead of using violence openly, modern institutions encourage individuals to discipline themselves. Schools, prisons, hospitals, factories, and military institutions all function as disciplinary systems.

In *Discipline and Punish*, Foucault explains how modern societies create “docile bodies,” meaning individuals who are useful, obedient, and productive. Discipline works by regulating time, movement, behavior, and habits. Students follow timetables in schools, workers follow schedules in factories, and soldiers follow strict routines in the military. The symbol of disciplinary power is the Panopticon, a prison design proposed by Jeremy Bentham. In the Panopticon, prisoners are constantly visible to a central observer, although they cannot know when they are being watched. As a result, prisoners discipline themselves.

For Foucault, the Panopticon represents modern society itself. Modern individuals behave properly because they know they may be observed. Surveillance becomes internalized, meaning people monitor their own behavior. Today, this idea is especially relevant in the age of CCTV cameras, biometric systems, workplace monitoring, and digital surveillance. Foucault’s later works introduced another important concept known as biopower. This idea appears mainly in *The History of Sexuality, Volume I*. Biopower refers to the regulation of populations through modern administrative and scientific practices. Unlike disciplinary power,

which focuses on individual bodies, biopower focuses on populations as a whole. Modern states collect information about birth rates, death rates, public health, disease, sexuality, and population growth. Governments manage populations through policies related to healthcare, sanitation, education, vaccination, and family planning. According to Foucault, modern political systems increasingly aim to “manage life.”

Biopower represents a major transformation in political authority. Earlier rulers mainly exercised the power to “take life or let live.” Modern governments, however, exercise the power to “make live and let die.” In other words, modern states seek to improve, regulate, and optimize the health and productivity of populations. For example, governments organize vaccination campaigns, public health programs, census operations, and welfare schemes. These practices are presented as beneficial and scientific, but they also allow states to monitor and regulate populations. Thus, power operates through care and administration rather than only through repression.

Nikolas Rose in *Powers of Freedom* (1999) argues that Foucault’s concept of biopower is extremely important for understanding modern liberal democracies. According to Rose, contemporary governments increasingly regulate citizens through medical, psychological, and administrative systems that shape individual behavior. Foucault also introduced the concept of governmentality, which refers to the techniques and strategies used to govern populations. Governmentality expands the meaning of government beyond the state. It includes all forms of conduct management through institutions, expertise, and self-regulation. For example, citizens are encouraged to maintain healthy lifestyles, pursue education, improve productivity, and manage their own risks. Individuals govern themselves according to social expectations. Thus, power works through freedom rather than direct coercion. Modern citizens appear free, but their choices are shaped by social norms and institutional pressures. This insight is one of Foucault’s most important contributions. He shows that modern power is subtle and invisible. People often believe they are acting freely, while their behavior is actually shaped by systems of knowledge and discipline.

Foucault's theory of power has had enormous influence across disciplines. In political science, his ideas transformed the study of governance, administration, and public policy. In sociology, scholars used his theories to examine institutions and social control. In gender studies, feminists applied his ideas to understand how bodies and identities are regulated through social norms. Judith Butler used Foucault's ideas to explain how gender identities are socially produced through repeated practices and discourses. Similarly, post-colonial scholars such as Edward Said applied Foucault's theories to analyze how colonial powers created knowledge about colonized societies in order to dominate them.

Foucault's ideas are also highly relevant in the contemporary digital age. Modern societies increasingly rely on surveillance technologies, digital databases, artificial intelligence, and social media monitoring. Governments and corporations collect massive amounts of information about individuals. Online activities, purchases, movements, and communications are constantly tracked.

This digital environment resembles Foucault's Panopticon. Individuals regulate their own behavior because they know they may be watched online. Social media platforms influence opinions, preferences, and identities through algorithms and data analysis. Thus, power operates not only through governments but also through technological systems and corporations.

Despite its influence, Foucault's theory of power has faced criticism. One major criticism comes from Jürgen Habermas in *The Philosophical Discourse of Modernity* (1985). Habermas argues that Foucault focuses too much on domination and provides no clear basis for democracy, morality, or human rights. If all truth is connected to power, Habermas asks, how can one criticize injustice or defend universal values? Marxist scholars also criticize Foucault for neglecting economic structures and class relations. They argue that capitalism and economic exploitation remain central sources of power, whereas Foucault pays more attention to institutions and discourse.

Some critics believe Foucault exaggerates the power of institutions and underestimates human agency. If power exists everywhere, critics ask, can individuals truly resist it? Foucault responded by arguing that power relations always involve resistance. Wherever power operates, there are possibilities for opposition and transformation. Another criticism is that Foucault's writing is often complex and difficult to understand. His concepts are sometimes abstract, and he does not provide clear political solutions. Nevertheless, his influence remains enormous because he changed the very framework through which scholars study power.

In conclusion, Michel Foucault's theory of power represents one of the most significant contributions to modern political and social thought. He rejected the traditional idea that power belongs only to the state or ruling class and argued that power exists throughout society in everyday relationships and institutions. Through concepts such as power/knowledge, disciplinary power, surveillance, biopower, and governmentality, Foucault demonstrated how modern societies regulate individuals and populations.

His analysis revealed that power is not only repressive but also productive; it creates knowledge, identities, norms, and social practices. Although criticized for neglecting morality and economic structures, Foucault's theory remains highly relevant in understanding modern surveillance, digital governance, public health management, and institutional control. In contemporary societies shaped by technology, data collection, and administrative regulation, Foucault's insights continue to provide powerful tools for analyzing the complex relationship between power, knowledge, and human behavior.

Check Your Progress

1. *Explain the meaning of "power/knowledge."*
2. *What is disciplinary power?*
3. *What is meant by biopower?*
4. *Define governmentality according to Foucault.*

4.5 Government and the Self

One of the most significant contributions of Michel Foucault in his later writings is his analysis of the relationship between government and the self. In his earlier works, Foucault mainly focused on institutions such as prisons, hospitals, schools, and psychiatric asylums. He studied how these institutions discipline and regulate individuals through surveillance, normalization, and control. However, in the later phase of his intellectual development, Foucault became increasingly interested in how individuals govern themselves. This shift led him to develop important concepts such as governmentality, ethics, subjectivity, and technologies of the self.

Foucault's discussion of government and the self appears mainly in his later lectures at the Collège de France and in works such as *The History of Sexuality, Volume II: The Use of Pleasure* (1984) and *The History of Sexuality, Volume III: The Care of the Self* (1984). These writings represent a shift from studying external forms of domination toward examining how individuals shape their own conduct.

To understand Foucault's theory, it is first necessary to understand what he means by "government." In traditional political theory, government usually refers to the formal institutions of the state such as parliament, executive, judiciary, and administration. Foucault gives the term a much broader meaning. According to him, government refers to all the ways in which human behavior is directed, guided, or shaped. Government includes not only state institutions but also schools, families, hospitals, religious organizations, workplaces, and even individuals governing themselves.

Foucault uses the term governmentality to explain this broader understanding of government. The word combines "government" and "mentality." It refers to the rationalities, techniques, and practices through which populations and individuals are governed. Governmentality therefore means the "art of governing." It includes the methods through which authorities try to shape the conduct of people. In his lecture series *Security, Territory, Population* (1977–78), Foucault explains that modern government is different from earlier forms of sovereign rule. Traditional rulers mainly exercised authority through laws, punishment, and coercion. Modern governments, however, increasingly govern through

administration, statistics, public policies, and social regulation. Instead of merely forcing obedience, modern governments seek to manage populations efficiently.

For example, governments regulate education, healthcare, sanitation, employment, public health, and welfare. Through these systems, governments shape the daily lives of individuals. Citizens are encouraged to become healthy, productive, disciplined, and responsible members of society. Thus, government operates not only through force but also through guidance and management.

Foucault argues that modern government depends heavily on knowledge. States collect information about populations through censuses, surveys, medical records, educational assessments, and economic statistics. This knowledge allows governments to regulate society more effectively. Thus, governmentality is closely connected with Foucault's broader idea of power/knowledge. An important aspect of governmentality is that individuals participate in their own governance. Modern societies encourage people to regulate themselves according to social norms and expectations. Citizens monitor their health, education, careers, and lifestyles in order to become "good" and "successful" individuals. In this way, power works through self-regulation rather than direct coercion.

According to Nikolas Rose in *Powers of Freedom* (1999), Foucault's concept of governmentality explains how modern liberal democracies govern people through freedom itself. Individuals appear free to make choices, but their choices are shaped by social expectations, professional expertise, and institutional norms. Rose argues that modern governance increasingly works by encouraging people to manage themselves responsibly.

For Foucault, this transformation is central to modern politics. Earlier societies relied more on direct control and punishment, whereas modern societies encourage individuals to govern themselves. Schools teach discipline and responsibility, workplaces encourage productivity and self-improvement, and healthcare systems encourage individuals to maintain healthy lifestyles. Thus, modern governance operates through self-management. This leads to Foucault's important concept of the self. Foucault argues that the self is not natural or fixed. Human identity is socially and historically constructed. Individuals become "subjects" through

systems of power, discourse, and social practices. Society shapes how people understand themselves, their bodies, desires, and identities.

In his earlier works, Foucault focused mainly on how institutions create disciplined subjects. In his later works, however, he became interested in how individuals actively shape themselves. He studied ancient Greek and Roman philosophy to understand how people practiced self-care and ethical self-formation.

Foucault uses the term technologies of the self to describe the practices through which individuals shape their own behavior and identity. These technologies include self-reflection, moral discipline, meditation, education, confession, and self-examination. Through such practices, individuals transform themselves according to certain ethical ideals. In *The Care of the Self*, Foucault explains that ancient Greek and Roman thinkers believed that individuals should actively cultivate themselves through discipline and ethical practice. Self-care was considered necessary for moral and political life. According to Foucault, this ancient tradition differed from modern forms of government because it emphasized ethical self-transformation rather than obedience to external authority.

Foucault's interest in the self does not mean he abandoned his earlier theory of power. Instead, he expanded it. He argues that individuals are shaped by power relations, but they also possess the capacity to shape themselves. Thus, the self is both an effect of power and a site of resistance. One important idea in Foucault's later thought is that modern individuals are encouraged to constantly improve themselves. Contemporary societies value productivity, efficiency, fitness, discipline, and self-management. People are expected to monitor their bodies, emotions, careers, and relationships. This creates forms of self-governance. For example, individuals today follow diets, exercise routines, educational goals, financial planning, and psychological self-help practices. These activities appear voluntary, but they are also shaped by social norms and institutional expectations. Thus, self-improvement becomes connected with broader systems of governance. According to Barry Smart in *Michel Foucault (1985)*, Foucault's later work demonstrates that modern power operates not simply through repression but through the creation of self-regulating individuals. People internalize social norms and govern themselves accordingly.

Foucault's theory of government and the self is also closely connected with his concept of biopower. Biopower refers to the regulation of populations through health systems, medical policies, birth control, sanitation, and welfare programs. Governments seek to improve the health and productivity of populations, while individuals are encouraged to maintain healthy lifestyles. Thus, public governance and self-governance become interconnected. For example, governments promote vaccination, exercise, healthy eating, family planning, and mental health awareness. Individuals are encouraged to take responsibility for their own health and well-being. This reflects the combination of governmentality and technologies of the self.

Foucault's analysis is especially relevant in understanding modern neoliberal societies. In neoliberal systems, citizens are encouraged to behave like entrepreneurs managing their own lives. Individuals must constantly improve their skills, compete in the market, and take personal responsibility for success or failure. According to scholars influenced by Foucault, neo-liberalism governs individuals not mainly through force but through freedom and self-management. People are expected to become independent, productive, and self-disciplined. Thus, economic and political systems shape individual identities and behavior.

Foucault's ideas also have important implications for democracy. Liberal democracies often emphasize freedom and individual rights. However, Foucault argues that democratic societies also contain subtle systems of regulation and control. Citizens are guided through education, media, health policies, administrative systems, and professional expertise. This does not mean democracy is simply oppressive. Rather, Foucault shows that modern democratic governance works through complex relationships between external regulation and self-regulation. Citizens participate in their own governance by accepting social norms and managing themselves accordingly.

Foucault's ideas have had enormous influence on sociology, political science, gender studies, psychology, and cultural studies. Feminist scholars used his theories to examine how women regulate their bodies and identities according to social expectations. Media scholars applied his ideas to study consumer culture and self-image.

For example, social media platforms encourage individuals to constantly present and manage themselves online. People monitor their appearance, opinions, and behavior because they know they are being observed by others. This reflects a modern form of self-governance and surveillance similar to Foucault's ideas.

Digital technology has made Foucault's analysis even more relevant. Smartphones, fitness trackers, apps, online education systems, and social media platforms encourage individuals to monitor their own activities. People track their health, productivity, finances, and social interactions. Thus, technology increasingly shapes self-regulation. Despite its importance, Foucault's theory has faced criticism. Some scholars argue that he overemphasizes the power of social systems and underestimates human freedom. Critics claim that individuals are capable of independent moral action and resistance.

Jürgen Habermas criticized Foucault for lacking a clear moral or democratic foundation. According to Habermas, Foucault explains how power operates but does not clearly explain how societies can achieve justice or democratic communication. Others argue that Foucault's theory may encourage excessive relativism because it rejects universal truths and fixed moral principles. Critics ask whether it is possible to defend human rights or social justice without universal ethical standards. Marxist scholars also criticize Foucault for paying insufficient attention to economic inequality and capitalism. They argue that class exploitation remains central to understanding governance and self-regulation in modern society.

However, supporters of Foucault argue that his theory provides powerful tools for critically examining how modern societies shape individuals. His work encourages people to question institutions, norms, and systems of authority that appear natural or neutral. An important strength of Foucault's theory is that it connects political structures with everyday life. Traditional political theory often focused mainly on constitutions, governments, and laws. Foucault, however, demonstrates that politics also operates through bodies, identities, lifestyles, and personal behavior.

His theory also expands the meaning of freedom. Freedom is not simply the absence of state control. Individuals may appear free while still being shaped by social expectations and institutional pressures. Thus, Foucault encourages critical reflection on how modern societies

influence human conduct. Another important contribution is his emphasis on ethical self-formation. In his later works, Foucault suggests that individuals can practice freedom by critically examining themselves and resisting imposed identities. Self-transformation becomes a form of resistance against domination.

According to Paul Rabinow, Foucault's later writings represent an attempt to understand how individuals can create themselves ethically within systems of power. Rabinow argues that Foucault moved from analyzing domination toward exploring possibilities of freedom and self-creation. Similarly, Gilles Deleuze and Foucault (1986) explains that Foucault's later work focuses on subjectivity and the ways individuals shape themselves within networks of power.

In conclusion, Michel Foucault's theory of government and the self represents one of the most innovative contributions to contemporary political thought. He expanded the meaning of government beyond the state and showed how modern societies govern individuals through administration, expertise, discipline, and self-regulation. Through the concept of governmentality, Foucault explained how power operates by shaping human conduct rather than merely imposing force. His analysis of the self demonstrated that identities are socially constructed and shaped by power relations. At the same time, individuals possess the capacity for ethical self-formation through technologies of the self. Foucault therefore connected politics with ethics, identity, and everyday life in new and important ways.

Although criticized for lacking a clear moral framework, Foucault's ideas remain highly relevant in understanding modern societies characterized by surveillance, digital monitoring, public health governance, consumer culture, and self-management. In contemporary democratic societies, individuals are increasingly expected to govern themselves according to social norms and institutional expectations. Foucault's analysis helps reveal the hidden mechanisms through which this process operates and encourages critical reflection on the relationship between freedom, power, government, and the self.

Check Your Progress

1. *Explain the meaning of “technologies of the self.”*
2. *What is the relationship between governmentality and self-regulation?*
3. *How does Foucault explain the social construction of the self?*

4.6 Critical Analysis of Michel Foucault’s Contribution and Concepts

Michel Foucault is widely regarded as one of the most original and influential thinkers of the twentieth century. His ideas transformed modern political theory, sociology, philosophy, history, cultural studies, gender studies, and criminology. Through concepts such as power/knowledge, discipline, surveillance, discourse, biopower, governmentality, and technologies of the self, Foucault offered new ways of understanding modern society and human behavior.

Foucault’s importance lies in the fact that he shifted the study of politics away from traditional concerns such as sovereignty, constitutions, and formal state institutions toward everyday practices, institutions, and systems of knowledge. He demonstrated that power operates not only through governments and laws but also through schools, prisons, hospitals, media, medicine, and social norms. His work therefore expanded the scope of political analysis and influenced almost every branch of the social sciences.

One of Foucault’s greatest contributions is his new understanding of power. Traditional political theories generally viewed power as something possessed by rulers, governments, or dominant classes. Power was understood mainly as coercion, repression, or legal authority. Foucault challenged this narrow perspective by arguing that power is decentralized and exists in all social relationships. According to him, power is not merely repressive; it is also productive. It creates identities, knowledge, norms, and forms of behavior.

This insight was revolutionary because it changed the way scholars understand social control. In *Discipline and Punish* (1975), Foucault showed that modern societies rely less on visible violence and more on discipline, surveillance, and normalization. Modern institutions create “docile bodies” that regulate themselves according to social expectations. This analysis

helped scholars understand how modern democracies exercise subtle forms of control without relying solely on force.

Barry Smart in *Michel Foucault* (1985) argues that Foucault's theory of power transformed social theory because it revealed the hidden mechanisms through which modern societies govern individuals. According to Smart, Foucault showed that power works through everyday institutions and practices rather than only through political authority. Similarly, Paul Rabinow in *The Foucault Reader* (1984) explains that Foucault uncovered the relationship between knowledge and power in modern society. Rabinow argues that institutions create knowledge about individuals in order to classify, regulate, and control them.

Foucault's concept of power/knowledge is another major contribution. He argued that knowledge is never neutral. Every society creates systems of truth that define what is normal, rational, healthy, or moral. These systems of knowledge support existing power relations. Doctors, psychiatrists, teachers, criminologists, and administrators all exercise authority through specialized knowledge. This concept had enormous influence because it challenged the Enlightenment belief that knowledge is objective and liberating. Foucault demonstrated that knowledge can also function as a tool of control. His analysis encouraged scholars to critically examine institutions and expert systems that claim authority over society.

Another important contribution is Foucault's concept of discourse. According to him, discourse refers to systems of language, ideas, and practices that shape how people think and behave. Discourses define what can be spoken, who can speak, and what counts as truth. For example, medical discourse shapes ideas about health and illness, while legal discourse shapes ideas about crime and justice. This concept became highly influential in cultural studies, feminist theory, and post-colonial studies. Scholars used discourse analysis to examine how identities and social realities are constructed through language and institutional practices.

Foucault's concept of biopower also represents a major intellectual achievement. He argued that modern states increasingly focus on managing populations through healthcare, sanitation, education, welfare, and public policy. Governments regulate birth rates, health standards, sexuality, and public hygiene in order to maintain productive populations.

This analysis remains highly relevant today, especially in understanding public health systems, welfare states, and population management. During the COVID-19 pandemic, scholars frequently used Foucault's concept of biopower to analyze lockdowns, vaccination programs, health monitoring, and public regulation.

Foucault's theory of governmentality further expanded political theory by redefining the meaning of government. According to him, government is not limited to the state. It includes all the techniques and practices through which individuals and populations are guided and managed. Modern governance operates through administration, expertise, and self-regulation rather than only through coercion. Nikolas Rose in *Powers of Freedom* (1999) argues that Foucault's theory of governmentality is extremely important for understanding modern liberal democracies. Rose explains that contemporary governments increasingly govern citizens by encouraging them to regulate themselves responsibly.

Another significant contribution of Foucault is his analysis of the self and subjectivity. In his later works, Foucault explored how individuals shape themselves through ethical practices and self-discipline. His concept of "technologies of the self" highlighted the role of self-reflection, moral training, and self-care in human life.

This aspect of Foucault's thought is important because it shows that individuals are not simply passive victims of power. People also participate in shaping their own identities and conduct. Thus, Foucault's later writings opened possibilities for resistance, ethical freedom, and self-transformation. Foucault's ideas have had wide influence across academic disciplines. Feminist scholars such as Judith Butler used his theories to examine how gender identities are socially constructed. Butler argued that gender is not natural but produced through repeated social practices and discourses. Post-colonial scholars such as Edward Said were also influenced by Foucault. In *Orientalism* (1978), Said applied Foucault's concept of discourse to show how Western colonial powers created knowledge about Eastern societies in order to dominate them.

Foucault's analysis of surveillance became especially influential in the digital age. His interpretation of the Panopticon as a model of modern society is now widely used to understand CCTV surveillance, biometric identification, online monitoring, and social media tracking. Modern societies increasingly rely on observation, data collection, and digital regulation, making Foucault's ideas highly relevant today.

Despite these contributions, Foucault's theories have also faced serious criticism. One major criticism concerns his understanding of power. Critics argue that Foucault sometimes presents power as so widespread and pervasive that it becomes difficult to identify clear sources of domination or resistance. If power exists everywhere, then the concept may lose analytical clarity. Another criticism is that Foucault pays insufficient attention to economic structures and class relations. Marxist scholars argue that capitalism and economic exploitation remain central sources of power in society. According to them, Foucault focuses too much on discourse and institutions while neglecting material inequality and class struggle. For example, traditional Marxists believe that economic ownership and class domination shape political institutions and social relations. Foucault, however, emphasizes micro-level forms of power such as discipline and surveillance. Critics claim that this weakens the analysis of capitalism and economic exploitation.

Alex Callinicos criticized post-structuralist thinkers like Foucault for neglecting economic structures and collective political struggle. According to Callinicos, Foucault's focus on fragmented power relations can undermine organized political resistance.

Another important criticism comes from Jürgen Habermas. In *The Philosophical Discourse of Modernity* (1985), Habermas argues that Foucault rejects universal reason and objective truth without providing an alternative moral foundation. Habermas claims that if all truth is connected to power, then it becomes difficult to defend democracy, justice, or human rights. According to Habermas, Foucault's theory risks leading to relativism because it denies universal standards of morality. Critics therefore question how Foucault's ideas can support ethical or political judgment. If all systems of truth are products of power, then how can one criticize oppression or injustice?

Some scholars also criticize Foucault for lacking a clear political program. Unlike Marxists or liberal thinkers, Foucault does not provide a detailed vision of an ideal society or a strategy for political change. His work is mainly critical and analytical rather than constructive.

Another criticism concerns Foucault's historical method. Historians argue that his genealogical studies sometimes oversimplify historical developments and ignore important complexities. His writings occasionally rely on broad generalizations rather than detailed historical evidence. Critics also point out that Foucault's language and style are often difficult to understand. His concepts are abstract and sometimes ambiguous, making his work challenging for students and readers. Despite this, his influence remains enormous because of the originality and depth of his insights.

Some feminist scholars have offered both appreciation and criticism of Foucault. While his analysis of bodies and power influenced feminist theory, some critics argue that he paid insufficient attention to patriarchy and women's specific experiences of oppression.

Nevertheless, many scholars defend Foucault against these criticisms. They argue that his purpose was not to create a universal moral theory but to encourage critical examination of institutions and systems of authority. Foucault wanted people to question what societies consider normal, natural, and true. Gilles Deleuze and Foucault (1986) argues that Foucault transformed philosophy by revealing the invisible networks of power operating in modern society. Deleuze believed that Foucault's work opened entirely new ways of thinking about politics, institutions, and subjectivity.

Foucault's contribution is particularly important in contemporary times because modern societies increasingly depend on surveillance, digital technology, administrative systems, and population management. Governments and corporations collect vast amounts of data about individuals. Social media platforms shape opinions, identities, and behavior through algorithms and online monitoring. In such a world, Foucault's analysis of surveillance, discipline, and self-regulation remains extremely relevant. His work helps explain how modern societies govern people not only through laws but also through data, expertise, media, and institutional practices. Foucault's theories also encourage critical

thinking about freedom. He demonstrates that freedom is not simply the absence of force. Individuals may appear free while still being shaped by social expectations, institutional norms, and systems of surveillance. Thus, his work challenges simplistic understandings of democracy and liberty. Another important strength of Foucault's thought is its interdisciplinary nature. His work crossed the boundaries of philosophy, sociology, history, psychology, and political science. This interdisciplinary approach made his theories widely applicable across fields of study.

In conclusion, Michel Foucault made an extraordinary contribution to contemporary political and social thought. Through concepts such as power/knowledge, discourse, discipline, surveillance, biopower, governmentality, and technologies of the self, he transformed the understanding of modern society and politics. He revealed that power operates not only through governments and laws but also through institutions, knowledge systems, and every day practices. Although criticized for relativism, lack of moral foundations, and insufficient attention to economic structures, Foucault's ideas remain deeply influential. His theories continue to shape debates on democracy, governance, surveillance, identity, public health, digital technology, and human behavior. In the contemporary world of data monitoring, institutional regulation, and social control, Foucault's insights remain highly relevant and intellectually powerful.

Check Your Progress

1. What criticism did Habermas make against Foucault?
2. Why do Marxist scholars criticize Foucault?
3. How are Foucault's ideas relevant in the digital age?

4.7 Let Us Sum Up

This unit discussed the major ideas of Michel Foucault in the context of post-structuralism and postmodernism. Foucault rejected the traditional understanding of politics that focused only on the state, sovereignty, and legal authority. Instead, he examined how power operates through institutions, knowledge systems, discourses, and everyday social practices.

The unit first introduced post-structuralism and postmodernism and explained how Foucault became one of the most influential thinkers associated with these intellectual movements. He challenged the Enlightenment belief in universal truth, objective knowledge, and fixed human nature. According to Foucault, knowledge is socially constructed and closely linked with power relations.

The unit then discussed Foucault's life, intellectual background, and major works. His writings such as *Madness and Civilization*, *The Birth of the Clinic*, *Discipline and Punish*, and *The History of Sexuality* transformed modern political and social thought. Through these works, he studied the relationship between institutions, knowledge, and power.

The concept of discipline and democracy explained how modern societies govern individuals through surveillance, normalization, examination, and disciplinary institutions such as schools, prisons, hospitals, and workplaces. Foucault argued that modern democracies rely not only on laws and force but also on subtle systems of social regulation. His analysis of the Panopticon demonstrated how surveillance creates self-disciplined individuals.

The section on power examined Foucault's revolutionary theory of power. Unlike traditional thinkers, he viewed power as decentralized and present in all social relationships. His concept of power/knowledge showed that knowledge is never neutral but connected with systems of control. The section also discussed disciplinary power, discourse, biopower, and governmentality.

The section on government and the self explained Foucault's later ideas about self-regulation and subjectivity. He argued that modern governance works by encouraging

individuals to govern themselves according to social norms and institutional expectations. Through technologies of the self, individuals shape their own identities and behavior.

Finally, the unit critically evaluated Foucault's contribution. His theories expanded the scope of political analysis and influenced sociology, feminism, cultural studies, post-colonial studies, and media studies. However, scholars also criticized him for relativism, lack of moral foundations, and insufficient attention to class and economic inequality. Despite these criticisms, Foucault remains one of the most important thinkers for understanding modern society, surveillance, governance, and power in the contemporary world.

4.8 Key Words

Post-Structuralism: An intellectual movement that questions fixed meanings, universal truths, and stable structures in society and language.

Postmodernism: A broad intellectual perspective that rejects grand narratives, universal truths, and absolute certainty.

Discourse: A system of language, ideas, and practices that shapes knowledge and social reality.

Power/Knowledge: Foucault's idea that knowledge and power are interconnected and support each other.

Disciplinary Power: A form of power that regulates individuals through surveillance, examination, and normalization.

Panopticon: A prison model proposed by Jeremy Bentham, used by Foucault as a symbol of modern surveillance society.

Normalization: The process through which societies define standards of acceptable behavior and identity.

Biopower: The regulation of populations through healthcare, public policy, sanitation, and administrative systems.

Governmentality:The techniques and practices through which governments and institutions shape human conduct.

Technologies of the Self: Practices through which individuals shape and regulate their own behavior and identity.

Subjectivity:The way individuals understand and experience themselves within social systems.

Surveillance:Continuous observation and monitoring used to regulate behavior.

4.9 Answers to Questions in Check Your Learning

1. Post-structuralism is an intellectual movement that rejects fixed meanings and universal truths.
2. Discourse refers to systems of language, ideas, and practices that shape social reality and knowledge.
3. Foucault defines power as decentralized and present in all social relationships rather than limited to the state.
4. According to Foucault, knowledge and power are interconnected because knowledge helps regulate and control society.
5. The Panopticon represents modern surveillance systems where individuals discipline themselves because they believe they are constantly observed.
6. Disciplinary power regulates individuals through surveillance, examination, and normalization.
7. Biopower refers to the regulation of populations through healthcare, welfare, public health, and administrative policies.

8. Governmentality means the techniques and practices used to govern individuals and populations.
9. Technologies of the self are practices through which individuals shape and regulate their own behavior.
10. Foucault explains that modern societies use surveillance systems such as schools, prisons, hospitals, and digital technologies to regulate behavior.
11. Critics argue that Foucault lacks a clear moral framework and pays insufficient attention to economic inequality and class.
12. Foucault is important because he transformed the understanding of power, governance, surveillance, and modern society.

4.10 Short Questions

1. Define postmodernism.
2. What does Foucault mean by discourse?
3. Explain the concept of power/knowledge.
4. What is disciplinary power?
5. Define biopower.
6. What is governmentality?
7. Explain the term “technologies of the self.”
8. What is normalization?
9. What is surveillance according to Foucault?
10. Mention any two major works of Foucault.

4.11 Long Questions

1. Discuss Michel Foucault's concept of power and its significance in contemporary political theory.
2. Explain the relationship between knowledge and power in Foucault's thought.
3. Critically examine Foucault's theory of discipline and surveillance.
4. Discuss the concept of governmentality and its relevance in modern democratic societies.
5. Explain Foucault's theory of biopower with suitable examples.
6. Analyze the relationship between government and the self in Foucault's philosophy.
7. Critically evaluate Foucault's contribution to post-structuralism and postmodernism.
8. Discuss the contemporary relevance of Foucault's ideas in the digital age.

4.12 Further Readings

Foucault, M. (1961). *Madness and civilization: A history of insanity in the age of reason*. New York, NY: Random House.

Foucault, M. (1963). *The birth of the clinic: An archaeology of medical perception*. New York, NY: Vintage Books.

Foucault, M. (1969). *The archaeology of knowledge*. London, UK: Routledge.

Foucault, M. (1975). *Discipline and punish: The birth of the prison*. New York, NY: Vintage Books.

Foucault, M. (1976). *The history of sexuality, Volume I: An introduction*. New York, NY: Pantheon Books.

Foucault, M. (2007). *Security, territory, population: Lectures at the Collège de France, 1977–1978* (M. Senellart, Ed.; G. Burchell, Trans.). New York, NY: Palgrave Macmillan.

Smart, B. (1985). *Michel Foucault*. London, UK: Routledge.

Rabinow, P. (Ed.). (1984). *The Foucault reader*. New York, NY: Pantheon Books.

Deleuze, G. (1988). *Foucault* (S. Hand, Trans.). Minneapolis, MN: University of Minnesota Press.

Rose, N. (1999). *Powers of freedom: Reframing political thought*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.

Dreyfus, H. L., & Rabinow, P. (1983). *Michel Foucault: Beyond structuralism and hermeneutics*. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.

Gutting, G. (Ed.). (2005). *The Cambridge companion to Foucault* (2nd ed.). Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.

Heywood, A. (2019). *Contemporary political theory*. London, UK: Red Globe Press.

Sabine, G. H., & Thorson, T. L. (1973). *A history of political theory* (4th ed.). New Delhi, India: Oxford and IBH Publishing.

Verma, S. P. (2004). *Modern political theory*. New Delhi, India: Vikas Publishing House.

Nelson, B. R. (2004). *Western political thought: From Socrates to the age of ideology* (2nd ed.). New Delhi, India: Pearson Education.