ALEXIS ebook

Indian Government and Politics

Dr. Narayana Srikanthreddy
Manoj Agarwal

ALEXIS PRESS
JERSEY CITY, USA

INDIAN GOVERNMENT AND POLITICS

INDIAN GOVERNMENT AND POLITICS

XXXXXXXXXX

ALEXIS PRESS

Published by: Alexis Press, LLC, Jersey City, USA
www.alexispress.us

First Published 2022

A catalogue record for this publication is available from the British Library

Library of Congress Cataloguing in Publication Data

Includes bibliographical references and index.

Indian Government and Politics by *Dr. Narayana Srikanthreddy, Manoj Agarwal*

ISBN 978-1-64532-330-3

CONTENTS

CHAPTER 1

AN OVERVIEW ON COHERENCE THEORY

Dr. Narayana Srikanthreddy, Assistant Professor,
Department of Management, Presidency University, Bangalore, India,
Email id- srikanthreddyn@presidencyuniversity.in

ABSTRACT:

Coherence theory is a philosophical concept that refers to the idea that truth is defined by the coherence of a set of beliefs or propositions. According to this theory, the truth of a proposition is determined by its coherence with other propositions within a particular system or framework of beliefs. The coherence theory of truth emerged as a response to the traditional correspondence theory, which asserts that the truth of a proposition is determined by its correspondence to reality. Coherence theorists argue that truth is not solely dependent on correspondence, but rather on the overall coherence of a system of beliefs.

KEYWORDS:

Belief Systems, Coherence, Consistency, Epistemology, Justification, Knowledge.

INTRODUCTION

Popperian critical rationalism offers sufficient reason for rejecting methodological approaches based on fallacious positivist tenets. However, it falls short of offering a credible account of science or a sophisticated enough framework for political inquiry. Despite being a significant advancement over early positivist conceptions of science, Popper's critical rationalism has a number of serious flaws. Post-positivist presupposition theories of science pose the biggest threat to critical rationalism. Popper's description of an observation as "theory-laden" is supported by presupposition theories of science. They both agree that "seeing is more than meets the eye" and that perception entails more than just the passive receipt of ostensibly visible sensory facts. They contend that perception is based on a set of theoretical assumptions that organize observation and attribute certain stimuli and particular configurations with significance. Presupposition theories contend that observation is not just theory-laden but also fundamental to and even the basis of all human knowledge [1], [2].

Science as a body of human knowledge depends on theory in many and intricate ways. According to presupposition theories of science, key ideas in the practice of science such as perception, meaning, significance, explanation, knowledge, and method are all theoretical constructs. Theoretical presuppositions provide criteria of relevance by which facts can be organized, tests envisioned, and the acceptability or unacceptability of scientific conclusions assessed; they accredit specific models of explanation and strategies of understanding; and they sustain specific methodological approaches. They shape perception and control what will be taken as a "fact"; they give meaning to experience and control the demarcation of significant from trivial events; they control the demarcation of significant from trivial events; they provide criteria of relevance by which Theoretical presuppositions organize the components of scientific

work and define the parameters of scientific dispute. They often do this on a subconscious or tacit level, which is why they seem to have such unchallengeable power. The notions of empirical "reality" and the "autonomy" of facts, which hold that facts are "given" and that experience is ontologically distinct from the theoretical constructs that are advanced to explain it, are profoundly affected by the pervasive influence of theoretical assumptions upon the practice of science. Such fundamental presumptions are called into question by the post-empiricist definition of a "fact" as a theoretically created thing. It implies that "experience" as a noun, "to experience" as a verb, and "empirical" as an adjective are not universal concepts that can be applied to different systems without changing their meaning." Experience is not "empirical" by default and does not self-identify as such. What we refer to as experience is dependent upon unquestioned assumptions that define and maintain it. It follows that any search for an unmediated reality is unavoidably fruitless once it is recognized that "facts" may only be so characterized in terms of past theoretical presuppositions. Any attempt to define a "unmediated fact" must mistake the "natural" for the "conventional," as in cases where "brute facts" are defined as "social facts that are largely the product of well-understood, reliable tools, facts that are not likely to be vitiated by pitfalls...in part, the ease and certainty with which can be determined and in part, the incontestability of conceptual base" Alternatively, the attempt to imagine a "fact" that already exists without any description of it, without any theoretical or conceptual mediation, must produce an empty notion of something completely unspecified and unspecifiable, an idea that will be of little use to science.

The idea of "brute data" and the "givenness" of experience are both seriously challenged by the realization of the myriad ways in which perceptions of reality are theoretically mediated. It also calls into question the viability of falsification as a method for testing theories against a separate reality. There must be a definite separation between theoretical postulates and independent correspondence rules that connect theoretical principles to specific facts in order for falsification to give an effective test of a scientific hypothesis. Neutral correspondence rules are fundamental to the possibility of refutation, to the potential that the world may show a theory to be incorrect. They embody the concept of theory-independent evidence. A theory is unlikely to be definitively disproven if there is no tenable separation between theoretical assumptions and correspondence rules, if what is assumed to be the "world" and what is understood in terms of "brute data" are both theoretically formed. Because the independent evidence needed for falsification does not exist, the evidence that is currently available is predetermined by the same theoretical assumptions as the scientific theory under investigation.

Presupposition theorists emphasize that it is always possible to'save' a theory from refutation, in contrast to Popper's confident conviction that empirical reality could provide an ultimate court of appeal for the judgement of scientific theories and that scientists' critical, non-dogmatic attitude would ensure that their theories were constantly being put to the test. Because it is always possible to avoid falsification by arguing that a counter-instance is only a 'apparent' counter-instance, it is not enough for a theory to be disproven by the existence of a single disconfirming instance. Furthermore, the theory-laden nature of observation and the theory-constituted nature of the evidence offer many justifications for challenging the veracity of the evidence as well as the methodology or results of specific experiments that purport to refute well-established theories. In addition, post-positivist analyses of the history of scientific practice suggest that there is substantial evidence that neither the existence of counter-instances nor the persistence of anomalies necessarily results in the abandonment of scientific theories, contrary to Popper's

assertion that scientists are quick to discard discredited theories. In fact, despite the presence of revealing objections, enduring oddities, and unsolved issues, the overwhelming evidence of scientific practice reveals that scientists adhere to long-established beliefs tenaciously. As a result, it has been proposed that the "theory" that scientists are usually skeptics, non-dogmatic, skeptical of conventional wisdom, and quick to reject dubious ideas has been disproven and should be abandoned.

The Popperian model of science confounds explanation with prediction, which exacerbates the falsification issue. Because it ignores the possibility that an incorrect theory might provide accurate forecasts and the idea that a confirmed prediction serves as confirmation of the validity of a scientific explanation. The idea that no theory can ever be definitively refuted is therefore further supported by the logical difference between prediction and explanation. The issue of induction also casts doubt on the viability of conclusive denials. The issue of induction raises the concern that a theory that is shown to be false today could not'stay' false by drawing attention to the potential that the future may vary from the past and present in unexpected ways. The falsifiability principle does not seem to provide the escape from induction that Popper had hoped for since the assumption of regularity that supports Popper's confidence that a failed theory would stay false forever is itself an inductionist presupposition. Because of this, despite the imbalance between verification and falsification in terms of logic, no corroboration can be greater or more conclusive than any falsification [3], [4].

The role of presuppositions and the nature of perception prevent direct access to the world's structure, according to presupposition theorists, who acknowledge that "ideally, scientists would like to examine the structure of the world which exists independent of our knowledge." The correspondence theory of truth faces a significant challenge when it is recognized that theoretical presuppositions organize and structure research by determining the meanings of observed events, identifying pertinent data and important problems for investigation, and indicating both strategies for solving problems and methods by which to test the validity of proposed solutions. Because it implies that science is no more capable than any other human endeavor of obtaining the Archimedean point or of transcending human fallibility. It also rejects the idea that "autonomous facts" may operate as the final arbitrator of scientific ideas. In fact, it necessitates that science be recognized as a convention of humanity based on the practical judgments of a community of flawed scientists working to address theory-generated issues in a particular historical context. It upholds a far less heroic and much more human view of science.

Presupposition theorists propose a coherence theory of truth as an alternative to the correspondence theory of truth, recognizing that all human knowledge is based on theoretical presuppositions whose congruence with nature cannot be established with certainty by reason or experience. Theoretical presuppositions, rooted in living traditions, provide the conceptual frameworks through which the world is viewed; they exude a "natural attitude" that distinguishes between what is understood as deviant, unnatural, utopian, impossible, irrational, or insane, and what is taken as normal, natural, real, or sane. The idea of theoretical presuppositions argues that theories work at the tacit level, in contrast to Popper's understanding of theories as conscious conjectures that may be systematically expanded and deductively expounded. It is challenging to identify and expose the complete spectrum of presuppositions that influence cognition at any one moment because of the way they shape "pre-understandings" and "pre-judgments." Additionally, any effort to clarify presuppositions must work within a "hermeneutic circle." Any attempt to investigate or dispute specific presumptions or expectations must do so within the context

provided by the other pressuppositions. If other presuppositions are to be exposed to thorough scrutiny, some must stay fixed. This is not meant to suggest that people are 'prisoners' bound by ideas, expectations, prior experiences, and language in a manner that makes critical thought difficult. Within the hermeneutic circle, it is possible to engage in critical analysis and abandon some theoretical presuppositions, but it is not possible to achieve transparency or an unmediated understanding of reality. For no critical reflective investigation can avoid the fundamental conditions of human cognition.

DISCUSSION

A coherence theory of truth admits that the reality is richer than theories developed to understand it; it accepts that theories are underdetermined by 'facts' and, as a result, that there may always be competing and different theoretical interpretations of specific occurrences. The relativist conclusion that all theoretical interpretations are equivalent is not implied by this statement, however. There is still a reasonable approach to make and justify critical evaluative judgments about rival theoretical interpretations even while there cannot be an appeal to neutral, theory-independent facts to decide between them. Presupposition theorists have in fact noted that a positivist commitment to the verification criteria of meaning is necessary for the assumption that the lack of independent evidence necessitates relativism. It only follows that no reasonable decisions can be made about the validity of specific claims in the absence of the "given" if one begins from the premise that the only way to determine a proposition's truthfulness is to assess it against the empirically "given."

It is possible to acknowledge that there are rational grounds for weighing the merits of alternative theoretical interpretations once the "myth of the given" has been abandoned and once the notion that the lack of one invariant empirical test for a theory's "truth" implies the absence of all criteria for evaluative judgement has been refuted. Although theoretical presuppositions shape how events are perceived, they do not produce perceptions out of "nothing," which is necessary to understand the nature of such assessments. 'World-guided' theoretical interpretations are used. They include both the prior knowledge that a particular perceiver brings to an event and the environmental inputs that start the cognitive process. Objects may be described in a variety of ways due to this dual source of theoretical interpretations, but this does not imply that all descriptions of an item are equal or that it can be perceived in every possible manner. Without prescribing a single, definitive description, the triggers that cause interpretation constrain the class of viable characterizations [5]–[7].

Deliberation, a rational activity that calls for the use of imagination and judgment in the study of the variety of facts and arguments that may be made in favor of diverse perspectives, is involved in the assessment of alternative theoretical interpretations. The arguments put forward in favor of different points of view gather facts, use different explanatory criteria, address various levels of analysis with variable degrees of abstraction, and use distinct reasoning techniques. This variety of factors provides a wide range of topics for consideration and evaluation. It gives everyone the chance to apply their judgment and makes sure that when scientists reject a hypothesis, they do so because they are certain they can show that the arguments put out to support it are flawed. It is merely a tribute to human fallibility that the arguments put out to support the rejection of one hypothesis do not prove beyond a reasonable doubt the truth of an alternate explanation. It is entirely consistent with the acceptance of the finiteness of human reason and the mutability of empirical relationships to acknowledge that the cumulative weight of the available evidence and

persuasive argument cannot shield scientific judgments from future discoveries that might warrant the rejection of the theories currently held to be true.

Presupposition theorists contend that any explanation of science that rejects to acknowledge the validity of the carefully reasoned judgments that guide the selection of one scientific theory over another must be bound by a flawed understanding of what it is to be rational. Deliberation entails the use of a variety of intellectual talents, even while the standards of evidence and the criteria for evaluation applied to theoretical problems cannot be condensed into a straightforward rule or described in inflexible methodological principles. Theories of science that confine rationality to a single method, such as logical deduction or empirical verification, are simply too limited to account for the many ways in which rationality manifests itself in scientific inquiry. The rules governing inductive or deductive logic cannot capture the richness and variety of interpretive judgments that are inherent to every stage of scientific investigations and that lead to the rational selection of specific scientific theories based on the cumulative weight of evidence and argument. Presupposition theorists advocate phronesis, or practical reason, as an alternative to logic as the archetypal form of scientific rationality since it is evident in the processes of interpretation and judgment that are essential to all knowledge.

According to presupposition theorists, the types of rationality used in scientific inquiry are better captured by a theory of practical reason. Phronesis represents a more expansive conception of the powers of the human intellect in contrast to the restrictive view advanced by positivism, which limits the toolkit of reason to logical methods and rejects creativity, deliberative judgment, and evaluative assessments as different types of irrationality. According to the presupposition theory, different processes like as contemplation, conceptualization, representation, recollection, reflection, speculation, rationalization, inference, deduction, and deliberation disclose different aspects of reason. Additionally, they contend that these various cognitive practices must be included in any adequate conception of reason. It is necessary to reject as flawed the instrumental model of rationality put out by positivists since it is obviously unable to account for these distinct types of reason.

Presupposition theorists contend that science must be liberated from the limiting assumptions that hide the variety of ways in which reason manifests itself and confine its application to the rigorous observance of a predetermined set of guidelines. There is no reason to believe that there must be some indubi foundation or some ahistorical, invariant method for scientific inquiry in order to establish the rationality of scientific practices, but it is also necessary to abandon the notion that the principles of formal logic, the techniques of empirical inquiry, or the characterists can be used to support the idea that science can provide absolute truths. Phronesis is a concept of rationality that can encompass the various ways in which reason is applied in scientific practices, identify the various potential sources of error in theoretical interpretations, and shed light on the evaluation criteria and standards of evidence and argument that must be met when deciding between competing theories for the explanation of an event. Therefore, phronesis is a more complete and powerful conception of scientific rationality than the debunked positivist alternative.

The updated idea of science offered by presupposition theorists places an emphasis on the accepted nature of scientific methods and the fallibility of scientific explanations and predictions. When faced with a reality that is richer than any partial understanding of it, scientists use their imagination and tradition to try to understand what is going on. They base their explanations of

things and events on a variety of assumptions about meaning, significance, experience, explanation, and assessment. Scientists strive to approach the truth about the world while operating within the constraints given by fallibility and contingency. They do this by using a variety of traditional procedures and methodologies such as practical reason, formal logic, and creative ideas. But because they always address an empirical domain that is theoretically constituted, their approximations are always constrained by theoretical presuppositions. Multiple interpretations of the same phenomenon are possible because theory is not determined by data.

The scientific community's opinion is applied to the conflicting interpretations when there are opposing theoretical explanations. The scientific community considers the data and arguments supporting the opposing perspectives while using practical reason. Practitioners in specific scientific fields use their practical judgment in weighing the evidence, repeating experiments, analyzing computations, examining the applicability of novel methods, evaluating the potential of novel concepts, and debating the reliability of specific conclusions. A consensus over which theory will be considered to be legitimate among scholars in a field develops via a process of discussion and deliberation. The decision is supported by arguments that may be made and put out as evidence of the insufficiency of other interpretations. The process of scientific reasoning is eminently logical since it offers tools for spotting frauds and idiots as well as for spotting subtler mistakes and more complex versions of the truth. The everlasting veracity of any specific results, however, cannot be ensured by the process's logic. The application of scientific reason is prone to error, and scientific conclusions are subject to revision.

Presupposition theorists' new definition of science contends that efforts to categorize the universe into ontologically separate categories of "facts" and "values," or into binary domains of the "empirical" and the "normative," are inherently incorrect. These efforts fall short in their understanding of the implications of the theoretical foundation of all knowledge and the theoretical mediation of the empirical domain. They are unable to comprehend the value-based nature of all presuppositions and the ensuing value-based nature of all empirical assertions. Description, explanation, and assessment are intertwined in the theoretically mediated world. Any effort to force a dichotomous relationship upon such inseparable processes amounts to a fallacy of false alternatives that is both misleading and illogical. Because it conceals the theoretical nature of facticity and negates the cognitive processes through which knowledge of the empirical sphere is produced. The idea that "pure" facts can be extracted and studied devoid of any value.

Furthermore, the world's dichotomous division into "facts" and "values" supports an incorrect and overly restrictive conception of human reason, one that ignores the importance of practical rationality in scientific deliberation and the fact that science is merely one example of how practical reason is applied in everyday life. Because it is predicated on false premises, the positivist conception of reason overlooks the fact that phronesis operates in both scientific and philosophical analysis, ethical debate, normative argument, political decision-making, and day-to-day practical decisions. Furthermore, the positivist assumptions underlying the fact/value dichotomy render reason powerless and eliminate the possibility that rational solutions to the most pressing issues of the modern era may exist by stipulating that reason can only function in a naively simple, "value-free," empirical realm.

Philosophers are fully aware of the counterarguments to empiricism, but they have had little effect on the methodology of in-depth political research. This is particularly regrettable since the

criticism of empiricism has broad repercussions for the field of political science. The post-empiricist conception of knowledge postulates that various theoretical presuppositions should have a pervasive impact on our understanding of the political world, sanctioning contentious definitions of politics and directing attention to dissimilar variables while simultaneously concealing the contentious nature of evidence put forth and the contestability of accepted explanation strategies. These kinds of queries draw attention to the political ramifications of certain types of inquiry. The politics of knowledge become a viable area of study, since some cognitive traditions' analytic methods may have political ramifications that empiricist principles obscure. Methodological restraints may support particular ways of political life by defining the topics that are appropriate for "science," limiting the activities accepted as "empirical inquiry," establishing standards for evaluating the results of inquiry, identifying the fundamentals of practice, and validating the ethos of practitioners. Because of this, methodology must be seen as "mind engaged in the legitimation of its own political activity," dispelling the empiricist fiction of methodological neutrality. Such a redesigned methodological notion necessitates a close investigation of the intricate relationships between distinct political theories, analytical methods, and polities. The stakes involved in such inquiries are briefly discussed in the next section in the context of conflicting conceptions of politics.

Politics: Constitutive Definitions

There isn't a single definition of politics that all political scientists adhere to within the discipline. The absence of a generally accepted definition does not suggest that the subject is indefinable or that politics is a straightforward idea that can only be understood intuitively. It also does not indicate that political scientists are incompetent in their field. Contrarily, conflicting definitions highlight significant methodological and epistemological debates within the field. Various political worldviews have various interpretations, in part because they are grounded in profoundly different conceptions of human possibilities and, in part, because they have distinct notions of reason, evidence, and explanation. As a result, the issues at stake in these conceptual conflicts go beyond discipline politics to include how politics are structured in the modern world. It is useful to contrast a traditional definition of politics with a number of definitions put out by modern political scientists in order to investigate these stakes.

The political and governing functions were not interchangeable in the classical paradigm put out by Aristotle in The Politics. Politics was only feasible as a relationship of equals, in contrast to rule, which generally required hierarchical ties of dominance and submission. Politics could only exist in a world of freedom, as opposed to activities connected to sustenance, production, and reproduction that took place in a domain regulated by necessity. According to Aristotle, the core of politics is the engagement of equals in collective decision-making on the theme and course of public life.

The pursuit of a way of life that is marked by human perfection by the people is the goal of politics, which is defined as the engagement of equal citizens in an exchange of governing and being governed. Aristotle pointed out that in order to do this, people needed to have a shared set of moral principles and a common understanding of what is right and wrong. Citizens could only engage together to accomplish their shared goals in such circumstances, escaping the muck of competing wills. Since equal citizens within the political community identify the values they wish to uphold and establish laws and institutions to actualize those values, political life serves as a testament to human freedom.

When Aristotle referred to politics as the "master art," he implied that it included some kind of practical knowledge about what is best for the society and how to achieve it. Aristotle, who was interested in the comparative study of politics, was well aware that such questions could be addressed at two distinct levels: on the one hand, by members of a political community who were actively influencing their community's life, and on the other, by an outsider interested in politics who was comparing the responses of various political communities to the same questions. Aristotle amassed significant proof of the degree to which political participation allowed determined peoples to express their freedom by gathering hundreds of constitutions. Diverse constitutions embodied various ideas of what it means to live a good life, reflecting the divergent values of various polities.Aristotle disagreed with the relativist notion that different ways of existence should be seen as equally advantageous in order to record various systems of political organization. Instead, he was convinced that methodical political investigation could offer a conclusive, authoritative response to the query regarding the highest level of human existence. Political knowledge, operating at the second level, might provide conclusive solutions to the fundamental political issues. It would be feasible to understand politics at its core by looking at certain constitutions.

A certain research methodology and an explanatory model are closely related to how Aristotle conceptualized politics and political knowledge. His approach calls for the preliminary collecting of several examples of a phenomena and special attention to accepted viewpoints about that phenomenon. An examination of similarities and contrasts allows for rigorous categorization based on fundamental characteristics, which are teleological in nature. Political research calls for a shift in methodology from partial viewpoints to holistic views, from opinions to an understanding of the object in its whole. It moves forward by considering several points of view, comparing them against one another, and looking for the complete vision that can survive scrutiny. As the investigation progresses, a deeper understanding of the overall form of things emerges, progressively exposing the bias and distortion of the initial viewpoints. Understanding develops via a persistent interaction with events whose significance first seems hazy or inchoate. Using this technique results in aletheia, truth that which endures after all mistake is eliminated.

The method Aristotle outlined for learning about politics assumes that reason is capable of separating reality from potentiality and essence from appearance. His research approach implies that, despite the difficult and demanding nature of the process, truth may be attained. He also highlights an important disconnect between freedom, power, and truth by drawing a contrast between the first order activity of politics and the second order activity of political philosophy. Because it recognizes that people may exercise their freedom, behave morally, and use their influence to institutionalize principles that fall short of realizing the potential of humanity. Truth may be overshadowed in politics by freedom and the ability of the populace to achieve its common ideals. Political theorists that methodically examine the nature and goals of political activity may be able to comprehend the reality of human potential. However, the ability to institutionalize the truth's principles remains far removed from the possession of truth.

The Aristotelian view of politics contrasts with the purposeful omission of any mention of the human telos in twentieth-century conceptions of politics. Political scientists abandoned examination of what may be in order to focus on describing and explaining what is, guided by empiricist presumptions. Thus, they made an effort to develop definitions of politics devoid of values and based solely on what is empirically observable. However, a cursory look at the definitions that political scientists use the most suggests that each definition subtly structures the

political in a thoroughly value-laden way.The 'institutional definition' of politics dominated the field of political science throughout the first half of the 20th century. According to this perspective, politics includes the operations of the recognized governmental institutions. The focus of empirical political study is on existing governmental institutions, which were established by custom and constitution. Political scientists often use a case-study technique to analyze constitutional provisions to determine the structures of governance and the allocation of powers within those structures in specific countries. A lot of time and attention is put into determining how individual constitutional clauses should be interpreted as well as researching how these clauses have evolved historically. This methodology often has a strong focus on the law, looking at both the legislative process and the role of the courts in interpreting the law. The history of diplomacy is often used to frame foreign policy, while the methods by which governments influence people' lives are typically used to frame domestic policy [8]–[10].

CONCLUSION

The coherence theory of truth has had a significant impact on a number of disciplines, including science, ethics, and epistemology. It has been used to investigate issues such as the link between justification and type of justification, as well as the function of coherence in scientific investigation. Despite being widely accepted, coherence theory has come under fire from a number of philosophers who contend that it can result in relativism or the denial of objective truth. The coherence theory is still an important philosophical idea in the research of truth and knowing, nonetheless. His research approach implies that, despite the difficult and demanding nature of the process, truth may be attained. He also highlights an important disconnect between freedom, power, and truth by drawing a contrast between the first order activity of politics and the second order activity of political philosophy. Because it recognizes that individuals have the right to exercise their freedom, act in good faith, and use their influence to institutionalize principles that fall short of realizing the aspirations of humanity.

REFERENCES:

[1] K. S. Kendler, ‘Toward a limited realism for psychiatric nosology based on the coherence theory of truth’, *Psychological Medicine*. 2015. doi: 10.1017/S0033291714002177.

[2] T. Jolliffe and S. Baron-Cohen, ‘A test of central coherence theory: Linguistic processing in high-functioning adults with autism or Asperger syndrome: is local coherence impaired?’, *Cognition*, 1999, doi: 10.1016/S0010-0277(99)00022-0.

[3] M. T. Graham and M. A. L. Bell, ‘Photoacoustic Spatial Coherence Theory and Applications to Coherence-Based Image Contrast and Resolution’, *IEEE Trans. Ultrason. Ferroelectr. Freq. Control*, 2020, doi: 10.1109/TUFFC.2020.2999343.

[4] C. A. Griffiths, P. Ryan, and J. H. Foster, ‘Thematic analysis of Antonovsky’s sense of coherence theory’, *Scand. J. Psychol.*, 2011, doi: 10.1111/j.1467-9450.2010.00838.x.

[5] D. J. Teece, R. Rumelt, G. Dosi, and S. Winter, ‘Understanding corporate coherence. Theory and evidence’, *J. Econ. Behav. Organ.*, 1994, doi: 10.1016/0167-2681(94)90094-9.

[6] A. Winter and D. Yang, ‘Operational Resource Theory of Coherence’, *Phys. Rev. Lett.*, 2016, doi: 10.1103/PhysRevLett.116.120404.

[7] E. Wolf, ‘Early days of coherence theory and the first Rochester conference on coherence’, *J. Eur. Opt. Soc.*, 2010, doi: 10.2971/jeos.2010.10044s.

[8] A. L. Yuille and N. M. Grzywacz, ‘A mathematical analysis of the motion coherence theory’, *Int. J. Comput. Vis.*, 1989, doi: 10.1007/BF00126430.

[9] T. Kraft, C. Spee, X. D. Yu, and O. Gühne, ‘Characterizing quantum networks: Insights from coherence theory’, *Phys. Rev. A*, 2021, doi: 10.1103/PhysRevA.103.052405.

[10] V. Ntouskos, F. Pirri, M. Pizzoli, A. Sinha, and B. Cafaro, ‘Saliency prediction in the coherence theory of attention’, *Biol. Inspired Cogn. Archit.*, 2013, doi: 10.1016/j.bica.2013.05.012.

CHAPTER 2

AN OVERVIEW ON POLITICAL THEORY

Mr. Kunal Saxena, Assistant Professor,
Department of Management, Presidency University, Bangalore, India,
Email id- drkunal@presidencyuniversity.in

ABSTRACT:

Political theory is a branch of philosophy that studies the concepts and principles related to politics, power, government, and society. It examines the ideas and theories that underpin political systems and seeks to provide insights into how societies should be organized and governed. Political theory encompasses a wide range of approaches and perspectives, including classical and modern political philosophy, political economy, political sociology, and political psychology. It also covers various topics, such as justice, democracy, freedom, power, and authority.

KEYWORDS:

Anarchism, Authority, Citizenship, Civil Society, Communitarianism, Conservatism, Democracy.

INTRODUCTION

The institutional definition of politics might be criticized for sins of omission, despite the fact that concentrating on the formal institutions of state has a certain intuitive appeal. What can be stated about societies without states if politics is only to be understood in terms of the state? How are states without constitutions to be understood if the constitution offers a guide for how the state should be run? What can be learned about states whose constitutions conceal the true balance of power in the country? How are revolutionary movements categorized if governments are by definition the center of politics? Political life is neither fairly nor thoroughly described by the institutional concept of politics. By stipulative definition, it certifies a certain way of making decisions inside the nation-state. By doing thus, it discreetly extricates crucial operations from the political sphere [1].

Many academics rejected the institutional definition of politics as being too exclusive due to issues like these. This definition falls short of capturing the whole spectrum of politics because it places the emphasis of political research only on the institutions of state rule. Political actors that work behind the scenes to affect political results, such as political bosses, political parties, and pressure organizations, are not taken into consideration. It eliminates all forms of political violence from the political domain, with the exception of those committed by governments. Thus, it invalidates revolutionary activity regardless of what caused it. Furthermore, the institutional definition of politics severely restricts the scope of human freedom by designating constitutionally mandated social transformation mechanisms as the upper bound of political possibility[2]. Additionally, the institutional definition of politics does not adequately account for the nature of international relations, leaving open questions regarding the political standing of a system devoid of both binding legal obligations and powerful institutions that could impose sanctions on obstinate nations.

Many political scientists contend that the best way to understand politics is as a struggle for power in order to avoid the restrictions of the institutional definition. According to this perspective, people become involved in politics to further their own self-interest. Who gets what, when, and how becomes the main topic in political science. Since power struggles can occur in places other than the official institutions of state, such a research focus is required to take political analysis beyond the purview of governmental bodies. Politics permeates the notion of the power struggle.

In a significant way, the concept of politics as a battle for power broadens the field of political study beyond governmental institutions and broadens the scope of political analysis beyond the domain of the empirically observable. Power is often used in ways that are difficult to see directly, and its consequences are often easier to guess at than to scientifically prove. Therefore, it is not surprising that many political researchers who approach politics as a power struggle base their research on a number of debatable presumptions[3], [4]. The idea that a person is driven largely by their libido dominandi, or want to power, is perhaps the most basic of them. Politics is believed to be fundamentally a zero-sum game with constant rivalry and dominance for the sake of exploitation as the main goal since it is assumed that people are driven by an insatiable thirst for power. However, the posited will to power, which serves as the explanation for the irrational nature of political life, is deeply ingrained in human psychology and is completely inaccessible to empirical study. It's crucial to recognize the circularity that underlies the cynical "realism" of those who support the conception of politics as a fight for power, despite their simple claim to be "political realists." Because people are motivated by libido dominandi, politics is defined as a struggle for power; however, involvement in politics is evidence that people are motivated by libido dominandi.

Circularity to an unacceptable degree is also seen in political "realists'" responses to detractors. The struggle-for-power concept has drawn criticism for failing to account for the whole spectrum of political phenomena: Why have principles like equality, freedom, and justice played such a significant and ongoing part in political life if politics is essentially a competition through which people attempt to impose their selfish aims on others? The struggle-for-power view of politics is unable to account for this aspect of politics due to its constant focus on the pursuit of personal benefit. Appealing to lofty ideas, according to political "realists" like Gaetano Mosca, is a sort of propaganda used to hide the repressive nature of political relations and increase the potential for exploitation. No one likes to face the bare face of power, according to Mosca. Political leaders do not want their self-serving goals to be revealed since it will make achieving them more difficult. The general public does not want to face their own avaricious tendencies. Therefore, leaders and followers work together to spread "political formulae" pious expressions that give governments legitimacy by disguising the interests of the leader. The political phrase has the same purpose whether it is used in support of the "divine right of kings," "liberty, fraternity, and equality," or "democracy of the people, by the people, and for the people": it is a magnificent falsehood that supports myth. As a result, political realists downplay the significance of substantive principles in politics by exposing them as further expressions of the drive to power, a claim made without any independent support.

Although such a degree of circularity may call into question the logic of the concept of politics as a struggle for power, it does not lessen the undesirable effects of the definition's wide dissemination by political scientists. The moral significance of political activity is only partly revealed when "science" claims that politics is nothing more than a battle for power. The criteria

for judging political systems are severely constrained if individuals are persuaded that politics always entails the pursuit of self-interest. The line between a decent leader and a tyrant is effectively erased in a significant way. Because if all politics is by definition a struggle for egotistical gain, then what sets one ruler apart from another cannot be the different goals that they each pursue. A "noble statesperson" and a "ignoble oppressor" can only be distinguished by the kind of political formula they use to do it. A 'good ruler' is only a skilled publicist. Regimes may be identified by their power to influence public opinion, not by the principles they uphold. It makes no sense to condemn the systematic manipulation of pictures as an abuse of the democratic process within the context of cynical "realism," since manipulation is a constant of political life. The fallacious idea that democracy might be anything greater is something that cynical science must reject.

Political science has greatly benefited from the third vision of politics that pluralists have articulated. Pluralists see politics as the act of balancing competing interests, avoiding the flaws of both institutional and power-struggle conceptions. Pluralists contend that people participate in politics to advance a variety of goals, in contrast to the cynical conviction that power is the sole value sought for in politics. While some political figures may only work for their own self-interest, others may advocate for causes like equality, justice, a clean environment, or the preservation of endangered species. Pluralists argue that politics is a means of advancing and defending values and interests without proactively restricting the range of values that could be pursued. Pluralists emphasize that politics is a process of 'partisan mutual adjustment', a process of bargaining, negotiating, conciliation, and compromise through which people seeking noticeably different objectives arrive at decisions with which all are willing to live. This is in contrast to the institutional definition's focus on the official agencies of government. According to this perspective, politics serves as a regulating activity, a way to resolve disputes amicably, and a method for selecting policy goals from a wide range of competing options.

DISCUSSION

A number of modernist presumptions on the proper relationship between the individual and the state are included into the pluralist theory of politics. Pluralists advocate for allowing people the freedom to pursue their own subjectively determined ends because they are skeptical of the ability of human reason to operate in the area of values and because there are no absolute values, so all value judgments must be relative to the individual. Politics must have as its only objective the most freedom-maximizing reconciliation of the individual's subjectively stated wants and interests with the needs of society as a whole. Additionally, pluralists insist that the state has no business promoting the interests of any person or group because they assume the fundamental equality of all people. Therefore, coalition building is considered by pluralists to be the decision-making principle that maximizes freedom when there are no valid reasons to favor one person or set of values over another. Politics as interest accommodation is only for this reason: the ability of the parties to reach an agreement determines the result of any negotiation. The brilliance of this procedural vision of politics is in identifying solutions that can be approved by the majority of those involved in the decision-making process.

Numerous virtues have been attributed by pluralists to their political philosophy. It stays away from the too rationalistic paternalist ideas of politics that presuppose the government is aware of what is best for the populace. It acknowledges the diversity of people and upholds everyone's right to take part in political life. It recognizes the many social power structures and gives them

all a proper place in the process of making decisions as a group. Those designated to act on behalf of citizens must also be understood to act as factions, whose behavior may be governed as much by organizational interests, partisanship, and private ambitions as by an enlightened conception of the common good. It also notes that in order to understand politics adequately, interest groups must be taken into account as well as the fact that competing interests exist within the official institutions of state.

Despite these benefits, pluralism has also come under fire for lacking an all-encompassing conception of politics. The interest-accommodation definition excludes war, revolution, and terrorism from the realm of politics by describing politics as a system of decision-making that serves as a substitute for force. The pluralist perspective makes the assumption that all interests are basically reconcilable by stressing negotiation, conciliation, and compromise as the fundamental political actions. As a result, it offers little insight into some of the most contentious political topics that allow for no compromise. Furthermore, pluralists often overlook the structural advantages that wealth and political office offer by treating all power bases equally. The idea of equal participation and influence rights ignores the enormous effect that the state and economy have on political outcomes. Furthermore, the ethnocentrism of the interest-accommodation definition of politics has been criticized. It erroneously conflates some traits of political action in Western liberal democracies with the character of politics everywhere and at all times [2], [5], [6].

Even while the pluralist conception falls short of providing a complete, value-neutral definition of politics, it still has a little impact on how politics are actually practiced in the modern world. The interest-accommodation conception, when accepted by social scientists as the core of politics, both legitimizes the activities of opposing interest groups as the most equitable method of determining policy and delegitimizes revolution and political violence as inherently anti-political. Even in less extreme situations, the pluralist conception of politics may act as a self-fulfilling prophesy, drastically limiting a political community's choices by imposing restrictions on the contexts in which political issues are evaluated.The fact-value dichotomy and the emotivist view of values are presupposed by the pluralist philosophy of politics. Evaluative judgments include concerns about subjective emotions, sentiments, or feelings rather than questions of knowledge or thoughtful consideration, according to emotivism, a meta-ethical theory that is a variation of non-cognitivism. When used in the political sphere, emotivism implies that moral and political decisions are matters of irrational whim that cannot be the subject of rational discussion.

Although emotivism has been debunked as a wholly inadequate explanation of morality and rejected by philosophers for decades, it is still promoted as uncontroversial fact by social scientists. Additionally, there is a ton of evidence to support the idea that "people today think, talk, and act as if emotivism were true" Discussions of the self, freedom, and social interactions are tainted by emotivist presumptions that are propagated in social science literature and assimilated into popular culture. The 'unsituated self', who selects an identity in isolation and based on arbitrary tastes, has become a cultural ideal. Contemporary conceptions of the self are heavily saturated with emotivist and individualist premises. The unrestricted pursuit of unique desires in the personal, economic, moral, and political spheres is how freedom is conceptualized. Moral difficulties are seen as strategic or technical concerns relating to zero-sum situations where the fulfillment of one choice may conflict with the satisfaction of another desire. Moral issues are considered in terms of maximizing one's chosen idiosyncratic values. Respect for other

people is synonymous with acknowledging their freedom of choice and their right to follow their own interests without hindrance. The non-judgmental approach of "walking away, if you don't like what others are doing" replaces condemning the immoral acts of others. Emotivism and individualism encourage people to only find significance in their own lives, which furthers the privatization of the ego and raises worries about whether people have enough in common to conduct meaningful conversations about their concerns.

Any acceptance of emotivism on a large scale has significant implications for political life. At its finest, relativism is produced by emotivism and aims to "take views, outlooks, and beliefs that appear to conflict and treat them in such a way that they do not conflict: each of them turns out to be acceptable in its own place." Suspending value judgment seeks to diffuse conflicts via conflict aversion. People avoid uncomfortable conflicts by avoiding others whose subjective preferences vary from their own. Citizens create a modus vivendi that enables coexistence among variety by acknowledging that values are ultimately arbitrary and so completely beyond logical explanation.However, this coexistence is flimsy, and the promise of conflict avoidance is largely unreal. Because cynicism lies beneath emotivism, it "obliterates any genuine distinction between manipulative and non-manipulative social relations" and reduces politics to a struggle of wills and cunning that is ultimately settled by force. Intrac disputes cannot be addressed via reasoned dialogue when avoidance methods fail since, in this perspective, reasoned speech is only a front for arbitrary manipulation. Therefore, the choices for political life are essentially reduced to either the fierce competition of opposing interests as defined by the pluralist paradigm or the use of force.

The severe privatization, loss of the public sphere, and "the disintegration of public deliberation and discourse among members of the political community" are the political legacies of emotivism. Because of the broad acceptance of emotivism's core principles, public discourse is undesired, useless, and unreasonable. Privatization creates a world where people are free to do as they like and fulfill their irrational needs, but it also creates a world where collective action is restricted by a set of ideas that made public discussion ineffective, if not impossible. Although the pluralist conception of politics is not the only source of emotivism in modern societies, its self-assured declaration of interest accommodation as the only workable form of politics contributes to a significantly degraded form of public life. Its use of scientific expertise to give its limited interpretation of political possibility the "legitimacy of fact" should raise some red flags for those who work in a field that values objective research.

In the 1960s, behavioural political scientists proposed a new method that would be widely comparative and substantially scientific in order to avoid the difficulties of ethnocentrism and develop a theory of politics that takes into account the political experiences of many cultures and eras. Systems analysis and structural-functionalism conceptualized politics as a self-regulating system living within a broader social context and performing required duties for that social environment, extrapolating from biological and cybernetic parallels. According to this perspective, politics requires carrying out a variety of duties without which society would not be able to operate. In order to maintain homeostatic balance, political science had the responsibility of identifying these crucial political functions, demonstrating how they are carried out in various cultural and social contexts, and determining how changes to one aspect of the political system affect other aspects and the system as a whole. Political scientists could then provide significant cross-cultural explanations and forecasts after political research had produced such a thorough grasp of political processes. Therefore, the objective of the systematic cross-cultural study of

politics was to produce a scientific understanding of the demands placed on political systems, the nature of the systems' adaptive responses, including the conversion processes that function to minimize change, and the scope of political development in terms of structural differentiation and cultural secularization that emerge when the system faces challenges that are greater than its capacity to handle them.

This functionalist view of politics, although being widely accepted, has trouble defining the essential political functions that societies need to operate. Despite generally agreeing with David Easton that the political system involves "those actions related to the authoritative allocation of values," functionalist scholars had different ideas about what those actions entailed. The authoritative formulation of system objectives, the authoritative mobilization of resources to fulfill goals, the integration of the system, and the distribution of values and costs are the four crucial political roles that Mitchell defined. A more comprehensive list was provided by Easton, Almond, and Coleman, and it included activities like interest articulation, interest aggregation, rule creation, rule application, rule adjudication, political recruiting, political socialization, and political communication.Both enumerations were criticized for not being precise enough to meet the model's expectations. The system and its boundaries were not clearly defined, the critical operating range beyond which the system was said to have ceased to function was not specified, and the requirements for equilibrium maintenance were not sufficiently explained to support a distinction between functional and dysfunctional processes. Critics said that the purported political tasks were more arbitrary than "vital" or "indispensible," and that terminological imprecision and ambiguity contributed to this belief.

Critics also noted that the model produced no tes hypotheses, much less identified ‘scientific rules of political activity, in contrast to the promise of scientific certainty that preceded the deployment of the functionalist paradigm of politics. Critics said that the main strength of the functionalist theory was heuristic: it offered a complex system of categorization that enabled many political systems to be represented in the same terms of reference, which was in stark contrast to the optimistic assertions made by its proponents. Cross-cultural assessment of similarities and differences was made possible by a shared analytical vocabulary. Critics of the functionalist theory of politics cited further drawbacks. Because of its focus on system upkeep and persistence, the model was uniquely unable to predict political change. Traditional approaches to political analysis regarded uprisings and coups as the main drivers of political change, whereas functionalist analyses saw such events as adaptive tactics for maintaining the status quo. As a result, the systems approach obscured crucial questions relating to the nature of political regimes and the crucial components of regime transition.

At one level, functionalist analyses had a tendency to conceal political change, but at a higher level, they had a tendency to impose an excessive uniformity on the range of political growth. The pattern of political evolution that may be seen in a few Western liberal democracies, including the United States and Great Britain, was considered the model for all political development in the functionalist literature. Political scientists who subscribed to a kind of "inputism" thought that certain types of economic growth made certain political developments impossible. The spread of capitalist markets would put pressure on traditional cultures, leading to a rise in demands for political engagement that would ultimately result in the establishment of liberal democracy. This projection has a very apparent ideological bent, and despite detractors' persuasive denial of functionalism's claim to be a science, political scientists have frequently praised it as an uncontested factual truth. What is crucial to note here is not only that political

scientists working within this tradition have misunderstood the political decisions of specific political communities for the universal political destiny of the species or that their convictions about the value-neutrality of their scientific endeavor have made them oblivious to the hegemonic aspects of their projections, but also that political scientists have used their influence as 'experts' to advise developing countries to Scientific claims have been used to impose "rational strategies" for political development, which severely restrict the freedom of individuals in developing nations and foreclose possibilities, regardless of how shoddy their basis.

Under the guise of value-free empirical inquiry, contemporary political scientists have substituted scientifically validated "facts" for political choice where Aristotle advanced a conception of political knowledge that preserved the distinction between the free choices of political agents in particular nations and the truth possessed by political theorists. They have advocated action to improve regime stability by reducing "dysfunctional" and "destabilizing" influences like public engagement under the guise of realism. They have pushed capitalism market relations as the foundation of an inescapable political growth on the basis of scientific prediction. Although the implementation of such policy recommendations is frequently justified as another instance of how knowledge accelerates progress, there are compelling arguments against such optimism. There is at least as much of a chance that scientific information will undermine freedom as there is that it will contribute to undeniable "progress" when the liberation-subversion dynamic appears in connection to knowledge recognized by modern political science.

Political behaviorism was dedicated to the idea that ideas might be operationalized in a totally non-prescriptive way, that definitions are and must be value-free, and that research procedures are neutral tools for the collecting and arrangement of data. According to behaviorism, a political scientist is essentially an observer who explains and describes what happens in the political realm. According to post-behaviourism, every research is conceptually constructed and infused with value, challenging the illusion of research's value-neutrality. However, post-behaviourism did not challenge the fundamental distinction between events in the political world and their retrospective analysis by political scientists by shedding light on the methods by which the conviction of value-free research concealed the valuative component of political inquiry. Critical theorists and postmodernists have argued that this idea of critical distance is just another myth in recent years. Post-modernists caution that political science must also be understood as a productive force that creates a world in its own image, even though it employs conceptions of passivity, neutrality, detachment, and objectivity to disguise and conceal its role. They emphasize that every scientific discourse is productive, generating positive effects within its investigative domain. There are valid grounds to take the post-modernists' warnings seriously, even from a quick assessment of the four ostensibly value-neutral conceptions of politics that have dominated twentieth-century political science. Because each definition not only interprets politics differently, but also subtly supports a particular way of conducting politics.

Implications: The Encyclopedia's Structure

An encyclopedia created in the late 20th century must vary significantly from its forebears if post-empiricist notions of knowledge and science, as well as post-modernist warnings about the productive impacts of disciplinary methods, are to be taken seriously. The effort to provide an overview of the key issues explored within the discipline's subfields must be matched by a method that permits questions about the fundamental elements of political research to emerge.

The book must make an effort to shed light on the significant consequences of various techniques rather than giving in to the fallacies of value-neutrality. Instead of endorsing the idea of a non-controversial scientific objectivity, efforts must be made to define and evaluate the principles that guide disciplinary decisions.This encyclopedia has attracted writers devoted to a broad variety of methodological techniques in order to achieve these goals. Instead of a brief summary of a topic's description, each contributor is required to write a succinct critical critique of it. Authors have been specifically invited to address methodological as well as content concerns related to the topic, participating in pertinent discussions about the advantages and disadvantages of various research procedures and separating sound methods from bad ones. The subfields in this encyclopedia are arranged. Instead of aiming for methodological uniformity within each subfield, efforts have been made to enlist academics who take opposing stances on related subjects in the hopes that the juxtaposition of opposing accounts will help shed light on the theoretical underpinnings and the political implications of alternative modes of inquiry. Thus, the inclusion of alternative perspectives is intended to enhance the portrayal of political life, increase awareness of the drawbacks of particular perspectives, and raise readers' analytical sophistication.

This encyclopedia's organizational structure poses a variety of risks. The encyclopedia runs the grave risk of failing to provide a comprehensive account of the state of political studies that covers political theory, contemporary ideologies, comparative political institutions, processes, and behavior, political cleavages within nation-states, theories of policy making, comparative examination of a range of substantive policy areas, as well as international relations and the most pressing issues facing the modern world. The volume confronts the possibility of dismissal associated with any attempt to challenge ingrained traditions and entrenched power because the behaviorists who continue to dominate the discipline of political science may choose to ignore rather than engage in sustained critique. This is because the volume adopts a strategy that challenges the empiricist foundation that sustains the majority of research in contemporary political science. Furthermore, the project runs the risk of being rejected by those who prefer a more heroic, albeit fictive, ion of the discipline's authority. This is because the project is advancing a conception of political science that replaces claims to transcendent truth with recognition of the far more fallible foundations of human cognition. Such hazards are both inevitable and common.

However, the creation of this encyclopedia also presents a number of opportunities. It offers a chance for a systematic inventory, including a review of the substantive research findings produced within the field, a reconsideration of the contribution that various analytical approaches have made to the development of those substantive claims, and, more broadly, an investigation of the theoretical foundations of political inquiry. It calls for a reconsideration of the power and knowledge dynamics within disciplinary discourses. It promotes further research into how outdated and unjustified disciplinary presumptions limit the ability to address the issues facing modern politics. By doing this, the encyclopedia will inspire original thought about the world as it is depicted in political science discourse. The final test of the encyclopedia's usefulness will be how much it helps in achieving this goal [7], [8].

CONCLUSION

From ancient Greece to the current period, political philosophy has been instrumental in forming political systems. It has been used to help make political choices, create political institutions and

processes, and upend political structures that have been in place for a while. Political theory is important in today's conversations and debates regarding political topics including globalization, ecology, social justice, and human rights. It is used to examine and criticize political structures and practices as well as to suggest other strategies for dealing with social issues. Political theory continues to be a controversial and varied area despite its significance, with several academics and schools of thought giving opposing viewpoints and ideas. However, political theory is still a crucial field of research for anyone interested in comprehending politics and how it affects society.

REFERENCES:

[1] S. Choat, 'Decolonising the political theory curriculum', *Politics*, 2021, doi: 10.1177/0263395720957543.

[2] N. Zhang, X. Chen, and H. Yin, 'Significance and Possibility of VR Technology Embedded in the Teaching of Ideological and Political Theory Course in Colleges and Universities', *IEEE Access*, 2020, doi: 10.1109/ACCESS.2020.3023151.

[3] D. Pietrzyk-Reeves, 'Normative Political Theory', *Teor. Polityki*, 2017, doi: 10.4467/00000000tp.17.009.6588.

[4] A. Baderin, 'Two forms of realism in political theory', *Eur. J. Polit. Theory*, 2014, doi: 10.1177/1474885113483284.

[5] M. Festenstein, 'Spotlight: Pragmatism in contemporary political theory', *European Journal of Political Theory*. 2021. doi: 10.1177/14748851211050618.

[6] A. Getachew and K. Mantena, 'Anticolonialism and the Decolonization of Political Theory', *Crit. Times*, 2021, doi: 10.1215/26410478-9355193.

[7] C. Kwok and N. K. Chan, 'Towards a political theory of data justice: a public good perspective', *J. Information, Commun. Ethics Soc.*, 2021, doi: 10.1108/JICES-11-2020-0117.

[8] B. van Leeuwen, 'Is architecture relevant for political theory?', *European Journal of Political Theory*. 2021. doi: 10.1177/14748851211063672.

CHAPTER 3

CONSTITUTIONAL THEORY: CENTRAL CONCEPTS

Dr. Ramalingam Mageshkumar, Assistant Professor,
Department of Management, Presidency University, Bangalore, India,
Email id- mageshkumar@presidencyuniversity.in

ABSTRACT:

Constitutional theory is a branch of political theory that focuses on the interpretation and application of constitutional law. It examines the principles, values, and institutions that underpin constitutional government and seeks to provide insights into how constitutions should be interpreted and enforced. Constitutional theory encompasses a wide range of perspectives and approaches, including originalism, textualism, living constitutionalism, and critical legal studies. It also covers various topics, such as the separation of powers, federalism, individual rights, and the role of the judiciary.

KEYWORDS:

Amendment, Constitutional interpretation, Constitutionalism, Democracy, Federalism.

INTRODUCTION

One of the trickiest ideas in politics is the notion of the state. Politics, according to some academics, is only concerned with the state; but, for others, politics also occurs in social circumstances that fall beyond the purview of the state. There is no consensus about what is being investigated, which is one of the most problematic issues in such discussions. Is the state a collection of governmental institutions, a system of laws, a subset of society, or a set of principles and ideals pertaining to civil society? The study of the state is hampered by these and several other problems. First, we'll examine the word's etymology, then the state's complex relationship to other political ideas, the conflicting interpretations of its past, and lastly the range of theoretical perspectives on it [1].

The Latin words stare and status are where the term state comes from. Status civitatis and status regni were phrases employed by medieval attorneys as well as Roman authors like Cicero and Ulpian. In this context, status refers to the ruler's standing, the presence of stability, or the conditions for stability. Traditionally, family, sex, a career, and most crucially, property were used to gain prestige. Here is also where we discover the ambiguous connection to the word "estate." The term "state" in English is really a contraction of "estate." This has a similar meaning to the ancient French term estat and the contemporary French word état, which both denote a profession or social rank. Groups varied in rank and hence in estate. This is where the phrase "estates of the realm" comes from. Other European languages, like Spanish's estado, have analogies. In most cases, the governing party or individual had the highest estate, including property, status, and family. The highest estate could have had the most influence and power.

Such power was often considered as a guarantee of law and order and the good of the community. It therefore had a connection to stability, which came from the same root phrase. Those in positions of authority the highest estate had crests, badges, and other symbols displaying their stateliness.

Some claim that the usage above demonstrates a state-awareness from the twelfth century or even earlier. Popular interpretations place emphasis on a later, more precise noun use in which the state is seen as a public force above both the ruler and the ruled, serving as the center of political and legal authority. Although this terminology is still used in more contemporary contexts, it is not just a matter of standing, stability, or stateliness; rather, it is a distinct new form of ongoing public power that defines a new kind of civil existence.

Regarding this latter state noun usage, there are basically two points of view. Both place the founding of the state in the sixteenth century, albeit one attributes this to Machiavelli and the other to French descendants of Italian humanism such as Guillaume Budé, Bernard du Haillan, and Jean Bodin. There seem to be some formal traits that are inherent to the state. It has a population and a region that can be identified geographically. It asserts control over all individuals and organizations found within its bounds and has broader objectives than other associations. The state is often seen as the source of law because of its legal nature. It is founded on procedural norms, which are accepted by society more widely than other regulations. The bureaucracy of office holders who have received training run the state's processes. The condition also represents the tightest use of power and resources within a region. Its monopoly is not just based on force; rather, most states attempt to justify such a monopoly by looking for public approval and acceptance. As a result, membership in a state denotes a civil disposition. Furthermore, the state is acknowledged by other states as an equal member of the international community, demonstrating its sovereignty both internally within its borders and externally. However, it should be noted that different perceptions of sovereignty have an impact on how we define the state. Last but not least, the state is an ongoing public authority that is apart from rulers and governed [2]–[4].

DISCUSSION

The relationship between the state and other political ideas, including society, community, sovereignty, and governance, is complicated. Many of these concepts have meanings that align with specific state-related perspectives. For instance, it is possible to claim that the state creates all relationships within itself. Nothing is unique from the state in this sense. The state takes on the form of society. The situation is flipped and society may be seen as being antecedent to and independent of the state if sovereignty is thought of as popular, being in the people who form the state for certain purposes. The state may either be considered as the same as government or as distinct from it and delegating power to it. These topics provide basic and complex interpretational challenges for political science students. In essence, there are three major viewpoints on the state's history. According to the first, the state was originally established in an early Greek polis about 500 BC. Political science, in Aristotle's view, was the study of the polis. In the polis, there were undoubtedly concepts of territory, citizenship, authority, law, and other concepts; but, there was no notion of distinct governmental powers, no concept of a distinct civil society, and no particularly clear concept of a legal constitution. Furthermore, religious, artistic, and ethical practices played a significant role in polis life. To term it a state in any modern sense

would be stretching the truth since it was so small-scale compared to current states. Additionally, empires were too ad hoc and disjointed to be referred to as states.

According to the second viewpoint, the state dates back to the early middle Ages. Ideas of transcending public benefit have been developed by Roman and canon law. The monarchy, which was once linked with papal supremacy, was connected to public power and law. The ideas of citizenship and the rule of law were also present in medieval political thinking. The first issue with this perspective is etymological can one honestly debate the meaning of a word that does not exist? Political use of the term "state" did not begin until about the fifteenth century. Second, the middle Ages' feudal system had a propensity towards fragmentation. A huge subsystem of connections made up feudal existence. The aristocracy, the church, and many of the bigger organisations had their own laws and tribunals. The monarchy did not hold a position of supreme sovereignty. It was often thought to be an elective position that wasn't necessarily inherited. To assist them reign, the kings also largely depended on the backing of the aristocracy and other estates. Conflicting allegiances and overlapping affiliations crisscrossed medieval society. Because monarchs were reliant on the realm's populace, they were frequently seen as the law's recipients rather than its creators. Last but not least, it is difficult to pinpoint well defined geographical entities throughout the middle Ages with continuously loyal inhabitants. The Church was the only allegiance that outlasted the affiliations of local groupings. They were all respublica christiana members. Prior to the development of the concept of separate political entities, it was imperative that this vision falter.

The third viewpoint places the founding of the state in the late middle Ages. Ages, and especially beginning in the sixteenth century. The etymology lends credence to this viewpoint. It is a viewpoint that many more recent authorities have expressed. However, there is some disagreement as to who theorized the concept and when and where the modern state's practice started. The competing authorities, as was previously noted, concentrate their efforts on France and Renaissance Italy under the first absolutist rulers. We shall now move to the range of academic approaches to the study of the state and their various merits after looking at the broad strokes of its historical genesis. In essence, there are five techniques, which often and sometimes unavoidably overlap. There are five.

1. Legal or judicial;
2. Historical;
3. Sociological/anthropological;
4. Political-scientific;
5. Philosophical/normative.

The method with the longest history is the lawful one. It goes back to the first accounts of the state, which used terms from Roman law. Roman law served as the foundation for words like legitimacy, power, and power when they were first employed in reference to the state in the sixteenth century. Roman law texts influenced the early criticisms of feudal authority, which were first made by papal attorneys. These served as the foundation for ideas of authority and law that prioritized centralized authority. However, many theorists of this century have resisted the temptation to define the state as a hierarchical body of laws connected by some form of sovereign authority. In actuality, this view is clearly preferred by the legal positivist intellectual tradition. Others think this strategy is too constrained. They assert that the definition and character of the state are influenced by a far wider range of elements than just a hierarchy of

laws. Numerous historians have penned in-depth analyses of the development of the state. Some focus more on the elements that contributed to the development of the state, such as the expansion of Renaissance city states, the Reformation, the dissolution of the Holy Roman Empire, the rise of centralized salaried bureaucracies, standing armies, centralized taxation, or dynastic and religious conflicts. Others place a greater focus on the development of certain concepts through time. In contrast to what legal or philosophical theories would have us assume, the practice of the state is far messier and pragmatic for the pure historian. Theory by itself is too simplistic and condensed to encompass all the competing interests and forces that preceded state expansion. This historical method has a flaw in that the state is not only an empirical concept that can be understood by reviewing past events. From its earliest incarnations in the political language of Europe, statehood has included concepts and notions of civic life. Our comprehension would be diminished if we ignored this aspect of the condition.The state has traditionally been seen by sociologists and anthropologists as a social structure that may be found in certain more advanced countries. To put it another way, "state societies" are a kind of society. It might also be said that the state is a kind of governance. Humans have structured their social life in many ways, including state organization. Many authors, including Marx, Durkheim, Duguit, Weber, and MacIver, had this perspective on the state. The analysis of society as a whole provided an explanation for the state.

The fact that this sociological method embraces such a wide variety of viewpoints, including Talcott Parsons' functionalism, Marxist political economics, and Durkheim's positivism, makes it difficult to summarize. This approach emphasizes the sorts of states and what gives birth to their appearance, the variables influencing their responsiveness and longevity, and the economic and social preconditions of states. For instance, Talcott Parsons considered the state to be a singular outcome of the division of labor in mature industrial nations. Due to this division of labor, specialized groups developed and centered on the state. Thus, the state suggested some degree of industrialization. Therefore, it could be characterized as a group of specialized organizations connected to the division of labor in advanced industrialized societies. Its role is to mediate and lessen friction and conflict between the various societal segments. States are formed when a group of people has the means to control their surroundings and resolve conflicts.

Political science has tended to emphasize the empirical method more in this century, depending on broad generalizations within explanatory frameworks. An empirical theory must meet the requirement that it can be put to thorough testing. It often incorporates concepts from political sociology, political economics, and psychology. It partially reflects an increasing scientist dedication, particularly in light of the work of David Easton and others during the 1950s behavioral revolution. It was believed that empirical theory held the key to the field's future development. Functionalism and neo-functionalism were introduced into comparative politics from sociology. Functionalist analysis gave rise to the theories of development and modernisation. The state is seen as a specialized organization that emerges to carry out certain tasks at an advanced level of modernisation. Statistics may be used to track how economic and social practices have changed over the state's history. These themes were prevalent in the development of early comparative politics writing.

A multitude of hypotheses are used in modern political science to describe the state. The most well-known ones are public choice theory, elite theory, corporatism and neo-corporatism, different kinds of Marxism, and pluralism and neo-pluralism. Such theories may provide political scientists empirically based insights on the state. Empirical pluralists and neo-pluralists believe

that groups make up society and that the state, or government, is the object of or the setting for pressure or interest group activities. When groups compete for resources in a market, they have power. For some, the government represents the powerful coalition in favor of a certain policy. Dahl's description of polyarchy illustrates how other pluralists see the government as an unbiased umpire or neutral arbiter. The majority of pluralists include a theory of democracy into their conception of the state, seeing it as a means of articulating interests and engaging in market competition. This idea of democracy is seen to be more grounded in reality than the more traditional, participatory ideas of democracy. Democracy is concerned with the struggle between groups and the choice of leaders, according to pluralists like Dahl and Schumpeter. The winning party in the election uses officials in the government to create policies. If pluralism is society-centered, a different strategy that emerged in the 1980s contrasts the previous one by being state-focused. The state is considered to be a significant complicated player as well as being comparatively independent from social concerns. The state's institutional structure and legal framework are regarded seriously. Independent of community preferences and decisions, state authorities and procedures are taken into account. In reality, one of the elements that shapes people's decisions is the state. Some believe that this is a small step toward reintroducing the state to political science. However, many political scientists would argue that this state-centric approach runs the risk of becoming overly state-centric. The state always acts in the best interests of society. From a more conventional normative standpoint, it may be argued that the state-centered approach still doesn't provide a sufficient explanation of what the state is or take the logic of state autonomy seriously enough.

All societies are ruled by tiny minority, according to early elite theorists like Mosca, Pareto, and Michels. Michels' "iron law of oligarchy" best captures this claim. They said that elites in politics continued regardless of the kind of government and that this was an objective, scientifically provable reality. With the more conventional pluralist view of governance, this stood in stark contrast. The phrase "democratic elitism" was coined as a result of attempts to reconcile elitism with pluralism in more modern elite ideas. The function of elite dominance in the state is at the center of elite theory. The empirical research of elite theorists focuses on the tiny groups that shape and shape policy, investigating their social background, methods of recruitment, and attitudes. Thus, states can be divided into groups based on the type, consistency, and diversity of their elites.

Current corporatist ideologies are undergoing a lot of change. The word "state" is often used by corporatists as a synonym for "government," while for others it refers to the incorporation of a number of significant interests within the framework of the state. In this regard, corporatism differs from pluralism due to the smaller number of competing organizations, the nature of the groupings, and their position within the political system. According to Cawson's taxonomy, there are three basic types of corporatism in modern political science: a completely new economic system that is distinct from capitalism and socialism; a kind of state inside a capitalist society; and a method by which interests are structured and interact with the state.

Marxism links historical class interests, the protection of private property rights, and capital accumulation to the state. The state's growth has kept pace with that of capitalist economies. However, two ideas have tended to predominate Marxist state thinking up until this point. The first views the state as the ruling bourgeoisie's repressive or forceful tool for maintaining capitalism. After the revolution, either the proletariat's dictatorship or communism will replace this class state, crushing it or causing it to wither away. The second viewpoint is that the state has

a certain amount of independence from the economic system and serves as a battleground for conflicting class interests. Additionally, according to this second account, ideological hegemony is used covertly to impose state dominance. Finally, the state is ultimately embedded in individual choice under the economic perspective. It has methodological individualism at its core. The logic of self-interested individual choice, of which public choice theory is a prime example, gives rise to the state. In terms of basic goals like defense, justice, and order, collective action enables a person to maximize advantages while minimizing costs. Therefore, establishing a state to accomplish these goals is in the best interests of sensible self-interested people.

In a different philosophical setting, a comparable argument may be found in the libertarian works of Anthony de Jasay and Robert Nozick. Such a theory, however, cannot permit an overly active and interventionist state since doing so will result in more costs than advantages for people. Therefore, it requires constitutional limitations based on personal preference. Many pro-market liberal and libertarian theories tend to explore the economistic approach to the state, though many would still assert that the foundations of their economic arguments lie in positivistic empirical analysis.Such political science techniques have two main drawbacks. They do not address normative state-related issues, to start. They define and explain states but fail to provide a solution to queries such, the complicated connections between a lot of state activity and normative values and human nature concepts render all the aforementioned methods handicapped. Political science's scientific and positivistic precepts tacitly reject values and seek empirical rigor, which in politics is a phantom. Furthermore, the various "rigorous" theories contain a variety of unarticulated normative assumptions. Regarding a complete understanding of the state, the more general empiricism claims made in political science are debatable.

The fundamental idea of classical political theory particularly that from the sixteenth century, is the state's ultimate philosophical/normative notion, together with the legal method. The classical school of thought has a commitment to normativity and has focused on questions of human nature, morality, the family, and constitutional structures. The right, best, or most just order is one of the two central tasks of classical political theory with regard to the state that still hold true today. The other major task is the identity and nature of the state, which is closely linked to the principles and ideals of civil society. Since they assume that the identity and nature of the state are unproblematic, many empirical theories of the state have this flaw. The state has never been taken for granted in traditional political philosophy. But occasionally classical political theory drifts away from the historical and political reality of the state, misrepresenting its nature in the process [5], [6].

It may be challenging to consider the state in connection to a larger framework of normative presumptions and values since we are as used to thinking of it as a kind of government or collection of institutions. Many philosophical theorists believe that political reality is partially constituted by the state. In other words, the state creates the basis for the discussion of politics in a civilized and intellectual environment. It represents an understanding of the proper social structure within which people may assimilate. People have reasonable dispositions toward the state that cannot be fully empirically studied. There are several philosophical/normative conceptions of the state, much like in political science. Normative explanations of the state may also be categorized in a variety of ways.

For instance, it is possible to categorize using multiple ideological traditions. This categorization ignores the fact that these ideologies do not see the state substantially differently, despite possible

disparities in the scope of governmental activity. The fact that some of the more empirical conceptions of the state, such corporatism and pluralism, were formed independently as normative theories is another issue. In the 1920s, fascist authors made an effort to create a unique, normative corporate state ideology. Such an endeavor is dubious since corporatism lacks a strongly unique normative theory of the state. The argument for a normative description of a pluralist state could hardly be much stronger. Although they have always been constrained by the unfavorable criticisms of the state rooted in the foundations of Marxist political economy, Marxists have also developed tentative normative theories of the state.

The effort to understand the state as being embodied in the absolute sovereign person was the first significant turning point in normative theory. This concept was developed in the writings of Bodin, Hobbes, and Boussuet as well as in the attempts at implementation made by kings like Louis XIV. It first appears in the beginning of the sixteenth century, especially in France. At its height, the sovereign was thought to own the realm and be legitimated by divine authority. The interests of the state were those of the sovereign. The sovereign is the physical representation of the state, demonstrating the ongoing significance of sovereignty throughout the history of the state. The sixteenth century's personal condition is where the impersonality of the twentieth century originates. The absolutist philosophy had a flaw in that it placed too much emphasis on the king. In reality, it was preposterous. It is also unlikely that it has ever been properly implemented. Throughout the absolutist era, royal power was subject to restrictions. It was often influenced by the monarch's personality as well as the political and economic environment of the realm. However, it gave the conversation about the state an enduring vocabulary.

The longest, most significant, and yet convoluted state concept is encapsulated in the constitutional theory. In essence, this theory views the state as a collection of institutional structures and values that, according to historical, legal, moral, and philosophical justifications, embody the diversification and limitation of authority as well as a complicated hierarchy of rules and norms that serve to institutionalize power and control interactions between citizens, laws, and political institutions. This hypothesis has its earliest inspiration from both medieval European thought and Roman law. The restrictions of the constitutional theory are not imposed on the state but rather form its foundation. The constitutional theory bases the importance of certain norms on how severe they are. In terms of statehood, every restriction is a self-restriction. Even though its roots are occasionally traced back to theorists like John Locke, constitutionalism had come to be most closely associated with liberalism and liberal democracy by the nineteenth century. Other ideologies have also found a comfortable home within the constitutional theory, including conservatism and parliamentary socialism. The types of restrictions used in constitutional theories have been incredibly diverse. They include complex political and moral tools like representation, as well as legal and historical themes like the doctrine of the ancient constitution, fundamental and common law, the rule of law doctrine, conventions, written documents, and bills of rights. It wouldn't be overstating things to suggest that the constitutional state framework serves as the foundation for the majority of modern political philosophy today.

The constitutional theory's strength is also its shortcoming. Everybody supports the constitution or aspires to do so. Paradoxically, this has resulted in its trivialization. Constitutionalism may devolve into a collection of mere procedural rules without any real meaning. First, political scientists have spent their time to explaining what is really happening in such governments using tools like elite or pluralist theory. This has only served to increase cynicism. Second, liberal democratic constitutionalism has had significant internal dispute on the scope of the executive

branch. For instance, some have been eager to restrict the state's involvement in the economy, while others have argued against such restrictions and for the state to play a major developmental role. The dispute between the ideas of the minimum state and the developmental state has been sparked by the latter claim.

The more comprehensive Greek polis life is the source of a third potent normative philosophy. It was created within the framework of the German idealism tradition against the background of the French Revolution, which was significant. The ethical condition is seen as the outcome of a lengthy historical development beginning with the Greeks. It is not a coincidental phenomena; rather, it springs from human beings' inherent capacity to reason. It is believed that the state and its people have a logical foundation. Citizens and institutions operate under the authority of the state. Although it is still grounded in the idea of constitutionalism, a key distinction is that it is focused on the maximum moral self-development and constructive freedom of its citizens. Thus, it combines a disposition toward thinking intelligibly with the goals of institutional structures and regulations. The reasonable rules and traditions that guide individual behavior are embodied in the state. The state therefore symbolizes a logical ethical order that is latent in each citizen's awareness, not just a system of laws and constitutional order or a collection of specific organizations. This theory's seeming archaism and unsuitability for the modern environment are its drawbacks. Most political science students see the concept of an ethical state as dubious and perhaps worrisomely authoritarian. However, it cannot be denied that it played a part in the state's reevaluations at the turn of the century.

According to the normative pluralist perspective, the state is a synthesis of active, semi-independent organizations in the widest sense. Not absorbed, but integrated, are groups. Pluralism is narrowly focused on the government. The state encapsulates group existence. It encompasses all groupings as a whole. It stands out from all other groupings in how it portrays the total. As the embodiment of the entire system of groups, the state guards against injustices committed by both individuals and groups, upholds fundamental rights, and controls how people behave in groups. Because it is composed of groups whose independence is acknowledged within the concept of the state, the pluralist state is not sovereign. Only multiple group life can safeguard liberty since groups have genuine legal personalities. The flaw in such a theory of the state is that pluralists never clearly address how the government relates to different groups, namely, which one has dominance? The groups themselves also had a certain amount of naivete. Groups may often be repressive and liberty-limiting. Also, with such a diverse population of interests, how can any kind of consensus be formed in such a society? Normative pluralists are unable to adequately respond to these questions. There are many different ways that we might examine the state. just by keeping in mind that it is not just a historical and social phenomenon but also a tissue of values and normative ambitions for civic life can a fair picture be obtained [7]–[9].

CONCLUSION

The evolution and interpretation of constitutions throughout history have been significantly influenced by constitutional theory. It has been used to assist in the development of constitutional institutions and processes as well as constitutional structural challenges. Contemporary discussions and disputes regarding constitutional matters, such as the reach of the executive branch, the boundaries of free expression, and the defense of civil rights, are also pertinent to constitutional theory. In addition to suggesting alternate methods of constitutional interpretation,

it is used to examine and criticize constitutional institutions and practices. Despite its significance, constitutional theory is still a contentious and varied area, with several academics and schools of thought giving opposing viewpoints and views. However, for anyone who is interested in comprehending the principles of constitutional government and its function in society, constitutional theory continues to be an important field of study.

REFERENCES:

[1] P. N. Subbanarasimha, 'Salience of knowledge in a strategic theory of the firm', *J. Intellect. Cap.*, 2001, doi: 10.1108/14691930110399950.

[2] J. Driver and E. Kaufman, 'THE INCOHERENCE OF PRISON LAW', *Harv. Law Rev.*, 2021.

[3] G. Duke, 'Strong popular sovereignty and constitutional legitimacy', *Eur. J. Polit. Theory*, 2020, doi: 10.1177/1474885117701602.

[4] L. K. Weis, 'The constitutional office of the legislature', *University of Toronto Law Journal*. 2020. doi: 10.3138/UTLJ-2020-0043.

[5] R. E. Barnett and E. D. Bernick, 'The letter and the spirit: A unified theory of originalism', *Georgetown Law Journal*. 2018. doi: 10.2139/ssrn.3049056.

[6] P. Szymaniec, 'Aharon Barak's Concept of Human Dignity and the Notion of Dignity in Jurisprudence of Polish Constitutional Court', *Philos. law Gen. theory law*, 2021, doi: 10.21564/2707-7039.2.242863.

[7] T. F. Blanken *et al.*, 'The role of stabilizing and communicating symptoms given overlapping communities in psychopathology networks', *Sci. Rep.*, 2018, doi: 10.1038/s41598-018-24224-2.

[8] D. E. Pozen, 'Constitutional bad faith', *Harv. Law Rev.*, 2016.

[9] M. M. Harmon, 'the Simon / Waldo Debate□: a Review and Update', *Public Adm. Q.*, 2013.

CHAPTER 4

A BRIEF DISCUSSION ON CONCEPTIONS OF POWER

Dr. Narayana Srikanthreddy, Assistant Professor,
Department of Management, Presidency University, Bangalore, India,
Email id- srikanthreddyn@presidencyuniversity.in

ABSTRACT:

Conceptions of power refer to the different ways in which power is understood and defined in social and political contexts. Power is a complex and multifaceted concept, and various theories have been developed to explain its nature and operation. One of the earliest and most influential conceptions of power is the idea of coercion, which suggests that power is the ability to force or influence others to do something against their will. This view of power is often associated with Machiavelli and Hobbes, who saw power as a necessary means of maintaining social order and preventing chaos. Another conception of power is the idea of authority, which suggests that power is the legitimate exercise of authority or control over others. This view of power is often associated with Weber, who argued that authority derives from the recognition and acceptance of those in power by those being governed.

KEYWORDS:

Authority, Coercion, Dominance, Elite theory, Empowerment, Hegemony.

INTRODUCTION

The core of political analysis is the idea of power. It is undoubtedly the key idea behind both descriptive and normative analysis. By placing blame on institutions and actors, we attempt to explain political occurrences and processes when we discuss elections, interpersonal disputes, and state policies. So we are discussing power. When we inquire about the structure of a decent or just society, we are contrasting the current state of affairs with some imagined alternative set of arrangements that may allow individuals to live their lives more effectively. Power is a topic that we also discuss here. It would seem hard to participate in political conversation without posing issues about the allocation of power in society, either subtly or overtly [1].

At least in part because of this, social and political theorists have spent a lot of time debating the meaning and significance of the concept of power, as well as how well or poorly it lends itself to scientific analysis. They have also debated why academics and the general public should care about any of the aforementioned topics. It is interesting to note that although most political theorists concur that power is a key term, they are unlikely to agree on much else. The result has been some difficult conversations between theorists who use the same words but have quite different meanings. It is perhaps fair to state that most political theorists function with some fundamental core understanding of power since such challenges of translation have never reached a point of incommensurability. The fundamental idea is that social actors' capacities to have an impact on the world in some way or another are what is meant by the concept of power, which is expressed in a variety of ways.

The Latin verb potere, which means "to be able," is where the word "power" originates. It is often used to indicate a quality, capability, or ability to make things happen. The idea is obviously related to the idea of dominance. The latter term, which is derived from the Latin word dominium, denotes some kind of control or mastery. Originally, it was used to indicate the patriarch's power over his home or territory. Although the word "power" has frequently been used interchangeably with "dominance," the latter word denotes an asymmetry, whereas the former is ambiguous. Authority and the idea of power are closely related to one another. However, the latter has a normative component that implies some sort of authorization or consent, whereas the former is similarly ambiguous in this regard. The grammars of these ideas and how they interact are fascinating and significant, but I'll focus on the fundamental idea of power as the ability to act, a genus from which the ideas of dominance and authority might be understood as species.

However, such a core is itself quite ambiguous and undoubtedly lends itself to numerous interpretations. As a result, a lot of real investigation and discussion has been clouded by what seems like endless and sometimes esoteric philosophical conflict. A cynical critic might attribute a large portion of this dispute to political theorists' unending methodological fixations, who support subdisciplines, journals, and careers by advancing meta-theoretical debate endlessly. Cynicism of this kind is not unjustified, but I believe there is more to the story. If it is true that political analysis cannot be done without bringing up the idea of power, it is also true that no discussion of power can be had without bringing up a wider range of philosophical, even metaphysical, issues regarding the nature of human agency, the makeup of social life, and the proper method for studying them. It should not be surprising that this debate has expanded to include the idea of power since these larger issues are, as the history of contemporary social science attests, very divisive.It would be hard to provide a thorough and nuanced picture of such dispute in a short piece like this. I'll give you a general idea of it now. In my opinion, there are four main models of power in contemporary political theory: (1) the voluntarist model, which draws on traditions of social contract theory and methodological individualism; (2) the hermeneutic or communicative model; (3) the structuralist model, which draws on the writings of Marx and Durkheim; and (4) the post-modernist model, which has been developed in various ways in the works of Michel Foucault and some contemporary feminists.

Each of these models gives a notion of people, social institutions, and analytical techniques in addition to a definition and refinement of the idea of power. Three things need to be made apparent before I go on to describe these models. I'll start by treating models as nothing more than broad categories or 'ideal kinds'. I do not want to imply any form of substantive agreement among the theorists characteristic of each paradigm, who often disagree on a wide range of topics despite some superficial similarities. Second, despite the beliefs of methodological ideologists, these models are not inherently mutually incompatible, even if each of them is sufficiently diverse and autonomous to be examined independently. It goes without saying that this is a difficult subject, but I will say that each model does provide some valuable insights, and that power theorists should definitely think in more synthetic terms than they are used to. Third, the models of power I shall explore below are distinct, not the ideas of how it is distributed in various social structures. In other words, the conversation will be mostly metaphysical. Many political theorists, including those involved in conceptual discussions about power, have fallen victim to the fallacy that there is a one-to-one relationship between meta-theory and theory, and such that, for example, a supporter of Robert Dahl's arguments regarding the behavioural study

of power is inevitably a pluralist, and the opposite is also true. This is not the case, as I have explained in other places [2]–[4].

DISCUSSION

All participants in the so-called "three faces of power" discussion and the majority of "rational choice" theorists have the same opinion. It is not a coincidence that such a viewpoint can be traced back to Thomas Hobbes' literature since it is anchored in the tradition of methodological individualism, which holds that all assertions about social life may be reduced to assertions about individuals. However, if collective subjects are viewed as unitary aggregations of individual wills and as strategic actors attempting to maximize some form of utility or value, then such a view can be extended from individual to collective subjects.

Robert Dahl's piece from the International Encylopedia of the Social Sciences is the standard explanation of the voluntarist approach. According to Dahl, having the ability to 'alter the sequence of events' is being able to persuade others to do actions they otherwise would not. Dahl's use of the terms stimulus and response suggests that this idea of power is based on a Newtonian analogy. He writes that "power terms in modern social science refer to subsets of relations among social units such that the behavior of one or more units depend in some circumstances on the behavior of other units." Unless an outside force intervenes to change our movements, we are all naturally at rest or moving at a constant speed. One such force is power. Dahl views power as a causal idea as a result. Dahl, a behaviorist, nevertheless, claims that his understanding of causation is wholly Humean. "The only meaning that is strictly causal in the notion of power is one of regular sequence," the author says elsewhere. "That is, a regular sequence such that whenever A does something, what follows, or what probably follows, is an action by B."

This perspective, which only views power in terms of the contingent success of actors in achieving their goals, as I have argued elsewhere, fails to differentiate between the successful exercise and ownership of power. It is likewise empiricist in how it views scientific explanation and causation, both of which, according to Dahl, are conceptualized in terms of Humeanism. Despite appearances to the contrary, Bachrach, Baratz, and Lukes Dahl's most vociferous and well-known critics—share this opinion. Power, according to each of these thinkers, is a behavioral relationship of real cause and effect that is used up in interpersonal interactions. While each of these theorists accepts the significance of collective rules and resources in their own unique ways, they all insist that these should be clearly separated from and unrelated to power. All three faces of power "can be seen as alternative interpretations and applications of one and the same underlying concept of power," says Lukes, who is frequently regarded as a "radical" critic of Dahl. Power, according to this idea, is the capacity to further one's interests while at odds with those of others.

This idea may be found in the works of several of the contemporary political theory's "founders." Thus, Thomas Hobbes defines power as the "present means, to obtain some future Good" in terms of human purposes. According to Hobbes and Locke, "Power and Cause are the same thing," and they both conceptualized causality in terms of mechanical, Newtonian principles. When a body is at rest, we have no idea of its potential for movement, and when it is in motion on its own, the movement is more of a passion than an action. Because when the ball follows the billiard stick's motion, it is not acting in any way; it is simply acting out of pure passion. Additionally, when it propels another ball that was in its path by impulse, it only transmits the

motion that it had received from the other and loses in itself proportionately to what the other received, giving us an idea of an active power of movement.

Insisting that "the idea of power is relative as much as that of cause" and that "both have reference to an effect, or some other event constantly conjoined with the former," David Hume is credited for canonizing this viewpoint. According to this theory, power is only empirical causality. The formulations of Hobbes and Hume are significant because they make explicit what many more modern formulations only hint at: that such a view of power presupposes an atomistic view of social relations, a Humean conception of causality, and an empiricist or 'covering law' model of scientific explanation. Any assertions of underlying causes or preexisting powers are false, according to Hume, who stated that "the distinction between power and the exercise of it is without foundation."

The behavioural revolution in power studies was based on a particular understanding of these works. The work of Max Weber, who defined power as "the probability that one actor in a social relationship will...carry out his own will" over the opposition of others, was another source of inspiration for many of the behaviouralists. This idea, which is fairly popular, combines the atomistic ontology and the Humean notion of causation with a phenomenological focus on intentionality. Power is seen as a relation of empirical causation in the literature of Laswell and Kaplan, March, Simon, and Dahl, where one actor wins out over another in a dispute of some kind. Later critics, like Nagel, continue in this vein even as they present sophisticated methodological arguments. Despite many differences, Nagel succinctly summarizes the behavioral perspective when he states that "the causal version of power has achieved widespread acceptance."

Numerous proponents of rational choice theory also hold this opinion. They all share the behavioral viewpoint that social existence should be understood in terms of the contingent interactions between people and groups, even if the majority of these theorists reject many of the more positivistic epistemological premises of behavioralism. They also have a common behavioral aversion to the postulation of underlying structures, hidden causes, and theoretical abstraction. Rational choice theorists, in contrast to many behaviouralists, are especially concerned in the motivations, incentives, and coordination issues associated with strategic bargaining. Although Hobbes' ideas of reputation and anticipated reaction as well as Weber's interest in strategic action can be linked to this interest, its more rigidly formalistic orientation is of more recent vintage [5]–[7].

Early attempts to conceptualize power using the principles of microeconomics self-interest, maximizing, marginal cost, and marginal benefit can be found in Peter Blau's Exchange and Power in Social Life. Power, according to Blau, is an exchange relationship between parties in which an imbalance in the services offered is made up for by one party's subordination to the other. Though they disagree with Blau on a number of points, other rational choice theorists are drawn to what Brian Barry calls "an economic analysis" of power. Barry agrees with the behaviouralists that using power to influence others' behavior is a good way to get their cooperation, but he goes a step further and defines power as "the possession of the means of securing compliance by the manipulation of rewards or punishments." According to this perspective, the actors engaged must obviously take into account the marginal cost and benefit. Such a focus raises a number of intriguing game-theory issues, such as how procedural norms

impact strategic bargaining, the strategic power of numerical minority, and the implications of boundary requirements on coordination issues that affect group bargaining.

The voluntarist model's claims to scientific objectivity contribute significantly to its appeal. In fact, its dedication to a blanket law model of scientific explanation and its claim to be able to make predictive and hence "falsifiable" generalizations are what keep it together as much as its atomistic social assumptions. In this regard, the ferocious onslaught of objections to empiricist philosophy of science that have been made over the last 20 years cannot help but lessen its allure. However, the model has also faced other criticisms. While the model accurately conceptualizes issues related to the exercise of power, some have argued that it is unable to provide theoretical justifications for how and why agents are able to exercise power in the ways that they do. Others have questioned whether the model ignores ideological issues and how pre-existing normative and cultural forms—which were not created out of thin air by any maximizing person or group—construct agents' preferences and practical horizons. The hermeneutic model gives expression to each of these objections in a unique manner.

The Hernan Model

The study of meaning is called hermeneutics. According to the hermeneutic theory of power, a particular social community's shared meanings define that community's power. This strategy shares with rational choice theory the notion that beliefs are the fundamental components of power relations and that rationality concerns are necessary in social interaction. However, it differs in that it contests the notion that cost-benefit analysis or instrumental rationality is a trait shared by all people. Hermeneutics, in contrast, is interested in the many normative and symbolic structures that influence the practical rationalities of placed social actors. This is based on the ontological tenet that since people are linguistic creatures by nature, the character of a society, including its power structures, can be discovered in its language. It also entails the epistemological conviction that researching social power properly requires some kind of hermeneutic knowledge rather than scientific empirical generalization.

Modern social theory has given the hermeneutic method more and more significance. According to Charles Taylor, for instance, the distinctive linguistic and conceptual nature of human social existence must be the primary guiding premise of any social explanation. As he puts it: It is important to note that the objects of public experience—such as rituals, celebrations, elections, etc.—do not resemble natural realities. Because they are not wholly distinct from the experience they inspire. The concepts and representations that support them have a role in how they are formed. A social activity, such as casting a ballot in a contemporary election or voting in the ecclesia, is what it is because of a set of widely accepted concepts and meanings, according to which placing stones in an urn or marking pieces of paper qualifies as making a social choice. These concepts regarding what is happening are crucial to the institution's definition.

The "canon" of Western political philosophy, which includes Aristotle, Machiavelli, Montesquieu, and Tocqueville, shows a respect for this. All of these authors attempted to explain the norms, mores, and "spirit of the laws" that made up forms of social power. None of them considered power as just an empirical compliance relation. Unquestionably, Hegel's chapter on "Lordship and Bondage" in The Phenomenology of Mind is a significant precursor of modern hermeneutic theories of power. Hegel's main argument is that even relationships of extreme dominance, which would seem to be completely anomic, are maintained by the need that their actors exhibit some kind of reciprocal acknowledgment. Hegel departs from the more atomistic

concepts found in Hobbes and Hume as well as the English tradition as a whole with his focus on the significance of awareness and reciprocity. Numerous German social theorists of the nineteenth century, such as Ranke, Dilthey, Simmel, and Weber, placed an emphasis on this idea in their writing.

On top of this strategy, other modern theorists have created. Since the voluntaristic approach is unable to accept a normative context that gives behavioral interactions meaning, Peter Winch insists that the exercise of power presupposes such a context:

This is often true of human actions as opposed to natural occurrences. For example, an event's character as an act of obedience is essential to it in a manner that is not true of an event's character as a clap of thunder. Long before humans could conceptualize them, there were electrical storms and thunder. However, it does not make much sense to assume that humans may have given and received commands prior to developing the idea of command and obedience. Because the primary way in which they demonstrate that they possess those ideas is through the performance of such acts. Recognizing what came before as an order is a necessary component of an act of obedience in and of itself.

Therefore, a command presupposes some level of mutual understanding, and obedience implies some sort of "taking" of the relevant command. Even though Hannah Arendt holds a more peculiar and normative perspective, she maintains that power cannot be understood using the voluntarist, Newtonian model: "Power corresponds to the human ability not just to act, but to act in concert." Power is never an individual's possession; it belongs to a collective and only lasts as long as the group stays cohesive. Arendt argues that people are inherently communicative creatures, and that their powers to act are nourished by the common connections and meanings they share.

Talcott Parsons also advances this viewpoint, but in a different fashion. Parsons worked to provide a complete theory of "the social system" that included phenomenological and voluntaristic perspectives. Thus, he emphasized the significance of social norm "internalization" as well as strategic interaction. Parsons contends that power isa generalized ability to ensure that units in a system of collective organization carry out legally binding obligations when those obligations are justified by their bearing on collective goals and where there is a presumption of enforcement by negative situational sanctions regardless of the actual agency of that enforcement in the event of recalcitrance.The focus on rules in these varied formulations is what unites them. Power, according to all of the hermeneutic model's proponents, is ingrained in a set of values that social actors' very identities and range of action. Although this model has a lot to recommend it, some have claimed that because of its focus on language, it misses the more'material' aspects of power, which may exist even if social agents are not aware of them.

Model of Structure

Both the structural and hermeneutic models share a dislike of methodological individualism and an understanding of the value of norms. However, it avoids treating power solely from a normative perspective, arguing that both voluntaristic and hermeneutic approaches miss power's structural objectivity. The roots of the structural model may be found in Durkheim's Rules of Sociological Method and Marx's explanation of the capitalist mode of production in Capital. Both theories claim that structural patterns that both facilitate and restrict human behavior are pre-given realities. These forms could contain a normative component, but that does not mean

that they can be reduced to the assumptions that social actors make about them. A relational social ontology is a component of the structural model. In opposition to voluntarism, it argues that society cannot be reduced to the characteristics of its members and instead consists of generally stable relationships in which people take part. Marx was right when he said that "the individual is the social being...which can individuate itself only in the midst of society." This is what the model really teaches. It does not reify social systems to have such a stance. Instead, these structures are seen as the medium and results of human action, to use Anthony Giddens' words. There is a "duality of structure," as he puts it. Social structures are both actual circumstances of the activities they control and the conceptions of these activities held by human actors.

Social structures do not exist in a vacuum. Without speakers speaking, for instance, there would be no language; but, language also serves as the means through which communication is made possible. As a result, agents may draw on the structural characteristics of language. In this way, it serves as a more generic model for social organizations that provide their members abilities. For instance, in this perspective, being a capitalist equates to having power. However, this power is not derived from the contingent interactions between capitalists and workers, nor is it diminished by their shared values and normative commitments. Instead, it is a characteristic of the capitalist system that agents can use to their advantage in order to further their own unique goals. The structural view and the hermeneutic view have many similarities, but the structural perspective is nonetheless dedicated to the goal of scientific explanation and to the idea that it is the responsibility of science to postulate about fundamental structures.

This last view deviates most drastically from the voluntaristic model, replacing empiricist ones with more conventional realist notions of science. In social and political research, the structural approach has risen to prominence. Of course, it is disputed, particularly by supporters of a more voluntaristic paradigm. However, less conventional, "post-modernist," writers also pose a threat to it. These typically contend that the structural model is still bound to certain'modernist' assumptions regarding the unity of the subject and the superiority of scientific discourse. Some of these criticisms, particularly the last one, are reminiscent of the Frankfurt School's critique of modern social science and instrumental reason. However, the structural viewpoint mentioned here and the understanding of power in critical theory are actually quite similar. Critical theorists, like structuralists, often see power as inherent in organized connections and want to use a kind of critical social science to find these structures.

Modeling Postmodernism

Along with hermeneutic and structural theorists, post-modernists reject voluntarism and individualism and hold that language and symbols are fundamental to power. However, they contend that scientific discourse lacks any clearly epistemic validity. Instead, they maintain that hermeneutic and structural conceptions of power, in particular, unfairly privilege particular conceptions of knowledge and human agency.

All postmodern discourses are "deconstructive" in the sense that they aim to alienate us from and undermine our confidence in assumptions about reality, knowledge, power, the self, and language that are often taken for granted in and used to support current Western society. Accordingly, Nancy Hartsock contends that redefining power necessitates "a relocation of theory onto the epistemological terrain defined by women's lives" and that this would "stress those aspects of power related to energy, capacity, and potential" rather than those linked to compliance and

domination. In a similar vein, Allison Jaggar maintains that a more "positive" definition of power may be defined and justified from a distinctly feminist "epistemological standpoint." These theorists are notable for their assertion that ideas of power are gender-specific and rooted not only in intellectual distinctions but also in fundamentally different types of experience. The feminist view of power emphasizes some relationships over others, usually those involving mutuality, and, like Arendt's view, it is quite explicitly normative, claiming to not only identify but also value areas of experience and human potential that more conventional, masculinist models of power had previously hidden.

This is a key area of overlap between feminist theory and Michel Foucault's work, which, in his words, aims to promote the 'insurrection of subordinated knowledges' that have been 'disqualified' and 'buried' by dominant discourses. They, too, believe that Foucault's genealogical analyses of power are "anti-sciences." Many of his ideas about power are similar to the structural model. He outright rejects the voluntaristic paradigm, which sees authority as something "that forbids, that refuses, and which has a whole range of negative effects: exclusion, rejection, denial, obstruction, obfuscation, etc." Like the structural model, he sees power as being made up of specific structures or "discourses" and believes that power has both a "positive" and a "negative" aspect. In other words, Foucault holds that whatever ‘resistances' authority engenders are themselves restrained by the structures in which they arise. Social actors are produced and empowered by the relations of power in which they engage. A vast critical literature has developed in response to Foucault's ideas on power. The most crucial point is that, despite his affinity for the structural model, Foucault's philosophical beliefs clearly set him apart from it.

First, he declares that all "global" or "totalizing" discourses on the study of social power are "totalitarian," and rejects them. Thus, he favors a localized analysis of "micro-power," contending that only such knowledge can help people avoid falling victim to contemporary forms of dominance and power. Second, Foucault seems to claim that even his "local knowledges" are anti-epistemological in any sense since he supports a "struggle against the coercion of a theoretical, unitary, formal and scientific discourse." Third, despite talking about "resistances," Foucault identifies the idea of the human subject with contemporary forms of dominance. He also says little about the relationship between structure and agency, as well as how agents can and do change the circumstances in which they live.

Finally, he seems to ontologize dominance in some way by leaning on Nietzsche. He rejects the issues with justice and freedom and asserts that "right should be viewed...not in terms of a legitimacy to be established, but in terms of the methods of subjugation that it instigates." In each of these ways, Foucault's understanding of power is very destructive. Additionally, his formulations appear to defy any organized theoretical or normative approach to social life, even though it is obvious that he wishes to offer some alternative. As many observers have pointed out, there is a significant contrast between Foucault's extreme anarchism, if not nihilism, and the feminist approach to power, which values feminine experience and strives for some degree of actual freedom. Therefore, compared to other models, the post-modernist model constitutes substantive unity less. Instead, a type of mistrust of current theoretical methods and the claims of epistemic privilege that they sustain best describes it [8], [9].

CONCLUSION

The four models of power I've described each have a purpose and focus on an important aspect of social life. Each of the first three models emphasizes a key idea: how shared norms, organized

relationships, and strategic agency are essential to how power is conceptualized. Additionally, the fourth model the postmodernist one provides crucial insight into the fractious and problematic nature of social life by arguing that power is complicated, ambiguous, and dispersed across a variety of social spaces and that conventional conceptions and methodologies are still largely insensitive to this. The structural alternative, in my opinion, provides the greatest opportunity for a unique synthesis of these concepts. It maintains a commitment to certain norms of scientific explanation and critique but also takes into account the new information offered by competing theories. It recognizes the significance of human agency and agents' own perceptions. The voluntarist insight into the significance of strategic maneuvering and the contingency of outcomes as well as the Foucauldian insight into the constitutive, positive character of power, which enables as well as constrains, can both be incorporated into Giddens's concept of the duality of structure and agency.

REFERENCES:

[1] B. Teles Fazendeiro, 'Domination and Togetherness: Conceptions of Power in Central Asia's International Politics', *Probl. Post-Communism*, 2021, doi: 10.1080/10758216.2020.1742162.

[2] G. Stahl, 'Aspiration paradoxes: working-class student conceptions of power in "engines of social mobility"', *Int. J. Qual. Stud. Educ.*, 2018, doi: 10.1080/09518398.2017.1286404.

[3] A. Allen, 'Feminist Conceptions of Power: A Critical Assessment', in *The Power of Feminist Theory*, 2018. doi: 10.4324/9780429495939-2.

[4] S. Gunn, 'From hegemony to governmentality: Changing conceptions of power in social history', *Journal of Social History*. 2006. doi: 10.1353/jsh.2006.0004.

[5] B. C. Schmidt, 'Competing realist conceptions of power', *Millennium: Journal of International Studies*. 2004. doi: 10.1177/03058298050330031401.

[6] R. M. Regoli, 'The conception of power: Reconsidered', *Soc. Thought Res.*, 2014, doi: 10.17161/str.1808.6117.

[7] B. Loomer, 'Two Conceptions of Power', *Process Stud.*, 1976, doi: 10.5840/process19766126.

[8] K. Enke, 'Conceptions of power among senior women administrators at liberal arts colleges in the upper Midwestern United States', *NASPA J. About Women High. Educ.*, 2014, doi: 10.1515/njawhe-2014-0014.

[9] S. Alatout, 'Towards a bio-territorial conception of power: Territory, population, and environmental narratives in Palestine and Israel', *Polit. Geogr.*, 2006, doi: 10.1016/j.polgeo.2006.03.008.

CHAPTER 5

A BRIEF DISCUSSION ON CONCEPTIONS OF LAW

Mr. Kunal Saxena, Assistant Professor,
Department of Management, Presidency University, Bangalore, India,
Email id- drkunal@presidencyuniversity.in

ABSTRACT:

Conceptions of law refer to the different ways in which the nature and purpose of law are understood and defined in legal and philosophical contexts. Law is a complex and multifaceted concept, and various theories have been developed to explain its nature and operation. One of the most influential conceptions of law is the idea of natural law, which suggests that law is rooted in a higher, moral order that transcends human conventions and institutions. This view of law is often associated with Aristotle and Aquinas, who argued that the purpose of law is to promote the common good and to ensure justice.

KEYWORDS:

Adjudication, Common Law, Constitutional, Criminal, International Law, Jurisprudence.

INTRODUCTION

A brief definition of law is the ordering and control of behavior. This, however, does not set it apart from other systems of command and control that come, for instance, from morality, religion, or social custom. Legal theorists have maybe disagreed most about the precise links between these various orderings and whether or not they can be separated clearly [1], [2].There have been two different types of legal disputes: one over the law's origins and the other over its components and structure. All human law must depend in part on adherence to that higher law for its validity if, as those theorists commonly referred to as natural lawyers believe, all law originated from divine law or some law of right reason immanent in the nature of things. The validity of a law may be determined regardless of whether it corresponds with natural or divine law, justice, morality, or reason, on the other hand, whether it may be established independently of or "posited" by a human legislator or legislators. In a nutshell, this was the perspective held by "legal positivists. Legal philosophers have held various beliefs on how the components of the legal system should be categorised in addition to differing on the origin and authority of law. Thomas Hobbes, Jeremy Bentham, and John Austin were among the legal philosophers who defined the operation of laws as the issuance by a legislator of mandates or imperatives that highlighted their collective will.

Many legal scholars, particularly in the United States and Europe, have focused on studies of the judicial process or the interaction of social and economic forces that influence legal institutions and legal decision-making rather than formal analyses of the legal system as a whole. John Chipman Gray, Jerome Frank, and Karl Llewellyn were members of the so-called realism or instrumentalist school in the United States. Realist and skeptic legal views first appeared in Scandinavia in the writings of Axel Hägerström, Karl Olivecrona, and Alf Ross. The debate

between positivist and anti-positivist views has persisted in analytic legal philosophy. The works of Ronald Dworkin exhibit one contemporary non-positivist perspective. It should be noted that there is a movement known as "critical legal studies," which has its roots in the United States, and which believes that all formal legal structures are controlled by socially powerful interests, and that judges and legislators make laws as exercises in the exercise of political power. The vast majority of legal philosophers since Aristotle have been squandering their time, if this notion of law is accurate.

The Ideas behind Law

The concerns highlighted in H.L.A. Hart's book The Concept of Law have dominated discussions concerning the nature of law in the English-speaking world for the last thirty years. Hart's book primarily aimed to refute John Austin's imperative theory of law, which Austin had portrayed in The Province of Jurisprudence Determined in 1832 as primarily consisting of commands or coercive orders backed by force coming from a sovereign legislator whom subjects were accustomed to obeying. In response to this "gunman theory," Hart argued that the notion of commands being routinely observed misses the mark in terms of both the range of sorts and purposes of law as well as the notion that the law is compulsory or binding in a manner that habits and practices are not. Criminal laws may be compared to orders, but civil laws and procedural norms are more difficult to compare. The purpose of laws is to allow and authorize private agreements as well as to command. They provide a variety of functions.

In addition to punishing criminals, laws may also provide advantages, control organizations, instruct future lawyers, inspire jealousy in non-natives, uphold traditional morals, and other things. According to Hart, the notion of a rule rather than the idea of a command is the key to comprehending a legal system. In contrast to habitual behavior, conforming to the rules entails a sense of responsibility and a critical eye toward any violations by those who are subject to the rules. Duty, duty, right, and authority are all determined by a few basic laws in any legal system. Other incidental rules will specify institutions, control legal change, and specify how laws are made. Hart contends that a legal system is only the union of these two categories of regulations. A rule of recognition, a special secondary rule that specifies the standard or circumstances under which acceptable laws may be established in the specific system, will be used to differentiate each system. According to the principle of recognition, in the United Kingdom, the Queen and both Houses of Parliament are the approved sources for new laws and amendments to existing ones. According to the hypothetical rule of recognition, the Federal Constitution and its processes, as applied by the United States' constituent people, are the only sources of legitimate law [3]–[5].

A comparable standard-setting or pedigree rule concept is presented in the writings of Austrian lawyer Hans Kelsen. Like Hart, Kelsen's theory is positivist in that it distinguishes between issues pertaining to morality and moral duty and those pertaining to legal validity and legal obligation. Because it is properly made in accordance with a rule that complies with the standards set forth in the system's ultimate rule or norm, law is valid and legally binding in both systems. According to Kelsen's view, any rule is only legal if it ultimately derives from a fundamental norm, or "Grundnorm," and if the system of norms is effective and susceptible to widespread compliance. It is necessary to assume that the Grundnorm itself is legitimate. This notion, according to Hart, is flawed because it is erroneous. In a legal system, the fundamental norm of recognition may be seen from two perspectives: one internal and one external. The

fundamental or pedigree rule is a working legal principle from the perspective of people who utilize and operate the system. It cannot, however, be valid or invalid in the same way as the norm of validity.

Neither can the entire legal system. Validity is a relational concept that describes how a lower rule or standard is treated in respect to a higher rule or standard. It is a matter of social truth that the ultimate standard or norm of recognition exists and has certain characteristics. From the perspective of an outsider, it is only the norm used in a certain culture to control and define its rules. Legality and validity are always understood in relation to a certain set of legal regulations. There isn't any legal legitimacy out there. An act may be permissible under English law, but not under French law, international law, or the law of the European Community. The validity of a legal rule may only be questioned if the rules in issue are recognized. A community's adherence to a certain set of norms is an issue of social reality. Hart's theory of law has come under fire for a number of its facets. Three concerns have been raised: the relationship between law, justice, and morality; the notion that law is made up of rules; and the use of rules in the judicial process.

DISCUSSION

Law, Morality and Legal Positivism

Legal positivists have often come under fire for disregarding the relationships between morality and the law. Critics have drawn attention to the crucial roles that concepts like rationality, due process, and justice play in common law and constitutional law in the majority of developed governments. These facts do not contradict Hart's kind of positivism or the ideas of older positivists like Austin and Bentham. Everyone agreed that there are several linkages between morality and the law. For instance, common moral beliefs have an impact on how positive legislation develops. Once again, morality may serve as a basis for legal critique or serve as an impetus for legal change. Third, a legal system may purposefully make morality compliance a requirement for the legitimacy of certain of its laws. However, the positivist argument would be that this final possibility is a contingent fact about those specific legal systems and not a requirement of all systems.

In The Concept of Law, Hart acknowledges that some fundamental aspects of human life must be considered by legal regimes in practice. Given our frailty and our limited capacity for generosity, it follows that for laws to be successful and long-lasting, they must provide for some fundamental necessities, such as the security of life, without which other laws would be useless and transient. As a result, human rules have a fundamental structure that is not accidental but does not constitute a logical precondition for their applicability. The natural law theorist's notion that law cannot be explained in simply formal terms, according to Hart, rests on this. He calls it the "core of good sense." There are certain criteria that are inseparable from the business of controlling human activity by laws, according to theorists like American jurist Lon Fuller, with whom Hart had a much-discussed dispute in 1956. Inherently, rules must be broad, apply impartially, be prospective rather than retroactive, and deal with comparable circumstances in a similar manner, and so on. Hart responded that although these conditions did not exclude the possibility that specific laws would be bad or unjust, they did not do so either. According to him, the fundamental tenet of positivism is that morality and law may be distinguished, at least inasmuch as the formal legitimacy of a law cannot be used to determine whether it is morally sound or deserving of the allegiance of its citizens.

Perhaps there isn't much of a difference between Hart and Fuller on this issue. It is accurate to say that when speaking about contemporary civilized, and notably liberal, legal systems, they often do so via their constitutional provisions by making the legality of laws depend not only on their formal, official adoption but also on their adherence to fundamental moral standards. The natural lawyer wants to assert that every system must be assumed to include a requirement that provisions violating fundamental ideas of justice should be treated as invalid and be declared to be so by courts in every system, whether formally specified in the positive rules of a constitution or not. This viewpoint seems to be acknowledged in the German Federal Constitutional Court's jurisprudence to some extent. The positivist premise, however, is that only those substantive criteria of validity established in the positive law of the constitution shall be judicially applied. This is impliedly the position taken by courts in the majority of states. If this makes it possible for certain unjust laws to be passed, the question presented is one of morality and politics for people and politicians rather than a legal one for courts of law. Law and morality are always separate in this sense for a Hartian positivist. In several areas of the law, judges and attorneys are required to study and apply moral principles, but only when the positive law itself so mandates.

Rules as Law

Professor Ronald Dworkin has disputed the idea that law can be viewed as a collection of various types of rules whose applicability is determined by a rule of recognition on the grounds that, first, law does not only consist of rules, and, second, there is no single rule of recognition that can serve as a test for the applicability of specific laws in contemporary developed legal systems. Perhaps a defense can be made for the theory outlined in The Concept of Law in response to these objections. It is debatable whether or not there is a fundamental difference between rules and principles. In a certain way, it contributes to an insightful study of the rule notion. In Dworkin's analysis, rules are considered as very specific guidelines that are claimed to be applicable in an all-or-nothing manner, while principles indicate objectives or purposes that may overlap and may have different weights in accordance with which they may be balanced. In reality, principles seem to be rule-like assertions that include ambiguous or generic terminology. The Austinian idea of law as command, however, was the main target of Hart's Concept of Law. It is possible to contrast imperative demands with both rules and principles, regardless of whether their differences go beyond degree. It is also possible that Hart's theory would not be irreparably undermined if it were to be acknowledged that legal systems sometimes include rules and principles.

At this point, the status of the most fundamental rule or standard the pedigree, fundamental norm, or recognition rule enters the discussion. One argument against the rule of recognition is that it could be harder to precisely state it for any given civilization than what Hart's explanation suggests. For instance, a lengthy and complicated statement would need to be constructed in order to completely state the fundamental rule of the British legal system. It could be necessary to make reference to both the power of Parliament to enact laws and the principles and authority of common law. Statutes may supplant common law, but common law is a distinct source of law that does not come from statutes. We might also wonder how much specificity needs to be included when stating or describing the ultimate sources of legal validity. Parliament may enact laws. But is it necessary to describe the structure, makeup, or process of the Parliament? What weight is given to the argument that a rule of this kind, no matter how lengthy or brief, cannot be used to determine whether a statute is valid?

The straightforward response is that it is not meant to serve that purpose in the sense of allowing a court or observer to determine whether a specific action or contested rule is or is not legal or is a legitimate systemic rule. For example, what powers, duties, and obligations had been established by laws validly made under it; who had been authorized to act and in accordance with what principles; what subsidiary or delegated powers had been established; what interpretative rules had evolved or been established; and many other things would need to be known in order to know that in addition to the rule of recognition. The fundamental norm of a system of rules could never be used as a yardstick or test of validity in that sense, any more than knowing who had the power to create and amend the rules of a game would be sufficient to allow one to serve as umpire in relation to the legality of specific actions in the game. That is not how such an identifying rule works. Its role is to serve as an indicator of the ultimate authority or source of appeal as to what is lawful or illegitimate in the system.

The Application of Rules by Judges

There has been much discussion around Professor Dworkin's critiques of the positivist rule model of law. The argument's last point is whether it is accurate to say that positivism is linked to a certain conception of adjudication. The Dworkin difference between rules and principles can lead one to believe that if a legal system just had rules, there would be clear solutions to all legal queries. The concept that a legal system consists of rules does not, however, bind its creator to the belief that all rules are permanent, definite, or certain if the difference between rules and principles is ignored. Hart's concept of adjudication does not imply the idea that applying rules mechanically is how they should be interpreted. It implies that most legal principles or ideas have a core meaning in which their application is clear-cut and a penumbral region in which their application is ambiguous. The Hartian paradigm, however, shouldn't be bound to any certain view of how judicial doubt in the application of legal norms should be handled. The positivist claim that morality is not a required component of legal validity need not be tied to a certain theory of decision-making. However, a lot of legal positivism's detractors portray it as being equivalent to or implying a mechanistic, rigid, or conservative view of the legal system. On the other hand, a positivist model could allow for and make provisions for interpretive rules or codes that gave judge’s instructions to apply any theory of interpretation at all, including the Dworkinian recipe, which instructed judges to apply rules that would make the most sense of the system's general purposes, whatever the judges believed those purposes to be, in difficult, ambiguous, or hard cases. A positivist could, however, want to include these aims in the fundamental constitutional provisions of the system.

There may be a feature of the disparities between European and American approaches to the concept of law in the Hart-Dworkin dispute. Since Hobbes, European philosophers have endeavored to enumerate the components and overall structure of legal systems. This tradition may have been influenced in some way by the linkages between legal theory and political philosophy, state theories, and ideas of political duty. Comparatively, American jurisprudence has focused heavily perhaps even obsessively on the judicial process, which may seem like only one component of a legal system. Part of the explanation may come from the nature and enormous political weight of American courts and adjudication. When we understand how judges should resolve disputes, we will understand what law is. Given that courts and adjudicators are taking on a greater role in European legal systems, that strategy might be useful. However, not all inquiries into the law concern how it should be applied or even how it should be applied in

complex situations. Judges, lawmakers, and people all have fundamental issues regarding legal systems, as well as the concept and function of law in society [6]–[8].

Law's Purpose and Limitations

Legal philosophers are not the only ones who are interested in the idea of law and how it relates to morality and political responsibility. Individual citizens sometimes have to choose whether or not they are subject to the law and where this applies. This query sometimes, albeit seldom, has to do with the judicial system in general. The people of those areas must determine what their moral and legal duties are if Lithuania proclaims itself to be an independent sovereign state or if Quebec unilaterally secedes from Canada, similar to how Rhodesia rejected its legal subordination to the United Kingdom in 1965. To determine cases challenging the conduct of the new governmental claimants to the exercise of legitimate power, courts must also apply some theory about the nature of law and the fundamentals of a legal system. Judges have cited and discussed legal theories in the Rhodesian case and in other Commonwealth territories where coups d'état or revolutions have occurred, particularly Kelsen's thesis that the legitimacy of laws in a system depends on the effective or generally effective operation of the system as a whole.

People in liberal societies also think that their duty to follow certain rules has certain boundaries. Disobedience to the law is permitted and even required by both natural law doctrines and legal positivism in appropriate circumstances, though natural law adherents would base their rejection of obligation on the view that certain laws that blatantly violate the standards of justice cannot be valid laws, while legal positivists would hold that legally valid and legally binding laws were not morally obligatory since violation Since they can always argue that they are exercising their legal right to disregard fictitious legal obligations in cases where the requirements of justice are disregarded by lawmakers, natural lawyers may not need to understand the concept of civil disobedience. Additionally, a Dworkinian citizen of Law's Empire might not feel obligated to regard legislative decisions or even those of the highest appeal court as the final, conclusive determination of what was and was not law. This could have an impact for civil disobedience strategies since it's regarded to be significant when people start or stop engaging in illegal behavior.

Understanding the nature and functions of the law is a crucial component of decision-making for the lawmaker and voter. Liberal cultures hold the view that using the law to compel or constrain individual behavior has moral boundaries. Should people be forced by the law to stop doing harm to themselves? Exists a sphere of private conduct where the law shouldn't encroach? How far should the law be used to impose ethnic harmony, limit freedom of expression, or inspire creative creativity? Questions about what law is and what it can and cannot achieve successfully are intertwined. The method element or functional uses of law have been tried to be generalized and analysed by certain contemporary legal theorists, bringing to light a variety of goals beyond the coercive or punitive functions. A grievance-resolution function, an administrative-regulatory function, a function that confers public benefits, and a function that facilitates private agreements are a few examples.

Perhaps it should be added that law serves an educational purpose. It is where the study of organized society starts. Activity in politics, society, and business takes place inside a framework whose bounds are established by the law and the constitution. Law is where political science starts, but it is not where it ends. Despite this, it cannot be considered a standalone science. The best legal minds have always understood this. "If your subject is law, the roads are plain to

anthropology, the science of man, to political economy, the theory of legislation, ethics and thus by several paths to your final view of life," said Mr. Justice Oliver Wendell Holmes. Maybe he went overboard. but not significantly [9]–[11].

CONCLUSION

Critical legal studies, a more contemporary perspective of law, contends that it is a political and social institution that both reflects and perpetuates power structures in society. This understanding of the law is often linked to academics who work to question and criticised prevailing political and legal frameworks. Other ideas of law include the notions that it is a tool for settling conflicts and fostering social order, a source of individual rights and liberties, and a system for fostering economic progress. In general, conceptions of law are important in forming our knowledge of legal systems and institutions because they provide light on how law functions and may be changed.

REFERENCES:

[1] R. V. Pasquín, ‘Reflexions on the conception and exercise of law: Corruption and juridical regeneration around the court acts’, *Isegoria*. 2019. doi: 10.3989/isegoria.2019.061.09.

[2] H. Beebee, ‘The Non-Governing Conception of Laws of Nature’, *Philos. Phenomenol. Res.*, 2000, doi: 10.2307/2653613.

[3] A. Bird, ‘The dispositionalist conception of laws’, *Found. Sci.*, 2005, doi: 10.1007/s10699-004-5259-9.

[4] anokh Dagan, ‘The Realist Conception of Law’, *Univ. Tor. Law J.*, 2007, doi: 10.1353/tlj.2007.0027.

[5] I. Prastyaningrum and H. Pratama, ‘Student conception of Ohm’s law’, in *Journal of Physics: Conference Series*, 2019. doi: 10.1088/1742-6596/1321/2/022028.

[6] J. Vega, ‘Limits from jurisdiction, conceptions of law and judicial activism’, *Doxa. Cuad. Filos. del Derecho*, 2020, doi: 10.14198/DOXA2018.41.07.

[7] Y. A. Gavrilova, ‘Semantic Conception of Law’, *Russ. J. Leg. Stud.*, 2019, doi: 10.17816/rjls18498.

[8] H. BEEBEE, ‘The Non-Governing Conception of Laws of Nature’, in *Readings On Laws Of Nature*, 2017. doi: 10.2307/j.ctt5vkh1c.16.

[9] B. Sander, ‘Democratic Disruption in the Age of Social Media: Between Marketized and Structural Conceptions of Human Rights Law’, *Eur. J. Int. Law*, 2021, doi: 10.1093/ejil/chab022.

[10] N. J. Fratiwi, A. Samsudin, T. R. Ramalis, and B. Costu, ‘Changing students’ conceptions of Newton’s second law through express-refute-investigate-clarify (ERIC) text’, *Univers. J. Educ. Res.*, 2020, doi: 10.13189/ujer.2020.080655.

[11] C. Soto and O. Bueno, ‘A framework for an inferential conception of physical laws’, *Principia*. 2019. doi: 10.5007/1808-1711.2019V23N3P423.

CHAPTER 6

A BRIEF DISCUSSION ON CONCEPTIONS OF JUSTICE

Dr. Ramalingam Mageshkumar, Assistant Professor,
Department of Management, Presidency University, Bangalore, India,
Email id- mageshkumar@presidencyuniversity.in

ABSTRACT:

Conceptions of justice refer to the different ways in which the nature and purpose of justice are understood and defined in philosophical and political contexts. Justice is a complex and multifaceted concept, and various theories have been developed to explain its nature and operation. One of the earliest and most influential conceptions of justice is the idea of distributive justice, which suggests that justice is about the fair distribution of resources and benefits in society. This view of justice is often associated with Aristotle and Rawls, who argued that justice requires the creation of institutions and policies that promote equal opportunities and outcomes for all individuals.

KEYWORDS:

Legal Justice, Moral Justice, Procedural, Rawlsian, Retributive, Social, Substantive Justice.

INTRODUCTION

The traditions of Aristotle and Locke have had a significant impact on how people see justice and morality in general. Both have been adjusted to modern living in democracies with a constitution. Perhaps "sanitized" is a better word to use, especially in the case of Aristotle. Aristotle and Locke first seem to disagree, but I believe this is an oversimplified observation. Locke is a staunch individualist, whereas Aristotle emphasizes the social character of the human animal, emphasizing how each person is a part of a larger total in their own humanity and sense of identity. Unavoidably, the fundamental structure of our decisions, who we are as people, and the very "I" that is a member of a "we" are manifestations of a certain social ethos. And this naturally includes the standards and values we uphold, as well as our most basic ideas of what is morally just and attractive. In contrast, Locke considers people to be autonomous. He sees them as autonomous, accepting of diversity, capable of live in a state of nature, seeking knowledge, and concerned with preserving their autonomy or right to self-ownership.

The preservation of individual rights will be the main focus of a Lockean ethic. This emphasis on individualism need not be at odds with Aristotle's or, for that matter, Hegel's emphasis on how deeply and irrevocably we are social beings that is, how our fundamental identities are shaped by society. Individualists who have a Lockean orientation should not discount their own history or the ways in which they were shaped by a specific ethos and its own set of rules. Being socialized in certain ways is essential to being human and is inevitable. We do not have to be socialization's captives, however. We are all unique human beings that have been shaped by a specific ethos, but only to a certain extent. We may sometimes alter our ethos by pushing it in various ways in part as a result of our ideas, wants, will, and actions when we are a certain kind of person and are

lucky enough to be in that position. And virtually always, by our unique responses, we are able to place ourselves in patterns of our own choice or at least partially of our own choosing, while being fixed and inescapably a part of the unique social environment in which we are. Of course, these ideas don't just appear out of thin air. They are not just the author's imagination at work. However, they are also not exempt from the person's effects. They are unique to them and exhibit their individuality. People or at least a sizable number of people think about the kind of world they want and have the capacity to reflect carefully on the kind of world they have, including the unique social creatures they and their fellows are. They can also occasionally shape the world to their advantage, including to their own reflective and knowledgeable advantage, under favorable circumstances. An Aristotelian emphasis on our social upbringing and a Lockean individuality need not contradict with one another [1].

Aristotle and Locke may disagree on what constitutes justice and how it should be interpreted. The ideal society, the finest dictatorship, according to Aristotle, is a hierarchical one in which illustrious and generous aristocrats rule and slaves carry out all other tasks. Aristotle placed great importance on human flourishing, yet it seems that only the ruling class enjoys this. Although Locke was not an egalitarian, he believed that in the natural state, all humans are free and that their natural rights serve to protect and enhance their autonomy, or self-ownership. All humans who are capable of autonomy and self-ownership should strive to achieve the autonomy and self-ownership we are discussing. The moral significance of the structure of rights is to safeguard everyone's individuality and property rights.

There will be classes and strata, but according to Locke, these distinctions won't be as severe as to threaten each person's right to self-ownership and their fundamental human rights. Everyone is free and stands with regard to self-ownership and the rights of people in a situation of equality, despite the fact that they each have their stations and obligations as God's creations. A just social order cannot permit a society of slaves or serfs, as in an Aristotelian conception of social justice, where some people's external resources are properly subject entirely to communal control such that their autonomy is undermined because they have no control or very little control over the means of subsistence. For Locke, such class distinctions are immoral. This does not imply, however, that no class distinctions are acceptable. Locke believed that what we now refer to as a class-structured society was just and reasonable. Although Locke does not have a clear idea of what human flourishing is like, like Aristotle did, whatever Locke's idea of human flourishing is, it cannot be a situation where human autonomy is compromised. The idea of justice that Aristotle had was overtly aristocratic. But as I said at the beginning, Aristotle is easily sanitized. His deeply social vision of human nature, which is crucial for a correct understanding of ethics and politics, might be eliminated without at all affecting his aristocratic beliefs.

DISCUSSION

Marx came to stress against the ideology of the rising bourgeois order with its individualism and atomistic conception of human nature, that persons, as social creatures, could, under favorable circumstances, enhance the communal character of their lives, with clear debt to Aristotle's emphasis on our sociality. Furthermore, a more egalitarian social order that would, in a way that the more stratified society could not, enhance both the human flourishing and autonomy of all human beings, could and would replace the extensively self-oriented individualism of the bourgeois world with its stratification into hostile groupings [2]–[4].

Marx believed that this more equitable social order would eventually replace the individualistic social order that Locke's theory represented, as well as the aristocratic, hierarchical social structure that Aristotle and the Middle Ages justified. The possessive individualism of the preceding bourgeois order will gradually disintegrate as this system develops as a result of the re-educative impacts of public ownership and democracy, which emerge in a world of increasing material wealth and creative capacity. Such individualism would eventually vanish, giving way to a true social harmony in which we would recognize both our community natures and our self-ownership with clarity of self-understanding. Self-ownership and community would go hand in hand.

Given the history of Marxism and the history of genuine socialisms that claim to be Marxist, there has been a great deal of skepticism regarding the harmonic interplay between community and autonomy both inside and outside of such societies. It was envisaged that under very complete circumstances of equality of situation, disadvantaged citizens would arise. They would be individuals who, on the one hand, had a strong sense of their individuality and self-ownership and, on the other, understood that there was a "we." This "we" would represent all of mankind rather than an ethnocentric "we." Such socialized people would have a feeling of the human community in addition to their awareness of discrete groups. However, authoritarian societies with extensive stratification that granted privileges and power to a small elite and allowed for little autonomy and equality instead emerged in actual socialisms. Also to be considered is the fact that although there was much talk of community, there was actually very little of it. These societies should be described as gesellschaften posing as gemeinschaften, as Marx described medieval societies. They are hardly instances of the decoupling of autonomy and community because neither existed in such societies.

What will the relationship between equality, community, and autonomy look like in a society that is really fair, and where will these elements end up? At the very least, equality appears to be necessary for fairness, but what sort and to what extent? .Will it only be equal opportunity, as many conservatives think? .If so, what is going to happen? Or will it need conditional equality as well, as social democrats and some on the left contend? .And once again, if that's the case, how should it be interpreted and how comprehensive should it be? Can we genuinely attain or even fairly approach equality of opportunity if we strive to remain with a vision of equality of opportunity coupled with meritocratic concepts of justice? Can there be anything like a fair start at the running gate in the battle of life if individuals arrive at the starting gate in varying states of advantage and disadvantage even if no one is restrained there by rules, regulations, or discrimination? Would there genuinely be a requirement for fair equality of opportunity if everyone, privileged and impoverished, had the freedom to run? To put it mildly, it is unlikely that we would. Furthermore, should equality of opportunity be understood to mean only or at all that everyone is free to engage in a struggle for supremacy without hindrance? Such a limited interpretation of equality of opportunity. Equal life chances for everyone would seem to be necessary for fair equality of opportunity, and that would appear to call for at least some semblance of equality of condition. However, how is the latter to be accomplished?

There can be neither equality of opportunity nor equality of situation, nor can there be one without the other. They are interdependent. The concept of equality of opportunity is mocked by equality of opportunity that just gives everybody a free start at the starting line. The main issue to concentrate on when attempting to define what fair equality of opportunity is is equality of condition since without it there is virtually anything that resembles equal life chances. But how

should we define conditional equality? It can scarcely be basic equality where everyone is treated equally in all respects, has the same amount of resources, and the like given our diverse demands and preferences. Not everyone needs or desires a pacemaker, a surfboard, or a Latin course. The goal should be to satisfy everyone's requirements equally, as much as is practical. This is not feasible, not even in circumstances of mild shortage or excess. However, it can only be roughly determined in these circumstances. When it is not possible to satisfy everyone's needs, we must create fair procedures for the uneven satisfaction of needs as a backup plan, using the equal satisfaction of needs as a heuristic. For instance, those who are most in need should be helped first, or we should give preference to those who will be most successful in addressing the needs of others when specific requirements are met. Here, we need to create methods for identifying our requirements as well as meta-procedures for determining whether the specific procedures for the uneven fulfilment of needs are justifiable. This is where Habermas' emphasis on procedures is most important.

Simple equality is insufficient as a standard of justice. Therefore, a more nuanced understanding of equality of condition is clearly required. Without something approaching equality of condition, we cannot achieve equality of opportunity. Without equality of opportunity, people will not have equal opportunities for a fulfilling life, and without an attempt to achieve that, people will not be morally equal to one another. We cannot have an egalitarian society in such a situation. On the other hand, moral equality is a very deeply ingrained idea that cuts across the present political spectrum. According to this viewpoint, every person's life counts and should matter equally, therefore politically speaking, we should have an egalitarian society. However, it seems to be the case that there cannot be moral equality if a world cannot be created in which equality of condition can be roughly approximated. Equal opportunity is rejected by libertarians and some conservatives as a naïve and maybe dangerous utopianism. However, they frequently support moral equality and favor a democratic society where everyone is treated equally. Given the plausibility of the aforementioned reasoning, it seems that they should follow their conservative forebears from a more aristocratic era and deny moral equality given their rejection of any notion of conditional equality. However, conservative libertarians typically take moral equality very seriously. Additionally, Ronald Dworkin has noted that modern conservatives share a similar belief in a society of equality with liberals and left-wingers. Such conservatives don't seem to hold their views in a reflective equilibrium, at the very least. That is to say, it seems as if they lack a logical and consistent set of beliefs. There cannot be moral equality without a semblance of conditional equality.

However, egalitarians face the same challenges as everyone else. For example, if we want to achieve something close to equality of condition in society, can we do it without a uniformity of ethos that would undermine individuality and autonomy? Wouldn't it also necessitate state intervention in people's lives, which would also be destructive to autonomy? Can we have both equality and autonomy, beyond the most basic and, as we have shown, insufficient definition of equality of opportunity? We cannot, according to libertarians and other right-wing theorists. According to them, neither an aristocratic nor an egalitarian notion of distributive justice in which everyone has their allotted stations and responsibilities in a "genuine community" can be the goal of a free society. Both caste and equality of situation undermine justice. Both types of societies are paternalistic and authoritarian, if not explicitly so.

Modern views of justice have centered on social fairness, or, as with Fredrich Hayek and Robert Nozick, its purported impossibility. Those who have been at the forefront of recent discussions of

distributive justice and a defense of an egalitarian conception of social justice include John Rawls, Brian Barry, Thomas Scanlon, Kai Nielsen, and Ronald Dworkin. They don't discount the reality or significance of issues relating to individual justice, but they contend that social justice issues should take center stage, with emphasis on how institutions should be set up and what needs to be done to establish and maintain just institutions. It is simpler to resolve issues of individual justice after those problems have been adequately addressed if we are aware of what fair social institutions ought to look like and how it is to be accomplished. We might better comprehend our individual obligations to one another as well as what we may reasonably anticipate and demand of one another if we could come to appreciate what a fair society would look like. The Lockean tradition, in contrast to the liberal social democratic tradition of Rawls and Barry and the Aristotelian tradition of Alasdair MacIntyre and Charles Taylor, has instead stressed questions of individual justice and most particularly questions of the rights of individuals. According to this viewpoint, justice is primarily concerned with defending the inalienable rights of individuals, which includes defending everyone's territory from invasion by others. According to this Lockean tradition, people are self-sufficient. The preservation of their right to self-ownership should be the main goal of justice and the basic idea of a well-ordered society [5]–[7].

In contrast, the Aristotelian tradition views a fair society including its idea of a well-ordered society in terms of an all-encompassing philosophy of what is best for humans. Additionally, and once more in contrast, the liberal social democratic tradition of Rawls, Barry, and Scanlon works with a minimal or thin theory of the good even though it rejects any comprehensive theory of the good in its conceptualization of a just society. In Rawls' example, the main focus is on describing the fundamental social and natural goods that any individual would need to have guaranteed in order to be able to carry out any sane life plan or any thorough notion of the good they may have that would similarly respect others. A vision of the good is necessary for establishing what rights we have, according to both liberal social democratic theory and Aristotelian philosophy. However, only the former calls for a comprehensive theory of what is best for people. Both argue against the Lockeans that an explanation of justice that comes close to being adequate cannot simply depend on a notion of inalienable rights that are seen to be self-evident upon thought or in intuition. Conceptions of the good minimal ones for social democrats, a complete theory of the good for communitarians determine what rights we have and how important they are in our lives.

There are still two very distinct demands for theories that primarily focus on justice as a characteristic of fundamental social institutions. Another emphasis, as discussed by David Gauthier and Jan Narveson, sees the function of justice as the creation of social devices that help people who are essentially egoists to get along better with one another. The first stresses the importance of justice as impartiality, and the second stresses the importance of justice as a basis for reasonable agreement among those who seek to take into account the interests of all. In their most persuasive current formulations, both views are constructivist accounts that do not rely on intuitionist or naturalist moral realist beliefs that assert that moral truths are revealed as some prior reality independent of human creation. Constructivist accounts, like that of Gauthier, reject such meta-ethical claims or, like that of Rawls, do not rely on such claims but instead proceed in a contractarian manner by choosing criteria for the right principles of justice or for just social practices by determining what people, determined to reach a consensus regarding what to regard as principles of justice and just social practices, would agree on in some hypothetical situation or what they actually would agree on when it comes to what would constitute those principles of

justice and just What Rawls more wisely discards as not required for the formulation of a theory of justice is what Gauthier rejects.

The tradition of seeing justice as impartiality has a largely Kantian origin, whereas the tradition of viewing justice as mutual benefit has a Hobbesian one. Recently, Brian Barry and Will Kymlicka made a compelling case that these two traditions are at odds with one another and cannot be reconciled. They also assert that these two at least obviously contradictory traditions are at odds with most modern theory on justice, most notably that of John Rawls. They contend that we cannot, contrary to what Rawls effectively claims, have it both ways. The right course of action, according to Barry and Kymlicka, is to reject the Hobbesian tradition of mutual gain. The best course of action is to acknowledge and make clear the tradition that emphasizes that justice is the unbiased assessment of everyone's interests. They contend that is the account that has to be clarified and expanded upon.

Influential versions of both viewpoints concur that "justice is what everyone could, in principle, reach a rational agreement on," a position held by Habermas and shown by Rawls' and Gauthier's work. Naturally, this is often seen as offering some support for social contract theories. Of course, there are differences between the mutual benefit perspective and the justice as impartiality view in terms of the motivations behind attempts at compromise. Once we comprehend what they are and how their various justifications differ from one another, we will see that these concepts are actually quite dissimilar from theories. The pursuit of justice is motivated by a desire for personal advantage, according to the perspective of mutual benefit. According to Hume and Rawls, people seek justice in our society and other cultures where there are favorable circumstances for it in order to further their own interests. People may believe that they may advance their interests more successfully by working together with other members of society under just conditions, which are, at least for the majority of people, the genuine realities of human life. This viewpoint holds that reasonable people will agree that certain limitations, such as those Gauthier mentions, are the essential minimum in return for other people's cooperation.

On the other hand, the justification for acting justly according to the justice as impartiality perspective cannot even be reduced to a sophisticated and indirect self-interest. According to this perspective, having the conviction that what happens to other people matters for its own sake is the proper motivation for acting justly. People should endeavor to develop a foundation for agreement that is acceptable from all points of view rather than seeing things just from their own perspective in light of the above. People are all self-originating sources of true assertions, as Rawls puts it in a Kantian sense. We agree with their arguments because we believe that all of their interests are equally significant and that their interests are comparable to our own. Because we are working to advance our own interests, we do not just consider, or perhaps even consider, their interests. According to the impartiality approach, at least in some of its formulations, justice would be the subject of a deal struck under circumstances that prevent the use of negotiating power as an advantage.

On the other hand, according to the mutual benefit hypothesis, justice may still be achieved even when parties to a negotiation are in different power positions and have distinct negotiating capacities. In fact, any agreement reached for mutual benefit when persons are so differently placed must take that into account. If self-interest is the driving force behind acting justly, then this strategy is unavoidable. Those whose power was disproportionate to their share under the

agreement would have a motive to try to overturn it, as Barry states in describing that position: "If the terms of agreement failed to reflect differential bargaining power." They wouldn't have a good enough cause to uphold the deal. The impartiality method, on the other hand, dissociates justice from bargaining power since it does not demand that everyone believe that doing what is right would benefit them. Even if doing justly does not benefit them in the short or long term, they may still have strong reasons for doing so.

Given this difference in orientation, agreements that the impartialist might regard as just do not permit the conversion of bargaining power into advantage. In fact, they expressly forbid it. Barry and Kymlicka contend that the mutual benefit strategy is not even a philosophy of justice. While the mutual advantage approach may produce some fundamental social cohesion principles, these will not result in just agreements because they accept as "just agreements" agreements reached in situations of unequal power. One of the fundamental characteristics of a moral system, namely the attribute of assigning equal weight to the interests of all the parties to the agreement, is absent from the resultant system of cooperation, along with the ensuing system of rights and obligations. In spite of the fact that it describes a framework for social cooperation, it is not a theory of justice or morality. On the basis of mutual benefit, some people may completely escape the legal system. It claims that individuals without negotiating power will go beyond the bounds of morality, in contrast to the impartiality of Kant. Not every person will be born with a certain moral standing. On this basis, some can only be used as a means. This would apply to young children, severely mentally disabled people, and future generations. All of these people are powerless in negotiations because they lack any means of taking revenge on those who mistreat them or disregard their well-being.

These are extreme situations, but in our class-separated and stratified society, the strong may sometimes abuse the weak without moral concern: they can exploit them and drive them up against the wall. When the dominating class feels quite safe, as it does temporarily, it may act logically in this fashion since it knows the dominated class lacks any real means of retaliation. If someone does acquire an unstoppable, almost uncontestable power, then, in Hobbes's words and according to modern Hobbesians, they have something with that power that "justifieth all actions really and properly in whomsoever it is found." But the limitations of justice would have no place in such a well-ordered world. Maybe we might implement a logical structure of coordination and cooperation. But then there would be no morality. There is no morally sound justification offered in this situation. We have a situation where the powerful can and do subjugate or exploit the weak for the benefit of the strong, which is fundamentally unfair. Barry makes the following statement to make his point: This provides us the distinguishing feature of the second approach, namely, that justice should be the subject of an agreement that would be reached by reasonable persons under circumstances that do not permit the conversion of bargaining power into benefit.

Perhaps a good analysis of what genuinely rational, purely self-interested people would do is provided by the mutual advantage theory. This is arguably the best course of action if we are going to participate in amoral realpolitik, but it does not provide us anything that even somewhat resembles a means of moral justification. A set of actions that would sustain or even permit those with greater bargaining power to influence events so that the weak would be killed, starve to death, or live in intolerable conditions of life when avoiding such outcomes is not a group of actions that can be rightly characterized as just. These methods are fundamentally unfair methods. Nothing is unfair if they are not.

A proponent of the mutual benefit theory would answer that her/his theory could never permit certain circumstances to arise since, regardless of how great the power imbalances, such circumstances could never be advantageous to both sides. But it's clear that this is a risky empirical claim. The weak may logically accept subsistence pay when faced with the threat of famine under severe and reasonably secure power differentials. Families struggling to make ends meet could decide it is in their best interests to choose child labor under difficult circumstances. When one is up against the wall, one may even decide that it would be in their best interest to sell themselves as slaves or to agree to participate in a game of death-by-Russian-roulette. Saying that none of these things would be advantageous to those in positions of power is a pretty speculative empirical argument in and of itself since it is unlikely that the weak would remain with such forcefully pushed deals. It is far from obvious that this would be the case under all practical circumstances. We can scarcely be sure that those in positions of power won't use their influence to their benefit by striking such difficult deals. However, impartiality theorists assert that regardless of what mutual advantage actually exists in this situation, we can know that such deals are unfair. Therefore, even if they do prove to be mutually beneficial, they are still morally unacceptable. The challenge to the principle of mutual benefit is not met by saying, "Well, maybe they won't be mutually advantageous."

Now let's look at theories of impartiality. Such theories can take many different forms, but regardless of whether they presuppose an original position or a state of nature, they view moral reasoning as a discussion or debate between agents who share a commitment to objectivity, to giving equal weight to the interests and needs of all. In other words, these are those who are deciding which principles should be accepted as true regardless of the viewpoint. According to Barry, it is the fundamental concept of impartiality. Although egalitarians in some ways, impartiality theorists like Rawls, Hare, Sumner, Baier, Nielsen, Barry, Scanlon, and Dworkin disagree on which social justice principles should be followed, they all contend that eliminating morally arbitrary inequalities, such as those resulting from differences in social circumstances or natural abilities, is necessary for justice as impartiality.

The fact that one of the primary justifications for appealing to impartial agreement is that it substitutes a moral equality for a physical or intellectual disparity highlights how fundamentally different such an approach is from the mutual benefit approach. The two perspectives, according to Kymlicka, are morally poles apart: "From the point of everyday morality, mutual advantage is an alternative to justice, not an alternative account of justice. Theorists who believe in mutual benefit are ready to give up much of common morality in favor of a more condensed morality that they believe to be more reasonable, therefore appealing to everyday morality rather than something more abstract like the moral point of view begs the issue. According to Hobbesian theories, there are no inherent obligations to others and no discernible moral lines that all people must abide by. The fundamental moral equality that underlies our physical disparity also does not exist. The Hobbesian might respond to the liberal call for moral equality by asking, "Why care about moral equality?"

To continue the mutual advantage theorist's critique of impartiality theory, Hobbesians would argue that impartialists do not pursue the discussion of justification issues far enough. They are unaware that a person only has a reason to do anything if the action they are considering doing would fulfill part of their wants. As a result, for something to be considered a valid reason to be done, justice must be shown to be in the agent's best interests. We formulate the Hobbesian issue of why those with uneven power should not use it for their own interests while keeping this in

mind. The impartialist might react to this by asserting in excellent Kantian style that morality does not need external justification. An adequate and original source of motivation that is neither more nor less artificial than Hobbesian self-interested motivation is provided by morality itself. People may be inspired to behave ethically by merely understanding the moral justifications for doing so [8].

CONCLUSION

The notion of social justice, which emerged more recently, contends that justice involves confronting structural forms of injustice and oppression in order to build a more equitable and fair society. This concept of justice, which is often linked to feminist, critical racial, and postcolonial ideas, aims to undermine the prevailing power structures and myths that uphold injustice. The concepts of commutative justice, which emphasizes the fairness of individual exchanges and transactions, and corrective justice, which emphasizes the undoing of wrongs or injuries that have been done, are other interpretations of justice. In general, ideas about justice are important for forming how we see social and political interactions and may provide light on how justice functions and can be attained in various situations.

REFERENCES:

[1] S. Moroni, 'The just city. Three background issues: Institutional justice and spatial justice, social justice and distributive justice, concept of justice and conceptions of justice', *Plan. Theory*, 2020, doi: 10.1177/1473095219877670.

[2] D. McLaren, K. A. Parkhill, A. Corner, N. E. Vaughan, and N. F. Pidgeon, 'Public conceptions of justice in climate engineering: Evidence from secondary analysis of public deliberation', *Glob. Environ. Chang.*, 2016, doi: 10.1016/j.gloenvcha.2016.09.002.

[3] K. H. Stumpf, C. U. Becker, and S. Baumgärtner, 'A Conceptual Structure of Justice - Providing a Tool to Analyse Conceptions of Justice', *Ethical Theory Moral Pract.*, 2016, doi: 10.1007/s10677-016-9728-3.

[4] D. P. McLaren, 'Whose climate and whose ethics? Conceptions of justice in solar geoengineering modelling', *Energy Res. Soc. Sci.*, 2018, doi: 10.1016/j.erss.2018.05.021.

[5] P. Crone and M. Khadduri, 'The Islamic Conception of Justice', *Am. Hist. Rev.*, 1986, doi: 10.2307/1867340.

[6] J. Arthur, K. Kristjánsson, and C. Vogler, 'Seeking The Common Good In Education Through A Positive Conception Of Social Justice', *Br. J. Educ. Stud.*, 2021, doi: 10.1080/00071005.2020.1724259.

[7] C. Okereke, 'Global environmental sustainability: Intragenerational equity and conceptions of justice in multilateral environmental regimes', *Geoforum*, 2006, doi: 10.1016/j.geoforum.2005.10.005.

[8] K. S. Ahmed, 'Evolving through tensions: preservice teachers' conceptions of social justice teaching', *Teach. Educ.*, 2020, doi: 10.1080/10476210.2018.1533545.

CHAPTER 7

A BRIEF DISCUSSION ON CONCEPTION OF RATIONALITY

Dr. Narayana Srikanthreddy, Assistant Professor,
Department of Management, Presidency University, Bangalore, India,
Email id- srikanthreddyn@presidencyuniversity.in

ABSTRACT:

Conceptions of rationality refer to the different ways in which the nature and purpose of rationality are understood and defined in philosophical, cognitive, and social contexts. Rationality is a complex and multifaceted concept, and various theories have been developed to explain its nature and operation. One of the most influential conceptions of rationality is the idea of instrumental rationality, which suggests that rationality is about maximizing one's self-interest or achieving one's goals through means that are effective and efficient. This view of rationality is often associated with economic theories and decision-making models that emphasize rational calculation and optimization.

KEYWORDS:

Behavioral Economics, Cognitive Biases, Decision-Making, Irrationality, Logical Reasoning, Normative Rationality.

INTRODUCTION

This unbiased acceptance will appear here to Hobbesians with their instrumentalist notion of rationality as unnatural and possibly evasive. However, they must also respond to Barry's assertion that it is an assertional viewpoint to equate rationality with the effective pursuit of self-interest. The idea of a rational ego is not contradictory. There is no proof that one must be an impartialist in order to be consistent. However, there is no compelling evidence to support the idea that the definition of "rational" mandates that anyone who is rational must also be an egoist. We have compelling reasons to accept the claims of an unbiased morality because we accept the formal criterion of universalizability and acknowledge that other people are fundamentally similar to us in having needs and goals, even sharing some of them in general.5 If someone doesn't care about other people's needs and goals, they are not being inconsistent; they are not breaking the universalizability criterion, but as Barry put it, "the virtually unanimous concurrence of the human race in caring about the defensibility of actions in a way that does not simply appeal to power" suggests that this appeal to impartiality and to moral equality is very deeply ingrained, considered a conviction to some extent held across cultures." Saying that these people conduct irrationally, or even acting in a way that is less than optimally reasonable, if doing so goes against their particular self-interest, amounts to using what is essentially an arbitrary and persuasive definition of what it is to be rational [1]–[3].

Whether they are impartiality theories or mutual advantage theories, all constructivist contractualist theories of justice and morality in general define justice as the set of rules and

standards that everyone might, in theory, agree upon. In terms of agreement, Barry and Rawls both view justice as impartiality. People who believe in the theory of justice as impartiality, however, reject the idea that justice must be understood in terms of agreement. The aim of justice is to offer a rational basis for agreement among individuals who do not only look at things from the point of view of their own interests but endeavor to take due account of the interests of others. Barry gives us an idea of what the emphasis on agreement would come to be. According to this definition, everyone can be justified in receiving justice. This idea presupposes the existence of a clearly moral motive, specifically the desire to act in accordance with moral standards that can be objectively defended to oneself and others.

Barry adopts Scanlon's view that the fundamental moral motivation is "the need to be able to defend one's actions to others on grounds they could not reasonably reject." These ideas are commonly accepted, but Kymlicka, among others, believes that they are essentially false. If we were only contemplating moral relationships between competent people, perhaps such a theory might hold true. However, there are also moral ties between us and young people and people with mental disabilities. It makes no sense to discuss unbiased agreement with young children or provide the mentally impaired with justifications they could not rationally reject. The standards of justice between them and us are very high, yet there is no room for discussion of justice in terms of something they and we might agree upon. It doesn't follow that we have no moral obligation to protect someone's interests just because they are unable to sign an agreement with us. Some people will stray outside the bounds of morality, especially those who are most in need of moral protection. This seems to be a problem that the reliance on agreement under impartiality theories shares with the emphasis on bargaining power within mutual advantage theories. The assertion that morality "only applies to a being if the notion of justification to a being of that kind makes sense," as made by Scanlon, is false.

Scanlon contends in support of his argument that a creature's ability to experience pain indicates the existence of a center of consciousness, and as a result, the idea of justification to such a being makes sense. Scanlon argues that the reason pain is so frequently used as a pertinent indicator of moral standing is because of this. But it is untrue that, if a being is capable of feeling pain, we can, in theory, at least come to an understanding with that being and address our justifications to that being. Infants and people with severe mental disabilities can feel pain, but they are unable to comprehend things in order to enter into agreements with us, so the idea of justification would not make sense to them. Agreement requires the being to be able to feel pain and to be a center of consciousness as well. They do, however, have moral standing. The fact that we cannot explain justification to a baby does not imply that the child has no moral standing. We don't grant moral status to a child because we can defend it or its moral guardian.

Because it can suffer or prosper, because such beings' lives "can go better or worse, and because we think their well-being is of intrinsic importance," we accord it moral status. Some beings we can provide reasons to, while others we cannot; what "makes them all moral beings is the fact that they have a good, and their well-being matters intrinsically" (Stanford philosopher Richard Dawkins). But to make such a claim is to depart from contractarianism, including its impartialist forms. But failing to do so would appear at least morally arbitrary. According to Kymlicka, justice should not be seen as impartiality in the contractualist sense, where it is founded on some sort of agreement, but rather as a standard that, with or without an agreement, accords equal weight to all interests. Our moral motivation is to respond to legitimate interests, not to get to an agreement. If we are moral beings, we simply learn to acknowledge that other people have

rightful demands that their interests be considered. The challenge is to identify or state just principles that give consideration to the interests of all parties. According to Kymlicka, agreement lapses.

We bear a clear duty to people who lack the capacity to defend, advocate for, or even acknowledge their own interests. In this line, and abstracting a little, Kymlicka argues that our most obvious duties are not to seek consensus but rather to consider people's interests and give them equal weight. This is a blatant assertion that justice is impartial. When they do it, our ideas of justice are justified. Whether or not we agree with these ideas, if they do not give equal weight to everyone's interests, this agreement does not support them. This binds us to the genuinely egalitarian belief that the interests of all people are important and important equally. Where that is not our guiding principle, we do not have justice, at least according to contemporary notions of justice. Of course, agreement is crucial from an epistemic and political perspective. However, it does not apply at the fundamental level, according to Kymlicka; that is, it does not apply when we are defining justice and the fundamentals of a just society. Justice, according to Kymlicka, "is about equal consideration of our legitimate interests at its most fundamental level, and the many virtues of agreement are assessed by reference to that fundamental idea, not vice versa."

While Kymlicka's argument is undoubtedly correct in some respects, there may also be flaws, which advances the idea of morality by consensus. Giving the interests of all parties equal weight, or treating everyone's interests seriously and equally, is what justice as impartiality ultimately amounts to. When two interests clash and one cannot satisfy both of them, proper names are irrelevant in deciding which interest takes center stage. The precise articulation of social justice concepts, like those found in Rawls, Scanlon, and Barry, becomes crucial in this case since we must deviate from mere equality. However, in order to proceed with such a differential weighting, such as to maximize benefits to the least fortunate while maintaining autonomy and just equality of opportunity for all, we should start from a position where we give equal consideration to everyone's interests and where we initially give an equal weight to all interests. Only after realizing that not all interests can be served equally do we search for unbiased and equitable alternatives to pure equality. But that does not negate the fact that justice involves taking all of our legitimate interests into account equally. This holds true whether or not there is anything that everyone who is capable of making such decisions and inclined to be reasonable would concur on. At least so far, things appear to be working against contractarians [4]–[6].

How do we know that is the case? How can we know that justice is what it is, that justice demands what it demands, that we must act in this way if we are to be just, and that our social practices must be constructed in this way in order for there to be just social institutions? Here, agreement might sneak in through the back door. Kymlicka writes as though we can simply infer or perceive that this is the case, as if we can simply see that these things are true. However, intuitionism and natural law theories, which require that we somehow simply have direct access to the truth indeed, on some accounts, the certain truth of specific moral propositions, are now widely acknowledged to be non-starters.

Thus, how does Kymlicka know that his fundamental substantive moral claims claims that are not subject to agreement are true or justified, and how can we know the same? Perhaps they are conceptual claims, and we can know that they are true by understanding what justice is, whereby to understand justice is to know how to use the word "justice" or a cognate term correctly. The

following conceptual hierarchy may be valid: to be just is to be fair; to be fair is to be impartial; and to be impartial is to give equal attention to the interests of all people. If this is the case, developing a solid knowledge of the application of "justice" will help us determine whether Kymlicka's assertions are true. However, that might not at all provide us with a way to meet mutual advantage theories. In contrast, Gauthier will change this use for his theoretical purposes until it is compatible with a set of principles that are rationally sustainable and that rational people will agree to be rationally sustainable when these people are carefully reasoning. Gauthier, for example, understands perfectly well the ordinary use of "just" and "justice" and what it commits us to, if we would stick with it. By being precise in our use of the terms "just" and "allied terms," we cannot get very far in defending substantive claims and substantive principles of justice. Such factors might refute some absurd claims, but they also give many rivals a chance to compete fairly.

In other words, it might offer us something akin to the first term, but it won't get us very far. But how does Kymlicka know that his arguments for the validity of justice are sound? He departs in the dark. In these situations, Rawls, Daniels, and Nielsen directly, as well as others subtly, have appealed to thoughtful conclusions or convictions in a broad reflective equilibrium. It has been wrongly assumed that this is an intuitionistic approach with all of its flaws and even more blatant concerns about ethnocentrism. Given the type of coherentism present in the appeal to thoughtful judgments in a broad reflective equilibrium, these accusations are unfounded. It begins with our most firmly held views of a very particular type, such as that enslaving people is wrong, racial prejudice is bad, and religious intolerance is unacceptable, and it aims to have a coherent group of these beliefs.

However, it also aims to demonstrate how such particular, well-reasoned convictions can be derived from and are justified by more general moral principles, some of which may even be regarded as judgments. One such concept that is likewise such an abstract, thought-out conclusion is "The interests of all human beings are of equal importance." To find what we can recognize as a consistent and coherent group of beliefs, we adjust many different factors in a reciprocal manner, occasionally changing or even abandoning a particular considered judgment, occasionally altering or even abandoning a more general principle, and occasionally coming up with a new one. We accomplish this by periodically cutting and occasionally growing our collection of well-considered ideas and judgments, but we never stop changing this concoction of convictions and beliefs. We continue doing this until we have something that, in our opinion, constitutes a cohesive and coherent cluster. So far, ethical intuitionism has provided us with nothing more, even though it is unnecessary and even inappropriate to assert that moral beliefs and principles have some strange epistemic status or the ability to capture the truth. In fact, we can avoid claiming anything about the epistemic standing of our moral claims or our principles of justice by adopting Rawls' approach.

DISCUSSION

Wide reflective equilibrium emphasizes that other things besides specific moral beliefs and moral principles must be appealed to in order to obtain the coherent web of belief and conviction that would constitute a wide reflective equilibrium. This is where wide reflective equilibrium clearly differs from ethical intuitionism, which is a narrow reflective equilibrium. The coherent set we seek includes not only particular moral convictions and more general principles, but also entire theories of morality, conceptions of morality's role in society, factual beliefs about the

makeup of society and human nature, beliefs about social change, as well as particular historical and sociological convictions about the nature of our situation. We are looking for a state of balance where each of these components functions as a cohesive whole. Because it conflicted with other, equally important specific considered convictions or a more general moral principle, a specific considered conviction might be abandoned in a narrow reflective equilibrium. However, in a state of wide-ranging reflective equilibrium, they might also be disregarded because they contradicted certain empirical facts about society, people, or our particular situation, or because they made demands that, given what we know about the world, could not be met, or because they were morally preferable beliefs that made much more sense in the context of certain carefully developed social or moral theories, or theories about the purpose of morality. Here, a wide variety of factors, including factual factors, are discussed that are pertinent to our choices of what to do or how to live. We begin with specific, carefully considered convictions, but they are supported by a wide range of empirical and theoretical convictions as well as by moral principles or theories. However, occasionally, with moral principles and theories, the relationship will be reversed, with the theories or principles supporting the specific, carefully considered convictions. This results in a critical morality that is free of moral intuitionism's subjectivism and conventionalism, even if these elements were not intended. Additionally, that critical morality serves as a defense against ethnocentrism. Even though some of the initial specific judgments we make may be ethnocentric, by the time they reach a wide reflective equilibrium, the ethnocentrism will have been eliminated [7]–[9].

Kymlicka would then, arguably, have a method of reason for his fundamental claims of justice if he were to use such an approach, and he would not just have to state them, somehow considering them to be natural laws or fundamental intuitions recoverable on contemplation. Undoubtedly, an explanation like Kymlicka's may be refuted using the technique of broad reflective equilibrium. Regardless of how it is used, it has the benefit that we can apply a technique that is very similar to the approach used in science and other fields instead of merely asserting or relying on intuition. However, by doing so, he would be tacitly appealing to some level of consensus, as we seek to achieve a broad reflective equilibrium based on our carefully considered convictions. This implies that we are in fact appealing to the beliefs of a particular people, a particular community, and its traditions, which are located in a particular cultural location and time. In such a group, we depend on a consensus, even if the shared considered convictions the considered judgements need not be and usually won't be the sole shared convictions the considered judgements of that community. They could sometimes resemble all humans fairly closely. But in order for them to be our well-considered judgments, they must be supported by our community's consensus, which naturally implies an understanding. As a result, agreement starts off pretty simply. He must demonstrate that the principles and claims of his impartiality account of justice may be put in a broad reflective balance by relying on thoughtful judgments in order to demonstrate that it is warranted. However, this does not necessarily imply that it has the support of everyone to whom it is addressed.

Some of the philosophers who use wide reflective equilibrium, relying on considered convictions in the process, are also constructivists and contractarians, and they combine their contractarianism with the wide reflective equilibrium method to create a coherent whole. According to Rawls, for instance, we at important points depend on considered beliefs as we do when selecting what is fair to accept when determining how thick the veil of ignorance is to be or how the initial position is to be defined. However, in order to assess whether we have for a while

reached a reflective equilibrium, we would need to have an idealized conception of justice that would be acceptable to both parties. Again, agreement is invoked at a very basic justificatory level. In order to demonstrate that Kymlicka's or anyone else's substantive claims of justice are justified, we must demonstrate that there is such agreement. This is not to say that the substantive principles and claims of social justice are not what Kymlicka claims they are or that justice is what we can agree on in certain idealized situations.Justice is like truth in this situation, we should remember that. Truth is not what scholars studying under perfect circumstances and for a significant amount of time would concur is the situation. But the best way to determine the truth may be through that. The greatest way to determine what is right may not be what would be agreed upon in the initial position, but it is justice nevertheless. We must carefully differentiate between what justice and truth are, what they signify, and how we decide what is true or right.

People who have moral principles will reason in line with the moral point of view, assuming there is such a thing. They will hope and reasonably anticipate that doing so will typically not impair their interests, but they will only believe that doing so is appropriate when it serves their own interests or at the very least does not conflict with those interests. They are not looking out for their own interests when they pursue justice. It matters in and of itself what happens to other individuals. But the question "Why be just?" is still open to us and to them. Can we provide general prudential justifications for why, even when acting only in his or her own interest, a person who is fully rational and aware of the non-moral facts would behave in the way that a just person would act?6 Kant made a distinction between someone who has excellent morals and someone who is morally upright. Can we demonstrate that, if they had excellent morals, rational, solely self-interested individuals would act in accordance with what is right or, at least, somewhat in accordance with what is right, but obviously not for the same reasons?

When asking that question, we should be aware that there are no morally acceptable answers to the questions "Why ought we to be just?" "Why ought we to be fair?" "Why ought we to do what is right?" or "Why ought we to be moral?" Asking them is equivalent to asking "Why should we do what we should do?" By definition, moral considerations take precedence over immoral considerations from a moral standpoint, but why choose that viewpoint at all? Moral reasons are not the overriding reasons, or at best they are only contingently overriding, from the point of view of individual self-interest, class interests, or from the point of view of a group of restricted maximizers intent on cooperation for mutual profit. They are indisputable from a moral standpoint, but not from these viewpoints. But why adopt a moral perspective? It is required by morality, justice, and fairness. The Hobbesian thesis may be seen as a potent effort to demonstrate that we have extremely compelling prudential reasons to be morally upright individuals both now and in the future. The finest possible reasons exist for us to continue supporting moral restrictions, including just practices, in the long run. The argument makes the notion that rational people will have excellent morals even if they are not morally perfect.

The impartialist arguments, like those made by Barry and Kymlicka, demonstrate, in my opinion, that Hobbesians cannot achieve justice via limited maximizing, which is ultimately simply another kind of essentially self-interested thinking. It is true that individuals might expect to promote their interests most efficiently by cooperation and while doing so, by consenting to accept some limits on their own individual utility maximization, as several current Hobbesians have persuasively argued. They will do better in the long term if they lower their expectations and work along with others, as the globe develops. Strong evidence for this is provided by David Gauthier. However, these forms of cooperation will not result in morality or a just system where

everyone's interests are taken into account equally, where what happens to others matters for its own sake, and where the justifications for action must be accepted from all points of view, not just those of the agent doing the reasoning. A social practice must serve the interests of all people in order to be right; it cannot merely serve the interests of one person, one class, or one elite. However, as we have seen, there are many different circumstances in which there are different power structures, and in which the powerful could exploit the weak without necessarily acting in an unwise manner if they pursued mutual advantage in some situations.

According to what we have observed, it may very well be to everyone's benefit in such situations. Justice cannot permit exploitation or the conversion of differing negotiating positions into advantages. People in these situations have a reason to work with the strong because, given their weakness, doing so will only make their situation worse. These situations are not uncommon in civilizations as we now know them. Therefore, despite being exploited, the weak have prudential reasons to cooperate given the imbalance of power and the determination of the powerful to maximize their own benefit. However, they are not being treated fairly, and the cooperation that results, while rational, lacks morality. It is unethical to treat individuals in this manner. From Hobbesian premises, we cannot arrive at morality, and consequently, we cannot arrive at justice. The Hobbesian asks why be just and seeks to prove that we should be fair because justice pays; the impartialist does not question why be just but rather demonstrates what justice is. It has been shown that the adage "justice always pays" is untrue. Though the type of social cooperation people engage in may differ greatly from justice, some form of social cooperation always pays. The Habermasian has not shown that the informed restricted maximizer or the enlightened egoist must be just in order to be fully rational. The Hobbesian, however, has not shown how we may get justice via enlightened egoism.

The Hobbesian would respond by claiming that morality is mostly illogical. Equal consideration of interests is required from a moral standpoint, yet doing so when it is not in one's own best interests is illogical. The interests of the person acting dictate what a sensible course of action is. The logical critical core of morality should remain intact even if it is much less than morality as it has been historically regarded when portions of morality do not sufficiently serve individual interests, according to Hobbes. As Barry argued, this strictly instrumentalist understanding of rationality is nothing more than assumption. An analysis of the term's usage does not prove that this is the only conclusion that rationality reaches. It is not unreasonable to give the interests of everyone the same weight. Saying it is a rational course of action has the same foundation in the use of the word "rational" as the assertion that being rational always means giving self-interested reasons priority.

There are alternative conceptions of rationality that serve other theoretical goals, but we may use theoretical arguments to justify such an instrumentalist understanding of rationality. We may use that Hobbesian understanding of reason for Hobbesian objectives, but we can also use these quite diverse conceptions of rationality for Habermasian, Aristotelian, or impartialist ends. There don't appear to be any compelling arguments in favor of accepting one of these goals over another that aren't related to these specific goals, and claiming that Hobbesian goals are the most logical ones begs the point. Furthermore, reductio arguments can be used to challenge the Hobbesian conception. According to such a Hobbesian account, it would not only be what reason permits, it would also be what reason requires, to enslave another class and force them to work themselves to the point of starvation. A theory of rationality that had this implication would not only be morally repugnant, it would also be unfounded and completely implausible [10]–[12].

CONCLUSION

Bounded rationality is a relatively contemporary notion of rationality, which contends that people are not always able to make perfectly rational judgments due to cognitive limitations and contextual circumstances. This theory of rationality stresses the significance of comprehending and overcoming cognitive biases and heuristics. It is often related to cognitive psychology and behavioral economics. Other conceptions of rationality include the idea of critical rationality, which emphasizes the value of challenging and questioning prevailing notions, and the idea of communicative rationality, which emphasizes the value of reasoned discourse and achieving consensus in social and political contexts. In general, ideas about rationality help to shape how we think about making decisions, solving problems, and interacting with others in social and political settings. They also provide insights into how rationality works and how it may be strengthened or extended.

REFERENCES:

[1] S. Park, "How to Formulate Scientific Realism and Antirealism," *J. Gen. Philos. Sci.*, 2019, doi: 10.1007/s10838-019-09470-w.

[2] A. Ross-Smith and M. Kornberger, "Gendered rationality? A genealogical exploration of the philosophical and sociological conceptions of rationality, masculinity and organization," *Gender, Work Organ.*, 2004, doi: 10.1111/j.1468-0432.2004.00232.x.

[3] K. Schafer, "Realism and Constructivism in Kantian Metaethics (2): The Kantian Conception of Rationality and Rationalist Constructivism," *Philos. Compass*, 2015, doi: 10.1111/phc3.12252.

[4] G. Barros, "Herbert A. Simon and the concept of rationality: Boundaries and procedures," *Rev. Econ. Polit.*, 2010, doi: 10.1590/S0101-31572010000300006.

[5] B. Engelen, "Nudging and rationality: What is there to worry?," *Ration. Soc.*, 2019, doi: 10.1177/1043463119846743.

[6] K. J. Rathe, "Relearning to think: Toward a biological conception of rationality," *Educ. Philos. Theory*, 2021, doi: 10.1080/00131857.2019.1707661.

[7] Y. Meinard and A. Tsoukiàs, "On the rationality of decision aiding processes," *Eur. J. Oper. Res.*, 2019, doi: 10.1016/j.ejor.2018.09.009.

[8] M. Sbisà, "Two Conceptions of Rationality in Grice's Theory of Implicature," *Ration. Belief Action*, 2006.

[9] W. J. Ma and M. Woodford, "Multiple conceptions of resource rationality," *Behav. Brain Sci.*, 2020, doi: 10.1017/S0140525X19001754.

[10] P. Millroth, A. Collsiöö, and P. Juslin, "Cognitiva Speciebus: Towards a Linnaean Approach to Cognition," *Trends in Cognitive Sciences*. 2021. doi: 10.1016/j.tics.2020.12.005.

[11] G. Figal, "Understanding situations: A hermeneutical conception of ⇜practical⇝ rationality," *Academy of Management Learning and Education*. 2020. doi: 10.5465/AMLE.2020.0296.

[12] M. D. Packard and P. L. Bylund, “From homo economicus to homo agens: Toward a subjective rationality for entrepreneurship,” *J. Bus. Ventur.*, 2021, doi: 10.1016/j.jbusvent.2021.106159.

CHAPTER 8

CONCEPTIONS OF HUMAN NATURE

Mr. Kunal Saxena, Assistant Professor,
Department of Management, Presidency University, Bangalore, India,
Email id- drkunal@presidencyuniversity.in

ABSTRACT:

Conceptions of human nature refer to the different ways in which the nature and essence of human beings are understood and defined in philosophical, scientific, and social contexts. Human nature is a complex and multifaceted concept, and various theories have been developed to explain its nature and operation. One of the most influential conceptions of human nature is the idea of essentialism, which suggests that human beings have a fixed and unchanging nature that determines their characteristics and behavior. This view of human nature is often associated with religious and metaphysical theories that emphasize the soul or spirit as the essence of humanity.

KEYWORDS:

Human Behavior, Human Nature, Innate Characteristics, Personality Traits, Psychological Essentialism.

INTRODUCTION

Theories of human nature aim to define and explain the essential characteristics of the human species. Many theorists then provide recommendations for how people should live their lives, both on a personal level and in terms of social and political policies. There has been fierce debate over a number of fundamental questions, including whether or not humans are fundamentally distinct from other animals, whether they differ significantly from one another, whether human nature is constant or historically and culturally variable, whether human nature is fundamentally good and only requires appropriate sustenance, or whether it is fundamentally flawed and needs to be changed. As a consequence, there has been significant debate over how politics and the government affect or maintain human existence [1]–[3].

In this entire discussion, the term "nature" has been used in multiple ways that are ambiguous. We often refer to human dispositions and behavior as they are understood in the society we now live in when we inquire as to how far human nature may be altered. However, a few significant thinkers—most notably Hobbes, Locke, and Rousseau have used the term "human nature" to describe how they believe people would behave if there were no society, no state, no government, no politics, and probably little to no culture or education. Occasionally, the conception is stated historically, making a claim about the state of affairs prior to the establishment of government. The difference has been described in a variety of ways, including between the natural and the conventional, the biological and the social, and the given and the constructed.

The question of whether it is better or worse to maintain mankind in its alleged natural condition is another significant uncertainty. What is 'natural' in today's discourse is often taken to be desirable; hence, anything defined as 'unnatural' is decried as evil. Famously describing the pre-social "state of nature" as "nasty, brutish, and short," Hobbes believed that the social compact was the only logical means of escaping from this condition of affairs. He and Locke both utilize the condition of nature as a tool to highlight the benefits of political society and to defend certain power dynamics. However, Rousseau claimed that society had imposed a variety of unfair inequalities in a writing about a century later. It is simple to see how his notions may be utilized to assist efforts at radical transformation since in his early work the condition of nature acts as a criticism of many of the key components of the present society. The notion that what is 'natural' must therefore be best has certainly been encouraged by Rousseau, yet it is a very divisive view.

This article will provide a succinct summary of some of the most politically significant conceptions of human nature, pointing out how normative beliefs may be masked inside seemingly factual theories and contrasting them on the matter of constancy vs changeability. Given sufficiently radical changes in political or economic structures, or in social practices like childrearing, education, or religious observance, some theorists have claimed that human nature could be significantly altered. We might refer to persons who advocate for such solutions as "social engineers" because they believe that if their suggested social structure were implemented, human behavior would be much improved and people would be happy. However, other theories whether biological, social, or theological suggest that there are strict boundaries to how much social context can affect human nature. The discussion here has broad implications that go beyond sociology, psychology, biology, philosophy, and religion as well as political and social theory. However, it does not boil down to a simple "yes" or "no" response to the question of whether human nature can be altered. This is because we cannot do justice to the various viewpoints by attempting to categorize them neatly into "constantists" and "variabilists." Instead, there are a wide range of opinions on how much human nature can change and under what circumstances it must stay the same. Therefore, we should review our chosen theories in chronological order.

Plato

In his long discourse The Republic from more than two thousand years ago, the Greek philosopher Plato outlined a profoundly influential depiction of an ideal society. His topics of debate include a broad spectrum, including education, art, the role of women, and metaphysics, psychology, and moral philosophy. According to Plato's idea of individual human nature, each person has three mental processes going on at once: reason, appetite, and spirit. Each of these factors has a necessary role to play, but they may sometimes clash; what is required for human flourishing is a harmonic synthesis of them, with Reason firmly in charge on an overall level. There is no inherent equality amongst humans since various persons will have different elements stronger.

In addition, Plato rejects the idea of social and political equality, going against the democratic trend in Athens at the time. He contends that the ideal way for society to be structured is for people who have the most developed Reason to be in positions of leadership and power since they are the ones who know what is best; it should not just be a question of counting everyone's views or preferences. In reality, he suggests a rigid three-class system for society, paralleling his three-part conception of the human mind or soul and impacting lifetime obligations and position.

There will be three classes: Rulers or Guardians, Auxiliaries, which includes all state employees including troops, police, and civil officials, and Workers in all trades, whether they are urban or rural. According to Plato, a society can only be peaceful and harmonious if each class of people is limited to doing just one specific task. Even if they would rather spend their time thinking philosophically, the trained elite has a responsibility to lead, whereas the Auxiliaries and Workers have no business ruling or even casting votes for potential rulers since they lack the necessary expertise. According to Plato, a society's well-being is not based on the happiness of each of its members individually. His demands for stringent regulation of the arts to stop any unsettling ideas from getting traction reflect a somewhat dictatorial air about his ideal nation.

Plato's definition of knowledge is underpinned by a complex, vigorously debated philosophical vision—the theory of Forms as perfect, everlasting, unchanging objects of knowledge comprehended by the Reasoning element inside the human soul. He makes the implication that ideas about what is best for people and society, or what we would today call problems of value, might be knowledge just as much as ideas in arithmetic or science. The obvious obstacle to this approach is the extensive and seemingly unresolvable disagreement that exists over the majority of value-related issues. Why are there still disagreements if there are facts concerning these issues, facts that everyone with a human brain can understand? Plato, who is aware of the difficulties in acquiring the necessary "expertise," lays out a thorough educational plan through which the future Guardians, or "philosopher-kings," are to be brought up. However, he is unable to guarantee that even the most intelligent elite will always act in the best interests of society as a whole rather than their own, and he provides no means of ousting the current government or resolving conflicts within it.

Therefore, Plato's conception is remarkably apolitical. He made no mention of how his recommendations might be implemented or upheld in actual politics; rather, it seems that he thought that their inherent reason would convince others to adopt them. His theory is timeless, transcendent, and otherworldly in nature; it does not account for human dispositions such as family ties that do not fit into his ideal state, it does not make allowances for failures to perform the social functions he assigns, and it does not take into account differences between individuals and societies at various times and locations [4], [5].

DISCUSSION

Hobbes

Hobbes portrays pre-social human existence as being very insecure in his book Leviathan, which is set during the English Civil War in the middle of the eighteenth century. This is because there is always a risk of conflict over resources. He grounds his explanation of individual human nature on a rigorously materialist notion of people as being nothing more than matter in motion, which he believes is necessitated by the new techniques of physical research. According to Hobbes, everyone is purely self-interested, seeking the fulfillment of their immediate desires as well as the acquisition of resources to satisfy their desires in the future: "I put for a general inclination of all mankind, a perpetual and restless desire of power after power, that ceaseth only in death." There is no cooperation, only constant competition between people of roughly equal strength and intelligence. There will always be a motive for each individual to launch pre-emptive attacks against others, consolidating their authority in order to improve security, even when they are in control of their home, their crops, their animals, etc. People even start to enjoy "reputation" and value having power over others for its own sake. As a result, without a

"common power to keep them all in awe," everyone is always at war with everyone else, even when no real combat is taking place. Longer-term endeavors like agriculture, manufacturing, or research have little motivation under this situation. There can be no concepts of justice, rights, property, or law that are appropriate; all that exists is the reality that something is physically yours until you are ejected by an overwhelming force.

The condition of nature cannot be changed by agreements between people since there is no incentive for anybody to uphold an agreement when it serves their own interests to breach it. In Hobbes's opinion, this offers each individual an overwhelmingly excellent reason to accept a social compact by which everyone subordinate themselves to the absolute power and authority of a "sovereign." "Covenants, without the swords, are but words, and of no strength to secure a man at all." 'The only way to erect such a common power, as may be able to defend them from the invasion of foreigners, and the injuries of one another...is to confer all their power and strength upon one man, or one assembly of men.' Thus is created a 'commonwealth', or what we would now call a state, with a government. The major goal is to demonstrate why everyone has a valid cause to accept the authority of the state, thus this does not necessarily need to be considered a historical event. The argument implies that any state power is preferable to none and that those who are in real control alone are deserving of devotion [6]–[8].

Hobbes' explanation of the power that the sovereign should possess is surprisingly dictatorial. Without the monarch's consent, a subject has no right to "cast off monarchy," that is, to break the contract and join another state or none at all. Hobbes asserts that there can never be a breach of contract by the sovereign since the agreement is only between the parties themselves and not between the parties and the government; the government may behave with "iniquity," but not "injustice." Additionally, the sovereign has the authority to decide which viewpoints are harmful to the state and may censor their publication. The sovereign is in charge of making laws and enforcing them, setting foreign policy and making war and peace decisions, selecting all government officials, and doling out rewards and punishments as they see fit. Hobbes doesn't establish any provisions to prevent abuses of power; instead, he appears willing to risk authoritarianism in order to escape the horror of the "state of nature," as he views it.

Locke

Locke paints a less ominous picture of the "state of nature" in his second Treatise on Government, which was written only a few decades later, around the time of the "Glorious Revolution" of 1688 in England, which reduced the power of the monarchy. Locke views the establishment of government more as a matter of convenience than as an urgent necessity. He acknowledges, to a certain degree, that human nature is social and that we are naturally inclined to live not just in families but also as members of larger groups since "it is not good for us to be alone." But he continues to make frequent use of the expression "pre-social," or at the very least "pre-governmental," state of nature.

Locke contrasts Hobbes in that he believes that this situation may be one of "peace, goodwill, mutual assistance and preservation." Locke views persons in this condition as being both free and equal in that no one has more power or authority than any other. Locke proposes a basic idea of property, with the unique rights of use and disposal, as a consequence of human life, even in the pre-social stage, which is another distinction from Hobbes' state of nature. Whatever someone "mixes his labor with" for personal gain, such as gathering wild fruit, growing crops, or mining ore from the ground, becomes their property. According to the saying, "as much as

anyone can use to any advantage of life before it spoils, so much he may by his labor fix a property in." Evidently, Locke is naively presuming that there is no shortage of essentials in the "state of nature." Hobbesian rivalry for resources is undoubtedly likely as soon as the human population exceeds the ability of the environment to support it, yet Locke may assert that people are not always violent against one another and that they won't be under circumstances of economic sufficiency. Since rational beings are able to understand that "no one ought to harm another in his life, health, liberty, or possessions," according to Locke, there is a "law of nature" that still holds true in this pre-social state. He contends that everyone has the right to punish violations of the rule of nature in the pre-social condition and that the injured person has a special right to seek restitution from the perpetrator since he is not so naive as to assume that everyone would effortlessly respect this law.

The government enters Locke's argument at this point. He claims that civil government is "a proper remedy for the inconveniences of the state of Nature" because he recognizes that it is risky to allow people be judges in their own situations since they can easily be lured into punishing beyond what is justifiable. But having observed the Stuart kings, he has learned that absolute monarchs can abuse their position of authority. And in a crucial critique of Hobbes, he asserts that absolute sovereignty is not at all an escape from the state of nature because, as long as there is no legal restraint on the power of the latter over the former, both the individual and the sovereign are actually in that state. Locke is a leading proponent of the necessity for all authority to be subject to restriction and for the legitimacy of government to rely on the agreement of the governed; his theories had a significant impact on the United States Constitution.

Hobbes and Locke have different ideas on what pre-social human nature is, which causes them to have different opinions about the best forms of government. Or is it actually the other way around—that people with diverse political opinions develop various hypotheses about human nature in an effort to support those opinions? These authors make no sincere effort to learn the truth about the prehistory of humanity or about how people would operate in the absence of governmental control. It seems to be extremely likely that the normative biases of the writers are already concealed inside what are portrayed as realistic, even scientific, representations of human nature—a possibility to which we must be alert in other theories.

Rousseau

As opposed to Hobbes or Locke, Rousseau seems to make a greater attempt in his Discourse on Inequality to offer a historically accurate depiction of the steps that modern society must have taken to develop from the prehistoric human state. He makes reference to some of the zoological accounts of strange animals and the anthropological data about ancient societies that were then making their way through Europe. He makes assumptions on how innate screams may have led to the development of human language. He charges Hobbes with reading into the state of nature reasons like pride that can only exist in society, and he asserts that people have a natural dislike of seeing another living being suffer, which restrains inter-individual rivalry. According to Rousseau's depiction of "the noble savage," people "wander in the forests, without work, without speech, without a home, without war, and without relationships," adding that they "have no need of his fellow men and have no desire to harm them." Other than minor variations in strength, intelligence, etc., there was no inequality between people. Each generation continued to live as their forefathers had done; no education nor historical advancement existed.

Rousseau continues by speculating on our modern-day development. He views the concept of property as being more unique to civil society than political authority. He contends that the period of time when families had developed and were living together in homes, with some degree of interfamilial socialization into communities, property rights recognized for the necessities of life, and offenses against these punished, was the true golden age. This is, in fact, very similar to Locke's state of nature. For Rousseau, this represented "the true youth of the world," and he sees all alleged advancements since then as really moving humanity closer to "the decrepitude of the species." He attributes the rot to the division of labor, particularly in agriculture and metallurgy, which forced many people to work under the supervision of others, allowed some to amass vast wealth, and made all the various forms of exploitation and economic and social inequality of which he was painfully aware possible. His melancholy interpretation in this essay is that economic advancement brought on by human intelligence has also bred depravity and brought out the worst in human nature. But it's possible that he idealized his hypothetical "golden age" because he abhorred some aspects of the society he knew.

Given that there is no practical chance of returning to the past, Rousseau did not provide many suggestions in that work for how to treat or ameliorate the unhappy condition he diagnosed in society. But in his later writing, particularly The Social Contract, he adopted a more optimistic stance, contending that, at its best, civil society does, in fact, provide the most complete expression of human nature. Rousseau used the concept of a "social contract" to clarify the deference due to political power, much like Hobbes and Locke. In order for people to form an agreement with one another, they are required to reach a point in the state of nature when they recognize that their very life is in jeopardy. However, in Rousseau's interpretation, the community as a whole, which becomes a moral entity in itself, receives the power rather than a Hobbesian absolute sovereign or even an elected government. And this has to do with his unique but rather enigmatic idea of the "general will," which, although always being for the benefit of the total, cannot be linked to the actual stated will of the people, even if they were to vote in an assembly. The 'universal will' must be what people ought to desire, not what they really want, or else a theory of human nature as it is as of this time is no longer relevant to Rousseau's philosophy. Such an idea makes it much too simple for individuals in positions of authority to assert that they know what is best for the people.

Marx

Karl Marx presents a comprehensive theory of the evolution of human societies through various stages, primarily characterized by the nature of their economic production—from the ancient cultures through the feudalism of the Middle Ages into the capitalist mode of production, to be superseded by a revolutionary change to the communist mode—while writing in the nineteenth century, when ideas of historical evolution were all the rage. Marx's theory of human nature holds that people are fundamentally social creatures who must labor to generate their means of sustenance, such as raising crops, domesticating other animals, constructing shelters, and creating tools, in addition to finding them in the world. This leads to Marx's assertion that a population's unique traits rely on the kind of society it belongs to, which in turn relies on the way that the basic requirements of existence are produced at the time.

This "materialist theory of history" is presented by Marx as an unbiased, factual examination of the norms guiding human civilizations. He was, however, more than simply a detached academic theorist; he was acutely conscious of what he saw to be the serious inequities that existed in the

capitalist society of his day. He not only anticipated, but also eagerly anticipated, the shift to communism since, in his opinion, only under such a system of shared ownership of the means of production would it be possible for all people to fully realize their potential. Marxist theory holds that a revolution cannot occur until a society's economic growth has reached a certain point. However, as that moment draws near, there will be opportunities for those with a clear understanding of the situation to organize and propagandize in order to set the stage for the revolutionary transfer of power to the communist party, as Lenin did in 1917. Marx can only be said to be a social engineer in this sense. He was upbeat but hazy about how things would develop after the revolution; he recognized the necessity for a "dictatorship of the proletariat" during a time of transition but believed that the state might "wither away" after that.

Experience has demonstrated that just the opposite really occurs: social engineering was carried out on a massive scale, state control expanded into practically every aspect of life, and the communist party rule intensified to totalitarian horror. Marxist analyses of human nature frequently overlook the persistence of particular patterns of behavior, such as the enjoyment of privilege and power by individuals and ruling groups, the rivalries sparked by nationalist and ethnic sentiment, and the desire of many people to pursue economic independence.

Community Darwinism

'Social Darwinism' presents an interpretation that enshrines competition as both inevitable and beneficial in human existence, in sharp contrast to the Marxian notion of human nature. Since Darwin's theory of evolution by natural selection is an explanation for the origin of the diversity of all living species and not a theory of human society, he cannot be held accountable for this viewpoint. However, political and social theorists who favor the least amount of government regulation of economic activity have frequently invoked certain Darwinian concepts to support their prescriptions since the times of Herbert Spencer in England and W.G. Sumner in the USA.

The term "survival of the fittest" might be seen as embodying their philosophy. This should not only be understood in the factual, Darwinian sense that only those people who are most suited to the environment in which they live will survive, but also in the normative sense that it is preferable that this should be the case and that those who are less suited should not survive, or at least not survive as well or for as long. It is a political ethic that elevates competition; it obviously benefits the prosperous capitalist since it seems to justify the ruthless eradication of competitors, bestows moral blessings on economic success in addition to material gain, and disfavors any attempt at resource redistribution through taxation or other coercive measures.

However, it is not much of a theory of human nature because all it does is highlight economic activity's competitive tendencies as one aspect of human behavior, assert that these can be advantageous for everyone, and then jump to the broad conclusion that individual economic freedom is the only thing that matters. It disregards any inter-person cooperation and seems to view individuals or families as solitary entities, refusing to acknowledge that participation in larger social groupings has a significant impact on an individual's identity, duties, and rights [9]–[11].

CONCLUSION

The constructivism theory, which contends that people actively create their identities and worldviews via social and cultural interactions, is a more contemporary theory of human nature.

The social and cultural theories that highlight the significance of language, power, and representation in influencing human cognition and behavior are often linked to this theory of human nature. Existentialism, which emphasizes the value of individual freedom and choice in defining human existence, and posthumanism, which questions conventional notions of human nature by incorporating technological and biological advancements, are two other theories of what it means to be human. In general, ideas about what it is to be human help to shape how we think about people and how they fit into the environment. They also provide us ideas about how to comprehend and explain human behavior and traits.

REFERENCES:

[1] S. Linquist, E. Machery, P. E. Griffiths, and K. Stotz, 'Exploring the folkbiological conception of human nature', *Philos. Trans. R. Soc. B Biol. Sci.*, 2011, doi: 10.1098/rstb.2010.0224.

[2] Y. Umarhadi, . Lasiyo, and H. Santoso, 'The conception of human nature according to Notonagoro and Drijarkara and their implications for the development of the Philosophy of Pancasila', *Res. Soc. Dev.*, 2020, doi: 10.33448/rsd-v9i11.9659.

[3] R. B. Louden, 'Anthropology from a Kantian point of view: toward a cosmopolitan conception of human nature', *Stud. Hist. Philos. Sci. Part A*, 2008, doi: 10.1016/j.shpsa.2008.09.007.

[4] M. J. Rosano, 'Liberty, nobility, philanthropy, and power in Alexander Hamilton's conception of human nature', *Am. J. Pol. Sci.*, 2003, doi: 10.1111/1540-5907.00005.

[5] M. Mårtensson, 'Recounting counting and accounting. From political arithmetic to measuring intangibles and back', *Crit. Perspect. Account.*, 2009, doi: 10.1016/j.cpa.2008.09.006.

[6] S. Chen, 'Toward multiple conceptions of the human-nature relationship: The "human-nature unity" frame in a Chinese village', *Int. J. Commun.*, 2017.

[7] J. O. Kenter, 'IPBES: Don't throw out the baby whilst keeping the bathwater; Put people's values central, not nature's contributions', *Ecosystem Services*. 2018. doi: 10.1016/j.ecoser.2018.08.002.

[8] I. J. Kidd, 'Creativity in science and the "anthropological turn" in virtue theory', *Eur. J. Philos. Sci.*, 2021, doi: 10.1007/s13194-020-00334-5.

[9] M. Alahmad, 'Strengths and Weaknesses of Cognitive Theory', *Budapest Int. Res. Critics Inst. Humanit. Soc. Sci.*, 2020, doi: 10.33258/birci.v3i3.1088.

[10] N. P. Lovrich, 'The Simon/ Argyris debate: bounded rationality versus self-actualization conceptions of human nature', *Public Adm. Q.*, 1989.

[11] H. L. Li, 'Toward Weaving a "Common Faith" in the Age of Climate Change', *ECNU Rev. Educ.*, 2020, doi: 10.1177/2096531120905208.

CHAPTER 9

A BRIEF DISCUSSION ON SKINNERIAN BEHAVIOURISM

Dr. Ramalingam Mageshkumar, Assistant Professor,
Department of Management, Presidency University, Bangalore, India,
Email id- mageshkumar@presidencyuniversity.in

ABSTRACT:

Skinnerian behaviorism, also known as radical behaviorism, is a theory of psychology that emphasizes the role of environmental factors in shaping human behavior. This approach was developed by B.F. Skinner in the mid-20th century, and is based on the idea that all behavior is the result of environmental contingencies, such as rewards and punishments. According to Skinnerian behaviorism, behavior is shaped through a process of reinforcement, where behaviors that are rewarded are more likely to be repeated in the future, while behaviors that are punished are less likely to be repeated. This process of reinforcement occurs through a variety of mechanisms, including positive reinforcement, negative reinforcement, and punishment.

KEYWORDS:

Connectionism, Environmental Determinism, Functional Contextualism, Human Behavior, Operant Conditioning, Radical Behaviorism.

INTRODUCTION

The behaviourist psychology of American psychologist B.F. Skinner, whose theories have had some limited success in explaining and modifying the behavior of various species of animal under laboratory conditions, has been extrapolated to create a conception of human nature that supports large-scale social engineering. In this instance, Skinner himself has asserted the theory's application to issues in human civilization, although it is unclear exactly what he suggests. He believes that hereditary traits have just a minor impact on behavior, and like Marx, he places a major emphasis on the flexibility of human behavior in response to social stimuli. But unlike Marx, he contends that skilled behavioral scientists can take action to create any type of people by simply arranging the conditioning influences in the desired way, regardless of the historical and economic context.

In order to maximize individual and society gains, he therefore suggests that social scientists "design a culture," abandoning problematic ideas like human freedom and responsibility as "unscientific." According to this perspective, people are just ordinary animals whose actions are influenced by conditioning factors from their social environments, both past and current [1], [2]. This obviously leaves open the question of what kind of people and society we should be attempting to create; on this point, Skinner is less explicit than Plato, and his perspective appears to amount to no more than the offer of a behavioral technology towards ends or goals that remain unspecified and could in practice turn out to be those of the commercial advertiser, the religious evangelist, the ruling party's propagandists, or whoever else is able to get access to the main message.

Socio-Biology

Turning away from the contemporary social engineers who believe that societal reform may influence people's behavior, let's focus on those who stress the inherent rigidity of human nature. People who hold a firmly biological perspective of humans as one species among many others and contend that the key determinants of our behavior are innate, bred into us by our evolution, and encoded in the molecules of our genes have become prominent in recent years. Freud is an intriguing intermediate instance in this, so let's quickly address him. He was a pioneer of the biological approach to human nature, advancing a theory of instincts while also highlighting the significance of early years of intense parental connection for character development. He contends that human behavior is influenced by unconscious, innate forces, often ignoring the explanations that are explicitly given as mere "rationalizations." The goal of Freud's unique "psycho-analytic" treatment was to bring into awareness the aspects that had been repressed into the unconscious mind, allowing for free rational judgment. However, in actual therapy, Freud seems to be more of a rationalist. Freud sometimes opined that his ideas may be applied to societal issues. However, nothing in the way of a social program or political creed can be attributed to him; only the prevailing notion that society and individuals must be reconciled. A certain amount of instinctive fulfillment must be sacrificed in order for civilization to exist, but our social structures must also take into account humankind's intrinsic, immutable nature.

Others who have examined humans as one kind of animal among others ethologists like Konrad Lorenz and, more recently, self-described "socio-biologists" like Edward O. Wilson have embraced this biological idea. Based on his hypothesis of intraspecific aggressiveness in a range of animal species, Lorenz gives a contentious diagnosis of violent tendencies in humans. He argues that it results from an innate "drive" that is triggered by certain cues like the presence of another male of the same species and blocked by other indicators like a peculiar posture of submission. In order to account for the distinctively intercommunal nature of human carnage which he attributed to the selective pressures of an alleged evolutionary past in which the competition for survival was more between tribes than it was between individuals Lorenz directly applied this theory to humans. He modified it, however, to take account of this intercommunal nature. No social reform will be able to reverse this natural inclination toward community violence. The safest course of action Lorenz can suggest is to divert it into sports, together with management through logical self-knowledge and a sense of humor.

A more thorough examination of the intrinsic components of human nature is provided by Wilson and others. Nowadays, there is less discussion of "instincts" as Freud and Lorenz defined them and more discussion of a vast array of genetically based predispositions that interact subtly with one another depending on the environment to produce behavior. However, the focus is still very much on innate tendencies, which are seen as the outcome of a long history of natural selection. Although their precise expression may depend on culture and personal conditioning, these tendencies will undoubtedly manifest themselves in some way. However, a lot of what sociobiologists say about human nature is inevitably going to be debatable for two reasons: first, because it is so challenging to distinguish the contributions of heredity, and second, because of the normative concerns that surround the discussion of human behavior. Since there must undoubtedly still be some role for culture to play, it is not expected that the science of human genetics will advance us to the point where we can make precise connections between specific genes and distinguishable types of social behavior.

For instance, the topic of human sexual roles as a whole is a contentious one. Socio-biologists may draw attention to the selective pressure on males to spread their genes as widely as possible, in contrast to that on females to carefully choose their partners for genetic fitness, but they also must admit that pair-bonding is a typical aspect of human behavior, unlike that of other primates. Consequently, they might attempt to explain both our monogamy and our frequent departures from it in terms of an evolutionary history that grafted pair-bonding onto a primate pattern of dominant male plus harem. They could attempt to use the system of our ancestors, in which men went hunting in packs and women took care of the young, to explain the conventional human sexual division of labor. Feminists, like Alison Jaggar, oppose any attempt to defend the continuation of traditional sexual roles on the grounds that they are biologically justified. They contend that, regardless of what may have been true in the distant past, culture is very much at play today and is therefore subject to challenge and change.

Is it possible for us to change human nature by genetic engineering, interfering to influence the very DNA of future generations, since human nature is, at least in part, a matter of genes? The eugenics movement earlier this century supported selective breeding as a means to achieve this; after all, we have successfully modified the traits of both plants and animals in this manner. But if we discover methods to control these genes at will, it might also be done more quickly once we learn about our genes themselves the way in which they are encoded in the DNA structures of the entire human genome. It's important to distinguish between negative and positive programs in both situations; the former merely aims to stop the conception of children with physical or mental disabilities, whilst the latter seeks to create the "best" types of people. Which features are we to select for in this positive selection? This is a much more ambitious and contentious task. Who gets to make this decision: the state, potential parents, or someone else? How might human reproduction be regulated on such a large scale? How could someone have the right to prevent someone else from having children? What we have here are potential ways to change human nature, not so much hypotheses about how it may be. Value-related considerations include whether to utilize such methods at all and how to do so. There doesn't appear to be any way around the conclusion that, insofar as facts about human nature are concerned, this does not resolve ethical debates about what it should be. Any attempt to use the scientific method to understand human nature raises contentious philosophical and ethical issues. Because some contend that we transcend biology in various ways, including through reason, consciousness, free will, social development, or even our connection to a divine Reality [3]–[5].

DISCUSSION

Conceptions of Legitimacy

Why do individuals willingly submit to and obey their authorities? Why do individuals respect and support institutions of power? People submit to authoritarian governments out of fear and without choice. However, as Xenophon was already aware, tyrants' authority is not solely derived from physical force and restraints. Even the most brutal dictators attempt to defend their control. Legitimacy is the key to understanding this justifying endeavor since it is the only thing that can turn ruthless power into a respected authority. Political theorists have long considered legitimacy. The issue of legitimacy is related to both Aristotle's division between monarchy, aristocracy, and democracy and Plato's concept of justice. Locke replaced the source of legitimacy in his explanation of the nature of government, substituting the agreement of the governed for the monarchs' alleged divine authority. Without including legitimacy, a study of the

notion of power would be incomplete. Legitimacy is a basic idea for modern political systems in which public involvement is a measurement of political value.

Descriptions of Legality

Since the advent of democratic governments, the idea of legitimacy and how it is defined have undergone significant change. According to Schaar, contemporary definitions of legitimacy reduce it to a matter of belief or opinion. Existing institutions are valid if individuals firmly believe that they are suitable or morally right. When we take into account Lipset's commonly recognized definition, which reads, "the capacity of the system to engender and maintain the belief that the existing political institutions are the most appropriate ones for the society," such a reference to beliefs becomes even more obvious. Merkl's definition, which reads, "a nation united by a consensus on political values...a solemn and widely accepted legal and constitutional order of democratic character...and an elective government responsive to the expressed needs of the people," also makes this point obvious [1], [6], [7]. Juan Linz suggests the following description of "minimalism": "the conviction that, in spite of flaws and failures, political institutions are superior to any others that may be established, and therefore can demand obedience." Another approach to determine legitimacy is via David Easton's idea of "diffuse regime support."

Max Weber created the most well-known definition of legitimacy in use today, dividing it into three categories: conventional, charismatic, and legal-rational. Numerous historical studies have effectively used this typology. According to Weber, "Since Weber, we have been busy putting the phenomenon into one or another of his three boxes and charting the progress by which charismatic authority becomes routinized into traditional authority, which gives way in turn to rational legal authority." Since a democracy's survival ultimately depends on the support of at least a majority of its citizens, legitimacy is especially crucial in democracies; it holds that at least a majority must deem it legitimate. So a democracy would lose its power if the people didn't give it legitimacy. However, in non-democratic regimes, the importance of legitimacy in this sense of popular belief and support is much lower. Although popular support or legitimacy may be advantageous in dictatorships where power is based primarily on force, it is not the most crucial factor.

Despite their lack of legitimacy, authoritarian governments yet feel the need to gain it. The Search for Legitimacy is a key phrase in Michael Hudson's book on Arab politics. He describes this necessity in detail: The main issue facing Arab governments today is political legitimacy. The instability of Arab politics and the authoritarian, despotic characteristics of all current Arab administrations are partly due to the lack of this essential political resource. Arab politicians, whether in the government or the opposition, must function in a political context where the legitimacy of the institutions, regimes, and rulers is, at best, intermittent. Assassinations, coups d'etats, and state repression may in reality result from...the poor legitimacy given to political processes and institutions under these circumstances.

The Abolition of Classical Legitimacy Typologies

The ideas of legitimacy and democracy have no connection in the Weberian typology. Only authoritarian regimes have historically possessed both traditional legitimacy and charismatic legitimacy. In systems that are genuinely democratic, they never show up. The inference is that certain autocratic governments may be acceptable. Some of the modern states with legal-rational

power are legitimate, especially the pluralist democracies; nevertheless, the majority of them are not, especially the authoritarian regimes. The legitimacy of a regime might be founded on more than one sort of authority now, making it more difficult to categorize authority clearly than it was in the past. The brief, revered Constitution of the United States is not the only foundation for its democracy. It has grown gradually, producing new procedures that were quickly institutionalized and routineized. How much tradition and how much reason exist in the democracy of modern India?

This notion of dual legitimacy has been tacitly acknowledged even by Max Weber. He spoke about the mechanics of the legitimation and delegitimization process. He created ideal kinds that are only theoretically hostile. In fact, all historic systems had certain elements of legality: the Russian tsars and Chinese emperors both observed some game rules. The charismatic phenomenon, so common between 1917 and 1980, is exceedingly uncommon now; Khomeini being the most recent example. As a result, the Weberian typology is no longer relevant in the analysis of modern political regimes. A personalization of power that is often fed by a cult of personality has replaced charismatic leadership. It would be a grave error to mistake real charismatic leadership for such a manufactured adoration.

In 1990, there were 160 sovereign countries in the globe. Of these, we may identify around 40 pluralist democracies with a legal-rational validity. Even monarchs like Britain, Spain, Belgium, Sweden, Norway, The Netherlands, or Japan have a legal-rational system of government; the Crown is only a mark of authority. These 40 nations are legitimately democratic. This straightforward explanation demonstrates that just 25% of states fall into the third and two out of the three Weberian kinds of legitimacy. Since the authoritarian regimes in three-quarters of all nations lack genuine legitimacy, they are not included in the Weberian typology. It would be essential to include a fourth "box" for the quasi-legitimacy type and a fifth one for the completely illegitimate regime in order to update this typology for the modern world. Naturally, there is a great deal of variation among authoritarian regimes. The issue at hand is how much dispersed support they get, to borrow Easton's word.

Implementing the Idea of Legalization

Politicians and academics often accept the dichotomy of legitimate and illegitimate. Legitimacy must be graded since reality is far more complex. A possible method for comparing political systems is to rank regimes on an imaginary axis from a minimum to a maximum degree of legitimacy. Many academics have felt that this kind of scalar measurement is necessary: "Legitimacy runs the scale from complete acceptance to complete rejection...ranging all the way from support, consent, compliance through decline, erosion, and loss." We may use the word "illegitimacy" to describe rejection that is intentional. No political regime is valid for 100% of the people, nor in all of its commands, nor permanently, and very few are likely completely illegitimate based merely on force, as Juan Linz emphasizes. Legitimacy never achieves unanimity, and neither do groups and people ever accept the political power's legitimacy equally. Between these two extremes, there are many people who are only partly persuaded by the claims of legitimacy made by the rulers. These people include members of the indifferent popular stratum, rebellious subcultures, nonviolent dissidents, and armed terrorists. The majority's support is often used as a litmus test for legitimacy, but as David Easton noted, it is also important to take into account the kind and degree of the popular support. According to Easton, the ratio of deviation to conformity may be determined by looking at how often laws are broken,

how violent people are, how big dissidence movements are, or how much money is spent on security. However, it is challenging to quantify "violations of laws" or "dissident movements" in empirical research.

As a result, we shouldn't assume that legitimacy exists in a nation just because it isn't questioned. The majority of people in the world's poorest nations do not consider illegitimacy to be a concern. Tyrannical rulers are often seen as a catastrophe in these nations. Legitimacy is not always present when violence is absent. For maybe one in every five Third World nations, the idea of legitimacy is inadequate. However, the absence of a revolt does not imply loyalty to the government. Only under certain historical conditions, such as when a dictatorship begins a liberalization process, is revolt feasible. Revolting against a totalitarian government may be suicide. By suppressing the protests at Tienanmen Square in June 1989, the Chinese communist authorities hoped to halt the fledgling reform movement. The most obvious indicator of illegitimacy is the number of coups d'état; take, for example, the three recent coups in Africa and previous ones in Latin America. A lot of academics have accepted this standard.

Can a political system's legitimacy be assessed based on the arbitrary support of the populace? Even when confidence is objectively examined, it is clearly a subjective thing. It may be difficult to gauge regime loyalty via surveys in nations that forbid free expression, for instance. The challenge of adequately gauging legitimacy is the major issue with any study of it. The legitimacy of a state is often measured indirectly by other factors in opinion surveys that aim to do so. Such surveys may be used to assess things that are connected to a state's legitimacy, such as support for its leaders and policies, emotions of patriotism, and desire to defend the nation, but none of these things really measure legitimacy in and of themselves. Supporting a leader and his or her policies does not necessarily entail endorsing the wider state structures, and opposing a particular leader or program does not always mean opposing the legitimacy of the state as a whole.

Despite all of these challenges, it is still possible to assess the legitimacy of political systems and determine whether one country's political system is more or less legitimate than another. A notion like legitimacy may be scientifically examined. The tautological cycle that all too often ensnares discussions of legitimacy can only be avoided by an empirical approach. Theoretically, there should be more compulsion the less legitimate something is. Therefore, it is advisable to take into account some indicators of coercion, such as the absence of political rights and civil liberties, in order to operationalize the concept of legitimacy. These metrics are based on assessments of the freedoms of speech, association, and assembly, the level of military involvement in politics, fair elections, freedom for religious institutions, an independent judiciary, unrestricted party competition, the absence of state terror, etc. In his book Freedom in the World, Raymond Gastil made an effort to rate nations based on these standards with the help of several experts. Such a rating serves as an acceptable replacement for a more direct scale of legitimacy.

One of the most effective signs of delegitimization is a high degree of corruption. The most notable historical instances are the collapse of the Soviet nomenklatura, the Iranian Shah's rule, and the fall of the Chinese imperial dynasty. Generalized corruption is often present when political regimes come to an end. The majority of African nations have institutionalized corruption at all levels of public administration, according to many testimony and hundreds of publications. The court often serves as a government's last line of defense against corruption. The

common person has little chance if they are infected as well. Then, we can forecast a crisis of legitimacy that will be caused by a coup, uprising, or revolution. Ironically, scandals are not signs of delegitimization since they can only happen in environments with some degree of speech freedom. On the other hand, we can be sure that a dictatorship that has scandals is not entirely unjust. In certain rare circumstances, the scandal can seem to be an unmistakable test of the regime's democratic functioning. The Dreyfus, Watergate, and Irangate scandals are outstanding memorials to the French and American democracies. There are probably no more than thirty nations in the world with sufficiently strong democracies to be able to force the president to resign or repair a political mistake against the wishes of the army: Italy is one of them. In 1976, President Leone was forced to resign due to a corruption scandal.

Legitimacy and Trust

The answers to a fairly straightforward question, "Should a police officer be obeyed?," reveal the difference between legitimacy and trust. The response "The officer should be obeyed because his/her order is right" implies legitimacy and trust; the response "This particular police officer is wrong, and an appeal to a higher authority should be made," however, indicates legitimacy without trust. Even if a specific police officer is not trusted, the police department as a whole may be seen as genuine. The legitimacy of the police as an institution is called into question if too many of its members are dishonest or unduly violent. Both the lack of faith in police as an institution and the distrust of police personnel may be experimentally assessed. The government itself can lose legitimacy if numerous other institutions are distrusted.

The notion of trust is restricted to the rulers who hold power in a temporary capacity, but the concept of legitimacy relates to the whole political system and to its permanent nature: Political trust may be seen as a fundamental emotive or evolutionary orientation toward the government. From high levels of trust to high levels of mistrust or political cynicism, there is a trust dimension. Thus, cynicism describes the level of hostility toward the government and is a statement of the conviction that the government is not operating and generating results in line with individual expectations. For pluralist democracies, this difference between faith in certain institutions or officials and the legitimacy of the rule is acceptable. Of course, no political system is perfect, not even a democratic one. Any institution will face criticism from a section of the population. The absurd pretense of authoritarian governments is unanimity.

Over the past two decades, survey research in about 20 pluralist democracies has revealed a lack of confidence in key institutions. This widespread decline in trust affects practically all developed democracies, which creates significant issues with democracy theory. Is the public's lack of faith in institutions a sign of a more fundamental loss of legitimacy or just a case of ritualistic cynicism? After examining a sizable quantity of American poll data, S.M. Lipset and W. Schneider openly inquire: "Is there a legitimacy crisis?" All democracies in West Europe, as well as Japan, Canada, and Australia, should be asked the same question. Lipset and Schneider's conclusion is that people are considerably more likely to lose trust in systems than they are in leaders. All of the measures that we have looked at indicate that public opinion of the effectiveness of significant institutions has been declining. The legitimacy accorded to the underlying political and economic structures has not significantly decreased. They come to the conclusion that the loss in confidence includes both substantive and flimsy components. It exists because the American people are so deeply disappointed in how their institutions are doing. Because Americans have not yet come to the point of rejecting those institutions, it is also in

some ways superficial. However, Jack Citrin argued in the early 1970s that we shouldn't equate a crisis of confidence with a crisis of legitimacy.

We arrive at similar conclusions after looking at the findings of surveys performed in 1981 by the European Value Systems Study Group and replicated in twelve nations in 1990. The majority of Europeans responded that they had "a great deal" or "quite a lot" of faith in the police, the military forces, the judiciary, the educational system, and the church when asked how much confidence they had in each of the institutions listed. The percentage is smaller for the legislature, the government, the media, and labor unions. Even in Britain, just 40% of respondents said they had faith in the parliament, which puts a major pressure on its legitimacy, especially in Italy. Although a sizeable portion of the population may show little faith in particular institutions, only a tiny minority said they were "on the whole dissatisfied or not at all satisfied with the way democracy is functioning in country," and only a tiny minority said they supported "radical or revolutionary change" to the current setup. The majority of people believe in the democratic system [8]–[10].

CONCLUSION

The creation of operant conditioning, a kind of learning in which actions are changed by reinforcement or punishment, is one of the major achievements of Skinnerian behaviorism. This strategy has been used in a number of industries, including education, training of animals, and therapeutic psychology. Skinnerian behaviorism has been criticized for failing to take into account how cognitive functions like attention, memory, and perception affect behavior. Others have criticized the theory for ignoring internal experiences and states in favor of external factors. Overall, Skinnerian behaviorism has significantly influenced psychology and is still being researched and discussed by academics and professionals in the area.

REFERENCES:

[1] H. Rachlin, ‘Teleological Behaviorism.’, *Am. Psychol.*, 1992, Doi: 10.1037//0003-066x.47.11.1371.

[2] A. Staats, ‘Skinnerian Behaviorism: Social Behaviorism Or Radical Behaviorism?’, *Am. Sociol.*, 1976.

[3] A. Akera, ‘Bringing Radical Behaviorism To Revolutionary Brazil And Back: Fred Keller’s Personalized System Of Instruction And Cold War Engineering Education’, *J. Hist. Behav. Sci.*, 2017, Doi: 10.1002/Jhbs.21871.

[4] E. C. Á. Flor, ‘The Influence Of E. Mach’s Empirical Criticism In The Development Of Psychology’, *Discusiones Filos.*, 2019, Doi: 10.17151/Difil.2019.20.35.6.

[5] L. B. Dourado, C. E. Lopes, And H. M. Pompermaier, ‘The Beetle In Skinner’s Box’, *Psicol. Teor. E Pesqui.*, 2021, Doi: 10.1590/0102.3772e37221.

[6] C. Muchon De Melo And J. C. De Rose, ‘The Concept Of Culture In Skinnerian Radical Behaviorism: Debates And Controversies’, *Eur. J. Behav. Anal.*, 2013, Doi: 10.1080/15021149.2013.11434464.

[7] ‘Skinnerian Behaviorism’, In *Encyclopedia Of Personality And Individual Differences*, 2020. Doi: 10.1007/978-3-319-24612-3_302494.

[8] H. R. Searight, 'The Rise Of Rogers' Humanistic Psychology And Skinnerian Behaviorism In Mid-20th Century America: The Historical Context Of Personality Theory.', *Psychological Specialties In Historical Context: Enriching The Classroom Experience For Teachers And Students.* 2016.

[9] J. E. R. Staddon, ' The Old Behaviorism: A Response To William Baum's Review Of The New Behaviorism ', *J. Exp. Anal. Behav.*, 2004, Doi: 10.1901/Jeab.2004.82-79.

[10] M. Campos Roldán, 'Una Reevaluación Del Conductismo Radical', *Lib. Lima*, 2005.

CHAPTER 10

A BRIEF DISCUSSION ON LEGITIMACY AND EFFECTIVENESS

Dr. Narayana Srikanthreddy, Assistant Professor,
Department of Management, Presidency University, Bangalore, India,
Email id- srikanthreddyn@presidencyuniversity.in

ABSTRACT:

Legitimacy and effectiveness are two important concepts in political science and sociology that are often used to evaluate the legitimacy and success of political systems and institutions. Legitimacy refers to the perceived or actual rightfulness of a government or institution to wield power and authority over a society. This can be based on a variety of factors, including historical tradition, legal frameworks, democratic processes, and public consent. When a government or institution is seen as legitimate, people are more likely to accept its authority and follow its rules and regulations.

KEYWORDS:

Authority, Consent, Democracy, Effectiveness, Elitism, Governance, Legitimacy.

INTRODUCTION

A political system's legitimacy and efficacy are intimately linked because, over time, the existence or absence of one may result in the expansion or decline of the other. Lipset was perhaps the first to analyze exactly the link between legitimacy and efficacy, contending that this relationship is essential to a regime's durability. He defines efficacy as "the extent to which the system satisfies the fundamental functions of government" or "the actual performance of the government." The stability of the government relies significantly on its level of legitimacy when it faces an effectiveness crisis, such as an economic downturn [1]–[3]. The Lipset matrix, which depicts the dynamics of legitimacy and efficacy, serves as an illustration of this. In a time of crisis, a regime that is in box a high legitimacy and effectiveness should shift to box B, demonstrating diminished legitimacy but preserved legitimacy. When the emergency is over, it should return to its original spot in box A.

Lipset's Matrix

Others have also made the case that legitimacy may be maintained after it has been attained. Eckstein emphasizes, for instance, that legitimacy generates a pool of support that ensures people' cooperation even when very unpopular policies are implemented. Legitimacy enhances the readiness of the public to accept shortfalls in effectiveness and builds a reservoir of goodwill that the authorities may draw from in trying times. A crisis in effectiveness would transfer the regime from box C to box D, where it would then be more likely to collapse. In contrast, if a regime is in box C, with a high degree of efficacy but a relatively low degree of legitimacy, the regime is more likely to survive. Analyzing historical instances can help you better understand the connection between these two ideas. A significant crisis in efficacy during the 1930s Great Depression had a negative impact on both the European and American economy. The impacts of

the Great Depression on the United States and Britain, where legitimacy was high, may be compared to those on Germany and Austria, where legitimacy was low. The efficiency issue in the first two nations did not incite anti-democratic forces or cast doubt on the legitimacy of the ruling government. Not the regime, but a change in leadership was what the people needed. The democratic rule, however, was overthrown in Germany and Austria as a result of the effectiveness crisis. The unemployment rate and support for the National Socialist Party were closely tied, as Kaltefleiter has shown.

Since long-term effectiveness can give a regime the chance to establish its legitimacy, moving from box C to box A is also conceivable. By achieving economic prosperity, the governments in Singapore, South Korea, and Taiwan have acquired enough legitimacy to eventually hold democratic elections. However, the most well-known instances of this are Japan and the Federal Republic of Germany, where under military occupation in an atmosphere of suspicion and skepticism, democracy was either established or brought into being. These two regimes' economic miracles propelled them from complete illegitimacy and severe national humiliation to the top of the list of the most legitimate pluralist democracies.

During the same time period, a colossus fell, but not due to a military victory but rather due to total inefficiency. The Soviet Union possessed the technical ability to infiltrate and dominate society in a vast and relatively wealthy region, in addition to having a revolutionary ideology for decades. The Soviet Union and its satellites in Eastern Europe's rapid collapse of the communist system after 1989 serves as an example of how a regime's economic inefficiency may undermine its legitimacy. The irony that the victorious ex-enemy, who now has a very legitimate and successful administration, is giving help to a powerful military force bereft of legitimacy and efficacy is the culmination [4], [5].

DISCUSSION

Actors In The Process Of Legitimation

Numerous authors have focused on the part that intellectuals play in the legitimation process. A bright future for the government may be foreseen when the intellectual elites have faith in it. However, the legitimacy of the regime appears more precarious when, on the other hand, the intellectuals are those who are against it. The most educated portion of the population protested in China in the spring of 1989. Less than one in a thousand members of Chinese society were students, yet they were successful in exposing the legitimacy of the rule.

Crane Brinton emphasizes the significance of the intellectual ferment, which later resulted in the spread of the new ideas to a significant portion of the population, resulting in a crisis of legitimacy, in a comparative analysis of the common factors in the revolutionary movements in Puritan England, in the United States during the time of Washington, in France in 1789, and in Russia in 1917. The working class in the Marxist theory is one such socioeconomic class that has drawn interest. In Protestant nations in the past and more recently with the Liberation theology in several countries in Latin America, the clergy has also historically played a significant role. In dozens of emerging nations over the last three decades, the army has been the most prominent delegitimization agent. Today, military officers rather than civilians are in charge of many of the authoritarian regimes around the world, especially in Asia and Africa.

In conclusion, the challenges of governing and steering society may help to explain some of the stresses on legitimacy and the erosion of confidence. There are two opposite types of ingovernability: either the state is not acting enough because it is economically too weak and lacks the resources necessary to influence society, or it is acting too little because it is overburdened with demands from a very complex society. Welfare states are examples of advanced democracies where this is the case.

The fact that political choices in sophisticated democracies must be made while being directly and constantly scrutinized by the public contributes to the public's lack of faith in institutions or authorities and the ensuing political criticism. People have the right to criticize a valid government. The leaders of authoritarian systems in emerging nations deal with a variety of issues. Their weakness results from the limited resources they have available, not from the excessive demands placed on them. Power, legitimacy, trust, and efficacy don't mean the same thing in Jakarta or London, or even in Washington or Cairo. One of the sins of Western cultural ethnocentrism may be the need to sum up these ideas in words that have universal applicability.

Liberalism Modern Ideologies

Today, liberalism presents itself as a logical body of thought and action with a clear place in the affairs of the day. Its supporters often regard themselves as a continuation of a longstanding tradition of moral and political contemplation, which is the basis of the interpretation that has come to be considered the most reliable of the importance and meaning of the political experience of the West in the modern age. It is portrayed as a survivor that has withstood the test of time and emerged, for the most part, justified by the path that events have followed, at a time when much of the plausibility has vanished from the rivals with whom it used to do fight.

It wasn't always like this. In truth, the sequence of events would not have in any way supported such a conclusion during a large portion of what is now widely regarded, retroactively, as the history of liberalism. In fact, in the imaginations of those who lived through it, there hardly existed for a large portion of the time in issue. For instance, John Locke rarely saw himself as such when he articulated the political goals of the Whigs in their conflict with the Stuart monarchy in seventeenth-century England, which is today generally regarded as a significant contribution to the establishment of the liberal tradition. There is also no proof that Kant, Locke's continental equivalent a century later, was much different in this way. Although Kant can rightfully be considered the author of some of the most significant ideas that have come to define liberalism, this was not his intention. Even before it became the fully developed political theory with claims to universal applicability that it has now become, he was a voice for a growing trend of thinking.

It has never been possible to interpret the ensuing collection of thoughts as anything other than one viewpoint among many. Since it made just as much sense for some people to define their politics in very different terms by the time it made sense for those who found themselves thinking in such terms to start identifying as liberals. Even as the process of emancipating people to live their lives as they chose, which was at the core of the liberal project, came into its own as a historical force with the political maturation of the rising "middle" class, it was still obviously very much in competition with other alternative visions that challenged root and branch most of what it entailed. It actually faced active opposition from more than one quarter precisely because it was so clearly associated with the radical change that came along with the economic revolution

that the entrepreneurial class pioneered, and it could not help but be perceived, in turn, as the reflection of a distinctly partisan response to the events in question.

Furthermore, even this identification with change had its boundaries. When it was at its height, it was common for supporters to refer to it as the embodiment of everything progressive. Such assurance was sparked, in part, by the liberal movement's success in imprinting itself on English society during the middle of the Victorian era. But even then, it was clear that certain developments were taking place that liberals were not at all likely to support and would actually be actively inclined to oppose. It was no surprise, for instance, that after the argument for expanding the vote to include the middle class had been established, the initiative in campaigning for greater democratization tended to fall to others, and liberals were predisposed to welcome that possibility with, at best, reluctance.

Likewise, when the welfare state's basis was being built. The liberal presumption was against it, despite the fact that the circumstances brought on by industrialization practically demanded the adoption of some level of community responsibility for the provision of social welfare. In particular, it was against anybody using their position of public authority to influence societal results in any way. Thus, others took the initiative in developing social insurance and modern social services, and it made sense to think of what was emerging in this regard as the result of currents of thought and practice other than those that found expression in liberalism, especially at a time when working-class parties were beginning to assert themselves as a political force.

Furthermore, the liberal prospect tended to become less certain as the movement in that direction gained more momentum. Numerous "new" liberals made creative adjustments to the new realities as they emerged, but they were left to wonder if they weren't clinging to an antiquated idea that had already served its purpose and was about to be replaced. One may readily interpret the sharp drop in electoral fortunes that even the more tenacious liberal parties tended to experience when up against any kind of persistent challenge from working-class parties as a sign of things to come. It became more difficult to believe that this was anything other than an irreversible trend as time went on [6]–[8].

This was especially true as constitutional experimentation that followed the war fell victim to crisis in country after country and movements espousing militantly illiberal sentiments rose to prominence. This was the case even more after the start of the war in 1914 and the several decades of ongoing social and political upheaval that it sparked. It was strongly emphasized that the reality that was emerging was one in which liberal thought simply did not fit. In fact, when the Great Depression hit in the 1930s, liberals frequently held liberal ideologies accountable for the weaknesses that were revealed and questioned whether there was a way to find effective protection without abruptly changing course. The 'end of laissez-faire' was almost inevitably drawing closer, as Keynes so succinctly put it. Questions about the viability of liberalism even as a framework for formulating economic policy were inevitably raised as it became clear that its continued influence was largely to blame for the societies in question finding it difficult to make the required adjustments.

Additionally, the uncertainty was not entirely eliminated by the Allies' victory in World War II. Liberals themselves could not help but worry whether the old issues might not resurface once the restoration effort got under way. Given the destruction to the European heartland, the economic outlook was likely for a protracted, drawn-out period of rebuilding that was destined to be uncertain, and there was no assurance that the course that events had taken after the previous war

would not be repeated. The political outlook wasn't much different either. It could hardly be assumed that the old roots of instability would not reassert themselves despite the broad desire to restore democratic democracy on a more stable foundation in the nations where it had failed to take root effectively. The success of the democratic rebound was far from certain, particularly in light of the communists' widespread support in a number of nations.

The ground was, however, being prepared for a totally different atmosphere to arise in its place at the same time that the anxieties that these circumstances aroused were becoming apparent. It quickly became clear that the predicted lengthy austerity was not going to happen. In fact, it became evident within a decade almost that an economic "miracle" was developing. As the effects of the resulting prosperity started to be felt, one fear after another started to fade, and it didn't take long before the right conclusions started to be drawn. Liberals in particular started speaking with a confidence and excitement that had not been seen for many years.

Of course, the recovery of nerve that liberals enjoyed in the post-war period was not just due to riches in and of itself. People who were anticipating much less could not help but be fascinated by the sheer magnitude of the growth that was experienced by much of Western Europe in particular. However, what really made a difference in changing the tenor of liberal thinking was how sustained the growth was. The continuous, ongoing growth of output, consumption, investment, and employment that occurred had little historical precedent, and it was obvious that the governments of the societies in question had committed themselves to actively managing economic life in ways that had proven to be helpful in producing this outcome. A "new" capitalism was developing as a result of a trying learning process that had provided priceless lessons about the pursuit of wealth. The longer the expansion continued, the more people were inclined to believe that the economic issues of the past had been successfully resolved.

The fact that wealth was being attained without the mass of the people paying a high price in deprivation was just as astounding. Quite the opposite. The advantages of affluence were broadly distributed. Economic success was seen as dependent on high employment rates and continually rising consumer demand. Affluence for the many was becoming into an economic as well as a political need, which was unique about the barrier that was being passed, as Galbraith in particular stressed. Consumption needed to be encouraged as a way of life if production was to be maintained at the appropriate level.

Social policy experienced a similar evolution when the welfare state fully emerged as a provider of benefits. The bias against communal provision had vanished as a result of the shared difficulties brought on by both the depression and the war, and in its stead had grown a conviction that each citizen had a right to be free from "want." Furthermore, it wasn't just intended to keep people out of poverty. From "cradle to grave," as a well-known liberal supporter of the English translation of this concept put it, the state was to ensure that no one was refused access to fundamental commodities and services. There was a growing propensity to consider ensuring a particular standard of living as well as equality of opportunity as tax funds increased and the concept of equality of opportunity gained popularity.

Furthermore, it was obvious how liberals and their ideas from Beveridge to Keynes had contributed to these developments. They were not alone, and the assistance of socialists in particular was crucial in determining the direction of events. However, the post-war liberal movement's active support and even sponsorship of the emerging mix of public and private arrangements went a long way toward explaining its appeal. Liberals were increasingly inclined

to claim credit for these policies and assume their necessity, which greatly contributed to the perception that they constituted the foundation of an emerging consensus about how to govern industrial democracies that was on the verge of surpassing all of its competitors. Much of the thinking that went into the policies in question reflected the prior development of liberal thought and practice over the previous half-century.

Despite all the support they received from other sources, it is easy to understand why liberals were drawn to these policies. A certain amount of intellectual convergence was developing, although it was clearly on liberals' behalf more than anybody else. Economic planning, social services, social insurance, and the rest of the components that went into creating the emerging "public household," to use Daniel Bell's apt phrase, were undeniably steps in the right direction for society, but by design they were almost always carried out in a way that fell far short of any real challenge to the liberal presumption in favor of private economic power. The ensuing economies may be considered "mixed," but there is no disputing the fact that they are fundamentally capitalist.

There was also little room for disagreement over the compromises made by the other parties. The pattern, in one country after another, was for the supporters of competing currents of thought that were at all serious contenders for power to abandon, in practice, much of what historically had set them at odds with liberalism, from the socialists' increasingly frank disavowal of nationalization to the Christian Democrats' renunciation of the confessional state. For all intents and purposes, they gave up a significant portion of what had previously defined their identity in the name of one or another kind of aggorniamento. In the process, they also largely eliminated the justification for any kind of moral resistance to what liberalism. In fact, the accommodations they made had a tendency to reduce what was left to little more than a collection of liberal themes in different variants.

This was particularly true in terms of the importance given to civil and political liberty. Their value tended to be more widely and deeply recognized after the trauma of totalitarianism, and the harder it became to find any kind of principled opposition to what they, the more obvious it became that their realization could be reconciled with both political stability and economic advancement. The days when their supporters had to deal with claims that they were tools of one or more-party goals were past, with the exception of the occasional criticism of "repressive tolerance" from one or more radical critics. They were replaced by an opinion environment in which, if anything, they were assumed to be the required starting point for any politics that had any chance of becoming legitimate.

The same environment also placed a high value on tolerance. Tolerance gained popularity for the first time since the religious conflicts sparked by the Reformation when the social and cultural circumstances that gave birth to the old ideological conflict faded and the aspire to the all-out triumph they engendered was shown false by events. Pluralism gained such relevance that it really started to assume the role of one of the primary distinguishing elements of the society in issue, with organizations ranging from Catholics to Communists going out of their way to profess their dedication to appreciating difference. They began to take great delight in their "openness" in this sense, and the more practice they had with it, the more self-conscious their use of it tended to be.

Therefore, it might not take long for this trend to find theoretical expression. For a limited while, it was hindered by the tendency of many liberals to accept the notion that what was happening

was the transcendence of ideology and to abstain from giving the concepts that were really in contention any detailed philosophical articulation. This was especially true when positivism's impact called into question the basic viability of moral and political philosophy. However, once Rawls demonstrated that it was both feasible and necessary to rejoin the philosophical issues at hand, it became immediately clear that a different construction was required on what was already being done. Because liberals themselves were clearly not about to admit that the tradition they were part of was over, as the renaissance of liberal theory that followed demonstrated. the exact opposite. The idea that pervaded their publications, with Rawls leading the way, was that liberalism was finally on its way to reclaiming its proper position as the public philosophy of the West after years of battle against rival after competitor.

There has never been much debate about the political nature of what was intended, despite all the work that has been made into making the outcome seem to be a common ground capable of accepting the genuine interests of other candidates. In fact, its political edge has tended to become more clear the more thoroughly the logic of the turn liberal thinking has taken in this most recent mutation has come to be disclosed. Despite all the talk of neutrality, the interpretation that is given to the experience in question is in no way neutral, and it is also not in the least neutral in terms of its practical ramifications. One pretty particular way of comprehending what has happened is presupposed, and it is followed, accordingly, by a preference for a certain way of thinking about its potential as well, as the repeated invocation of Kantian premisses demonstrates.

The peculiarity of the priority and meaning that liberals are likely to attach to liberty is what is particularly brought into stark perspective in this relationship. Because it's not just in what they have to say as one good among many. They would have it understood to be the basic good, the achievement of which has been above all what the recent experience of the West has been about, building on the exceptional importance that personal autonomy has come to acquire as a consequence of the events of the previous century. They contend that more than anything else, the societies in question have discovered the importance of the capacity for individuals to be self-determining to function, in Rawls' words, as moral agents, choosing one's own conception of the good and living life accordingly and that their achievement has been to demonstrate how this can be successfully pursued as a way of life.

Furthermore, according to the liberal theorists of today, nothing has contributed more to this outcome than the growing understanding of the limits of human ability to dictate how life should be lived. They now tend to be predicated on an equally dedicated epistemological modesty, which is a marked contrast to the days when liberal arguments were distinguished by the boldness with which they affirmed the power of reason. They are inclined to attribute the success that the so-called "liberal" democracies have achieved to the increasing acceptance of the sense of restraint this entails. There is no way, practically every significant liberal thinker now asserts matter-of-factly, that we can know with any sort of objective certainty what "God's will" or the "laws of history" dictate, and it is because of this "fact" that the peoples in question have been able to live as they have due to an increasing acceptance of it by those peoples. Through extensive experience, they have come to understand the futility of giving what are essentially private visions a public role, as well as the improperness of doing so. In fact, tolerance has led them to see it as the only proper answer to the challenge given by the diversity of the good that people are willing to pursue as a result of their experiences with it.

It is also said that they have learnt the importance of the resultant variety. Not only have they become used to accepting ideas and values that vary from their own, but they have also grown to see the potential that such a practice offers. Because it becomes more clear that the result is to progressively increase the possibilities for uniqueness to develop the more consistently and purposefully it is pursued. People are essentially encouraged to explore and invent in conformity with their own unique preferences and inclinations as opposed to adhering to one or more pre-existing patterns, with the consequence that life takes on a more variegated and fluid aspect. As a result, the breadth of the diversity that humans are capable of is felt in a level that has never been possible before, and the path is now clear for its exploration as a goal in and of itself.

It is clear from virtually everything about the way this is done that it is assumed that the fact that such an opportunity now presents itself to the societies in question represents a historical accomplishment of the first magnitude. To make the case for embracing this possibility as a matter of principle is, in turn, above all what liberalism has come to stand for. There is no mistaking the assumption that permeates the arguments advanced by Rawls and those who have followed his lead that the way of life to which they seek to give expression amounts to more much more than just one more in history's ongoing succession of different ways of ordering human relations. This is true even though they speak in increasingly historicist terms and make a point of avoiding any sort of explicit metaphysical commitments. In fact, the exact reverse. As the Cold War fades and liberal ideas are adopted as liberation symbols in one popular uprising after another, there is a tendency to revive the old liberal fallacy that what the liberal vision represents is the ultimate resolution of the search for the good society, beyond which further progress is neither necessary nor possible.

This is a remark that is far easier to make than to explain, however, precisely because so much of the reasoning that liberals are now given has an increasingly historicist bent. In fact, logically speaking, its defense turns out to be extremely odd. The doctrinaire universalism of a doctrine that is so adamantly dedicated to elevating tolerance to a virtue has undoubtedly always struck observers as a bit of an aberration. However, back when liberals were able to support their claims in this regard with broad generalizations about human nature whose merits they were willing to debate, what they said at least appeared to be consistent from an epistemological standpoint. But today, even that appearance of consistency is gone, and all that is left is a presumption in favor of treating the relevant experience as authoritative. Any sort of acknowledging metaphysical commitments is dismissed as being outmoded, and liberal theorists are reduced to relying solely on the considered experience of the West.

It is a testament to liberals' current confidence that history will support their positions that such a premise can be taken for granted so casually in serious theoretical discussions. But it also reflects the silences to which they have been reduced, in no less way. Since they do so equally out of necessity and out of choice, it can hardly be denied that they do so even as they benefit from the success that ideas derived from their tradition currently enjoy. They are scarcely in a position to engage meaningfully in discussions about the general virtues of the activities they favor at a time when they have all but abandoned any pretense of an objective justification for them. They have no further information beyond what they have stated as their own priorities or 'past'. Of course, this may, in a practical sense, be sufficient as long as the returns it continues to provide are agreeable. Nothing, after all, can make important issues appear irrelevant like the confirmation of an occurrence. However, nothing can give them new significance like a turn of events, which also serves to highlight the hollowness of explanations based solely on tradition. Because when

things are going well, what appears to be "self-evident" can all too easily turn out to be anything but when things are not. This is an eventuality that, presumably, will never need to be faced if liberals are right in their belief that a turning point has been reached and that a world where the triumph of their philosophy can be treated as a done deal for all practical purposes is on the horizon. History will certainly decide the matter, and it will do so in a way that renders all further discussion useless. However, the opposite may happen if the talk of the "end of history" that we are currently hearing proves to be nothing more than another ideological delusion. This is particularly plausible if it turns out that the economic vibrancy and stability that underpin the manner of life that liberals today take for granted is anything but long-term. In particular, in the event that development slows, it is nearly guaranteed that issues that are now being ignored will resurface in public discourse, maybe in a way that liberals will be less equipped to handle than before. They may really find it difficult to understand what they are up against because they have become so used to taking things for granted that should never be taken for granted. This is the shadow that looms in the distance while the dominant public ideology of the West rejoices in its greatest victory.

CONCLUSION

Effectiveness and legitimacy have a complicated connection, and the two ideas often rely on one another. People may oppose its authority or undercut its programs, which may make it difficult for a government or organization that is seen as unjust to accomplish its objectives. Similar to this, an inefficient organization or government may lose credibility as people begin to doubt its capacity to oversee affairs and provide their requirements. Effectiveness and legitimacy may sometimes clash with one another. A government could, for instance, repress dissent or limit civil freedoms in order to accomplish its objectives, which might damage the legitimacy of the government in the eyes of the general people. Alternatively, even if a government is making an effort to address significant issues, it may lose legitimacy if it is perceived as being too feeble or indecisive. Overall, there is a complex and nuanced relationship between legitimacy and effectiveness that differs across political systems and institutions. It's crucial to comprehend how these two ideas interact in order to assess the legitimacy and performance of political systems and to create efficient policies and governance techniques.

REFERENCES:

[1] K. Bäckstrand, J. Kuyper, and N. Nasiritousi, ‘From collaboration to contestation? Perceptions of legitimacy and effectiveness in post-Paris climate governance’, *Earth Syst. Gov.*, 2021, doi: 10.1016/j.esg.2021.100115.

[2] A. F. Rengifo and L. A. Slocum, ‘The identity prism: How racial identification frames perceptions of police contact, legitimacy, and effectiveness’, *Law Soc. Inq.*, 2020, doi: 10.1017/lsi.2019.72.

[3] T. S. H. Teo, S. L. Kim, and L. Jiang, ‘E-Learning Implementation in South Korea: Integrating Effectiveness and Legitimacy Perspectives’, *Inf. Syst. Front.*, 2020, doi: 10.1007/s10796-018-9874-3.

[4] J. W. Kuyper, B. O. Linnér, and H. Schroeder, ‘Non-state actors in hybrid global climate governance: justice, legitimacy, and effectiveness in a post-Paris era’, *Wiley Interdisciplinary Reviews: Climate Change*. 2018. doi: 10.1002/wcc.497.

[5] S. Grimm and W. Merkel, ‘War and democratization: Legality, legitimacy and effectiveness’, *Democratization*, 2008, doi: 10.1080/13510340801991072.

[6] L. Bos and W. van der Brug, ‘Public images of leaders of anti-immigration parties: Perceptions of legitimacy and effectiveness’, *Party Polit.*, 2010, doi: 10.1177/1354068809346004.

[7] K. Bäckstrand, ‘Multi-stakeholder partnerships for sustainable development: Rethinking legitimacy, accountability and effectiveness’, *Eur. Environ.*, 2006, doi: 10.1002/eet.425.

[8] T. La Porte, ‘The Legitimacy and Effectiveness of Non□State Actors and the Public Diplomacy Concept’, *Public Dipl. Theory Concept. Issues*, 2012.

CHAPTER 11

AN OVERVIEW OF CONSERVATISM

Mr. Kunal Saxena, Assistant Professor,
Department of Management, Presidency University, Bangalore, India,
Email id- drkunal@presidencyuniversity.in

ABSTRACT:

Conservatism is a political and social philosophy that emphasizes tradition, continuity, and the preservation of established social institutions and values. Conservatism is typically characterized by a skepticism towards radical social change, a belief in limited government, and an emphasis on individual liberty and responsibility. Conservative thought has a long history, with roots in the classical and Christian traditions. Modern conservatism emerged in the late 18th century as a response to the French Revolution and the radical social changes it brought about. Since then, conservative thought has evolved and developed in response to a variety of political and social contexts.

KEYWORDS:

Authority, Capitalism, Classical Liberalism, Communitarianism, Conservatism, Human Nature.

INTRODUCTION

The defining characteristic of modern politics has been the resurgence of conservatism as a potent political movement. Conservatism, as a philosophical perspective, an ideology, and a political movement, has come to define the parameters of policy discussions in the main Western countries. A thorough examination of historical definitions and an awareness of current political factors are necessary to comprehend the many strands of conservatism. The opposition to change and the rise of equality that first emerged in the eighteenth century has evolved into a movement with an intellectual foundation that seeks to justify a restructuring of society, politics, and the economy in the second half of the twentieth century. Divergent tendencies are present in the movement. As a starting point for comprehending this issue, we will define modern conservatism before looking back to its historical roots to understand the causes of the discrepancies that today's conservatism faces [1], [2].

Present-Day Conservatism

The acceptance of inequality is a recurring subject in political conservatism. Conservatives of all stripes share the belief that differences rather than similarities between individuals matter more. Conservatives believe that these discrepancies hold the solutions to the issues with social order and productivity. Conservatives have been more convinced of the need to treat people differently based on a range of moral and economic grounds than classical liberals, who believed that people should be viewed as equals for all civic purposes. Conservatives acknowledge the reality of human inequality, but they cannot agree on how to address it. Conservative philosophy may be divided into two main subgroups, traditionalist and individualist. Conservative individualists

contend that the greatest amount of individual freedom is in the best interests of society since there is such a clear disparity between people's skills and capabilities. People will learn to take responsibility for their own actions and will be encouraged, especially in a free-market society, to develop skills that involve the production of goods and services that are in demand by the community, if they are allowed to pursue their own talents and interests without interference from the government. Contrarily, traditionalist conservatives typically claim that the main issue is how to set up the institutions that will restrain and direct individual behavior in order to bring about some level of order and social cohesion given the limitations of human nature and the inequality that results from those limitations.

Conservative individualists place a high value on initiative and entrepreneurship when determining how individuals vary from one another; traditionalists place a higher value on character and intrinsic talent. Both provide arguments for inequality that are fairly comparable, but there are also significant distinctions that have significant political ramifications. Individualist conservatives believe that initiative and entrepreneurship are character traits that are a matter of choice and are attainable by everyone. On the other hand, character and natural talent are moulded by inheritance, breeding, and the civilizing influence of institutions and they will undoubtedly be put to the test in a world rendered disordered by the flaws in human nature. The political implication is that traditional conservatism points toward institutions like the family, the church, and the business, but individualist conservatism points to the market as the leading institutional form.

Individualists and traditionalists have quite different views of freedom as a political ideal. The former adhere to the classical liberal view on the importance of individual liberty while rejecting the majority of the liberals' constraints that are community-focused. Conservative individualists would disagree with what Locke stated about limitations on accumulation, Mill on utilitarian judgments, and Green on the role of reason in defining actual freedom. The individualist conservative perspective is most amenable to libertarianism, and its calculation is based on the logic of material self-interest. Traditional conservatives perceive freedom in a more nuanced way. They contend that the right framework is necessary for true freedom to exist. Without restrictions, license rather than liberty results. Institutional constraints provide frameworks within which freedom that is advantageous to people may be ethically practiced.

Because it rewards effort, logical decision-making, and entrepreneurial skill, the market is the individualist conservative's preferred social instrument. Although they have defended the institution of private property as a necessary adjunct of other institutional bases for society, including the family, the bourgeois state, the church, and the corporation, traditionalists have always been wary of the market in general. Traditional conservatives are concerned about the market's inclination to upend established institutional life patterns. These two ideologies have clashed on topics like the need of a social safety net for the less advantaged. Traditional conservatives think that society's many levels should be handled appropriately. Conservatives who value individualism see redistributive actions as compulsion. Such governmental initiatives are only seen as impediments to the process of free will and individual decision-making, which should be let to decide on the "true" distribution of rewards in accordance with effort.

Other topics that separate the two tendencies are education, abortion, and the environment. Traditional conservatives believe that promoting education is a crucial part of passing along the values and cultural heritage of Western civilisation. Even as it perpetuates the principles of

civilization itself, education aids in the establishment of the hierarchy of ability. According to individualists, education should resemble a marketplace where individuals may purchase anything they want. The use of vouchers for educational services offers a way to implement this idea while maintaining public taxes as the system's primary funding source. The variety of educational programs and the devolution of parental authority puts policymaking where individualist conservatives believe it belongs: in the hands of the people.

The use of government coercion to impose morality and the idea that people should be free to select their own method of reproduction are directly at odds with abortion. Similar problems arise for conservatism when it comes to environmental concerns. Individualists are more inclined to advocate freedom of action or market incentives that reward preservation; traditionalists favor conservation via governmental control when appropriate. Conservative capitalism is the movement that combines these opposing ideologies. It is a movement that exhibits significant internal conflict between institutionalist thinking and respect for the value of personal autonomy. The former reflects historical ties to traditional behaviors, whereas the latter is a result of capitalism philosophy as it has come to be understood in the West. This distinguishes conservative capitalism from liberal capitalism, which was characterized by the pre-Thatcherite social democratic consensus in Britain and the widespread adoption of reform liberal principles in American politics from the New Deal until the 1980 election of Jimmy Carter. The future of this partnership will be discussed in the essay's last section, but first, a quick historical overview will provide the background information that is needed [3], [4].

DISCUSSION

The European Roots of Conservatism

The attitude toward change is the fundamental concept of the traditional study on conservatism. According to the Oxford English Dictionary, the political word "conservatism" first occurs in Matthew Arnold's writings in 1835, and its definition has to do with upholding conventional social and political structures. Shortly after, conservatism is defined as a skepticism against pagan ideas of redemption in Disraeli's Coningsby. Along with its apparent benefits for maintaining the status quo of the elite, resistance to change has intellectual roots in two very distinct traditions: the theories of natural law on the one hand, and epistemological skepticism on the other. In contrast to the latter, which undercut the foundation upon which suggestions for change might be based, the former presented a consistency to human affairs that could be used to reject the prospect of innovation.

The idea of a natural order is as ancient as philosophy, and the Middle Ages gave it a political shape that embraced a hierarchy that was acceptable to those who accepted social stratification based on class or religious devotion. There is a natural order in society that, when brought to maturity via the right institutions, will result in as much order and justice as human beings are capable of. This is similar to how an acorn matures into an oak tree. While skepticism has its conservative applications, it can also be used to challenge tradition and custom. David Hume, by alternatively revealing the blatant roughness of political arrangements and mocking the pretensions of theorists who would dignify authority with formulae based on agreement, opened the door to a severe criticism of the institutional innovations of classical liberalism. Liberalism lacks the rationalist certainty that it once had, therefore it is now simply a speculative philosophy from which certain insights on justice might be drawn to help developing institutions of law and order.

Traditional conservatism's conceptual foundation is natural law, whereas individualist conservatism's guiding principle is skepticism. There is no inevitable contradiction between them since those who doubt human creations may coexist with others who believe that justice cannot be achieved by humans. However, there is a type of skepticism that undermines both the foundations of traditional society and the claims made by the new liberal order. Adam Smith addresses political economics in this way, and it was through his research that the foundation for contemporary liberalism and conservatism was established.

Smith argued that market-based liberalism is the economic equivalent of democracy. Here was the doorway to widespread involvement in economic affairs based on labor, if not actual capital. Misguided government policy a government of the privileged found in its mercantilist practices a theory that both justified a strong state and the enrichment of political supporters, and this government was the adversary of the market. Smith represented the people's ally in the manner of 1776. But Smith's ideas also had a strong moral conservatism to them. His main concern was the issue of moral behavior. He tries to illustrate in The Theory of Moral Sentiments how a fair and impartial government may be vital in restricting the type of self-serving attitude about the appropriation of property that is all too natural and all too destructive of self-control and constructive behavior. The expansion of this institutional analysis in An Inquiry into the Nature and Causes of the Wealth of Nations shows that the market will produce a certain amount of self-discipline in the pursuit of getting the best return on investment, whether it be for labor or capital, by harnessing the power of vanity through the price system. The conversion of harmful behavior into socially beneficial energy was the major challenge, according to Smith. At that point, he didn't hold out much hope for perfection or even considerable progress; all he wanted was to prevent injury and boost economic production.

The conservative movement's explicit political goal is to oppose using government power, particularly to advance equality. The resistance is based on a mistrust of rationalist abstractions, a positive appraisal of custom and tradition, and a fundamental acceptance of human differences as the cornerstone of civil order, according to the writings of Edmund Burke, the leading articulator of traditional conservatism as a philosophical orientation. Because Burke could accept the American colonial revolt as an assertion of traditional English rights by disenfranchised citizens, this conservative orientation did not always require a rejection of change. He also opposed the French Revolution as a deadly attempt to impose the ideals of liberté, egalité, and fraternité. Burkean conservatism amounted to believing in a variety of powerful institutions that function to create a "organic society" marked by moderation, discipline, and turning to religion for comfort in the face of life's vicissitudes [5]–[7].

At the same time, conservatism in late eighteenth-century Germany came to signify a variety of things that centered on maintaining the status quo, reform, and reaction. The defining factor for the orientation to change had to do with how to best maintain distinctions in status, power, and rank that were consistent with traditional notions of what it is to be human. The best course of action for some entailed straightforward opposition to innovation, for others, cautious moderation of the forces of change, and for others who were the least practical, a return to the past. Nationalism gave these intellectual aspirations a tangible political expression for conservatives in both England and Germany. Although the nation provided, at least in the abstract, the hierarchies of meaning and authority that support a conservative political analysis, the state was still viewed with some skepticism. Progressives, liberal reformers, or radicals may use the state as their platform as it is unique from the country. Although the country was created

as a response to medieval imperialism, by the late eighteenth century it had come to stand for the qualitative and spiritual principle that could be in opposition to the quantitative and rationalist axioms of classical liberalism and its radical offspring. This fusion of ideology and politics gave rise to the tragic partnership between conservatism and nationalism.

French conservatives like Joseph de Maistre fused nationalism and Christianity to create a reactionary form of conservatism that attacked all of classical liberalism's and radicalism's inventions, declaring that the social contract was a fiction that improving upon "the state of nature" was a dangerous illusion, and that democracy itself was an affront to divine law. While this kind of return to the past limited conservatism's appeal, the association made between nationalism and Christianity gave it a populist opening that resurfaces in modern conservative movements. Conservatism became an ideology when it assumed the shape of a partisan creed during the political campaigns of the nineteenth century, if an ideology may be defined as a world view that comprises a program of political action. Stoicism and the pessimistic view of human nature held by medieval Christians are the origins of the traditional conservative worldview. Its main themes include the need of hierarchy, the effects of human limits, and the indispensable function of spiritual faith. The development of the Tory party under Disraeli's leadership, the founding of the Federalist Party in the United States by Alexander Hamilton, and the burgeoning of rightist partisanship on the Continent are what gave conservatism a contemporary political presence. Conservatism developed as a powerful ideological force in each area.

The emergence of a political agenda can be readily seen, despite opposition to describing conservatism as anything more than a collection of attitudes that need to change. Disraeli provided guidelines for the preservation of differences and the celebration of customary arrangements that went above and beyond prudence to vigorous affirmation in order to combat the utilitarianism of his day. A distinctly Tory political platform was characterized by the battles over the Reform Bills and the alliance with Victorianism. By the turn of the century, Britain had reached the height of its power and influence in international affairs thanks to the alliance of nationalism, conservatism, and imperialism. The First and Second World Wars' widespread social and physical destruction upended this power's basis inside the conservative class order and the economic ties that stemmed from imperialism. It was a testament to the strength of nationalist symbolism that Churchill invoked Britain's "finest hour," but it also signaled the beginning of the end for conventional conservatism in British culture. At the conclusion of World War II, the Conservatives suffered their first significant loss of power, and when a Labour government was put in place in 1945, the balance of power shifted to the left.

While socialists dominated public discourse over the following four decades, consideration for conservative institutional preferences was a significant factor in the social democratic consensus's institutional innovations. The delivery of services may have been made more democratic, but the British welfare state's institutions nonetheless maintained a significant amount of internal hierarchy and external autonomy. As a result, the concessions that the Conservative Party was pressured into making during the 1950s, 1960s, and 1970s up to the formation of the first Thatcher government were more understandable.

The end effect was an entitlement-driven bureaucracy that by the 1970s was becoming more and more outcast and losing popularity. The British welfare state had its greatest crisis at a period of rising expectations, decreasing resources, and growing strength of means of collective action due

to union leadership of the Labour Party. Because of their involvement in it and the debunked traditionalism that guided their doctrinal approach, the Conservatives were not able to take advantage of this crisis sooner. Margaret Thatcher's development of her unique blend of individualist conservatism in economic policy and social traditionalism provided a strong conservative capitalist agenda with which to fight a split left. This combination was destroyed, and Thatcher's tenure as prime minister was brought to an end by the unpopularity of doctrinally motivated policies like the poll tax.

Conservative North Americanism

In the American context, the tale of how old conservative dogma fell apart is different, but the outcome was very similar. Alexander Hamilton assembled a powerful coalition of nobodies in the newly independent colonies with the goal of forging a robust national political and economic order that could fend off the democrats and debtors' growing influence. In order to balance competing pressures between those who desire renown and must nurture public respect and those who seek dominance and are motivated to take advantage of the forces of production, his conceptual framework rested on the idea of an elite. He envisioned a noblesse oblige-driven elite in charge of a powerful federal union's machinery and responsible for spreading the advantages of the new society throughout the continent.

When Andrew Jackson refused the rechartering of the Bank of the United States in 1832, Hamilton's idea was severely institutionalized and failed in the fight against the democratizing forces headed by Thomas Jefferson. Ironically, Jackson destroyed this conservative institution in the name of laissez-faire, which would subsequently serve as the guiding doctrine for a revitalized conservatism 150 years later. The loss of the South in the Civil War dealt conservatism in the United States a second significant blow. Even though many conservative citizens supported the Union, the intellectual underpinnings of the confederate cause included a full range of conservative values, from respect for traditional institutions to the division of the population along racial, gender, and class lines. The Union's triumph encouraged the radicalization of democracy and its expansion to movements for complete civil rights for women's and minorities' rights.

While conservative institutionalism was the reason why American politics began to decline in the nineteenth century, conservatism persisted as a staunch defense of the limited foundation of the constitutional contract up until the New Deal. The political restraints of constitutional conservatism were significantly weakened by the democratization of politics brought about by populist, progressive, and socialist initiatives, but they were not completely lifted until the Supreme Court agreed to the Roosevelt administration's policy innovations in the late 1930s.

From that point on, only its hostility to communism throughout the Cold War stopped classic conservatism from steadily fading into political obscurity. To revive the term and bring conservatism to the forefront of public attention in presidential campaigns, starting with Barry Goldwater's unsuccessful bid in 1964 and ending with Ronald Reagan's victory in 1980, it took the combination of a new individualist interpretation and a complex crisis within liberal capitalism. Reagan's victory was considerably more obviously the result of a coalition of traditionalists and individualists, despite the fact that debates over policies and priorities were typically won in the latter's favor. His triumph was made possible by the revisionist sociology of academics who abandoned the left for a new conservatism that claimed to uphold individual freedom in a more robust manner than the reformist left had.

In contrast to the British and American patterns, the 'Red Tory' tradition had a decisive role in forming political economics institutions in Canada. Traditionalist conservatives with a flair for institutional innovation came up with the idea that government-based national and provincial economic institutions in the fields of banking, transportation, communications, and mineral extraction should take the lead in creating a distinctive identity for Canadian culture. Although there was plenty of room for partisanship in the distribution of influence and control within this institutional framework, the goal of these efforts was not at odds with the desires of populists or even liberals for a significant portion of Canada's history. The opposition party's steadfast adherence to classical liberalism and the delicate nature of devolutionist politics in a precarious federation prevented the spread of laissez-faire terms into the Canadian conservative vocabulary. A new strain of conservatism was made possible by the economic load of the welfare state during the readjustments that followed the oil embargo as well as the splits on the left between establishment liberals and Western populists.

The Mulroney administration was a turning point for Canadian conservatism. Its defining characteristics were free commerce and a limited role for the state. The Free Trade Agreement puts Canada's cultural and economic cohesion to the test, directly challenging the conservatives' lingering nationalism and traditionalism. By the axioms of modern economics, there is little choice but to implement the program if increases in the gross domestic product are to be achieved that are comparable to those of other industrialized countries, even though doing so runs the risk of endangering Canada's future as a sovereign nation. The future of conservative political fortunes may depend on whether such advantages materialize given the disparity in economic power between Canada and its main trade partner. The Canadian experience is putting to the test whether conservatism can endure a loss of cultural unity and national identity in the pursuit of economic ambition [8]–[10].

CONCLUSION

Conservatives also stress the significance of individual liberty and responsibility and contend that these principles must be safeguarded by limited government. They think that instead of advancing social or economic equality, government should be limited, decentralized, and devoted to upholding law and order and defending individual rights. Conservatives are accused of being too cautious of social development and change, as well as of being opposed to initiatives aimed at reducing social and economic inequality. They also criticize conservative policies that put social welfare second to individual liberty, claiming that this might result in a lack of assistance for the most defenseless members of society. Although it has its detractors, conservatism is still a powerful political and social philosophy that has a big impact on political parties and social movements all over the world.

REFERENCES:

[1] H. Fuad, A. Fatchan, and W. Kuncara, ‘Riset Akuntansi dan Keuangan Indonesia URL□: http://journals.ums.ac.id/index.php/reaksi/index Perplexity in Accounting Conservatism: a Perplexity in Accounting Conservatism: a Critical Review Critical Review’, *Ris. Akunt. dan Keuang. Indones.*, 2021.

[2] A. Mora and M. Walker, ‘The implications of research on accounting conservatism for accounting standard setting’, *Account. Bus. Res.*, 2015, doi: 10.1080/00014788.2015.1048770.

[3] M. Tugendhat, 'The Conservative Case for Human Rights', *Polit. Q.*, 2019, doi: 10.1111/1467-923X.12713.

[4] F. Şentürk, 'Litigation Risk, Auditor Conservatism and An Overview of Turkey Characteristic', *J. Account. Financ. Audit. Stud.*, 2018, doi: 10.32602/jafas.2018.009.

[5] M. S. Mahmoud, 'Recent Progress in Stability and Stabilization of Systems with Time-Delays', *Mathematical Problems in Engineering*. 2017. doi: 10.1155/2017/7354654.

[6] U. Hidayah and B. Prasetiya, 'Multicultural Education In Madrasah Diniyah As Prevention Of Religious Conservatism', *J. Tarb.*, 2019, doi: 10.30829/tar.v26i1.417.

[7] J. Farney, 'Cross-border influences or parallel developments? A process-tracing approach to the development of social conservatism in Canada and the US', *J. Polit. Ideol.*, 2019, doi: 10.1080/13569317.2019.1589953.

[8] J. Ohlson and L. Van Lent, 'Introduction to the Special Section on Conservatism in Accounting', *Eur. Account. Rev.*, 2006, doi: 10.1080/09638180601102073.

[9] K. P. Krzysztof Piątkowski, 'Konserwatyzm czy konserwatyzmy? Problemy współczesnych badań nad źródłami przekonań prawicowych', *Człowiek i Społeczeństwo*, 2018, doi: 10.14746/cis.2018.45.5.

[10] J. Sharples and P. James, 'A review of conservatisms in fracture mechanics assessments', in *American Society of Mechanical Engineers, Pressure Vessels and Piping Division (Publication) PVP*, 2021. doi: 10.1115/PVP2021-61934.

CHAPTER 12

CONSERVATIVE CAPITALISM: LINES OF CLEAVAGE

Dr. Ramalingam Mageshkumar, Assistant Professor,
Department of Management, Presidency University, Bangalore, India,
Email id- mageshkumar@presidencyuniversity.in

ABSTRACT:

Conservative capitalism is a political and economic ideology that combines conservative principles with free market capitalism. It emphasizes the importance of limited government intervention in the economy, individual responsibility, and the preservation of traditional social institutions and values. In conservative capitalism, the free market is seen as the best mechanism for promoting economic growth and prosperity, with limited government intervention necessary to protect property rights and maintain a level playing field. Conservatives argue that excessive government regulation and intervention can stifle economic growth, reduce individual liberty, and lead to inefficiencies and waste.

KEYWORDS:

Capitalism, Classical Liberalism, Conservatism, Economic, Freedom, Neoliberalism.

INTRODUCTION

Traditionalist conservatism's advantages in continental European politics were also its disadvantages, however the emergence of Christian democratic parties helped to moderate the extremes and kept conservatism in many parts of Europe as a potent opponent to the left. The allure of nationalism and its fusion with Christian religious identifications resulted in a complicity between chauvinistic views and aristocratic forms that dates back to the late nineteenth century. During the Second World War in France, Charles Maurras took this alliance's anti-semitic, pro-fascist potential to full, and when the Vichy administration collapsed, he was found guilty of it in court. Houston Stewart Chamberlain established a connection between the Austrian, German, and British Aryan nationalisms that supported Adolf Hitler. Hitler quickly outpaced any genuine resemblance between Nazism and an identifiable conservatism. Hitler's dreams of Aryan supremacy served as a justification for the ruthless murder of human life, while anti-Semitism evolved into a genocidal obsession that no Christian could defend. Though conservatism and fascism can be conceptually separated, the early complicity of some conservative intellectuals, literati, and politicians in its ascent to power contributed to the decline of conservative parties' credibility [1]–[3].

However, the combination of religion, nationalism, and social conservatism only reached its institutional zenith and persisted for a significant amount of time in Franco's Spain. Although José Ortega y Gasset's writings provide an intellectual foundation for a moderate form of Spanish conservatism, the Franco regime went much further than Ortega's warnings about the masses to institutionalize an oppressive hierarchy. The combination's regressive character was well shown by the widespread violations of human rights and the reluctance to take into account

simple social justice programs of the sort that contributed to the post-war modernization of the rest of Europe. El Caudillo, sometimes known as Franco, became a symbol of contemporary conservatism, and Latin American administrations often bore his face.

The adoption of police state techniques by governments that identified as conservatives offered the growing number of educated people a cause to reject the right and those who were dedicated to eradicating global injustices a reason to embrace the left. The ties between proto-fascist anti-Semitic attitudes and conservative peasant parties in eastern and central Europe served as a justification for both the post-war subjugation of eastern Europe and the Russian annexation of Latvia, Lithuania, and Estonia at the start of the Second World War. It is clear that conservative excesses contributed to the extremes of political conflict that created the conditions for both the Second World War and the Cold War, despite the fact that there were many strong forces at play in these circumstances.

However, in the years following the Second World War, conservatism took on a kinder face and reclaimed its rightful position in the politics of the Western democracies. The Federal Republic of Germany's Konrad Adenauer and France's Charles de Gaulle served as examples of conservative leadership, with the former supporting the idea that conservatism and democracy may coexist. Continental conservatives, and to a lesser degree American conservatives, were able to boost the credibility of the right anytime it dipped away from an accommodating left because of their steadfast opposition to communism. Adenauer and de Gaulle helped the European right regain some confidence by focusing on issues of cultural cohesion, traditional social norms, and Christian moral conviction.

Continental conservatives were unable to effectively address the social innovations of an affluent middle class or the distributive demands of an increasingly powerful labor movement, but they were successful in preserving the core of a national identity in a society that was becoming more secular and materialistic. If distributive equality continues to be a secondary concern in modern European politics and the right successfully harvests the benefits of anti-communism, the groundwork for a robust conservative presence may have been set. But there are new sources of conflict that are affecting all Western conservative movements, and these could very well determine whether they survive [4], [5].

DISCUSSION

Conservative capitalism's conflict between individualist and communitarian features has been made clear in disagreements over a variety of subjects, including education, financial security, the decentralization of political power, and many more. It is becoming more and more clear that each inclination is divided along lines of class attitude, if not actual class, by cross-cutting divisions. Between establishment conservatives, who are grounded on the traditional institutions of Western society, and moralist conservatives, who base their politics in evangelical churches, cause-based groups, and patriotic associations, there is a division within traditionalist conservatism. Both support the use of state power to influence people's behavior by restricting their liberties. However, there is a significant degree and moral purpose difference between these points of view.

Moralist conservatives are more likely to see government assistance as a way of encouraging reliance and personal laxity, in contrast to establishment conservatives who advocate a reasonable compromise with the welfare state as a matter of preserving social stability. Whereas

establishment conservatives support government initiatives to control the population, moralists want to use legislation to limit access to abortion, limit sexual freedom, and censor pornography. Establishment conservatives have a tendency to restrict personal freedom of action, whilst moralists favor the application of discipline as a method of fostering moral development. American moralist politics had a significant role in ensuring Republican dominance of the US Senate from 1980 through 2006 as well as Pat Robertson's 1988 presidential campaign. The choice of Indiana senator Dan Quayle as vice president was partially based on forging an alliance between George Bush's establishment politics and the senator from that state's moralist appeal. Similar distinctions between populist and corporate conservatives exist on the individualist side of conservative capitalism. In both left- and right-wing American politics, populism has a lengthy history. Populism has been linked to nationalism and nativism on the right. In its most recent incarnation, the populism of the right is concerned with threats to individual freedom brought on by government regulation as well as the collaboration of the biggest financial and business interests in an elite politics that threatens small business owners, independent entrepreneurs, farmers, non-union workers, and people who believe in the free market's purest theory. Major firms, and particularly multinationals, tend to frighten populist conservatives [6]–[8].

Conservatives with roots in the corporate banking industry and ties to the main manufacturing units also pledge fealty to the free market. Their focus is on using economic growth to address social issues, but they are also open to using government as an active actor in advancing economic freedom and defending capitalist interests against both internal and foreign intrusion. Corporate conservatives see the government as a helpful ally in the fight to preserve the mobility and independence of capital by cooperating at the elite level. For instance, corporate conservatives see monetary regulation as their primary tool for influencing economic policy in a way that is favorable to their interests, in contrast to populist conservatives who would very readily dissociate the government from its role in monetary regulation. While major corporations have historically operated with a high level of security and continuity, populism has historically appealed to smaller commercial interests. The gap between populists and corporate conservatives has become wider as a result of recent regulatory changes that have made corporate takeovers easier. In contrast, the targets of takeover attempts look for methods to elude the logic of a speculative market, while the latter find the possibility of real competition at the large corporate level to be rejuvenating.

These conflicts within conservative capitalism are not yet as significant as the divisions on the left, which allowed conservatives to take control in the majority of Western nations. However, they might have stopped the concentration of that power. From 1983 on, Congressional opposition to President Reagan's conservative agenda, part of which came from moderate Republican opposition to the breach of conventional understandings surrounding income security policy, among other concerns, was rather successful in thwarting it. Before being ousted by a challenge rooted on that group, Prime Minister Thatcher had to put up with repeated uprisings by traditionalists in her own party. It has usually been evident that moralist conservatism has been valued more by governments on both sides of the Atlantic as a recruitment tool than as a source of genuine legislative efforts.

The problem for conservative politics will likely lay more in sustaining coalitions among opposing impulses than in mobilizing any sector in its purest form since it is in the nature of politicians to make alliances. Reform liberals in the United States may be seen as having adopted

some of the moralist conservative policies at the same time because they support the death penalty, vigorous anti-drug campaigns, and the prosecution of pornographers in order to counter the conservative movement's political appeal. Another option is to use the conservative capitalism's incompatible components as mutually reinforcing justifications. Indolence among the underprivileged is more likely to be to blame for productivity declines than the crippling impacts of corporate conflict. Instead of the persistence of injustices in the allocation of life chances, the predicament of the poor might be traced to poor individual decisions made in a free market. The consequences of conflicting policies on the allegiances of conservative voters may be overcome by these chances for rationalization within the wider context of conservative capitalism. There are a number of alternatives to the categorization system proposed in this article, all of which focus on making contrasts between what is new and what is traditional in conservatism, such as neo-conservatism and the New Right. Because neither the traditionalist nor the individualist stream represents new thinking, there is little consensus regarding what exactly qualifies as novel under these labels. As opposed to the alliance of establishment and corporate conservatism that characterized conservative parties prior to the mid-1970s, some see the New Right as a combination of moralist and populist conservatism.

This categorization accurately conveys the idea that political successes have been built on a coalition that has never previously achieved such success. Some people consider the New Right to be the label for individualist conservatism, which is opposed to conventional conservatism. Here, the introduction of proponents of a conservative variant of classical liberalism is shown as novel. The issue with both options is that the historical foundation and ongoing influence of the greater conservative frame of reference are neglected. Additionally, there is the false assumption that this is a coordinated movement. In fact, several influential philosophers who are regularly quoted by conservatives, like Friedrich Hayek, completely reject the name of conservative. Conservative capitalism is a term that both allude to the hybrid character of the movement and preserves important intellectual allusions to its historical origins.

Looking forward, the long-term sustainability of conservative capitalism may be in danger if the focus shifts from topics like anti-communism and economic progress to those related to the environment and the politics of human development. Environmental concerns pit the corporate basis of conservative politics against the increasingly sizable majorities of the general populace. The wall of separation that conservatives have worked so hard to erect between the market and government may be breached by issues relating to parental care, health benefits, and the development of educational opportunities.

On the overall, conservatives' track record of predicting steady economic progress, a drop in crime, and the gradual eradication of social issues has not proven convincing. In the case of the United States, economic growth in Western nations has been fueled by private, public, and corporate debt. There may be a limit to the financial basis for such achievements as have been accomplished, but in Britain, the sale of nationalized assets and the earnings from oil rights have preserved an uncomfortable equilibrium between the old welfare state and the new market freedom. Both a significant rise in incarceration and the reinstatement of the death penalty in the United States have not seemed to make the streets any safer. As families continue to disintegrate, especially among the impoverished, anger over moral concerns is growing. Even in the face of ongoing economic expansion, income and wealth inequality has increased in both countries.

As a result, conservative capitalism has been successful in changing the political landscape of Western nations, even if it has not yet created a foundation as strong as the New Deal in the United States or the postwar development of social services in Britain. The individualist trend has little remedies to give, but traditional conservatives may be able to solve the challenges of the environment and human growth, which are becoming more and more important. Even without the threat of communism, conservative capitalism poses the hazard of causing a political movement to become disoriented due to internal conflicts.

Marxism

Marx's 'critique of political economics' did not become a coherent social philosophy, a worldview, or a political system until after his passing. Engels started the process of codifying Marx's views as "the Marxist world view," elaborating on it as "scientific socialism," extending it to include a "dialectic of nature," and comparing it to traditional German philosophy. Through his writings and correspondence, which were widely read in the rapidly expanding socialist movement, Engels had a significant impact on the first generation of Marxist thinkers. By the end of the nineteenth century, Marxism had established itself as a separate social theory and political philosophy with three key components that could be distinguished, mainly beyond the purview of traditional academic institutions.

The first component examines the many forms of human societies and their historical development, giving the economic system, or "mode of production," a prominent position as a deciding or conditioning factor that shapes the whole form of social life. The way that material existence is produced, in Marx's own words, "determines the general character of the social, political, and spiritual processes of life." The forces of production and the relations of production are the two components that make up the mode of production itself. Following this analysis, two of the central concepts of Marxist thought were revealed: a periodization of history that sees the ancient, Asian, feudal, and modern capitalist modes of production as progressive movements; and an understanding of the fundamental role of social classes, as determined by their place in the system of production, in forming and transforming the main types of society.

An explanation of how societies develop from one kind to another is the second component of Marxism. The growth of the forces of production and the relationships between classes are two processes that are essential to these transformations. Marx himself emphasized this in his well-known statement that "the handmill gives you a society with feudal lords, the steam mill gives you a society with industrial capitalists." However, from another perspective, the main driver of change is the struggle between classes over the overall structure of production and the general form of social life. However, these two processes are connected in that the rise of a new class is tied to the development of the productive forces, which makes it impossible for the current economic and political system, which has become a barrier to further development, to continue. Therefore, the development of modern capitalism is portrayed as the rise of a new class, the bourgeoisie, equipped with a new technology, which gradually transformed the system of production and established itself as the dominant class.

This transition from feudalism to capitalism has been a preferred model for the Marxist theory of history. However, different degrees of "determinism" or "voluntarism," or differences in emphasis in the description and explanation of historical changes, emerged early in Marxist thought and have persisted. The third component of Marxism is the study of contemporary capitalism and its growth, which was the primary focus of Marx and other Marxists. The

opposition and conflict between the two main classes the bourgeoisie and the proletariat become ever clearer and more intense in capitalism, and the economic contradictions of the capitalist mode of production which take the form of recurrent crises constantly worsen. The working-class movement's power as a political force dedicated to the creation of a new society steadily grows as the economic system becomes more socialized as cartels and trusts flourish and a close relationship between manufacturing and bank capital develops. This analysis of capitalist development and the rise of mass socialist parties compelled a focus on the circumstances under which a socialist society would emerge, which in turn led to the development of Marxism as a political theory that gave the socialist parties intellectual direction and served as an ideological weapon in their fight against bourgeois dominance. Marxism was a key component of the socialist parties' cohesion.

But there was some disagreement about the nature and reach of Marxist thought right from the start. Marxism was primarily a theory of the historical development of human society for Kautsky, whose writings predominated in theoretical discussions from the late 1880s to 1914. It was also a scientific, evolutionist, and deterministic theory that shared many characteristics with Darwinism.

Contrarily, Plekhanovoften referred to as the "father of Russian Marxism" presented Marxism as a comprehensive worldview, or "dialectical materialism," within which historical materialism was seen as a specific application of its fundamental principles to the study of social events. The main aspects of Marxism were all intensively developed throughout the first decade of the twentieth century, although in distinct directions and amid growing critical discussion.

Marxism as a scientific theory of historical development and the capitalist economy had a dominant position in Germany under Kautsky's influence, though some of its claims had started to be contested in the "revisionist debate" started by Bernstein, who disputed the notions of an eventual economic collapse of capitalism as a result of ever-worsening crises.

The group of Austro-Marxists, who made up the first identifiable'school' of Marxist thought, also advanced Marxism as a social theory and, more precisely, as a sociological framework in Austria. They were positivists, like Kautsky, but in a more sophisticated way, inspired by neo-Kantianism and Mach; Max Adler was primarily responsible for developing their philosophical beliefs, which were regarded solely as a philosophy of science rather than as a metaphysical theory. The Austro-Marxists were pioneers in expanding Marxist social science into new topics via their research on nationality and nationalism, the social uses of law, and the recent growth of capitalism.

They not only offered Marxist social science a methodical shape. They were all involved in the rapidly expanding socialist movement at the same time, which allowed for a constant tight connection between theory and practice to shape their work.

Though there was no widespread socialist movement in Russia at the time, Plekhanov's idea of Marxism as a philosophical worldview, which Lenin inherited, greatly influenced the intellectual movement that it became. Out of this matrix emerged the notion of instilling the populace with a "socialist consciousness" from outside and the development of the Bolshevik ideology, which placed an emphasis on the crucial function of a well-organized revolutionary party and eventually became the ideology of the Soviet state.

DISCUSSION

Marxism Between the Two World Wars

The First World War and the Russian Revolution fundamentally altered the circumstances that would shape Marxist ideology moving forward. The start of the war was seen as a confirmation of the theories of imperialism advanced by Hilferding, Bukharin, and Lenin, but it also exposed the frailty of the working-class movement in Western Europe in the face of nationalism and sowed deep divisions within the German Social Democratic Party, which by the end of the war and following the suppression of revolutionary uprisings in 1918–19 had lost its former dominance as the epicenter of Marxist thought and practice to the Bols However, the war itself increased state intervention in the economies of the combatants, and it appeared to many Western Marxists of a more gradualist persuasion to open up new possibilities for a socialist transition, raising new concerns about how that transition would be carried out and what shape a socialist economy would take. But in a number of ways, the Russian Revolution was the event that had the biggest influence on Marxist theory. First and foremost, Soviet Marxists had to deal with the practical challenges of building a socialist society. In the 1920s, there were heated discussions about the policies of the transitional period, particularly the urgent need for rapid industrialization of a backward agrarian society as a problem that Marxists in industrially advanced nations had never had to deal with. These concerns left a lasting impression on Soviet Marxism that became one of its defining traits [9], [10].

Second, the Bolsheviks' brand of Marxism gained unique significance as a result of their achievement in creating the "first workers' state" in contrast to the socialist movements' failure elsewhere in Europe. Following the establishment of distinct communist parties and the Third International, Marxism was sharply split into two main streams, much like the working-class movement itself. As Stalin solidified his dictatorship, Soviet Marxism evolved into a comprehensive worldview and, to a greater and greater extent, into a dogmatic state ideology that was imposed by the 'vanguard party' and its leaders and that forbade any critical reflection or debate. It was influenced by the legacies of Plekhanov and Lenin as well as by the unique socioeconomic circumstances of Russia. Following the Great Depression and the rise of fascism in the capitalist world, Marxist thought was then largely associated with Soviet Marxism in the 1930s. This ideology was widely disseminated through the Third International and its affiliated parties, and it gained political sway.

However, outside of the Soviet Union, Marxism continued to develop in more varied, open, and critical ways in response to new issues, such as the 1920s' apparent stabilization of capitalism, the Soviet Union's growing bureaucracy and totalitarianism, the 1930s' economic depression, the rise of the fascist states, and the resurgence of the threat of war. Because of the dominance of large corporations and banks and the increased state involvement in the regulation of economic life, Hilferding defined the changes in capitalism during and after the war as a development of "organized capitalism," which is characterized by an expansion of economic planning. Although later, after the experiences of National Socialism in Germany and Stalinism in the Soviet Union, he recognized that the process could well lead, and in these cases had led, to a totalitarian society, he still thought of this ongoing "socialization of the economy" as a further stage in the transition to socialism; in his last work, he began a systematic revision of the Marxist theory of the state. Others, such as Gramsci, Trotsky, and Bauer, examined the economic and social factors that had enabled the rise of fascism. Neumann published a significant analysis of National

Socialist Germany as a system of "totalitarian monopoly capitalism," and research into the psychological underpinnings of fascist movements also got underway.

Although there are two main currents of thought, there were a variety of ways that Western Marxists interpreted fascism and the interwar period in general. The social democratic Marxists were largely devoted to a conception of the transition to socialism as a gradual, evolutionary, and mostly peaceful process coming out of the economic growth of capitalism itself, but acknowledging that the fascist regimes had to be resisted by force. However, the versions of Marxism that presented it as a scientific theory of society were rejected by those Marxists who belonged to the new communist parties, most notably Korsch, Lukács, and Gramsci. As a result, they emphasized the factor of consciousness in the working-class movement, which led them to emphasize the crucial role of revolutionary intellectuals in creating a socialist worldview. However, he later disowned the "revolutionary, utopian messianism" expressed in this book and his later work was primarily focused on literary criticism and aesthetic theory. Lukács had intended for this to give the working class a true insight into the historical process, or a "correct class consciousness." Gramsci also saw the socialist worldview as a collection of theories and convictions developed by the intellectuals of a progressive class, which was necessary if the class was to gain political dominance, social and cultural hegemony, and start the process of creating a new social structure.

A group of intellectuals connected to the Frankfurt Institute of Social Research developed a comparable understanding of Marxist theory, first inspired by the works of Korsch and Lukács, which ultimately bloomed luxuriantly into the Frankfurt school of "critical theory." Horkheimer, Marcuse, and Adorno, who were most closely associated with the Institute in the 1930s, gave Marxist thought a distinctive academic orientation. They were disengaged from any direct participation in political action and grew increasingly doubtful of the working class' ability to effect social change in Western capitalist societies. Their critical research focused primarily on bourgeois culture, particularly as it appeared in positivism and empiricism in modern philosophy as well as in the social sciences as "traditional theory," which they interpreted as the implicit or explicit viewpoint of contemporary natural sciences. However, by 1939, many of these Western Marxist intellectuals had either passed away or had fled to exile, and Soviet Marxism had even more thoroughly taken over the European scene. Their theories didn't start to have an impact on a new intellectual renaissance of Marxism until two or three decades later [11].

CONCLUSION

Traditional social structures like the family, church, and community are also emphasized by conservative capitalism, which contends that these institutions provide crucial moral and social direction required for a vibrant society. The focus on traditional societal norms is criticized for having an exclusionary effect and for limiting possibilities for vulnerable groups. An additional essential component of conservative capitalism is the conviction in personal accountability and independence. Conservatives contend that instead of depending on government assistance or intervention, people should be in charge of their own economic success. Policies like low taxes, scaled-back social welfare programs, and little government regulation often reflect this viewpoint. Conservative capitalism has its detractors who claim that it may result in severe economic disparity and a lack of assistance for the weaker sections of society. They claim that it can be overly skeptical of government intervention, especially in areas like consumer safety and environmental protection.

REFERENCES:

[1] A. M. Fischer, 'The Dark Sides of Social Policy: From Neoliberalism to Resurgent Right-wing Populism', *Dev. Change*, 2020, doi: 10.1111/dech.12577.

[2] S. Hakemy, *Capitalism and Freedom*. 2017. doi: 10.4324/9781912281107.

[3] I. Lindberg, G. Ågren, and C. Hogstedt, 'The rise, decline, and future of the swedish left', *International Journal of Health Services*. 2011. doi: 10.2190/HS.41.4.h.

[4] H. B. Jones, A. Furnhamb, and A. J. Deilea, 'Religious orientation and the Protestant Work Ethic', *Ment. Heal. Relig. Cult.*, 2010, doi: 10.1080/13674670802111862.

[5] A. R. Hall, 'Critical Reflections on Donor Influence and the Role of Critical Communication Pedagogies in the Classroom. Wicked Problems Forum: Undue Donor Influence in Higher Education', *Communication Education*. 2020.

[6] D. Nicol, '"Bad Business": Capitalism and Criminality in Agatha Christie's Novels', *Entertain. Sport. Law J.*, 2019, doi: 10.16997/eslj.230.

[7] S. M. A. De Moraes and R. C. Martins, 'A degradação social do trabalho e da natureza no contexto da monocultura canavieira paulista', *Sociologias*, 2010, doi: 10.1590/s1517-45222010000200008.

[8] P. Thomas, 'Selling God/saving souls: Religious commodities, spiritual markets and the media', *Global Media and Communication*. 2009. doi: 10.1177/1742766508101314.

[9] J. Nevers, 'The First World War and the Regulatory State: Danish experiences and expectations', *Scand. J. Hist.*, 2019, doi: 10.1080/03468755.2019.1582436.

[10] S. K. Thomas, ' Tim McCaskell, Queer Progress: From Homophobia to Homonationalism ', *Somatechnics*, 2017, doi: 10.3366/soma.2017.0226.

[11] C. Bernardi, 'When status broke the "color line". Capitalism, labour and conflicts on mexican migration in arizona (1960s–1970s)', *Iberoam. - Nord. J. Lat. Am. Caribb. Stud.*, 2020, doi: 10.16993/iberoamericana.488.

CHAPTER 13

A BRIEF DISCUSSION ON POLITICAL FASCISM

Manoj Agarwal, Associate Professor
Teerthanker Mahaveer Institute of Management and Technology, Teerthanker Mahaveer University,
Moradabad, Uttar Pradesh, India
Email id-agarwalmanoj21@gmail.com

ABSTRACT:

Political fascism is an authoritarian political ideology that emerged in the early 20th century. Fascism emphasizes the importance of a strong, centralized government led by a charismatic leader who embodies the values and ideals of the nation. Fascists often advocate for extreme nationalism, racism, and militarism, and reject liberal democracy and individual rights. Fascism emerged in Italy under the leadership of Benito Mussolini in the 1920s, and quickly spread to other countries, including Germany under the leadership of Adolf Hitler. Fascist regimes typically prioritize the interests of the nation or the race over the interests of the individual, and often employ violence and repression to suppress political opposition and dissent.

KEYWORDS:

Corporatism, Dictatorship, Fascism, Totalitarianism, Nationalism, Propaganda.

INTRODUCTION

Marxist philosophy could only emerge in a drastically changed environment as a result of the Second World War and its aftermath. The creation of Stalinist governments in the nations of Eastern Europe increased the geographic region where Soviet Marxism almost ruled unopposed, albeit this absolute supremacy was fleeting. Early on, Yugoslavia broke away from the Soviet Union, enacted a novel system of economic and social organization based on workers' self-management, and started to formulate its own brand of Marxist theory, centered on the Praxis group of sociologists and philosophers, which shared many similarities and close ties with some varieties of Western Marxism. After Stalin's death, there were numerous uprisings against the Stalinist system in other parts of Eastern Europe, which led to an increase in dissident Marxist thought that was partly influenced by Western Marxism. There was also more interaction with Western philosophy and social science [1]–[3].

Marxist philosophy expanded faster outside of the Soviet Union than it had ever done since the turn of the century. The socialist and communist parties in Western Europe were at their strongest during the immediate post-war period, and Marxist ideas were widely accepted in both political and cultural movements as well as, for the first time, in academic social sciences, philosophy, and the humanities. A new strain of existentialist Marxism influenced by Sartre fiercely opposed the Stalinist aspects of Marxism that were still present in certain circles, most notably the French Communist Party. After the Hungarian uprising in 1956 and the rise of the "New Left," Western Marxism as a whole, in all of its varied forms, became more and more critical of the traditional Soviet version, both as a social theory and as a political doctrine. The pre-war publications of

Lukács, Gramsci, and the Frankfurt Institute members started to be read by a larger audience starting in the late 1950s, but this readership was now largely academic. With the exception of Italy, where Gramsci's writings significantly influenced the Communist Party's outlook, and to a lesser extent Austria, where Austro-Marxism still had some sway over the Socialist Party, Marxist thought spread most quickly in universities and during the late 1960s student movement. For the first time in Western Europe, Marxist theory took center stage in academic education, gaining prominence not only in the long-established fields of history, sociology, and political science, but also in economics, anthropology, philosophy, and aesthetics. The Economic and Philosophical Manuscripts, which encouraged widespread discussion of the concept of "alienation" by philosophers and sociologists, and the Grundrisse, which proposed new conceptions of the process of development of capitalist society, were two of Marx's lesser-known writings that were given new attention as a result of this efflorescence.

Numerous concepts that were recently discovered in these Marxian texts were closely related to the concerns of Lukács, Gramsci, and the Frankfurt school. For a time, as a result of these various influences, Marxist thought in one of its significant manifestations became primarily a critique of bourgeois culture as a "reified" system of thought, which the Frankfurt school claimed was composed of a positivist, scientific, and technological world view. Following in this tradition, the next generation of Marxists were concerned with bourgeois thought-forms, which sparked vigorous methodological discussions that focused on issues with knowledge theory and scientific philosophy. Thus, Habermas attempted to establish an epistemological foundation for critical theory in his earlier writings while continuing to criticize positivism in the social sciences. Later, he created a theory of communicative action that highlights the contribution of language and communication to social evolution and restates the Frankfurt School thesis that technological or instrumental rationality dominates modern societies, in contrast to the role of practical reason in the social "life-world." In Habermas's focus on cultural phenomena such as rationality, legitimation, and modernism, there is an obvious continuity with the critical theory of Adorno and Horkheimer, but there is also a partial return to Marxist themes like class, the economic development of capitalism, and the role of the state that had largely disappeared from critical theory by the late 1960s.

Despite the wide variations among individual thinkers, the type of Marxist thought that was influenced by Lukács, Gramsci, the Frankfurt school, the Praxis group, and existentialism can be broadly characterized as "humanist" in the sense that it was primarily focused on exploring human consciousness, interpreting cultural artifacts, and challenging ideologies. However, this was not the only form of Western Marxism to flourish in the years following World War II. A more empirical, and in a broad sense positivist, approach predominated in economics, as well as to some extent in other social sciences, and research was focused on issues like the post-war development of the capitalist economy, the class structure, and the challenges of Third World development in relation to international capitalism. Through the work of Althusser, who argued that Marx, after his early "humanist" period, eliminated the human subject from social theory and constructed a "new science" of the levels of human practice which are inscribed in the structure of a social totality, structuralist ideas that were already influential in linguistics and anthropology were introduced, strengthening this orientation of Marxist thought.

Since the goal of Marxist theory in its developed form is to reveal the "deep structure" that underlies and generates the directly observable phenomena of social life, it is understood to be concerned with the structural analysis of social totalities. The main goal of Althusser was to

establish the'scientificity' of Marxism on the basis of a theory of knowledge and science. The new conception of theory that he developed had an impact on the social sciences in a variety of areas, such as research on pre-capitalist societies and the class system in capitalist societies. Althusser's influence rapidly diminished in the 1980s as a result of his conception of Marxism as a science, which was also harshly criticized for both its complete exclusion of human agency from social life's processes and for an extreme anti-empiricism that reduced knowledge to a purely theoretical, self-contained entity. The realist philosophy of science, which holds that there is an underlying structure to social life that has 'causal powers' but is mediated by human consciousness in the creation of its effects, has, however, developed the idea of Marxism as a 'natural science of society' in a more discriminating manner during this time.

Concerns with Marxism Today

Two significant splits in Marxist thought have persisted over the past few decades: one between Soviet and Western Marxism, though the former has by this point lost most of its sway and much of its distinctiveness; and, more significantly, one between the broad and somewhat overlapping categories of "humanist" and "scientific" Marxism. Marxism has also expanded in scope and diffuseness, making it more difficult to define its bounds and to determine how it relates to the social developments of the late 20th century. Marxism has largely turned into an academic "subject" and a source of intense intellectual debate in the current climate, while its effect on social and political movements has drastically decreased. The influence of other theoretical and philosophical views, which have always been present to some extent as evidenced by its engagement with positivism, Hegelianism, phenomenology, existentialism, and structuralism at various points in time, has increased to the point where it can be suggested, for example, that "the concept of Marxism as a se" has become increasingly involved with more general debates in the social sciences and the philosophy of science. The alternative, of course, is that Marxism will incorporate some of their ideas as it engages with other theories, reinvigorating itself as one of the most potent explanatory frameworks ever developed in the social sciences. To provide a convincing analysis of the long-term development of capitalist economies, which have been conceptualized in a variety of ways as "organized capitalism," "state monopoly capitalism," or "corporatism," and most recently in terms of the neo-Marxist approach of "regulation theory," is one of the most difficult challenges facing any revived Marxist social theory [4]–[6].

Marxism, however, has historically served as both a social theory and a political philosophy, and the two components were intertwined during the time when Marxist thinking supplied the framework for the mass socialist and communist parties. This political function has greatly diminished in modern times. Marxism no longer makes up most of the socialist or social democratic parties' doctrines or political platforms in the West, and in the once Soviet-dominated area, political discourse has diverged significantly from its Marxist framework in recent years. The current debates about democracy and political pluralism have little in common with Marxism, but what they do highlight as a major gap in Marxist political thought is the lack of a systematic analysis of the concept and practice of democracy, particularly what socialist democracy entails.

It is not possible to describe modern Marxist thinking as a highly definite, homogeneous, and clearly stated theory of human society and history since it has an ephemeral nature that spreads into, absorbs from, and contributes to many other forms of social thought. However, as a very inclusive and adaptable paradigm, it continues to have a significant impact on humanities and

social sciences research, and in this indirect manner, it may also have a sporadic impact on political action. However, its influence as a worldview that directly motivates a distinctive political doctrine has undeniably diminished, not least because the circumstances and issues facing human societies in the late 20th century are so very different from those at the time that Marx developed his main ideas and his early followers developed them into a thorough framework of theory and practice.

DISCUSSION

One of the most contentious political phenomena of the 20th century has been fascism, mostly due to the total lack of any consensus over the meaning of the word itself or the larger political processes to which it refers. Fascism is regularly used as a disparaging term to describe a broad range of political actions. It has been linked by detractors at various points to almost all of the main movements, especially the more extreme ones, whether on the right or the left.

The Fasci Italiani di Combattimento, a radical nationalist group founded by Benito Mussolini and others in 1919, is credited with coining the phrase. Fascio, which in Italian means "bundle" or "union," was a term used to refer to a variety of new political organizations, especially those that were more radical in nature. The Partito Nazionale Fascista, or Fascist Party for short, was formed from the Fasci Italiani di Combattimento two years later, in 1921, turning the original substantive into an adjective. The first and most representative "fascist regime" was established when fascist leader Mussolini was elected prime minister of Italy in October 1922. In 1925, he changed his administration to a one-party dictatorship.

However, a growing tendency to generalize beyond the Italian example and use the term fascist or fascism to describe any right-wing authoritarian movement or system emerged as early as 1923. Therefore, the general trend was to label any kind of non-leftist authoritarianism as fascist, while competing left-wing movements, especially Soviet Stalinists, started using the term to refer to leftist competitors. By the 1930s, the word "fascist" was sometimes reduced to being nothing more than a derogatory slur used to describe political rivals, and this categorical but ambiguous sense has persisted to the present [7]–[9].

Despite the ambiguity, a small consensus has developed among some of the top experts on fascism, who use the term to refer to the specific historical phenomena of a group of radical nationalist movements that emerged in Europe between the two World Wars, first in the Italian Fascist and German National Socialist movements, and then among their numerous counterparts in other European countries. According to the general view, particular movements with the same traits did not exist before 1919 and did not materialize in any appreciable way outside of Europe or during the years after 1945. However, there is still debate among academics about whether the various allegedly fascist movements in interwar Europe can be considered as a single, generic phenomenon or whether their differences necessitate only discussing them separately. The former perspective, which views fascism as a more widespread phenomena than just an Italian or German political shape, tends to be supported by the majority of opinion today.

A effective definition of fascism as a generic concept must be able to distinguish fascist movements from other political phenomena while simultaneously defining the shared distinctive traits of all fascistic movements in Europe throughout the 1920s and 1930s. Such comprehension must include fundamental elements like:

1. The standard fascist negations

2. fascist ideology and objectives; and

3. The relative originality of fascist structure and style.

Fascism opposed almost all of the pre-existing political sectors, including the left, right, and center, in an effort to assert a novel new identity and claim new political territory. It was thus anti-liberal, anti-communist, and anti-conservative, however fascists shown a willingness to form short-term coalitions with right-wing organizations, which in part lessened its anti-conservatism.

Fascist movements are the most extreme and radical manifestation of nationalism that contemporary Europe has ever seen in terms of ideology and political objectives. They wanted to establish new nationalist, authoritarian states that weren't only based on conventional ideas or models. Although fascist groups had very different economic objectives, they all shared the desire to create a new, regulated, multi-class, integrated national economic structure. These structures were variously referred to as national corporatist, national socialist, or national syndicalist. All fascist movements sought to either strengthen the nation's position in the world or at the very least, drastically alter how it interacted with other countries. Their doctrines typically involved an effort to develop a fresh take on contemporary self-determined secular doctrine and were founded on a philosophy of idealism, vitalism, and voluntarism.

The movement's originality was most clearly represented in the way it was structured and carried out. The artistic organization of meetings, symbolism, and political choreography were heavily emphasized, depending particularly on romantic and mystical elements. With the intention of creating a large-scale party militia, all fascist groups sought to accomplish mass mobilization as well as the militarization of political relationships and behavior. Fascists, in contrast to certain other radical groups, actively favored the use of violence and emphasized the idea of masculine domination. While promoting an organic view of society, they fervently supported a new elitism that elevated youth above other stages of life. Fascist groups showed a particular propensity for an authoritarian, charismatic, and personal style of command.

A small group of military veterans, ex-socialists, former revolutionary syndicalists, and Futurist cultural avant-gardists formed the Italian Fascist organization in Milan in May 1919. As it adopted a sophisticated "leftist" nationalist program at the time, it initially struggled to garner a significant following. Only at the end of 1920, when it extended into the north Italian countryside and launched an offensive against the Socialist Party there, did fascism become a widespread movement. The Socialists were first condemned by fascists for their internationalism rather than their economics, but the movement gradually turned right on economic matters as well. Conservatives who feared socialism found the fascists appealing as shock soldiers, and the fascists themselves appealed to almost all sections of society as the sole new national movement unencumbered by the past or by class interests. Mussolini led the infamous "March on Rome" in October 1922, which persuaded the King to install him as constitutional prime minister when the legislative system reached a standstill. The two years that followed saw a rise in authoritarianism as well as a lack of clarity on the structure of a Fascist government. In January 1925, Mussolini finally erected a direct political dictatorship after significant deliberation.

Then, from 1925 to 1929, the new fascist government was built. Even though the Mussolini rule was far from a complete dictatorship, it accepted the idea of the "totalitarian state." Its influence

was mostly restricted to the political arena. Many facets of the Italian Constitution were still in effect, and the King, not Mussolini, continued to be the head of state. A new concordat was made with the Roman Catholic Church, elite segments of society were left unmolested, the economic system enjoyed significant flexibility, the military maintained some administrative autonomy, and there was relatively little cultural control. The government set up and ran a system of national syndicates, subsequently known as national companies, to control economic activities, although in reality business and management had a great deal of autonomy. In 1928, a new "corporate chamber" that was made up of members picked by political and business organizations rather than by direct nomination and vote, took the role of Parliament itself. The Italian society seemed to embrace the new rule, which heralded itself as the alternative to the traditional left and right, during the majority of the 1920s while the economy flourished.

In spite of the fact that fascists also claimed to be revolutionaries and empire builders, Mussolini lacked the will to carry out a thorough social or institutional change. Instead of having full authority over it, as in the Soviet Union, the Fascist Party itself was reduced to a small bureaucracy and subjected to the ordinary government administration. Thus, rather than operating as a fully totalitarian regime, the fascist regime was more like a limited or semi-pluralist dictatorship. Mussolini relied more on the expansion of state administrative agencies to restore economic stability during the 1930s downturn than he did on the new national businesses. Despite widespread promotion, there was also no educational revolution.

Mussolini was more gripped by a kind of megalomania and his personal myth of the "Duce" while being conscious that he had failed to bring about a genuine revolution. He was confident that the invasion of Ethiopia in 1935 would be the start of a new African and Mediterranean empire, which would make Fascism great. He thought that a new Fascist culture and the Fascist "new man" would emerge following the establishment of a new empire and another generation of Fascist supremacy in Italy.

Although the term "fascism" originated with Italian fascism, most commentators refer to Adolf Hitler's National Socialist movement in Germany, whose character and history were in many important ways very different. While the process of turning Italian fascism into a significant mass movement took little more than two years, it took more than ten years in Germany. Numerous other small radical nationalist and rightist organizations had to contend with Hitler's original National Socialist German Workers' Party. It had to spend 10 years creating a strong party structure and a sizable following after making only one unsuccessful attempt at taking office in 1923. The Depression, a severe political and economic catastrophe that threatened to further destabilize German society in the wake of the horrors of the First World War and the early post-war years, provided it with a golden chance.

By 1932, the "Nazis," as they came to be called after the German pronunciation of the first two syllables of "National," had overtaken all other political parties in Germany. This was largely due to their campaign of making inconsistent promises to various segments of German society. They presented themselves as the only potent national force capable of reuniting a fractured, ailing nation and restoring security and prosperity. Adolf Hitler was elected Chancellor on January 30, 1933, using the same legal and constitutional procedures as Mussolini, with the backing of the majority of Nazis and other right-wingers in the parliament.

By taking over the German presidency in the middle of 1934, Hitler proceeded to build a full-fledged political dictatorship within just six months. He also became the official head of state. To

increase Hitler's authority, the majority of German institutions undertook a broad Gleichschaltung, often known as "coordination." The German dictatorship developed into one that was both more effective and thorough than the Italian one, but in Germany the focus was also on political power inside the government rather than on comprehensive institutional or social upheaval. A new "people's community" of shared interests was established by the Nazis, with formal equality of rank but differentiation and subordination of social roles. Similar to Fascist Italy, the majority of the nation's social and economic structure was preserved, and the concept of private property was usually upheld.

Hitler, on the other hand, had certain fundamental purposes in mind from the early 1920s forward, but Mussolini had significant trouble formulating a totally cohesive program or even identifying his own ambitions. Aryanism, also known as Nordicism, was a racial theory that served as the foundation of Hitlerian dogma. It reduced all values and accomplishments to racial standards and held that the Nordic race was inherently superior. Hitler believed that in order for the genuine Nordic master race to flourish, it needed to be granted its own "space," which meant claiming Lebensraum in eastern Europe. The true Nazi revolution, which in Hitler's opinion was not a social, economic, or even cultural revolution, but an actual racial and biological revolution to purge the German race of inferior elements and create the new breed of "supermen," could only occur after a successful war to dominate most of Europe. This strange worldview, which was based on race and conflict and was essentially a kind of global social Darwinism, took precedence over economic and political ideologies. Hitler believed that because only a victorious war could establish the circumstances for a racial revolution, war must come before revolution.

The first four years of Hitler's rule, from 1933 to 1944, saw some strained ties with Italy. The Nazi ideology's extreme racial inclinations and the lower status of south Europeans in it were both well known to fascists. Hitler, however, was the only prominent figure in Europe to endorse Italy's invasion of Ethiopia and saw Mussolini as the only other European dictator who shared his views. Italian interests in the Mediterranean and Africa, neither of which were the main goals of German expansion, made him believe that Germany and Italy were natural partners.

In the Spanish Civil War of 1936, both Germany and Italy intervened on behalf of the right-wing Spanish Nationalists. They originally created the "Rome-Berlin Axis" in October of that year, an informal agreement intended for mutual consultation and cooperation. By 1937, Mussolini had surrendered to Hitler, his hatred of Germany motivated by a mix of jealousy and terror. He carried out a partial and superficial "Nazification" of Italian fascism in 1938, introducing the goose step and a new theory of "Italian racism," since he was certain that a militarily strong Germany would soon control Europe. Although this belated doctrine defined the Italian race as the result of history and culture, rather than mere biology as in the Nazi scheme, it was still a feeble attempt to create a special place for the Italian 'race' in the new racial order.

Mussolini didn't join the Second World War until June 1940, just before France was overthrown. Then, in an effort to establish an independent Italian sphere of power, he tried to start his own "parallel war" in Africa and the Balkans. Mussolini quickly suffered a crushing loss in this, and by 1941, he had ally status with Hitler. He was toppled in July 1943 by a combination of the Italian Crown, the military, and dissident Fascists when the war hit Italy square in the face. In a failed effort to garner support for a return to the semi-collectivist ideologies of early radical Fascism, Mussolini, who had been saved by German commandos, governed a new 'Italian Social Republic' in German-occupied northern Italy from 1944 until 1955.

Hitler's personal objectives were to rule practically all of continental Europe, which would allow Germany to finish the racial revolution and ultimately rule the whole globe. Hitler invaded the Soviet Union in 1941, vowing a specific "war of racial extermination" for the ultimate conquest of Lebensraum, after France had fallen to him.The "Final Solution" for the eradication of European Jewry, the most heinous of Nazi programs, also occurred at the same time. In Hitlerian doctrine, Jews were defined as a malevolent "anti-race" of parasites committed to racial pollution and the eradication of all genuine culture. They were seen as the arch-enemy of the Nordic race and of all true races. Hitler came to think that the only way to make the world safe for the development of a master race was to completely eradicate all Jews. This process had started as early as 1939–1940, but two years later it ultimately took the shape of mass extermination camps. Nearly six million Jews had been wiped out by the time the war was over and Nazism was overthrown, making it the largest single act of deliberate genocide in human history. Fascist-type movements emerged in practically all of the European nations throughout the 1930s, as well as in other areas of the globe. However, German Nazism was by far the most powerful and important variation of what historical analysts often refer to as "generic fascism." Due to fascism's extreme beliefs' lack of appeal in most nations and situations, the vast majority of these fascist-like groups were total failures. By the late 1930s, there were a lot more anti-fascists than fascists in all of Europe.

Nevertheless, at least four additional fascist movements received significant public support and are worth a quick mention. For instance, the Hungarian Arrow Cross movement was the only other fascist-like organization to match German National Socialism in terms of public popularity. The Arrow Cross may have retained close to 35% of the vote in the Hungarian elections seven years after the Nazis won 38% of the popular vote in Germany in 1932. Because of the trauma of the First World War and the disproportionately larger loss of land and people in Hungary than anyplace else, there were proportionally more diverse fascist parties and organizations than in any other nation in the world. If anything, the sense of hurt nationalism was more stronger than it was in Germany. Ferenc Szalasi's Arrow Cross movement, which advocated a higher level of social collectivism and economic reform than many other fascist organizations, was particularly popular among workers and impoverished peasants. Szalasi wanted to create a "Greater Danubian Federation" with Hungary as its leader, although he did not personally support violence and war to the same degree that Hitler and Mussolini did. However, after the German military had occupied Hungary in 1944, Hitler finally installed the strongly anti-Semitic Arrow Cross. Although drastic political and economic changes were imposed, there was not enough time during the few brief months of Arrow Cross rule that followed before the Soviet military invasion.

In Romania, Corneliu Zelea Codreanu's Legionary, or Iron Guard, movement rose to prominence in the late 1930s. Romania was economically poor and politically split despite being one of the war's winners. The Legionary movement began with the backing of college students and soon gained a sizable following among impoverished peasants. In contrast to other fascists, Iron Guardists placed a heavy focus on religion, passionately endorsing Romanian Orthodoxy as vital to the wellbeing of the country. However, the Legionaries had no real agenda; their aim was to create the "Omul Nou," or "new man," through radical nationalist and religious culture. Even though it was unclear how these interests were to be expressed and organized, the current government and elite were to be overthrown in favor of the interests of the average Romanian. However, the movement was eventually integrated into the government in 1940 when General

Mihai Antonescu overthrew the monarchy and installed a new dictatorship. Codreanu and the top Legionary leaders were murdered by the government police in 1938. The Romanian army swiftly routed the Guardists' subsequent, futile effort to gain complete control in January 1941, dealing them a blow from which they never fully recovered.

However, the Franco regime also had a strong Catholic and cultural traditionalism foundation and carried out a broad right-wing neo-traditionalist revival. Given the strong anti-Falangist sentiment among many Catholics and right-wingers, Franco took care to curtail the influence of the new state party. The 'defascistization' of Franco's rule began in 1943, when it was beginning to seem unlikely that Hitler would win the war. When the Falange was severely degraded and the government was rebuilt as a "Catholic corporatist" system of "organic democracy," this was quickly expanded in 1945 after the war. Defascistization really became a constant and continuing aspect of the system, which changed gradually and chameleon-like. In 1958, the Twenty-six Points had been replaced with nine trite "Principles of the Movement," a collection of clichés about the country, its unity, and family values after a failed effort by moderate Falangists to mount a return in 1956. The quasi-fascist elements of Franco's government that existed at the time of his death in 1975 were long gone.

The dual rightist/fascist nature of the early Franco government offers a compelling illustration of both the possible convergence and divergence of fascist and radical right forces. Although the two industries shared many similarities, they were also distinct and had unique characteristics in almost every European nation. As revolutionary leftist movements displayed some of the fascists' organizational and stylistic traits, radical rightist movements shared some of their political objectives. However, the fascists were distinct from the radical right in that they rejected both the left's internationalism, egalitarianism, and materialist socialism as well as the radical right's cultural and economic conservatism and specific social elitism. Once it is realized that significant political movements with all and not just some of the traits of fascism existed only in Europe between 1915 and 1945, it is easier to understand the historical singularity of fascism.

Fascism was attempted to be emulated outside of Europe throughout the 1930s in places including China, Japan, southern Asia, South Africa, Latin America, and even the United States. These non-European ideas failed to win widespread support or political success. Fascism was an odd mix of strong nationalism and cultural and social radicalism that neither grew in the soil of non-European democracies nor in more conventional and backward countries abroad. Only a few fascist characteristics were embraced by imperial Japan during its extensive war effort from 1937 to 1945. In 1942, parliamentary elections were conducted, and the country's legal and institutional structure remained largely unaltered. Japan, where traditional elites and the military supplied authority, never adopted a single-party system.

The broad masses, in instance, were said to be the classes of national society that fascists claimed to represent. On the other hand, Marxists said that they were nothing more than a weapon of the bourgeoisie's most aggressive, monopolistic, and reactionary elements. Evidence from actual studies does not support any of these extreme views. Fascist organizations sometimes attracted their early supporters from tiny groups of the radical elite, including in certain instances university students and former military personnel. Although some fascist movements received some support from the upper bourgeoisie, the lower middle class, on the whole, was the largest source of fascist support. The same may have been said for several other political organizations, since this was one of the greatest social strata in Europe throughout the 1920s and 1930s. A

majority of the party members in both Germany and Italy came from the urban working class. University students and impoverished peasants provided the main support in Hungary and Romania, and there was also significant agricultural support in certain regions of Italy.

Since 1923, a dizzying array of hypotheses and analyses have been put forward to understand fascism. One of the most prevalent schools of thought is that this event was the result of certain economic forces or interests, or of particular social groupings, such as large business, the bourgeoisie, or the petite bourgeoisie. These theories of socio-economic causation are predominantly of Marxist influence. In a second group of ideas, psychocultural motives are highlighted in relation to certain personality theories or school of social psychology. A different strategy has emerged from modernization theory, which contends that fascism is closely tied to a certain stage of modern development. Fascism, on the other hand, is sometimes cited by totalitarian theory proponents as a key component of the larger phenomena of twentieth-century totalitarianism. However, the approaches that are most adaptable and successful are historicist in nature and use multiple causal explanations to account for the major aspects of European historical development, particularly its key variations in various countries, during the early twentieth century.

A historicist approach would explain fascism by seeking to identify crucial historical factors that were shared by those national contexts that gave rise to strong fascist groups in diverse nations. Key distinctions in the national situation, political issues, cultural trends, economic challenges, and social structure should be identified by these criteria. The common factor in terms of national condition was often one of extreme status deprivation or nationalist aspirations being severely frustrated. In terms of purely political conditions, powerful fascist groups emerged in certain nations when they were starting, or had just started, the challenging transition to direct democracy. The main cultural milieu variable likely had to do with how much rationalism and materialism were accepted, as opposed to idealism and vitalism, the latter of which were considerably more conducive to fascist.

Only in nations that were going through severe economic hardships could fascism also flourish to a substantial extent, although the nature of those hardships varied greatly depending on the country from highly industrialized Germany to very backward Romania. The widespread perception that issues were national in scope but maybe vaguely international in origin was probably the most prevalent characteristic of the economic factors involved. Different syndromes may be seen in terms of social mobilization, but the most prevalent factor involved widespread discontent among young people and the lower middle class in general. However, for fascist movements to gain a solid mass base, this discontent had to spread somewhat further into the lower classes. Once again, none of the aforementioned factors not one, not two, nor even three were sufficient to result in a sizable fascist movement. Conditions were only favorable in the select few nations when all five factors were present roughly at the same time.

Because the political victories of fascist movements were few, it was primarily due to Nazi Germany's military expansion that fascism briefly became a significant force in Europe. Similar to how fascism was doomed to political oblivion by Germany and Italy's total loss in the Second World War, it was impossible for fascist groups to become powerful political powers after 1945. Above all, the association of fascist-style policies with Nazi Germany's militarism and mass murder fundamentally damaged their reputation among succeeding generations. Fascism did not, however, totally disappear in 1945. Numerous attempts have been made to revive fascism, and

during the second half of the 20th century, hundreds of small-scale grouplets, typically less significant than the previous, emerged. Although these groups have a strong presence in western Europe, they are also widespread in North and South America and other regions of the world. Neo-fascist parties are often radical protest groups that operate outside of politics and struggle to gain support. The'skinhead' white racist movement of the late 1980s is one recent example of how such organizations have a history of extreme racism in the United States and in other European nations, including France. The lone movement in Germany that attempted to some degree to capitalize on the Nazi legacy fell short of mobilizing 2% of the electorate. The "Italian Social Movement," the main Italian successor to the old Fascist Party, has been the most successful neo-fascist organization, nonetheless. In a few regions of Italy, the MSI received 6% or more of the vote in local elections as it attempted to modernize and update fascist philosophy in a more moderate and intelligent manner. Though it is unlikely that the specific manifestations of early 20th-century European fascism can be successfully revived, worried enemies occasionally do so. Similar to how the late twentieth-century era of international interdependence appears to rule out war among the major European and industrial nations, widespread cultural, psychological, educational, and economic changes have made the resurgence of something as murderous as Nazism in a large industrial nation almost impossible. Extreme viewpoints and any appeal to populist, irrational politics are discouraged by the dominant culture of materialism and consumerism.

In various Third World nations vs the West, movements and governments with the greatest resemblance to specific fascist elements emerged in the latter part of the 20th century. More than a few governments in Afro-Asian nations have propagated their own versions of national socialism or national corporatism, as well as using elitism and violence, as well as ideologies of mysticism and idealism, in some cases. Nationalist regimes of one-party dictatorship have been common. 'Cult of personality' and charismatic dictatorships have sometimes been effective there as well, such that more distinct fascist traits have recently played a significant role in Africa and Asia than in the West. The nationalist movements and dictatorships of the Third World have also developed distinctive identities and profiles of their own, and in no way have they literally copied or revived the fascist movements and regimes of Europe. Nevertheless, it is not possible to refer to more than specific features and tendencies.

When some commentators speculate about the "return of fascism," they are referring to the emergence of new forms of authoritarianism and dictatorship, which is a rather different question, rather than the revival of the specific forms of early twentieth-century European fascism and Nazism. There are several manifestations of the "authoritarianism temptation" in various sorts of radical politics. Although it is unlikely, the emergence of new modern dictatorships in significant Western nations cannot entirely be ruled out. To avoid becoming a literal return to the past, any new authoritarianism in the 1990s would have to acquire certain traits fit for its own period [10], [11].

CONCLUSION

The focus placed on unity, discipline, and order as well as the rejection of liberal democracy and individuality are often used to describe fascism. Fascists often contend that strong, centralized leadership is required to maintain social stability and national cohesion since democracy is frail and ineffectual. Fascism is criticized on the grounds that it often results in repression, brutality, and genocide and is inherently incompatible with liberal democracy and human rights. The focus

on militarism and aggressiveness, which may result in war and conflict, is another thing they condemn about fascist governments. Fascism continues to be a powerful political philosophy despite these accusations, having supporters and movements in several nations all over the globe. Far-right organizations and individuals continue to employ fascist ideologies and symbols, and fascist governments from the 20th century continue to have a significant influence on politics and society in many nations.

REFERENCES:

[1] A. Boito, 'The brazilian path to fascism', *Cad. CRH*, 2021, doi: 10.9771/ccrh.v34i0.35578.

[2] N. Toloudis, 'The Political Economy of Fascism: Evidence from Greece', *Geopolitics*, 2021, doi: 10.1080/14650045.2020.1726321.

[3] A. J. Motyl, 'Putin's Russia as a fascist political system', *Communist Post-Communist Stud.*, 2016, doi: 10.1016/j.postcomstud.2016.01.002.

[4] T. Bar-On, '"Islamofascism": Four competing discourses on the Islamism-fascism comparison', *Fascism*, 2018, doi: 10.1163/22116257-00702005.

[5] D. R. Holmes, 'Fascism at eye level the anthropological conundrum', *Focaal*, 2019, doi: 10.3167/fcl.2019.840105.

[6] A. Hrubon, 'Pioneers of clerical fascism?mythical language of revolutionary political catholicism in slovakia and visions of a "new nation"1', *Konstantinove List.*, 2021, doi: 10.17846/CL.2021.14.1.131-145.

[7] N. Mukherji, 'Is the ghost of fascism haunting political thought?', *Econ. Polit. Wkly.*, 2018.

[8] F. Evans, 'Deleuze's Political Ethics: A Fascism of the New?', *Deleuze Guattari Stud.*, 2016, doi: 10.3366/dls.2016.0213.

[9] C. Fuchs, 'Everyday life and everyday communication in coronavirus capitalism', *TripleC*, 2020, doi: 10.31269/triplec.v18i1.1167.

[10] E. Gentile, 'Fascism as Political Religion', *J. Contemp. Hist.*, 1990, doi: 10.1177/002200949002500204.

[11] M. Berezin, 'Fascism and Populism: Are They Useful Categories for Comparative Sociological Analysis?', *Annual Review of Sociology*. 2019. doi: 10.1146/annurev-soc-073018-022351.

CHAPTER 14

CLASSIFICATIONS OF FUNDAMENTALISM

Anand Joshi, Assistant Professor
Teerthanker Mahaveer Institute of Management and Technology, Teerthanker Mahaveer University,
Moradabad, Uttar Pradesh, India
Email id-anandjoshi869@gmail.com

ABSTRACT:

Fundamentalism is a term used to describe a variety of religious and political movements that emphasize a strict adherence to traditional beliefs and practices. Fundamentalists often reject modernity and secularism, and may view themselves as defenders of a perceived religious or cultural purity. In religious contexts, fundamentalism often involves a literal interpretation of sacred texts, a rejection of scientific and secular knowledge, and a strong emphasis on traditional moral and social values. Fundamentalist movements have emerged in many religions, including Christianity, Islam, and Judaism.

KEYWORDS:

Authority, Biblical literalism, Conservatism, Dogmatism, Faith, Fundamentalism.

INTRODUCTION

Many social scientists claimed that secularization was an inevitable side effect of modernization in the 1950s and 1960s. The significance and influence of religion in society and politics would diminish to insignificant levels as economic and political growth spread secular principles. However, developments in the 1970s and 1980s were completely at odds with what the modernization theories had predicted. The influence of religion did not decline over the globe, but rather significantly rose, especially in Muslim nations. Indeed, it can be argued that secularization and Westernization acted as a spark for the revival of religious political movements, enlisting a sizable populace in support of fundamentalist causes. As a result, the current rise of fundamentalism calls into question key tenets of modernization literature and raises crucial issues that need more research [1], [2].

Understanding and analyzing populist religious fundamentalist movements is one of the most hard and difficult challenges that social scientists face. Religious fundamentalism has been a driving force behind progressive social development, higher social welfare for the most vulnerable elements of society, and increasing political engagement for formerly marginalized groups in several regions of the globe. Religious fundamentalism has galvanized the public in different areas of the globe to support conservative causes and campaigns to limit or eliminate the rights of certain political community members. Therefore, one could claim that the same phenomenon promotes both justice and injustice.

Islamic fundamentalism, Christian fundamentalism, and Jewish fundamentalism are the three unique types of religious fundamentalism that will be examined in this article. The distinctions between these kinds of fundamentalism are more pronounced than their similarities, despite the

fact that they all share a commitment to a hegemonic ideal and show a readiness to participate in a variety of political actions to fulfill that ideal.

Fundamentalism of Islam

In addition to rejecting the notion that religion and modernity are incompatible, adherents and supporters of Islamic fundamentalism assert that, in many Islamic nations, religious precepts are the most important drivers of advancement. Islam is seen as a complete and timeless system that applies to all peoples in all locations and at all times. The separation of religion from the state is not even imaginable, which is one of its main differences from Christianity. Islam includes a kind of government. Government is set up to carry out the law, which is found in the Qur'an. However, it is contended that the application of Islamic values and principles does not imply that the way of life in the time of the Prophet Muhammad should be imitated. In order to strengthen their movements and make them viable in the context of the contemporary world, several fundamentalist groups have actually sought to embrace more modern ideals and ideas that do not conflict with religious precepts.

Fundamentalism in Islam is a complicated issue. On the one hand, historically, it has been a way for the general public to communicate aspirations and worries that are influenced by local cultural elements. On the other hand, throughout the post-colonial era, it served as a platform for conflict and struggle in Muslim cultures. According to some Muslim academics, there are two strands to Islamic fundamentalism one beneficial and the other destructive. The opposition to secularism and the secularist ideologies of nationalism, capitalism, and socialism in the Muslim world makes up the negative. The endeavors at reviving and rediscovering Islam as a full ideological framework for living as well as a system in its entirety constitute the positive thread.

Some Muslim intellectuals hold the opinion that "fundamentalism" is a strange phenomena that emerged from the special circumstances in Christian history when attempts were made to impose the literalist reading of the Bible on all Christians. Christian fundamentalism is seen as being more traditional, in favor of maintaining the status quo, and working to reinforce the moral and ethical foundation of society. In contrast to Islamic fundamentalism, which is extremely political and revolutionary and seeks to alter every area of peoples' socio-economic and political lives, Christian fundamentalists are often seen by the general public as being unrealistic and regressive. Islamic fundamentalism is a phenomena that has evolved from local and indigenous cultures in response to the social upheavals that are plaguing Muslim communities. It advocates for a return to Islam and its core values. The Qur'anic revelation, traditions, the words and deeds of Prophet Muhammad and the first four caliphs, who founded the first Islamic community and state, and who provide the ultimate example for emulation, are the pinnacle of these principles. Islamic fundamentalism has been well summed up by a well-known Muslim author as "the rededication of oneself to the establishment of social justice and equity in society" and "the confirmation of Islamic social morality."

The fact that there is no separation between the secular and religious domains in Islam is its most significant characteristic. A governing body with rules and regulations was established in Medina by the Prophet Muhammad himself. Because of this, Islamic fundamentalism has always been a political force that lurks in the shadows, and emphasis on Islam as a moral and social movement to create the Islamic order has been a typical feature of the goals of Islamic groups. This has resulted in increased involvement in Friday public prayer, media attention to religious and moral concerns, Islamic attire, and an overall increased feeling of religiously motivated social duty.

Therefore, it is argued, Islamic fundamentalism should be viewed as a practical, dynamic, and progressive ideology that is well suited to meet the needs of contemporary society. Despite some regional differences and indigenous details, the various Islamic fundamentalist movements share similar goals and tendencies. They have shown to be steadfastly committed to Islam and to be quite inventive in how they approach the problem of modernisation.

All movements of Islamic fundamentalism aim for total reform, or the transformation of all facets of life to place faith at the center. They contend that what is required is a stronger devotion to what had previously been shown to be the correct path rather than fresh interpretations of time-tested ideas. The Shari'a must replace the foreign laws that were brought over from the West as the ultimate source of law. They contend that the adoption and replication of foreign laws is a rejection of God's rules and will result in the obliteration of the basis for an Islamic state.

The inability of secular and Western ideologies to address the socio-economic and political issues in society is one of the main causes of the rise of populist Islamic fundamentalist organizations. The Western ideologies of Marxist materialism and liberal pluralism, which had been promoted under the pretense of modernization ideas just a few decades earlier, have become disillusioned, depressing, and wary as a result of this failure. The perceived danger of eroding the traditional system of values and social identity was amplified among the people with the introduction of Western and foreign ideas of capitalism and socialism by political rulers and governing regimes in Muslim cultures. A different ideology was sought for by the populace as a genuine and local point of reference as a result of this sense of threat. Islam fully embodied this worldview. They often turn to the restoration of old values and familiar culture as a defense mechanism against the perceived external danger to the group's national integrity and identity when challenges to their ethnic identity and social and political integrity come from the outside [3], [4].

Many academics have advanced the idea that in the majority of Islamic societies, the search for identity and security, the discovery of familiar values and beliefs in the midst of rapid social, economic, and political change, have been the most significant factors in the revitalization and rise of Islamic fundamentalist movements. In order to combat the extreme instability and insecurity brought on by the Westernization of their societies, Muslim fundamentalists are committed to developing lifestyles, social structures, and personal as well as societal values. They also want to safeguard and defend their societies from the negative effects of Western ideologies.

Secularist leaders and rulers in Muslim nations are said to have not only failed to modernize their societies but also to have sparked enormous upheavals and disarray, which led to a reliance on the West. The authenticity of the rulers and the legitimacy of the political system have therefore come under public scrutiny. Traditional values also faced threats from political persecution, a lack of social fairness and economic equality, moral degeneration, and rising corruption. It is further suggested that this perplexing condition of circumstances has aided in the resurrection of religion's political influence. Islamic doctrine brought followers and believers comfort and a feeling of shelter, helping them handle the heavy load of life. It promised a clear picture of the future and the resolution of all issues. Due to the fact that historically the Muslim clergy have often served as the agents of socialization and political mobilization of the people, the traditional clergy's position in Islam has been crucial in this respect. Additionally, the clergy has served as a bridge between the populace and the government, protecting them from the oppressive and

unjust authority of rulers. The clergy make a commitment to advancing the interests of the people, who over the decades of transition had been largely cut off from the modernization of culture, society, and economy.

DISCUSSION

History of Islamic Fundamentalism

The roots of Islamic fundamentalist movements are found in the history of Islam, both medieval and modern. The history of Islam has contained an element of fundamentalist reaction from the time of its inception. For example, a group known as the Kharijites , deserted 'Ali, the fourth caliph, accusing him of disobeying the literal meaning of the Qur'an because of his agreement to arbitration over the issue of Mu'awiyya's claim to the caliphate. There is total agreement among all Islamic fundamentalists that the very condensed period of the first sixty years after the rise of Islam is the foundation of the true and pure Islam [5], [6].

The twentieth century has witnessed the advent of several Islamic spokesmen and leaders of Islamic thought and ideology whose writings have had immense impact not only on their contemporaries but also for future generations. These writings have occupied the supreme place in forming and shaping a comprehensive Islamic vision and a blueprint for action to confront the threat posed to Islamic ways of life by inroads of Western and modern values and institutions.

One of the most outstanding and important Islamic fundamentalist movements by far has been that of the Ikhwan al-Muslimin in Egypt, founded in 1928 by Hasan al-Banna, a school teacher. The Ikhwan is regarded as one of the most popular and aggressive of Islamic fundamentalist organizations. The influence of the Ikhwan went far beyond Egypt and spread into many neighbouring Arab countries. As a conservative organization, it provided the only channel for the expression of anger, frustration and disillusionment with secularization and Westernization for many millions of Muslims. Throughout the 1970s and 1980s, the Ikhwan remained the only prominent means for the expression of Sunni Islamic political thought in Egypt, Sudan, Syria and Jordan. A similar organization, Fadayan-i Islam, was founded in the mid-1940s by Navab Safavi in Iran. All the leaders of the group were executed in 1956, after which the organization went underground. It has reappeared following the 1979 revolution under the leadership of Ayatollah Khalkhali but remains a fringe organization.

Few Islamic thinkers and scholars of the twentieth century can compare with Seyyid Quit, the leader of the Ikhwan in Egypt, in the significant impact upon the revitalization and restoration of Islam and development of Islamic thought and ideology in contemporary Muslim societies. His writings have led to the emergence of several Islamic movements in the Muslim world. The foundation of Qutb's thought was based on the premise that the Western world has failed in establishing the promised conscientious and humane societies and that this failure has led the Muslims in search of other accep, indigenous alternatives in order to save their societies from the dangers posed by the invasion of alien cultural values. This alternative ideology is found in Islamic culture. Seyyid Qutb's works consist of careful analysis of the 'disease' with which Muslims are afflicted. He found that this disease was nothing but adaptation of foreign ways and alien models and blind imitation of Western ideas in their countries. Some scholars regard Seyyid Qutb as the person who tried to bridge the wide gap between the ultra-conservative, traditional ulema and the modern sciences and knowledge by opposing the excessive materialism of the West and secularization of Muslim societies but not opposing modernization and progress in

economic and social areas as long as they were not detrimental to the welfare of the society or in conflict with basic Islamic values.

The foundation of Mawdudi's ideas and assumptions is that Islam is a complete and total ideology which does not need explanation or interpretation except within its own context. For Mawdudi, Islam is perfect and there is no need for its justification. His defence strategy for the preservation of Islamic values and principles is as follows: the Western world is corrupt and morally decadent and must be strenuously opposed. He claims that Islam is a total ideology which has appropriate answers to all human predicaments and social dilemmas. Mawdudi insists, without hesitation, that the Shari'a must be supreme and rule over all humankind. Mawdudi was perhaps the most dogmatic and uncompromising of Islamic fundamentalist leaders.

One of the least studied of contemporary Islamic fundamentalist leaders is Ayatollah Ruhollah Khomeini. Khomeini's message was lucid and unambiguous. To the classic Islamic call for the struggle against imperialism and secularism, he added the unique and unprecedented corollary that the religious leaders must fully participate in the governance of the Islamic community. He declared that it was not only the right but the responsibility of the religious establishment to rule and control the affairs of the country. This doctrine was at once ultra-conservative and revolutionary. It advocated that all people must participate in politics as a religious duty and that the clerics were bound by religion to govern.

Christian Fundamentalism

Within the Christian context, the term 'fundamentalism' seems to have acquired its current meaning from twelve volumes of essays called The Fundamentals, written between 1910 and 1915 by several prominent conservative Protestant scholars. Commissioned and underwritten by two wealthy Californian laymen alarmed by the increasing 'worldliness' of mainline Protestant churches and wanting a forceful statement of the true religion, The Fundamentals were a stunning success. Over three million copies were distributed and a movement was launched. In its historical and current American context the term fundamentalism refers to those primarily Protestant Christians who firmly believe in the literal truth or accuracy of the Bible in all its statements, the need to avoid contemporary seductions in personal conduct , and the utter impossibility of achieving eternal salvation by human effort. Salvation is achieved by faith in Jesus Christ which is manifest in a zealous witness to the truth.

While Christian fundamentalism is most prominent in the United States, its influence has spread elsewhere, particularly in Latin America and English- speaking nations. Northern Ireland is home to the Revd Ian Paisley, a fundamentalist leader with American ties who has mixed virulent, anti-Catholicism with conservative Protestant dogma. In England, Festival of Lights, a political movement with some fundamentalist leadership, has worked quietly for two decades to enhance public decency. Fundamentalism is often confused with other concepts, such as Evangelicalism, of which it is a subset. Evangelicals are biblical literalists who believe it is their primary duty to proclaim the gospel. They may be politically liberal, conservative, radical pacifist or strictly non-political. Fundamentalists are evangelicals who are militantly conservative and who see themselves in a war with secular humanists for cultural dominance in America. There remains a tension within fundamentalist ranks between those who believe the best way to fight is to separate from organized political and social interaction with the larger culture to concentrate on individual conversion and those who believe it necessary to take the battle to the larger political and cultural arena. Fundamentalism is also sometimes confused with the New Right, a popular

American political phenomenon of the 1970s and 1980s. The New Right was a loosely and often tenuously affiliated movement of several major ideologies:

Economic Libertarianism, a largely secular movement supporting free enterprise, less government regulation and low taxes; Social Traditionalism, a collection of groups concerned with the breakdown of the traditional family, religion and morality; and Militant Anti-communism, a collection of groups, many with roots in the old right and McCarthyism, who considered the Soviet Union to be a continuing threat and who are concerned with national security and military spending. Perhaps the one thing all three groups have in common is a hatred for liberals, whom they consider the source of many of the world's problems. Fundamentalists are heavily concentrated in the Social Traditionalist stream, although a few theological entrepreneurs such as Hal Lindsey have attempted to tie in Christian concepts such as millenialism and a final battle between the forces of good and evil at Armageddon with anti-communism and nuclear war. Contemporary social scientists and journalists have expanded the concept of 'fundamentalist' to encompass any group, no matter what its belief system, which they perceive to be religiously motivated, which proclaims dogmatic adherence to a certain set of religious beliefs and which are socially rigid and led by zealous proselytizers. The expansion of the concept to include non-Christian groups is not without value for there are common threads which run through various religious movements [5], [6].

The power of contemporary fundamentalist movements has caught most social scientists and Western policy makers by surprise. Exactly why development and so-called modernization had quite the opposite effect from the predicated secularization is a matter of some dispute. Perhaps the most widely held hypothesis, based on a theory of status politics, holds that not only does development proceed with a differential impact, improving the economic lot of elites far more rapidly and dramatically than that of ordinary citizens, but modernization confronts the basic values, traditions and lifestyles of non-elites through conspicuous consumption, the introduction of new materialism, and public displays of heretofore alien symbols, dress, and social activities. Under this hypothesis fundamentalists became politically active in response to perceived threats from the larger environment.

The difficulty with this hypothesis is that it is not borne out by available data. What data do show is that fundamentalists in each tradition have moved into the economic middle class, are more urban than rural, are very close to the educational levels of the larger non-fundamentalist majority and tend to be as technologically sophisticated as other citizens.

A second hypothesis, which might be called a political entrepreneur theory, posits that fundamentalists were enticed out of their political isolation by other more secular conservative leaders, political entrepreneurs who had considerable organizational skills and who had developed financial resources through mass-mailing techniques. These leaders recognized fundamentalists as social traditionalists who could be mobilized to become active participants in a new conservative majority.

Enlisting the fundamentalists gave these entrepreneurs a rich tradition of symbols, rituals and values with which to appeal to 'the silent majority' of Americans, as well as access to local communities and several highly visible and charismatic leaders. A variation of this is the Resource Mobilization Model which posits that fundamentalism, like any social movement among identifiable groups, emerges when three factors are present: opportunities, resources and incentives or motives. These factors were available in Christian, Jewish and Islamic movements.

History of American Christian Fundamentalism

The roots, if not the name of fundamentalism, reach as far back in American history as the two great Awakenings in the 1740–50s and 1830–40s. In each instance a popularized, non-hierarchical and theologically unsophisticated wave of religiosity swept through the Congregational and Episcopal churches through revivalist preaching and, in the rural areas, camp meetings. Separate Baptist and Methodist churches quickly evolved into distinct traditions, gaining adherents not only from among the older mainline churches but from the large numbers of unchurched as well. The message was simple: every person can read and interpret the Bible, immoral acts are to be avoided, salvation comes from faith in Jesus Christ, and spread the Good News. This was broad gauge evangelicalism, and some have argued that in the pre-Civil War period it also mainstream America.

The post-Civil War period confronted this righteous, self-assured popular Protestantism with enormous challenges. Immigration, industrialism, Darwinism and socialism, each in a somewhat different way, threatened to overwhelm what was perceived as an emerging Christian culture. Immigration and industrialization brought waves of Catholic and Jewish workers to rapidly expanding cities where drinking, gambling, dancing and other social vices made a mockery of the virtuous life so central to the Protestant ethic. Darwinism confronted the biblical literalism that provided the foundation of evangelical Christianity, and socialism promised a worldly salvation that had no need for faith at all. While mainline churches attempted to incorporate new ideas and adapt to modernization, evangelicals fought back in both public and private arenas. They became, in their own way, extraordinary social reformers, working for prison reform, establishment of private charities for the poor, the ill, the alcoholic; they fought first for public schools and then for Sunday Bible schools, and for laws prohibiting gambling, pornography, prostitution and work on Sunday. Above all they worked for temperance. Although never developing a sophisticated intellectual tradition, they saw Darwinist evolutionary theory as a direct challenge to biblical literalism and fought to keep it out of the public schools. Ironically, despite their social and theological conservatism, evangelicals were among the first to grasp the implications of technological innovations such as the radio and mass fund-raising. For over two decades the Old Time Gospel Hour had the largest audience of any radio programme.

Two major crises occurred in the 1920s that radically altered the thrust of evangelicalism/fundamentalism for several decades. In 1925 the widely publicized Scopes trial, in which a young Tennessee teacher was convicted of teaching the theory of evolution, exposed fundamentalist beliefs to widespread ridicule. The late 1920s also saw a major backlash against the prohibition amendment for which fundamentalists had fought so valiantly, and which had proved to be a social disaster. Although the amendment was not officially repealed until 1933, by that time the thoroughly discredited fundamentalists had withdrawn from public debate over social issues to organize and build their own institutions. This retreat was aided in no small measure by the emergence of a doctrine of dispensationalism which held that salvation was an ‘other-worldly experience’ based on personal victory over sin and on personal witnessing. Fundamentalists, in short, became emphatically nonpolitical. For several groups this ‘separation’ became a touchstone of true faith.

In the late 1960s fundamentalist preachers, many of whom had developed large church followings and TV ministries, began to speak out on political issues. Pressure began to build as a result of several Supreme Court cases outlawing officially sponsored prayer in the public schools

and various legislative enactments which fundamentalists perceived as promoting a general moral permissiveness and undermining the family. Most commentators agree that the 1973 Supreme Court decision in Roe v. Wade declaring many restrictive abortion laws to be unconstitutional was the single most important trigger for political activism. The lobby group, Moral Majority, founded in 1979 by the Revd Jerry Falwell, was the most visible of several groups formed to press for a conservative political social agenda. In 1988 fundamentalist TV minister Pat Robertson mounted a credible, if short-lived, campaign for the Republican nomination for the presidency.

By 1989, however, the power, prestige and funding of fundamentalists groups dropped significantly. In large measure their constituency became disillusioned after scandals rocked the TV ministries. In addition, the presidency of George Bush proved to be less receptive than that of Ronald Reagan, and as victories declined so did interest and funds. Moral Majority was disbanded and replaced by a much smaller, less active Liberty Federation. The Revd Jerry Falwell himself drew back to focus his efforts on his church and Liberty University in Lynchburg, Virginia. Christian fundamentalism has a long tradition; it will not disappear quickly. Political activism among fundamentalists, however, does ebb and flow as the opportunities, resources and incentives dictate. The 1970s and 1980s saw a massive outflow of energy which had a significant influence on the American electorate's shift to a conservative direction. The early 1990s appear to be witnessing a period of withdrawal and regrouping. The Gulf crisis helped accelerate a return to dispensationalism. But while fundamentalism may be in a period of political quiesence, it remains a latent political force among a large minority of American Christians [7]–[9].

CONCLUSION

Fundamentalist groups, frequently in reaction to perceived dangers from outside factors like globalization, secularism, or diversity, aim to restore or construct a society based on a certain set of traditional values. This may include a rejection of democratic institutions and norms as well as a commitment to using violence or force in order to further one's political objectives. Fundamentalism's detractors contend that it may be polarizing, exclusive, and intolerable, and that it can result in prejudice towards and persecution of minority groups. Additionally, they contend that fundamentalist movements frequently put group interests ahead of those of the individual and may be hostile to those freedoms and rights. Despite these criticisms, fundamentalism continues to have an impact on political and social discussions about matters related to religion, culture, and identity in many parts of the world.

REFERENCES:

[1] I. Mustofa, Enizar, M. Hadi, and D. Irwansyah, 'Reading types of islamic fundamentalism in lampung province: (A Study on Doctrine and Movement of Islamism at Lampung University)', *Qudus Int. J. Islam. Stud.*, 2019, doi: 10.21043/qijis.v7i2.5719.

[2] R. A. Hidayat, 'Fundamentalisme Pasar Dan Fundamentalisme Agama Sebagai Antitesis Ideologi Pancasila', *J. Ilm. Mimb. Demokr.*, 2013, doi: 10.21009/jimd.v12i2.6281.

[3] F. Sadowski, J. Endrass, and A. Zick, 'Are authoritarianism and militancy key characteristics of religious fundamentalism? A latent class analysis of an Egyptian Muslim sample.', *Psycholog. Relig. Spiritual.*, 2019, doi: 10.1037/rel0000165.

[4] M. Riesebrodt and K. H. Chong, 'Fundamentalisms and Patriarchal Gender Politics', *J. Womens. Hist.*, 1999, doi: 10.1353/jowh.2010.0541.

[5] A. Schipper, 'Fundamental truthmakers and non-fundamental truths', *Synthese*, 2021, doi: 10.1007/s11229-019-02266-x.

[6] T. E. Tahko, 'Boring infinite descent', *Metaphilosophy*, 2014, doi: 10.1111/meta.12084.

[7] J. D. Van der Vyver, 'Religious Fundamentalism and Human Rights', *J. Int. Aff.*, 1996.

[8] R. Izad, 'Akar Gerakan Teologi Politik Fundamentalisme Islam Abad Modern Perspektif Karen Armstrong', *Islam. Insid. J. Keislam. dan Hum.*, 2018, doi: 10.35719/islamikainside.v4i1.44.

[9] P. McCartney, 'Spiritual bypass and entanglement in Yogaland ('Greek passage'): How neoliberalism, soft Hindutva and banal nationalism facilitate yoga fundamentalism', *Politics and Religion Journal*. 2019. doi: 10.54561/prj1301137m.

CHAPTER 15

A BRIEF DISCUSSION ON CONTEMPORARY POLITICAL SYSTEMS

Mohit Rastogi, Associate Professor
Teerthanker Mahaveer Institute of Management and Technology, Teerthanker Mahaveer University, Moradabad, Uttar Pradesh, India
Email id-rtmohit@yahoo.co.in

ABSTRACT:

Contemporary political systems refer to the various forms of government and political structures that exist in the world today. These systems can be classified into several broad categories, including democracy, authoritarianism, communism, and hybrid systems that combine elements of multiple forms. Democracy is a system in which power is held by the people, either directly or through elected representatives. It is typically characterized by free and fair elections, the rule of law, and protections for individual rights and freedoms. Examples of democratic systems include the United States, Canada, and many countries in Europe.

KEYWORDS:

Authoritarianism, Capitalism, Democracy, Dictatorship, Fascism, Federalism.

INTRODUCTION

Fundamentalism in the Jewish tradition is akin to and distinct from that in the Christian tradition. Contrary to the latter, it has its origins in nineteenth-century European Zionism, a movement to establish a homeland for Jews in Palestine, the country from which they had been exiled by the Romans some 2,000 years earlier. Jews living abroad mourn the loss of Jerusalem and constantly ask God for a Messiah who would reinstate Jewish rule over the nation of Israel. Jewish tradition holds that God will carry out all of this at the appropriate moment. Zionists, who were formerly considered to be a radical intellectual fringe group, were denounced by orthodox Jewish authorities for attempting to manipulate God via political activity. However, the violent anti-Semitic outbursts that occurred throughout Europe in the 1870s gave weight to the argument that Jews needed their own land and gave Zionism the legitimacy it had previously lacked [1], [2].

There were three distinct groups or streams of thought as the Zionist movement grew and developed. First, religious Zionists who supported and held to the notion that a Jewish return to Israel was a component of God's larger purpose for Jews. Second, labor Zionism, which sprang from European socialism and was far more concerned with fostering economic development and organization than it was with rejecting religious components. Finally, there was a secular, rationalist movement that aimed to establish a democratic Jewish state devoid of any religious restrictions or adornments.

These three streams continued to cause conflict and division among the Jewish community after the state of Israel was established in 1948. Despite being the largest stream, labor Zionism was not powerful enough to rule alone; coalitions had to be formed. The secularists were the second-largest faction and the Labour Party's obvious rival. The smaller religious parties were thus the

obvious candidates for coalition partners. In fact, the Labour Party was compelled to enact several aspects of orthodox Jewish law in order to form a governing coalition in 1948. These included: public observance of all Jewish holidays and the Sabbath, respect for the law of kosher in government agencies; public financing for religious schools; and observance of orthodox marriage and divorce laws. The Law of Return, which stipulated that every Jew in the world had the right to immigrate to Israel and become a citizen, was added to these in 1950. Because they created a foundation for a religious Jewish identity rather than just a territorial or ethnic identity, these actions had a significant influence on later fundamentalism. Even though they have always been a minority in Israel, religiously orthodox Jews have continued to be a force in Israeli politics, insisting on stricter observance of the Torah in exchange for their willingness to support any coalition that comes to power.

The Six Day War in June 1967 served as the catalyst for the rise of Jewish fundamentalism. In a surprise triumph, Israel took the West Bank, including East Jerusalem, from Jordan, the Golan Heights from Syria, and the Sinai peninsula and Gaza Strip from Egypt. In addition to giving Israel sovereignty over significant tracts of territory and a sizable, hostile Arab population, the conquest also presented the Israeli leadership with a very challenging theological issue. What portion of the land should it retain? Should Jews be permitted to emigrate to the occupied countries? These issues gave rise to modern Jewish fanaticism. Many pious Zionists saw Israel's triumph as confirmation of their conviction that they were carrying out God's will. Religious Zionists made the retention of the lands a fundamentally religious issue on which there could be no compromise and no concessions, while others, both within Israel and in the larger international community, thought that Jews were now in a position to trade the captured land for assurances of peace. For the first time, ardent secular nationalists joined them, and together they put up a combative, determined front against any attempts by the administration to bargain.

Jewish settlement construction in the occupied areas, notably the West Bank, swiftly became a key tactic used to make it more difficult for the government to restore the land. These initiatives resulted in the creation of Gush Emunim, or the "Bloc of the Faithful," in 1974. This fundamentalist, religio-political organization built new communities both officially and illegally and ignored the authorities' orders to demolish them. Another, more sinister tactic was to harass and expel Arabs who wouldn't give up their land for these communities. Jewish colonies in the occupied territories grew swiftly after the right-wing Likud Party, headed by Menachem Begin, unexpectedly defeated the Labour Party in 1977. As a consequence, the ruling coalition was much more supportive of the aims of Gush Emunim. Gush Emunim "more or less deliberately encouraged the harrassment of Palestinians in the West Bank to create tension and increase Israeli reluctance to withdraw from the area," claims one expert. If this was their plan all along, they undoubtedly succeeded.

One outcome was a shift in the political landscape that led to the emergence of a number of new fundamentalist religious parties, such as Morasha and Kach, the latter of which was a violent organization founded by a former American named Meir Kahane with the stated aim of driving all Palestinian Arabs out of the territory they had conquered. Although they still make up a small portion of Israeli society, the rise of these groups has increased support for Gush Emunim and the settlement movement. It is increasingly doubtful that any Israeli administration could remove the IDF from occupied land or forcibly destroy the settlements.The 'intifada', or rebellion, that erupted among the more than one million Arabs as a second effect of settlement and harassment by fundamentalist organizations all but guaranteed that no peaceful coexistence would be

possible in the near future. Thirdly, there was a continued decline in support for Israel everywhere, even in the US and UK. In Israeli politics, Jewish fundamentalism is still a strong, aggressive force. We'll have to wait and watch whether their actions cause a reaction among Israeli people and a subsequent collapse. By late 1991, it had not taken place. There is just one thing that is certain: Whether it takes the form of fundamentalism in Islamic, Christian, Jewish, or other religious traditions, it is still a small but formidable political force and is not going to go away any time soon [3].

DISCUSSION

Liberal democracies may be recognized by the implicit agreement between their representative governments and the people they represent, as well as the particular framework that governs that agreement. The agreement states that the government's claim to be acting in the interests of the people is a requirement for its legitimacy and the expectation of compliance with its laws. The competitive political election is the formal system that controls this legitimacy bargain. Voters have a variety of candidates to select from during contested political elections. In order to make decisions that matter, it seems that there should be at least two organized political parties with a possibility of winning. Basic freedoms of speech, the press, assembly, and association are granted to the public so they may develop and express opinions on governmental policy. All people may effectively engage in the competitive elections that choose the leaders by using these liberties. By participating in elections in this way, citizens are indirectly contributing to the direction of society's public policies as a whole. Democracy's core idea is that the populace should participate in making decisions.

A number of liberal democracies sometimes employ the referendum, a public vote on a proposed legislation, to engage citizens directly in policymaking. However, the majority of legislation is made through the representative institutions, even in Switzerland, where the device is used more frequently than anywhere else. The word "liberal" in the phrase "liberal democracy" calls attention to two aspects of these political structures. First, they base their claim to democracy on being receptive to the desires of the people rather than on some notion of the people's best interests as determined by the authorities or by some ideological framework. Second, all of a minority's political and civil rights should not be superseded by the desires of a majority. The freedom to organize and participate in politics is at the very least one of these rights. Due process, privacy, and property rights may also be included, however liberal democratic thinkers disagree on how these rights should be defined. If political and civil rights restrictions are supported by majorities of the populace, tensions between the "liberal" and "democratic" components of liberal democracy may arise. Both are crucial elements of a liberal democracy, and they frequently support one another [4], [5].

Modern and Historical Cases of Liberal Democracy

The twentieth century is chiefly responsible for the rise of liberal democracy. Only the United States, France, and Switzerland came close to granting universal male suffrage by the 1870s; the right to vote for women was granted much later. In 1902, there were around nine democracies among the forty-eight sovereign countries, assuming very lenient voting eligibility rules. Representative governments and universal suffrage proliferated after the First World War as a result of social group pressures on the inside and imitation on a global scale. Out of the 65 independent countries that existed at the time, there were probably 22 democracies. Some of these, most notably Weimar Germany, fell apart amid the upheaval of the early 1930s global

economic depression. Liberal democratic practices continued to expand after the defeat of the Axis forces in World War II and the dissolution of the European colonial empires. Many recently independent Third World countries had democratic governments at first, but they were unable to maintain their political systems.

Since the 1950s, the number of liberal democracies has fluctuated, though it has been gradually rising with the growth of independent states. While some authoritarian regimes have been replaced by democracies, some well-established democracies have also been overthrown. Several nations have gone through periods of both democracy and authoritarianism. There are now between thirty and forty democracies in the globe, according to a variety of estimates from the 1960s and 1970s. This represents less than one-quarter of all independent sovereign governments. Up to 30% of the governments in 1985 may have been categorized as liberal democracies, according to a detailed assessment, although the stability of several of them was questionable.

The majority of research on modern liberal democracies focus on Western Europe and North America, as well as a few tiny states here and there, as well as Japan, Australia, New Zealand, India, and Venezuela. Late 1980s developments in Latin America, the Pacific Rim, and Eastern Europe showed a shift toward liberal democratic characteristics in all three regions: greater freedom of information and association, even semi-competitive elections where voters could exercise their right to free choice with some restrictions. The formerly strictly regulated regimes of Poland, Hungary, East Germany, and Czechoslovakia saw a remarkable shift toward full liberal democracy in 1989. The two main differences between liberal democratic procedures are party systems and constitutions. The intricate procedures used by modern liberal democracies to choose decision-makers and formulate policies are exceedingly complicated and diverse. The construction of "variants" of liberal democracies, including unitary and federal systems, presidential and parliamentary systems, two-party and multi-party systems, is the attention of many commentators.

Constitutional Structure: Decision-Making

In democracies, there is consensus on a 'constitution' that outlines how laws must be formed and how the decision-makers are to be selected. Any decision rule's degree of inclusiveness the proportion of the membership that must consent before a policy is accepted is its most fundamental conceptual characteristic. The rule of thumb under a pure dictatorship would be that one person makes all the policy decisions. A majority plus one vote must be obtained in a majoritarian system in order for a policy to be approved. The decision-making standard in a fully consensual system is unanimity: a policy cannot be accepted unless everyone agrees to it. Theorists of democracy agree that dictatorships and any decision-making processes needing the consent of a tiny minority are incompatible with the idea of democracy. Most people would agree that it is impractical to make any policy with total consensus. However, they disagree on whether a simple majority or another more inclusive rule should be used. Theoretically, we anticipate that the majority form would be more effective in determining policy, whilst the consensus form would be more protective of minorities' rights.

In many democracies, amending the constitution as a whole specifically calls for the use of a more inclusive decision-making process. Such regulations may be elaborately ratified by regional entities, as in the American situation of ratification by three-quarters of the states, or as simple as a two-thirds majority in the national legislature. Others may need broader support for a

specific piece of legislation, such the ratification of a treaty or the imposition of additional taxes. The majority of democracies have institutional structures that, in practice, need the concurrence of representatives of more than a mere majority of the population, in addition to stated requirements for more than majority support for enacting legislation. The growth of straightforward majoritarian decision procedures for the representatives may be inferred from several structural distinctions in liberal democratic constitutions.

'Federal-unitary' refers to a dimension that takes into account the size and strength of the legislative chambers, the degree to which the government is effectively centralized or decentralized, and the mechanisms for constitutional change, according to Lijphart's analysis of majoritarian and consensual elements in twenty-two s democracies. New Zealand and Britain are at the further end of majoritarianism. There aren't many restrictions on the central government's authority in these nations. Germany, the United States, and Switzerland are at the federal extremes, requiring a range of institutions, such as a second parliamentary chamber and regional governments, to participate in numerous policy-making processes. According to Strom's research, parliamentary committee structures may also help minorities have more influence over governmental decisions. Once again, the result is that policymaking in nations like Norway or Belgium becomes more inclusive than just majoritarian. Major policy changes in these systems typically require the approval of representatives of far more than a simple majority of the population.

Another crucial component of the decision rule is how the executive and legislative branches are divided in terms of authority. The legislature selects and has the power to dismiss the prime minister in the majority of the parliamentary governments in Europe. Although the executive may control a controlled majority of lawmakers in the legislature, the two are still closely entwined. True presidential systems, like those in the US and Venezuela, have different resources available to the legislature and the chief executive to influence decision-making. The interplay between party control and each one's unique abilities will determine how they are balanced. These regimes will become less majoritarian and need wider coalitions as party power is fragmented. 'Semi-presidential' mixed-regime examples include France and Finland.

Election laws: constitutional structure

The criteria by which the representatives who decide policy are chosen are outlined in democratic constitutions, which is a second essential component. First-past-the-post electoral election systems, as Riker has shown, were considered to favor the formation of majorities and the elimination of minor parties as early as the eighteenth century. The 'law' that such regulations often lead to two-party systems was first put out by French sociologist Maurice Duverger many years later. 'Proximate' or'mechanical' effects in the accumulation of votes and 'distal' or 'psychological' impacts as voters and politicians anticipate the mechanical consequences, according to Duverger, are both necessary for majoritarianism. There is evidence of both mechanical and psychological impacts, according to recent studies, although the former seems to predominate in most situations.

Today, Britain, the United States, and many countries that were once ruled by the British, such as New Zealand, Jamaica, Canada, and so forth, still use the "first-past-the-post" electoral system, in which a nation is divided into single-representative constituencies, and the candidate who receives the most votes wins the district. A good illustration of the mechanical consequences, which may result in parliamentary majorities being generated even when votes are equally

distributed across districts, can be seen in the British general election of 1983. Despite receiving 25% of the vote and finishing second in more districts than either "major" party, the Liberal-Social Democratic Alliance only won a small number of parliamentary seats. On the other hand, despite receiving just around 40% of the popular vote, the Conservatives were able to secure a strong parliamentary majority.The many variants of proportional representation are the main alternative election rules. PR, which is preferred by the majority of the countries in continental Europe, establishes multi-member parliamentary districts with parties represented in accordance with the district's voter support. The system's operation may be influenced by factors including the size and complexity of the districts, the precise guidelines for allocating "remainder" votes, and the existence of "cut-off" regulations that exclude parties with less than a particular number of members. However, the presence of PR allows many small parties to form, seek, and secure legislative representation with only a small percentage of the national vote in systems like those in the Netherlands or Denmark. Under PR norms, it is difficult for lone parties to win parliamentary majorities.

Competitive party systems: an important connection

Party competition shapes the crucial electoral connections between voters and decision-makers. No significant democracy has been able to function without political parties as the means of coordinating and arranging elections, as Bryce noted seventy years ago. Citizens' potential to influence elections without such a structure is very constrained. Parties are also a way for constitutional restrictions to influence democratic policymaking and, sometimes, a way to get beyond such restrictions. Party rivalry is influenced by the society's historical social and political divisions, political tactics, societal ideals, as well as constitutional provisions. Party systems often have a strong capacity to maintain themselves over time and independent impact of their own. Lijphart discovered that the number of successful political parties came the closest to describing the consensus components other than the unitary-federal ones.

There is a ton of material on party rivalry and party structures. Much of the analysis is dominated by two key distinctions. The first of them differs between multi-party systems and two-party, or at least majority electing, systems. Two-party systems are naturally preferred by theorists and observers who support accountability and the ability to carry out promises, as well as the pre-election collection of voter preferences that seem to go with majoritarian administration. People who support multi-party systems frequently favor elaborately consultative political processes and explicit representation of social and political factions in decision-making.

The level or kind of political conflict that each party system expresses is a key factor in differentiating them from one another. Most party system theorists believe that highly polarized party systems, in which there is a significant difference between the stated policy platforms of major parties, or in which 'extremist' parties, which challenge the fundamental tenets of society, gain significant strength, are hazardous to the continued functioning of democracy. In his well-known analysis of polarized pluralism, Sartori contends that such systems increase the ideological ferocity of policy debate, foster a pattern of reckless "outbidding" by extreme parties, and prevent power changes that might keep ruling parties accountable to the people. According to extensive study, polarized or radical party systems often encourage instability in party administrations and maybe even widespread unrest.

Since numerous theorists have explicitly or implicitly connected multi-partism and polarization, the two distinctions are frequently combined in arguments. It seems to be true that the

constitutional provisions that support several political parties in parliamentary representation will also permit representation from extreme parties if unrest develops. The claim that multi-partism as a whole promotes or intensifies political strife, however, has little factual basis. Some multi-party systems, like those in Norway and the Netherlands, have persisted for extended periods of time without being destabilized by political extremism.

Systems of interest groups

Political scientists have given considerable attention to the ability of specific systems of interest group arrangements to deal with national economic problems more effectively than others in the last decade, even though the "major variants" of liberal democracy have traditionally been defined by constitutional and party systems. A system of interest groups that is mostly centralized and comprehensive, ongoing political negotiations between organizations, political parties, and state agencies, and a supporting ideology of national "social partnership" are only a few examples of the arrangements together referred to as "democratic corporatism." It has been noted that in contrast to systems with more competitive interest group and party relationships, such as Britain and the United States, the countries with these regularized corporatist relationships performed better overall in terms of inflation and unemployment during the challenging years of the mid-1970s and early 1980s. While the majority of research to date has focused on labor and industrial relations, many nations are currently looking into the effects of different systems of interest group relations in other policy areas and at other times [6]–[8].

CONCLUSION

In the political and economic system of communism, resources are distributed in accordance with the needs of the community and property is owned collectively. Centralized economic management, political repression, and limitations on personal liberties and rights are common features of these regimes. The communist regimes in China and Cuba are two examples. In hybrid political structures, many governmental types are combined. For instance, some nations have a mixed economy that includes aspects of socialism and capitalism or a constitutional monarchy where the monarch acts as a symbolic leader but elected officials really hold real authority. Instances of hybrid systems include the United Kingdom and India. Modern political structures are continually changing as new types of governance emerge and preexisting ones adjust to new conditions. Political scientists, politicians, and citizens all have an interest in studying political systems since they can have a big influence on people's well-being and the stability of countries.

REFERENCES:

[1] B. Firdaus, ‘The Perspective of Qur’an on Khilafah: Its Implementation towards The Contemporary Political System’, *J. Islam. Stud. Cult.*, 2021, doi: 10.15640/jisc.v9n1a1.

[2] E. Aizenberg and M. Hanegraaff, ‘Is politics under increasing corporate sway? A longitudinal study on the drivers of corporate access’, *West Eur. Polit.*, 2020, doi: 10.1080/01402382.2019.1603849.

[3] A. N. Karneev, ‘Elements and channels of bottom-up feedback in contemporary China’s political system’, *World Econ. Int. Relations*, 2021, doi: 10.20542/0131-2227-2021-65-7-56-63.

[4] C. G. Thies and D. Sobek, 'War, economic development, and political development in the contemporary international system', *Int. Stud. Q.*, 2010, doi: 10.1111/j.1468-2478.2009.00586.x.

[5] R. Magni-Berton and S. Panel, 'Gerontocracy in a comparative perspective: Explaining why political leaders are (almost always) older than their constituents', *Sociol. Compass*, 2021, doi: 10.1111/soc4.12841.

[6] B. Szerszynski, M. Kearnes, P. Macnaghten, R. Owen, and J. Stilgoe, 'Why solar radiation management geoengineering and democracy won't mix', *Environ. Plan. A*, 2013, doi: 10.1068/a45649.

[7] J. Blanchette, 'Ideological Security as National Security', *Comp. Gov.*, 2020.

[8] C. Deirdre, P. Mair, and Y. Papadopoulos, 'Positioning accountability in european governance: An introduction', *West Eur. Polit.*, 2010, doi: 10.1080/01402382.2010.485862.

CHAPTER 16

CITIZEN INFLUENCE IN DIFFERENT VARIANTS OF LIBERAL DEMOCRACY

Rajiv Verma, Professor Teerthanker Mahaveer Institute of Management and Technology,
Teerthanker Mahaveer University, Moradabad, Uttar Pradesh, India
Email id-dr.rajiv_verma@rediffmail.com

ABSTRACT:

Liberal democracy is a form of government that combines the principles of democracy with those of liberalism. It is characterized by free and fair elections, the rule of law, the protection of individual rights and freedoms, and a commitment to open and tolerant societies. In a liberal democracy, power is held by elected representatives who are accountable to the people through regular elections. The government is limited by a constitution and the rule of law, which protects individual rights and freedoms such as freedom of speech, religion, and association.

KEYWORDS:

Civil Liberties, Constitutionalism, Democracy, Democratic Accountability, Economic Liberalism, Electoral Systems.

INTRODUCTION

Theoretically, the complex features of party, constitution, and interest group systems may be reduced to a single dimension of majoritarianism and commensalism. It should be simple for public to judge policy responsibility and hold incumbents accountable when the constitutional arrangements, party and interest group structures cooperate to elect dominant government majorities, competent to determine and execute policy without additional extensive negotiation. The incumbents may be removed from office and the opposition may be installed if the results of policy are unacceptable. Because incumbents seeking re-election will anticipate citizens' desires, citizens should frequently get the policies they want without going through a complicated process of search and rejection. Such majoritarian political structures may encourage mandate procedures. them may utilize elections to establish the fundamental policy agenda for the future if the parties provide them with different policy options and maintain their promises after being elected. Such alternative promises might be a crucial means of enlarging possibilities and bringing the desired policy change among voters into sharper focus. Additionally, voters will find it simple to punish incumbents who break their promises because of the majority rule system's clarity of accountability [1], [2].

The main obstacle to citizen control faced by the majoritarian versions is the electoral weapon's bluntness in the face of a wide range of political concerns. There will be numerous potential coalitions of people on different topics if none of these causes can bring citizens together in the same manner, creating a single "dimension." On certain issues, those who make up the majority will be outnumbered by the minority. Some policies will not have majority support due to the

pure majoritarian variant's propensity to "freeze" into law all the promises made by the party winning office. Even more uncomfortable for the idea of citizen control are circumstances where the majority of the government is formed by the application of electoral laws on less than a majority of the vote.

Additionally, the existence of multiple issue dimensions makes it difficult for incumbents to be held simply accountable. On what matter are they to answer? And what should a voter do if the opposition makes future policy promises that are just as repulsive as the incumbent's shortcomings? Some of these issues are avoided in the democratic system based on consensus. It will be possible to establish various ruling coalitions on various subjects if inclusive decision and election procedures assist in electing a number of parties or factions that reflect multiple voter opinion configurations. Prior to the next election, the parties must first construct legislative coalition governments with stances that more intricately reflect the diversity of voter preference clusters. As an alternative, a "minority" administration may enlist assistance from various groups outside the government on various topics. The party government will also need to bargain with those who have access to resources via committee posts, the other legislative body, regional administrations, etc. There will be fewer instances of prospective majorities being "early eliminated."

However, the consensual version has drawbacks that offset its advantages. Voters find it challenging to understand any relationship between their decisions and governmental policy due to the convoluted processes of negotiation. Even those who do not adhere to a tight mandate model may find the lack of connection to be aggravating, as Dutch voters highlighted by supporting the protest party D66 more than 20 years ago. Even more fundamentally, determining who is responsible for policy may be challenging. It may be difficult for American voters to determine who to hold responsible for failed policies given the country's split presidential-congressional leadership, fluctuating party factions, powerful committees in Congress, considerable state government power, and an often-meddling Supreme Court. Similar to Belgium, Switzerland, and Italy, short-lived coalitions, recurrent minority administrations, and powerful committees may make it difficult to determine who is responsible. When the potential alternative policy makers are also tainted by power-sharing, it is difficult to find a way to express fundamental democratic dissent by ousting the incumbents.

There may be no democracy, or at least none that political science has yet to name, that ensures the best single strategy for citizen involvement. Instead, each of the main variants and their combinations has pros and cons of its own. Depending on the quantity and severity of the challenges dividing the populace as well as the traits they value most, each form of weakness may have a different impact. Perhaps understanding the advantages and disadvantages of the various strategies is sufficient at this time.

DISCUSSION

Citizen Participation in Liberal Democracy

Whatever the opportunities for control that the various democratic models present, it is still up to the people to take use of them. Utilizing both electoral and non-electoral channels will be necessary for effective citizen control in order to supplement the crude but necessary electoral instruments with forms of participation capable of conveying citizens' desires more completely and clearly.

Taking part in elections

Voting is undoubtedly the most common and evenly distributed method of citizen engagement in modern democracies. It is also obvious that voter turnout rates vary systematically amongst liberal democracies. In national elections, voter turnout varies from roughly 50% of eligible voters in Switzerland and the United States to nearly 90% in Australia, Austria, Belgium, and Italy. The average voter turnout in countries without mandatory voting laws is just under 80%. Even though turnout varies from election to election, it typically remains fairly consistent within each nation as opposed to the pronounced cross-national variations. The opinions and qualities of the population vary, which has an impact on the rates of political engagement. Differences in the institutional setting, such as compulsory voting, registration rules, nationally competitive election districts, and, maybe less obviously, other aspects of the party and policymaking systems, are much more significant [3], [4].

Community Involvement and A Campaign

Both campaign activity engagement and voting are impacted by institutional context. Election-related activities, including working for parties and candidates, are undoubtedly controlled in certain countries by a small number of devoted activists or by party members who get favors. Other nations, particularly the United States, have extensive, decentralized party and candidate organizations that significantly increase voter turnout. Still, according to participation studies, partisanship and socioeconomic resources are less important in determining who votes than they are in determining a citizen's willingness to participate in political campaigns or other community activities. For instance, high levels of civic engagement have been achieved in the United States because to a mix of a comparatively organized and educated populace and largely autonomous municipal governments; involvement is, however, more usually from the wealthier members of society. The concerted efforts of unions and labor parties to organize and mobilize the disadvantaged may somewhat, but not entirely, offset the participation advantages of individuals with greater social and economic resources. Political science has not yet fully completed the work of constructing a thorough picture of the degree, kinds, and equality of citizen usage of the opportunities for democratic involvement.

Citizens and interest groups in liberal democracies

In every kind of political system, there exist organizations that try to influence decision-makers to take into account the needs and interests of its members. In liberal democracies, there are factors that naturally favor the establishment of many interest groups of all different types. These groups multiply as societies get more complex and organizationally distinct, as well as when people become, generally speaking, more educated and informed citizens. Some of them are created specifically to express political demands, while more are compelled to do so when the interests of the organizations collide with a potentially political problem. Democracies, however, differ significantly in the density of interest group structure and the relationships between organizations and political parties for both historical and socioeconomic reasons. In Sweden and certain other Scandinavian nations, citizen involvement in voluntary organisations seems to be even greater than it is in the United States and Austria.

Such action on the part of labor unions, consumer organizations, churches, commercial and professional associations, leisure clubs, and so forth has been seen by some academics as crucial to liberal democracy. One school of thinking places a focus on dispute resolution. Multiple group

affiliations can bring people together and promote considering various points of view by "cross-cutting" them. A different school of thinking emphasizes group activities that may mediate between the citizen and the state, assisting people in understanding and refining their own wishes, interpreting them politically, and engaging in politics outside of electoral politics. Compared to the clumsy association between party and election, the group action may communicate the desires of individual individuals to policy makers with a great deal more clarity and focused precision. Compared to an individual citizen working alone, they can mobilize greater resources. Even if they were originally or mainly established for another reason, their presence may address many of the issues disgruntled but dispersed people have with organizing and mobilizing.

Other democratic theorists have viewed interest groups with suspicion, highlighting the possibility that their unique demands and advantages may be at odds with the general good or the interests of the less well-organized, who are frequently the less educated and wealthy members of society. As an example, Schattschneider described "the pressure group" as "a parasite living on the wastage of power exercised by the sovereign majority" and subsequently said that "the business or upper-class bias of the pressure system shows up everywhere." Competitive elections should, in general, help curb the inclination for policy makers to follow their own preferences as well as the tendency for them to react to the more often voiced interests of the better-off and the organized. The electoral restriction is really limited by concerns with voter attention, information, and competing interests. Thus, interest group organization is crucial for all sections of the citizenry.

The Prerequisites for a Sustainable Liberal Democracy

Societies of all sizes and sorts may have liberal democracies. It is feasible to develop and maintain a liberal democracy in any society, given a sufficient level of autonomy and the residents' willingness for it. However, some aspects of the social environment are much more supportive of liberal democracy and offer better chances for its survival than others. Furthermore, political theorists have long held that some variants are more likely to survive than others. The first prerequisite is that the chances for liberal democracy would be significantly impacted by the global environment. In the worst case scenario, liberal democracy may not be permitted to emerge in cultures that have been as deeply ingrained as those in Eastern Europe between 1945 until relatively recently. In 1956 in Hungary and 1968 in Czechoslovakia, the Soviet Union made it very apparent that, despite the wishes of the people, it would not permit multiparty competition and free elections in both states. Eastern Europe's transition to democracy was made possible by significant shifts in Soviet policy in the late 1980s. Additionally, a would-be democracy can be undermined by the financing of internal uprisings by foreign governments or by an internal minority believing they may be a majority in another state.

Less directly, the state of the world might provide a compelling case for or against domestic democratic supporters. In the 1970s, the expectation that liberal democracy would be a requirement for full entry into the European Community and its valuable markets strengthened pro-democratic forces in Spain and Greece. According to Huntington, "the rise and decline of democracy on a global scale is a function of the rise and decline of the most powerful democratic states" throughout the course of human history. Second, a society's chances of maintaining democracy will depend on how modernized it is. Economically developed cultures are better able to cope with internal conflict, particularly economic conflict, because of their higher wealth and

income. Greater levels of literacy, more dense communication channels, and more intricately formed patterns of associational life are all factors that support a populace capable of handling democratic involvement. The growth of an independent, native middle class, which has traditionally been a significant democratizing factor, is also significantly correlated with the degree of modernisation. Only a few relatively underdeveloped and economically underdeveloped societies, like India, have managed to maintain democracy.

Third, the likelihood of a successful liberal democracy is likely to be impacted by the level of internal socioeconomic and ethnic fragmentation. Achieving political stability in a nation with divides based on language, ethnicity, race, religion, and other demographic traits that include a strong sense of personal identity for both people and groups is likely to be more challenging under any system. They often deal with public policy challenges that are especially difficult to settle by negotiation and band-aid solutions. Even more challenging to resolve than multiple groups with no majority are situations where the society is simply divided into majority and minority ethnic groups. Additionally, the threat to social groups' and individuals' identities causes a high degree of feeling intensity as well as the rapid growth of mistrust and fear. Ethnic conflicts may resist the most creative attempts at democratic reconciliation if they are organized internally and fear and resentment have accumulated. Examples include the protracted wars between the Basques in Spain and Northern Ireland in the UK. Ethnic homogeneity is not a need for democracy, as seen by the relative achievements of ethnic politics in Switzerland, Belgium, and Canada without significant violent conflict. But it certainly makes the job simpler.

There is little question that a favorable international environment, socioeconomic advancement, and racial homogeneity are factors that make the introduction and maintenance of liberal democracy simpler. In actuality, it is also true that modern democracies are situated in nations with free-market economies. The relationship is undoubtedly there, albeit it is difficult to determine whether it is a result of the group autonomy fostered by free markets or the result of the incompatibility of broad society command control systems with both liberal democracy and market-oriented economics.

In addition to these more or less objective social and economic requirements for democracy, it is probable that a society's cultural traditions and beliefs may support or undermine liberal democracy. Historical political divisions and wars may plague a nation's political existence and make democratic dispute resolution more challenging, as France has shown the rest of Europe over the last 200 years. It has often been observed that successful democratic growth is often associated with a Protestant religious history; it has also been stated that democracy has unique challenges in Islamic countries. Liberal democratic institutions seem to function more reliably and effectively when such citizen attitudes as social trust, subject and participant competence, social cohesion, and a "ethos of civic involvement" are present.

The advantages of each key variation for maintaining democracy have been hotly debated among theorists of the effects of liberal democratic constitutions and party systems. Any of the methods will likely last if there is widespread public agreement on the fundamental rules and policies of the community. Since the Second World War, Lijphart has studied twenty-two liberal democracies and found examples of both highly majoritarian and highly consensual types. Additionally, he discovered various combinations of federalized majority party systems and centralized, multi-party systems. On the other hand, in very stressful circumstances, any of them may fail. It is also not clear whether or not the extreme polarization of public opinion is best

addressed by proportional representation and consultation as opposed to forced inclusion under two-party majoritarian politics. Supporters of majority rule emphasize the power to act quickly and forcefully and argue that this ability might be crucial in tense situations. Numerous authors have believed that multi-party systems are fatefully unable to handle significant internal crises, at least since the fall of the Weimar Republic. Majoritarian politics are unstable in the face of ferocious opinion battles, according to a viewpoint with often counterproductive ramifications. Majoritarianism often results in the repression of minorities and/or too great a danger for the status quo to cede power. Societies that are deeply split along racial or other lines must adopt consultative, non-majoritarian structures. Multi-party or consensual agreements may not make the situation worse, but they do have a tendency to bring unrest from the streets to the constitutional arena.

If democracy fails, it may do so in several ways depending on the kind of democracy. Majoritarian regimes are more prone to give in to the powerful government's inclination to stifle civil liberties or even competition in the name of stability or abolish elections altogether in the name of security or continuity. Consensual systems are more likely to stagnate, be unable to deal with important policy problems, lose the trust of the populace, and pave the way for military intervention. However, there is no universally applicable magic formula; rather, it is up to the social elites to come up with strategies for overcoming the shortcomings and maximizing the advantages of their particular brand of liberal democracy. Liberal democracy's fundamental tenet is that everyday people must be alert and wise enough to support efforts to preserve freedom and democracy [5], [6].

Liberal Democracies and Alternatives to Democracy

Liberal democracy seemed to be fading as late as the middle of the 1970s. The military or executive coup overthrow of democracies that appeared to have stabilized and been well-established in Uruguay, Chile, Turkey, and the Philippines; the tragic civil war in Lebanon; and the suspension of democratic elections and rights in India and Sri Lanka all suggested that democracy was too brittle to handle Third World conditions. Academics in the industrialized West expressed gloomily their concerns about the "ungovernability" of liberal democracies in modern cultures after being alarmed by student uprisings, terrorist attacks, "stagflation," strikes, and dwindling party identification. They were discouraged by the short-sighted, budget-driven policies of democratic leaders and large electorates.

It is probable that difficult times will return. So it would seem appropriate to end with a brief comparison of democracies and their non-democratic counterparts. First, protecting civil rights and individual freedom from elite exploitation is the simplest area in which to demonstrate democracy's greater performance. The relationship between political rights and civil freedoms is quite obvious when one looks at Freedom House's annual research on both topics. Significant civil liberties are permitted by some authoritarian regimes. Certain liberal democracies have curbed press freedoms and civil rights, or they have abused minorities' positions. However, it is clear that political rights, electoral competition, and civil liberties are all intertwined. Furthermore, there is some evidence that democracy helps to keep serious violence under control. If we had greater information on the violence that occurs in authoritarian institutions, this evidence would likely be more convincing. However, Hibbs' meticulous examination of widespread mass political violence revealed that repressive policies were less common under

regimes where elites were elected. Additionally, he noted that such elite restraint in the face of populist unrest and protest served to prevent the escalation of serious violence.

It is more challenging to be certain about the evidence for liberal democracy in areas like economic development and welfare policies. Comparison is a challenging undertaking due to data issues as well as the rather dissimilar techniques used within each kind of regime. Theoretically, we would anticipate that liberal democracies would be more inclined to implement welfare measures and generally adapt to the consensus-based policies that voters favor. Many scholars of Third World development were pessimistic about the capacity of liberal democracies to encourage the savings necessary for long-term growth precisely because of this expectation.

The best comparisons of welfare policies before 1980 suggest little difference between liberal democracies and other types of regimes in average welfare policies or average growth in either the Third World or in Eastern versus Western Europe. This is true despite both the hopes and fears of policy tendencies in liberal democracies. Recent research and the events that occurred in Eastern Europe in the late 1980s appear to favor liberal democracies. The 1980s proved, at the very least, that there are several economic patterns that may exist under each sort of political government. They have also shown that people in liberal democracies are capable of rejecting parties that advocate for unending welfare and tax increases. Thus, there appears to be justification for cautious optimism regarding voters' ability to control elite behavior in contemporary liberal democracies.

It is too simple to be enthusiastic about how liberal democracies would do in comparison to non-democratic regimes as the 1990s get underway. The defeat of liberal democracy and mixed capitalist economies over their most significant adversary seems to be imminent as the communist ideology is in disorder, Soviet authority over its European neighbors appears to have been relinquished, and central command control systems are in economic disaster. Perhaps a more sobering lesson is that no system provides the ideal means of governing modern society. Churchill's maxim is still the most reliable: In this world of sin and misery, several systems of governance have been attempted and will continue to be tried. Nobody makes the claim that democracy is flawless or intelligent. Indeed, it has been claimed that democracy is the worst type of government, barring any other types that have occasionally been tried [7]–[9].

CONCLUSION

Liberal democracies put a high focus on diversity and tolerance as well, understanding the value of many viewpoints as well as the need of respectful dialogue and compromise. It recognizes the significance of civil society, which includes free press, non-governmental groups, and an active public sphere. Liberal democracy is criticized for being susceptible to populism, demagoguery, and the sway of special interests and money. Additionally, they note that liberal democracy's emphasis on individualism and competition can result in social inequality and fragmentation and may not be suitable for all societies and cultures. Despite these difficulties, liberal democracy is still regarded as a highly effective and influential system of government, and many nations have adopted its tenets in an effort to strengthen democratic institutions and practices.

REFERENCES:

[1] S. F. Anzia, ‘When does a group of citizens influence policy? Evidence from senior citizen participation in city politics’, *J. Polit.*, 2019, doi: 10.1086/699916.

[2] A. Simonofski, A. Clarinval, B. Vanderose, B. Dumas, and M. Snoeck, 'What influences citizens' expectations towards digital government? An exploratory survey', *Digit. Policy, Regul. Gov.* , 2021, doi: 10.1108/DPRG-12-2020-0173.

[3] N. Jalli, 'Exploring the influence of citizen journalism content on the Malaysian political landscape', *Kaji. Malaysia*, 2020, doi: 10.21315/km2020.38.1.4.

[4] W. Li, 'The role of trust and risk in Citizens' E-Government services adoption: A perspective of the extended UTAUT model', *Sustain.*, 2021, doi: 10.3390/su13147671.

[5] N. Spielmann and E. A. Minton, 'Representing another nation: The influence of foreign citizen ambassadors on product evaluations', *J. Bus. Res.*, 2020, doi: 10.1016/j.jbusres.2018.05.035.

[6] P. G. Farnham, 'The impact of citizen influence on local government expenditure', *Public Choice*, 1990, doi: 10.1007/BF00124366.

[7] Y. K. Dwivedi and M. D. Williams, 'Demographic influence on UK citizens' e-government adoption', *Electron. Gov.*, 2008, doi: 10.1504/EG.2008.018874.

[8] J. E. Wright, 'Will They Even Hear Me? How Race Influences Citizen Complaint Outcomes', *Public Perform. Manag. Rev.*, 2020, doi: 10.1080/15309576.2019.1660188.

[9] S. Bowler and T. Donovan, 'Democracy, institutions and attitudes about citizen influence on government', *Br. J. Polit. Sci.*, 2002, doi: 10.1017/S0007123402000157.

CHAPTER 17

COMMUNIST AND POST-COMMUNIST SYSTEMS

Vibhor Jain, Associate Professor
Teerthanker Mahaveer Institute of Management and Technology, Teerthanker Mahaveer University,
Moradabad, Uttar Pradesh, India
Email id-vibhorjain7@gmail.com

ABSTRACT:

Communist and post-communist systems refer to the political and economic systems that were established in countries that followed Marxist-Leninist principles, particularly during the Soviet era. Communist systems were characterized by centralized planning, state ownership of property, and political repression, while post-communist systems refer to the political and economic systems that emerged in these countries after the fall of the Soviet Union in the early year. Communist systems were established in many countries during the 20th century, including the Soviet Union, China, Cuba, Vietnam, and several countries in Eastern Europe. These systems aimed to establish a socialist society based on the principles of collective ownership of the means of production and the distribution of resources according to need. However, they were also characterized by political repression, censorship, and the suppression of dissent.

KEYWORDS:

Authoritarianism, Central Planning, Collectivization, Command Economy, Communist Party, Democracy.

INTRODUCTION

About one-third of the world's population lived in systems that purported to be constructing communism prior to the so-called "East European Revolution" of 1989–1990; such systems can be referred to as communist. Even at the end of the 1990s, well over 1.5 billion people were still living in communist systems, even though it looked that most of these systems would transition to 'post-communist' status in the next decade. Although references to "post-communist" states will be made when necessary, the majority of this essay deals with communist states as they existed up until 1989 [1], [2].

Some commentators have argued that the term "communist" should not be used because none of the communist states have ever claimed to be communist; instead, most have claimed to be at some stage of socialism. However, there are two main justifications for why the term "communist" is still preferred over all others. First, according to Marx, the word "communism" refers to two phenomena: the ideal society strives to achieve and the political movement that abolishes the status quo in order to foster the circumstances necessary for society to progress in that direction. In fact, he made it quite evident that the political movement was more similar to his definition of communism than the ideal. Second, there are and have been a number of socialist systems in the globe that are not structured in the same manner as communist governments and do not claim to be constructing a communism in the Marxist tradition. Libya,

Tanzania, Nicaragua, and Burma are just a few examples. It seems reasonable to refer to the former as socialist and the latter as communist in order to prevent misunderstanding with such governments[3].

The issue of whether or not self-ascription, which is basically the criteria employed above, is acceptable in evaluating whether or not a certain nation should be categorized as "communist" has generated much controversy in the study of comparative communism. Harding contends that it would be incorrect to label a government as communist or Marxist, as he prefers to call it based only on the objectives it proclaims. For him, the proper circumstances and methods for their implementation must exist. With the possible, partial exceptions of Czechoslovakia and what was, until October 1990, the German Democratic Republic, this argument has a flaw in that none of the existing communist or even post-communist systems had the conditions necessary for the construction of socialism when the communists came to power.

Harding contends that Marxism may only become a useful vocabulary of legitimacy for Jacobins, populists, nationalists, or tyrants if a dictatorship does not have the appropriate degree of development, for example. In reality, there aren't many communist systems that haven't had 'Jacobins, populists, nationalists, and dictators' as their leaders for at least some of the period, thus one wonders whether genuine regimes may be included using Harding's methodology. To be fair to Harding, it sometimes looks as if he wants to distinguish between communist and Marxist governments. The reader is ultimately unsure as to whether Harding is actually pleading for the use of the term "Marxist regime" only as an ideal type, or whether he does in fact wish to use it as an alternative label to "communist." However, on other occasions he does appear to use the term Marxist to apply to many of the regimes most observers would choose to call communist. So let's think of an alternative strategy.

John Kautsky offers one of the most thought-provoking assessments of the topic of what makes a communist state. Kautsky claimed that none of the characteristics others have used to categorize communist regimes are exclusive to such systems in a 1973 paper. He contends that the only factor that really separates them is their symbols, and he believes that symbols are inadequate as a criteria for differentiation. The primary issues with Kautsky's position are two. First, symbols may be significant, particularly if they are closely tied to how society is really organized. Second, while it is possible to find examples of non-communist systems that approach these issues similarly to the communist systems and isolate each of the variables he identifies such as a nationalist element in the ideology, an authoritarian political structure, state intervention in the economy, etc. the specific combination of variables in communist states is fairly unique. Because of this, Kautsky goes too far in asserting that communist systems are similar to many other systems, even while his argument that we shouldn't regard them differently from all other sorts of systems is undeniably valid.

There are four qualities that define a communist state, according to the authors of one of the best-selling introductions to them. First, each of these states has a central ideology that is based on Marxism-Leninism. They have "administered" or "command" economies rather than "market" economies, and the economy is mostly or virtually fully owned by the government rather than by private individuals. Third, they are often governed by one or more major communist parties, with authority typically being highly centralized and structured in accordance with the notion of "democratic centralism" inside these parties. Finally, in communist governments, the communist party effectively exercises direct control over institutions that in liberal democracies are more or

less independent of the political authorities. This is known as the "leading role" of the communist party. This seems to be one of the best analyses of the characteristics of a communist system; however, it will be argued below that communist states are dynamic and that some of the above characteristics are less prominent than they once were even in those countries that are not yet 'post-communist'; the question then needs to be raised as to whether or not such dynamism ultimately steers these states away from communism. For the time being, some of the factors may be more thoroughly explored, supposing that this fourfold analysis is more-or-less accurate [4].

Josef Stalin, the Soviet leader, is believed to be the one who first introduced the phrase "Marxism-Leninism." The ideology is materialist, which means that those who hold it assume that matter—the physical world in which we live determines our mental processes. They are radically different from idealists in this regard Hegel is a great example who think that ideas themselves are reality and that the world is only a mirror of these ideas. Marxism-Leninism is also said to be founded on a dialectical worldview, which, to put it simply, holds that everything is always changing and that change results from the interaction and growth of many causes. Class conflict, which in turn reflects changes in the nature and ownership of the means of production, is the most significant aspect for Marxist-Leninists as well as Marxists generally.

Marxist-Leninists refer to their ideology as "scientific" and think that such processes are subject to rules. To this Marxist foundation, Vladimir Ilyich Lenin, the first Soviet leader, added two particularly crucial elements. First, he created the concept of an elite, centralized, and close-knit political party. In 1921, he reaffirmed the necessity for a close-knit party where factionalism would not be permitted even after a socialist revolution. This notion was first presented in What is to be Done? before the Russian Revolution of October 1917. This is where the Marxist-Leninist emphasis on the unified and centralized party has its roots. Lenin also offered a significant study of imperialism. Lenin's views have inspired a lot of revolutionaries in the developing world even if many of his theories on the subject have been proven false. This is largely because they accepted his view that the world is divided into imperialist nations and colonies, and because he appeared to demonstrate how a group of domestic communists could develop their country independently of the imperial powers, largely through a tightly organized and centralized political system.

The reader is highly encouraged to study both the article on Marxism in this encyclopedia and the materials given in the bibliography at the conclusion of this essay since the foregoing analysis of Marxism-Leninism is simply a thumb-nail sketch. It should be noted at this point that several communist nations have added words to the term "Marxism-Leninism" to designate their own brand of ideology. The People's Republic of China, which at the time of writing still officially referred to its ideology as "Marxism-Leninism and Mao Zedong Thought," is the most well-known example. The Chinese expressly differentiate between the 'pure' ideology of Marxism-Leninism and the 'practical' ideology of Maoist thinking. This is more so than many other communists. This theory holds that Marxism-Leninism is primarily an analytical framework, a general approach to understanding the world, while the "practical" aspect of the ideology is required to apply this framework to the specific circumstances in a given nation during a specific time period and develop policies, among other things, in light of them. Official nationalism is a significant component that is often included in the "practical" ideology but really runs counter to the "proletarian internationalism" of classical Marxism. The ideology of North

Korea, which is referred to as "Marxism- Leninism and Juche," is an excellent illustration of this; Juche is a strongly nationalist philosophy.

Different communist states have varying degrees and types of state ownership and central economic planning. Albania, North Korea, and Cuba are examples of nations at one extreme of the spectrum where there has been very little private ownership and a significant degree of central planning. On the opposite extreme are nations where central planning is/was not only far less extensive than in other communist republics, but also largely indicative. Private business has not only been permitted, but especially fostered. Yugoslavia, Hungary until 1989, the USSR, and—at least until the middle of 1989—the PRC are examples of countries with this style of economy.

There are two prevalent fallacies that need to be dispelled, notwithstanding the fact that a strong communist party has governed over all communist republics. The first is that there is no doubt that all communist regimes are one-party nations. Even though the communist party typically holds a majority, several communist states, including Bulgaria, the GDR, Poland, the PRC, and Vietnam, formally had a bi- or multi-party system for a long time. But it must be understood that until the post-communist transition is well under way, minor parties typically do not have a big impact in these nations. Second, the communist party had little to no role in the early years of communist rule in several of the non-European communist republics, like Cuba and Ethiopia, sometimes simply because it did not exist. In these situations, the nation was primarily referred to as communist in terms of the leaders' formal commitment to Marxist-Leninist ideology and communism as a final destination, even though, strictly speaking, some leaders, like Castro, did not even commit themselves to these ideas until sometime after they had seized power. One of the numerous reasons why experts occasionally dispute on whether to label a certain system as "communist.

DISCUSSION

The 'democratic centralism' concept, as previously established, governs the formation of communist parties. under fact, many other political organizations under communist regimes, including a large portion of the state, have adopted this principle legally in recent years. Democratic centralism within the Party included the following, under Article 19 of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union's ratified Statute from 1986:

1. Election of each of the highest to lowest ranking Party bodies;
2. Periodic reports by Party bodies to their higher bodies and Party organizations;
3. Rigid Party discipline and the majority's submission to the minority;
4. The fact that judgments made by higher authorities are enforceable against lower ones;
5. Each Communist must take personal responsibility for carrying out his or her obligations to the Party and participating in all organizations' and leading Party bodies' activities.

In this fundamental political principle, "centralism" was the noun, and "democratic" was the modifier; in other words, "democracy," however defined, was only intended to act as a control on a centralized system, not to constitute the basis of the system itself. It is beyond the purview of this article to thoroughly discuss the many methods in which communist parties exert their "leading role" in society, particularly over other institutions like the media and labor unions. In many respects, the so-called nomenklatura system is the most significant example of this. Although there are some slight variations in how this is carried out from nation to nation, the

fundamental idea is universal. The communist party is hierarchically structured, with secretaries and secretariats at each level having a list of positions known as the nomenklatura at that level. The party must have some influence over who is hired for and/or removed from these important positions; in some situations, the party must be actively engaged in this process, in others just informed. The crucial distinction is that the nomenklatura comprises all of the politically significant and delicate positions at a particular level, not just party seats. Editorships of local newspapers, directorships of various production companies, deans of local institutions, and other positions may be included in a city's nomenklatura. Even though the majority of people in most communist states are party members, not everyone appointed to a nomenklatura position will be one [5], [6].

By using the aforementioned standards, it is feasible to pinpoint more than twenty countries across four continents that practiced communism up to 1989. Afghanistan, Albania, Angola, Benin, Bulgaria, Cambodia, China, Congo, Cuba, Czechoslovakia, East Germany, Ethiopia, Hungary, North Korea, Laos, Mongolia, Mozambique, Poland, Romania, South Yemen, Soviet Union, Vietnam, and Yugoslavia were among them. They were listed alphabetically after each other. However, many of the aforementioned nations went through overt systemic crises in the years 1989 to 1990; as a result, by the middle of 1991, only four of the aforementioned nations still met most definitions of a clearly communist system. Thirteen more seemed to be in different phases of change, albeit they weren't yet distinctly "post-communist." The remaining two were not just post-communist but had also both combined with neighboring nations that had a similar culture after 1990, so ceasing to exist as sovereign entities, leaving only four countries that were still in existence that were unmistakably "post-communist." The dynamism of communist governments must inevitably be analyzed in order to understand what caused all of this. What follows must be given in a fairly broad way, and different communist nations will resemble the pattern more or less.

Communists often seize control during times of emergency. Most often, crises have place either during or after a significant international conflict. The 1917 crisis in Russia, the first communist state in the world, was partially brought on by the nation's dismal performance in the First World War. Only one other nation, Mongolia, came into communist rule between 1917 and the middle of the 1940s; in this particular instance, the system was in crisis due to domestic issues rather than external forces like war. However, a number of new communist states emerged following the Second World War. Thus, between 1945 and 1950, communists seized control of China, North Korea, Vietnam, and eight East European states. Each had different conditions, but they all had an old government that had fallen or was in the process of falling, and in several of them, the Red Army or other kinds of Soviet participation helped local communists seize power. There was only one new communist state in the 1950s, and even this is debatable in some ways because Castro did not formally declare his commitment to Marxism-Leninism until 1961. Castro came to power primarily as a result of the corruption and widespread unpopularity of the Batista regime rather than an international conflict.

The communist world did not see a significant growth throughout the 1960s either; in the opinion of many, communists assumed power in the Congo in 1968 and in South Yemen in 1969. In the early to mid-1970s, the second significant wave of communist growth took occurred. The victory of the communists in a global conflict and the continued demise of many European empires, particularly the French and Portuguese, were the main causes of the crisis in this instance. Thus, following the overthrow of the Caetano regime in Portugal in September 1974

and the subsequent Portuguese abandonment of its centuries-old empire, Benin, an ex-French colony, came under communist control in 1972, while Angola and Mozambique swiftly came under MPLA and Frelimo control, respectively. Ethiopia and Afghanistan, the other two nations that fell under communist rule in the 1970s, experienced crises that resulted in revolutionary change primarily because of the unpopularity and general decline of the General Daoud and Emperor Haile Selassie regimes, respectively.

The lack of communist ascension to power in economically developed nations or nations with a long record of liberal democracy is one of the most startling findings in a comparative study of communist power grabs. In this sense, Marx was wrong to foresee the formation of what we often refer to as communist regimes. The fact that communists typically come to power in developing nations has the effect of making the new rulers feel under pressure to quickly and fundamentally transform their nations. They frequently start doing this after consolidating their power, which can take anywhere from a few years to several decades depending on the country. This desire for quick change can be explained by the need for their nation to quickly advance industrially and economically to a point where, according to Marxist theory, a truly socialist and eventually communist system can be established, as well as by the need to show that the Marxist-Leninist development model is superior to other options, most notably capitalism.

It is typical for the transformation to be accompanied by relatively widespread physical terror given both this commitment to a quick "revolution from above" which typically involves socializing the means of production and collectivizing agriculture and the widespread hostility that this frequently engenders. Several communist states, including the USSR in the 1930s, the majority of Eastern Europe in the late 1940s and early 1950s, Cambodia in the mid- to late 1970s, Afghanistan at the end of the 1970s, and several of the African communist states in the late 1970s and into the 1980s, have prominently featured terrorism. During the period of transition, overt physical terror and a less severe "thought reform" have sometimes coexisted in some communist countries in Asia. The second sees a large number of individuals committed to "re-education camps" who the dictatorship deems to be either overtly antagonistic or else not sufficiently favorable in their sentiments toward communism. In the majority of situations, they are effectively prison-camps where internees undergo rigorous resocialization exercises. Such camps have been widely used by North Korea, China, Vietnam, Laos, and others.

The aforementioned should make it quite clear that communist nations often exert power largely via coercion throughout the consolidation and fast transition stages. But as time goes on, governments change, and the drawbacks of the primarily coercive mode become more and more clear. Therefore, communist leaderships typically aim to emphasize legitimacy rather than coercion. It is possible to identify at least seven types of legitimation, including old traditional, charismatic, teleological, eudaemonic, official nationalist, new traditional, and legal-rational. To a limited degree, each of these modes may be connected to a particular era of the communist state's growth. A new communist regime's primary early duty is to delegitimize its non-communist predecessor and erode long-standing traditions. It may be difficult for many older individuals, especially those who still believe in the divine right of kings, to acquire loyalty to the new kind of political order.

Communists may aim to give the impression that their very top leaders are superhuman and have made extraordinary efforts and personal sacrifices to serve the people as part of their attempts to undermine traditional values and quite possibly at the same time that coercion becomes the

predominant form of power. In recent years, the most extreme personality cults have been those of Kim Il Sung in North Korea and the late Nicolae Ceausescu in Romania. This is an attempt to legitimize in terms of leadership charisma, and it can be seen in the personality cults communist propagandists have created around leaders like Lenin, Mao, and Ho Chi Minh.

However, as educational standards rise and the essentially secularizing effects of communist power begin to manifest themselves, charismatic legitimation, like coercive power, typically starts to seem less appropriate and effective. As a result, communists start searching for other forms of legitimacy. In fact, this is often when the shift from power mostly based on coercion to power primarily based on legitimation starts to take place. During this time, teleological legitimation is frequently emphasized. At this point, communists primarily seek power by pointing to their crucial role in guiding society toward the improbable end-goal of communism. The CPSU Programme's 1961 publication serves as an excellent illustration of this effort at teleological legitimation.

Goal-rational or teleological legitimation frequently fades into obscurity over time for a variety of reasons, such as the cynicism brought on by years of coercion, by new leaders criticizing the shortcomings of their predecessors, by economic shortages, and by doubts about the practicality of achieving many goals within a sufficiently short time-frame that it could act as a stimulus to people. Usually, a less ambitious type of legitimation that is more focused on meeting the consumer's immediate needs takes its place. Eudaemonism, a term used to describe this kind of legitimation, aims to appease the public via effective government. When realistic socialism and better meeting consumer demands were both prioritized in the late 1960s and early 1970s, this was a significant characteristic of many European communist states. At that time, many communist countries in Europe enacted economic reforms that were intended, among other things, to satisfy these demands. At the end of the 1970s, China can be seen to have implemented a somewhat similar—though in many ways more radical—plan, and Vietnam also took steps in this direction in the 1980s.

Unfortunately, economic reforms rarely prove to be as effective as communist leaderships had hoped, which makes eudaemonic mode legitimacy difficult. To this, there are several replies. One is a new focus on official nationalism, in which communist authorities strive to win over the population by appealing to their nationalist sentiments. This approach may refer to a glorious pre-communist past or it may highlight recent national successes. However, such nationalism has risks. For instance, putting too much emphasis on the past can undermine communism's relatively radical ideas, and official nationalism can spark unofficial nationalism among ethnic minorities. 'New traditionalism' may be used to describe another regime reaction. In doing so, communist leaderships highlight the benefits of former eras of communism and either imply or openly propose that a return to some of the old communist norms might lessen contemporary issues. Gorbachev's focus on the good elements of the Lenin period and, after the middle of 1989, the Chinese leadership's more favorable reevaluation of the Maoist era are two examples of this. Once again, this kind of legitimation may present issues. For example, current leaders must choose carefully from the policies of their predecessors since current situations are sometimes substantially different from those that applied in the previous period. Some of these policies would be wholly unsuitable today.

Many communist leaders either fundamentally shun them or use them sparingly due to the issues with official nationalism and new traditionalism as mechanisms of legitimation. Instead, a focus

on legal-rational legitimation started to emerge in several communist states in the 1980s. There were clearly evidence of modernization in nations like Hungary, Poland, and the USSR even before 1989, despite the claim made by certain political theorists that this method of legitimation is the only one suitable for the'modern' state. An stress on the rule of law and, thus, the depersonalization of politics and economics are two prominent characteristics of legal-rationalism. Not only do communist politicians make references to the rule of law in their speeches, but there are also more tangible manifestations of this development, such as the limiting of political officeholder tenure, granting citizens the right to file lawsuits against public officials at any level, genuinely contested elections, and increased acceptance of investigative journalism. Mikhail Gorbachev, the Soviet leader since March 1985, is intimately identified with these changes in the USSR, which are evident in his focus on political and economic reform, more transparency and honesty on the part of the authorities, and increased political rights for the populace.

It is probable that many communist leaders have adopted these steps towards legal-rationality because other forms of justification have fallen short. On one level, it may be assumed that the leaders are using the relatively recent encouragement of people to criticize dishonest, ineffective, or haughty party and state officials as a means of ensuring correct execution of the economic reforms. In the past, presidents have often enacted economic performance-improving measures, only to see their own bureaucrats destroy these programs because they were seen as being against their interests. As a result, steps towards legal-rationality, such as widespread participation in campaigns against dishonest officials, have been employed by both Deng and Gorbachev—in different ways and to different extents as a means of enhancing economic performance. This strategy was likely motivated more by ways to enhance performance than by a dedication to a true rule of law as it is understood in the West. The leaders' ultimate goal seems to be to be able to revert to eudaemonic legitimation, but this time on the basis of a genuine improvement in the economy and therefore in living conditions.

However, developments in the late 1980s suggested that communist leaders were powerless to stop the legal-rationality-instigating actions that they felt compelled to take. People often want and expect more from communists than they can or are willing to provide because of the movements toward more open politics and privatization. At the end of the 1980s, this tension became very apparent in the USSR, China, and several East European states. One reaction is a return to coercion; the June 1989 massacre in Beijing and its aftermath are illustrative of this. Some communist nations, most notably the majority of the East European states, however, proved unable to reverse the trend. Many communist leaders discovered that they, as well as their system, were going through a serious identity crisis. The 'communist' system started to resemble what for so long had been depicted as the arch-enemy, the liberal democratic capitalist system, the more they let aspects of legal-rationality into the system. Even worse, rather than incorporating the finest features of both types of systems, the new hybrid system seemed to focus more on their negative qualities.

On the one hand, the communists were now willing to tolerate rising inequality, inflation, and unemployment. On the other hand, residents still did not enjoy the same degree of Western-style living standards or freedom of expression, assembly, or travel. The leaderships of many communist regimes also started to lose trust in what they were accomplishing as the leader of their role-model confessed that his country was in crisis and unsure of its future course. This fundamental conundrum was one of the main reasons for this. By 1989–1990, many communists

understood that the very dynamic of communist power had led them to a point at which that power and system had run its course. This realization was prompted by a condition of fundamental contradictions, pressure from below, and the loss of their primary role model. There are currently two issues that need to be resolved. To start, why are certain nations farther ahead than others in their transition from communism to post-communism? What distinguishing characteristics do post-communist nations have, secondly?

The first question has a complicated answer. Political culture, economic growth, knowledge of events elsewhere in the globe, and, it would appear, the communists' method of taking power are just a few of the numerous variables that need to be taken into account while coming up with an explanation. Thus, it appears that there is a fairly distinct pattern whereby countries where communism was essentially installed by a foreign power move to post-communism more quickly than countries where native communists assumed power largely through their own efforts. Poland and Hungary, for instance, are farther along in their transitions than Yugoslavia or Albania. The latter nations, however, are also experiencing the identity problem mentioned above, and it is probably definitely only a matter of time until they too become 'post-communist' states.

It's also challenging to provide a satisfying response to the second query, particularly in a piece of writing of size. In its simplest form, a post-communist state is one where communists formerly held power but have since lost their position of political dominance. However, this definition doesn't tell us much about the new political structures and ideologies, the economic system, etc. It would be ideal to investigate these factors in depth; however, this is not currently feasible for a number of reasons. On one level, post-communism is better understood as the rejection of something namely, the oppression, elitism, corruption, deceit, hypocrisy, and ineptitude of genuine communist systems than as the assimilation of a specific set of political, economic, and social objectives and strategies. In this regard, it is simpler to come to an understanding on what it is not than what it is.

It's true that there seems to be a general consensus among the many governments that are in or are moving toward the post-communist stage that a pluralist political system and an economic system that is more competitive and more privatized, similar to Western systems, are desired. The development or renewal of civil society is a distinguishing element of early post-communism; people are to have considerably more freedom than they have had under the new arrangements to organize themselves without undue governmental intrusion. However, there are also a lot of different perspectives within each of these nations regarding the kind, rate, and course of change that is wanted and/or feasible. The ways to accomplish these objectives, even when there is a fair amount of agreement on them, are often not obvious. The challenge of developing a competitive, mainly privatized economy often referred to as a "market" system is perhaps the finest illustration. on instance, many Poles and Russians favor a market economy but provide few specific suggestions on how to create one.

As the euphoria of overthrowing communist governments is replaced by various harsh realities of early post-communism, such as worsening domestic inflation and unemployment in the context of a global recession, a mood of disappointment and even despair may set in. This is one of the ramifications of this apparent gap between ends and means. Future nationalist, authoritarian, and perhaps racial demagogues who, although not communist, may be at least as unwelcome as their Marxist-Leninist forebears might take advantage of such despondency.

However, there are other possible outcomes for post-communism besides this grim one. Interaction with the rest of the world might ensure a better future for post-communism if the global economy performs well in the 1990s, however unlikely this may appear at the start of the decade.

Post-communism has been discussed before in a very generic manner, almost as if it were a single phenomenon. While there are many similarities among the various nations that are in or are in the process of transitioning out of communism, there are also significant differences and potentialities related to things like the degree of racial homogeneity, the accessibility of natural resources, etc. It is quite likely that certain post-communist nations and societies will fare much better than others, in part because of this. This is yet another reason why, at least for the time being, a thorough analysis of "post-communism" is not possible. A conclusion may be used to make two more points. First off, despite the fact that most communist regimes have recently struggled with severe identity problems, some of the principles that communist leaders once purportedly upheld might resurface in the post-communist age. Nevertheless, a social democratic system is more likely to allow for the realization of such values than a communist one. Second, those systems that are now either still communist or in transition are likely to be affected by what happens to the post-communist nations. It may be possible for communists who are currently in power to extend their reign if post-communist regimes are seen to be just marginally better than communism. This would only be a brief reprieve, though. Because of the dynamism of communism in power, democratic centralism, the de facto one-party state, and the centrally planned national economy eventually become outmoded and are replaced either abruptly or gradually, violently or amicably, from below, above, or outside, depending on the specific circumstances. Communism is sometimes a somewhat successful system for modernizing civilizations, but it cannot coexist with post-modernity or modernity based on law and pluralism [7], [8].

CONCLUSION

Globally speaking, communist and post-communist systems continue to influence political and economic discourse on topics like democracy, capitalism, and social justice. Many of these nations started making the transition to market-based economies and democratic political systems after the fall of the Soviet Union. With high rates of inflation, unemployment, and social unrest, this time of transition was often challenging. Additionally, many of these nations struggled to build solid democratic institutions and uphold political stability. Currently, the success of the transition of post-communist nations to market-based economies and democratic political systems varies. Some nations, like Poland and Estonia, successfully carried out reforms and were admitted to the European Union. Others, such Russia and Belarus, still battle economic stagnation and political persecution.

REFERENCES:

[1] S. P. Ramet, *Adaptation and transformation in communist and post-communist systems*. 2019. doi: 10.4324/9780429034350.

[2] I. Szelenyi, ‘Weber’s theory of domination and post-communist capitalisms’, *Theory Soc.*, 2016, doi: 10.1007/s11186-015-9263-6.

[3] O. Romanyuk, ‘Post - communist system transformation: features, results and prospects’, *Drinovsky Sb.*, 2021, doi: 10.7546/ds.2021.14.13.

[4] A. Cichocka and J. T. Jost, ‘Stripped of illusions? Exploring system justification processes in capitalist and post-Communist societies’, *Int. J. Psychol.*, 2014, doi: 10.1002/ijop.12011.

[5] R. Baum, D. S. G. Goodman, and G. Segal, ‘China Deconstructs: Politics, Trade, and Regionalism’, *Contemp. Sociol.*, 1997, doi: 10.2307/2655104.

[6] G. Roland, ‘The evolution of post-communist systems’, *Econ. Transit.*, 2018, doi: 10.1111/ecot.12164.

[7] T. Michalski and J. St□pień, ‘Ageing in European post-communist countries - Is it a threat to the welfare system?’, *Environ. Socio-Economic Stud.*, 2021, doi: 10.2478/environ-2021-0011.

[8] Z. Enyedi and F. C. Bértoa, ‘Institutionalization and de-institutionalization in post-communist party systems’, *East Eur. Polit. Soc.*, 2018, doi: 10.1177/0888325417736808.

CHAPTER 18

CONTEMPORARY AUTHORITARIAN REGIMES

Nazia Hasan, Assistant Professor Teerthanker Mahaveer Institute of Management and Technology,
Teerthanker Mahaveer University, Moradabad, Uttar Pradesh, India
Email id-nazia_14m@yahoo.co.in

ABSTRACT:

Contemporary authoritarian regimes are political systems characterized by concentrated power in the hands of a single leader or ruling party, limited political and civil liberties, and a lack of meaningful democratic participation. These regimes often use a variety of tactics to maintain their grip on power, including censorship, propaganda, intimidation, and violence. Authoritarian regimes have become increasingly prevalent in recent years, particularly in countries such as China, Russia, and Turkey. These regimes often use the rhetoric of nationalism and stability to justify their actions, and may portray democratic institutions and civil society as threats to national security.

KEYWORDS:

Authoritarianism, Censorship, Civil Liberties, Dictatorship, Electoral Fraud, Human Rights.

INTRODUCTION

The idea of authoritarianism is quite contentious, much like many other terms in modern political science. The history of the idea in political inquiry literature is lengthy and sometimes hazy. Since there is no widely accepted definition of the term to guide our discussions of it and other related terms, such as democracy and totalitarianism, which are used to categorize modern political regimes, there is confusion and controversy surrounding it. Because these ideas lie at the nexus of attempted scientific accounts of politics and government and the divisive realm of actual political practice, the whole problem of categorizing regimes is further complicated. Therefore, these terms not only signify aspects of regimes but also suggest both positive and negative evaluations of their normative value. Although this has not always been the case historically, the idea of an authoritarian regime has generally carried a rather negative connotation in recent times [1], [2].

The issue of normative connotation, in turn, creates a link back into the field of scientific analysis because it touches on a key concern shared by all regime types: legitimacy, or the guiding principles that political actors use to defend the way they structure the political system in any given society. Max Weber, a significant political sociologist, long ago developed the theory that the key to the long-term stability of any form of regime is the extent to which the people it controls come to accept the validity of its essential organizing ideas. A regime's ability to maintain order and rule a particular society is supposedly increased when people believe in its legitimacy since it grants power to specific administrations that act in its name.

The ideas of regime form and legitimacy lead us right away to one of the most significant political issues facing most of the modern world: the issue of governance, or the capacity of governments to maintain order while also addressing the issues that face a particular community. In terms of concept, that inquiry entails the examination of the interactions of three separate dimensions: state, regime, and governance. Can some governments use the state's authority to create a type of governance that can endure through time and through changes in leadership, even when those governments provide solutions to problems? The majority of the most important issues facing governments today, particularly in less developed nations, are economic in character.

These conceptual problems of governance and legitimacy are intimately related to many of the most crucial topics concerning the understanding of modern authoritarian regimes. Many analysts contend that the emergence of authoritarian regimes results from circumstances where the legitimacy of other regime types, such as democracy, is compromised due to the fact that governments are unable to address many of the most important economic issues facing a society. Governmental incompetence may cause a crisis of confidence in the status quo, leaving it open to uprising, coups, and other violent means of overthrow. The new government is often authoritarian in that it aims to consolidate governmental authority in the hands of a powerful president who then takes action to enforce answers to urgent issues using force and coercion, if necessary. In other words, "authoritarianism" is often brought on by a serious crisis in democratic administration [3].

Many strong governments that were established recently using these methods then announced their plans to establish an authoritarian regime, within which new governments would be elected on an ongoing basis in order to fundamentally reorganize and reform society. However, as analysts like Linz have noted, modern authoritarian regimes have found it particularly challenging to justify their own existence because the idea of democracy today has become so pervasive that it has all but monopolized legitimacy throughout the world. Thus, especially in the long run, authoritarian regimes are immediately viewed as being unjust. According to this claim, authoritarian regimes in place today can only establish a fleeting sense of legitimacy tied to a current crisis; legitimacy rooted in exceptional circumstances and doomed to fade as the crisis either passes away or proves intractable to authoritarian measures as well.

Since its inception, the idea of authoritarianism has been closely related to many other ideas, including those of autocracy, dictatorship, oligarchy, patrimonialism, sultanism, and many more. Throughout much of human history, authoritarian forms of rule predominated on a global scale. Authoritarian regimes were often founded on value systems that gave them legitimacy. The majority of these regimes, in Weber's view, belonged to a single historical general category he dubbed "traditional authority." The rise of the modern state was associated with patrimonialism, the most significant form of traditional authority in the Western world. As a type of government, patrimonialism was associated with kings who centralized power under a single, personal central authority, which served as the source of law. The civil and military officials who made up the foundation of the administrative structure that eventually gave rise to the modern bureaucratic and professional military branches of the state over time defined this top-down style of government.

A tiny political class of nos competed among themselves for positions in the service of the patrimonial prince under the traditional patrimonial system, which Weber described as an

idealized theoretical type. The main source of conflict among this class was faction. They were the patrimonial ruler's 'clients' or retainers, and their positions were secured via favor or patronage. By directing the flow of patronage or prebends, the ruler attempted to exert control over the discordant estate of Nos. Because many of its core dynamics still exist in what are frequently referred to as patron-client relationships or clientelism, it is necessary to have some understanding of this traditional regime form of patrimonialism. Clientelism is a characteristic that may be seen in a variety of modern regimes, but it is most pronounced and obvious in authoritarian modern regimes in the developing world, which in some ways resemble patrimonialism. However, these "neo-patrimonial" manifestations of authoritarianism are cut off from patrimonialism's original, traditional base of legitimacy, and they coexist with other manifestations of contemporary authoritarianism in a setting where contemporary democratic values define them as either illegitimate or, at best, transient expedients on the path to democracy.

Another significant reason to briefly consider these historic forms of authoritarianism or autocracy is that they could provide light on a fundamental idea of authority that still underlies all manifestations of authoritarianism, even if it is weakly so. This idea, which was first expressed in institutions like the Roman Catholic Church, connects the right to govern with a corpus of esoteric, transcendent, or holy knowledge that must be applied to human concerns. All historic forms of power, from the golden stool of the Ashanti ancestors to the mandate of heaven of the Chinese to the notion of the divine right of kings in the West, were permeated by this "authority" to interpret or disclose transcendent esoteric truths. The idea of a transcendent source of law tied to a central ruling power that formulated law and administered it via a staff of highly skilled officials was prevalent, whether it was in the church, imperial China, or Louis XIV's France.

This fundamental notion of a centralized power that governs and upholds the law for a society continues in many significant ways into the modern era of political regimes. Institutions ingrained in ostensibly democratic regimes, like the US Supreme Court, show indications of it. It was amply demonstrated by the plebiscitary links to the French 'national will' that Charles de Gaulle claimed to represent, as well as by the constitution of the Fifth Republic that de Gaulle 'gave' to the French. In many 'authoritarian' or 'totalitarian' regimes linked to overt ideologies, like Marxism or other expressions of a putative national or collective will, destiny, or the like, we see the persistence of claims to interpret authoritatively secular bodies of knowledge. We also see it in a number of modern authoritarian systems where strong leaders employ teams of highly skilled professionals who assert a unique capacity to interpret arcane amounts of information considered essential to further the modernization and economic progress of a nation. They often make the case that such technically sound principles must be enforced in the face of the egotistical personal wills of classes, interest groups, regions, or political parties in order to serve the national good. Even today, a lot of political leaders and observers link the central administrative branch with the idea of the "general good," but legislative bodies and political parties are often linked to partisan and particularist objectives. It is no coincidence that all authoritarian governments are centered on a robust executive branch [4].

Therefore, while 'liberal democratic' values seem to be winning out in terms of rhetorical legitimacy, there are plenty of guiding principles that support the central role of strong executives serving a technically advanced elite corps of officials in the current global scene. What really exists, therefore, is a persistent conflict between top-down, monistic ideas of rule

and bottom-up, pluralistic, "democratic" conceptions of regime authority and legitimacy. These ideas are connected to two different conceptual traditions on the structure of the state that have developed in conflict over the course of centuries in the West, according to British political theorist Michael Oakeshott. In one, known as universitas, the state and society are viewed as a single corporate entity that is managed by an executive board of fiduciary agents charged with guiding the entity to meaningful corporate goals or ends. In the other, known as societas, society is viewed as an amalgamation or plurality of interests held together in a state by a set of rules or procedures that allow them to pursue their various interests in concert. While Societas tends toward a more legislative-centered concept of democracy in which the government articulates the variety of interests inherent in society in a rule-bound manner, Universitas tends toward an administrative concept of rule that is executive-centered and has authoritarian overtones. There is little doubt that authoritarian governments still use a modernized, technical version of universitas as a justification principle; in many cases of protracted economic disaster, the argument has some validity. However, authoritarian regimes may struggle to explain themselves in the contemporary environment. Furthermore, even though many nations are in the process of changing from authoritarian to democratic regimes, they are actually constructing systems that incorporate robust universitas components within ostensibly democratic frameworks.

The theories of modernization and development that came to dominate in the 1950s and 1960s as a result of the work of a top-tier group of political scientists affiliated with the Committee on Comparative Politics of the Social Science Research Council helped to shape how authoritarian regimes are currently conceptualized in political science. This corpus of thinking saw all cultures as following a linear route from traditional to contemporary by using a "structure function" way of analysis. According to this viewpoint, "democracy" refers to a contemporary system of governance associated with a society attaining a certain degree of economic and social development and achieving the required social criteria for democracy.

According to modernization theory, democracy was the ideal condition for society to reach as they made progress and modernized. When societies were transitioning from traditional to modern modes of state organization, the most important theoretical as well as practical political problems emerged. Societies might deviate into more harmful regime types during that transitional stage, which is often classified as some kind of authoritarianism or totalitarianism. In this corpus of philosophy, the negative regime types were principally defined in opposition to the democratic regime type. Authoritarianism and totalitarianism were seen as expressions of traditionalism that would eventually disappear as cultures developed, respectively. Totalitarianism was seen as a bad symptom of modernity.

The idea proposed a continuous progression toward modernity with opposing poles. When democratic structures were grafted onto less advanced societies that were not yet sufficiently developed to receive and root them, authoritarianism became a kind of residual regime category that defined a condition that societies either had to break out of to modernize or lapsed into. Authoritarianism evolved into a category into which fell a range of regimes that did not fit into either of the two prevailing ideal kinds, while democratic and totalitarian regimes were both characterized in terms of ideal typical words. Additionally, rather than being viewed in isolation, the various forms of authoritarian governments were seen as a kind of by-product of the pathology of democracy as it appeared at various points during the transition process.

To recap, the crucial stage in the transition to modernity and its positive expression, democracy, was the time when societies had the potential to either veer late into totalitarianism, particularly in the form of communism, or earlier into some form of authoritarianism. Unsurprisingly, the theory predicted that poor nations in the "Third World" were more likely to choose an authoritarian form of governance. The fact that governments like the one in the United States have a tendency to create programs like the Alliance for Progress to provide financial and technical aid designed to promote development, modernization, and democracy in regions like Latin America is also not surprising given the theory's origins. The scientific realm of political theory and that of political practice obviously converged in this area.

DISCUSSION

In his acclaimed book Political Order in Changing Society, Samuel P. Huntington made an important and somewhat critical variation on the modernization theme, arguing that rather than creating a foundation for democracy, modernization actually created political ferment that, if it exceeded the existing containment capacity of governmental institutions, would result in political decay and the breakdown of public order. Order and security were Huntington's top political priorities, and they naturally came before any effective government structure. It was necessary to establish institutions that could rule in order to maintain order and security. Huntington and others argued in this revision of Hobbes' Leviathan that the military was frequently the only contemporary, professionalized, and organized national institution capable of guiding a society through the perilous process of institutionalizing democracy. According to this theory, an authoritarian military government might in reality be used to establish a political order that would ultimately build the institutional framework required to preserve order and governability while controlling the disruptive impacts of modernity [5], [6].

The causal train underwent a significant change as a result of our investigation. Modernization often led to deterioration and instability, which made it necessary to rebuild governmental capability, enforce order, and establish institutions. The military was one of the only entities capable of rebuilding a modern state framework that might ultimately be democratized, and political deterioration practically drew the military into politics. An authoritarian government with a military-based foundation that builds institutions has the potential to be a forerunner of contemporary democracy and a facilitator of regulated modernisation.

The emergence of non-democratic governments in the developing world gave rise to theoretical worries about authoritarianism. Many of these regimes in places like Africa had a rather personalistic and patrimonial feel, which made them suitable for treatment as regressive elements during the transition period. The expansion of military-based authoritarian governments in Latin America's more industrialized nations between 1964 and 1973, as well as the installation of an authoritarian dictatorship in Greece from 1967 to 1974, were both significant developments. Social scientists reacted to these events by taking a fresh look at authoritarian Spain and Portugal and noting that Mexico, despite its outward appearance of democracy, really had an authoritarian government. These governments were very well-organized and complicated, without the patrimonial flavor of those in Africa, and publicly declared their intention to promote the modernization and economic growth of their various countries. Later observers started to notice that fast rising Asian nations like South Korea and Taiwan were being headed by powerful governments acting inside unmistakably authoritarian frameworks, which gave these assertions more credence.

In a now-classic piece, Juan Linz criticized the bi-polar continuum of democracy and totalitarianism and argued that it was essential to identify a particular form of authoritarian government while writing in the middle of these events and processes. This kind had a very contemporary shape, not a conventional one. Linz based his idea on the situation in Spain and created a definition that compared this regime to many of the traits of democracy and totalitarianism that are well-known. Political systems with limited, not responsible, political plurality, without comprehensive and guiding ideologies, wide nor vigorous political mobilization, and where a leader exerts power within nominally ill-defined but really relatively predicable boundaries are considered authoritarian regimes.

Many people's perspectives on the subject have been influenced by Linz's influential work, especially those of students of Latin American politics. Guillermo O'Donnell's Modernization and Bureaucratic-Authoritarianism: Studies in South American Politics, another classic, came next. O'Donnell completed the reversal of the link between modernization and authoritarian government types in addition to describing a particular sort of contemporary authoritarian regime, the bureaucratic-authoritarian regime. The bureaucratic-authoritarian regime was seen as a natural byproduct of capitalist growth and modernization inside comparatively developed but dependent communities like those in the southern cone of South America, cast in the new framework of dependency theory. By connecting the phenomena of dependence and capitalism to particular forms of authoritarianism, O'Donnell's influential work made a direct connection between would-be scientific discourse and the ideologically charged political rhetoric of the time, in contrast to earlier works that had related to practical political polemics in a more indirect and implicit way. Since then, debates have raged around these topics, illuminating the ways in which real-world political realities influence theoretical debates on regime types, for better or worse.

In her work "Dictatorship and double standards," political scientist Jeanne Kirkpatrick distinguished between totalitarian and authoritarian regimes, highlighting the inevitable overlap. Kirkpatrick contended that authoritarian regimes, while repressive, were more benign and capable of reform into capitalist democracy; as a result, United States policy in Latin America, in particular, should reflect those theoretically construed differences. He relegated the former category exclusively to Marxist-Leninist regimes. One cartoon response to the outcry this story caused observed that the true difference between the two was that whereas totalitarian governments detained, executed, and tortured individuals, authoritarian regimes outsourced many of those tasks to the private sector.

The joke was based on a significant insight into the ongoing totalitarian versus authoritarian conceptual debate: typically, the term "totalitarian" was used to describe regimes linked to command economies while the term "authoritarian" was primarily used to describe regimes linked to economies driven, at least in part, by markets and private economic interests. By rejecting the totalitarian category and combining such regimes into a fairly wide definition of authoritarianism, Amos Perlmutter aimed to further this discussion by using primarily political structural elements to describe authoritarianism. The contemporary authoritarian paradigm, which Perlmutter characterizes as "an exclusive, centralist political organization populated and dominated by an oligarchic political elite," is the focus of his book contemporary Authoritarianism: A Comparative Institutional Analysis.

In reality, the idea of totalitarianism has lost some of its luster in modern discourse, and democracy and authoritarianism seem to be the two most often used classifications. Not surprisingly, all regime types that cannot claim to be democratic seem to be shoved into the category of authoritarianism more often than ever. Frequently, the term "authoritarianism" is defined by elaborating characteristics that are the opposites of positive democratic characteristics. For instance, Perlmutter continues straight away to say, "These regimes are characterized by repression, intolerance, encroachment on citizens' private rights and freedoms, and limited autonomy for nonstatist interest groups."

The definition of sub-types must take precedence over the definition of the contemporary authoritarian regime itself given the extent of the category. Unfortunately, the number of sub-types fluctuates depending on who is defining them and the peculiarities of the regime the analyst is analyzing. We simply do not now have a sub-type categorization system that is widely used.

Perlmutter presents a framework of sub-types in his broad-brush method that might be a helpful place to start for the analyst looking for direction through this conceptual maze. He identifies four basic sorts of states: the Party State, the Police State, the Corporatist State, and the Praetorian State. He focuses on what he terms parallel and auxiliary institutions including police, party, military, and professional groups. The Personal, Oligarchic, and Bureaucratic-Authoritarian sub-types fall under the latter group. It must be emphasized that this design, like with all others, is still subject to harsh criticism and discussion. For instance, O'Donnell's bureaucratic-authoritarian regime, one of the most prominent ideas about contemporary authoritarianism in Latin America, is demoted to the position of a sub-type of a sub-type in Perlmutter's typology, which is, to put it mildly, a debatable decision.

Obviously, we won't resolve these conceptual problems here. Broadly speaking, modern authoritarian governments are first described as the opposite of the positive description of procedurally constrained constitutional democracies. Modern authoritarian regimes are therefore described as "regimes of fact" and "regimes of exception" in Latin American legal philosophy. The use of governmental authority under authoritarian regimes, which lack democratic, legal, or procedural balances, is fundamentally random and hence unpredictable. These systems often center on a powerful president who exercises authority with a cartel of political, military, bureaucratic, and other elites who write the laws that are imposed on the greater society. The persistence of universitas concepts of state organization, as well as a perceived need for an authoritative capacity to interpret esoteric but necessary knowledge, do hold out the possibility of some type of legitimation, especially in the face of a severe crisis like war, economic collapse, or the like. While the prevalence of democratic values seems to limit the ability of authoritarian regimes to establish their legitimacy. These regimes range in structure from very individualized neo-patrimonial regimes to highly structured regimes with institutional, military, and bureaucratic roots. It is obvious that we will not be able to develop a single explanation of origins for such a complicated, diverse, and worldwide phenomena. Surveying some broad opinions is possible, especially in relation to Latin America's recent experiences. In general, we may divide origins explanations into three categories: cultural explanations, broad structural economic explanations, and more particularly political structural and behavioral explanations. These categories, although separate, sometimes overlap in reality.

The emphasis of cultural explanations is on the ascribed underlying patterns of institutions and beliefs that make a society more susceptible to authoritarianism. The strongest version of the viewpoint views authoritarianism as the defining feature of a society that is always attempting to escape the foreign democratic systems that have been artificially imposed on these civilizations. Authors like Howard Wiarda have presented this argument in its clearest and most compelling form in works on Latin America. Weaker versions of the argument have validity, particularly when it comes to the organizational structures utilized by authoritarian governments and the principles that might be used to support the legitimacy of such a system. But there are many issues with the argument when it is presented in its strong or deterministic form. One is that authoritarianism in various regional and cultural settings cannot be explained culturally by the characteristics emphasized in one regional tradition. Another stems from a Weberian claim that if all traditional cultures were fundamentally authoritarian at one time, how is it possible that some of them remain authoritarian in modernized versions, others are patrimonial, and others are democratic? There must be some more influencing factors at play.

To explain the many diverse kinds of autocratic, totalitarian, and authoritarian governments that have inhabited the contemporary political scene, a variety of broad structural theories stressing socio-economic elements have been suggested. A transitional dilemma between traditional and contemporary society is a basic thesis of modernization that is varied by many. In order to explain contemporary communist revolutions, authors like Ulam, for instance, cited the disruptive consequences of early capitalist growth on traditional communities. In a similar spirit, Barrington Moore emphasized that whether a country progressed toward democracy, fascism, or peasant-based communism depended on how pre-existing aristocracies responded to the commercialization of agriculture. The Old Regime and the French Revolution by Alexis de Tocqueville, which included his insight that modernizing revolutions in traditional autocracies will most likely result in a greater centralization of power in a Bonapartist-type state, is echoed in many of these types of explanations. Tocqueville also established the idea that mass mobilization has a tendency to result in the development of centralized, manipulative control systems.

Guillermo O'Donnell's research on modern authoritarian regimes is the most thorough and conceptually sophisticated to date. Even though it was designed to take into account recent authoritarian regimes in South America's southern cone, O'Donnell's work, with sui modifications, has wider implications. According to O'Donnell, effective modernization in the context of dependent capitalist growth results in a highly modernized type of authoritarianism rather than democracy, reversing the link between modernization and regime outcomes. The political imperatives that result from the need for relatively developed nations like Argentina and Brazil to migrate from an easy, import-substituting industrialisation to a wider and deeper kind of capitalist industrialization construct the causal relationship. The particular need is that working-class populations who were previously included via coercive populist methods be pushed back out. This exclusionary imperative necessitates a government with the will and capacity to repress the excluded over an extended period of time. Despite having an economic foundation, O'Donnell's theory connects to more overtly political explanations. His work is strongly related to those who believe that the emergence of new regimes is molded by cyclical crises brought on by the overriding need for all societies to settle the continual conflict between the desire to amass wealth for investment and the need to establish the legitimacy of new regimes.

My preferred way of putting it is as a conflict between political and economic reasoning; a trade-off that is especially harsh in less developed nations. Political logic urges governments to enhance support for themselves and the regimes that support them, among other things, by addressing the immediate material needs of people and groups, which often entails raising overall consumption levels. However, economic logic dictates that an investment surplus should be built up primarily by reducing consumption, especially in nations with a lack of capital. Any accumulation strategy, in actuality, entails a cost that is unevenly distributed across the population. Groups that are frequently chosen to bear the costs frequently resist, either through political means when available or through direct conflict when not. The formation of an authoritarian regime with sufficient concentrated power to impose the cost allocations inherent in any model of development or stabilization strategy can thus occasionally result from countries becoming politically immobilized around these issues; open competitive or even semi-competitive democracies are particularly vulnerable.

Purely political justifications might take many different shapes. Again, according to Huntington, the 'crisis of transition' is a source of traditional institutions' 'political decay' and, as a result, creates a 'praetorian situation' in which social conflict is not resolved by institutions. Due to the Hobbesian condition, there is a tendency to use force to enforce order and install a military-dominated government. This theory is especially relevant to the less developed nations of Latin America and parts of Africa, where neo-patrimonial authoritarian governments tend to be highly individualized. A version on this institutional argument would claim that societies are more prone to a praetorian scenario during critical transitional periods like decolonization or economic restructuring. It is interesting to observe how modern Africa's highly personalized and factionalized authoritarianism resembles the personal dictatorships of nineteenth-century Latin America, sometimes known as the era of the caudillos. The main issue facing governments in both situations was sovereignty since it was necessary to transform the administrative pieces of earlier imperial regimes into contemporary nation-states. In the less developed world, problems with state and nation building have brought strong and frequently charismatic leaders to the fore, much like in Europe during the age of the centralizing monarchs.

While issues of economic development and political impasse in relatively more complex societies tend to produce more organized and technocratically focused types of authoritarian regimes, one might make the argument albeit with some trepidation that in the developing world, extreme praetorian situations tend to produce highly personalized authoritarian regimes of the neo-patrimonial type. The subject of development costs tends to generate regimes that tilt toward the bureaucratic-authoritarian type in situations as different as Argentina, Brazil, Mexico, South Korea, and Taiwan when these challenges are played out in nations with some kind of capitalist economy. In fact, these experiences cast doubt on any flimsy assertion that capitalism and democracy in the developing world are always compatible and beneficial.

The major emphasis of other political analyses is on the reasons why democratic or quasi-democratic systems "break down" into authoritarian regimes. In this sense, Linz and Stepan have argued that it is important to concentrate on the specific decisions made—or not made—by politically significant people and organizations during trying times. A contemporary version on this thesis, focused primarily on Latin America, claims that presidential systems, which there have a notable tendency to be stalled by refractory legislatures, are to blame for the trend for extra-legal changes of administration of an authoritarian kind. As a solution, this argument has suggested switching to parliamentary systems.

Once again, we find ourselves in the midst of a complicated and perplexing environment when it comes to the internal structure and operation of modern authoritarian regimes. To make things more straightforward, we may argue that the dynamics and internal organization of authoritarian systems are formed by how they handle the control and policymaking of two fundamental tasks. In general, coercion and co-optation are used to maintain power in authoritarian systems. The political importance of the military, police, and paramilitary formations increases when coercion, whether as mobilization or repression, predominates. Coercion may take the form of the considerably less well-structured, episodic, and individualized terror used by regimes like El Salvador or Haiti, or the organized and systematic state terror of the secret police or paramilitary murder squads as in Stalin's Soviet Union or Argentina under the military.

But like other regimes, the majority of authoritarian ones aim to gain public support and maintain control through at least ostensibly voluntary methods. The primary voluntary process is co-optation, in which people and organizations provide the regime with broad political support and/or acquiescence in exchange for particularized substantive benefits. The key to co-optation is for those who are co-opted to rely on the system for the supply of certain advantages in exchange for which they forfeit their political rights, which eliminates an essential form of check on governments.

Co-optation takes the form of developing intricate networks of patron-client relationships in highly personalized neo-patrimonial regimes; as a result, the main dynamic in politics is fierce factional competition to forge personal connections directly to the patrimonial center, which is the cornerstone of patronage. In this form of government, the rulers spend a disproportionate amount of time attempting to maintain their hold on power by manipulating the web of clientelistic factions that revolve around them, including the security forces. Co-optation is often developed in corporatist arrangements in more structured types of authoritarianism when some recognized organizations are more or less explicitly integrated into the institutional framework of the regime. These corporatist structures are often asymmetrical, or "bi-frontal," in that they allow for significant access for certain parties while restricting or obstructing it for others. Such regimes often take the shape of one-party governments like Mexico where the governing party serves as the primary instrument of co-optation and control in areas where co-optation is prevalent. In reality, the majority of today's authoritarian regimes, like Brazil's from 1964 to 1983, combine clientelism with corporatist organizations, coercion, and co-optation, leading to a complex web of connections between formal and informal factions, party organizations, security organizations, and other groups. Each of these patterns has to be examined individually.

The dynamics of intra-elite factional politics drive and, to some extent, overwhelm the policy-style of personalistic-authoritarian governments; intrigue seems to take the place of policy. The policy-making process in more highly organized bureaucratic-authoritarian regimes reflects the instrumental challenges that these regimes set for themselves in relation to the issues of cost and benefit allocations related to the process of government-led economic development and/or crisis management. 'Managing the economy' is the main difficulty facing such governments in terms of policy, apart from concerns of control. As previously said, such "modernizing authoritarian" regimes sometimes attempt to justify themselves by projecting a universitas image of rule in which the creation of policy is monopolized by an apolitical policy elite installed by a powerful president. Such elites are often well-educated technocrats, whose claim to policy domination is founded on their skill or aptitude to comprehend and translate into policy packages obscure technical knowledge like economic theory. According to O'Donnell, this kind of collaboration

between civilian technocrats and military elites is a key structural aspect of decision-making in the bureaucratic-authoritarian system. In order to protect the policy elites from pressure from the general public, the administration often deploys control mechanisms throughout the policy-making process. The executive-based policy elites, particularly the economic policy teams, are shielded from social pressures and are able to develop programs that are then "given to society" by presidential decree and defended as being in the interests of the whole country as opposed to that of egotistical pressure groups.

This approach to policy is both a blessing and a curse for today's authoritarian countries. A benefit because it enables governments to deal directly with impasse and crisis; a disadvantage because numerous organizations start to demand access to the decision-making process, especially when a crisis subsides. Even though policies created exclusively by executive-based policy elites are theoretically in their best interests, many groups including those who ostensibly benefit from economic policy, like big business discover that they value ongoing access to the policy process as much as, if not more than, policies created by those elites. In other words, these bureaucratic-authoritarian regimes often cause a "crisis of representation" inside themselves. The need for greater representation in the political process, at least in Latin America, prompted a number of influential early supporters to rebel against authoritarian governments in the middle of the 1970s and take the helm of large-scale social movements calling for the restoration of procedurally defined representative democracy.

Many people now believe that a worldwide trend toward democracy is all but inevitable because of the'redemocratization' movement that took place in Latin America in the 1980s, the thinning of authoritarian authority in several Asian nations, and the recent fall of communist authoritarian governments. Many people have reiterated the claim that capitalism and democracy are positively related as a result of this trend, which is frequently connected to a parallel push to adopt more market-centered or "capitalist" economies. This optimistic forecasting goes so far as to claim that liberal democracy and neo-liberal economics would bring about the "end of history." There are numerous reasons to question whether this optimistic viewpoint is accurate. First off, authoritarian governments still exist in a variety of locations, including China, Africa, and the Middle East. Second, many regions of the world are still afflicted by the same sorts of crisis conditions that gave birth to contemporary authoritarian governments. As the forces of regionalism, ethno- and religiosity-based sub-nationalism, and other forces advance to challenge existing state structures, one of the major crises is the need to redefine 'national state' organizations.

Importantly, many of the less developed nations still struggle with a plethora of issues related to promoting economic growth. Many nations in areas like Latin America must simultaneously deal with the effects of a decade-long severe economic crisis, which was characterized above all by enormous foreign debts, and the task of consolidating democratic structures. The conflict between economic and political logic is more pronounced than ever in each of these situations, in part because foreign lenders and organizations like the International Monetary Fund pressure governments to enact stringent austerity measures that come with significant financial commitments. Within the framework of neo-liberal stabilization and reorganization programs, the costs are disproportionately high and unequally distributed.

Many people have noted that governments must be able to define, carry out, and sustain technically sound economic programs, which are frequently very unpopular due to cost concerns.

To do this, governments often need to establish a powerful executive center that can shield groups of technocratic policymakers from distributive pressures brought on by interest groups. In reality, many nations are exhibiting a pronounced propensity towards detached and authoritarian-like policy frameworks inside formally democratic systems. Strong CEOs who rule by fiat over the economy or multi-party agreements that turn legislatures into rubber stamps for executive policy packages are two ways to perpetuate such styles.

As we come to a conclusion, it is important to remember that the persistence of complex policy issues, especially those involving questions of economic and political logic, will continue to create the same kinds of crisis situations that have historically given rise to authoritarian regimes. A cyclical oscillation between conventional democratic regimes and diverse authoritarian "regimes of exception" is therefore one option.

The likelihood that the difficult present situation will result in the emergence of new types of regimes that go beyond our existing nebulous classifications of "democratic" and "authoritarian" is maybe even greater. We might see new varieties of hybrid regimes that combine liberal democratic components, such regular elections, with a robust executive-focused competence to interpret authoritatively and carry out technically effective economic management programs. These hybrids might be built upon lasting party pacts or brand-new forms of civil-military partnerships. Whatever the case, it would be a mistake to once again treat the idea of authoritarianism as a theoretical art object [7].

CONCLUSION

Many authoritarian systems continue to exist despite these difficulties, and some may even be viewed as role models for other nations looking to preserve political stability and economic growth. Critics contend that these regimes severely restrict people's liberties and rights, which might eventually thwart social and political advancement. Although they may seem stable in the short run, authoritarian regimes frequently face long-term problems like economic stagnation, social unrest, and isolation from the rest of the world. When there are no clear succession plans, authoritarian regimes may occasionally be susceptible to internal strife and power struggles.

REFERENCES:

[1] O. J. Reuter and G. B. Robertson, ‘Legislatures, cooptation, and social protest in contemporary authoritarian regimes’, *J. Polit.*, 2015, doi: 10.1086/678390.

[2] O. J. Reuter and G. B. Robertson, ‘Subnational appointments in authoritarian regimes: Evidence from russian gubernatorial appointments’, *J. Polit.*, 2012, doi: 10.1017/S0022381612000631.

[3] A. Del Sordi, ‘Sponsoring student mobility for development and authoritarian stability: Kazakhstan’s Bolashak programme’, *Globalizations*, 2018, doi: 10.1080/14747731.2017.1403780.

[4] G. Robertson, ‘Political Orientation, Information and Perceptions of Election Fraud: Evidence from Russia’, *British Journal of Political Science*. 2017. doi: 10.1017/S0007123415000356.

[5] D. Lewis, ‘Civil Society and the Authoritarian State: Cooperation, Contestation and Discourse’, *J. Civ. Soc.*, 2013, doi: 10.1080/17448689.2013.818767.

[6] O. J. Reuter and G. Robertson, 'Legislatures, Cooptation, and Social Protest in Contemporary Authoritarian Regimes', *SSRN Electron. J.*, 2013, doi: 10.2139/ssrn.2295352.

[7] B. Madlovics and B. Magyar, 'Post-communist predation: modeling reiderstvo practices in contemporary predatory states', *Public Choice*, 2021, doi: 10.1007/s11127-019-00772-7.

CHAPTER 19

A BRIEF DISCUSSION ON MILITARY DICTATORSHIPS

Satyendra Arya, Associate Professor Teerthanker Mahaveer Institute of Management and Technology,
Teerthanker Mahaveer University, Moradabad, Uttar Pradesh, India
Email id-satyendra_arya17@rediffmail.com

ABSTRACT:

Military dictatorships are a form of authoritarian government in which the military plays a dominant role in governing the country. In military dictatorships, a small group of military leaders seize power through force, often in response to a perceived threat to national security or political instability. Once in power, military dictatorships often suppress dissent and limit political freedoms in order to maintain control. They may also use violence, torture, and other forms of coercion to enforce their rule. Military dictatorships often justify their actions as necessary to maintain stability and protect the country from internal or external threats.

KEYWORDS:

Martial Law, Military Rule, Nationalism, Political Repression, Propaganda, State Violence.

INTRODUCTION

According to reports, Oliver Cromwell said, "Nine out of ten citizens despise me? What difference does it make if just that tenth is armed? The essence of military dictatorship is summed up in this succinct remark by the first and final military ruler in modern English history. Military dictatorship refers to the kind of government when a military commander or military junta seizes control of the government via a coup d'état and rules without any checks or balances as long as they can continue to depend on the backing of the armed forces [1]–[3]. According to several researchers studying military rule, bureaucrats, managers, politicians, and technocrats often make up a significant portion of military regimes. Thus, it is difficult to maintain the distinction between military and civilian laws. For instance, current military governments are not exclusively military in nature, according to Amos Perlmutter. Rather, they are fusionist regimes, which are military-civil in nature. Although military dictators frequently include technocrats and political outlaws in their ruling councils, this does not obfuscate the line between military and civilian rule. The civilian advisors who joined the military administration serve at the military dictator's mercy. Furthermore, in a military dictatorship, the military ruler and his military advisers predominately participate in all "decisions of decisive consequence." As a result, authoritarianism's specific subtype of military dictatorship is revealed.

In terms of its roots, legality, scope of governmental penetration into society, or combinations of all of these, military dictatorship varies from other kinds of authoritarianism. Although the absolute monarchies of Europe's seventeenth and eighteenth centuries are frequently contrasted with the military dictatorships of today, there are significant differences between the two forms of government. First, every government with military roots has an underlying feeling that it lacks legitimacy since force does not always lead to right. On the other hand, the establishment and

administration of the absolute monarchy in Europe were backed by strong historical legitimacy. By establishing a civil administration, notably via the machinery of tax collection, the European kings expanded the direct authority of the central government over the whole, more-or-less, of culturally homogenous state-territories. Today's military dictators in the Third World often use harsh tactics to address the issue of national integration in governments split along ancestral lines. As we'll see later, once military commanders seize control from civilian political leaders, the issues with nation-building only become worse.

Military dictators are also distinct from the caudillos who thrived in post-independence Latin American states with institutionally broken down. The caudillos weren't trained military personnel. They were warriors and explorers who used violence to further their political agendas, but they lacked organized military forces to back up their governments. In terms of their sources of legitimacy, military autocrats vary from civilian autocrats. The Third World's civilian dictators draw their authority from their participation in the independence movement, the leadership of the individual parties they formed, fraudulent elections, or both. As we will see later, they do so through maintain "a vertical network of personal and patron-client relations," a method of governance also used by military dictators.

Finally, there are three ways that military dictatorship is different from totalitarian dictatorship. Totalitarian leaders first assert their legitimacy by citing their ideologies, which they claim to be superior and nobler versions of democracy. Military dictators seldom promote complex ideologies; instead, Juan Linz described them as having "distinctive orientations and mentalities." Second, totalitarian dictators, as opposed to military dictators, take power by setting up armed political parties. Totalitarian leaders establish their party as having absolute authority over all institutions, including the armed forces, while in power. Third, totalitarian dictators attempt to dominate the whole population via a one-party system and extensive use of terror, while military dictators tolerate "a limited, not responsible, pluralism."

The early Roman constitution is where the name "dictator" originated. According to this constitution, a magistrate might be chosen and given special powers for a period of six months to manage any unanticipated emergencies. When the post-constitutional rulers of the Roman empire used the Praetorian guards as their main source of authority, this constitutional dictatorship transformed into a military dictatorship. A few European nations, including Spain, Portugal, and Greece, had military dictatorships more recently. Military dictatorship, however, has only recently arisen as "a distinctly and analytically new phenomenon, restricted to the developing and modernizing world" in post-second World War Third globe countries. The fact that between 1946 and 1984, nearly 56% of Third World republics had at least one military coup d'état provides insight into the widespread occurrence of military dictatorship in these countries. It provides us some notion of the depth and severity of military dictatorship in the coup-prone nations in the developing countries since 57% of the Third World's military coup-affected states have been under military control for half or more of the previous four decades [4], [5].

DISCUSSION

Growth of Military Dictatorship

To explain military involvement and the rise of military dictatorship in emerging countries, many schools of thought have developed. In order to explain military intervention, the first school, the organizationalists, focuses on the unique qualities that are often assigned to professional Western

military organizations, such as centralized command, hierarchy, discipline, and cohesiveness. The organizational structure created to carry out military duties as well as expertise in the "management of violence" are at the core of these armies' capacity to act politically, according to Morris Janowitz. However, the military's organizational decay, not its organizational strength, frequently creates the conditions for different military factions to carry out sudden and quick raids on the government. The organizationalists emphasize organizational dynamics inside the army more so than factors outside the barracks to explain the political behavior of soldiers, regardless of whether they are discussing the military's organizational strength or disintegration. Clause Welch claims that organizational elements are a considerably stronger indicator of success than sociopolitical or environmental factors after examining African coups since 1967.

A second set of academics examines the justifications for military rule by focusing more on society as a whole. Military involvement, according to S.E. Finer, is caused by the "low or minimal political culture of the society concerned." Military justifications do not explain military operations, according to Samuel P. Huntington. The simple explanation for this is that in under-developed nations, the overall politicization of social forces and institutions is a larger phenomena, of which military interventions are but one particular expression. .The skeptic behaviouralists are the third category, and they focus on the internal dynamics of military hierarchies, cliques within the army, business interests, personal aspirations, and the quirks of specific military individuals in order to explain the political behavior of the army.

Many well-known Latin American scholars, most notably Guillermo O'Donnell, have attempted to explain the emergence of military dictatorship in Latin America from the 1960s to the mid-1980s in terms of interactions between global economic forces and regional economic trends, particularly in countries like Argentina, Brazil, Chile, and Uruguay that are relatively more developed than the region as a whole. According to O'Donnell, these bureaucratic-authoritarian regimes emerged in the aforementioned nations during "a particularly diaphanous moment of dependence." This "historical moment" was brought about by the "exhaustion" of local import-substitution sectors and the decline of the global market for Latin American primary exports. As a consequence, there was an economic crisis characterized by increasing inflation, falling GNP and investment rates, capital flight, deficits in balance of payments, and other similar phenomena. The popular sector in Latin American nations was subsequently stimulated by this crisis. Other social classes saw this as a danger. As we will explain later, military commanders stepped in to establish bureaucratic, authoritarian regimes in conjunction with civilian technocrats since they were already well-versed in the concepts of "national security" and terrified of a Cuban-style revolution that would spell the end of the army as an institution [6]–[8].

According to some academics, one of the primary justifications for military involvement in emerging nations is that, in contrast to troops serving in Europe's growing standing armies, soldiers in these nations experience "military structural unemployment." Between the sixteenth and eighteenth centuries, the European states created standing armies. Europe was also a persistent battleground for interstate conflicts during this time. Today, where are the Third World wars taking place? According to our study, the average duration of conflicts in Europe from 1415 to 1815 was four years, however from 1946 to 1984 it was less than two months. Even if we increase the median duration of wars in Third World nations by nine to make the comparative period comparable for both regions, Third World wars still last an average of one and a half years, or about one-third as long as conflicts in Europe.

While the armies of Europe were almost constantly at war between 1495 and 1815, the armies of the Third World only engage in "barrack sittings." With a monopoly on the means of violence, Third World militaries are easily alienated from society because they are unable to fill a necessary societal need brought on by the absence or rarity of war and inadequate training facilities. They are more likely to expand their roles because of their social exclusion. The 'cumulative catastrophe' that is pervasive in Third World nations makes it simple for alienated militaries to identify chances to intervene. After the military took over Pakistan in 1958, a former chief justice of Pakistan claimed that the brave armed forces of Pakistan had nothing to do and thus subjugated their own people.

Military Intervention: Empirical Studies

Modern social scientists would disagree with any one master paradigm and contend that no one mode of inquiry can sufficiently explain a complex social and political phenomena on its own. The occurrence of a military coup d'état and the expansion of a military dictatorship in any given nation is explained by the convergence and interplay of numerous of the factors mentioned above. The relative importance of each variable in the interaction process is the key query. The specific'mix' of factors involved in the process of armed takeover of state power may be understood using statistical methods. The predictability of coups d'état: a model using African data by Jackman and Poverty, the coup trap, and the capture of executive authority by Londregan and Poole stand out among the many empirical research on military interventions. These two studies utilize sophisticated statistical models with a theoretical foundation to explain military coups d'état. Military coups d'état are the function of structural elements virtually in a deterministic pattern, according to Jackman's analysis. Idiosyncratic factors, which Zolberg and Decalo stress, only account for one-fifth of the variation in coups d'état.

In their recent study, which covered 121 countries from 1960 to 1982, Londregan and Poole built a statistical model that allowed them to use the military coup d'état as the dependent variable and the income level, economic growth rate, coup history, and interdependence of coups and economic growth as independent variables. They discover that high levels of wealth and economic development, taken alone, prevent coups d'état. Their research shows that the likelihood of coups d'état is twenty-one times higher in the poorest nations than it is in the richest. More intriguing is their claim that a nation has a considerably tougher time preventing further coups after experiencing one because "coups spawn countercoups" The theoretical and empirical investigations mentioned above have significantly improved our knowledge of the incidence of the military coup d'état, even if no grand theory has yet been proposed. This comprehension, however, falls short. Much of the subsequent social, economic, and political development of coup-affected governments is influenced by the methods of government and policies used by military rulers. Let's now talk about the strategies that military dictators often use to maintain their authority.

Rulership Strategies of Military Dictators

In order to maintain control over the armed forces, military dictators' primary method of governance is to manage their "constituency." This tactic often entails the development of domination over the whole army by the faction commanded by the military dictator in nations with non-professional militaries split along ethnic or religious lines. The development of this domination often calls for the deployment of crude and cruel violence to crush rival military units and scare the populace into complete surrender. Mengistu of Ethiopia, who used'red terror'

against civil revolutionaries on such a large scale that even the initial supporters of the military coup were not only disenchanted but appalled, is one of the most infamous military dictators in this regard. No less brutal in "eliminating and annihilating opposition within the military and outside it" than Idi Amin, Bokassa, and Mobutu.

Military coups d'état are more or less organized and disciplined actions in nations with professional and disciplined militaries, such as Argentina, Brazil, Pakistan, and Peru. This is due to the fact that the professional soldier is susceptible to the discipline of the army as an institution, unlike the soldier in non-professional armies who is devoted exclusively to himself or at most to his party. At the time of intervention, professional armies frequently become factionalized at the highest levels. The top commanders quickly come to an agreement on how to distribute power among themselves and work out their disputes. The hierarchy's higher echelons continue to be the focus of the power struggle, therefore discipline among the officers and rank and file is unaffected.

The distinction between military dictators who seize power via a series of coups and countercoups and those who do it with the aid of professional armies, however, is one of degree rather than type. Between 1964 and 1985, torture in Brazil evolved into "an intrinsic component of the governing process." In their "dirty war" against the leftists, Argentina's military authorities between 1976 and 1983 murdered anywhere from 6,000 to 30,000 citizens. Zulfiquar Ali Bhutto, the country's first elected prime minister, was forcibly removed by the military administration of Zia-ul Huq in Pakistan on the basis of a decision made by what have been referred to as "rigged benches" of the High Court in Lahore and the Supreme Court of Pakistan.

Military dictators establish a sophisticated network of intelligence services as repression becomes a key component of their governance approach. Alfred Stephan discusses how the military intelligence agencies in Brazil developed into a serious challenge to the junta that controls the country in his most recent book, Rethinking Military Politics: Brazil and the Southern Cone. As Stephan contends, the Brazilian military's decision to begin the liberalization process, which eventually resulted in the military's removal from power, was motivated by the need for public support against the intelligence community. Another example is General Zia-ul Huq of Pakistan, who established the Inter-Service Intelligence Directorate, one of the most powerful military and internal security organizations in the Third World, to monitor both officers and politicians. It now employs 100,000 people.

However, using violence and intelligence surveillance are bad leadership tactics. Raising the salary as well as other benefits and perquisites of the military personnel is a better strategy to keep the troops happy. Soon after taking power, military regimes nearly always raise the defense spending. Defense budgets are often maintained at high levels in succeeding years after being increased. In Asia, sub-Saharan Africa, and Latin America during the 1960s, the average annual expenditure on defense as a percentage of total state budgets was almost twice as high for militarized governments as it was for non-military governments. Defense spending in emerging countries is expanding at a faster pace than in industrialized ones. The majority of a developing nation's defense budget is used to purchase expensive weapons in hard currency from industrialized nations, thus these expenditures have little impact on local economy.

Depoliticizing and limiting popular involvement is another method of governing used by military dictators. The military dictatorships in Latin America often use corporatism to achieve this goal. The military regimes operate under this paradigm and aim to "eliminate spontaneous interest

articulation and establish a small number of authoritatively recognized groups that interact with the government apparatus in defined and regularized ways." One-party systems were put in place by certain military dictators, particularly in the Middle East and sub-Saharan Africa, as a structural means of organizing and regulating participation. Since 1966, the army wing of the Ba'ath Party has controlled the country of Syria. But in Iraq, the Ba'ath Party and the military appear to work in harmony. The parties established from above by military dictators like Mobutu in Zaire, Eyadema in Togo, and Kerekou in Benin don't appear to have much of an impact on the formulation of public policy and are unlikely to pick who would succeed the current military leaders. These organizations are essentially instruments of the military government. Aristide R. Zolberg said in a 1966 article that single parties created in West Africa are often paper entities. Bienen's argument that the single-party system is more like US political machinery in terms of patronage distribution appears more on point. The African one-party system, which is often led by the military dictator himself, is in fact a component of a larger patrimonialism-based rule plan. The most prevalent example of this is Mobutu in Zaire. Around 2,000 foreign-owned businesses were taken over by Mobutu in November 1973, and he then distributed them as "free goods" among the political and business elite. This generosity was enjoyed by Mobutu and the other members of the Popular Revolutionary Movement's politburo. Political scientists in the West, notably those in the United States during the 1950s and 1960s, seem to have attempted to overestimate the significance of the military in the modernization of Third World nations in order to make their studies of policy relevant. Guy Pauker published a piece in World Politics arguing for the use of force to stop the advance of the armed communist cadres as they attacked the nations of South-East Asia. The military was soon portrayed as a highly contemporary force with the ability to apply its technological and organizational talents to sectors of government and administration by a number of prominent academics.

These theoretical formulations were "unencumbered by empirical evidence," to borrow the humorous language of Henry Bienen, but subsequent empirical study on the actual effectiveness of military regimes has generally contradicted these early theoretical predictions. In fact, a research by Eric A. Nordlinger revealed negative and zero-order relationships between the political power of the military and social and economic modernizations. This was based on an examination of cross-national data from seventy-four non-Western and non-communist nations. R.D. McKinlay and A.S. Cohan came to the conclusion that "there is no profound effect on economic performance produced by military regime when MR and CMR are compared with CR" in another cross-national aggregate study of all independent, non-communist countries with a population greater than one million, covering the period from 1951 to 1970. In a different study, data from 77 independent Third World nations covering the years 1960 to 1970 were used to make the following conclusion: "In short, military intervention in Third World politics has no unique effect on social change, regardless of either the level of economic development or geographic region." The newest empirical research previously mentioned above comes to the following conclusion: "A country's past coup history has little discernible effect on its economy, despite the dramatic effect of economic performance on the probability of coups." We find no evidence that the likelihood of a coup d'état now or in the recent past has a major impact on the growth rate [9], [10].

CONCLUSION

Throughout history, military dictatorships have been common, especially in Asia, Africa, and Latin America. Military dictatorships have often taken the role of democratically elected civilian

administrations, which has left political representation and democratic engagement lacking. They often put military interests ahead of civilian concerns and may be linked to corruption and violations of human rights. Military dictatorships have been seen by some as a means of bringing stability to nations experiencing political instability or violent conflict, notwithstanding their disadvantages. Critics contend that, in the long run, the suppression of democratic institutions and civil society can thwart social and economic advancement and even fuel more unrest and conflict. Overall, military dictatorships pose a serious threat to democratic principles and the rule of law and are often linked to political persecution and violations of human rights.

REFERENCES:

[1] F. Zurita, 'Educational policies and Chilean civic-military dictatorship (1973-1990): The process of neoliberal and authoritarian transformation of teachers' training and workspaces', *Educ. Policy Anal. Arch.*, 2021, doi: 10.14507/epaa.29.4593.

[2] V. Alberti, 'Brazilian military dictatorship in History classes', *Tempo e Argumento*. 2021. doi: 10.5965/2175180313332021E0102.

[3] D. Acemoglu, D. Ticchi, and A. Vindigni, 'A theory of military dictatorships', *Am. Econ. J. Macroecon.*, 2010, doi: 10.1257/mac.2.1.1.

[4] A. Carvalho, 'ProfHistória graduate teachers' perspectives on teaching civil-military dictatorship in present time', *Tempo e Argumento*. 2021. doi: 10.5965/2175180313332021E0103.

[5] F. A. Z. Garrido, 'Teaching work during the Chilean civic-military dictatorship (1973-1990): An overview from public educational policies', *Historia da Educacao*. 2020. doi: 10.1590/2236-3459/92711.

[6] C. Fico, 'Ditadura militar brasileira: Aproximações teóricas e historiográficas', *Tempo e Argumento*, 2017, doi: 10.5965/2175180309202017005.

[7] H. C. Rafante, J. H. da Silva, and K. R. M. Caiado, 'The national federation of apaes in the context of the civil-military dictatorship in Brazil: Construction of hegemony in the field of special education', *Educ. Policy Anal. Arch.*, 2019, doi: 10.14507/epaa.27.4474.

[8] C. Gamarnik, 'Limits and paradoxes of a press photograph: Analysis of a photo of mothers of plaza de mayo during the military dictatorship in Argentina', *Fotocinema*, 2021, doi: 10.24310/Fotocinema.2021.vi22.11706.

[9] A. L. Horbach, 'Black authorship and resistance in the the civil-military dictatorship in Brazil', *Nau Lit.*, 2020, doi: 10.22456/1981-4526.104956.

[10] M. Borges, 'The prevalence of the memoir over the novel in narratives about the Brazilian military dictatorship', *Estud. Lit. Bras. Contemp.*, 2019, doi: 10.1590/2316-40185813.

CHAPTER 20

MILITARY DICTATORSHIP AND THE CIRCLE OF POLITICAL UNDERDEVELOPMENT

Dr. Abhinav Tiwary, Assistant Professor,
Department of Decision Sciences, CMS Business School, JAIN (Deemed to-be University), Bangalore, India,
Email Id -dr.abhinav_tiwary@cms.ac.in

ABSTRACT:

The Circle of Political Underdevelopment is a theory that suggests that a lack of political development can contribute to a cycle of poverty and underdevelopment. This theory argues that political instability and weak governance can create a vicious cycle in which underdevelopment leads to further political instability and weak governance. According to the theory, underdeveloped political systems are characterized by weak institutions, corruption, and limited political participation. This can lead to a lack of investment in infrastructure, education, and other critical areas, which in turn can contribute to poverty and economic underdevelopment. As a result, citizens may become disillusioned with the political system, which can lead to further instability and weak governance.

KEYWORDS:

Authoritarianism, Corruption, Dependency Theory, Dictatorship, Global Inequality, Imperialism.

INTRODUCTION

Even worse than in the area of economic development, military regimes have performed poorly in the area of political development. It is sometimes stated that the military alone can bring about the national unity that is a need for political growth since the majority of the new countries are split along ethnic, religious, linguistic, and regional lines. This theory is not supported by how military dictators have performed so far. Following a "policy of blood and iron" in Pakistan, military rulers Ayub Khan and his successor Yahiya Khan were responsible for creating the first prosperous separatist movement in the Third World. Similar to this, following the coup on January 15, 1966, Nzeogwu and his henchmen began a merciless assault on important military and political figures, which marked the beginning of Nigeria's dissolution. For two years, the military leadership oversaw the civil war in Nigeria, which resulted in tens of thousands of combat fatalities. Similarly, from 1958 till the present, the military authorities of Sudan have been engaged in combat with the rebels in the southern region of the nation [1]–[3].

In reality, military involvement often results in a vicious cycle that worsens the political underdevelopment that led to the installation of military authority in the first place. The creation of strong political institutions, according to Huntington, is a crucial component of political progress. Any nation's politicians' political abilities are its main source for creating political institutions. The ability to adapt to new difficulties, ideological commitment, the ability to respond to challenges, and the arts of administration, negotiation, representation, and bargaining are only a few of the political talents required for the development of a political system that is

sustainable and self-sustaining. These abilities can only be learned in the rigorous classroom of the working world. Soldier-rulers, such as Ayub Khan in Pakistan, Acheampong in Ghana, or Castello Branco in Brazil, are unable to comprehend the practical sides of the grand game of politics because of their "military minds" and viewpoints. They substantially impede the political process's free flow and send would-be candidates into a protracted state of slumber. When it comes to the formation of political abilities, the era under military control is often a complete waste of time. The chance for those who were formerly under a military dictatorship to develop their political talents is likely to be continuously delayed with the advent of every new military administration since around two-thirds of civil and military regimes are overthrown by military coups d'état.

In the Third World, just one-third of the military regimes that have been in place have been replaced by civilian ones. In certain situations of civilian restoration, newly installed civilian leaders quickly show they are unable to live up to the expectations of the people with their official performance. This is not unexpected given the overall intractability of the issues facing emerging countries and the lack of political acumen in the civilian leaders brought on by the previous period of military control. When there is even the slightest evidence of popular unhappiness with the civilian administration, military commanders waiting in the wings overthrow it and claim that their prediction of the failure of self-seeking politicians has come true. Consequently, a new phase of political waste begins [4], [5].

DISCUSSION

Role Expansion of the Military and Defence Vulnerability

The boundaries of state continue to be completely open to attack as the army starts to "patrol the society." Several armies have been compromised by the expansion of their political roles over the past 20 years, and they have suffered humiliating losses at the hands of other armies that have only been encouraged to become more professional. Fratricidal feuds among the Syrian army's commanders severely hampered the Syrian army's performance in the 1967 Arab-Israeli War, which prevented it from launching a significant assault against the Israeli army. Internal political conflict also weakened the Iraqi army.

The increase of the Egyptian military forces' political involvement is another reason for Egypt's complete failure in the conflict of 1967. 'Monumental disregard of the most simple norms of defending aircraft on the ground' was a crime committed by the Egyptian air commanders. As a consequence, on the first day of the conflict, an Israeli pre-emptive assault rendered a significant portion of the Egyptian air force utterly inoperable. In little than a week, the Egyptian army fell apart. The combat ability of the Pakistani military forces in the 1971 conflict with India was similarly weakened by thirteen years of political engagement. One may claim that the Pakistani troops in the erstwhile East Pakistan were unable to put up a strong fight against the Indians because they were deprived of all logistical assistance from West Pakistan due to an Indian blockade. But there is no other explanation for why Pakistani forces failed to pose a serious threat to Indian forces on the western front than a lack of fighting spirit and ability on their part.

Idi Amin's armed forces in Uganda serve as another illustration of how the political role of the armed forces erodes military vitality. At first acting as a tool of Idi Amin's terror and brutality, they then disintegrated when confronted with inadequately equipped Tanzanian troops and an

exiled Ugandan force in April 1979. More recently, in the Falklands/Malvinas War, Great Britain easily defeated an Argentina military corrupted by politics.

The 'New Professionals' Failure

Latin America has provided the most dramatic and painful evidence to refute the military's assertion that it can govern more effectively than politicians. In Brazil, Argentina, Peru, and Chile, military rulers took control for indefinite periods in order to fundamentally alter social, economic, and political institutions. To support their reign, they created the "doctrine of national security." This theory claimed that the governments of Latin America were at war with the communist rebels on an internal level. The days of the "old professional" soldier, engaged in conventional warfare against foes on the outside, were fast coming to an end. The main need was for a "new professional soldier" who was skilled in waging a "total war" against the domestic enemy on the fronts of the military, social, economic, and political. It became the manifest destiny of the 'new professional soldiers' to establish control over all facets of society, bring about rapid socio-economic development, and win the glory of thwarting the great threat to Western civilization because civilian leaders lacked the necessary abilities and organizations to fight the new war.

Brazil served as a test case for how the ideology of national security and national development should be put into practice. Brazil possessed the greatest troops and resources in all of Latin America, and its "new professionals" maintained power for 20 years to demonstrate their tenacity. However, the new professional soldiers' attempts at political and economic reform turned out to be illusory. Conflicts between military governments and military institutions as well as the growing factionalism within the armed forces plagued the military regimes. As a consequence, there was persistent instability and inconsistent policies. In addition to highlighting socioeconomic and geographic divisions, the soldier-rulers' expansion plan resulted in a debt load of over US$90 billion by the early 1980s. As public unrest increased, military governments "deepened the revolution" by using increasing amounts of terror and torture.

The changes brought about by the new professionals in Argentina largely mirrored the trend in Brazil. As a result of the country's severe economic downturn, its foreign debt quadrupled from US$9.8 billion in 1978 to US$38 billion in 1982. The Argentine military authorities employed torture and intimidation on a far wider scale than their Brazilian colleagues did as opposition to the regime grew. The 'armed intellectuals' of Peru attempted to play the most revolutionary role. They adopted major land reforms, declared new education policies, nationalized fisheries, oil, and other natural resources, implemented the system of worker participation in industrial enterprises, and mobilized mass involvement in national interest group organizations. The'revolution from above' failed, however, since Peruvians utterly disapproved of the changes implemented by the soldier-rulers. On the other hand, the extreme reform initiatives supported by the military severely shook the country's economy. Ironically, Peruvian people compelled the reigning army elite to restore civilian politics to power in 1980, after officers had seized it from them in 1968.

Several conclusions can be drawn from the current discussion. It seems that soldier-politicians are unable to significantly advance socioeconomic growth in the nations they control. Even worse has been the military's performance in terms of political development. Military regimes exacerbate the political development issues that the civilian regimes first encountered and deny the civilian politicians the chance to build critical political competencies, continuing the cycle of

political underdevelopment. Finally, the military's role growth leads to weaknesses in internal and foreign security. Thus, it seems vital to study the military's exit from politics.

Retreat of the Military from Politics

Armed forces organizational characteristics have a role in the kind and length of the military's retreat from politics. Factionalism in non-professional armies produces the syndrome of sudden intervention-withdrawal-reintervention, as we have already seen, until one faction gains control of the whole army and imposes a prolonged period of military rule. Some of the officers who rose to power with the aid of professional armies later left politics out of sheer exhaustion from managing the Third World's troubled nations. Bolivia, Sudan, Pakistan, Thailand, and El Salvador are just a few of the countries where spontaneous popular revolutions have pushed military leaders to step down. However, these multi-class uprisings are unable to establish civilian governments, and typically military juntas regain power.

Developing a consensus among the political parties opposed to military rule is one approach to stop the spread of military dictatorship. As a result, the military juntas lose access to the "civilian constituency," which some academics claim is often a need for a military coup d'état. The major political parties in Venezuela and Colombia made a political contract to share power for 20 years, removing support for military intervention. These two nations have been able to preserve civilian government for almost three decades because to a combination of powerful political parties opposed to military dictatorship. The above-discussed strategies for military disengagement from politics are superstructural in nature and cannot end the cycle of intervention-withdrawal-intervention. The goal of a social revolution is to replace one social class with another as the governing class, resulting in a catastrophic social structural shift and a long-lasting and durable military retreat. The two archetypal social revolutions the bourgeois and the proletarian consolidated the hegemonic classes' hold on the bourgeoisie and the proletariat, respectively, and took over the armed forces.

The few instances of long-term withdrawal that have occurred in Third World countries support this theory. The cathartic effect is the same, "politics in command," whether it is a revolution of the Jeffersonian farmers and the middle classes as in Costa Rica in 1948, or a revolution under a coalition of classes professional middle class and peasant class as in Mexico, or a socialist revolution led by the scions of upper and middle classes in Cuba and Nicaragua, or a revolution supported by the peasantry in Venezuela, or reactivated upper classes in Columbia. Revolution is essentially an intellectual process, with military aspects coming second. The revolution establishes the military's role in the emerging society. The revolution's new political formula prioritizes the importance of ideas over weapons, policies over tools, and politics over firearms. It also features a new system of power distribution. The aftermath of the modern social revolution is analogous to the two archetypal social revolutions the bourgeois and the proletarian in this regard.

Institutions in politics

Executives at all levels of government. Every nation, from the simplest to the most complicated, has an executive branch that is referred to as its "government" in the literal sense. In each of these situations, there is a body, usually a tiny one, tasked with managing that organization. The number of national CEOs has more than doubled since the 1940s as a consequence of autonomous governments effectively ruling the whole world since the third quarter of the 20th

century. Evidently, the executive is a focal point of political life, if not the main point. This is still true even when people sometimes express misgivings about CEOs' abilities to significantly influence the course of events, much alone substantially change the social and economic structure of their nation. They do, however, have a greater chance than any other entity to influence society since it is their duty to do so.

The focal point of political activity is the national government, which is a very compact body whose opinions are often well-publicized. The 'will' of parties and even legislatures is less distinct and vague. It is simpler to conceive about national governments as groups that have a shared objective and really function as teams since they are relatively small and very visible, even when they may be divided and their disagreements may even be on display. However, there are significant differences between governments. They differ in terms of their composition, internal structure, selection processes, duration, and powers both official and informal. There are autocratic governments as well as governments that come from the people or their representatives; egalitarian and hierarchical governments; governments that appear to last forever and governments that are fleeting; and, finally, strong and weak governments.

Governments are hard to identify because of how hazy their borders are. They frequently include undersecretaries or junior ministers, who are regarded as members of the government because they are appointed by ministers and depart from office at the same time as them, but other individuals who meet the same requirements can also be included, such as the ministers' personal staff. The personal staff of leaders and junior ministers may thus need to be considered since they may have a significant impact on decision-making. Many of the president of the United States' advisors and members of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union's Politburo fall into this category. administrations may have a distinct core made up of the leaders and at least a number of ministers, but the 'tail' of these administrations is essentially made up of a 'grey zone' with ill-defined borders.

It may be simpler to describe the duties that a national executive does. However, even these are not entirely clear. Governments are supposed to "run the affairs of the nation," but they can only do so to a certain extent because they are "helped" or "advised" by various organizations, political parties, the legislature, and, most importantly, the enormous bureaucracies that have now accumulated in all states. There are three distinct roles that governments must play. They must first formulate policies, and they must formulate practical ideas that can be executed and politically supported. An agricultural, industrial, or social policy will be developed based on the country's perceived "needs" as well as the perception of what the populace is willing to "live with." Thus, conception serves a purpose. Second, governments have an implementation role, at least inasmuch as they must discover ways to make policies a reality. As a result, they must hire and manage a bureaucracy that can carry out the policies. Because there are significant differences between those who "dream" and those who "manage," members of the government must possess a variety of skills. This dual function can lead to conflicts. However, there is a third function coordination that can be seen as intermediate. Making sure that the policies do not conflict with one another and, ideally, grow harmoniously is a crucial part of the process of developing policy. Additionally, the development of policies necessitates making decisions or at the very least setting priorities for both financial and human resource constraints. Since not everything can be done at once, a schedule must be created; however, this schedule must take into account how different policies interact with one another as well as the internal logic that guides policy development [6]–[8].

Therefore, the three components of governmental action are conception, coordination, and direction of implementation. The government must integrate these aspects since they are conceptually separate. However, this combination inevitably leads to issues because conception, coordination, and implementation will all be prioritized differently depending on the situation. It is also not surprising that the conflict between the three objectives or functions of government has only been partially resolved. The development of governmental structures in the modern world has been the result of a variety of ad hoc experiments that have been more or less successful.

Evolution of Governmental Arrangements

The complexity and variety of the jobs that CEOs are doing are reflected in modern governmental structures. The variations in the structure of these executives are not a recent phenomenon; for example, the oligarchical structures of the Renaissance republican cities in Italy were very different from those of the absolute monarchies that first emerged in the sixteenth century, and even more so from those of the theocratic and despotic regimes that were in power in the Muslim world at the same time. Governmental structures have been attempted to be "domesticated" in the nineteenth century in order to give them a less random and more logical nature. The landscape in Europe and North America has been dominated by two constitutional systems for a century. On the one hand, the cabinet system, which was developed in England and Sweden, is predicated on the idea that the prime minister, who serves as the head of the government, must function within the framework of a collegial system, in which a group of ministers actively participates in decision-making while also being in charge of putting those decisions into action in a specific sector. Western European nations progressively embraced cabinet administration. The last vestiges of absolutism, meantime, were steadily weakened throughout central and eastern Europe, to the point that the cabinet system first seemed likely to completely replace previous absolutist and authoritarian political institutions.

The constitutional presidential system, in contrast to the cabinet system, was initially formed in the United States and then progressively expanded throughout the whole of Latin America. In this model, the executive branch is hierarchical rather than collective, and ministers answer only to the president. This formula implies some relegation for both the head of state and the ministers, even if it is more similar to the monarchical system than the cabinet system. However, the formula hasn't worked out too well in Latin America because many presidents have felt constrained by their office, which has resulted in coups and the installation of authoritarian and even "absolute" presidential governments.

Before 1914, at least one of the two constitutional formulas had already run into issues. After the First World War, there were many more issues as the communist system in Russia, fascist authoritarian regimes in Italy and later much of southern, central, and eastern Europe, as well as numerous absolute presidential systems, both civilian and military, in many Third World countries, came into existence. These changes were marked by the rise or resurgence of the strong leader role that constitutional systems had aimed to reduce and the subsequent loss of the notion of collaborative or at least collegial governance promoted by cabinet government. Although it was a result of the growth of parties, this period was also marked by the "invention" of a new type of executive structure: the intrusion of parties, and in authoritarian systems typically of a single party. This structure had not yet reached its full potential in either of the two constitutional systems. Decades later, this kind of structure is still in use in several Third World

countries as well as in communist countries. The single party system is still significant in explaining the makeup of government, even if just as a temporary system, despite the fact that many communist regimes have had significant challenges since the late 1980s. Dual forms of leadership and administration were also developed as a result, and they significantly influenced the traits of executives in the modern world.

Governmental structure types in the Modern World

Governments may be categorized along two axes: first, they can be more or less hierarchical or collective; second, they can be concentrated in one body or split into two or more. Since decisions must be made by the entire body, neither the prime minister nor any particular group of ministers are formally permitted to involve the entire government. Cabinet government is therefore ostensibly egalitarian and collective. 'Collective responsibility' is the alternative of this clause, which states that all ministers must abide by cabinet decisions. In its most severe version, the rule implies that ministers must also speak in favor of all decisions made by the cabinet.

Nearly all of the cabinet-based nations, including Western Europe, many Commonwealth nations, Japan, and Israel, significantly erode these principles in practice. First of all, many of these nations follow British tradition in that collective decision-making only pertains to members of the cabinet strictly speaking. As a result, the government in these nations might be significantly bigger due to the presence of a sizable number of junior ministers. The latter are subject to the rule of collective accountability but are not involved in making decisions. Second, the cabinet cannot physically address all the problems that need to be discussed during its typically brief sessions, which last two to three hours each week due to the volume and complexity of the choices. As a consequence, although while the cabinet officially approves every decision, many of them are in reality delegated to certain ministers, committees of ministers, or even the prime minister and a few other ministers. At its most convivial, cabinet administration is sometimes even hierarchical.

There are several cabinet governments, however. Some are actually quite close to being collective, for instance because of a coalition or political traditions. Before making decisions, the prime minister must rely heavily on discussion with colleagues. The Swiss Federal Council serves as the greatest example of collective executive, however there are additional instances of collective administration in the Low Countries and in Scandinavia. In truth, this is not a cabinet government in the traditional sense. 'Team' cabinets are more typical among single-party governments, like those in Britain and other Commonwealth nations. In 'team' cabinets, the ministers have often collaborated for a number of years in parliament and share a lot of the same goals and even a similar attitude. There is a sense of mutual understanding despite the fact that many tasks are entrusted to certain ministries, committees, or the prime minister. Finally, there are "prime ministerial" governments, in which the head of the government enjoys significant popularity as a result of significant and repeated electoral victories or as a result of the fact that he or she founded the party, the regime, or even the nation. Ministers in these governments are notably dependent on the head of the government. These situations have often occurred in Third World cabinet administrations, and they have sporadically happened in Western Europe. In these circumstances, the relationship between the prime minister and the ministers resembles a hierarchy.

The vast majority of other forms of government are hierarchical, in that ministers and all other officials are totally dependant on the head of state and head of government; they can be

appointed and removed at will; the head of government delegated authority to them to make decisions; and they have no official voice in decisions that do not directly affect their department. Traditional monarchical regimes had these structures; the constitutional presidential system did not change this concept. Eighty countries, mostly in the Americas, Africa, and the Middle East, have authoritarian presidential executives, compared to about fifty that have cabinet-type governments. These authoritarian presidential systems, which proliferated in the Third World after World War II, also adopted a similar formula.However, there are differences in how hierarchical these governments are. Members of select families may have significant authority under traditional monarchies, and other people may have assisted the succeeding head of state in securing power in civilian or military presidential regimes. In fact, the US president has greater freedom in this area than the majority of foreign presidents who hold constitutional office and are less reliant on party support. Furthermore, due to the complexity of the issues, particularly the economic and social ones, many heads of state are compelled to hire well-known managers or civil servants as well as pay attention to their opinions to the point where they may have an impact outside of their department. Because of this, it is challenging to consider the US executive to be really hierarchical; rather, it is better characterized as atomized. Because departments are large, they naturally develop into independent empires. The horizontal relationships between each department and Congress, particularly with the committees relevant to the departments, undermine any vertical relationships that might exist between departmental heads and the president because these groups want to make sure that they receive the appropriations and laws that they believe they require. Finally, the connections that form between departments and their customers tend to weaken the president-to-department hierarchical linkages even further. To guarantee that their plans are carried out, presidents have admittedly employed larger personal staffs since Franklin Roosevelt did so in the 1930s. However, this has made it more challenging to identify what the "real" government of the United States is. The American government therefore mimics somewhat the multiple arrangements that are prevalent in several nations, particularly communist ones, by progressively becoming a government with two tiers.

The governments that we have so far discussed are gathered into a single entity. In fact, conventional analysis has always assumed that governments function as a single entity. However, this viewpoint is debatable. It is dubious in the context of the contemporary United States, and it is even more dubious in the case of communist states, where the executive branch has historically been under the close control of the party, particularly the Politburo, whose First Secretary has been widely regarded as the nation's "true" leader. In fact, the Soviet Union's government has historically been made up of four distinct bodies. The Politburo, one of these bodies, has traditionally been primarily responsible for formulating policy with assistance from the Secretariat, while the Presidium of the Council of Ministers has been in charge of coordination and the Council of Ministers has dealt with implementation. The prime minister, who is a member of the Politburo, Presidium, and, naturally, the Council of Ministers, as well as certain of the more significant ministers, serve as the connections between these groups.

Thus, multi-level governments have been around for a long time in communist countries; similar structures have also emerged in a few non-communist single-party systems and a few military regimes. To make sure that the normal administration implemented the military rulers' policies, Supreme Military Councils or Committees of National Salvation were established. This formula, which was invented in 1962 in Burma, was adopted by numerous African nations. It also briefly

existed in Portugal in the years after the overthrow of the regime there in 1974. These arrangements have varied in their durability and apparent effectiveness, and they are often less structured than in communist countries [9]–[11].

CONCLUSION

Both social revolutions and the permanent removal of the military from politics are uncommon. As the year 2000 approaches, it seems that Third World countries now ruled by military dictatorships will continue to do so, albeit the military regime's leaders may change. The significant pro-democratic reforms occurring in the East European nations are not expected to have a significant impact on the Third World countries. This is due to the distinct national histories and social, economic, and political developments of Eastern European and Third World countries. Even in regimes where the military is in charge, there may be public uprisings; nevertheless, long-reigning militaries may find it difficult to cede control to civilian authorities, as Burma's army recently shown. The majority of military dictators will continue to hold rigged elections and plebiscites as a way to "pay respect to democracy." It's possible that certain Latin American governments' advances will vary from those in other parts of the globe. All of the political parties in Argentina, Brazil, Chile, Peru, and Uruguay appear to be unified against additional military involvement due to the previous military dictatorships in those countries' dismal economic performance and very oppressive character. Since 1983, civilian government has prevailed in Argentina at least due to anti-army sentiments, notwithstanding the country's citizens' economic hardships. Latin America's current democratic "cycle" may be longer than previous ones.

REFERENCES:

[1] Y. Yoo and M. Kim, '"Korea national prayer breakfast" and protestant leaders' prophetic consciousness during the period of military dictatorship (1962–1987)', *Religions*, 2018, doi: 10.3390/rel9100308.

[2] P. Szelegieniec, 'The rise and fall of the revolutionary left in "People's Poland": Kuroń, Modzelewski and the struggle for workers' socialism under post-stalinism (1956–89)', *Historical Materialism*. 2021. doi: 10.1163/1569206X-00001559.

[3] M. Bezerra, 'Jair Bolsonaro's diplomacy: dismantling traditional foreign policy of Brazil', *Cuad. Iberoam.*, 2021, doi: 10.46272/2409-3416-2020-8-3-35-42.

[4] M. H. Ingiriis, '"Sisters; was this what we struggled for?": The gendered rivalry in power and politics', *J. Int. Womens. Stud.*, 2015.

[5] P. Szelegieniec, 'The Rise and Fall of the Revolutionary Left in "People's Poland"', *Hist. Mater.*, 2021, doi: 10.1163/1569206x-00001559.

[6] S. Presente and M. Ristović, 'Distrustful neighborhood Yugoslavia and Greek colonels, 1967-1974', *Nuova Riv. Stor.*, 2018.

[7] B. Shepherd, 'Political Stability: Crucial for Growth?', *LSE Ideas Strateg. Br.*, 2010.

[8] M. Quet and M. Noel, 'From politics to academics: Political activism and the emergence of science and technology studies in South Korea', *East Asian Sci. Technol. Soc.*, 2014, doi: 10.1215/18752160-2416948.

[9] P. Voglis, '"The junta came to power by the force of arms, and will only go by force of arms": Political violence and the voice of the opposition to the military dictatorship in Greece, 1967-74', *Cult. Soc. Hist.*, 2011, doi: 10.2752/147800411X13105523597922.

[10] W. S. Heinz, 'The military, torture and human rights: Experiences from Argentina, Brazil, Chile and Uruguay', in *The Politics of Pain: Torturers and Their Masters*, 2019. doi: 10.4324/9780429313929-5.

[11] P. J. Bertocci, 'Bangladesh in the Early 1980s: Praetorian Politics in an Intermediate Regime', *Asian Surv.*, 1982, doi: 10.2307/2643756.

CHAPTER 21

A BRIEF DISCUSSION ON GOVERNMENTAL LEADERSHIP

Dr. Vishal Soodan, Assistant Professor,
Department of Marketing, CMS Business School, JAIN Deemed to-be University, Bangalore, India,
Email Id- dr.vishalsoodan@cms.ac.in

ABSTRACT:

Governmental leadership refers to the individuals or groups responsible for making decisions and guiding the direction of a government. This includes elected officials, bureaucrats, and other political leaders who are responsible for setting policies, managing resources, and representing the interests of their constituents. Effective governmental leadership is critical to the success of a government, as it can shape the direction of a country and impact the lives of its citizens. Good leaders are able to balance competing interests, communicate effectively, and make decisions that benefit the country as a whole. They must also be able to respond to changing circumstances and adapt to new challenges as they arise.

KEYWORDS:

Accountability, Authority, Charismatic Leadership, Decision-Making, Delegation, Federalism.

INTRODUCTION

The behavior of their leaders' shapes executives. Political leadership is difficult to evaluate, extremely visible, and often discussed. Despite being seen and heard by relatively few people, great leaders from antiquity, the Renaissance, and modern times were all well known to their contemporaries. The visibility of leadership has been significantly increased by the development of the mass media, particularly television, but it has always been prominent. Their merits and shortcomings were probably the topic of many discussions; they were at least the focus of academic work. Indeed, while the idea of leadership was starting to be studied, historians' studies were primarily focused on describing their actions [1]–[3].

Leaders may be seen as heroes or villains, good or terrible, but they can also be viewed as more or less successful and effective. In this regard, a contrast has been drawn between true leaders and "mere" "power-holders" or, maybe more precisely, "office-holders." It makes sense intuitively to assert that most rulers likely the vast majority do nothing to influence the course of events, while only a small number are great "stars" who, at least theoretically, have a huge impact on humanity's future. Another distinction has been made between "great" leaders who completely "transform" the character of their society and those who are more focused on ensuring that society functions and who make compromises and "transactions" while accepting the framework in which economic, social, and political life occurs. Instead of being seen as a dichotomy, this contrast could be seen as two poles of a continuous dimension that deals with the "extent of change" that leaders want to effect. In a somewhat related context, Max Weber first established the idea of "charisma," which has since lost some of its significance in light of Weber's more rigid definition but nevertheless played a significant role in the modern world. This

is especially true in emerging nations where personal rule has been widely used alongside the two major Weberian categories of traditional and bureaucratic-legalistic rule in order to ensure the maintenance of regimes and governments that lack fundamental backing.

Only two types of rulers constitutional presidents and prime ministers in parliamentary or cabinet systems have their range of activities strictly limited. A third kind of constitutional monarchs currently often only serve a symbolic purpose. Since it typically coexists with either a symbolic monarch or a symbolic president, the position of prime minister is, at least theoretically, less prestigious than that of president. Although these heads of state have few actual powers, they carry out ceremonial duties that give them authority that prime ministers are not granted. For this reason, several prime ministers from the Third World, particularly in Black Africa, worked to change the constitution a few years after independence to allow them to become presidents.

Since all decisions made by the cabinet must be approved, the power of the prime minister is ostensibly limited. However, as we have already pointed out, there are significant differences in the influence of different prime ministers. Presidents manage hierarchical administrations, thus although their authority is quite diverse, they often have a significant amount of influence. Since the constitutional presidency, outside of the United States, has only had modest success, this is especially true in authoritarian presidential systems, which make up the vast majority of situations. Authoritarian presidents, particularly military rulers of whom there are typically around two dozen in the modern world either govern without a constitution or create one that is tailored to their goals. They are sometimes permitted to be re-elected indefinitely. The legislature may be dissolved by autocratic rulers, and they are the only ones who can run the country. Many nations, especially in Africa, have gained independence at the same time that these absolute presidencies have spread. In Asia, however, leaders frequently continued to be constrained, at least in part, by the restrictions placed on prime ministers. Many authoritarian presidents served as the nation's first leaders because they had the power to create and reshape political institutions as they saw fit.

Some of them came very close to being 'charismatic' leaders in the full sense that Weber defined. They were the 'fathers' of their nations and often held office for two decades or more; as a result, they made up a disproportionately significant percentage of the longest-serving presidents in the modern world. They primarily depended on strong public support as well as authoritarian techniques. The successors of these first leaders often found it more difficult to govern in such a "paternal" and absolute style, which frequently led to a more "domesticated," but still very authoritarian, presidency.

Dual leadership makes up an intriguing kind of executive leadership. Although the single-leader rule is frequently regarded as the standard, it does not always apply. There are instances of government by council, which is distinct from the cabinet system, as well as "juntas," or temporary military governments, which are most common in provisional governments in Latin America. However, there are also many instances of dual leadership. History has seen instances of dual leadership; Republican Rome, for instance, was predominantly governed by two consuls. Its current evolution was first sparked by rulers' desire to share some of their burdens with a first or prime minister. This happened in highly authoritarian nations as well, from the early seventeenth century in France with Richelieu through the nineteenth century in Austria with Metternich and Germany with Bismarck. This happened in part as a response of public pressure. It happens as a result of administrative requirements or problems with validity.

Due to this, nations as diverse as France or Finland, communist states, the kingdoms of Morocco and Jordan, and 'progressive' states like Tanzania, Algeria, or Libya have all adopted dual leadership. It exists in both liberal and autocratic systems, conservative and 'progressive' systems, and communist and non-communist systems, though in communist states the distinction between party secretary and prime minister makes the distinction particularly strong as it corresponds to the division between party and state that has historically characterized these countries.

Although dualist systems are frequently seen as transitory, there are enough instances of dual leadership that have persisted for many years to cast doubt on the 'natural' nature of single leadership. Between a quarter and a third of the world's countries are governed by a dualist system, and in the majority of these countries the system has functioned as intended. The distinction between a leader embodying the national legitimacy and a leader embodying the administrative legitimacy suggests that the two leaders are not equals, but given the complexity of the modern state, it is hardly surprising that leadership must frequently be shared in order to be effective.

Thus, leaders can play a variety of roles; it is obvious that not all of these distinctions are due to the nature of the regime. The importance of personal traits also seems obvious on the surface, yet it is difficult to quantify them and even appraise them broadly. Although research has started to examine the influence of personality traits on national leadership, many questions remain. Numerous studies conducted by experimental psychologists have shown a positive correlation between leadership and intelligence, dominance, self-confidence, achievement, drive, sociability, and energy. Recently, revolutionary leaders have drawn a lot of attention since they have been shown to have a number of characteristics, including nationalism, a sense of justice, and a sense of purpose, as well as vanity, egotism, and narcissism. These leaders also exhibit relative deprivation and status inconsistency, and it was discovered that they have strong linguistic and organizational abilities. Overall, as has been shown in the case of American presidents, two factors drive or energy and pleasure with the job appears to be crucial. It is obvious that personal factors play a significant role in the development of leadership, even though it is difficult to gauge the extent to which, under different circumstances, leaders can alter the institutions that they need to exercise their power and even though the role that they play in this regard is frequently overshadowed by the durable and even ostensibly permanent character of these institutions [4]–[6].

DISCUSSION

The Impact of Leaders and Governments

Ministers and other leaders have brief careers; they typically hold office for four to five years on average, and very few hold it for 10 or more. With the exception of conventional monarchs, duration was historically longer in communist regimes than everywhere else, but developments that occurred in the 1980s significantly shortened it there as well. Governmental accomplishments are difficult to assess because of their brief tenures in office. To begin with, one must make a distinction between what 'would' have happened 'naturally' and what really happened as a result of a decision made by the government. Second, it is frequently impossible to directly link specific results to specific governments, for a variety of reasons, including the short tenure of governments, the way in which they "slide" into one another through coalitions and cabinet shuffles, and the "lag" between policy development and implementation. Therefore, it

should come as no surprise that generalizations about the effects of governments have remained rather nebulous and have focused more on general traits of entire classes of executives than specific cabinets. It has been shown that social democratic administrations affect social and economic life, at least in many ways, despite the sometimes-held belief that governing parties no longer vary from one another. Additionally, it appears to be established that Third World military governments do not perform economically better than civilian governments, despite what some had claimed. The volatility of ministerial personnel, for example, has not been shown to have the detrimental effects on social and economic growth that are sometimes claimed it does. On the other hand, other generalizations frequently made about governments have not yet been substantiated. The influence of leaders is also difficult to determine entirely for the same reasons. The fact that their society has a strong yearning for change and so offers chances that are unavailable to those who lead a society whose members are content with the current quo aids "great" revolutionaries in seeming to have a significant influence. Thus, the unrest that was present at the time in Russia and China aided Lenin's or Mao's efforts. As a result, it is important to consider the demands made by the populace, particularly by its loudest members, in addition to the policies that these leaders have developed and put into effect.

Even if they may be influential by stifling a significant desire for change, rulers who manage the system as it is and do not try to change policies may be seen as having relatively little influence. While in power, those who enact policies intended to fundamentally transform their society may still have a greater impact than those who only make relatively minor changes. Therefore, it is necessary to compare the rulers to the ruled and the personality traits to the general atmosphere of the populace in order to evaluate the role of leadership. It must be evaluated across time as well; in fact, it may never be entirely decided since it may be applied to generations that have not yet been born. It may also change since a leader's actions may be reversed by his or her successors. For instance, many who have followed Mao have significantly altered, if not completely overthrown, his policies. Therefore, compared to the 1970s, the founder of the communist regime does not seem to have had as much of an impact in the nation with the highest population [7], [8].

Considering how much importance the media, NGOs, and huge segments of the public put on national executives, it may seem counterintuitive to question whether governments are important. This contradiction is only one of the numerous contradicting feelings that seem to be fostered by governments. Such opposing viewpoints may be understandable given that governments and their leaders are both attractive and repulsive because they are at least ostensibly powerful and grant their members an aura of power, or auctoritas, which fascinates, tantalizes, but also worries and, in the worst cases, frightens those who are the subjects and observers of political life. The great complexity of the tasks to be accomplished, the frequently ephemeral nature of their members, the numerous ways in which they can be organized, and the ultimate paradox namely, that it is ultimately almost impossible to know how much they affect the destinies of humankind are all contradictions and paradoxes of governments.

Legislatures

It is the Legislative Century. Before and after the Second World War, constitutions incorporating a national legislature replaced existing governing institutions all over the world as colonialism failed and nations multiplied. The revival of legislative institutions fueled Eastern Europe's political change in the late 1980s. In the first democratic elections since the Second World War,

the communist party was not in charge of selecting members of parliament. As the twenty-first century draws near, legislative institutions are present all across the globe and their power seems to be growing.

However, the viability of legislatures over the past 50 years has been uneven. Legislative bodies have retained or even enhanced their significance within the governing structures of democracies with a longer history. Legislative bodies have been significant governing organizations in various recent democracies. The destiny of legislatures has varied in various fledgling democracies. For instance, after 35 years of Japanese colonial rule in Korea, the country held national elections in 1948 to elect its first National Assembly. The new constitution's chosen president quickly became dictatorial and repressed political dissent. The Syngman Rhee administration was overthrown in 1960 by a student uprising, which was followed by free elections for the National Assembly. The new administration was ousted by a military coup in less than two years. Two years later, the military junta organized elections and won control of the democratic process. This pattern of military rule interspersed with returns to democratic elections has persisted in South Korea and is also common in other emerging countries. Another country with intermittent military control is Pakistan, where the military has held power for 24 of the country's 43 years of independence.

This really short historical journey into legislation aims to illustrate two ideas. First, the durability of legislative institutions in some of the more recent democracies is as perplexing as their volatility. Even though those of us who live in relatively stable political systems may perceive stability as the normal course of events, its absence elsewhere serves as a reminder of what is present here. What is present and missing those results in stability in one situation and instability in another is the conundrum. The second thing to consider is that legislatures and elections now serve as a backup plan. Elections and legislatures are where the nation goes when generals or colonels find themselves so split that they are unable to govern or when they have had enough of ruling, as has sometimes occurred in Latin America. Legislation seldom regulates firearms, but for the last 50 years, it has remained extraordinarily strong. A significant shift in global history has been the alteration in the fall-back stance. Legislative bodies have gained the status they have had in Europe for around 200 years in other parts of the globe.

What Elections Mean and Why

Some people are elected to government, while others climb through the ranks of the military or civilian bureaucracies. Legislators differ from the majority of other members of a country's political elite in that they are elected, which is a distinguishing entry point into the political elite. Given that legislators are chosen by election, it is crucial to understand how they differ from other governmental structures in a country.

Who is chosen?

Are lawmakers chosen from distinct social groups than those who generate other political elites? Compared to other questions regarding legislatures, this one has received more in-depth research and may thus be addressed with more assurance. No, is the answer. The majority of lawmakers are well-educated, affluent males from upper social classes. Donald Matthews has compiled the vast body of research on the social backgrounds of legislators and found that the results are the same across Latin America, Asia, Africa, Western Europe, and communist countries: legislators are chosen from the privileged classes of society. On this theme, there are only two variations.

The status gap between lawmakers and electors is bigger in less developed nations with tiny elite populations and huge numbers of the poor than in more developed nations with more evenly distributed money. Only a small number of communist countries and Scandinavian countries have legislatures with a majority of women. The proportion of women in the Supreme Soviet has decreased by half as a result of perestroika; before to the Supreme Soviet election in 1989, women held around 33% of the seats, but after the 1989 election, they only won 17% of the seats.

Legislators are chosen from the same social groups as other members of the elite. Legislators are not unique from other political elites in this regard, but elections do generate a legislature that is quite different from the population in terms of its social experiences. Elections may help the elite circulate, but the elite are the ones who are doing the circulating. You must look elsewhere for the effects of elections.

Legislators and constituents' issues

The US military was abruptly called into action to send a sizable deployment of soldiers into Saudi Arabia in August 1990. A young Michigan couple who were engaged were split up after he was sent to South Carolina while traveling to Saudi Arabia. The pair set up to be married at the post where the soldier was temporarily stationed with the assistance of Michigan Senator Carl Levin, a member of the Armed Services Committee and a candidate for re-election. On Michigan television and network news, Senator Levin, the couple, and the wedding were covered. The incident merits retelling in light of the following observation on legislatures:

Third World lawmakers have had to deal with demands that their Western colleagues seldom face since the political and nonpolitical spheres are not always clearly separated in non-Western societies. Elections concentrate lawmakers' attention on the issues of their people, whether in the Third World or the United States. In Thailand, lawmakers stated that they were requested to serve as middlemen in arranging weddings. Legislators get involved when it comes to marriage arrangements since only they have the authority necessary to help.

One of the most crucial jobs for Tanzanian lawmakers, according to them, is bringing the concerns of their people to the government's notice. Helping their people deal with government offices, recognizing regional issues and making them public, and acting as a mediator between their community and the government were among the members of the Colombian Congress' most important duties. Chilean lawmakers made a lot of effort to help their citizens through a complicated social security system and include local projects in the budget. Kenyan, Korean, and Turkish legislators said they were successful in allocating funds to their districts. For the United States or Western Europe, the situation remains the same.

The study identifies two themes that describe the concerns of the constituents. Bureaucratic apathy is one topic. Members of the US Congress and Chilean legislators both have to deal with the social security bureaucracy when trying to get them to recognize and address a constituent's unique situation. The second subject is regional economic growth. In Kenya, local development may take the form of an access road or a well, whereas in the US, it might take the form of a nuclear fuel reprocessing facility. Planners care about finding the greatest location, whether in Kenya or the US, while elected legislators are more concerned with the constituency's economic prosperity.

Elections may make lawmakers more likely than other political elites to pay attention to voters' needs, but a peculiar aspect of the Korean constitution offers more concrete proof of the claim. The Korean constitution briefly provided that two-thirds of the National Assembly members must be elected to their positions and one-third must be appointed. The clause essentially ensured that the president's party would have a commanding majority in the National Assembly. Additionally, it allowed Kim and Woo to compare how appointed versus elected National Assembly members behaved. Compared to appointed lawmakers, elected legislators were far more likely to participate in constituency service activities. Elections are important because they direct lawmakers' emphasis to constituents' issues.

Representation is the Anglo-American manner of phrasing this subject: "For whom you speak; to whom you speak." Two lines of inquiry into the relationship between elections and governmental action began with the Legislative System, which has direct historical origins in Edmund Burke. The fundamental idea is that representation serves as the means through which the opinions of the people are translated into governmental decision-making. Based on this idea, one line of inquiry looked at the correspondence between lawmakers' votes and the views of their constituents. This line of research's most clear thesis was "Congress and the public: how representational is one of the other?' . The issue was most thoroughly explored in a series of studies (Miller and Stokes 1963) that included sample surveys of the electorate and legislative votes. The second strand investigated the representational role orientation of lawmakers in more detail, following Wahlke et al. who did not have access to public surveys. More nations were included in the study since this second research approach may be used in nations where survey data were not accessible.

Understanding the flaws in this framework for the connection between elections and governance is the end outcome of the study. There have been several criticisms and reformulation efforts. In particular, three objections are significant. First of all, one conclusion of the second strand of study was that lawmakers do not seem to play the role in policy making envisaged in the theory. The first strand of study discovered, among other things, that individuals do not contribute and do not carry around well-reasoned opinions on the wide variety of policy issues that governments must address. Third, it is simple for lawmakers to portray consensus when people agree. Constituents disagree more often than they agree, therefore "representation" is useless when it comes to dictating what a lawmaker will or should do. A more descriptively appropriate reformulation that refocuses on the significance of elections is required.

The reformulation may start by observing that elected politicians constantly argue from two opposing angles when stating their positions on what the government should do. While speaking to the electorate, they also address each other. They seek more supporters for the next election by recalling previous supporters while speaking to one other and the public. This approach relies on a call for support rather than representation. It is acting to generate a will in the electorate rather than carrying out the will of the voters. In the French parliament, Frank Baumgartner makes a case for this interpretation of policy considerations. By recasting topics which the government has framed as technical issues in terms of equality, French cultural heritage, and other significant political symbols, opposition parties shift the discussion, criticize the administration, appeal to their base of supporters, and recruit new ones. Boynton shown that in the debates over clean air, arguments that are quite technical may nonetheless influence people's opinions. Shanto Iyengar demonstrated how the framing and reframing of communication may significantly affect how people react. The reframing itself is not crucial, however. Reframing is rather uncommon, but it

is an impressive illustration of what elected officials constantly do when they address the public from the floor of the legislature. And people do react. Elections are conducted, and in more affluent cultures, there exist organizations for interest groups and public opinion surveys that serve as a bridge between elections. As a result, conversation the official's plea and the electorate's answer, as well as the electorate's appeal and the officials' reaction is a better formulation than representation. Elections are crucial because they allow politicians to interact with their supporters.

How electoral systems matter

The conduct of elections has not yet been considered on the question of why elections important. There are significant variances amongst election systems, and these variations have an impact on which constituents lawmakers pay attention to and how they interact with electorates. The criteria for selecting a winner, the geographic area in which candidates are chosen, and the management of nominations are three aspects of electoral systems that are especially significant. The three characteristics are mixed in many different ways around the globe, however the three's most significant effects may be handled separately. Three factors are often considered when picking the winner of a vote. A candidate could require a majority of the votes cast, a plurality of the votes cast, or seats might be given to parties according to the percentage of the vote they obtained during the election. Systems that require a majority or a plurality of votes result in the parties gaining a bigger proportion of seats in the legislature than their percentage of votes than those that do not. Even fewer seats in the legislature go to parties who received lower percentages of the vote in the election. Proportional representation, which allots seats based on the percentage of votes cast in the election, is less likely to favor or disadvantage minor parties when converting votes into seats. The process of counting has the effect of either making fewer or more discussions. In majority and plurality systems, small parties do not endure, and the conversations that follow are limited to the few that do. At one extreme, the nation may be split into geographical regions, with one legislator chosen from each region; this system calls for a majority or plurality rule to choose the winner. The opposite extreme is counting votes using the whole nation as the geographic unit; this necessitates some kind of proportional distribution of seats based on votes. The geographic unit used to tally votes changes who the politicians' constituents are. Residents who live in a particular area will be considered constituents. Local in this context denotes a location. Constituents and local have quite different connotations when the country is the utilized as the geographic unit. Constituents might include anybody in the country, regardless of where they reside, who is concerned about the status of the environment.

Without being nominated first, one cannot be elected. In virtually every nation, political parties have some level of influence over nominations, but this power may vary greatly. If the election system employs proportional representation, it is extremely simple for a party organization to dominate nominations since that system necessitates a nationwide list of candidates. Election outcomes depend greatly on who makes the list and where they are listed. The influence of nomination by parties is minimized in election systems based on smaller geographic regions, particularly if a primary election is involved. This alters whether there are more or fewer talks. The number of talks decreases and the number of legislators who disagree with the party are easily replaced in the subsequent election when parties exert tight control. When parties lack control, the number of conversations increases as each candidate tries to appeal to a different segment of the electorate [9]–[11].

CONCLUSION

Governmental leadership philosophies may range greatly, from authoritarian to democratic. While democratic leaders may solicit input from a wide range of stakeholders and promote participation and collaboration, autocratic leaders may make decisions unilaterally and without input from others. Effective political leaders must be able to inspire trust and confidence in their public and be held responsible for their choices and actions, regardless of their leadership style. They must also be able to negotiate intricate political structures, balance conflicting agendas, and cooperate with other leaders to accomplish shared objectives. Overall, effective government leadership is necessary for any government to succeed since it may assist to guarantee stability, promote economic progress, and advance the welfare of people.

REFERENCES:

[1] F. Simangunsong, S. P. Lamawato, and I. Hutasoit, 'Management development of district in the administration of local government in East Flores Regency, East Nusa Tenggara Province', *J. Urban Reg. Anal.*, 2020, doi: 10.37043/JURA.2020.12.2.2.

[2] T. Willaert and G. Roumans, 'Nitpicking online knowledge representations of governmental leadership: The case of belgian prime ministers in wikipedia and wikidata', *Lib. Q.*, 2020, doi: 10.18352/LQ.10362.

[3] T. Chapple-McGruder *et al.*, 'Leadership Disparities in State Governmental Public Health Workforce: Examining the Influence of Gender', *J. Public Heal. Manag. Pract.*, 2020, doi: 10.1097/PHH.0000000000000883.

[4] A. M. Cabodevila, 'Leadership challenges in christian non-governmental organisations', *HTS Teol. Stud. / Theol. Stud.*, 2020, doi: 10.4102/hts.v76i2.5944.

[5] H. H. Alsaqqa and Ç. E. Akyürek, 'Assessment of organizational culture types, leadership styles and their relationships within governmental and non-governmental hospitals in Gaza Strip of Palestine', *BMC Health Serv. Res.*, 2021, doi: 10.1186/s12913-021-06351-1.

[6] R. De Mucci, 'Governmental Leadership without a Political Party', *Open J. Polit. Sci.*, 2018, doi: 10.4236/ojps.2018.83020.

[7] K. C. Ryckman and J. M. Braithwaite, 'Changing horses in midstream: Leadership changes and the civil war peace process', *Confl. Manag. Peace Sci.*, 2020, doi: 10.1177/0738894217726762.

[8] A. Kiriukhina and T. Farkas, 'Changes in governmental leadership strategies after pandemic', *Stud. Mundi – Econ.*, 2021, doi: 10.18531/studia.mundi.2021.08.05.17-24.

[9] J. L. Angel and S. Mudrazija, 'Local Government Efforts to Mitigate the Novel Coronavirus Pandemic among Older Adults', *J. Aging Soc. Policy*, 2020, doi: 10.1080/08959420.2020.1771240.

[10] J. Blondel, 'Types Of Governmental Leadership In Atlantic Countries', *Eur. J. Polit. Res.*, 1977, doi: 10.1111/j.1475-6765.1977.tb01210.x.

[11] P. D. Candidate, D. Cătălin, and P. Studies, 'Non-Governmental Organization Leadership And Development. A Review Of The Literature', *Manager*, 2013.

CHAPTER 22

LEGISLATURES AND THE ARGUMENT ABOUT A NATION

Dr. Dinesh. N, Associate Professor,
Department of OB & HRM, CMS Business School, JAIN Deemed to-be University,
Bangalore, India,
Email id- dinesh.rao@cms.ac.in

ABSTRACT:

Legislatures play a critical role in the functioning of democratic systems of government, as they are responsible for making and passing laws that affect the lives of citizens. Legislators are elected officials who are responsible for representing the interests of their constituents, and for engaging in debate and negotiation to shape public policy. One of the central arguments for the importance of legislatures is that they provide a space for democratic deliberation and debate. By bringing together representatives from diverse constituencies and political perspectives, legislatures can facilitate discussion and compromise, and help to ensure that laws and policies are responsive to the needs and preferences of citizens.

KEYWORDS:

Bicameralism, Constitutional Law, Democracy, Federalism, Institutional Design, Legislature.

INTRODUCTION

Politics is the constant discussion of what should be done as a country and how it should be done, where the rules that govern the discussion may itself become a topic of discussion. Therefore, the laws that we argue by include legislatures. The legislators, a portion of the general populace, are given special standing in the discussion by the legislature. Their arguments are given attention in a manner that the arguments of others are not. They speak in spaces where others cannot. They speak and listen when others do not by becoming politicians. It may thus seem strange to describe legislatures as a component of the systems through which we engage in debate. Legislators should be occupied enacting legislation rather than fighting, it is countered, as they are the ones who make laws. It is unquestionably true that, with very few exceptions, constitutions creating legislatures need legislation to be enacted by the legislature in order for it to become a law. In a formal sense, laws are passed by legislators all over the globe.

The expectation does not match what legislatures actually do if one assumes that those laws will be proposed by legislators, written by legislators, significantly changed during consideration and passage by legislators, or that legislators will fail to pass legislation that is conceived of and written elsewhere. Legislative academics generally agree that legislatures have a very limited impact on the creation and formulation of laws. Of course, distinctions may be made. When it comes to creating policy, the US Congress has a far greater impact than other legislatures. It was discovered that the Costa Rican legislature had a greater influence on the creation of laws than the Chilean legislature. The British House of Commons and the German Bundestag both have more legislative sway than Kenya's legislature, which they both far outweigh. These differences,

however, are made only within a very small range. What is required is a better, more descriptive description of the function of legislatures in national politics [1]–[3].

As a result of the prior explanation of why elections important, it is natural to conceive of legislatures as the most recent election, with lawmakers asking for support on the floor and the subsequent election serving as a proxy for the debate over what should be done as a country and how to go about it. Elections and debate are downplayed when seeing the legislature as a body that writes laws, on the other hand. Scholars and other observers are thus taken aback when "politics," or the upcoming election, interferes with the legislature's ability to write laws or not.

Legislative bodies and the present debate

The present condition of the debate is recorded during an election. In elections, the issue becomes who should carry out the nation's policy, with each party arguing their position on what should be done and how. Voters' registration at the polls reflects the current status of the debate, who is convinced by whom, and the result is represented by those holding elected positions. The arrangement of the offices, especially the interaction between the legislative and executive branches, has a significant impact on the likelihood that the present state of the debate will result in legislation. While in some nations the executive, commonly referred to as the president, is chosen independently from the legislature's election, in other nations the executive, typically referred to as the prime minister and cabinet, may, or in some circumstances must, be made up of lawmakers. In a study of 56 legislatures, Herman and Mendel found that most did not require the executive to be drawn from the legislature, and that fourteen legislatures forbade their members from holding executive positions, while seventeen required some or all of the top executive officers to be drawn from the legislature.

In a nation with a president and an election system that creates few political parties in the legislature, embodying the present state of the debate in those in government is simple. The executive branch is in existence thanks to the election of the president, who also names the cabinet and heads of other ministries. Elections to the legislature often result in a majority that sets up the legislature. However, the current state of the argument is registered in a group of officials to continue the argument, regardless of whether the majority party in the legislature and the president are affiliated or not. There is another stage in the debate in nations where the legislature serves as the executive body and when the election system creates a plethora of political parties in the legislature. A coalition in the legislature must be formed in order to establish a government. The present condition of the dispute is not completely recognized in those in power until a coalition administration is formed. These two groupings of offices are often utilized. There is no presidential system in the United States. The parliamentary systems used in many European democracies have the offices set up as outlined. On these themes, however, there are numerous variations. For instance, in Great Britain, the prime minister and cabinet are chosen by the legislature, but the electoral system results in few parties being represented in the house. As a result, there is often a majority party in the house, and the majority party forms the government without the need for a coalition.

The claim that elections reflect the present state of the debate by enshrining that state in offices is supported by research on coalition administrations. The early studies, which can be traced back to Riker's theory of coalitions, made the erroneous assumption that the formation of coalitions was only motivated by office seeking. According to this viewpoint, the second phase in creating a government would only tangentially reflect the present status of the debate by first deciding

how seats would be allocated before negotiating how the rewards of office would be divided. However, this idea of coalition building turned out to be inadequate. The theory's shortcoming was most obvious in its failure to take into consideration minority alliances. If obtaining elected office was the primary driving force for coalition formation, the majority of lawmakers who were not part of the coalition ought to have established a government and divided the posts among themselves rather than allowing a minority to hold them. Minority cabinetry made up 30% of the cabinets analyzed. The formation of a coalition administration is now generally accepted among academics to be, at least in part, a continuation of the debate about what the country should do and how.

Research on coalition administrations also shows that the debate over the direction the country should take continues after elections, both within and outside of the legislature. Coalitions may endure anywhere from a few months to more than fifty-two months, but there is a wide range in how long they continue. First, scholars tried to explain a coalition's longevity in terms of its founding qualities. According to this viewpoint, the status of the debate at the time of the election would account for the duration of a coalition. After the election, governing would include enacting legislation that reflected the status of the debate at the time of the election. Although this cannot be entirely disregarded, it is at most a partial explanation. Recently, scholars have improved their theories of coalition persistence by including post-election events. After the election, things happen, the dispute goes on, and a new ruling coalition is established, recording a new phase in the conflict.

The study of coalition governments helps to clarify how all legislatures operate. The necessity to create coalitions and the dissolution of coalitions make the processes taking place in all legislatures visible to the public. Any legislature you visit will have ongoing debates about what the country should be doing and how it should be done, whether it be on the floor, in the hallways, in committees, or anywhere else that legislators congregate [4]–[6].

DISCUSSION

The level of detail in the Arguments

Both a healthy economy and clean air are possible. That is one level of detail in a discussion about the economy's impact on health and the effects of air pollution; it is similar to the level of detail found in headlines about political campaigns. Arguments over the level of pollution caused by automobiles and how crippling the pollution is for how many individuals get more depth when it is said that vehicles are a significant source of pollution that creates health issues for those with asthma and other lung conditions. More information can be added by describing the harmful chemicals emitted by vehicles, how much the chemicals would need to be reduced in order to reduce health effects to an acceptable level, how an acceptable level is determined, how much emission reduction is provided by current catalytic converters, how far emissions could be further reduced with improved catalytic converters, how much improving catalytic converters will cost, and how the chemicals that escape during the sale of gasoline contribute [7]–[9].

Simple is the point. At each of these degrees of specificity, debates may and often do take place. Laws may be described at each of these degrees of specificity, but they cannot be written at each level of specificity. A legislation that simply said, "There shall be clean air," would not specify what automobile makers, for example, should do to comply with the rule. Laws include a wealth of information that the majority of people and politicians are unaware of or unable to assess.

The degree of specificity in the argument is a notion that may be used to combine the idea that legislatures are debate venues, the institutional framework for creating legislation, and lawmakers' consideration of constituent concerns. It is a very rare voter who wants to fully understand the chemistry of air quality and its regulation. Voters may be persuaded that it is important to clean the air even if it means some additional costs for vehicles or they may be persuaded that the health effects do not justify the costs to the economy. Votes are cast for the party and candidate who seem most likely to act, with the disputes in election campaigns being carried on in minimal detail.

The argument at one level of detail must be turned into the argument at the far more specific level of law when a government is constituted. In the majority of nations, this is carried out by executives and subject matter experts employed by government agencies. The majority of the members of the majority party in the legislature or the majority of the members who make up a coalition generally vote in favor of the bill when it is presented to the legislature by the government. Legislators often lack the knowledge necessary to thoroughly assess the legislation. The US Congress is unique in that its members gain sufficient experience in its permanent committees to debate specifics. The majority of the communication between Congress and the administration occurs while the legislation is being discussed in committee. As in other nations, when legislation moves to the full legislature, the level of debate returns to the level of specificity at which elections are held. And just as in other legislatures, the chances of passing a bill presented by the committee are high between 85% and 98%).

Permanent committees also provide the head of the committee debating clean air legislation the chance to voice the concerns of the auto industry in his Michigan-based constituency. However, it should be noted that even though it is assumed that the US Congress is a strong legislature and the Kenyan legislature is a weaker one, the action of the Michigan congressman is not qualitatively different from the action of the Kenyan legislator who negotiates special arrangements for his district. The details include a lot of constituents' worries. In such situation, lawmakers become deeply engaged.

Courts

An authoritative forum for the resolution of legal issues is a court. In contrast to the historical perspective, many of the characteristics associated with judicial independence, legal professional competence, and objectivity were absent or significantly altered during the many centuries of judicial institutional development that preceded the emergence of courts in the variety of contemporary legal systems of the world. Modern courts are typically independent of other branches of government. Martin Shapiro noticed accurately that models of the ideal judicial system are widely used by analysts of the characteristics of courts. Among them, Max Weber's conceptual framework is important. A court will be staffed by professionally qualified judges, whose professional integrity and independence are guaranteed by basic constitutional guarantees, in line with the main components of his ideal model. These courts are essential components of bureaucratic systems intended to guarantee consistency and reason. Charles Ogilvie and other historians have linked monarchical influence to one of the primary families of law in Europe.

As a result, legislation that applied to the whole realm in England was not only decided by judges but also by the queen. Weber, on the other hand, categorized courts in respect to three fundamental categories of ruling regimes: conventional, charismatic, and 'legal' or constitutional. According to Weber, the structure of the courts under each of these categories would depend on

the kind of governmental system. In a traditional system, judges would be appointed ad hoc, courts would be staffed with custom-conforming judges, and decisions would be made in accordance with custom. A charismatic leader's will would be the source of law in such a system, and choices would follow this leader's particularistic philosophy. In contrast, in a constitutional regime, law would be created objectively based on impartial constitutional or statutory standards, in courts staffed by judges selected on merit after extensive professional training, and decisions would be made objectively based on generally accepted laws and fair procedures.

In actuality, neither historically nor now, courts, judges, and whole legal and judicial systems do not exactly follow such conceptual frameworks. Instead of following symmetrical conceptual models, modern courts and judicial systems may differ in line with legal cultural characteristics. The fundamental distinctions across the main families of law in terms of court structure, judicial training, internal institutional processes, and professional organization highlight significant cultural variants that deviate from Weber's model. Similar to how historical broad differences in the presence or absence of legal experts in courts and the extent of administrative power over courts in Western Europe change ideas about centralized control.

The main families of law differ in a number of significant ways regarding the fundamental characteristics of courts. Following their introduction as a result of the conquests and colonial expansions of Spain, Portugal, France, Great Britain, the Netherlands, and, to a lesser extent, other European countries, two such families, which originated in Western Europe, gained influence in other nations. In contrast to the civil law family, which formed in parts of Western Europe on the basis of remnants of Roman law, the common law system began in Great Britain. Early in the nineteenth century, Napoleon Bonaparte provided the greatest fulfillment for the focus on codification in civil law. Traditional comparisons of the common law and civil law traditions typically focus on key distinctions between them, including how courts operate, judges' roles, the significance of stare decisis the principle that precedents are controlling judicial independence, the function of lawyers, and the sources of law themselves.

The source of law in civil law regimes is the legislative body, not the judges. Judges in common law systems, on the other hand, work autonomously. Law is therefore the manifestation of legislative intent in parliamentary civil law systems. It represents the monarch's will under a system of absolute monarchy. Legal treatises were often quite important in medieval times, reflecting the enormous effect of the law schools of major universities on the development of legal principles in civil law. It was anticipated that the strict codification of the civil law that began in the Napoleonic era would lessen the influence of legal scholars, but in the majority of civil law countries, including France itself, the role of law faculties in analyzing modern codes and in providing commentary on legislative reform of civil law elements is still significant. Contrarily, although academic commentary is prevalent in common law countries, the majority of these countries still rely on judges to identify major legal changes or to maintain deliberate continuity via legislative action and judicial interpretation. In the past, universities in Great Britain played a far lesser role in legal analysis and almost none in the preparation of attorneys. Both the provincial training centers for lawyers and the Inns of Court for barristers preempted the latter role. Barristers were the only attorneys eligible for selection as judges of the higher courts and competent to participate in the adversarial process before higher British judges.

The structure, processes, and make-up of courts often reflect traits that are closely connected to those of the primary family of law that gave origin to the judicial system. Archetypes of the

common law and civil law systems are described in their countries of origin as well as in a few colonial and post-colonial settings, in order to demonstrate the relationship between the judicial system and the historic family of law. The underlying political structure and historical experience of each country, as well as some of the essential features of the family of law, may be reflected in the way that courts are organized. Thus, the Canadian court system incorporates the majority of its colonial British heritage, with some limited modifications brought about by the country's commitment to federalism. In contrast, the hierarchy of courts in Great Britain embodies organizational principles that reflect centuries of monarchical efforts at national unification. A Supreme Court of Canada Chief Justice named Bora Laskin proposed that there are five broad court organizational patterns that are often used in contemporary judicial systems. One is the English model of a unitary system, where a national appellate court of universal jurisdiction acts similarly to a British criminal or civil Court of Appeal or, eventually for domestic British issues, the House of Lords, "not limited to any class of cases," in a manner similar to that of a national court of appeals in the United States.

A higher appellate court in a federal system with explicit statutory or constitutional jurisdictional powers and limitations, similar to those in Article III, section 2 of the United States Constitution, is a second model, of which the Supreme Court of the United States serves as an example. This approach places a significant amount of jurisdictional duty on issues or disputes between the governments of a country's political subdivisions, such as American states, Canadian provinces, or Swiss cantons. But in addition, a court like the Supreme Court of the United States has extensive appellate jurisdiction as well as some designated original jurisdiction over all issues of constitutional significance. Laskin cites a third model that is based on British Commonwealth experience and has a higher appellate court that is "purely federal," only hearing cases that are statutorily or constitutionally designated and excluding other constitutional disputes that could be resolved by direct appeal to the British Privy Council's Judicial Committee. The fourth model calls for "a strictly constitutional court," which apparently lacks any authority over legislative interpretation. With one chamber dedicated to federalism concerns and a second to other constitutional matters, Laskin's fifth model is based on the French Court of Cassation.

In order to categorize courts, Laskin emphasizes differences between unitary and federal systems, underscoring the fact that courts were often established and maintained to serve goals other than the ideal of impartial conflict resolution. For instance, in order to choose a final arbiter in American federal-state relations, the delegates to the Philadelphia Convention in 1787 had to reach a number of compromises. As a result, the Supreme Court was established as the final arbiter after anti-Federalist delegates rejected executive and legislative supremacy. A lasting compromise between the states' rights-oriented anti-Federalists and the nationalist-leaning Federalists was achieved by defining "judicial power" in this way. Many of the former favored the idea of the Supreme Court serving as the last arbitrator but were concerned that it would be unable to curb the dominance of states' rights. In spite of their reservations about whether a nationalistic Supreme Court would eventually weaken the sovereignty of the states, many of the latter group nevertheless backed the Supreme Court. The classic debate over the American Supreme Court's role in federal-state relations and governmental affairs in general was sparked by Alexander Hamilton's Federalist No. 80 and Robert Yates' "Letters of Brutus," particularly numbers 11, 12, and 15.

Bora Laskin highlighted federalism as a crucial organizational concept for several higher appellate courts, and he did so very effectively. This viewpoint suggests that many of the

qualities of the courts selected for the difficult task of upholding a constitutional or statutory federal division of powers and responsibilities include jurisdictional power sufficient to uphold a constitutionally ordained delineation of the superior role of a national government in particular subject matter areas, such as the clause of the Supremacy Clause of the Constitution of the United States that states: "This Constitutio Or, on the other hand, the jurisdiction of an appellate court may reflect a broad empire-unifying role, similar to what the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council of Great Britain has performed for centuries. Similar to this, courts associated with federalism occasionally include fundamental accommodations meant to protect or reassure ethnic, linguistic populations, such as the requirement that three of Canada's nine Supreme Court members be members of the French-speaking minority, or Switzerland's informal but widely acknowledged policy of including members of each of the nation's three major linguistic groups German, French, and Italia.

Federalism is not a crucial organizational concept for many countries. Instead, courts are set up and run in accordance with the social, economic, and political power that is currently in place. This is best shown by the long-standing legal and cultural ties between colonial countries and their former colonies. The structure of courts, on the other hand, is mostly influenced by internal, domestic experiences, sometimes with a lengthy historical background, in countries that avoided foreign dominance. Sweden serves as a nice illustration. Nils Stjernquist, professor emeritus of political science and former rector magnus of the University of Lund, discussed the historical and modern justifications for the sparse use of judicial review and its limitations in Sweden during a lecture at the University of Lund. First off, Sweden's political growth has nothing to do with federalism. Sweden has a unified system and always has. The monarch was supreme in two major categories of law as monarch in council, which gave rise to modern Swedish administrative law, and as monarch in court, which gave rise to the modern Swedish judicial system during centuries of earlier Swedish monarchical absolutism.

The Swedish monarch no longer had a substantial role in either category of law after the fundamental constitutional reforms of the eighteenth century, but the essential separation between administrative and judicial decision-making has been preserved in the contemporary Swedish legal system. Administrative and judicial decision-makers in Sweden still see themselves, at least in part, as the enforcing agents of governmental administrative, statutory, and constitutional power. Individual rights have been gradually and more emphasized. However, historically, the scales have tipped in favor of governmental authority. It should come as no surprise that the majority of Swedish judges and administrative decision-makers have a strong propensity for moderation given such a long-standing practice. The majority of the time, this restriction takes the shape of respect to the Riksdagen, the Swedish Parliament, which is the final source of legal power after the absolute monarchy of prior ages. The idea of impartiality is important to the ideal vision of a court or judicial system, however in many courts and legal disputes, power often takes precedence over legal objectivity. The most egregious instances of prejudice and partiality in the legal and judicial systems have historically been related to military conquest and its immediate and long-term effects. modern court analysts like Alan Christelow and Hans

S. Pawlisch examined and critiqued instances in which the legal system and courts were used as tools of cultural imperialism. In the fifteenth, sixteenth, seventeenth, eighteenth, and nineteenth centuries, when non-Western legal cultures were conquered and severely limited or destroyed, Spain, Portugal, France, the Netherlands, and Great Britain applied canon law doctrines of

warfare and conquest that had been developed in Western Europe in the thirteenth century. Pawlisch carefully examined this relationship. He then looked at how the British specifically used these legal principles when they conquered Ireland during the Tudor and Cromwellian eras. According to Christelow, French legal imperialism in colonial Algeria resulted in the redistribution of property from the native Muslim Arabic population to the nineteenth- and early twentieth-century French Christian settlers. Law was used as an instrument of subjugation, of maintaining civil order, as a subtle form of religious and racial discrimination. Similar accusations have sometimes been leveled against tribunals that have been given international jurisdiction about favoritism to the legal and financial interests of the most powerful countries. In the post-World War II period, jurists from Third World countries have questioned the allegedly Eurocentric, pro-colonial bent of international law in addition to the laws imposed by colonial states like Portugal.

The organization and structure of courts, family of law, method of teaching judges and attorneys and supporting court workers, and extent of judicial authority or jurisdictional features all depend on whether or not a country suffered long-term colonial dominance. There are numerous key factors impacting the development of these judicial characteristics for the very few countries that are generally free of foreign legal imperialism. These are, in particular:

1. Whether the country is set up as a unitary or federal structure, as recommended by Laskin;
2. The internal features of the entire government organization;
3. The nation-specific historical elements;
4. The judiciary's connection to democracy;
5. The link between the judicial branch's authority and either parliamentary supremacy or excessive executive power, such as that exercised by a monarchical or military dictatorship; and
6. The unique function of higher appellate courts in countries where judicial review the authority to judge the legality of legislative or executive branch actions is used.

The fundamental feature of all common law countries, that judges create law rather than applying a legislatively or monarchically established code, has, of course, been significantly transformed in actuality by the emergence of statutory law in these common law nations over the nineteenth and twentieth centuries. The common law is used in some form or another in almost all of the former British colonies, including Australia, Canada, India, Israel, New Zealand, Pakistan, and the United States. Judges and higher appellate justices have used judicial authority to a far larger extent than in the majority of common law nations in some of these countries where written constitutions with provisions deemed superior to ordinary legislative enactments have evolved. The United States is the most significant example, particularly in light of Chief Justice John Marshall's landmark ruling in Marbury v. Madison that defined and supported the theory of judicial review. After adopting its constitutional Charter of Rights and Freedom in 1982, it has been argued that Canada would further up its judicial review efforts.

The ultimate kind of judicial power is judicial review, which gives judges the jurisdiction to declare legislative acts, executive branch decisions, and the conduct of their subordinates and administrators unlawful. Therefore, courts with such authority participate in national governmental affairs much more broadly than courts without such authority. In fact, the American Supreme Court has been regarded as exerting judicial supremacy throughout a number

of historical eras when there has been significant judicial activism in the United States, such as the early New Deal period of the 1930s. The supremacy of Parliament is deferred to the British courts, even those at the top of the judicial hierarchy. Judicial review is often present in countries that have a federal system of government rather than a unitary one, such Australia, Burma, Canada, India, and Pakistan. Historically, judicial review has been a relatively infrequent component of the judiciary's authority in countries with courts set up in line with the civil law family of law. Switzerland, a civil law country, may have been the biggest pre-1940 exception since it used judicial review in its Federal Court to evaluate cantonal laws.

Many civil law countries, whether they were set up as federal or unitary systems, adopted judicial review after the Second World War. Under American pressure, the unitary systems of West Germany and Japan underwent the transformation during the post-war military occupation. In the years after the war, Austria and Italy likewise reacted with restricted types of judicial review. After the war, France too adopted a restricted review policy. The latter three systems are all unitary systems. The fifteen-member Supreme Court of Japan includes a Chief Justice. The court convenes in three panels of five judges each on a regular basis, with the exception of a few en blanc sessions. Japanese judges and justices are educated independently from lawyers as professional judges, following centuries of history and practice in continental European civil law systems, from which Japan's system was developed in the Mejii period. The power of Japanese Chief Justices has unintentionally been constrained as a consequence of the mandatory retirement age of seventy for members of the Japanese Supreme Court. Japanese judges often hold the position of Chief Justice late in their careers, frequently close to the age of mandatory retirement, since promotion to that position is based on length of service on the Court. As a result, Japanese justices are typically unable to hold that position for an extended period of time, comparable to the more than three decades enjoyed by American Chief Justices John Marshall and Roger B. Taney. Indeed, they served for an average of about four years between 1947 and 1980.

The only country in this group that adopted limited judicial review and was not placed under Allied military administration after the Second World War is France. It was extremely cautious in its voluntary acceptance of judicial review, and it did not apply to courts in the country's normal administrative and judicial court systems. The National Assembly and Council Presidents, together with seven additional members selected by the Assembly and thereby the Council, served on the Constitutional Committee, which was established by the authors of the Fourth Republic's constitution. The committee was presided over by the President of the Republic. Its responsibility was to prevent proposed laws of iffy legality from becoming law without a constitutional change. The President of the Council of the Republic and an absolute majority of the Council must request the committee to take action before it may. A Constitutional Council was established with the de Gaulle Constitution of 1958, and it is made up of all former French presidents as well as nine other people, three of whom are selected by the presidents of the Republic, Senate, and National Assembly. Ordinary and organic laws, treaties, and protocols may be declared unconstitutional by this council, each of whose members is typically a lawyer. Despite the extent of the powers, neither individuals nor the majority of groups have the right to challenge. It is hard to get to and has restricted access.

In 1951, West Germany established the Federal Constitutional Court. Its sixteen members are selected by the two chambers of the legislature. It convenes in two chambers and has shown to be far more muscular than its creators had expected in key judgments like its 1975 abortion

decision and its 1966 ruling on political party finance. In 1945, the Austrian Constitutional Court was restored. Its fourteen members were chosen by the Republic's president on the basis of proposals made by the legislature. Austria's Constitutional Court has evolved similarly to that of West Germany during the 1970s, becoming increasingly aggressive. The Corte Constituzionale in Italy was established in 1948 but didn't start hearing cases until 1956. The Italian Constitution of 1948 is ultimately interpreted by this Constitutional Court, which has fifteen members. The Court of Cassation, the Council of State, and the Court of Accounts are Italy's regular higher administrative and judicial courts, making it theoretically superior to them. The Constitutional Court has actually been referred to be a fairly restrained court, despite being made up mostly of older people with long careers as judges, lawyers, or law professors.Even though courts that engage in judicial review frequently receive a lot of attention, the common law, civil law, religious, and socialist families of law's prototypes are actually the seemingly more banal regular judicial and administrative courts found in these countries. Furthermore, courts imposed on regions or subject countries frequently followed the models of the regular court systems of major colonial powers. These systems were characterized by a few key characteristics. One of the most powerful civil law countries, France imposed its legal system on the world, first through Napoleon Bonaparte's codification of French civil law, then through its dissemination in the wake of his continental military victories and, finally, through the widespread acceptance of versions of his code in many parts of Western Europe that had rejected his military regime. This happened particularly during the nineteenth and early twentieth centuries. Following Napoleon Bonaparte, France, a significant colonial power, disseminated its legal system, including the majority of its court system, mode of legal education, and system for organizing legal professionals, throughout the world.

At the height of its colonial influence, France generally incorporated its colonies as parts of metropolitan France, so this had a significant and long-lasting impact on colonial law. The division between ordinary judiciaries and administrative tribunals, which is often absent in the legal systems of England and America, is one of the key aspects of French court structure. The Court of Cassation is the highest court of appeal in the ordinary French legal system. Neither does this court have initial jurisdiction over matters that are appealed to it. However, it assesses whether decisions made by a lower court were accurate and, if so, remands the case for a new trial to a court with similar jurisdiction and rank. If error is discovered again on a second appeal, the Court of Cassation will issue a conclusive final ruling. The Courts of Appeal, which are below the Court of Cassation, have civil and criminal jurisdiction as well as authority to hear appeals from several special courts, such as juvenile and rent tribunals. Courts of Instance to Courts of Major Instance hear civil appeals. On the criminal side, small offenses are handled by Police Courts, lesser offenses are handled by correctional tribunals, and serious offenses are handled by Courts of Assize.

The Regional Councils of Administrative Tribunals make up the first level of France's administrative courts, with the Council of State—originally founded by Napoleon Bonaparte in 1797—at its core. There are seven departments within this Council, although only the Litigation Section is focused on administrative law. The others deal with a variety of drafts for the executive and legislative branches as well as advisory views on those subjects. No organization in the United States or Great Britain plays the same function as the Council, which is made up of career civil employees, many of whom are graduates of the elite National School of Administration. Furthermore, regular French judges who are educated as civil servants and

career jurists in a manner distinct from the regular education of lawyers are also the products of a particularly excellent and intensive specialized education system, just like French administrative judges. In the modern era of the 20th century, it was widely believed that the major common law and civil law legal systems' courts and judges had attained a high level of independence from political control as well as a comparable high level of professional competence and ethical integrity. However, more often than not, the specific political circumstances within each country governed, not the historical customs of each family of law. As a result, countries with civil law, such as Germany in the 1930s or a number of Latin American countries, lost their judicial independence and professionalism to military juntas or dictators like Adolf Hitler. Similar to this, during the fascist era of Benito Mussolini, Italy lost both its judicial independence and a significant portion of its judicial integrity as judges were frequently subject to state political control and were corrupted by private financial inducements. Soviet Russia is the country most often used as an example of how judicial independence was lost in the 20th century. The Tsarist absolute monarchy's civil law system was hardly a model of judicial independence, and by the early 1920s, the Procurator General, a key aspect of Tsarist absolutism and judicial control, had been modified to suit Soviet requirements. In conclusion, the socioeconomic and political realities of their countries are often reflected in contemporary courts. Though judicial objectivity and independence are closer to being achieved than in previous eras in many jurisdictions around the world [10]–[12].

CONCLUSION

Politics is the continual debate about what and how we should do as a country. Legislative elections are important because they direct lawmakers' attention to their constituents and the arguments that sway those constituencies. The dispute is continued at a different degree of specificity by legislatures. The debates over elections and the debates over legislatures are not pointless discussions. They are arguments that have significant ramifications for both the people and organizations that make up nations. An argument loss might be quite expensive. Because of this, American automakers are willing to spend as much as the law permits to support a member of Congress running for reelection who takes their concerns seriously. Guns are employed in other locations to secure victory in disputes. At least in the near term, bullets consistently outperform votes. Throughout human history, people have utilized weapons to win disputes. The prevalence of using votes instead of bullets to choose the winners and losers of the debate is remarkable for this half-century.

REFERENCES:

[1] J. L. Pomeranz and M. Pertschuk, “Key Drivers of State Preemption of Food, Nutrition, and Agriculture Policy: A Thematic Content Analysis of Public Testimony,” *Am. J. Heal. Promot.*, 2019, doi: 10.1177/0890117118823163.

[2] E. L. Rubin, “Statutory design as policy analysis,” *Harvard J. Legis.*, 2018, doi: 10.2139/ssrn.2947258.

[3] R. DWORKIN, “The Forum of Principle,” in *A Matter of Principle*, 2021. doi: 10.2307/j.ctv1pncpxk.5.

[4] J. M. Smits, “Contract Law: A Comparative Introduction, Chapter 1,” *SSRN Electron. J.*, 2015, doi: 10.2139/ssrn.2669692.

[5] A. L. Brophy and E. L. Troutman, "The Eugenics Movement in North Carolina," *SSRN Electron. J.*, 2015, doi: 10.2139/ssrn.2650083.

[6] H. B. Farber, "Do You Swear to Tell the Truth, the Whole Truth, and Nothing but the Truth against Your Child?," *SSRN Electron. J.*, 2011, doi: 10.2139/ssrn.1410738.

[7] P. C. Ordeshook, "Individual preference and social choice," in *Game Theory and Political Theory*, 2010. doi: 10.1017/cbo9780511666742.003.

[8] P. L. Lindseth, "Agents Without Principals?: Delegation in an Age of Diffuse and Fragmented Governance," *SSRN Electron. J.*, 2005, doi: 10.2139/ssrn.605282.

[9] L. R. Pruitt and M. R. Vanegas, "Urbanormativity, Spatial Privilege, and Judicial Blind Spots in Abortion Law," *Representations*, 2014.

[10] P. Mcguinn, "Ringing the Bell for K-12 Teacher Tenure Reform," *Cent. Am. Prog.*, 2010.

[11] J. M. Bessette, "Deliberation: Political Aspects," in *International Encyclopedia of the Social & Behavioral Sciences*, 2001. doi: 10.1016/b0-08-043076-7/01130-x.

[12] J. Hoppit, *Parliaments, nations and identities in Britain and Ireland, 1660-1850*. 2013. doi: 10.1093/ehr/cej024.

CHAPTER 23

A BRIEF DISCUSSION ON INVESTIGATIVE THE BUREAUCRACIES

Dr. Vinoth. S, Professor, Department of Finance,
CMS Business School, JAIN (Deemed to-be University), Bangalore, India,
Email Id- dr.vinoth@cms.ac.in

ABSTRACT:

Bureaucracies are formal organizations that are typically characterized by a hierarchical structure, a division of labor, and a set of standard procedures and rules. Bureaucracies are found in many different settings, including government agencies, corporations, and non-profit organizations. In government, bureaucracies play a critical role in implementing policies and delivering services to citizens. Bureaucrats are responsible for carrying out the day-to-day functions of government, from processing applications and enforcing regulations, to managing budgets and providing assistance to citizens in need.

KEYWORDS:

Administration, Authority, Bureaucrats, Civil Servants, Decision-Making, Hierarchy.

INTRODUCTION

Large-scale organizations known as bureaucracies are prevalent in both the public and corporate sectors of modern society. Although the term "bureaucracy" was only recently created, it actually has much older Latin and Greek roots. According to Fritz Morstein Marx, the term's first half may be linked to the Latin word burrus, which means a black and somber color. In Old French, a word similar to bure was used to describe a specific kind of textile covering for people, particularly those used by governmental authorities. The term "bureau" was first used to refer to the covered area, subsequently to the next room or office. Eventually, the Greek suffix for kind of rule was added to bureau, creating the term bureaucratie. Vincent de Gournay, a French minister of trade in the eighteenth century, is credited with coining this phrase to describe governance as control by officialdom. Soon after, it emerged in many other languages under the name Bürokratie in German [1], [2].

Meanings

This history explains the derogatory meaning often and widely used to the term "bureaucracy" when it is used to indicate dissatisfaction of the deeds of public servants or opposition to the steps necessary in big organizations that are seen to be burdensome and ineffective. But in the social sciences, the term "bureaucracy" also has a less pejorative and more neutral meaning that refers to organizational arrangements of a particular kind that are typical of modern societies. In this sense, bureaucratic organizations are those that exhibit characteristics outlined in the works of German social scientist Max Weber and his successors. Hierarchy, specialization, professional competence, separating the office and the incumbent, full-time occupational commitment, fixed

monetary salaries, and written regulations specifying internal relationships and procedures to be followed in bureaucratic operations are characteristics of Weber's 'ideal-type' bureaucracies.

It is inevitable that the terms "bureaucracy" and "bureaucracies" have ambiguous meanings. Here, the emphasis is on identifying characteristics that set bureaucratic organizations apart from other forms of organizations, without having any effect on the results of the organizations themselves. This is the Weberian interpretation of the phrase, as opposed to Harold Laski who used it to refer to a form of governance where officials' control over it puts regular individuals' freedoms in danger. Even Weber, who stressed the advantages of bureaucracies over other organizational kinds, voiced worry about the 'overtowering' power positions of fully established bureaucracies late in his career. Henry Jacoby has more recently argued that bureaucracies are essential but hazardous, with a high risk of usurping political authority. According to his perspective, the creation and subsequent reliance on the forerunners of contemporary bureaucracies by ancient civilizations was an essential step in the protracted process of centralization and power accumulation that began long ago. The ensuing contradiction for our period is that bureaucracy is risky and possibly usurpative while yet being essential and inevitable. Modern cultures expect, rely on, and despise the bureaucratic machinery at the same time. This attitude is essentially gloomy about prospects for the future.

The propensity of Merton and others to stress as typical bureaucratic behavior features that are "dysfunctional," "pathological," or "self-defeating," likely to thwart the achievement of organizational objectives, is another example of this negative perspective. As behaviors typifying the "trained incapacity" of bureaucrats, red tape, buck passing, rigidity and inflexibility, over-secretiveness, excessive impersonality, unwillingness to delegate, and reluctance to exercise discretion are all identified. Undoubtedly, this type of behavior is common in bureaucracies, but so are a variety of other behaviors that have a more favorable impact on achieving organizational goals. Some scholars of bureaucracies, Friedrich being one prominent example, place emphasis on qualities like objectivity, accuracy, consistency, and discretion, referring to them as "desirable habit or behavior patterns" that are typically adopted by those who work in bureaucratic organizations [3]–[5].

DISCUSSION

Despite these discrepancies in describing the predominant bureaucratic behavioral traits, there is broad consensus regarding the fundamental structural traits of bureaucratic organizations. Victor Thompson's succinct description of such an organization as being made up of a highly intricate hierarchy of power placed above a very elaborate division of work is a good example. According to Friedrich, the three essential structural traits are as follows:

1. Hierarchy;
2. Specialization or differentiation; and
3. Certification or skill.

Such structural qualities of bureaucracies are common in today's "organizational society," as Robert Presthus puts it. For instance, a public bureaucracy is a necessary component of every modern nation-state and serves as one of its primary political institutions. Therefore, both the analysis of specific polities and the comparison of them require an understanding of the distinctive internal characteristics of various nation-state public bureaucracies and of the relationships between these bureaucracies and other institutions in the political system. The

previously mentioned negative potentialities in bureaucratic operations, such as the self-defeating tendencies of bureaucratic behavior patterns that undermine the achievement of policy goals, and the risks of public bureaucracies encroaching on the proper roles of other political institutions, must be taken into account as part of this study.

Structural Changes

Much attention has been paid to how national public bureaucracies vary from one another in terms of organizational characteristics, and there is broad agreement on the most suitable classifications. Three such fundamental divisions appear among the more industrialized nations. The democracies on the European continent along an arc from Scandinavia to western and southern Europe make up one group, along with maybe other instances that are geographically dispersed, such Ireland, Israel, and Japan. Great Britain, the United States, and other former British colonies including Canada, Australia, and New Zealand are included in a second category. The Soviet Union and those Eastern European countries that have been a part of the Soviet bloc since the Second World War make up the third category [6]–[8].

The public bureaucracies in each of these groupings have some fundamental commonalities despite major individual variances. The first category, which includes Germany and France as examples, is commonly referred to as the "classic" systems because it most closely resembles Weber's "ideal-type" bureaucracy. The modern public service is often traceable to an older, highly professionalized royal service. Higher ranking bureaucrats are deeply involved in the policy process, are permitted to participate in political activity, frequently have opportunities for second careers in either the public or private sectors, and generally enjoy high prestige in society. Members of the bureaucracy are recruited on a career basis according to educational attainment.

The second group of nations have a "civic culture" characterized by a high level of public involvement in political issues. Civil service reform took place after the middle of the nineteenth century in both Great Britain and the United States, and even later abroad. This indicates that a public service based on selection by competence or merit is relatively new. Although educational background is becoming more significant, there are more ways to enter the bureaucracy and there is more internal mobility. The extent to which higher-level bureaucrats participate in policymaking differs from nation to nation. Politicians and professional bureaucrats often follow different and distinct career paths, and they are frequently subject to strong limitations on their ability to engage in partisan political action. Public sector positions do not enjoy the same level of public respect as in more traditional institutions, particularly in the more egalitarian former British colonies.

The communist bloc nations historically shown the highest levels of bureaucracy in both the apparatus of the ruling party and the government. Due to the wide breadth of party and state activity, the sole option for the majority of people has been a "public" bureaucratic profession of some kind. As factors in bureaucratic selection and promotion, educational and professional qualifications have gradually surpassed loyalty considerations, so that the backgrounds and career paths of higher bureaucrats in these countries now differ from those of their counterparts elsewhere less noticeably than they did in the past. Prediction is risky due to the dramatic and unanticipated changes that are occurring in these systems as the 1990s get underway, but the trend in terms of the societal role of bureaucratic organizations between the communist bloc and other developed countries appears to be toward greater convergence rather than increasing divergence.

The public bureaucracies of Third World developing nations are typically grouped together as a fourth major category, but there are significant differences among them in terms of competence, educational backgrounds, career prospects, participation in public policymaking, and societal power status of bureaucracy members. The impact of inherited colonial public service patterns, the general lack of security in bureaucratic careers, the significance of the public sector in societal decision making generally, and the frequent ascendance of military bureaucrats over both civil bureaucrats and politicians are just a few generalizations that can be made.

Changes in Behavior

The identification and categorization of different national patterns of bureaucratic behavior are still in their early stages of complexity, in contrast to organizational or structural differences. Clearly, the success of such attempts depends on cultural variables. Knowledgeable researchers who are themselves products of the culture described have provided some insightful studies of certain examples. A good illustration is Crozier's study of bureaucratic behavior in France. He links these features to more broader French cultural attributes, highlighting the virtues of reason, impersonality, and absoluteness. According to him, France is really a "stalemate society," with the bureaucratic structure serving as a bridge between two deeply ingrained but incompatible mindsets. One is a tendency to steer clear of direct, face-to-face authority connections as much as possible, while the other is a prevalent absolutist and universalism-based understanding of authority. The bureaucratic system resolves the fundamental French conundrum regarding authority as necessary but difficult to tolerate by combining an absolutist idea of power with the removal of the majority of direct dependency connections. At the same time, the system struggles with coordination, decentralization of decision-making, and change adaptation. The development of more thorough comparative research is reliant on social, political, administrative, and organizational examination at a range of pertinent levels. At each of these levels, some advancements have been made. A significant amount of the cultural variations across cultures may be attributed to four value dimensions, according to Hofstede. Which are:

1. Individualism-collectivism;
2. The avoidance of uncertainty in risk-taking and ambiguity-related attitudes;
3. Power distance, which focuses on perceptions of power distribution patterns; and
4. Masculinity-femininity, which has to do with how'masculine' the prevailing values are in terms of assertiveness, progress, and acquisition of material items.

Hofstede identified eight country clusters with specific patterns in their value systems that differently impact behavior in these social groups after analyzing data from forty countries that showed diverse combinations of these value dimensions. Almond and Verba conducted groundbreaking research on the idea of political culture as a means of discriminating across various national polities. To investigate attitudes toward the public bureaucracy as a component of political systems, Nachmias and Rosenbloom have suggested a model for the more constrained idea of bureaucratic culture. This model builds on their earlier work. They focused on two dimensions: orientations of citizens or the general public toward the public bureaucracy and orientations of the bureaucrats themselves toward the bureaucracy, while maintaining the cognitive, emotional, and evaluative cultural orientation sub-types proposed by Almond and Verba.

They also wanted to evaluate how these two sets of dimensions were congruent. The idea of organizational culture has lately been employed by Schein and others to concentrate on particular

companies, particularly in the privately owned. Schein defines organizational culture as: a pattern of fundamental assumptions invented, discovered, or developed by a given group as it learns to deal with its problems of external adaptation and internal integration that have worked well enough to be accepted as true and, consequently, to be taught to new members as the proper perspective, thought process, and emotional response to those problems. This concept unmistakably acknowledges that cultural traits at higher levels of inclusion in society have a considerable impact on corporate culture. The bureaucratic culture model seems to have the greatest potential among these studies for thoroughly profiling the features of various national bureaucratic systems. It has only been used in Israel, and any application on a global scale would need an enormous amount of data collection and processing.

More progress has been made in the comparison of the interactions between public bureaucracies and other political institutions in a range of contexts. One common presumption is that political modernization or development necessitates a balance between the public bureaucracy and institutions in the 'constitutive' system, so that the public bureaucracy is subject to efficient external controls from these other political institutions and thus plays an instrumental role in the operation of the political system rather than usurping political power and taking over as the dominant political elite group. In the study of varied patterns of interactions between public bureaucracies and the 'constitutive' political institutions, two elements have drawn the greatest attention. The first is the function of the "state" or the level of "stateness" inside the polity, and the second is the make-up of the current political system.

An increase in interest in political institutions and a decline in interest in political functions have been contemporary trends in comparative political studies. This "neo- institutionalism" has expanded the idea of degree of "stateness" as a tool for comparing different societies and has highlighted the significance of the "state" as separate from both "society" and "government." Based on the level of "stateness," Metin Heper and a group of collaborators have set out to define six categories of bureaucracy that correspond to the four ideal polity types. The'stateness' of 'personalist' and 'ideological' polities is high; the 'liberal' and 'praetorian' polities are low. Three examples imply a one-to-one correspondence between polity type and bureaucracy type: 'personalist' with a 'personal servant' bureaucracy, 'liberal' with a Weberian 'legal-rational' bureaucracy, and 'praetorian' with a'spoils system' bureaucracy. Depending on whether the high level of'stateness' is connected with a ruler, the bureaucracy itself, or a dominating party, the 'ideological' polity may create any one of three forms of bureaucracy.

Heper and his colleagues use case studies from both the past and the present when using this framework for study. The implication is that the 'Bonapartist' or 'Rechtsstaat' bureaucracy in the 'ideological' polity would present the most unbalanced situation in favor of the bureaucracy, followed by the'spoils system' bureaucracy in a 'praetorian' polity. However, the authors do not directly address the issue of balance between the bureaucracy and other institutions. The additional connections between politics and bureaucracy suggest that a ruler, a political party, or some other source or combination of sources is able to exert adequate external influence over the bureaucracy. The modern case studies seem to support this conclusion. In any case, there is likely some'stateness' present in every polity, which has implications for the bureaucracy's behavior and its function in the political system.

The sort of political regime that exists in the polity is another constant factor that is likely to be very important for describing and contrasting public agencies. In spite of taking part in important

policy choices, public bureaucracies in Western democracies are ultimately accountable to and under the authority of a variety of extra-bureaucratic political entities. There are distinctive national factors that influence bureaucratic behavior enough to warrant description and study on an individual basis, but in terms of their core traits, they are essentially comparable political regimes. European one-party communist bloc political regimes, exemplified in the past by the Soviet Union, are also balanced in this sense, but the source of control over the official state bureaucracy has been concentrated in the dominant party, and this is likely to continue despite perestroika reforms opening up the political arena to other parties or political groupings, leading to additional channels for maintaining bureaucratic accountability. Because of their sheer number and diversity, emerging nations in the Third World must be categorized into broad political regime groups in order to be compared. There have been many different categorization methods put out, with differences mostly in language as opposed to fundamentals.

Some Third World democratic regimes with competitive party systems closely resemble Western democracies, but they are frequently overthrown and their legitimacy and stability are more in doubt. Evidence suggests that nations that have chosen for the presidential form of democracy as opposed to the parliamentary one may be more vulnerable. Only a small number of these nations have a long history of free elections, open competition between two or more parties, and peaceful political transition. Costa Rica is a prime example. Many Third World nations now have single-party systems, with restrictions on or outright bans on political competition from outside the party. In other situations, party rivalry is permitted, but one dominating party has dominated politics for the majority of the period, sometimes even since the country's independence. In these regimes, it is assumed that the ruling party can be peacefully replaced following an electoral defeat. This idea has already been proven twice in India, and in the next years, it may also be tried in Mexico. These Third World countries all feature political systems that may be characterized as being "party-prominent," with the public bureaucracy having secondary political functions.

'Bureaucratic-prominent' regimes, whereby military and/or civil officials exercise political authority either directly or covertly, are far more prevalent in the Third World. A devoted and minimally competent bureaucracy is essential for the survival of traditional regimes with monarchical or religious leaders, who are a dwindling category. A personalist or collegial bureaucratic elite with one or more obviously dominant professional bureaucrats is the most common kind of government in the Third World. There are several examples in underdeveloped countries around the globe. In countries with a political history of swings between bureaucratic elite and competitive civilian regimes, high-ranking military bureaucrats are frequently crucially influential behind the scenes or are in a position to intervene and replace a civilian government. Overall, the relationship between public bureaucracies and other political institutions, which are often seen to have a more genuine claim to the exercise of ultimate political power, is therefore one of imbalance rather than balance.

Powers in Public Bureaucracies

Various initiatives to reduce bureaucracies' excesses or even replace them with alternative organizational structures have been launched as a result of the acknowledged tendency in most countries for the public bureaucracy to assume an increasing importance in the formulation and implementation of public policy at the expense of executive officials and legislators.

Chief executives have attempted to reform administrative agencies by establishing or strengthening managerial units with personnel and budgetary controls, increasing the number of political appointees in the agency's upper leadership levels, and taking a more active role in the hiring of senior career bureaucrats. In an effort to match the expertise of bureaucratic professionals in a variety of program areas, legislatures and legislative committees have frequently greatly increased their staff capabilities. They have also tried to improve their capacity to investigate administrative actions and implement corrective measures. Many nations have started 'equal opportunity' or 'affirmative action' programs to increase the representation of underrepresented groups in the public sector, like women and racial and ethnic minorities. Greater access to public documents and proceedings has been made possible by "sunshine" laws. Courts in the US and other nations have seen a sharp increase in administrative law matters and have started to step in more regularly to reverse or amend administrative judgments. The Scandinavian system of ombudsman has been extensively copied overseas to safeguard the public from administrative abuses or deficiencies as a corrective tool for people. This is a selection of the policies intended to improve public bureaucracies' control without materially altering their nature or their function in contemporary society. Evaluations of the outcomes are conflicting. R.E.Wraith noted that the typical attitude is one of ongoing worry and that:

Public administration has grown significantly in response to the growing influence of government and governmental entities on daily life. Because of its prevalence and size, public administration appears to "feed on itself" and has the potential to outgrow political control. Nevertheless, Donald C. Rowat recently came to the conclusion that these reform initiatives are likely to have the following overall effects: "the influence of senior officials will more nearly represent the interests of society," "the bureaucracy will be supervised and controlled more closely," and "bureaucratic influence will be reduced by 'increasing the political input into policy-making."

Options to Bureaucratic Systems

Some bureaucracy opponents suggest going even farther, either by limiting the scope of bureaucracies' operations or by replacing them with other organizational structures. Ramos and other proponents of "social systems delimitation" and a "new science of organizations" acknowledge that bureaucracies with their hierarchical and coercive characteristics are still necessary for managing activities that are centered on the market, but they also call for the recognition and encouragement of other institutional arrangements in which members of the organization are peers or are subject to minimal formal controls. They argue that these non-bureaucratic organizational forms are more applicable to real-world situations. Thus, the operation of bureaucracies would be authorized but constrained in comparison to the present.

Advocates of alternative and ostensibly more suitable organizational models want to replace modern bureaucracy with a more radical reorientation. In contrast to Weber's earlier claim that bureaucracies were most effective at addressing societal needs when a society recognized the legitimacy of a "legal-rational" pattern of authority, the argument is that societal needs today call for a predominately post-bureaucratic type of organization, though its specific characteristics are still unknown. Bureaucracies are expected to continue to be the most common kind of organization for the foreseeable future, notwithstanding the likelihood and presumably desirableness of organizational change and its timing and structure. As a result, efforts must

continue to be directed at maximizing the benefits and reducing the drawbacks of bureaucracies as they function in modern society.

Relationships between governments: unitary systems

The term "intergovernmental relations" was first advocated by Anderson, who described it as "an important body of activities or interactions occurring between governmental units of all types and levels within...the federal system." Wright has expanded on this basic concept by identifying five specific traits. First, IGR acknowledges the diversity of connections among all tiers of government. Second, it highlights interactions between people, particularly between public officials. Third, these connections are ongoing, regular, and unofficial. Fourth, IGR maintains that all public officials, whether they are politicians or administrators, have a crucial role in society. Finally, it highlights the political dimension of interactions and places a strong emphasis on substantive policies, particularly those involving money, such as who raises how much money and how it is spent to achieve which goals.

The term IGR draws attention to the many, behavioral, ongoing, and dynamic interactions that take place between different governmental leaders. It may be likened to a new, distinct, and visually appealing filter or idea that could be applied to the political scene of the United States. Talking about central-local interactions is likely more prevalent when discussing unitary states. The 'visual filter' of IGR is consequently much more innovative when it is used with unitary systems [9]–[11].

CONCLUSION

One of bureaucracies' key benefits is that they provide a methodical, standardized approach to handling challenging jobs. Bureaucracies may aid in ensuring that activities are accomplished successfully and efficiently by splitting work into distinct roles and responsibilities and by creating explicit rules and processes for carrying out those duties. But bureaucracies can also be criticized for operating slowly, ineffectively, and insensitively to the needs of the public. The rigidity of bureaucratic rules and processes, according to some critics, may stifle creativity and innovation. Others may contend that bureaucracies are vulnerable to corruption and other unethical practices. Despite these difficulties, many bureaucracy supporters contend that bureaucracies are necessary for modern societies to function. Bureaucracies may contribute to the welfare of persons and the general stability of society by offering a systematic and standardized method to handling complicated activities and by ensuring that policies and services are provided fairly and effectively.

REFERENCES:

[1] A. Rubtsov, ‘From unrest to demonstrations: The policy of the russian authorities regarding mass political actions of the radical youth of the 1870s’, *Antropol. Forum*, 2020, doi: 10.31250/1815-8870-2020-16-44-114-138.

[2] R. MacGregor Pelikanova, E. D. Cvik, and R. K. MacGregor, ‘Addressing the COVID-19 challenges by SMEs in the hotel industry – a Czech sustainability message for emerging economies’, *J. Entrep. Emerg. Econ.*, 2021, doi: 10.1108/JEEE-07-2020-0245.

[3] Z. Yuezhi, ‘Watchdogs on Party Leashes? Contexts and implications of investigative journalism in post-Deng China’, *Journal. Stud.*, 2000, doi: 10.1080/146167000441312.

[4] M. DeSisto, J. Cavanagh, and T. Bartram, 'Bushfire investigations in Australia: A case for building collective leadership practices for crises events', *Leadersh. Organ. Dev. J.*, 2020, doi: 10.1108/LODJ-07-2018-0270.

[5] T. Felle, 'Digital watchdogs? Data reporting and the news media's traditional "fourth estate" function', *Journalism*, 2016, doi: 10.1177/1464884915593246.

[6] A. Bonica, J. Chen, and T. Johnson, 'Senate gate-keeping, presidential staffing of "inferior offices," and the ideological composition of appointments to the public bureaucracy', *Quart. J. Polit. Sci.*, 2015, doi: 10.1561/100.00012085.

[7] K. Flynn, 'Covert disclosures: Unauthorized leaking, public officials and the public sphere', *Journal. Stud.*, 2006, doi: 10.1080/14616700500533577.

[8] D. Calderón Sánchez and I. D. Mora Vargas, 'El rol de los ángeles azules en la implementacion. Una mirada desde el proyecto de habitabilidad de calle en Bogotá', *Rev. Cimexus*, 2021, doi: 10.33110/cimexus160204.

[9] D. Cecchin *et al.*, 'Welfare in pig housing - Brazilian and Portuguese legislation', *J. Anim. Behav. Biometeorol.*, 2018, doi: 10.31893/2318-1265jabb.v6n3p77-83.

[10] E. Garrido, G. S. Pimenta, O. M. Moura, and M. F. R. Fusari, 'Collaborative research as an approach to foster teacher development, teachers' production of knowledge and changes in school practices', *Educ. Action Res.*, 1999, doi: 10.1080/09650799900200097.

[11] M. DeSisto, J. Cavanagh, and T. Bartram, 'Bushfire investigations in Australia', *Leadersh. Organ. Dev. J.*, 2019, doi: 10.1108/lodj-07-2018-0270.

CHAPTER 24

INTERGOVERNMENTAL RELATIONS: UNITARY SYSTEMS FORM OF DECENTRALIZATION

Dr. M. Govindaraj, Associate Professor,
Department of Marketing, CMS Business School, JAIN Deemed to-be University, Bangalore, India,
Email Id- dr.govindarajm@cms.ac.in

ABSTRACT:

Intergovernmental relations refer to the interactions and relationships between different levels of government within a political system, such as between national, state, and local governments. These relationships can take many different forms, including cooperative efforts, conflict, negotiation, and collaboration. One of the key challenges of intergovernmental relations is balancing the interests and responsibilities of different levels of government. In many cases, different levels of government may have different priorities or policy objectives, and may struggle to work together effectively. For example, national governments may seek to promote a unified national agenda, while local governments may prioritize more localized concerns.

KEYWORDS:

Authority, Centralization, Decentralization, Federalism, Intergovernmental.

INTRODUCTION

IGR nomenclature tries to depict the profusion without creating confusion, yet it is both abundant and perplexing. One of the most charged political concepts is decentralization, which may nearly match the passions that democracy and equality can arouse. Decentralization is not just "good," but centralization is unquestionably "bad." In such normative disagreements, picking a side is not required. Decentralization may be characterized and categorized in its many ways. Such a detached approach necessitates some degree of verbal dexterity [1]–[3].

Decentralization is the process of distributing authority to lower levels of a geographical hierarchy, whether that hierarchy consists of state governments or corporate headquarters. Or, to put it more succinctly, it alludes to the actual power structure. According to this definition, the phrase includes multiple decentralization or decentralization across levels of government as well as within each form of government, as well as political and bureaucratic decentralization, federal and unitary states. The goal of 1 is not to categorize the many kinds of decentralized systems that exist worldwide. Its more modest goal is to outline the several forms decentralization might take.

Deconcentration refers to "the redistribution of administrative responsibilities within the central government." It is also known as "field administration." Prefectoral and functional systems may be broadly distinguished from one another. In the integrated prefectoral system, the local governments and other field officers of the center are both under the supervision of a prefect a representative of the center located in the regions. They represent "the authority of all ministries

as well as the government generally and the main channel of communication between technical field officials and the capital," according to their higher officers in the field. French departmental prefects and Indian collectors/district commissioners are two well-known examples. The prefect is not superior to, and does not coordinate, other field officers in the unintegrated prefectoral system; rather, the prefect is only one of several avenues of contact with the center. Additionally, they are not the heads of local governments; rather, they only serve as their supervisors. The district officer in Nigeria and the Italian prefect are two examples of an unintegrated structure. Field officers are members of several functional hierarchies within the functional system. Each of the several policy areas has its own administration. There isn't a general coordinator for the area. Coordination takes place in the center. The United Kingdom is a prime example of this network of diverse functional areas. The act of "delegating decision-making and management authority for specific functions to organizations that are not directly under the control of central government ministries" is referred to as delegation.

These organizations go by a variety of names, including quangos, non-departmental public entities, and parastatal organizations. Public businesses and regional development organizations are among them. Transferring duties to nonprofit organizations or the commercial sector is not covered by this category. Common terms for these transfers include privatization and debureaucratization. Because the relevant agencies are no longer a part of the government's territorial hierarchy, privatization is not a form of delegation. The implications of privatization will be discussed below and may have a significant impact on that hierarchy.

Devolution is the exercise of political power by lay institutions, mainly those that are elected, in regions that are determined by local features. The conclusion is that "local units are autonomous, independent, and clearly perceived as separate levels of government over which central authorities exercise little to no direct control." British local government is seen to be the first location of devolution. The debate has so far centered on service-defined sectors and the devolution of bureaucratic power. When discussing devolution, the decentralization of political power to local or regional government is brought up. It is impossible to make a clear difference between these two levels of governance since the phrase "regional government" is used to describe the reform of local administration. Since the early 1980s, there have been significant changes in regional government, necessitating the distinction.

Federalism is defined individually in this dictionary; therefore, I won't go into much detail here. With devolution to local governments, federal states are often seen as being more decentralized than unitary ones. Two words of caution are necessary, however. First, the nominal separation of powers found in a federal constitution might be quite different from how federalism is really implemented.

The federal government has a lot of power to sway and regulate the various states. Second, there may be a significant amount of devolution inside a unitary state, as was the situation in Northern Ireland from 1920 and 1973. In other words, it is dangerous to believe that there is a continuum from federalism to reconcentration, as 1 suggests. The issue of whether "there is anything about a federal constitution which is important for the way in which intergovernmental relations are conducted" is far more crucial. The word "IGR" refers to all decentralization in this text. Identification of differences in IGR between federal and unitary systems is considered as an inquiry rather than a question of stipulative definition, and the investigator's theoretical perspective will significantly influence the results [4]–[6].

DISCUSSION

Theoretical Approaches

The study of IGR uses a variety of theoretical frameworks, such as public/development administration, "new right," center-periphery, "radical," and intergovernmental methods. The public/development administration approach places a strong emphasis on governmental institutions, practices, and decision-making processes. It is more concerned with description than theory, with real-world issues than with analysis and justification. The harmful effects of centralization and the promotion of decentralization, particularly local self-government in both developed and developing nations, are its core concerns. The traditional division between the agency and partnership models in the analysis of IGR is a result of the public administration approach. In the agent model, central departments supervise the implementation of national policies by local authorities. In the partnership model, local governments and central agencies are on an equal footing and have a great deal of freedom to create and carry out their own policies. It is said that due to its reliance on federal subsidies and heightened federal regulations, local government has stopped acting as a partner and has started acting as an agent.

The 'new right' strategy combines bureaucratic, political, and economic elements. The economic component emphasizes cuts in government spending as well as the importance of markets and competition in a thriving economy. The relationship between markets and freedom is at the core of the political component. The appeal is for a minimum state, with its duties restricted to the defense of foreign interests and the preservation of private property. The bureaucratic component condemns the over-provided of services by bureaucrats working in their own self-interest and urges for the employment of private sector management techniques to increase efficiency or, in the absence of such, the replacement of private for public provision. This strategy emphasizes the shrinking role of local government, the outsourcing of services to the private sector, and improving service responsiveness and efficiency in the context of decentralization and IGR. Privatization has been the most prominent policy of this strategy in both developed and developing nations.

The interaction between central political institutions and peripheral or territorial political interests and organizations is the focus of the center-periphery relations approach. Hechter, for instance, makes the case that in Britain, an economically developed center colonized i.e. controlled and taken advantage of—less developed regions, including Scotland. This notion has been applied to center-periphery interactions in emerging nations under the garb of the concept of "political penetration." Political penetration, for instance, is described as "an heuristic concept" by Coleman that is concerned with the ways in which "the political-administrative-juridical center of a new state establishes an effective and authoritative central presence throughout its geographical and sectoral peripheries, and acquires a capacity for the extraction and mobilization of resources to implement its policies and pursue its goals. "

The radical approach has neo-Marxist and neo-Weberian variations, but at the very least, this approach rejects explanations couched in terms of the behavior of individual actors, investigates the connection between IGR and social classes, investigates 'crises' to find the social roots of administrative problems, and uses functional explanation. Saunders, for instance, states his "dual-state thesis" as follows: Local government in Britain is primarily structured on the idea of citizen rights and social need and is focused on supplying social consumption via competing modalities of political mediation. On the other hand, social investment and fiscal policies are

typically developed through central and regional levels of government within a relatively exclusive corporate sector of politics built around the idea of private property rights and the requirement to keep the private sector profitable. In a similar vein, Smith has argued that centralization in developing nations is not a result of the center's superior technical and administrative skills, but rather of "the configuration of political forces emerging in a new state as new relations of production develop with the support of state intervention."

The intergovernmental approach is a subset of neo-pluralist theory that aims to explain how interaction and behavior patterns in IGR are evolving. Neo-pluralism examines the effect of expert influence, the logic of technological rationality, the privileged position of a small number of interest groups, and the intricate interdependencies within decentralized governmental institutions while discussing IGR. For a number of sophisticated industrial liberal democracies, these themes have been elaborated. Hanf contends that this means that the issue with these nations is that their governments' power to solve problems has been broken down into a number of sub-systems with constrained responsibilities and capabilities. Governments are simultaneously faced with more and more duties where the issues and potential solutions tend to transcend the lines of distinct authorities and functional authority [7]–[9].

Therefore, coordinating policy actions through networks of different but interdependent organizations is a significant challenge for political systems in any advanced industrial nation. The interconnectedness of governmental organizations, the limitations to rational policy making, the factorization and professionalization of policy systems, the development of policy through network interaction, and the limits to rational policy making are all stated to be recurring elements of sophisticated industrial society. The alleged hallmark of pluralism, unrestricted market rivalry between organizations, has been supplanted by oligopoly.

This concise overview of the many methodologies used to research IGR does not adequately summarize each theory and does not provide a criticism. It does, however, highlight the field's important multi-theoretic aspect. Each theory has a different analysis unit, analysis level, and assessment standard. These ways are considerably more than just angles of view or approaches, as Allison has noted. Each conceptual framework is made up of a collection of presumptions and categories that affect the analyst's ability to ask questions, uncover relevant data, and come up with answers. Allison was analyzing the Cuban missile crisis, but his basic point holds well for the study of IGR as well. Any IGR account "should draw on several or all of the theories relevant to the empirical questions examined, using them as sources of competing hypotheses and interpretations," according to the ideal world. The intergovernmental method is the foundation for the discussion of IGR trends in developed and developing nations that follows.

Developed Nations

According to Page and Goldsmith, three criteria may be used to assess the role of local government in the contemporary state: functions, discretion, and access. As a result, local government systems differ in the scope of services that are assigned to them, their capacity to decide on the kind, degree, and funding of services, and the nature of their interactions with central actors. Page and Goldsmith come to the conclusion that there is a difference between North European and South European states after studying central-local interactions in seven unitary nations. Local authorities have greater responsibilities in North European nations, which include Norway, Denmark, Sweden, and the United Kingdom, and there is a more distinct division of labor between the center and the municipality. In comparison, local governments in

France, Italy, and Spain spend a far lower percentage of overall public spending. Discrimination in the provision of services cannot be made with any certainty. In reality, discretion varies across services rather than between nations. The various control mechanisms vary. Statutory regulation is the favored approach in North European countries, where local government is free to act whatever it pleases within the bounds of the law. The favored approach in South European countries is administrative control or thorough governmental approval of local operations. Access patterns in North European nations are likewise unique. While in South European states the pattern is one of local elites with direct access to central elites as well as indirect interest group representation, local authorities in these countries have large national interest groups to conduct central-local negotiations. Because of this, local governance in South European states has a greater impact on national policymaking.

Why is it that the countries of North and South Europe are consistently different? Page and Goldsmith provide several hypotheses as potential reasons. For instance, they propose that the propensity for administrative regulation in the central-local relations system of the South European nations may be explained by the experience of a Napoleonic state. Social-democratic governments devoted to the expansion of welfare state services in North European nations employed municipal government to provide such services. The demand for public services and the expansion of local government's size and professionalism sealed the doom of clientelism in central-local relations. Page and Goldsmith place special focus on "the conditions under which local politics maintains or loses its importance to national politics" among the answers that may be offered.

As a result, professional-bureaucratic service delivery networks have not replaced local government in South European nations, which have "a firm pillar of effective support at the national level for the expression of localities' needs." But recent developments shouldn't be obscured by this emphasis on differences. While the center in South European states has decentralized functions in response to the same fiscal pressure, the impact of the resource squeeze has led the center in North European states to exercise more detailed control. None of the aforementioned variables can account for this convergence; instead, it may be attributed to "the center's need to manage and control its local territories."

The majority of comparative local government literature offers case studies of specific local government systems, too many of which give little or no consideration to IGR. The benefit of Page and Goldsmith's account is that it offers descriptions of IGR in other nations in addition to comparisons. Long and boring discussions of architecture, functions, and finances are avoided. Additionally, it disproves some of the more well-known myths surrounding the study of IGR, such as the notion that financial dependence on the central government plays a significant role in determining the level of local discretion. Most importantly, it avoids comparing the level of centralization/autonomy of local administration across different countries. Such terminology is useless; for instance, which system is more centralized if British local government has more functions but French local government has greater access to and influence over the center? It is feasible to compare issues and/or trends within IGR systems as opposed to IGR systems as a whole. Reorganization, the strain on resources, political decentralization, and distinctiveness are four such developments that have defined the last 20 years.

In Western Europe, municipal government restructuring has become a mini-industry. According to Dente, there are four basic kinds of reorganization: organizational reforms, financial reforms,

functional and procedural reforms, and structural reforms or changes that influence the number of local units. Municipalities have been merged, regional levels of government have been established, and participatory local service delivery agencies have been introduced as three different types of structural change. Changes to a local government's internal organization, known as organizational reform, are often implemented to improve decision-making efficiency. Below is a discussion of financial reforms in response to resource constraints. The term "functional and procedural reforms" refers to a variety of changes, including the introduction of new, function-specific planning systems in the UK and the diminution of prefectoral power in France and Italy.

On the need for structural transformation, there was virtually a "conventional wisdom" that "functionalism" or efficient service delivery was key. In other words, it was believed that local government entities were too tiny in size and had insufficient financial and professional resources to fully use economies of scale. As a result of reform, there are fewer local units, they are larger, functions have been moved out of the local area, and there are less chances for public engagement. The reformers did not, however, have it all their own way, which is as essential. According to Dente's conclusion, "the weight of local tradition, and particularly the significance of the local political systems, with their clientelistic practices and their personal links between the politicians and the electorate," permitted change to be either opposed or used to local benefit.

As a measure of the flexibility of local taxes and grants, the term "resource squeeze" refers to the difference between local taxes and grants and local spending. In other words, has the rise of local income kept pace with the growth of local expenditures in a period of inflation? Newton provides evidence of the picture's diversity. While local government in Britain was getting worse, and local government finances in Italy had reached crisis levels, Denmark and Sweden had few issues. The discrepancy between the duties and powers of local authorities, which was made worse by inflation since local authority taxes were not progressive, is the sole shared local financial issue, according to Sharpe. Regardless of how it was characterized, the center's reaction to the resource shortage included increasing the amount of resources it provided, consolidating the grant systems, and tightening its supervision over local spending. Furthermore, because central governments were also under financial strain, they delegated tasks to local and regional organizations, thereby widening the gap between functional obligations and financial authority. Local governments' responses included reducing services locally, moving services to the commercial sector, and increasing income via fees and borrowing.

The gradual centralization of sophisticated industrial society seems to be shown through structural and financial transformations. There are, however, opposing tendencies. Sharpe cites the rise of ethnic nationalism and the growth of neighborhood councils in support of his claim that the 1970s witnessed the political decentralization of Western democracies. Similar to this, Tarrow contends that as the effectiveness of national parliaments is diminished by the movement of functional conflicts to the top of the political system, citizens are increasingly turning to territorial institutions rather than 'functional' representation, strengthening the territorial dimension in representation even as it is being replaced in policy making and administration.

Additionally, centralization and differentiation were mutually exclusive. Rhodes and Wright propose that policy networks should be the primary emphasis rather than local governments. The central government is non-executant, which means that it depends on other organizations to provide services. Local governments are among these organizations, but they are not the only

ones; the center operates via and with a wide range of institutional instruments that Beer refers to as "professional-bureaucratic complexes." The resultant network of organizations will be confined to that specific policy sector or sub-sector or function-specific. In other words, various policy sectors are delineated and separated from one another. In a modern industrial society, differentiation and centralization coexist yet there is no one, unifying central actor:

Multiple centers are created and horizontal coordination is lost as a result of conflicting interests within a single center and the professionalization of operational policy systems. We now inhabit a time of "centreless" civilizations. However, each policy system might be centralized, at least in the sense that its core frequently intervenes.

In industrialized nations, IGR shows paradoxical trends between structural and financial centralization and political decentralization and differentiation. No simple conclusion about the start of a centralized period can be justified. Instead, there is a time of organizational complexity in which IGR must address the full spectrum of organizations, including professional-bureaucratic complexes and policy networks, rather than just relations between central and local governments.

Developing Countries

It is impossible to separate the wider issue of political and economic growth from the function, destiny, and form of local government in emerging nations. Indeed, local government took on a significant amount of responsibility after the end of colonial rule. Mawhood sums up the 'traditional model' as follows:

1. There should be a local organization in charge of a wide variety of local services that is legally independent of the federal government.
2. To generate a significant portion of its money, it should have its own taxes, treasury, budget, and accounts.
3. It need to have its own trained employees that it may recruit and dismiss.
4. A council with a majority of the vote would decide on internal policy and practice.
5. Last but not least, the central government officials were only to serve as outside inspectors and consultants, with no control over the local authorities.

In the 1960s, decentralization in general and this model in particular were popular in developing nations. There were many factors contributing to its popularity. First, it was seen as a means of overcoming the constraints of national planning by reducing red tape, addressing local needs, and getting closer to issues. Second, it enhanced central "penetration" into rural regions, which helped to raise awareness of the plan, mobilize support for it, and get around obstructive local elites. Thirdly, it promoted national unity by encouraging participation from many religious, ethnic, and tribal groupings. Fourth, it reduced central control and direction and improved decision-making speed and flexibility, promoting experimentation. Sixth, it boosted the administrative capacity of the localities and regions and improved the coordination of service delivery. Fifth, it raised the efficiency of the centre by relieving top management of mundane chores and lowering the diseconomies of scale generated by congestion at the centre. Last but not least, it formalized participation, gave a variety of interests the chance to have a "stake" in upholding the system, prepared people for democracy and politicians for governance, and therefore produced political maturity and democratic stability.

Theory and practice quickly and noticeably separated. The practice in most nations is for the central government to nominate the councils or committees of the local government together with their chief executives, therefore Dele Olowu concludes that African local governments essentially function as extensions of state bureaucracy. Therefore, it is questionable whether "local government" is a suitable term to describe what are, in reality, local administration systems.

Cheema and Rondinelli discuss the central "schizophrenia" caused by the delegation of authority to local authorities. They also demonstrate how local governments in Asia, like those in Africa, serve as "bureaucratic instruments of the center." Experience "has almost always fallen far short of expectations," writes Smith, while Mawhood mentions the "chaotic inefficiency of decentralized government." In short, central nominees took the role of elected entities, significant duties were not delegated, there was a lot of central supervision, and local governments lacked sufficient authority and funding. Even field administration has been harmed by improper power delegation, which has led to waste, redundancy, and wasteful spending. At the end of this dark tunnel, there are two lights. First, according to Cheema and Rondinelli, there have been slight improvements in the administrative and technical capabilities of local and regional agencies, the ability of local political leaders and bureaucrats to lobby the center for resources, and access for people living in underserved rural areas. They also mention the growth of municipal and regional planning for development. Second, there was a resurgence of interest in the classic model in the 1980s. What factors promote local government and create a long-lasting link between central and local government, therefore, becomes the crucial question?

The limitations on decentralization and IGR are interpreted in very different ways. The center's actions might be seen as a reaction to subpar local standards and the necessity to manage limited resources. According to reports, the center monopolizes an urban, educated, and monetarily powerful elite, leaving only a small pool of talent in local government where morale is often low and discipline is lacking. More importantly, local governments had to contend with fierce opposition from existing castes and classes of landowners who were protecting their sectoral interests, as well as with a contemporary ruling elite vying for control of the country's resources. A significant effect was also performed by historical causes. In both Africa and Asia, British authority first established a pattern of administrative centralization, which in turn unleashed a competing inclination toward centralization on the side of educated Africans and Asians, Subramaniam argues the argument forcefully.

The main distinction is that centralist tendencies in Francophone Africa "were not conceived as retaliatory safeguards against a centralizing colonial administration but rather as necessary replications of French centralism itself." Effective local administration has also been hampered, as noted by Rondinelli and Cheema, by a dearth of "both the resources and the authorities to raise sufficient revenues to carry out the tasks transferred from the center." Technological and economic considerations made all of these limitations much worse. The 'compulsive management of resources' to encourage economic growth, central planning, new technologies for communication and information gathering, as well as 'the encompassing terror' of global finance and markets all contributed to the facilitation of centralization. However, political factors played a major role in recentralization. As Wallis underlines, regimes' poor legitimacy caused them to consolidate power at the top in order to address their political fears. Similar to this, Smith contends that alliances between state bureaucrats and class interests are what lead to centralization.

There are undoubtedly a number of barriers preventing local government and the associated IGR system from developing. Environment, interorganizational connections, resources, and the characteristics of implementing agencies are the four groups of elements that Rondinelli and Cheema identified as influencing the implementation of decentralization programs. Briefly translated, the effective implementation of decentralization policies necessitates: an understanding of a country's political structure, its dominant ideology, policy-making processes, and local power structures; the interaction and coordination of numerous organizations at various levels of government, which depends, in turn, on things like clear objectives, standardized budgeting, accurate communication, and effective linkages; sufficient financial, administrative

Although shorter, Mawhood's list of "tentative propositions" regarding the circumstances supporting the traditional model of decentralization is no less intimidating. As a result, local government thrives in areas with moderate party competition, an effective national government, good public safety, citizens who have become accustomed to the modern form of government, a lack of resources that forces the central government to turn to the local community for support and resources, and a strong traditional authority structure. In essence, decentralization necessitates political power and economic weakness, two characteristics that should never be combined. IGR is similar to the command or agency model of interaction in emerging nations: the center proposes, and the locality decides. Local administration has supplanted and damaged local governance. The transmission of central plans into action on the ground is not automatic, however, and even field administration systems have complex organizational relationships. For instance, local bureaucrats frequently exercise a great deal of discretion, and the status hierarchy of a bureaucracy makes accurate reporting difficult.

The future of IGR is not bright, given how grim its past has been. According to Wallis, "autonomy looks very much an unattainable idea in view of the political and economic considerations prevailing in most countries," the requirements for successful decentralization are stringent. However, he goes on to say that there is probably scope for a constrained version of the "bottom-up" approach. Grassroots participation has been a component of the reaction in developing nations to perhaps much more severe financial and economic issues, just as central governments in wealthy countries offloaded tasks to deal with resource constraints. Mawhood comes to the conclusion that local government's traditional duty of ensuring efficient, cost-effective administration and social and economic transformation has been surpassed. In emerging nations, the idealistic notion of local self-government has taken a terrible beating.

Trends

Only a few more years will pass before the year 2000. Like miracles, the revival of local authority will take some time. IGR seems to be characterized by centralization, control, and decreasing accountability, at least in the near future. But there must be some qualification to such a hopeless situation. Both wealthy and emerging nations are clearly trending toward increased centralization, according to commentators. Centralization and differentiation coexist, yet at the same time, there is an increase in the fragmentation of the federal government. It is said that an ideological challenge to the function of government occurred in the 1980s. Its restrictions were relaxed. It is possible to see the rejection of central planning and the reemergence of markets as a decentralization effort. A frequent and well-known example of this process is privatization. Privatization is a murky case, however. Direct control through ownership is replaced by indirect control via regulation. It modifies the manner in which the government intervenes, but it does not

eliminate it, nor does it necessarily end the issue of the interaction between the industry and the government. However, it does alter the policy network by bringing in new players and relationships and giving persistent issues with control and accountability a novel spin. Above all, it demonstrates how governments are using a wider range of tools to implement their policies. Special purpose authorities are given responsibilities rather than general purpose governments. Government has not been rolled back but splintered and politicized, a process which can only frustrate the attempt to control through centralization. Institutional 'ad-hocracy' is the order of the day, a process which generates conflicts between agencies competing for 'turf' and between central government and local authorities who resent being bypassed.

Such fragmentation not only undermines governance and encourages policy sloppiness, but it also makes the government more complicated. According to Elgin and Bushnell, complexity has the following negative effects:

1. Decreasing relative ability of a specific person to understand the whole system.
2. Decline in the amount of public involvement in decision-making.
3. Lowering openness to the public for decision-makers.
4. Increasing involvement of specialists in decision-making.
5. Costs of coordination and control have grown out of proportion.
6. There are more and more unanticipated and counterintuitive effects of governmental decisions.
7. Decreasing system performance overall.
8. Most system members are unlikely to notice the system's general decline as it continues.
9. Complexity also affects accountability and control.

Political decentralization will be the response to centralization and control. According to Sharpe, ironically, the centralization of society and the governmental apparatus is also a byproduct of the decentralist trends in Western politics. They are not only an epiphenomenon of centralization; rather, they are a response to it. Similar to this, Wallis contends that in emerging nations "optimism is in the air" due to initiatives to support functional village councils in places like Kenya and Sri Lanka.

The key idea is that institutional centralization faces opposition from political decentralization. It shouldn't be associated with the revitalization of local government since such institutions might be strongholds of conservatism and reaction. Instead, it might pose a problem for the powerful interests that dominate local politics. Even if the 1980s saw a decline in the micropolitics of the city and the growth of ethnic nationalism, these issues did not go away. They will be the second component of the 1990s' politicization of IGR.

This surge of politicization will draw attention to the shortcomings of traditional legislative accountability procedures. Accountability cannot be described in institutional terms in governmental systems with a high degree of differentiation; instead, it must include the networks of policies, their connections, and the policies themselves. The accountability framework has to be tailored to policies in order to evaluate their efficacy rather than just their procedural accuracy. There will be a greater push for novel local accountability mechanisms. IGR is about to enter a turbulent period. Old relationship patterns were disturbed in the 1980s, but there was no consensus on what should replace them. It is unlikely that functional performance or political accountability would improve as a consequence of the proliferation of institutional forms and rise in complexity [10]–[12].

CONCLUSION

Many nations have set up official structures and mechanisms for intergovernmental cooperation and coordination to deal with these issues. Joint committees, intergovernmental agreements, and shared decision-making procedures are a few examples of these. Intergovernmental interactions may be impacted by a variety of informal elements, such as interpersonal connections, political allies, and common goals or ideals, in addition to official channels. A democratic form of governance cannot operate without strong intergovernmental cooperation. Intergovernmental relations may assist to guarantee that policies and services are provided effectively and efficiently, and that the interests and priorities of people are adequately reflected at all levels of government, by fostering collaboration and coordination across various levels of government.

REFERENCES:

[1] J. Phillimore, "Understanding Intergovernmental Relations: Key Features And Trends," *Aust. J. Public Adm.*, 2013, Doi: 10.1111/1467-8500.12025.

[2] C. Alcantara, J. Broschek, And J. Nelles, "Rethinking Multilevel Governance As An Instance Of Multilevel Politics: A Conceptual Strategy," *Territ. Polit. Gov.*, 2016, Doi: 10.1080/21622671.2015.1047897.

[3] B. De Villiers, "Codification Of 'Intergovernmental Relations' By Way Of Legislation: The Experiences Of South Africa And Potential Lessons For Young Multi-Tiered Systems," *Ssrn Electron. J.*, 2013, Doi: 10.2139/Ssrn.2211934.

[4] T. A. J. Toonen, "The Unitary State As A System Of Co□Governance: The Case Of The Netherlands," *Public Adm.*, 1990, Doi: 10.1111/J.1467-9299.1990.Tb00760.X.

[5] D. Wood And T. R. Klassen, "Intergovernmental Relations Post-Devolution: Active Labour Market Policy In Canada And The United Kingdom 1996-2006," *Reg. Fed. Stud.*, 2008, Doi: 10.1080/13597560802223912.

[6] C. V, "A Critical Analysis Of The Dynamics Of Intergovernmental Relations In Zimbabwe," *J. Polit. Sci. Public Aff.*, 2018, Doi: 10.4172/2332-0761.1000326.

[7] E. Hepburn, "Forging Autonomy In A Unitary State: The Åland Islands In Finland," *Comp. Eur. Polit.*, 2014, Doi: 10.1057/Cep.2014.10.

[8] D. R. Cameron And R. I. Hofferbert, "The Impact Of Federalism On Education Finance: A Comparative Analysis," *Eur. J. Polit. Res.*, 1974, Doi: 10.1111/J.1475-6765.1974.Tb00752.X.

[9] C. Tapscott, "Intergovernmental Relations In South Africa: The Challenges Of Co-Operative Government," *Public Adm. Dev.*, 2000, Doi: 10.1002/1099-162x(200005)20:2<119::Aid-Pad118>3.0.Co;2-G.

[10] D. T. Studlar, "What Explains The Paradox Of Tobacco Control Policy Under Federalism In The U.S. And Canada? Comparative Federalism Theory Versus Multi-Level Governance," *Publius J. Fed.*, 2010, Doi: 10.1093/Publius/Pjq003.

[11] M. Exworthy, "Primary Care In The Uk: Understanding The Dynamics Of Devolution," *Heal. Soc. Care Community*, 2001, Doi: 10.1046/J.0966-0410.2001.00306.X.

[12] V. Butenko, "Perspective directions of improvement of management of intergovernmental fiscal relations in Ukraine on the example of the developed countries of the world," *Econ. Ecol. socium*, 2018, doi: 10.31520/2616-7107/2018.2.1-1.

CHAPTER 25

INTERGOVERNMENTAL RELATIONS: FEDERAL SYSTEMS

Dr. M. Govindaraj, Associate Professor,
Department of Marketing, CMS Business School, JAIN Deemed to-be University, Bangalore, India,
Email Id- dr.govindarajm@cms.ac.in

ABSTRACT:

A federal system of government is one in which power is divided between a central government and regional or state governments. In a federal system, the central government is responsible for national issues such as defense, foreign policy, and monetary policy, while the regional or state governments have jurisdiction over local issues such as education, healthcare, and transportation. One of the key advantages of a federal system is that it can help to promote greater participation and representation at the local level. By giving regional or state governments more power, citizens are able to have a greater say in decisions that directly impact their daily lives.

KEYWORDS:

Centralization, Decentralization, Dual Federalism, Federalism, Fiscal Federalism, Intergovernmental Relations.

INTRODUCTION

Federalism is a notion whose roots may be traced back to the ancient world and biblical times. Federal political systems are built on political and social ideas regarding federalism. Federal systems have existed in a variety of ways since the Hellenistic world's loose tying together by treaty of sovereign nations for particular military or economic goals. But after the United States constitution was finally adopted in 1787, the Swiss, Canadian, and Australian federations used federal principles as a model, and immediately after the Second World War, numerous nation-building experiments were conducted, particularly in Europe, Asia, Africa, the Middle East, and the Caribbean [1]–[3].

Federalism essentially offers an organizational framework for achieving some kind of political unification among a population whose traits show variation and variety. This system allows for the restricted, specific reasons of combining distinct regional political units under a single, overarching administration while yet preserving the integrity and considerable autonomy of each distinct regional unit's government. This is accomplished by allocating duties and responsibilities in a way that safeguards the legitimacy of both levels of government. Both tiers of government have the power to enact laws, collect taxes, and interact with the general public. The separation of powers and responsibilities between the central and regional governments is typically outlined in the constitution, and there are typically established mechanisms and processes for resolving conflicts and disagreements between the central and regional governments as well as between two or more regional governments. Federal systems need some level of cooperation between central and regional administrations in all sorts of societies where they are in place. Intergovernmental interactions, however, are vital in contemporary nations with federal systems

and a considerably greater level of interdependence across all levels of government. Political scientists are thus now interested in how federal systems really function in reality, in addition to ideas of federalism and how they are applied in constitutions and laws. How the central and regional levels of government interact, how authority and responsibility are distributed, how conflicts and disagreements are settled, and to what extent the central and regional governmental bodies can effectively collaborate in the national interest to solve problems, are all crucial considerations.

Conceptual Invariances

Definitional issues often hinder discussions of federal systems and the intergovernmental relationships within them. This is especially true for the words "federalism," "federal," and "federation." Federalism, in its widest form, refers to the joining of individuals and organizations with mutual agreement for a specific goal without sacrificing their separate identities. The word "federal" was first used by Bible-centered federal theologians in seventeenth-century Britain and New England to describe a framework of sanctified and eternal agreements between God and humanity that served as the cornerstone of their worldview. The Latin term foedus, which means covenant, is the source of the English word federal. Social theorists of the nineteenth century adopted this understanding of the federal government and utilized it to create a number of different social contract theories. Federalism, as a political tool, may be regarded more specifically as a system of organization that distributes authority to protect individual and local liberty. Political groups often take on a specific character under federal political systems. This is true for both official institutions of government and political parties as well as interest groups.

Federalism has also been envisioned as a tool for pursuing other political and social objectives. First, federalism has been seen by many as a way to bring individuals together who are already bound together by ties of nationality. In such situations, the combined political entities are seen as a component of the larger national whole. Fundamentally, this is the accepted American interpretation of federalism at the moment. An alternate perspective holds that federalism may bring together many peoples for significant but constrained goals without undermining their fundamental attachments to their current governments. The latter arrangement places significantly more restrictions on the federal government's authority, and the system is sometimes referred to as a confederation. The fact that the words "federation" and "confederation" are sometimes used interchangeably, however, contributes to some degree of misunderstanding. The concept of confederation is still used today for international political bodies like the National Atlantic Treaty Organization and the European Economic Community.

Comparatively speaking, federal systems are different from similar political structures. Dual or multiple monarchy, whose unity between political entities occurs only via the sovereign and the exercise of his or her executive authority, are conceptually distinct from true federal systems. In 1707, the legislative union of England and Scotland resulted in the end of the dual monarchy. Such legislative unions closely resemble federal systems, with the exception that some non-centralizing aspects may be retained under the union's constitution. Scotland therefore has its own national ministry with a different administrative structure under the cabinet government system of the United Kingdom. Decentralized unitary states, in which local administration is often constrained and subject to oversight and overall control by central authorities, are another example of a system that differs from federal systems. In such democracies, the national government may curtail local autonomy. In reality, many South American countries that declare

themselves to be federal combine the exercise of central government authority with the devolution of power to regional administrations.

In political discourse, the term "federal" is often misused. Federal has often been used to describe constitutions and types of government, while some authors have also mentioned federal societies and federal philosophies. According to Livingston, the federal government serves as a tool for articulating and presenting the federal features of society. if they are grouped territorially, or geographically, a federal society might develop. The society cannot be considered federal if they are not organized into territorial groups.

In such systems, "intergovernmental relations" must be separated from federalism and federal systems. Since it involves both the actual distribution of power and principles governing those relationships, federalism is more than just the relationships between the various governmental entities in a federal system. Federalism is also interested in how federal principles affect other political structures, such as political parties and election systems.

DISCUSSION

Essential Characteristics of Federal Systems

In terms of their formal constitutions, the distribution of powers, how they function, and which federal values they prioritize, federal systems vary greatly. However, political theorists and investigators of empirical studies have found it useful to attempt to define those elements necessary for a truly federal system. Watts thus highlighted the idea of dual sovereignty, wherein central and regional administrations work concurrently, each distinct from the other and essentially autonomous in its own field. Each has a direct connection to the people. Each level of government must be clearly defined by the constitution in terms of its roles and responsibilities, and each must be autonomous within its own domain. The division of power should typically, but not always, be outlined in a written constitution, and an independent court should be established to interpret the ultimate constitution and serve as a watchdog over the constitutional separation of powers. Twenty years before, K.C. Whaley, whose works had a significant impact on the trials with new federal systems that took place after the Second World War in Asia, Africa, the Middle East, and the Caribbean, particularly in the British Commonwealth, spoke in-depth on what federal government is. One essential component, in his view, was the separation of powers between the national and regional governments. But unlike the post-revolutionary association of American colonies, where the central government was subordinate to regional governments, each level within its sphere is independent and autonomous. The general and regional governments are each, within a sphere, co-ordinate and autonomous, according to the federal principle, he said. This requirement sounds too strict and at odds with reality since, under many federal systems, such as those in the United States and Australia, federal laws and treaties take precedence over those of state governments [4]–[6].

The matters entrusted to the constituent units...must be substantial and not merely trivial; central organs are to some extent directly in contact with individuals, both to draw authority from them through elections and also for the purpose of extorting taxes and compliance with regulations; the members of the constituent units are to some extent directly in contact with the central organs... Recent definitions of federalism by Daniel J. Elazar, a renowned American scholar of the subject, include a written constitution, non-centralization, a true division of powers, direct interaction with the populace, mechanisms to uphold non-centralization, and the federal

principle. Elazar claims that, hypothetically, These patterns of conduct and the arguments put forth to support them serve to reaffirm the fundamental tenets that the strength of a federal polity derives not from the power of the national government but rather from the authority vested in the nation as a whole, that both the national government and the governments of the constituent polities are possessed of only delegated powers, and that all governments are constrained by the common national constitution.

Federal systems and Federalism

Political institutions and systems that included parts of federal ideas were created generations before the name "federal" was used. Federal arrangements were initially formulated in the alliances of city-states, tribes, and religions in the ancient Greek world. The Achaean League, a super polis or coalition that offered military protection, is a prime example. As the first federal polity, the League caught the interest of academics in the nineteenth century. The Israeli political system is an example of a union of component polities founded on a feeling of shared nationality around the same period. The notion of cultural home rule, which was an example of a kind of contractual devolution of political authority, was used to establish political arrangements in a number of the major ancient empires, including those ruled by the Persian, Hellenic, and Roman empires.

Feudalism and the leagues of self-defense formed by the commercial cities of central Europe during the Middle Ages both included features of federalism. Later quasi-federal structures emerged under a multiple monarchy system in Spain and Italy. Federal principles were first applied to state-building by biblical scholars of the Reformation in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries; these concepts served as the organizational foundation for the federation of the United Provinces in the Netherlands in the late sixteenth century, while the Swiss established a loose confederation of cantons.

The emergence of the nation-state in the 16 and seventeenth centuries is linked with the earliest contemporary articulation of federal concepts. In this case, federalism offered an alluring solution to the nation's unification issues. Early in the seventeenth century, Johannes Althusius saw the potential of federalism and regarded it as a means of achieving national unity after examining the Swiss and Dutch constitutions. He was the first to differentiate between leagues, multiple monarchies, and confederations as well as to link federalism with popular sovereignty. But the first modern federal system that of the United States in 1787 was not established until the ideas of British and continental thinkers were combined with biblical thinking immediately after the American revolution. Since then, thoughts regarding federalism have been greatly influenced by its development and its success.

Compared to others who had tried out federal concepts previously, the founders of the United States had certain advantages. Their culture was post-feudal and had only existed for a brief period of time. Up until the 20th century, the United States was a largely isolated country that had only seen modest foreign forces. Additionally, Americans were primarily focused on the operational details of making federalism work. In the discussions surrounding the passage of the constitution and in The Federalist's formulations, a theoretical foundation for the American experiment was developed. The eventual outcome was a compromise between those who wanted the states to play a major role and those who wanted the central government to be dominant. Essentially, the model used was

that the business of State is 'divided' between two popularly elected governments, a national government embracing the whole territory of the nation and a regional government for each of the lesser territories; that each government will possess the basic facilities to make, manage, and enforce its laws 'like any ordinary government'; that subject to the provisions of the constitution, each government is 'free' to act 'independently' of, or in concert with, the other, as it chooses; that jurisdictional disputes between the national government and the governments of the lesser territories will be settled by judicial arbitration; that the principle of national supremacy will prevail where two valid actions, national and regional, are in conflict; that the instruments of national government, but not necessarily the lesser territories, are set forth in a written constitution; that the national legislature is a bicameral system in which one house, the 'first branch', is composed according to the size of the population in each territory, while each territory has equal representation in the 'second branch'; lastly that the constitution is fundamental law, changeable only by a special plebiscitary process. For the next two centuries, the federal way of thinking was greatly influenced by the United States constitution and the experiment that followed. It gave important inspiration for other federal attempts, including the constitutions of Canada and Australia. Additionally, it gave researchers the popular archetype they kept using. Wheare said in a piece he published soon after World War II that "since the United States is universally regarded as an example of federal government, it justifies us in referring to the principle, which distinguishes it so markedly and so significantly, as the federal principle."

Apart from Canada, Switzerland, and Australia, a number of new countries were inspired by federal ideals prior to the Second World War. For instance, in Latin America, Argentina, Brazil, and Mexico all embraced federal systems, while Colombia and Venezuela's constitutions also featured federal concepts. There were other trials in Europe, such as the Weimar constitution in Germany, and to accommodate the Irish, the United Kingdom employed federal ideas. However, the big push for federal systems emerged after the Second World War as a result of decolonization movements in Asia, Africa, the Middle East, and the Caribbean, as well as post-war reconstruction in Europe. The majority of post-colonial federations were founded by Britain. Some of these post-war federal initiatives quickly came to an end, such the attempt to create an All-Indian federation, while others persisted for some time until being replaced by other systems, like Rhodesia and Nyasaland. However, many of the federal systems that Britain established are still in place today; Malaysia, Nigeria, India, and Pakistan are just a few examples.

Many have been astonished by the federal system of government's enduring appeal. Fifty years ago, academics like Harold Laski came to the conclusion that federalism was out of date and unfit for the contemporary period. I deduce in a word that the time of federalism is finished, he said in a 1939 letter. Federalism, however, offered a useful model for building political systems of a manageable size, for achieving some degree of transcending unity in geographic areas of ethnic diversity, and as a means of power sharing between major ethnic groups, particularly in the process of building new nations in North America and Australia and in decolonization. The federal solution proven to be a successful formula in such circumstances when the forces for integration and for separation have been at conflict with one another. But over the past 20 years, interest in federalism has somewhat decreased, particularly in Africa and as more and more developing countries have experienced economic difficulties. On the other hand, the federal form of government looks incredibly resilient and adapts to the changing needs of contemporary industrial society in modern federal systems like those found in the United States, Canada, and

Australia. Such political systems have issues with organizational complexity and the diversity of power linkages, but two Canadian researchers claim that these systems have a higher chance of devolving power to lower and more controllable levels.

Relations between Governments

How effectively and how efficiently contemporary political systems really function, and how national, regional, and municipal governments, as well as local government organizations, strive to cooperate to address common issues, are among the current top concerns of political scientists and other researchers interested in federalism. There is constant discussion over how effectively these structures accommodate the contemporary requirements of individuals and the tasks of government in modern federal systems, such as those found in the United States, Canada, and Australia. These systems have created a particularly complex collection of machinery and linkages. Federal governments and intergovernmental commissions sometimes propose significant structural reform, as well as various approaches to rationalization, obtaining more efficiency, and simplification, but significant changes have proven difficult to implement. The strong inclination of federal government entities and activities to dominate in their relationships with state and local government is another recurring worry.

Central and regional administrations were able to function with a significant degree of freedom under such federal systems throughout their very early years. Each had distinct, mutually agreed-upon areas of duty, and for a long time, the primary policy areas remained virtually the exclusive purview of government at one level or another. Although it is debatable how much shared responsibility actually operated in the early years of these systems, this situation did not last for very long. For instance, Elazar passionately argues that the American system of government was always characterized by cooperation between governments at various levels and that "virtually all the activities of government in the nineteenth century were shared activities, involving federal, state, and local government in their planning, financing, and execution." However, this argument must be understood in light of his defense of the states' constitutional rights in the American system and his conviction that effective federalism necessitates a true alliance and balance of power between the national and local levels of government.

It is evident that under modern federal systems like those in the United States, Canada, and Australia, a very sophisticated set of machinery and connections in intergovernmental interactions have formed, regardless of the merits of the discussions concerning the exact nature of federal arrangements in their early phases. According to O'Toole, the defining characteristics are complexity and interdependence. Complexity refers to the intergovernmental network's size and degree of differentiation, while interdependence refers to the way that power and responsibility are distributed among the various levels and branches of government even within a single policy domain. This condition resulted from a combination of internal issues pertaining to social welfare, crime, education, transportation, and urban necessities, as well as a variety of external pressures, such as significant wars and international crises, recessions, and depressions. Furthermore, there have been unique issues like racial segregation in the US and ethnic and cultural diversity in Canada. The existing network of interconnected political entities spans a broad area and contains around 80,000 distinct governmental entities in the United States, including federal, state, county, municipal, and special-district authorities. Their duties and authority overlap, and there is intense rivalry when it comes to providing public services.

Complex new political institutions have been built in each of these contemporary federal systems to allow governments at different levels to interact, negotiate, settle disputes, and engage in cooperative operations. Premiers' Conferences, the Loan Council, and many distinct ministerial councils in Australia, for example, handle a broad variety of policy realms, from agriculture and education to company regulation and transportation. Various administrative structures that support regular official meetings and cooperative activities go hand in hand with the political structures that bring heads of state and ministers together. Consider the situation of education in Australia, which was to be solely a state issue at the time the federal constitution was drafted at the beginning of the twentieth century. To the point where it now contributes the entire operating and capital funds for all public higher education as well as a sizeable portion of the costs of technical and further education at both government and non-government schools, the federal government gradually became more involved in the education sector. The Australian Education Council, which has its own distinct secretariat and offices and is backed by several permanent and ad hoc committees and working groups made up of federal and state officials, is where federal and state education ministers meet on a regular basis. Sometimes it is decided that certain projects will be carried out by either the federal government or the states, but in other situations, such as with the new Curriculum Corporation, the federal government and the states collaborate to work via a new public corporation structure that is formally owned by the ministers.

In federal systems, fiscal relations are particularly problematic, particularly when it comes to such as how taxes and fees are collected, by whom, and how these resources are pooled and dispersed. Resources are distributed by federal governments in a variety of ways to the public, regional, and municipal governments. These include direct grants to people or organizations as well as intergovernmental transfers made through block grants, tied grants, or grants for specific purposes. There are various procedures in place to attempt to equalize the resource base of each regional entity. For instance, the Commonwealth Grants Commission, created in 1933, has been distributing federal tax funds to Australia's poorer states for many years.

The Federalism Study

The study of federalism moved away from normative theory and toward empirical inquiry in the late nineteenth and early twentieth century as political science developed as a subject. Federalism was a topic of study for academics like Bryce and Dicey who were interested in political systems. With a few notable exceptions, however, the study of federalism was mostly disregarded for a very long time. In the late 1930s and early 1940s, there was a resurgence of interest in federalism, spurred on by issues with intergovernmental relations inside the United States and the intense period of nation-building that followed World War II. Beginning in the 1930s, a new generation of political scientists started to question the unique features of federal systems as well as how federal structures impacted the growth and operation of other political system elements like interest groups and political parties. By the 1960s, academics with an interest in public administration, comparative politics, and the politics of developing nations were all paying attention to federalism. Intergovernmental relations scholars have been leading the way worldwide since the 1970s in an effort to better understand the dynamics of interaction between governments at various levels in complex federal systems like those in the United States, Canada, and Australia.

This research has drawn interest from economists, public finance students, political scientists, and students of public administration. It has also been given significant impetus by the work of

numerous commissions and committees of inquiry established by governments to look into potential changes to current systems.Federalism scholars have focused their attention on a range of specific issues throughout the last 20 years. Here, three stand out. The first is on the motivations for federations, or why individuals really band together to form a federal union. It would seem reasonable to assume that individual's join together to establish federations for a number of reasons, and it would be doubtful if any one combination of criteria worked consistently. While Watt's work follows the historical comparative study of Wheare and is concerned with the search for significant patterns, Wheare's comparative study was more historically oriented.

According to Riker, federalism "is an agreement between potential national leaders and representatives of constituent governments for the purpose of aggregating territory, the better to lay taxes and raise armies." Two factors, which he refers to as the "expansion condition" and the "military condition," make the parties more likely to favor such a deal. The expansion condition refers to the politicians who make the deal and want to increase their geographical authority to counter a military or diplomatic danger from outside, or to be ready for such an assault or aggrandizement, but who are unable to employ force for a variety of reasons. According to the military requirement, the politicians who accept the deal must give up part of their independence in exchange for unification, and they must do so in response to a military-diplomatic danger or opportunity. The theory that the military and the expansion circumstances are crucial to the occurrence of federalism is validated, according to Riker, who looks at various instances of the formation of federations. In his analysis of six recent federal experiments, Watts cites a variety of social dynamics and motivations, each of which had the ability to unite or divide society. He comes to the conclusion that although each case's primary reasons differed,

Two qualities stand out as being shared by all of them. First, there was a geographical distribution of the differences within each of these societies, at least to some extent, leading to regional demands for political autonomy. Second, in every recent federation, as in the older ones, there existed at the same time strong desires to be organized under autonomous regional governments for some purposes due to opposing ways of life or the desire to protect disparate interests, as well as powerful desires to be united for other purposes due to a community of outlook or the expectation of common benefits from union. The friction between the competing desires for territorial integration and for Balkanization was the end consequence in each case. Both of these hypotheses have not been fully accepted. Regardless of these two strategies, according to Davis, the construction of federal systems always involves a debate of the political structure that will be created as well as a negotiation process to accommodate competing interests.

The evolution of competing tendencies toward integration and decentralization and how federal systems develop over time are the subject of a second debate among academics. The Comparative Federalism Research Committee of the International Political Science Association conducted international comparative research, and it came to the conclusion that although the majority of federal systems seem to be centralizing legislative powers, there are a few instances where the contrary tendency is present. The similar pattern has been seen in other recent investigations. What conditions favor decentralization and integration? Will the trend toward integration eventually change federal systems to unitary structures and the trend toward decentralization eventually result in disintegration? These issues have not been settled by debate. For instance, Davis disputes the idea that the solution is solely dependent on institutional

capacity or political propensity and believes that all complex societies exhibit a centralizing tendency in their federal systems. He contends that in such societies, talking about independent action by either the federal or regional governments is meaningless because two governments have grown so shackled to one another in the bed of nationalized politics that neither can move, speak, or breathe without immediately affecting the other. In such circumstances, central governments have a strong propensity to assume a dominant role, particularly in terms of fiscal relations. The exact allocation of financial resources among the various levels of government also has a significant impact on the political and administrative interactions between the federal government and the states.

Livingston adopts a distinctive strategy. In conclusion, he argues that there are other ways to interpret federalism than the formal, legal, or jurisprudential perspective. An alternative is to focus on the social structure of society the different types of interests that make up society, their diversity, where they are distributed geographically, etc. The federal characteristics of the society are based on how evenly social variety is dispersed within the territorial unit. Every civilization, or country as he like to call them, is more or less tightly interwoven depending on the unique historical, cultural, economic, political, and other elements that shape it. Each is made up of constituent parts that, to varying degrees, feel unique from one another. Additionally, these differences may be dispersed among a society's members in a way that certain attitudes are only present in specific geographic regions, or they may be dispersed widely across the entire society. A society that is federal may arise if they are organized territorially, or geographically. The society cannot be deemed federal if they are not divided into territorial groups [7], [8].

Understanding a society's federal characteristics can help one comprehend integration or decentralization as well as how a federal system function. Friedrich, who views federalism primarily as a process, has a fairly comparable theoretical perspective. He contends that the process of federalizing may operate in the direction of both differentiation and integration, with federalizing being either the process by which a number of different political units...enter into and develop arrangements for cooperating on problemor the opposite process, whereby a previously unitary political community achieves a new order through the process of differentiating into a number of separate and distinct political subcommunities, enabling the differentiated communities to come to separate, independent decisions and policies regarding issues they no longer share. Federalism makes reference to this procedure as well as the structures and patterns that it produces.

Friedrich's writing is complicated and ambiguous, much like Livingston's method. For instance, it might be difficult to distinguish between federal and non-federal procedures. Furthermore, he makes no real mention of the connection between structure and process. But he leads us to believe that, in general, federal systems are not static but rather adapt to different pressures. Other academics have approached the issue of decentralization and integration trends from different angles when it comes to federal systems that are changing. According to Brown-John, contemporary federal systems have relied more on agreements between governments, sometimes negotiated by public officials, than on constitutional modifications to bring about change. This makes shifting relationships easier. The significance of executive elite contact was previously highlighted by another Canadian academic, Donald V. Smiley, as one of the distinctive features of Canadian federalism.

Finally, there has been a lot of discussion, particularly in the United States, about how to conceptualize intergovernmental relations, the structure of a modern federal system, and the intricate connections between various agencies and levels of government. Although the system is disorganized, Grodzins emphasizes the significance of the three levels of government in the US. He compares the American federal system to a marble cake, noting that it is not at all like a layer cake and instead is a framework of sharing and integration. It isn't a sticky substance or anything else separating three levels of government. Operationally, it is a marble cake, or rainbow cake as the British refer to it. Even duties that may be considered to be the most national, like international affairs, or the most local, like police protection or park upkeep, are not the exclusive domain of one level of government in the United States. Elazar, who was Grodzins' research assistant, has a similar perspective and emphasizes the value of collaboration and shared accountability. However, there is some ambiguity in their work regarding the precise scope of powers at various levels and what happens in the event of a serious conflict and disagreement between the partners [9]–[11].

CONCLUSION

The promotion of political stability and accountability as well as increased local engagement and representation are just a few benefits that federal systems of government may provide. They may, however, run into issues with uniformity and cooperation across the various levels of government. Therefore, it is crucial for nations thinking about a federal system to carefully consider the advantages and disadvantages and to set up efficient channels for intergovernmental coordination and cooperation. Federal systems may provide a flexible and responsive approach to governance that can meet the interests and goals of people at all levels of government if competent governance mechanisms are in place.

REFERENCES:

[1] N. Bolleyer and E. Bytzek, ‘Government congruence and intergovernmental relations in federal systems’, *Reg. Fed. Stud.*, 2009, doi: 10.1080/13597560902957484.

[2] B. Inyang, ‘Contending issues in the management of Intergovernmental Relations in the Nigerian federal administration system’, *Mediterr. J. Soc. Sci.*, 2014, doi: 10.5901/mjss.2014.v5n3p226.

[3] J. Poirier, ‘Intergovernmental Relations in Federal Systems: Ubiquitous, Idiosyncratic, Opaque and Essential’, *50Shadesoffederalism.Com*, 2015.

[4] A. Dhillon, ‘Crossing Boundaries for Intergovernmental Management’, *Int. Public Manag. J.*, 2021, doi: 10.1080/10967494.2020.1865743.

[5] C. Ianni Segatto, ‘Settlement and Integration Policies in Federal Contexts: The Case of Refugees in Canada and Brazil’, *J. Refug. Stud.*, 2021, doi: 10.1093/jrs/fez065.

[6] J. Poirier and C. Saunders, ‘Comparing Intergovernmental Relations in Federal Systems: An Introduction’, in *Intergovernmental Relations in Federal Systems: Comparative Structures and Dynamics*, 2015.

[7] A. Lecours *et al.*, ‘Explaining intergovernmental conflict in the COVID-19 crisis: The United States, Canada, and Australia’, *Publius*, 2021, doi: 10.1093/publius/pjab010.

[8] E. N. Timushev, ‘Debt burden, local fiscal decentralization and fiscal incentives of regional authorities’, *Financ. Theory Pract.*, 2020, doi: 10.26794/2587-5671-2020-24-1-58-75.

[9] D. J. Kena, ‘Federal-states intergovernmental relations impact on regional states autonomy in Ethiopia: A view with Oromo protest’, *African J. Polit. Sci. Int. Relations*, 2017, doi: 10.5897/ajpsir2016.0884.

[10] C. Saunders, ‘Grappling With The Pandemic: Rich insights into intergovernmental relations’, in *Comparative Federalism and Covid-19: Combating the Pandemic*, 2021. doi: 10.4324/9781003166771-27.

[11] A. Benz, ‘Two types of multi-level governance: Intergovernmental relations in German and EU regional policy’, *Reg. Fed. Stud.*, 2000, doi: 10.1080/13597560008421130.