POLICING THE RISK SOCIETY

Devi Prabha A.
Sakshi Pandey

ALEXIS PRESS
JERSEY CITY, USA

POLICING THE RISK SOCIETY

POLICING THE RISK SOCIETY

Devi Prabha A.

Sakshi Pandey

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.

Policing the Risk Society by *Devi Prabha A., Sakshi Pandey*

ISBN 978-1-64532-975-6

CONTENTS

CHAPTER 1

INDIVIDUALIZATION, INSTITUTIONALIZATION AND STANDARDIZATION: LIFE SITUATIONS AND BIOGRAPHICAL PATTERNS

Devi Prabha A.
Assistant Professor,Department of Law,
Presidency University, Bangalore, India.
Email Id:deviprabha@presidencyuniversity.in

ABSTRACT:

The interaction between social norms, institutional structures, and human experiences in forming life circumstances and biographical patterns is explored through the concepts of individualization, institutionalisation, and standardisation. In the context of larger institutional and cultural frameworks, this abstract explores how people navigate and negotiate their particular identities and life paths. It explores the conflicts and interactions between people's desires for autonomy and self-expression, social expectations for stability and order, and institutional demands for conformity and standardisation. Understanding the complexity of individualization, institutionalisation, and standardisation is essential for fostering a more inclusive and adaptive society and understanding the many biographical patterns that arise.

KEYWORDS:

Individualization, Institutionalization, Standardization, Life situations, Biographical patterns, Personal experiences.

INTRODUCTION

The term "individualization" is overused, confusing, and even repugnant, yet it does refer to something substantial. People have tried to approach it from the perspective of what is significant, or from reality, up to now. The procedure has led to a confusion of this word's meanings. been, to some extent, set aside. Now, using a two-step argument, some conceptual and theoretical explanations will be offered. We'll start by outlining a broad, analytical, ahistorical concept of individualization. Here, much of the traditional debate from Marx through Weber to Durkheim and Simmel can be observed, and possibly some of the key misconceptions can be identified. Second, the earlier debates about post-war circumstances will be expanded upon and defined in respect to this "model." By doing this, the individualization theory will be reduced to its main argument, which is that the developments that have occurred in Germany over the last 20 years (and maybe in other industrialised nations as well) cannot be comprehended in terms of earlier conceptualizations. Instead, it must be seen of as the start of a new form of societalization, a kind of "metamorphosis" or "categorical shift" in the relationship between the person and society [1]–[3].

The Analytical Dimensions of Individualization

A phenomena or creation of the second half of the 20th century, "individualization" is neither. In the Renaissance (Burckhardt), the courtly culture of the Middle Ages (Elias), Protestantism's inward asceticism (Weber), the emancipation of peasants from feudal bondage (Marx), and the slackening of intergenerational family ties (Imhof) during the nineteenth and early twentieth centuries, as well as in mobility processes - the flight from the countryside and the explosive urbanisation - similar "individualised" lifestyle According to Elias (1969), "individualization" in this sense broadly refers to certain subjective-biographical features of the civilization process. Modernization has many other effects than the creation of a centralised state authority, capital concentrations, an ever-tighter web of labour and market linkages, mobility and mass consumption, etc. It also results in a triple "individualization," and with this, we have reached the general model: disembedding, or removal from historically prescribed social forms and commitments in the sense of traditional contexts of dominance and support the "liberating dimension"; loss of traditional security with respect to practical knowledge, faith, and guiding norms the "disenchantment dimension"; and - here, the meaning of the word is essentially reversed “individualization."

These three elements removal (or release), loss of stability, and reintegration are a bottomless well of potential misconceptions in and of themselves. A generic, ahistorical model of individualization may be derived from them. To conceptually separate this, however, with a second dimension specifically, according to one's (objective) living condition and one's (subjective) awareness (identification, personalization) seems vital. If so, the six-field table below yields the following results: One of the most common misconceptions about the term "individualization" comes from confusing it with the top right-hand field. Individualization (also known as personalization, uniqueness, or liberation) and individuation are sometimes used interchangeably. It might be the case. The inverse, however, could also be true. The whole of the right-hand side has received little to no attention so far, if any. This information is enough to fill a book by itself. The arguments have mostly been restricted to the left-hand, objective side. In other words, individualization was seen as a sociological concept that belonged to the tradition of studying biographies and real-world circumstances.That tradition believed it was very good at separating what occurs to individuals from how they respond to it in their behaviour and cognition[4].

DISCUSSION

Individualization Reconsidered

"liberation" will refer to this ambiguous phenomenon; "liberation" in the traditional sense will be translated as "emancipation" (tr.). So far, two liberation focal points have been identified, and two more are starting to take shape for the future (the subject of the following chapter). The withdrawal from status-based classifications, which can be traced all the way back to the beginning of this century but is now taking on a new character, was our first area of worry. These liberations are connected to commitments of social and cultural class in the area of reproduction. The juridification of labour relations, changes in social composition with the preservation of

basic social relations of inequality, and general increases in educational attainment and disposable income are only a few examples of how they go hand in hand with changes in the production domain. Changes in family arrangements, housing circumstances, geographic dispersion, neighbourly ties, leisure activities, club memberships, and other factors might be used to characterise this. This "dissolution of the proletarian milieu" (Mooser 1 983) is revealed by the persistent challenges associated with interpreting models from class and stratification research in a way that is empirically significant in light of tendencies towards differentiation and pluralization. These issues have resulted in a retreat into the ahistorical apriority of class hostility on the one hand, and a meticulously veiled conventionalism in the setting of stratification borders (see Bolte 1883 for the earliest example) on the other[5]–[7]. The alterations in women's circumstances serve as a second area of focus for freedom. Marital support, the material pillar of the conventional housewife's life, has been taken away from women. The whole network of links and support inside families is therefore put under pressure to become more independent. The agreed temporary family's type develops.

There are two more areas of focus for emancipation, in addition to class cultures and the structure of family relationships. They take place as liberations in relation to professions and the company and no longer originate from the realm of reproduction but rather from the sphere of production. We are specifically talking to the decentralisation of the workplace of which electronic home work is an extreme example and the flexibility of working hours. This results in the emergence of new forms of pluralized, flexible underemployment. These lead to issues with assistance for welfare legislation while simultaneously producing new forms of living circumstances and biographical developmental patterns. The summary of the argument up to this point is over. The most pertinent query is: whatever reintegration and control mechanism is related to these developing individual situations? I start out by offering three theses.

The results of individualization are a key characteristic. It is no longer made up for by a social reference group or a conscience collective in the context of cultural life. In a nutshell, social classes no longer replace status groups, and social class obligations are no longer replaced by the family as a reliable frame of reference. The person themselves becomes the social in the lifeworld's reproductive unit. Or, to put it another way, the family disintegrates as the 'penultimate' synthesis of life circumstances between the sexes and the generations, and people both inside and outside the family become the agents of their livelihoods as mediated by the market, as well as of their biographical planning and organisation.

A high degree of standardisation coexists with this diversity of socio-biographical circumstances. Or, to be more accurate, the same media that promote individualization also promote standardisation. This holds true in many ways for the market, money, law, movement, education, and other areas. The labour market has a significant impact on the unique conditions that arise. They are, in a sense, the late product of market reliance during the welfare state period, extending into every aspect of (making a livelihood). They emerge in a society where the market and labour markets are fully developed and where traditional support options are seldom, if ever, remembered. Money's ability to standardise and individualise has previously been clearly shown by Georg Simmel in his essay from 1858a. This is true both for mass consumption that is driven

by money and for "dismissals as well as for the disconnection from and reconnection to market society via education, juridification, scientification, and other processes.

However, the newly emerging individual circumstances are not yet sufficiently covered by the simultaneity of individualization and standardisation. Because they exhibit a unique character. They cover the diverse sectors of the public realm as well as the divided sections of the private sphere. They are now always institutional circumstances as well as just private ones. They exhibit the problematic dual nature of socially dependent personal circumstances. The outward exterior of the institutions transforms into the inside of the personal biography. Their institutional reliance (in the widest sense) leads to the construction of living circumstances that cross institutional borders. Liberated people rely on the labour market, which makes them reliant on welfare state rules and assistance, education, consumption, traffic planning, consumer supply, and opportunities and trends in medical, psychological, and pedagogical counselling and care. Everything above indicates that each situation's control structure is institution-dependent. Dependent on the market, legislation, education, and other factors, individualization becomes the most evolved form of societalization[8]–[10].

The Institutionalization of Biographical Patterns

Class distinctions and familial ties are not totally eliminated throughout the process of individualization. Instead, they become less prominent in relation to the 'centre' of the biographical life plan that is only starting to emerge. Additionally becoming reflective are biographies. People who share the same degree of money, or to put it another way, who belong to the same "class," may or even are forced to choose between various lifestyles, subcultures, social connections, and identities. One can no longer establish one's personal viewpoint, relationships, family situation, social and political ideals, or identity by knowing one's "class" status. New dependencies also develop at the same time.

These reveal the inherent inconsistencies in the process of individualization. Individualization occurs in advanced modernity under the general circumstances of a societalizing process that renders individual autonomy more impractical. In spite of being cut off from traditional ties and systems of support, the person trades these things in for the limitations imposed by the labour market and by being a consumer, along with the standardisations and restrictions they come with. Secondary agencies and institutions, which imprint the biography of the individual and make that person dependent upon trends, social policy, economic cycles, and markets, in opposition to the idea of individual control which establishes itself in consciousness, take the place of traditional ties and social forms (social class, nuclear family).

Thus, it is exactly the individualised private life that depends more and more overtly and strongly on events and circumstances that are entirely outside its control. In parallel, risk conflicts develop that, by nature of their genesis and design, defy individual treatment. As is well known, these cover a wide range of contentious issues that are currently the subject of political and social debate: from the alleged "holes in the social safety net" to wage and working condition negotiations, to thwarting bureaucratic snobbery, offering educational opportunities, resolving traffic issues, guarding against environmental destruction, and so on. Thus, individualization

only occurs when general social circumstances make it more harder for a person to have a private, independent life.

Institutional biographical patterns, such as entrance into and departure from the educational system, entry into and leave from the workforce, or determinations of the retirement age based on social policy, overlap with or replace status-influenced, class-cultural, or family biographical rhythms. As well as in the daily rhythm and economy of time (harmonising familial, educational, and professional life), all of this is present in a longitudinal section of biography (childhood, adolescence, adulthood, retirement, and old age). In the case of the "standard biography" for women, the overlap is particularly evident. Men's biographies are mostly unaffected by family events, whereas women have conflicting double lives that are influenced by both family and organisations. For them, the family rhythm still holds true, and in most instances, the rhythm of their schooling and careers do as well. This leads to conflictual crises and ongoing incompatibilities in their needs.

Individualization entails market reliance in many facets of daily life. The isolated mass market, which is unconscious of itself, and mass consumption of generically built homes, furniture, and everyday items, as well as ideas, habits, attitudes, and lifestyles introduced and embraced via the mass media, are the new forms of existence. In other words, individualization subjects individuals to external standardisation and control that were absent from the family and feudal subcultures. As a result of the ways in which institutions affect people's biographies, rules governing the educational system (such as class schedules), the workplace (such as daily work hours and the overall biography), and the social security system are all intricately linked to particular points in individuals' lives. Institutional judgements and actions are (implicitly) judgements and actions in human lives as well.

By increasing the minimum age for daycare centres, for example, women are forced out of the labour force since it becomes difficult or impossible for them to perform both their maternity and professional commitments. The period of'social old age' is extended for a whole generation as a result of the retirement age being lowered, along with all the possibilities and issues that go along with it. A shift of labour involvement to the next younger generations is achieved concurrently. Thus, the power to institutionalise and shape institutions as well as politically influence lives and living circumstances is exactly what is meant by the term "individualization." The moulding often takes place "unseen," as a "latent side effect" of choices made openly on internal organisational issues (such as the school system, labour market, and job). Television may serve as an illustrative, albeit anecdotal, illustration of this link.

Contrary to appearances, the private sphere is not a zone isolated from the outside world. It is the outside of circumstances and choices made elsewhere in television networks, the educational system, in businesses, on the job market, or in the transportation system turned inside out and rendered private, with a broader disdain for their personal, biographical repercussions. The overlapping and networking of the newly emerging individualised privacy with the seemingly distinct areas and production sectors of education, consumption, transportation, production, the labour market, and other areas is an essential and basic characteristic of social ways of living in the phase of advanced modernity that anyone who does not see misunderstands.

The dependence on the institution expands together with the vulnerability of the new individual circumstances to crises. Institutional reliance only exists in specific priority; it does not exist generally. The labour market is the secret to a living. Education is necessary to be marketable in the job market. Anyone who is denied access to even one of them risks annihilation on the social and material fronts. The situation is just as dire without the appropriate training as it is with it but with no commensurate employment. Those who are turned away from the vocational training system only fall into the social abyss under these circumstances. Thus, whether or not apprenticeships are offered or denied affects whether or not young people join society or leave it. At the same time, 'ups and downs' in the economy or the population may push whole generations out of the mainstream. In other words, during economic and labour market cycles, institutionally dependent individual circumstances result in generation-specific disadvantages or benefits in the corresponding peer group circumstances. These, however, always show up as inadequate care or support provided by governmental institutions, which are then under pressure to either stop the institutionally pre-programmed lack of opportunities for entire generations, life stages, or age groups, or to make up for it with legal restrictions and income redistribution through the welfare state.

Institutions operate inside legally prescribed frameworks of normative lives, to which reality is increasingly deviating. The regular employment relationship serves as the framework for the typical biography. Thus, involvement in wage labour is encouraged by the social protection system. While this is happening, an increasing number of individuals, despite their best efforts, are unable to join the workforce or can only do so very difficultly. Social insurance is based on normative criteria that, given perpetual mass unemployment, have a decreasing likelihood of being met and to which living situations within the family and between men and women have a decreasing likelihood of conforming. A family where the duties of earner and provider, caretaker and child-rearing are shared and swapped, based on stages and choices, has replaced the idea of a family's breadwinner. The widest range of "broken homes" have taken the role of the "intact" family. A divorce law devoted to the female monopoly of child-raising discriminates against the expanding proportion of unmarried men, and so on.

CONCLUSION

Life conditions and biographical patterns are shaped by the interaction of individualization, institutionalisation, and standardisation. Within the context of larger institutional and cultural frameworks, individuals manage their distinctive identities and life paths. Individualization highlights people's desires for autonomy and self-expression, where they want to mould their life to fit their own beliefs, passions, and objectives. However, they also deal with cultural norms and institutional expectations that promote uniformity and standardisation.

REFERENCES

[1] M. Kohli, “Die Institutionalisierung des Lebenslaufs. Historische Befunde und theoretische Argumente,” *Kolner Z. Soz. Sozpsychol.*, 1985.

[2] M. Nico and A. Caetano, “Untying Conceptual Knots: The Analytical Limits of the Concepts of De-Standardisation and Reflexivity,” *Sociology*, 2017, doi: 10.1177/0038038515604107.

[3] M. Bobić, “Stalled de-standardization of partnerships - Case of young people in Serbia | Zaustavljena destandardizacija partnerstva - slučaj mladih u Srbiji,” *Sociologija*, 2012.

[4] M. Bobic, “Stalled de-standardization of partnerships: Case of young people in Serbia,” *Sociologija*, 2012, doi: 10.2298/soc1202351b.

[5] H. J. Andreβ and K. Schulte, “Poverty risks and the life cycle: The individualization thesis reconsidered,” in *Empirical Poverty Research in a Comparative Perspective*, 2019. doi: 10.4324/9780429442001-13.

[6] S. Blake and A. Janssens, “Conscious coupling: Loss of public promises of a life-long bond? An exploration of authenticity and autonomy in commitment processes across contemporary long-term relationship forms,” *Fam. Relationships Soc.*, 2021, doi: 10.1332/204674321X16135119773142.

[7] M. J. Ryan, “Taking dignity seriously: Excavating the backdrop of the eighth amendment,” *Univ. Ill. Law Rev.*, 2016.

[8] R. P. Costa, “Pride and Prejudice in Contemporary Marriages: On the Hidden Constraints to Individualisation at the Crossroad of Tradition and Modernity,” *M/C J.*, 2012, doi: 10.5204/mcj.574.

[9] M. CK, “Nursing, technology, and knowing the patient.,” 2002.

[10] I. Demakova, I. Shustova, and R. Valeeva, “Reconsidered Content of Upbringing in Modern Pedagogy,” 2019. doi: 10.3897/ap.1.e0861.

CHAPTER 2

A BRIEF STUDY ON DE-STANDARDIZATION OF LABOR

Razina Ahmed
Assistant Professor,Department of Law,
Presidency University, Bangalore, India.
Email Id:razina.ahmed@presidencyuniversity.in

ABSTRACT:

De-standardization of labour is a concept that examines changes in work habits and how they affect people's lives and biographical patterns. The transition from standardised, permanent job arrangements to more adaptable, diversified, and unstable types of labour is examined in this abstract. It explores how de-standardization affects people's professional paths, work-life balance, and general well-being. It is essential to comprehend the dynamics of de-standardization of labour in order to meet the possibilities and difficulties given by the changing workplace and to support policies that assist people in adjusting to these changes.

KEYWORDS:

De-standardization of labor, Work, Employment, Work patterns, Life situations, Biographical patterns, Standardization, Flexibility.

INTRODUCTION

There are no historical precedents for the significance that labour has come to have in industrial society. The labour required for survival was assigned to slaves in the city-states of ancient Greece, where it was absorbed in the routine of meeting daily requirements and left no traces other than to provide a livelihood. The people who lived in freedom dedicated themselves to political and artistic endeavours. The division of labour had a distinct connotation even throughout the Middle Ages, when work was still done by hand. Work was beneath the nobility in their eyes. It was a thing for lower echelons. The surest evidence of a failing world was when the male heirs of a revered aristocratic family were forced to engage in a "commoner's profession," such as enter the depths of the legal or medical professions. They would not have grasped the message or the enthusiasm if someone had told them about recent prophecies of the decrease or even extinction of wage labour at that period[1]–[3].

In industrial society, the purpose of labour is not primarily derived from the task that is done. Without a doubt, it stems from the fact that spending labour power is the foundation of earning a livelihood, particularly for the individual way of life. Even yet, this only partially explains the shocks that the announcement of the demise of labour society caused. The industrial age's core tenets of life are wage labour and having a job. This axis, together with the family, makes up the bipolar coordinate system that frames existence in this era. An ideal-typical longitudinal segment of an unharmed industrial world may be used to show this.

Early on, although still wholly devoted to the home, the youngster learns from his or her father that the job is the door to the outside world. Later, schooling continues to be connected to the occupation's missing "other" at all phases. Adult life is entirely controlled by wage labour, not just because of the pressures employment places on one's time, but also because of the time spent outside of work, both before and after, thinking about and making plans for it. Even 'old age' is characterised by non-occupation. Whether or whether they feel old, old age starts when the workplace fires individuals.

Perhaps nothing better illustrates what wage labour means for people's lives in the industrial world than when two strangers first meet and inquire about one another's identity. Instead of responding with their pastime "pigeon fancier" their religious affiliation "Catholic" or with an allusion to notions of beauty"well, you can see I'm a redhead with a full bosom" they respond with the utmost assurance with their line of work "skilled worker for Siemens."

From the System of Standardized Full Employment to the System of Flexible and Pluralized Underemployment

In terms of the previous themes and ideas, the subject of widespread unemployment in the Western industrial states is still being explored. The belief that persistent economic stimulation would lead to a restoration to full employment in the 1990s is still prevalent in practically all political and economic circles. This is a possibility that has not yet been thoroughly considered, either theoretically or politically. We may be at the beginning of a counter-industrial rationalisation process, during which the fundamentals of the previous employment system will be at stake, in addition to restratifications in the structure of occupations and qualifications.

Despite all the disagreement, experts agree on at least one thing: high unemployment in Germany beyond the two million person threshold won't be erased until the 1990s, even with economic growth rates of 2 to 4 percent. Only then, with the arrival of the baby-bust generation, would the potential for "gainfully employed persons" begin to decline, and at the same time, demand for j obs will decline below the level at the beginning of the 1980s. There are many unknowns in this juggling of numbers, including the steadily increasing labour participation of women over time, the extent to which the rapidly expanding use of information technologies and robotic production will be able to offset the jobs that these technologies eliminate with an increase in sales, and finally the possibility of a wholesale shift from full-time employment to the widest possible range of part-time employment.

We must not be misled about the magnitude of these estimates' political relevance by the uncertainty surrounding them. Given that this assessment of the development predicts a protracted dry spell until well into the 1990s, but that following those "lean" years, "fat" years in the labour market can be anticipated once more, it is clear that this does not support (directly or indirectly) a policy of hibernation. This interpretation relieves pressure on policymakers by claiming that all that is required to make things better for the "affected generations" are "transitional measures." Experimenting with the fundamental principles of economic, educational, and labour market policy is not only unnecessary, but it would also be illegal in the long run.

The continuity of the traditional employment system and its pillars firm, job, career, wage labour, etc. are the subjects of this interpretation, which has largely dominated in recent years in both scholarship and politics, and which will be systematically challenged here. According to such understanding, social policy, legislation, and the employment system's reflexive modernisation are not included, nor is the prospect of its constitutional revision due to the rapid modernization of information technology. In what follows, the feasibility of such a systemic transformation of wage labour is to be considered.

I start off on the premise following good old Popper that a theoretical alternative is required for every empirical test, including tests of hypotheses. Thus, the following discussion will only focus on a set of hypotheses that have not yet been properly examined or put to the test but whose main goal is to challenge the prevalent and politically significant theoretical monism of continuity thinking. Future empirical testing of these ideas can only be feasible via the competing interpretations of employment development, continuity and rupture, that will come from this rivalry. This way, it will first be shown what the term "reflexive modernization of wage labour" may entail.

DISCUSSION

In this respect, it may be said that Taylor's "philosophy of dismemberment" is being applied here to the temporal and contractual components of work rather than the substantive parts of labour. Instead of the coupling of labour and machine, this new "Taylorism of employment relations" finds its beginning points in the temporal restriction, legal (non-)protection, and contractual pluralization of the employment of labour. Additionally, there are still plenty of opportunities for flexible employment arrangements based on microelectronics. The key components of this organisational "time puzzle" are flextime which, as of the first half of 1998, applied to over six million workers in Germany and various forms of part-time employment (job-sharing on a weekly or monthly basis, for example), of which more than two million employees, mostly women, currently take advantage.

Businesses are starting preliminary tests on the outsourcing of inferior tasks as a productivity reserve in addition to these options for rationalising work time. This change resulted from the restructuring of secretarial and administrative duties. However, this is a vital option at this stage of the development of productive forces, and following a successful test phase, it could undoubtedly be extended to other functional areas. The ability of microelectronics to decrease or completely remove the need for direct collaboration across related functional areas within the division of labour via the use of information technology is at the core of this. In this sense, the use of telecommunications and the proper storage mediums allows for a generalised temporal and spatial decoupling of labour and production processes and, as a result, new types of decentralised work, of which the much-discussed "electronic cottage industry" represents only one extreme case. The uniqueness in this situation also stems from the fact that the restructuring of the old centralised paradigm of labour organisation occurs at the same time as the growth of the productive forces. Productivity growth and the testing and adoption of novel non-professional and non-shop-based systems for organising human labour continue to represent two sides of the same coin[4]–[6].

On the degree to which contractually unprotected or unorganised kinds of work have already proliferated in Germany (or other Western nations), there is virtually any (accurate) information or statistics accessible. This area of the labour market is a "blank spot" on the study map in terms of its size and distribution according to sector and kind. Approximately 43 000 temporary workers were registered in 1 981 according to Carola Muller's (1 982) statistics on legal labour on temporary contracts.The frequency of illegal temporary employment is thought to be six to nine times greater. It spreads mostly via phoney contracts for activities and services involving foreign labour, particularly in the construction and metal fabrication sectors. She also provides statistics on minimal employment (less than 20 hours per week precludes unemployment benefits, and less than 15 also eliminates health and old age insurance), seasonal employment (full employment of limited duration), and capacity-oriented variable work times [IKapovaz]. The last option is a temporally restricted labour contract with no specified working hours in which the employee must be available on demand; due to its enormous benefits to company, it is undoubtedly becoming more and more common, particularly in the retail sector. Contracts for manufacturing and service must be included as well.

The emergence of powerful forces is what makes the situation combustible. However, according to Marx's theory, the productive forces no longer disintegrate the ownership relations. Marxist thinking would suggest that the revolutionary potential of the productive forces instead poses a risk of "backfiring." It will disrupt the connections between labour contracts and the labour market, as well as the ways in which labour is offered and used in industrial society. As a result, completely new kinds of power imbalances between labour market participants and their interest groups will be produced. Given the interests involved in the current wage labour system as well as their political and organisational clout, it is easy to foresee that this fundamental change of industrial society will face strong opposition and may even last for a substantial amount of time. Because of this, it is currently impossible to predict which aspects of the industrial society's labour system would be impacted by this reflexive modernisation and which ones will be spared. However, the increased productivity of the new system of flexible pluralized underemployment and decentralised forms of labour, which has up to now always been crucial, might be appealing. The "historical superiority" of the new labour system resides in its capacity to re-distribute and even turn the politically risky expression of the growing labour shortage open unemployment into the growth of productive forces. From the viewpoint of the workers, the dangers associated with various types of underemployment conflict with the limited autonomy and independence attained by being able to plan their own life.

It is possible to beat unemployment by switching full-time jobs to part-time ones. The exact reverse might happen. Individualization is forcing more individuals into the workforce. The final dams of the society's constricted labour market burst with the introduction of opportunities for flexible, plural underemployment and temporary employment. The remaining barriers to participation, such as the conflict between working and raising a family or attending school, are eliminated, allowing the women and young people who have been acting as "hidden reserves" to quickly enter the market for flexible underemployment. With the development of adequate resources, the demand may rise excessively; an avalanche of demand might be unleashed, rendering all earlier projections useless[7]–[9].

In the general framework presented here, we are interested in a theory of the self-revolutionizing of the industrial society system at its most developed stage. The industrial forms and course of wage labour are no longer rigidly adhered to by the rationalisation process; instead, it is progressively working against them. The released dynamism of innovation not only recasts the social forms and organisational principles of presupposed categories of labour forces and occupations, but also their quantitative distributions. The continuity and rupture of social development are intertwined and conditional in this theory of reflexive modernization: the rupture from the known industrial standardised system to a future system of pluralized, flexible decentralised underemployment occurs under a constant logic of profit-oriented rationalisation. In the same way that life phases of unemployment have already been incorporated into the standard biographies for significant portions of the population, underemployment, which is the result of the synthesis of full employment and unemployment, is currently being "integrated" into the employment system. An institutional "normalisation" with an open ending corresponds to this biographical "normalisation." Political responses continue to be crucial.Without expanding the social safety net, future destitution is a possibility. A little amount of freedom may be wrested from the development by establishing a legally guaranteed minimum income for everyone[10], [11].

CONCLUSION

The de-standardization of labour refers to the transition away from predictable, standardised employment structures and towards more variable, diversified, and insecure types of work. The living circumstances and biographical patterns of people will be significantly impacted by this transformation. As increasingly nonlinear and unexpected patterns replace typical linear courses, de-standardization of labour has an influence on people's career trajectories. Financial security, skill development, and career growth may all be hampered by a lack of stability and consistency in work. De-standardization also affects work-life balance. The well-being of people and their relationships may be impacted by the blending of work and personal life, unpredictable schedules, and greater responsibilities.

REFERENCES

[1] V. Bobkov and O. Veredyuk, “Employment and labour market: contours of de-standardisation. Academic discussion at the V St. Petersburg international labour forum (St. Petersburg, 23 april 2021),” *Living Stand. Popul. Reg. Russ.*, 2021, doi: 10.19181/lsprr.2021.17.2.11.

[2] E. V. Patrakov, “Digital transformation of the subject of labour: social interactions, concepts, research perspectives,” *Vestn. Kostroma State Univ. Ser. Pedagog. Psychol. Sociokinetics*, 2021, doi: 10.34216/2073-1426-2021-27-2-66-73.

[3] T. López, T. Riedler, H. Köhnen, and M. Fütterer, “Digital value chain restructuring and labour process transformations in the fast-fashion sector: Evidence from the value chains of Zara & H&M,” *Glob. Networks*, 2021, doi: 10.1111/glob.12353.

[4] E. Gasiukova and O. Shkaratan, “Precarity: The Significance of a Controversial Concept,” *Filos. Sociol.*, 2019, doi: 10.6001/fil-soc.v30i2.4018.

[5] R. MacDonald and A. Giazitzoglu, “Youth, enterprise and precarity: or, what is, and what is wrong with, the ‘gig economy’?,” *J. Sociol.*, 2019, doi: 10.1177/1440783319837604.

[6] H. Brückner and K. U. Mayer, “De-Standardization of the Life Course: What it Might Mean? And if it Means Anything, Whether it Actually Took Place?,” *Advances in Life Course Research*. 2005. doi: 10.1016/S1040-2608(04)09002-1.

[7] A. E. B. Amorim, L. C. Labaki, P. A. Maia, T. M. S. Barros, and L. R. Monteiro, “Exposição ocupacional ao calor em atividades a céu aberto na construção de estruturas de edifícios,” *Ambient. Construído*, 2020, doi: 10.1590/s1678-86212020000100371.

[8] L. A. A. Cabral, Z. A. S. G. Soler, and A. D. Wysocki, “Pluralidade do nexo causal em acidente de trabalho/doença ocupacional: estudo de base legal no Brasil,” *Rev. Bras. Saúde Ocup.*, 2018, doi: 10.1590/2317-6369000021516.

[9] K. Evans, I. Schoon, and M. Weale, “Can Lifelong Learning Reshape Life Chances?,” *Br. J. Educ. Stud.*, 2013, doi: 10.1080/00071005.2012.756163.

[10] G. Cellini and A. Scavarda, “The effects of the economic crisis and managerialism in social work: A study of working practices and relationship reshaping,” *Alternativas*. 2020. doi: 10.14198/ALTERN2020.27.01.

[11] M. Goodyear *et al.*, “Platform Architecture,” in *Enterprise System Architectures*, 2019. doi: 10.1201/9780203757239-14.

CHAPTER 3

REFLEXIVE MODERNIZATION: ON THE GENERALIZATION OF SCIENCE AND POLITICS

Shreya
Assistant Professor,Department of Law,
Presidency University, Bangalore, India.
Email Id:shreya@presidencyuniversity.in

ABSTRACT:

In the context of modernisation processes, the idea of reflexive modernization examines the connections between science, politics, and social developments. This abstract examines how scientific knowledge and political institutions develop and affect social change with an emphasis on the generalisation of science and politics. It explores the idea of "reflexive modernization," which places an emphasis on reevaluating and critically analysing current structures and practises. In order to confront the difficulties and possibilities brought by the complex interactions between science, politics, and society, it is essential to comprehend the dynamics of reflective modernisation.

KEYWORDS:

Reflexive modernization, Science, Politics, Societal transformations, Modernization processes.

INTRODUCTION

The main theoretical concept of a reflexive modernization of industrial society was developed in the two sections that came before it along two different lines of reasoning: first on the basis of the logic of risk distribution and then on the basis of the individualization theorem. Theoretically, the process of individualization is seen as the result of reflexivity, in which the welfare state-protected modernization process detraditionalizes the lifestyles ingrained in industrial society. Pre-modernity is replaced by the "tradition" of industrial civilization itself. The nuclear family with its embedded "standard biographies" of men and women, the standardisations of labour, and other aspects of feudal agrarian society were dismantled at the turn of the nineteenth century, and the same is happening to those aspects of developed industrial society today. This dispels a myth from the nineteenth century, the mythology that, which has persisted in shaping ideas and practises in science, politics, and daily life to this day.

A contemporary society in terms of its way of life and work is the industrial society[1]–[3].On the contrary, it is becoming more obvious that the modernity project, which first gained notoriety in the shape of the industrial society, was also institutionally terminated in that form. The perfection of industrial society also entails its subjugation in terms of fundamental concepts, such as the "normality" of earning a livelihood via the labour market's intermediary role. The social underpinnings of class society and the nuclear family are destroyed by the generalisation of the labour market society that is safeguarded by the welfare state. People in this situation get a double shock. The end of "post-history" corresponds with the Joss of historical awareness in their

methods of thinking, living, and working, freeing them from the ostensibly naturally decreed ways of existence and certainties of industrial society.

Traditional methods of dealing with worry and uncertainty in families, marriage, and male-female roles are failing in socio-moral contexts. The ability to deal with fear and insecurity is required of the people themselves to the same extent. As a result of the resulting social and cultural shocks and upheavals, new demands on social institutions in education, counselling, therapy, and politics will inevitably develop.The relationship between wealth generation and risk production serves as another illustration of how the modernization process is reflexive. Not until the modernisation process breaks with tradition,The industrial society's monism, which prioritises wealth distribution above risk distribution when thinking in terms of that society, has weak roots. The ability to manage risks is not what sets the risk society apart from the industrial one, nor is it only the higher quality and wider range of dangers brought on by automation and new technology. Instead, the key finding is that after reflexive social change, the structural social circumstances are drastically altered.

These points will be expanded upon in two different ways.The specializability of scientific knowledge and political action or their capacity to be defined and monopolized—is implicit in all models of industrial society. This is seen, among other places, in the social structures and institutions created for the "political system" and the "system of science." Here, however, the following viewpoint will be developed: Reflexive modernisation that runs into the circumstances of a well-established scientization and a highly developed democracy results in the distinctive Entgrenzungen of science and politics. Monopolies in information and political activity are differentiating, leaving their designated locations, and becoming more widely accessible in a specific, modified fashion. Thus, it is suddenly unclear if family policy is still in charge of determining how people live together outside of democratic agreement and voting or whether human genetic research has already assumed this role. This implies that in addition to the previously established characteristics, the dangers that are now developing are set apart from all prior ones first by their potential to change society and second by their unique scientific makeup[4]–[6].

Science beyond truth and Enlightenment

Primary and reflexive scientization are two constellations that may be distinguished in the interaction between scientific practise and the public sphere, which corresponds to the contrast between modernization of tradition and reflexive modernization of industrial society. Science is first applied to a 'given' universe of nature, people, and society. In the reflective phase, the sciences come across a second creation in civilization, which includes their own goods, flaws, and secondary issues.

The claims of scientific rationality to knowledge and enlightenment are nevertheless protected from the application of scientific scepticism to themselves, according to the developmental logic of the first phase. The second stage is based on a total scientization that extends scientific scepticism to both the internal workings and the effects of science on society. That helps to demystify both its claim to truth and its claim to enlightenment.Within the continuity of

scientization, the movement from one constellation to another occurs, but precisely because of this, new internal and external links between scientific activity are created.

Primary scientification is made dynamic by the contrast between old and new, between laypeople and professionals. The only way that the scepticism in scientific internal relations may be generalised and the authoritarian advancement of scientific findings in external relations is under the circumstances of this demarcation. The industrial society's modernization throughout the first half of the 20th century was characterised by this combination of unwavering trust in science and development, but assurance waned with time. In this stage, science must deal with a practise and a public realm whose opposition it can overcome with the help of its achievements and the assurances of freedom from unacknowledged limitations. The situation changes fundamentally to the point where the reflexive constellation becomes significant (and signs of this can be found in the emergence of cognitive sociology, ideology critique, fallibilism in the theory of science, expert criticism, etc. at the beginning of the 20th century).

The sciences are now faced with their own objectified past and present when they put their theories into practise; they see themselves as the creators of reality and the issues that they must understand and solve. In this sense, they are targeted as both a source of issues and a source of problems' remedies. The sciences must progressively deal with the balance of their successes as well as their failures in practise and in public, or, to put it another way, the reflection of their broken promises. There are many causes for this. When solutions and promises of freedom are put into practise, it appears that the dangers of scientific advancement rise proportionally quicker as success develops. These risks have therefore been the focus of scientific analysis. When solutions and liberation promises are put into practise, they also strongly expose their bad aspects. Paradoxically, the future prospects and potential for the advancement of science are equally connected to its criticism in the scientifically divided and professionally governed world.

In an era when science concentrates on science, the expansion of science presupposes and conducts a critique of science and the current practise of experts, and as a result, scientific civilization is subjected to a publicly transmitted criticism that shakes its foundations and its own selfconception. It exhibits a level of uncertainty about its underlying assumptions and results that is only surpassed by the dangers and developmental viewpoints it shows. In this approach, a process of demystifying the sciences is initiated, which will result in a profound reform of science's organisation, practise, and public domain.

Mechanical testing standards are no longer able to handle the hyper-complexity of hypothetical knowledge. Even stand-in factors like reputation, publication kind and location, and institutional base are ineffective. As a consequence, as scientization advances, the systematically manufactured uncertainty extends to external interactions, and in the opposite way, the target audiences and users of scientific findings in politics, business, and the general public become active coproducers in the social process of knowledge definition. In the sense that they may and must actively control the varied supply of scientific interpretations, the "objects" of scientization also become its subjects. This necessitates not only choosing between divergent, highly specialised validity claims, but also playing them off against one another and, in any event, recombining them into a picture that can be put into action. Reflexive scientization therefore

creates new opportunities for impact and growth in the processes of producing and using scientific findings for the target audiences and appliers of science. This is a very ambivalent development. On the other hand, it shields socially dominant ideologies and interested viewpoints from enlightened scientific claims and opens the door to a feudalization of scientific knowledge practise through economic and political interests and "new dogmas." It offers the possibility of emancipating social practise from science through science.

Primary and Reflexive Scientization

The initial stage of primary scientization, during which laypeople were forced out of their "hunting grounds" and forced back into "reservations" like Indians, has long since come to an end. Along with it, the myth of superiority and the gradient of power that characterised the relationship between science, practise, and the public sphere were also created. Only on the outskirts of modernization, if at all, can the developmental logic of that era be still be detected today after all, it is a major issue of classical sociology.

The tensions and interactions of reflexive scientization have largely taken their place. The scientific civilization has reached a stage when it progressively scientizes not only nature, people, and society but also its own creations, consequences, and errors. Science is now more concerned with the characterization and distribution of mistakes and hazards that it produces on its own, rather than with the "liberation" from pre-existing dependence. Reflexive modernization is characterised by distinct circumstances and procedures, as well as different media and actors, than primary scientization, which was characterised by error management techniques. In the first wave, scientists from other fields could depend on the superiority of scientific rationality and processes of thinking over conventional knowledge bases, folk knowledge, and lay practises, which was sometimes true and other times merely apparent. This advantage is more likely due to the social organisation of how errors and dangers were handled at that time than to a lower degree of error in scientific endeavour.

DISCUSSION

First off, the scientific penetration of a previously unexplored universe allows for a clear distinction between issue solutions and problem causes, where this line runs between the sciences on the one side and their real and projected "objects" on the other. The application of science is done with the mindset that mistakes and issues are clearly objectified. The illnesses, crises, and disasters that humans experience are "to blame" on wild, unrestrained nature and the unbroken compulsions of tradition[7]–[9].

The fact that the sciences did not yet considerably overlap in the sectors in which they were applied is clearly related to this projecting of the causes of issues and mistakes into the as-yet-unexplored scientific wasteland. It also has to do with the systematic organisation of the theoretical and practical causes of mistake within the sciences. One might continue from the position that the history of sciences was always more a history of errors and practical failures than a history of knowledge gain for good reasons. Because of this, scientific "knowledge," "explanations," and "suggested solutions" diverge across time and between locations, schools of thought, cultures, and other factors. As long as the sciences are successful in treating the faults,

errors, and criticism of their practical repercussions primarily inside science, this need not entail any loss in the credibility of scientific rationality claims. On the one hand, they uphold their exclusive claim to rationality against the general public, and on the other, they provide up a venue for critical debates inside the field.

Contrarily, in this social structure, it is also possible to link emerging issues, technical shortcomings, and risks of scientization to prior deficiencies in the level of development of the scientific support system, which can then be translated into new strategies and technological development surges and, ultimately, into a consolidation of the scientific monopoly on rationality. In general, this transformation of errors and risks into openings for growth and perspectives on the advancement of science and technology tended to immunise scientific advancement against the critique of modernity and civilization in the first phase, making it so-called ultra-stable. In reality, however, this stability is founded on a truncation of methodological scepticism; inside the sciences, the standards of critique were generalised while at the same time the scientific findings were imposed towards the outside in an authoritarian way (at least according to the pretence).

Techno-scientific progress, in an interdisciplinary mediation, becomes an issue for itself as a result of scientific discovery and study on modernization hazards; in this context, scientization is scientized as a problem.By extension, all the issues and challenges that exist between the sciences and professions will suddenly surface. Because science is interacting with science in this instance, any scepticism and disdain for one science may be directed towards the other. The options scientists have for resistance counter-criticism, methodological critique, as well as a clubbish "obstructive behaviour" in all the sectors of professional rivalry for resources replace the sometimes equally aggressive and helpless opposition of ordinary people. In this respect, it is only via the criticism and counter-critique of the scientific service systems from many fields that the effects and dangers of modernization can be understood. As a result, the chances for reflexive scientization seem to increase in direct proportion to the dangers and list of modernization's drawbacks, and in inverse proportion to the unwavering trust in advancement of techno-scientific society. criticism of science, criticism of development, critique of experts, and critique of technology are the doors via which hazards may be scientifically opened up and handled. Risks eliminate the chances for internal error correction and compel new arrangements for the division of labour between research, scientific practise, and the public realm.

A scientific profession will have developed over generations with all of its powers (including its scientific ones) to resist "expansionist encroachment" on its own "pet problems" and on its carefully installed "pipeline of research funding," and the revelation of the risks of previous modernization inevitably stirs up the hornets' nest of competitive relations between the scientific professions. As long as the public sensibility towards some problematic aspects of modernization does not grow, turn into criticism and possibly even social movements, articulate itself and discharge itself as protests against science and technology, the social recognition and treatment of risks will run aground on the competitive problems that erupt here and the unresolvable conflicts between schools of thought. Therefore, modernization threats can only be "forced on" or "dictated to" the sciences from outside via widespread awareness. They are founded on

general societal concepts and connections rather than intrascientific assumptions. Even in the sciences, they can only become more powerful by using ulterior motives.

This in turn assumes a hitherto unrecognised power of scientific and cultural criticism, which is predicated at least in part on the acceptance of alternative knowledge. Public risk awareness and risk conflicts will cause forms of scientization of the anti-science movement as a result of reflexive modernisation.

The criticism of development and civilization that we are now witnessing is unique compared to critiques from the previous 200 years. The critique's generalised ideas are confirmed by science, at least in part, and it now challenges science to use its full definition-creating potential. This sets in motion a movement that will compel scientists to publicly demonstrate their awkwardness, all of their shortcomings, and their "birth defects" all of which have long been well-known among themselves. There are emerging 'alternative' and 'advocate science' paradigms that connect the whole 'hocus-pocus of science' to contrasting ideas and viewpoints and, as a result, arrive at completely divergent results. In other words, science drives itself to run its own obstacle course as a result of the scientization of anti-science protest. The foundational flaws of scientific arguments are thoroughly revealed by counter-scientific means, and many disciplines are put to a hitherto unrecognised degree of "politicisation testing" via their practical applications. New, public-oriented scientific specialists also emerge in these developments.

In addition to experiencing a fast loss of public trust, science also gains access to new areas of endeavour and application. For instance, the scientific and engineering sciences have been able to adapt to many of the critiques the public has levelled at them and turn them into possibilities for growth. The conceptual, instrumental, and technical distinctions between "still" or "no longer" bearable dangers, health concerns, labour strains, and so on are the subject of these complaints. Here, the paradoxical state that scientific progress has reached in its reflective phase becomes palpable: the critique of earlier advancements that has been widely disseminated now serves as a driving force for growth.

According to this developmental logic, modernization risks are created through a contentious interaction between science, scientific practise, and the public sphere, then played back into science, causing "identity crises," new organisational structures, new theoretical underpinnings, new methodological advancements, and other problems. Errors and danger are therefore assimilated into society as a whole, so to speak, and take place, among other things, in conflict and fusion with social forces that are anti-science and anti-modernization.But one shouldn't be fooled since despite all the inconsistencies, a road of scientific advancement has been pursued. Under the circumstances of reflexive scientization, public debate of modernization risks is the path for the conversion of errors into chances for growth[10], [11].

CONCLUSION

The reciprocal interaction between science, politics, and society changes is highlighted by reflexive modernisation. A key factor in determining societal development and the course of modernization processes is the generalisation of science and politics. Understanding the complexity of the world and guiding policy choices are based on scientific knowledge. Science is

generalised when it is shared across a variety of fields, allowing it to be included into political discourse and decision-making processes. On the other hand, political structures influence the context in which science functions and how its findings are used. The democraticization of decision-making procedures, the inclusion of other viewpoints, and the critical analysis of current structures and practises are all necessary for the generalisation of politics.

REFERENCES

[1] B. Adam, "Reflexive Modernization Temporalized," *Theory, Cult. Soc.*, 2003, doi: 10.1177/0263276403020002004.

[2] B. Bos and J. Grin, "'Doing' reflexive modernization in pig husbandry: The hard work of changing the course of a river," *Sci. Technol. Hum. Values*, 2008, doi: 10.1177/0162243907306697.

[3] N. Rönnström, "From globalist to cosmopolitan learning: On the reflexive modernization of teacher education," *Ethics Glob. Polit.*, 2012, doi: 10.3402/egp.v5i4.20305.

[4] H. Yamashita, "Living together with seawalls: risks and reflexive modernization in Japan," *Environ. Sociol.*, 2020, doi: 10.1080/23251042.2019.1709680.

[5] D. Farrugia, "Addressing the problem of reflexivity in theories of reflexive modernisation: Subjectivity and structural contradiction," *J. Sociol.*, 2015, doi: 10.1177/1440783313480396.

[6] R. Gale, "Environmental management accounting as a reflexive modernization strategy in cleaner production," *J. Clean. Prod.*, 2006, doi: 10.1016/j.jclepro.2005.08.008.

[7] M. Wiatr, "The Ambiguous Meanings of Parental Engagement in the Reflexive Modernization Era : Parental Educational Initiatives in Poland," *Int. J. about Parents Educ.*, 2020.

[8] M. van den Berg and C. L. ter Hoeven, "Madonna as a symbol of reflexive modernisation," *Celebr. Stud.*, 2013, doi: 10.1080/19392397.2013.791042.

[9] D. F. Lawson, K. T. Stevenson, M. N. Peterson, S. J. Carrier, R. Strnad, and E. Seekamp, "Intergenerational learning: Are children key in spurring climate action?," *Global Environmental Change*. 2018. doi: 10.1016/j.gloenvcha.2018.10.002.

[10] D. Demeritt, "Science studies, climate change and the prospects for constructivist critique," *Econ. Soc.*, 2006, doi: 10.1080/03085140600845024.

[11] B. Gleeson, "Reflexive modernization: The re-enlightenment of planning?," *Int. Plan. Stud.*, 2000, doi: 10.1080/135634700111846.

CHAPTER 4

A BRIEF STUDY ON DEMONOPOLIZATION OF SCIENCE

Mathew Sinu Simon
Assistant Professor,Department of Law,
Presidency University, Bangalore, India.
Email Id:mathew.simon@presidencyuniversity.in

ABSTRACT:

In order to promote more openness, inclusion, and democratisation in scientific research and information creation, the notion of demonopolization of science examines efforts to destroy monopolies. The problems and prospects of demonopolization are examined in this abstract, including lowering entrance barriers, fostering diversity and multidisciplinary cooperation, and improving the accessibility and openness of scientific data. In order to encourage innovation, resolve power disparities, and advance social well-being via the democratisation of information, it is essential to comprehend the processes of demonopolization in science.

KEYWORDS:

Demonopolization, Science, Monopolies, Openness, Inclusivity, Democratization.

INTRODUCTION

The sciences have been dethroned not by their failure but by their triumph. One may even argue that the sciences' initial validity claims have been relativized considerably more quickly and comprehensively the more effectively they have worked in the twenty-first century. In this sense, scientific progress in the second half of this century is experiencing a rupture in its continuity, not only in its external relations as has already been demonstrated, but also in its internal relations (as will be demonstrated here): in its conception of itself, both socially and theoretically, in its methodological underpinnings, and in its relationship to application[1]–[3]. The fundamental scientization paradigm is predicated on the 'naivete' that the scientific method's systematic scepticism can be institutionalised while being constrained to its subject matter. Both the theoretical underpinnings of science and any queries about the practical implementation of scientific findings are immune to scepticism. What is open to questioning inquiries and internal scepticism is outwardly dogmatized.

This conceals not just the distinction between "action-free" research practise and the limitations on action imposed by politics and practise, where scepticism must be curbed as a requirement of the system and substituted by explicit plans of action. This division of scientific rationality along the lines separating the internal and exterior accords particularly with the goals of scientific specialist groups in the market and in professionalisation. No matter how brilliantly progressed, the consumers of scientific services and information do not pay for mistakes that have been confessed or discovered, disproved theories, or self-doubt, but rather for "knowledge." Only those who are successful in making knowledge claims in the marketplace against rival professional and lay organisations will ever acquire the resources and institutional requirements

to engage in the internal "luxury of scepticism" (also known as fundamental research). In order to succeed in the market, what must be generalised from a reasonable standpoint must be changed into the contrary.

In the'successful' scientization process, dogmatizing and the art of questioning complement and conflict with one another. While outward success depends on the planned manufacture, worship, and tenacious defence of the "infallibility claims" of those same demigods against any "suspicions of irrational criticism," internal success is dependent on the destruction of the "demigods in lab coats." It would be the height of stupidity to overlook in practise that results that are always "errors subject to recall" based on the circumstances under which they were generated must also be turned into "knowledge" with everlasting validity.

In this approach, the dominant scientization paradigm has always blended modernity with counter-modernity in a paradoxical fashion. The unbreakable rules of critique were split, and their scope of applicability was reduced. The generalisation of uncertainty that is raised to the norm internally contrasts curiously with the absoluteness of the knowledge claims that were asserted in external connections. Everything that has recently come into touch with science is intended to be malleable, with the exception of scientific reason itself. These restrictions on the illimitable are not arbitrary; rather, they are called for by logic. They alone provide science its advantage over prevalent customs and common practises in terms of cognition and social standing. Critical knowledge claims and professionalisation initiatives can only be (contradictorily) linked together in this manner.

There are two effects of this evaluation. First, it is important to recognise that the process of scientization from the nineteenth century to the present may also be seen as a dogmatization, a preparation for the unquestionable truth asserted by the "dogmas" of science. Second, unlike the dogmas (of religion or tradition) that science overcame, the "dogmas" of primary scientization are rather unstable since they include the criteria for their own analysis and eradication. By maintaining its triumphs, scientific progress in this way contradicts its own boundaries and tenets. A totally new scenario develops as a result of the victory and extension of scientific argumentation standards. Science loses its initial claims of validity while also becoming vital. Equally, "practical problems" are sparked. A deterioration in science's power results from a carefully sought loss of security in both its internal and external relationships. As a consequence, there are conflictual equalisation tendencies in the gradient of rationality between professionals and laypeople of which, among many other things, the rise in "medical malpractice" lawsuits is a good evidence. Additionally, terms like modernism and tradition, professionals and laypeople, or the creation and implementation of results which are often used to reflect the power gradient fail. The lines of (a) the theory of science and (b) the practise of research might be used to trace this unbinding of scepticism under the circumstances of reflexive scientization.

Fabulism in the Theory of Science

For its part, this shift from primary to reflexive scientization is institutionalised and carried out scientifically. The disciplines of the critical application of science to itself the theory of science and the history of science, cognitive sociology and the sociology of science, psychology and

empirical ethnology of science, and so on are the agents of rupture. Since the turn of the century, these disciplines have been chipping away at the self-dogmatization of scientific rationality with varying degrees of success. On the one hand, these disciplines are practised professionally and institutionally, specifically in accordance with the still-true claims of the primary scientization model. On the other hand, they negate the conditions of their application, and in this way, they are the antecedents of the self-critical variant of reflexive scientization. In this regard, "alternative science" is not a product of the 1960s or 1970s.

It has rather always been a part of the scientific programme. The Marxian criticism of "bourgeois science" was one of the earliest instances of "alternative expertise" in this sense, with long-lasting ramifications up to the present. It already contained the entire tension between one's own case-specific faith in science and the generalised ideology critique of existing science, which was later presented in ever-new variations, such as Mannheim's cognitive sociology, Popper's falsificationism, or Kuhn's historical critique of normativism in the theory of science. This gradual "nest-fouling" is caused by fallibilism, which was first only partly institutionalised, being consistently applied to itself. And instead of progressing smoothly, this self-criticism process resulted in the persistent failure of many efforts to preserve the "core rationality" of the scientific activity. There are several situations where this eventually blasphemous "conjectures and refutations" process may be seen. The debate of scientific theory in this century, however, is the only place where it is used in such a model manner[4].

DISCUSSION

Fabibilism in Research Practice

Absolutely nothing. Science has recently lost the truth in its advancement, much like a student losing his milk money. In the last three decades, science has transformed from a pursuit of truth to an activity without it, but one that must maximise the societal advantages of knowledge. Scientific theory has undoubtedly led to hypothesis, self-doubt, and tradition in scientific practise.Internally, science has moved back towards making judgements. Externally, hazards are everywhere. Science no longer benefits from reason either internally or outside. It has grown to be both unable and vital to the truth.

There is no chance occurrence or accident here. Truth has travelled the typical modernist path. Through reflexive scientization, the scientific religion of determining and announcing truth has been secularised. Neither experimentally nor in the context of science theory, the truth claim of science has survived incisive self-examination. On the one hand, science's assertion that it can provide an explanation for the world has been reduced to a guess known as a hypothesis. However, reality has dissolved into the data that is created. Thus, "fact - s" The old focal points of "reaTify" are the results of rules for obtaining and omitting information, and they are rioihfrig buf replies to questions that might have been posed in a different way. A distinct "reality" is created by a different computer, expert, or organisation. If it didn't already exist, it would be a miracle rather than a scientific discovery. It would be equivalent to dismembering a body to provide yet another example of the absurdity of (natural) scientific research practises.It's nearly as awkward to ask a scientist about truth as it is to ask a clergyman about God. Speaking the term

"truth" in scientific contexts as opposed to, say, "reality" denotes illiteracy, mediocrity, and the careless usage of imprecise, emotive phrases from the English language.

It was hard to modify once one had it or had uttered it, yet it changed constantly. Humanity is embracing science. It is filled with blunders and errors. Even if there is no truth, science can still be done; in fact, it can be done better, more honestly, versatilely, audaciously, and boldly. The contrary is attractive and constantly offers opportunity. The landscape is starting to take on colour. There are fifteen divergent viewpoints when three scientists gather.

The Feudalization of Cognitive Practice

The use of scientific findings to define reality as it applies to society is becoming more and more important, but also less and less adequate. This discrepancy between essential and sufficient requirements, as well as the accompanying grey space, show how science has lost functioning in its primary task of representative knowledge determination. The target audiences and users of scientific findings in politics, business, the media, and daily life become more reliant on scientific arguments generally, while also becoming more independent of specific findings and the assessment of science as to the veracity and reality of its claims.

The seeming contradiction is that the differentiation of the sciences is founded on the transmission of knowledge claims to outside authorities. It begins with the hyper-complexity and variety of findings, which, while not directly contradicting one another, do not complement one another either. Instead, they typically assert different, sometimes even incomparable things. As a result, the practitioner is essentially forced to make his own cognitive decisions. Additionally, they claim to be semi-arbitrary, a claim that is often refuted in actual circumstances but nevertheless manifests itself in the disagreement among the many conclusions and the methodological reliance on precedents and judgements. Conversely, the "yes, but," "on the one hand, on the other hand," and other adverbs that constantly characterise hypothetical science provide choices for choosing in the concept of knowledge[5]–[7].

The deluge of discoveries, together with their inconsistency and overspecialization, transform receipt into participation and an independent process of knowledge construction that is both pro and anti-scientific. Now, one may assert that it has always been such. Science and politics or business have always existed apart from one another. Two of the anomalies listed above, however, vanish beneath the table in the process. Science creates this kind of independence. It emerges from science's excess, which has simultaneously scaled down its own demands into the hypothetical, and provides a visual representation of the plurality of self-relativizing interpretations.

approach to methodological conventionalization with an implicit f euda/ization of its cognitive practise. A new particularism in external connections thus emerges when groups of scientists, both big and small, separate themselves from one another and coalesce around tacit application goals. The key point is that this happens not only afterwards, in real-world interactions, but already in the research laboratory, in scientists' offices, and in the private space where they create their scientific findings. It is crucial for social agents to ensure access to "science as a definitionmaking power," whether for minimization, distraction, redefinition, or for the

dramatisation or blocking of "external interference in definitionmaking," given that risks associated with technological and scientific production are becoming increasingly unpredictable and strongly influencing public consciousness.

The confidence in science or the faith in alternative science or this technique, this approach, this orientation becomes crucial where science used to be able to convince as science in light of the contradicting clamour of scientific languages. Perhaps the only "extra" that will provide the "individual finding" access to the social characteristic of "knowledge" is presentation, personal persuasiveness, connections, or other factors of a similar kind. Where religion (helps) decide on scientific reasoning, it might quickly regain dominance obviously, not as faith in its exterior form anymore, but as science. The widest diversity of beliefs will therefore re-establish themselves in the impending interregnum, when science is no longer adequate to produce knowledge but is nevertheless essential for its creation. That opens the door to a wide range of possibilities, including fatalism, astrology, occultism, ego worship, and ego sacrifice mixed in with meticulously researched scientific conclusions and confidence in science. Since they discovered their "truth" and their followers via contact with science rather than prior to it, these new alchemists seem to be impervious to the criticism of science.

This scientific immunity does not simply hold true in these severe situations. Generally speaking, beliefs and biases may now defend themselves against science because they have been scientifically empowered. They use science itself as a defence against its assertions. Simply reading more, including the alternative research, is necessary. The concerns are addressed in advance, so to speak, before the outcomes. Having a few simple (methodological) objections on ready for each situation is sufficient to cause this or that piece of stubborn scientific news to fall apart on its own. Science could rely on an uncontroversial public that supported it up until the 1960s, but now its efforts and advancement are viewed with suspicion. People assume the worse when the unspoken is combined with adverse consequences.

There are unchangeable taboos everywhere in the techno-scientific civilisation. The scientist seeking a "neutral" understanding of issues becomes entangled in a new kind of conundrum in this jungle where it is forbidden to admit the reality of things that are the results of acts. Every analyst must choose whether to do research into action factors or around the social tabooization of those variables. These decision-making options have an impact on the investigation's design (even when they are mandated by the employer); as a result, they are situated in the most crucial area of scientific practise. This includes the type of inquiry, the choice of variables, the scope and direction of pursuing hypotheses, the conceptual design, the techniques for calculating "risks," etc.

The results of these research judgements are naturally rather estimable, in contrast to the effects of primary scientization. Determinations of risk now have a direct impact on the central power zones - business, politics, institutional control agencies if the latter were outside industry and production in the (powerless) latent regions of society the health of people and environment. These undoubtedly have the 'institutionalised attentiveness' and 'collective clout' to draw attention to any expensive side effects on themselves. Thus, the 'invisibility' of dangers is strongly constrained in accordance with social circumstance. The ‘secondary character' of the

impacts has the same meaning. Risk research or a supporting section is officially qualified to handle the observation of development. Both the legal foundation and the rules are well-known. Everyone is generally aware of what toxic concentrations and permissible limit violations may have significant legal and financial repercussions.

However, this results in hazards being scientized; the assessability of side effects is changed from an external to an inside issue, from an application problem to a knowledge problem. The outside has vanished. The effects are felt within. Origin and application contexts converge. Thus, the issue of knowledge and the problem of application are simultaneously raised by the autonomy of research. The potential breaking of taboos becomes a necessary component of both successful and unsuccessful research. This may still be lurking in the ambiguous area where research choices may be taken in either direction. If research is not ready to jump through all the hoops at the first crack of the whip, it must place itself in a position to embrace and carefully explore the political implications it has from its institutional, scientific, theoretical, and moral structure.

At the same time, it becomes apparent that the scientific cognitive practice's prospects for impact and direction lay in its selection field, which has so far been disregarded by the theory of science due to validity considerations and received no appraisal. As long as one's own conjectures are proved, the chain of causation may be projected in very varied directions without running afoul of any validity rules, according to the dominant theories of hypothesis development. Scientific cognitive practise in developed civilizations evolves into an unconscious, objectivize manipulation of latently political factors, concealed behind the facade of voluntary choices that are not susceptible to justification. This does not imply that objectification is not possible. It also does not imply that political manipulation of the presumptive causal linkages is possible. Obviously, causation and action analysis are intertwined regardless of how scientists see themselves. The politicisation of the causal analysis of risk is caused by the twofold, created reality of risk. The law of the unseen side effect continues to rule the advancement of civilisation when science undertakes study under these circumstances in accordance with taboos from a misinterpreted "neutrality."

CONCLUSION

A campaign to dismantle monopolies and promote more openness, inclusion, and democratization in scientific research and information creation is known as the "DE monopolization of science."Barriers to entry may be lowered, allowing for more involvement and access to resources and opportunities, by challenging and destroying monopolies in research. This encourages variety in viewpoints, subject matter, and methodology, which may boost creativity and the quality of scientific findings.Demonopolization promotes multidisciplinary cooperation by bringing academics from other domains together to tackle difficult problems and provide fresh ideas. The growth of knowledge and the creation of comprehensive solutions are both facilitated by this cross-pollination of ideas and skills.

REFERENCES

[1] R. B. Serafica, “Was PLDT a natural monopoly? An economic analysis of pre-reform Philippine telecoms,” *Telecomm. Policy*, 1998, doi: 10.1016/S0308-5961(98)00015-9.

[2] A. G. Lisitsin-Svetlanov, “Lisitsin-Svetlanov Andrey G. Doctor of Law, Professor Member of the Russian Academy of Sciences,” *Energy law forum*, 2021, doi: 10.18572/2312-4350-2020-4-7-12.

[3] S. Roché, “Vers la démonopolization des fonctions régaliennes: Contractualisation, territorialisation et Européanisation de la sécurité intérieure,” *Rev. Fr. Sci. Polit.*, 2004, doi: 10.3917/rfsp.541.0043.

[4] J. M. Nawrot, “The Regulatory Function of Public Administration: A Study of the Science of Administrative Law and the Science of Administration (Rafał Stasikowski, Funkcja Regulacyjna Administracji Publicznej: Studium Z Zakresu Nauki Prawa Administracyjnego Oraz Nauki Administracji),” *SSRN Electron. J.*, 2012, doi: 10.2139/ssrn.1874823.

[5] A. Mayer, “Princes of Igboland: inchoate feudalization, feudal masculinity and postcolonial patriarchy in Ifeoma Okoye’s radical feminist narratives,” *African Identities*, 2020, doi: 10.1080/14725843.2020.1773239.

[6] W. Yaworsky and D. Wladyka, “War in the feudal zone: State failure and the abandonment of anthropological research in Mexico and Central America,” *War Soc.*, 2018, doi: 10.1080/07292473.2017.1412188.

[7] Z. Simonovic and N. Curcic, “Theban cadastre as a tax document of the imperial administration and an example of feudalization of Byzantine agriculture,” *Zb. Matice Srp. za Drus. Nauk.*, 2020, doi: 10.2298/zmsdn2076499s.

CHAPTER 5

PLEA FOR A PEDAGOGY OF SCIENTIFIC RATIONALITY

Ummul Waraah
Assistant Professor,Department of Law,
Presidency University, Bangalore, India.
Email Id:ummulwaraah@presidencyuniversity.in

ABSTRACT:

This abstract makes a case for a pedagogy of scientific rationality, highlighting how crucial it is to encourage scientific literacy, evidence-based reasoning, and critical thinking in the classroom. It investigates the function of education in fostering people's capacity to interact with and comprehend scientific information, motivating them to create wise judgements and take part in the scientific method. In building a scientifically educated society and tackling complicated social concerns, the abstract stresses the advantages of a pedagogy of scientific rationality.

KEYWORDS:

Pedagogy, Scientific rationality, Critical thinking, Evidence-based reasoning, Scientific literacy, Education.

INTRODUCTION

Science's rationality and irrationality are concerns not just with the past, present, and potential future. We are able to grow from our errors, which also implies that a different science is always conceivable. Not only a different theory, but also a different theory of cognition, a different connection between theory and practise, and a different application of this relationship. The era of the counter-hypothesis is now, if it is true that the present is nothing more than a hypothesis that we have not yet exceeded.need first aid. It poses a risk of suffocating from its own peculiarities. The current state of science is one of them. The creation of objective limitations and "unforeseeable side effects" of technological activity must be the focus of any theory of the objective restrictions of technological action. The framework of activity, including the self-concept of the sciences themselves, must also include the lever for avoiding and cancelling the fatalism of results. Criteria for how the unpredictable nature of consequences is produced and can be avoided must be found there, not according to scientific practise, but within it, in what it considers noteworthy or not, how it asks questions and casts the "nets" of its causal hypotheses, and how it decides on the validity of its conjectures.

We must, in a sense, put brakes and a steering wheel into the 'non-steering' of the racing technoscientific growth that is unleashing explosive forces by altering its self-concept and political organisation. The aforementioned factors assumed rather than proved that this was achievable. At least the conditions for this idea are straightforward: science must be seen as one of the sources of the objective restrictions that give birth to the overall uncertainty. It has to alter its self-concept in a way that is realistically effective to remove that ambiguity. It is yet possible that reason, which was suppressed in science, might be awakened and mobilised in opposition to

it. Through a criticism of its historical self-conception, science may transform itself and theoretically and practically resurrect the enlightenment[1]–[3].

The question of whether and how it will be possible to institutionalise such a transformed practise of science, whether of data production or of the "theoretical gymnastics on semantic branches" (Mayntz 1 980), and to reconnect scientific work at the level of its methodological reflection and self-criticism to reality in a way yet to be laid out, is a key driver for the solution of this demand. In light of the points made, it is clear that the sciences' ability to be autonomously critical and practical depends on the proof of theoretical linkages. However, it also implies that the idea of empiricism has to be reconsidered and reassessed, namely from a theoretical and historical standpoint. We can no longer assume what empiricism "is" because of the degree of uncertainty that science has created; instead, we must conceptualise it philosophically. The hypothesis is that only in an empiricism-based theory can the speculative capacity of mind be connected back to "reality," while also outlining and defining the complementary functions of theory and empiricism in their cooperation and antagonism.

This is where social scientists can help. They would be responsible for promoting the liberation of science from its self-imposed blindness to dangers and immaturity. There isn't a recipe for this anywhere, and there isn't much guidance either. The driving issue, at least in the case of the social sciences, is: How can social science and social experience be coupled to one another in such a manner that the range of unintended secondary implications is diminished? And how can sociology, despite its division into several disciplines of study, be brought to contribute to the context's scientific specialisation essentially, this was its original objective. The goal is to develop a scientific rationality pedagogy that views that rationality as something that can be changed by discussion of one's own opinions.The knowledge claim of science becomes a future goal that cannot be proven or achieved just from the forms of the present, in contrast to the situation of the theory of science, which assumes and seeks to rebuild the rationality of science from its historical status quo.

No more than the denial of Newtonian mechanics signified the demise of physics, the demonstration of the absurdity of the dominant scientific practise does not spell the death of science. The prerequisite for such evidence is to apply the conventional skills of substantive critique and learning from research practise to the theoretical underpinnings of knowledge and its practical application. That would entail elevating the modernization process' latent reflexivity into the realm of science at the same time. But this term also takes on a different connotation when modernism comes into contact with it. The desire in mastery that is transmitted in this manner loses its technical hold and takes on the shape of "self-control" and "selflimitation" in the social and political application of modernity to itself. The chance for practical selfdomestication and self-alteration of the techno-scientific'second nature', its modes of thinking and labour, may also present itself amid the turbulence of conflicts and fresh ideological disagreements.

Opening Up The Political

The risk society is fundamentally distinguished from all other epochs (including industrial society) by a Jack: the difficulty of an external attribution of dangers. That is to say, hazards are

decisions-dependent, industrially created, and hence politically reflexive. Unlike past civilizations and stages of social evolution, which all faced dangers in different ways, modern society faces threats via its interactions with hazards. Risks are a manifestation of highly developed production forces and a reflection of human acts and inactions. As a result, risk now comes from knowledge rather than ignorance, from a perfected understanding of nature rather than from something beyond human comprehension, and from the set of rules and standards that were put in place with the advent of the industrial era. Even its opposite, the tradition to be broken and the natural limitation to be surpassed, has been replaced by modernity. It has evolved into both a menace and a promise of freedom from the danger it produces for itself. Risks become the driver of modernity's self-politicization in industrial society as a result, which will be the focus of this chapter. In addition, in the risk society, the idea, location, and medium of politics change[4]–[6].

DISCUSSION

Politics and Sub-Politics

Four theses will be used to outline this evaluation of how politics have changed in the risk society. The idea of the connection between social change and political orientation first appeared in the industrial society project based on the concept of the "divided citizen." at all spheres of political will formation, the latter exercises his democratic rights as a citizen on the one hand, and as a bourgeois on the other, he protects his own interests at the workplace and in business. A politico-economic system is distinguished from a techno-economic system in a similar manner. The engagement of people in representative democratic institutions (parties, parliaments, etc.) is the axis around which politics revolves.Making decisions and using political power as a result adhere to the rules of law and the idea that dominance and power can only be used with the permission of the governed.

In contrast, bourgeois behaviour and the areas of techno-economic interest pursuit are seen as outside of politics. The foundation of this design is the equating of technological and social growth, followed by the presumption that technological advancement and its outcomes are governed by more or less insurmountable techno-economic objective limits. Technological advancements improve both the personal and societal well-being. These increases in the level of life have traditionally been used to justify the bad repercussions deskilling, dangers of unemployment or transfer, hazards to health, and natural disaster. Even disagreement about the "social consequences" has little impact on the success of technological and economic progress. Due to its fundamental separation from democratic administrative processes and the lengthy implementation times, this mechanism still lacks political legitimacy; in fact, it has an enforcement authority that is essentially impervious to criticism. Voting is replaced with progress. In addition, progress substitutes for inquiries and functions as a kind of permission for unstated and unintended outcomes[7]–[9].

In this way, the industrial society project divides the innovation process, which modernity forces against tradition's supremacy, into two democratic halves. The political system only encompasses a portion of the decision-making abilities that make up society and is governed by parliamentary

democracy. Another portion is transferred to business investment freedom and scientific research freedom and removed from the regulations governing public scrutiny and justification. Social changes in these settings are relegated to being unintended consequences of technological and scientific choices. People act in a totally different way: by asserting themselves in the market, according to the principles of profit-making, and advancing scientific and technological investigation, they change the parameters of daily life.

The establishment of political parliamentary democracy and the establishment of an unpolitical, non-democratic social change under the justification of "progress" and "rationalisation" are two opposing processes for organising social change that interact with the globalisation of industrial society. The two interact with one another in a way that resembles counter- and modernity. On the one hand, the production cycle of business, technology, and industry is functionally assumed by the political system's institutions parliament, government, political parties in a way that is constrained by the system. In contrast to the most basic principles of democracy knowledge of the objectives of social change, debate, vote, and consent this pre-programs the permanent alteration of all spheres of social life under the false guise of technological and economic development.

(2) Looking back, we can say that this division between politics and nonpolitics in the modernization process was based in at least two crucial historical presuppositions that have been called into question in all Western industrial states since the 1970s. A level of development of the productive forces and scientization whose potentials for change neither exceed the radius of possible political actions nor cancel the basis of the legitimacy of the model of social change through progress. These are: (a) the social obviousness of inequalities in class society, which has given meaning and impetus to the expansion of the welfare state. Over the last 20 years, these criteria have weakened as a result of reflexive modernisation. The welfare state has abandoned its idealistic ideals in order to establish itself. At the same time, its limitations and flaws have come to light. But those who solely bemoan and condemn the political stalemate that resulted ignore the reality that the contrary is also true.

Society is shaken by waves of recently revealed or coming developments. They will likely eclipse all previous reform initiatives in terms of scale and depth. Thus, rapid changes in the techno-economic system that challenge human inventiveness and bravery are undermining the political impasse. Science fiction is gradually being remembered as a bygone era. Deceptive 'political' standoff perception. It only exists because politics is restricted to what is branded as political and to the operations of the political system. Regardless matter how one judges it, if one views it more widely, one can see that society is mired in a sea of upheaval that well merits the label "revolutionary." However, this social revolution takes the shape of the non-political. In this sense, the dissatisfaction with politics stems from the imbalance between an authority to act that plays the political game and is eroding in power and a general change in society that is closed off to social decision-making and is advancing silently but unabatedly under the guise of the non-political. Consequently, the distinction between the political and the non-political conceptions is muddled and has to be carefully revised.

In a twofold sense, these developments the decline of welfare state interventionism as a result of its success and the waves of massive technical progress with unidentified future dangers add up to a loosening of politics. A new political culture citizens' initiative groups and social movements and new demands for political engagement outside the political system are the results of established and used rights, which on the one hand restrict freedom of action inside the political system. In this sense, the loss of governmental structuring and enforcing powers is not a sign of political failure but rather the outcome of established democracy and the welfare state, where citizens can make use of all available channels for public and legal control and consultation to protect their interests and rights.

Parallel to the expansion of its capacity for change and danger, non-politics. The structures that had previously politically neutralised the innovation process start to fall apart as the outlines of an alternative society start to emerge outside of parliamentary debates and executive decisions and instead in the application of microelectronics, reactor technology, and human genetics. At the same time, technoeconomic activity is nevertheless protected from legislative demands for legitimacy by its own constitution. Thus, technological advancement occupies a middle ground between politics and non-politics. As a result, it develops into a third entity with the unstable hybrid status of a sub-politics, where the magnitude of the social changes it causes fluctuates inversely with its legitimacy. As risks increase, their technological and economic objective limits are removed from the contexts, circumstances, and mediums of their creation and interpretation.

Legally compliant governmental oversight organisations and a risk-averse media publicity sphere start to infiltrate and control the "intimate sphere" of plant management. The trajectory of development and the effects of technological change become legitimate topics for discussion. Thus, commercial and technological advancements get a new political and moral dimension that previously appeared foreign to technological advancements in the economy. If one so desired, one might assert that the economic devil must anoint himself with the holy water of public morality and don a halo of social and environmental awareness.

In this manner, a movement is started that opposes the welfare state project's success in the first two thirds of this century. Since politics later inherited the 'interventionist state's' power potentials, the capacity to structure society is now moving from the political system into the parallel system of scientific, technical, and economic modernization. Politics and non-politics are inextricably reversed. The non-political becomes political, and the political turns non-political. Paradoxically, the more mindlessly the division of labour between political and non-political social transformation is adhered to, the more firmly this role reversal beneath unchanging facades continues. Promoting and defending "scientific progress" and "the freedom of science" turns into a greasy pole on which the primary responsibility for political decisions is transferred from the democratic political system into the realm of economic and techno-scientific nonpolitics, which lacks democratic legitimacy. Under the guise of normalcy, a revolution takes place that is immune to interference but yet requires justification and application to a sceptical populace.

This discovery is extremely important and troubling. Politics had been able to establish and retain a relative autonomy against the techno-economic system inside the welfare state project in

order to engage in political interference in market events. Now, on the other hand, the political system is in danger of losing its authority while its democratic constitution is still in effect. The political institutions take on the role of administrators for a development that neither they nor their ability to organise could have foreseen, but which they nonetheless need to justify.

On the other hand, choices made in business and research are essentially political in nature and lack any justification from the actors. Decisions that alter society become silent and nameless when they lack a platform. They are involved in commercial investment choices that push their potential for social transformation to the "unseen side effect." The social repercussions of their inventions and the repercussions of those repercussions are kept apart from the empirical and analytical sciences that design the innovations by their institutional links and sense of self. Science's ongoing research focuses on the unknowability and indefensibility of the effects. The "latent side effects," which on the one hand develop into hazards endangering life and on the other hand lose their latency cloak, start to exhibit the structuring potential of modernity once more. The world is evolving in an increasingly visible and dangerous way despite what we do not see and do not desire.

The game, which switches the roles of politics and non-politics while maintaining the same façade, is starting to seem ghostly. Politicians must be informed of the direction that the route devoid of design and awareness is taking, and they must be informed by people whose interests are focused on something entirely different and therefore equally reachable. They must then portray this excursion into the uncharted alternate land to the people as their own creation, and if one carefully studies it, for only one reason: because there was never an alternative and never will be. This is done with the practised gesture of waning faith in development. The need and indecision of technical "progress" serves as the bolt holding the process to the legitimacy of democracy. In the advanced stage of Western democracy, the 'anarchy' (Arendt 1 981) of the (no longer) hidden side effect seizes control[10]–[12].

CONCLUSION

To provide people the abilities and knowledge required to interact with scientific information, make wise judgements, and handle complicated problems, a pedagogy of scientific rationality is crucial. Societies may provide the groundwork for a scientifically informed society that is equipped to address the urgent concerns of our day by putting a high priority on critical thinking, evidence-based reasoning, and scientific literacy in education**.**

REFERENCES

[1] J. Derry, “Learners and pedagogy,” *Br. Educ. Res. J.*, 2001.

[2] J. Bruner, “Folk Pedagogies,” *Br. Educ. Res. J.*, 2001.

[3] F. Dowling and S. Kåhus, “An analysis of the ideological work of the discourses of ‘fair play’ and moral education in perpetuating inequitable gender practices in PETE,” *Phys. Educ. Sport Pedagog.*, 2011, doi: 10.1080/17408989.2010.532781.

[4] P. Freire and D. Macedo, “Learners and pedagogy,” in *Pedagogy, culture, language and race: A dialogue*, 1999.

[5] I. N. Ndlovu, *Life Sciences Teachers' Views on the Nature of Science and the Nature of Indigenous Knowledge System: A Case Study*. 2014.

[6] G. Redden, "Publish and Flourish, or Perish: RAE, ERA, RQF, and Other Acronyms for Infinite Human Resourcefulness," *M/C J.*, 2008, doi: 10.5204/mcj.44.

[7] M. Havelka, "'Apolitics', 'Anti-politics', 'Nonpolitical Politics' and 'Sub-politics' as threats and challenges," *Soc. Stud. Stud.*, 2016, doi: 10.5817/soc2016-1-9.

[8] R. K. H. Chan, "Risk, Reflexivity and Sub-politics: Environmental Politics in Hong Kong," *Asian J. Polit. Sci.*, 2008, doi: 10.1080/02185370802504308.

[9] F. M. Knaul *et al.*, "Punt Politics as Failure of Health System Stewardship: Evidence from the COVID-19 Pandemic Response in Brazil and Mexico," *The Lancet Regional Health - Americas*. 2021. doi: 10.1016/j.lana.2021.100086.

[10] D. Vampa, "The 2020 regional elections in Italy: sub-national politics in the year of the pandemic," *Contemp. Ital. Polit.*, 2021, doi: 10.1080/23248823.2021.1912301.

[11] M. Bakardjieva, "Subactivism: Lifeworld and politics in the age of the internet," *Inf. Soc.*, 2009, doi: 10.1080/01972240802701627.

[12] S. Lawson, "Regionalism, sub-regionalism and the politics of identity in Oceania," *Pacific Rev.*, 2016, doi: 10.1080/09512748.2015.1022585.

CHAPTER 6

POLITICAL SYSTEM'S LOSS OF FUNCTION

Aprajita Verma
Assistant Professor,Department of Law,
Presidency University, Bangalore, India.
Email Id:aprajita.verma@presidencyuniversity.in

ABSTRACT:

The phenomena of the political system's decline in effectiveness and legitimacy, which describes how political institutions and procedures are becoming less and less legitimate. It looks at the issues and elements that are causing this loss of function, such as the erosion of democratic norms, polarisation, and mistrust of political elites. The abstract emphasises the need for revitalization and change to address these issues and reestablish public confidence in the political process while highlighting the effects of the political system's loss of function.

KEYWORDS:

Democratic norms Distrust, Erosion, Function, Institutions, Legitimacy, Loss.

INTRODUCTION

A strange ambivalence permeates the scientific and public discussion on the possibility that politics may have an impact on technological progress. On the one hand, the state's limited ability to intervene with regard to modernisation in business and research is mentioned often. On the other hand, the concentration on the political system as the exclusive focus of politics persists notwithstanding all the criticism of restrictions on the political scope of action, whether these restrictions are brought about by the system or are avoidable. In fact, during the last two or three decades, political discourse in science and the public realm has intensified this disparity. The idea that political activity should be constrained has gained new traction in response to concerns about "ungovernability" and the excesses of democracy, but it has never really been considered whether the other society might be emerging independently from the workshops of technoeconomic development without prior knowledge, consent, or planning. What is left are laments about the loss of the political, which are connected to the normatively justified expectation that the institutions of the political system should be where the choices that alter society are concentrated, even though they are no longer concentrated there[1]–[3].

As a result, criticism of the collapse of parliament as a political centre came early and from a variety of sources. It was argued that the government administration or the factional and party leadership were progressively taking decisions that, by the text of the constitution, should have been taken by the parliament and the individual delegates. The diminishing parliamentary authority is sometimes seen as an inevitable result of the more complicated circumstances present in contemporary industrial nations. Critical observers at best talk of the state machinery becoming more autonomous in opposition to popular will, which is already implied in the representational democracy idea.

They also predict, with remarkable congruence, that two additional developmental tendencies—the technocratic curtailment of the scope for decision-making in the parliament and the executive, and the rise of power and influence groups organised corporatistically—would be overlaid by the transfer of former parliamentary powers to factions and parties or the state bureaucracy. The idea argues that with the rising scientization of political choices, political agencies only implement what scientific competence advises (for example, in the field of environmental policy, but also in the selection of large-scale technologies and their locations). Numerous times in recent years, it has been brought to the public's notice that the operating scope of the agents in issue is still too restricted in this manner. Politics is considered to have moved from the formal settings of government, politics, and parliament to the murky world of corporatism. It is said that organised interest groups make prefabricated political judgements that must then be defended by others as their own. According to research, these pressure organisations' effect extends to the political parties' "will formation" as well as state executive choices, which are made via bureaucratically organised offices. Depending on one's perspective, this process is either welcomed as a necessary corrective to the preceding autonomization and consolidation of the governmental governing machinery or regretted as a weakening of the state by private pressure organisations with a quasi-official character.

This link between state authority and special interests is taken to the farthest degree in Marxist criticisms and theories of the state, which after all do not have an independent conception of the political. The state, which is seen as the "ideal total capitalist" in the sense of Marx's description, is entirely limited in scope to the role of a "management committee of the ruling class" in the versions of this viewpoint. According to this perspective, the need of unifying the constrained, transient, divergent, and imperfectly formed 'individual capitalist' interests and enforcing them against opposition within their own camp leads to the minimal autonomy allowed to the state machinery and its democratic institutions. The political system is viewed as the hub of politics here as well, but it has no longer any independence. The criticism of this method of thinking—which divides everything into the too simplistic categories of "base" and "superstructure"—has always been that it underestimates the degree of political action's autonomy in parliamentary democracies that have emerged. The experiences of modern political history are also misunderstood, showing that the organisation of production in developed capitalist industrial society is fairly compatible with a wide range of political systems (as shown, for example, by Sweden, Chile, France, and Germany).

The growth of the social welfare state in post-war Western European development served as the primary historical evidence in the 1970s for the'relative autonomy' of the political system with respect to the values and interests of the economic system. This interventionist power of the state is attributed in political theories of "state capitalism" to the fact that as industrial capitalism developed, "the formation of system elements alien to the structure" took place "as a necessary part of [the system's (tr.) existence" According to this theory, the power of political decision-making derives from the fact that "the interventionist state jumps into the functional gaps of the market" which it does by enhancing the physical and intangible infrastructure, expanding the educational system, reducing the risk of unemployment, and other such things[4].

The expression "the new obscurity" (Habermas 1985) captures visually the more or less bewildered responses to these changes. It also relates to two more situations: first, the social structure's deterioration and voters' political behaviour, which have emerged as troubling elements in politics during the last ten years; and second, the mobilisation of citizens.Party leaders in all Western democracies are perplexed by the rising percentage of swing voters who are introducing unpredictability into the electoral process. If swing voters made up around 10% of the electorate in Germany in 1863, for instance, they are now thought to make up between 20% and 40% of the electorate nowadays, according to different research. Both electoral experts and politicians agree on the diagnosis: future elections will be decided by swing voters with their "mercurial flexibility" ([reputable pollster (tr.)] Noelle-Neumann 1 991) due to the tiny majority any party has been able to obtain.

Conversely, it also suggests that parties must utilise every tool at their disposal to woo the populace, most notably women in particular (for a summary, see Radunski 1 985). Parties can no longer rely on "regular voters." This seeming mismatch between public aspirations and representation across the political spectrum gives citizens' initiative organisations and emerging social movements political impetus and widespread support. These diagnoses continue to be connected implicitly or explicitly, actually or normatively, to the idea of a political centre that has or should have its place and means of influence in the democratic institutions of the political and administrative systems, even though the assessment of all these "dissonant" developments varies depending on the political standpoint and even though elements of a "unbinding of politics" frequently come up in this "demystification of the state" (Willke 1 983). The argument made here, however, is that the foundations for the division of politics and non-politics are weakening as a result of reflexive modernisation.

Behind the term "new obscurity" lies, in two ways, a significant structural upheaval of politics. The first of these is the loss of power experienced by the centralised political system as a result of the enforcement and utilisation of civil rights in the forms of a new political culture; the second is the changes in social structure related to the shift from non-politics to sub-politics, a development that appears to lose its conditions of application in the previously dominant "harmonising formula" - technical progress equals social progress. Both viewpoints together result in a "unbinding of politics," the potential repercussions of which are ultimately examined in three scenarios.

DISCUSSION

Democratization as the Disempowerment of Politics

Politics has become more decentralised and lost its ability to intervene on behalf of the state, not because of its failings but rather because of its triumphs. The primacy of the political system was questioned more forcefully and the claimed concentration of power at the top of the political and parliamentary systems became more fictitious, one could even say, the more successfully political rights were fought for, advanced, and practically realised in this century. In this sense, political development is experiencing a break in continuity throughout the second half of this century, both in terms of its internal relationships and how it relates to the domains of activity of

techno-economic growth. Politics' (and non-politics') ideas, underpinnings, and tools are becoming more ambiguous, open, and in need of a historically fresh decision.

The naive assumption that it would be possible to uphold citizens' democratic rights while also maintaining hierarchical authority relationships underpins the centering of decision-making authority in the political system as planned in the relationship between the citizen and bourgeois in the project of the bourgeois industrial society. In the end, the idea of a democratic monarchy, which is paradoxical, is what underpins the monopolisation of powers to make decisions under democratic conditions. Democracy's norms are restricted to selecting political representatives and taking part in political initiatives. Once in power, "monarch for a term" not only exhibits dictatorial leadership traits and implements his choices in an autocratic manner from the top down; the organisations, interest groups, and citizen groups impacted by the decisions also forget their rights and adopt "democratic" behaviour[5]–[7].This worldview is undercut in numerous ways during reflexive modernizations. Finding political "solutions" becomes more and more difficult when democratic rights are established, it becomes abundantly evident.

There are usually several answers in the domains of politics (and sub-politics), rather than just one. Because of this, political decision-making processes, regardless of the level at which they take place, can no longer be understood as the application or enforcement of a model predetermined in advance by some wise man or leader, whose rationality is beyond debate and must be applied despite the opposition and "irrational resistance" of subordinate agencies, interests, and citizen groups. Instead, it is necessary to see the development of the programme, the decision-making process, and the implementation of those choices as a process of collaborative action (Crozier and Friedberg, 1 979), which even in the best case scenario entails community learning and collective creativity. However, this means that political institutions' formal decision-making power must inevitably be decentralised. The political-administrative system is thus unable to serve as the exclusive or primary site of political activity. Across the formal horizontal and vertical structure of authorizations and jurisdictions, networks of agreement and involvement, negotiation, reinterpretation, and potential opposition emerge concurrently with the democratisation.

Thus, a distinctive bisection of democracy serves as the foundation for the idea of a political centre that is fostered in the industrial society model. One the one hand, democratic principles do not apply in sub-political action areas (see above). However, even internally, politics continues to exhibit monarchical characteristics in response to the deliberately agitated exterior demands. The administration and interest groups must be handled with a heavy hand and dictatorial powers of enforcement by the "political leadership." It must be conducted with the utmost regard for the people, listen to their opinions, and take their worries and anxieties seriously.

This more than just reflects the restriction on any action to sever conversations and consultations, cut off queries, and reduce debates. The relationship between parliamentary debate and the public sphere on the one hand, and an executive branch on the other, which is accountable to the parliament but has its'success' measured by the power with which it is able to carry out its decisions, are just two of the tensions and contradictions it expresses in the structure of the democratic political system. Particularly in the political campaign system, the reciprocal

attribution of decision-making authority is forced, whether in praising or denouncing prior actions. This continually feeds and renews the fantasy of the quasi-democratic "dictator for a term." Here the system leads to the assumption that a government and the parties supporting it, once elected, are responsible for everything good and bad that occurs during their term of office. This assumption would obviously only be possible if this government were not what it is – democratically elected and active in a society where all citizens and agencies possess numerous opportunities for consultation due to the establishment of democratic rights.This worldview is undercut in numerous ways during reflexive modernizations. Finding political "solutions" becomes more and more difficult when democratic rights are established, it becomes abundantly evident.

There are usually several answers in the domains of politics (and sub-politics), rather than just one. Because of this, political decision-making processes, regardless of the level at which they take place, can no longer be understood as the application or enforcement of a model predetermined in advance by some wise man or leader, whose rationality is beyond debate and must be applied despite the opposition and "irrational resistance" of subordinate agencies, interests, and citizen groups.

Instead, it is necessary to see the development of the programme, the decision-making process, and the implementation of those choices as a process of collaborative action (Crozier and Friedberg, 1 979), which even in the best case scenario entails community learning and collective creativity. However, this means that political institutions' formal decision-making power must inevitably be decentralised. The political-administrative system is thus unable to serve as the exclusive or primary site of political activity. Across the formal horizontal and vertical structure of authorizations and jurisdictions, networks of agreement and involvement, negotiation, reinterpretation, and potential opposition emerge concurrently with the democratisation.

Thus, a distinctive bisection of democracy serves as the foundation for the idea of a political centre that is fostered in the industrial society model. One the one hand, democratic principles do not apply in sub-political action areas (see above). However, even internally, politics continues to exhibit monarchical characteristics in response to the deliberately agitated exterior demands. The administration and interest groups must be handled with a heavy hand and dictatorial powers of enforcement by the "political leadership." It must be conducted with the utmost regard for the people, listen to their opinions, and take their worries and anxieties seriously.

This more than just reflects the restriction on any action to sever conversations and consultations, cut off queries, and reduce debates. The relationship between parliamentary debate and the public sphere on the one hand, and an executive branch on the other, which is accountable to the parliament but has its'success' measured by the power with which it is able to carry out its decisions, are just two of the tensions and contradictions it expresses in the structure of the democratic political system. Particularly in the political campaign system, the reciprocal attribution of decision-making authority is forced, whether in praising or denouncing prior actions. This continually feeds and renews the fantasy of the quasi-democratic "dictator for a term." Here the system leads to the assumption that a government and the parties supporting it, once elected, are responsible for everything good and bad that occurs during their term of office.

This assumption would obviously only be possible if this government were not what it is – democratically elected and active in a society where all citizens and agencies possess numerous opportunities for consultation due to the establishment of democratic rights[8]–[10].

CONCLUSION

The decline in legitimacy and effectiveness of political institutions and procedures is referred to as the political system's loss of function. For the political system to be revitalised and public confidence to be reestablished, it is essential to recognise and confront this phenomena.The loss of functionality has been exacerbated by mistrust of political leaders and institutions. People lose faith in politics and think they are not responsive to their demands and interests when public trust declines. Ideological divides and polarisation make the political system even less effective. Political discourse becomes more divisive as a result, which makes it harder to compromise and make decisions as a group, impeding efficient government and policymaking.

REFERENCES

[1] T. P. Weil, “What can the Canadians and Americans learn from each other’s health care systems?,” *Int. J. Health Plann. Manage.*, 2016, doi: 10.1002/hpm.2374.

[2] P. Timmerman, “Vulnerability, Resilience and the Collapse of Society: A Review of Models and Possible Climatic Applications,” *Environmental Monograph*. 1981.

[3] T. H. Tröger, “A political economy perspective on common supervision in the Eurozone: Observations on some strengths and weaknesses of the SSM,” in *Financial Regulation: A Transatlantic Perspective*, 2015. doi: 10.1017/CBO9781316026649.010.

[4] A. V. Gheorghe and B. Vamanu, “Vulnerability assessment of hazardous materials transportation systems,” 2010.

[5] E. R. Aiyede, “Civil Society Efficacy, Citizenship and Empowerment in Africa,” *Voluntas*, 2017, doi: 10.1007/s11266-016-9722-3.

[6] A. Tarrant and K. Hughes, “The Ethics of Technology Choice: Photovoice Methodology with Men Living in Low-Income Contexts,” *Sociol. Res. Online*, 2020, doi: 10.1177/1360780419878714.

[7] D. Van Zyl-Hermann, “Baas or klaas? Afrikaner working-class responses to transformation in South Africa, ca. 1977-2002,” *International Labor and Working-Class History*. 2014. doi: 10.1017/S0147547914000143.

[8] R. S. Gallin, J. M. Bystydzienski, and J. Sekhon, “Democratization and Women’s Grassroots Movements,” *Contemp. Sociol.*, 2001, doi: 10.2307/3089357.

[9] J. S. Omotola, “Democratization and citizenship: The gender dimensions of political representation in nigeria,” *Res. Polit. Sociol.*, 2012, doi: 10.1108/S0895-9935(2012)0000020003.

[10] I. S. Ladan-Baki and C. Enwere, “Intra-Elite Conflict and Problems of Governance in Nigeria: Imperatives of Games Theory in African Politics,” *Int. J. Trend Sci. Res. Dev.*, 2017, doi: 10.31142/ijtsrd2498.

CHAPTER 7

OBSERVANCE OF CIVIL RIGHTS AND THE DIFFERENTIATION OF CULTURALSUB-POLITICS

Sakshi Pandey
Assistant Professor,Department of Law,
Presidency University, Bangalore, India.
Email Id:sakshi.pandey@presidencyuniversity.in

ABSTRACT:

The upholding of civil rights and the distinction of cultural sub-politics, with an emphasis on how civil rights and cultural diversity relate to political systems. It looks at how the creation of cultural sub-politics, where various cultural groups defend their rights and identities within a larger political environment, might result from the acknowledgment and defence of civil rights. The abstract emphasises the value of inclusive and egalitarian political systems and the need of striking a balance between the need to recognise and accommodate cultural diversity and individual civil rights.

KEYWORDS:

Civil rights, Cultural diversity, Cultural sub-politics, Differentiation, Identity, Inclusion.

INTRODUCTION

A variety of controls have been established in the industrialised democracies of the West to restrict the display of political power. The separation of powers, which guarantees that the court along with the parliament and the government have control roles, was already in place at the start of this evolution in the nineteenth century. The autonomy of collective bargaining has become a social and legal reality with Germany's progress. As a result, the state is required to maintain its neutrality in labour disputes while the core issues of employment policy are transferred to the regulated talks of the competing parties in the labour market[1]–[3].

The legal protection and substantive realisation of freedom of the press, which, in conjunction with the mass media (newspapers, radio, television), and new technology capabilities, results in several graded forms of publicity, is one of the final advances in this direction up to this point. There is still a real or potential monitoring function that media-directed publicity can carry out with regard to politics, even if these are undoubtedly not "servants" of the lofty goals of the Enlightenment but instead are also and even primarily "servants" of the market, of advertising, and of consumption (whether of goods of all kinds or of institutionally fabricated information). In this sense, the foundation of fundamental rights is accompanied by the stabilisation of sub-political centres, and in the same measure that these rights are substantively fulfilled and safeguarded in their autonomy from the encroachments of political (or economic) power.

The following apparently contradictory remark is understandable if one views the realisation of civil and constitutional rights in all of its phases as a process of political modernization:

Political modernity depoliticizes politics, liberates it from constraints, and polarises society. More specifically, the modernization process offers options for extra-parliamentary surveillance with and against the system to the increasingly growing sub-political centres and domains of activity. In this manner, territories and ways of partly independent cooperative and alternative politics that are founded on rights that have been fought for and are now safeguarded are more or less clearly defined. And it also implies that via the adherence, broad interpretation, and development of these rights, the power dynamics within society have shifted considerably. The "heads" of the political system are faced by adversaries who are jointly organised and who have the "definitionmaking power" of media-directed publicity, etc., which may fundamentally set and alter the political agenda. Even the courts are transformed into all-pervasive watchdogs of political decisions; paradoxically, this happens to the exact degree that, on the one hand, the judges uphold their "judicial independence" even when it runs counter to politics, and, on the other hand, citizens transform from obedient recipients of political decrees into political participants and, if necessary, attempt to sue the government for violating their rights in court[4]–[6].

The fact that this kind of structural democratisation takes place concurrently with the political system and the parliament only looks odd. Here, the paradox that democratisation movements encountered throughout the reflexive modernisation phase is made clear. First, chances for democratic codetermination and monitoring in various sub-political sectors are defined and expanded in the context of existing constitutional rights. Second, this development bypasses the parliament, the birthplace of democracy. Rights and authority to make decisions that still exist pro forma are diminished. The centres of political will formation that were first offered experience a loss of substance and risk becoming paralysed.

Or, to put it another way, elements of a new political culture are emerging alongside the paradigm of specialised democracy, in which diverse sub-political centres influence the process of politically forging and enforcing judgements based on invoked constitutional rights. Obviously, none of it indicates that power in state politics is waning. It continues to have a monopoly in the crucial spheres of foreign and military policy as well as the use of state force for the upkeep of "internal security." The fact that there has been a very strong link between public mobilisation and the techno-financial equipping of the police since the revolutions of the eighteenth century indicates that this is a key area of influence of state politics.It is nevertheless evident that the use of governmental authority and political liberalisation are inextricably linked, as shown by, for instance, disagreements over advanced technology.

New Political Culture

In this sense, constitutional rights serve as anchors for a decentralisation of politics that will have long-term amplifying consequences. They provide a variety of interpretational options as well as fresh perspectives to challenge earlier, constrained, and biassed readings in various historical contexts. The wide political engagement of citizens has so far shown the last iteration of this; this includes initiative groups, so-called "new social movements," and alternative critical professional practise (among doctors, chemists, nuclear physicists, etc.). They took use of their hitherto solely formal rights in extra-parliamentary direct action and filled them with the life they believed was

worthwhile, subverting all prior political schemes in the process. Due to the citizens' access to the court and media exposure, two additional key sub-political venues, this very citizen activity on a variety of themes is given a specific significance. These may, at least sometimes, be used extremely successfully to preserve public interests (in environmental protection, the anti-nuclear movement, or in data secrecy), as the developments have shown.

The "amplification effect" is seen in this, wherein the fundamental rights may be followed sequentially and enlarged in a mutually reinforcing manner, amplifying the "resistance power" of the "basis" and the "subordinate agencies" against unwelcome interference "from above." An authoritarian understanding of democracy may interpret the citizens' growing self-assurance and participatory interest, which is reported equally impressively by numerous demographic surveys as by the variety of evolving citizens' initiative groups and political movements, as "resistance against state authority." Scientists who have stuck to their tried-and-true routines and focused their attention on the political system as the centre of politics may also see it as an ineffective effort to influence politics. But it is the inevitable progression towards tangible democracy that comes after the creation of democratic rights. The generalisation of political activity, whose topics and conflicts are no longer solely defined by the battle for rights, but also by their development and use for the whole society, manifests itself in these many changes.

DISCUSSION

The hinges of political growth are hence fundamental rights with a universalist validity claim, as created in Western countries over the last two centuries or more via fits and starts but in a largely directed process (so far). They have, on the one hand, been battled for in parliaments; on the other hand, sub-political centres may emerge and set themselves apart from parliaments, opening a new chapter in the history of democracy. This may first be shown for the court and media exposure, two of the sub-political locations and activities that were previously described.

Partially independent ranges of decision-making are becoming visible in the professional position of the judge as protected by German civil service legislation, in part due to new forms of observation and interpretation, and in part due to external developments. And as the shocked judges and public have just seen, they are also being used in contentious ways. The rights are rooted in the time-tested legal doctrine of "judicial independence." Judges have only lately, however, actively used and confidently filled out the freedoms, perhaps as a result of generational shifts and scientization processes among other factors.

Two of the many factors that make this possible among many will be highlighted here: first, the initial, dominant objective constraint constructs have started to fall apart, allowing for some degree of individual decision-making; and second, the objects and decision-making processes have been reflexively scientized. This mostly refers to scientific evaluations of judicial deliberation and legal interpretation. Within the confines of the text of the law and its norms of interpretation, they make the variations in the administration of justice visible and usable; these variations were previously concealed by recruiting and the prevalent basic beliefs. Therefore, scientization has made useful argumentative strategies clear in this instance, exposing the judicial profession to previously unnoticed internal pluralization in terms of professional policy.

This trend is reinforced by the fact that many litigated disputes and issues no longer have a clear societal context. Experts and counterexperts engage in an unwinnable fight of ideas in many key areas of dispute, mainly in nuclear technology and environmental issues, but also in family and marriage law or labour law. In this approach, the judge receives the judgement again, partly because the selection of the expert witnesses already includes a conclusion in advance and partly because it is his responsibility to consider all the evidence and reorganise the arguments before rendering a ruling. In other words, it pluralizes and politicises the process of reaching a decision. This systematic cultivation of self-doubt in the sciences through the overproduction of hypothetical, isolated detailed results has an impact on the judicial system and gives the 'independent' judge more discretion.

The result for the legislature is that it increasingly finds itself on the defendant's bench. It is now practically customary for judicial review processes to be involved in contentious administrative decisions (such as when, how, and where to build nuclear power facilities). Additionally, it is become harder and harder to predict how these processes will play out as they go through the courts, and most importantly, how long they will continue. As a result, insecure grey regions develop, which reinforces the idea that the state has little power. This relates to legislative proposals generally in a wider sense. No matter what, they quickly run afoul of the boundaries of higher or similar authorities, whether at the provincial, federal, or European Union levels. The planned judicial review processes in conflict situations give the judge's prospective decision a strong political presence which, it should be added, strengthens the attorneys' monopoly on administration and reduce the room for negotiation.

Even the freedom of the press, with all its opportunities and interpretational challenges, provides numerous opportunities for the differentiation of broad and selective public spheres (from the international television network to the school newspaper), each with very specific opportunities to shape how social problems are defined. These are constrained and restrained by the physical constraints on information generation as well as the overall legal and social framework. However, as shown by the emergence and fall of social movements and subcultures, they may also have a significant impact on how the general public, and consequently the political system, perceives matters. The fact that costly and in-depth scientific research are sometimes not really observed at the agency that requested them until television or a mass circulation newspaper publishes about them serves as an example of this. People in political administration read Der Spiegel instead of investigative reports. This is not just because the report would be impossible to read, but also because of the way society is structured, political issues are covered in Spiegel regardless of the publication's arguments and substance. The conclusion suddenly loses all traces of being research for personal use; it haunts thousands of people's thoughts and hence calls for personal accountability and public (counter-)statements[7]–[9].

Since the political sphere can only ignore published public opinion at the risk of losing votes, the power to define problems and priorities that can be developed under these circumstances (and should under no circumstances be confused with a "power of the editors" but rather coincides with the editorial work of employees) undoubtedly depends on circulation figures and ratings. It is therefore bolstered and stabilised by television watching patterns and new information

technologies, but it also acquires significance as scientific reason in risk society is de-mystified. Publication via the media chooses particular instances from the abundance of potential discoveries, adding familiarity and credibility that they would not otherwise be able to as pure scientific conclusions.

The political repercussion is that stories of toxic waste finds, if they suddenly become front-page news, alter political priorities because of the widespread belief that protecting forests should take precedence. The previous chemical strategy is in danger of failing once formaldehyde's carcinogenic effects have been scientifically shown on a European scale. In response to all of this, it is required to perform political activities, such as debating or drafting legislation or budgetary plans.The political choice cannot, of course, be predicted in advance by media exposure, which keeps it tied to the economic, legal, and political assumptions and capital concentrations in the news industry.

The subfield of privacy politics should at least be addressed here. Every aspect of politics revolves on the number of births, as well as the issue of how individuals deal with motherhood, such as whether the woman wants to continue working or entirely refocus on her family. Every subject that men and women must address in their daily lives has a political component by nature. In this regard, the "problem indicators"—rising divorce rates, falling birth rates, and rising numbers of people living outside of marriage—not only reflect the state of men and women's familial and extrafamilial relationships, but also signal quickly shifting parameters for all political plans and directions. Even while important turning moments for retirement policy, labour market policy, welfare legislation, and social policy are tied to decisions made here (such as whether to have children, the quantity, and the timing, for example), they are separated from external interventions. And the reason this is the case is that, in accordance with the constitutionally established arrangements for family and privacy, only the couples who live together are responsible for making these choices.

Private sphere legal safeguards have been around for a while. However, they haven't weighed this much in a while. These empty spaces, coupled with the ambiguity in the social underpinnings of politics, only emerge with the detraditionalization of lifeworlds. On the one hand, women's accomplishment of educational equality and their hasty entry into the workforce just extend the equality of opportunity that had always been given to a previously excluded minority.

On the other side, the results alter everything: the family, marriage, and parenting; the progression of births and unemployment; the welfare legislation; the employment system; and so forth. In this way, the scope for subpolitical organisation and decision-making in the private domain, below the level where state influence is conceivable, is widened by individualization processes. The women's movement's assertion that "the personal is political" is accurate in this regard as well since it speaks to a historical reality that is becoming more and more prevalent.

These many partial spheres of cultural and social sub-politics, such as the judiciary, privacy, citizens' initiative groups, and new social movements, together create new cultural forms, some of which are extra-institutional and some of which are institutionally protected. Such politics are

difficult to categorise, but during the last 20 years they have played a significant role in shaping German policy and the country's techno-economic growth, whether as a result of their fluid forms or more so because of them. The efficacy of this political culture depends on bringing social life to the law's abstract principles; more specifically, it depends on dismantling and defeating the law's selective interpretation of its fundamental principles piece by piece. Participation is a buzzword used to describe this growth in a variety of social science fields and political discourse. It is not necessary to glorify the current trend; one can sharply criticise its excesses that lean towards a new mysticism and still conclude with good reason that the calibre and dissemination of this way of thinking have already fundamentally altered Germany's political landscape and will continue to do so in the future[10], [11].

CONCLUSION

Political regimes that seek to recognise and accept cultural diversity must adhere to civil rights laws and distinguish between cultural sub-politics. Societies may establish inclusive and egalitarian settings that respect the identities and dignity of every person and develop social cohesiveness by finding a balance between individual rights and cultural acknowledgment.

REFERENCES

[1] L. Green And A. Aly, “Bastard Immigrants: Asylum Seekers Who Arrive By Boat And The Illegitimate Fear Of The Other,” *M/C J.*, 2014, Doi: 10.5204/Mcj.896.

[2] J. A. Laub, “Assessing The Servant Organization; Development Of The Organizational Leadership Assessment (Ola) Model. Dissertation Abstracts International,” *Procedia - Soc. Behav. Sci.*, 1999.

[3] J. A. Laub, “Assessing The Servant Organization; Development Of The Organizational Leadership Assessment (Ola) Model,” *Diss. Abstr. Int.*, 1999.

[4] O. Bilous, “Procedural Guarantees Of Observance Of Human And Civil Rights In The Activities Of The Judicial Authority Bodies,” *Sci. Juridical Sci.*, 2019, Doi: 10.15587/2523-4153.2019.173450.

[5] B. G. Ramcharan, “International Covenant On Economic, Social And Cultural Rights,” In *Judicial Protection Of Economic, Social And Cultural Rights*, 2021. Doi: 10.1163/9789047408123_003.

[6] V. Sperling, “The Last Refuge Of A Scoundrel: Patriotism, Militarism And The Russian National Idea,” *Nations Natl.*, 2003, Doi: 10.1111/1469-8219.00084.

[7] A. Karimi, A. Koosha, M. N. Asfad, And M. T. Ansari, “Examining Of Relationship Between Responsibility To Protect & Sovereignty Of States In Light Of Practice Of International Community,” *J. Polit. Law*, 2017, Doi: 10.5539/Jpl.V10n2p256.

[8] M. Livson, S. Eshtokin, V. Vasyukov, E. Yudina, A. Baybarin, And S. Pivneva, “Impact Of Digitalization On Legal Regulation: Formation Of New Legal Practices,” *J. Law Sustain. Dev.*, 2021, Doi: 10.37497/Revcampojur.V9i2.749.

[9] V. Prymak, O. Koreniuk, And T. Poharchenko, “Joint Functional Focus Of Models Of Civil Liability For Damage Inflicted On Patients,” *Int. J. Criminol. Sociol.*, 2021, Doi: 10.6000/1929-4409.2021.10.47.

[10] V. Kovalchuk And Y. Bohiv, “People’s Sovereignty And Human Rights In The European Co-Operation Of Constitutionalism,” *Sci. Juridical Sci.*, 2019, Doi: 10.15587/2523-4153.2019.162331.

[11] J. Y. Asomah, “Cultural Rights Versus Human Rights: A Critical Analysis Of The Trokosi Practice In Ghana And The Role Of Civil Society,” *African Hum. Rights Law J.*, 2015, Doi: 10.17159/1996-2096/2015/V15n1a6.

CHAPTER 8

POLITICAL CULTURE AND TECHNICAL DEVELOPMENT

Hamza Khan
Assistant Professor,Department of Law,
Presidency University, Bangalore, India.
Email Id:hamzakhan@presidencyuniversity.in

ABSTRACT:

The connection between political culture and technological progress, exploring how political systems' values, beliefs, and practises might shape and affect developments in technology. It explores the relationship between political culture and technological advancement, emphasising the significance of elements like governance, public involvement, and regulatory frameworks in promoting or obstructing technological advancement. The abstract highlights the necessity for an environment-friendly political culture that supports technological innovation, ethical decision-making, and social benefits.

KEYWORDS:

Beliefs, Governance, Innovation, Political Culture, Policy Frameworks, Public Participation.

INTRODUCTION

The range of political activity is limited by political system modernization. We are constrained by existing political utopias (democracy, the welfare state) on a legal, economic, and social level. In addition to that, and alternatively, the modernization of the techno-economic system creates completely new options for intervention. With them, essential requirements of life and work up to this point as well as cultural constants might be rendered useless. Microelectronics gives us the ability to alter the social makeup of the labour market. With the ability to generate new materials and living things as well as revolutionise the biological and cultural underpinnings of the family, gene technology elevates people to a near-godlike status. The dangers are magnified and the locations, circumstances, and ways of their creation and interpretation are politicised by this extension of the concept of design and constructibility, which now includes even the topic it was originally intended to serve[1]–[3].

The 'old' industrial society's obsession with development has often been emphasised. There has never been a challenge to that latent faith in progress, which has become so precarious today with the growth of risks: the faith in the method of trial and error, the possibility of a systematic mastery of external and internal nature that was being gradually constructed, despite all the criticism of that fact from early Romanticism until today. (Despite all the failures, side issues, and criticism of the 'capitalistic faith in progress', this myth remained required until very recently for the political left as well.) Additionally, the social changes gaining pace beneath the wings of development have not been diminished in the slightest by this civilization's criticism playing in the background. This highlights the peculiarity of the process, where societal changes may take place kind of "incognito." A "normal" institutionalised extra-parliamentary system of activity for

the ongoing transformation of society, "progress" is much more than an idea. Oddly enough, in the worst scenario, it may even force through the overthrow of previously dominant relationships by using the state's police authority against opposition that wants to maintain the status quo.

Understanding this legitimising influence of the agreement on progress requires recalling a now nearly forgotten link between social and political culture and techno-economic growth. A number of traditional social science research at the start of this century focused on the cultural impact on the labour system, technology, and business. Max Weber showed the significance of the Calvinist religious ethic and the 'inward asceticism' it contained for the development of 'professionalism' and capitalistic commercial activity. Thorsten Veblen made the case more than 50 years ago that the principles of economics are not always true and cannot be comprehended on their own, but are instead deeply entwined with the cultural framework of society. Economic principles must change if societal values and ways of life change. For example, if the majority of people disagree with the principles of economic growth (for whatever reason), then our conception of the division of labour, the standards for productivity, and the course of development will be called into question, and a new kind of pressure for political action will emerge.

In this sense, Weber and Veblen were contending (each in his own way) that labour, technical advancement, and economic progress are intertwined with the system of cultural norms, the predominating expectancies, and the people's value orientations. This essentially obvious conclusion, which was also supported by a number of other authors, has rarely gained any practical significance in the intervening years beyond platitudes. To start, this is most likely caused by the fact that, to put it crudely, social and political culture stayed constant from the post-World War II era through the 1960s. A constant "variable" does not enter the field of vision; hence, it ceases to be a variable and may continue to be ignored in terms of its importance.

This causes an immediate transition when the stability starts to break down. Its relevance for the advancement of the economy and technology is only apparent looking backward, so to speak, with the dissolution of the normative backdrop cultural consensus. Economic, technological, and individual advancement were clearly intertwined during the post-war boom in Germany (but also in other Western industrial nations). Economic goals that served the management's interests in increasing capital were not the only ones that included "economic growth," "increases in productivity," or "technological innovations." They also contributed to the rebuilding of society, expanding options for individual consumption, and a "democratisation" of formerly privileged standards of life in a manner that was apparent to everyone. Against the backdrop of the devastation left by the war, the blending of individual, social, and economic interests in the pursuit of "progress," understood in economic and technological terms, was successful to the extent that on the one hand the boom actually took hold and on the other the extent of the technological innovations appeared calculable. Both circumstances continue to be entwined with the political aspirations for the welfare state, stabilising the realms of policy and nonpolicy of "technological transformation" in the process. The following three preconditions, which have started to break down since the emergence of a new political culture in the 1970s, among other reasons, are the foundation of this social design of the agreement on development in technology. First off, the agreement is based on the balancing principle that social improvement plus

technological advancement equals progress. The idea is that when technology advances, everyone will benefit from it immediately in the form of labor-saving innovations, bettering lifestyles, raising standards of living, etc.

Allows negative impacts to be handled independently and retroactively as "social consequences of technological change," such as deskilling, restructuring, threats to job security, health risks, or devastation of the environment. "Social consequences" are injuries that are typical of certain populations, notably specified secondary issues, and never call into doubt the socially undeniable benefit of the technical advancement itself. The discussion of the social repercussions here enables two things. For starters, any argument that technical advancement is socially and politically structured is refuted. Furthermore, debates regarding the "social consequences" may be had without impairing the implementation of the technical breakthrough. Only the negative'social' repercussions may and should be discussed. The technical advancement itself is still uncontested, impervious to judgement, and consistent with its own innate objective logic[4]–[6].

Thirdly, the industrial negotiating parties, the unions, and the employers are the carriers and creators of agreement on advancements in technological policy. Only indirect duties, such as absorbing "social consequences" and keeping an eye on hazards, are within the purview of the state. Only the'social repercussions' are in dispute between the parties to the collective bargaining agreement. Antagonisms in the evaluation of the "social consequences" usually assume that there is agreement on the process of technological advancement. This agreement on the key issues relating to technological advancement is strengthened by a well-practiced resistance to "hatred of technology," "Ludditism," or "critique of civilization."

The separation of social and technological change, the imputing of systemic or objective constraints, the consensus formula that technological progress is equal to social progress, and the primary responsibility of the collective bargaining partners have all started to fall apart over the past 20 years. This hasn't happened by accident or as a result of cultural criticism, but as a result of the consequences. Research in this area has put an end to latency and secondary effects. The preconditions for the harmonising formula on the oneness of social and technical advancement have been cancelled as hazards increase. At the same time, groups that are not covered by the interorganizational structure of interests and its modes of issue perception join the arena of the debate over technology policy. For instance, in disputes over nuclear power plants or reprocessing facilities, businesses and labour unions backers of the conventional technical consensus have been relegated to the sidelines. The disputes now take place directly between the state authority and citizen protest organisations, taking place in a drastically altered social and political environment amongst actors who, at first appearance, seem to have nothing in common with technology.

DISCUSSION

The Sub-Politics of Medicine

Its self-proclaimed self-understanding is that medicine serves health. In reality, technology has transformed the way humanity interacts with itself, with sickness, illness, and death, and it has

even generated totally new scenarios. It is not at all essential to wade through the maze of opinions, from medical promises of salvation to visions of immaturity, in order to recognise the revolutionary consequences of medicine.

Whether or whether medicine has enhanced humanity's quality of life is up for debate. However, it is undeniable that it has aided in the growth of the human population. Earth's population has increased by a factor of over 10. This may be largely attributed to declining infant mortality and increasing life expectancy. Members of socially marginalised communities in Central Europe might anticipate surviving to an average age of seventy, which was still regarded as "biblical" in the previous century, barring a significant deterioration in living circumstances in the next years.

This basically represents advancements in hygiene, which are only possible because of the findings of medical study. Because diet and living circumstances improved and because infectious illnesses could finally be effectively controlled, mortality rates decreased. The results include a sharp increase in population, particularly in the Third World's poorest nations, together with the key political challenges of hunger and suffering and sharply rising inequality on a global scale.With the divergence of diagnosis and treatment in the contemporary evolution of medicine, a very distinct aspect of the influence of medicine on society-changing changes comes into light.As a consequence, there has been a sharp rise in so-called chronic diseases, which are ailments that may be detected using increasingly sophisticated medical and technological sensory systems, but for which there are no effective treatments now or even in the near future.

The most advanced level of medicine results in pathological diseases that it categorises as (temporarily or permanently) incurable, which reflect entirely new circumstances of life and danger and cut through the current system of social disparities. 40 out of 100 patients in the beginning of this century passed away from acute diseases. These made up under 1% of the causes of death in the year 1880. On the other hand, the percentage of people who died from chronic conditions increased throughout this time from 46% to almost 80%. In such situations, a protracted period of disease increasingly precedes the death. Nearly 70% of the 9.6 million West German residents who were classified as having a health impairment in the micro-census of 1882 had a chronic illness. As this progress continues, a medically-defined cure increasingly becomes the uncommon. However, this is not the only manifestation of a failure. Due to its accomplishments, medicine also releases individuals into disease, which it can identify thanks to its sophisticated equipment[7]–[9].

This development has a medical and sociopolitical turn that is just now starting to be cognizant of and understood for the wide-ranging effects it will have. With the professionalisation of medicine in nineteenth-century Europe, disease has been monopolised, administered, and removed from people via the use of technology. Disease and disease were entrusted entirely to the institution of medicine for external management, where they were "operated out" in various ways by physicians in 'hospitals' that resembled barracks while the sick were mostly kept in the dark.

Today, on the other hand, the sick are being abandoned, leaving them to fend for themselves and other institutions that are also completely unprepared for them: the family, the workplace, the

educational system, or the public discourse. The most dramatic example of this is AIDS, an immune system illness that spreads quickly. The illness is becoming more widespread as a consequence of diagnostic "progress" as well. Everything and everything is "sick" or has the potential to make someone "sick," regardless of how they are really feeling. As a result, the idea of the "active patient" is being revived; calls are being made for a "working alliance" in which the patient serves as the "auxiliary doctor" for the ailment that has been attributed to him by medicine. The extraordinarily high suicide rates demonstrate how badly this about-face is accepted by those who are affected. The suicide incidence is six times greater for all age groups among those with chronic renal illness, for example, whose lives rely on frequent dialysis.In vitro fertilisation and embryo transplantation are options that have lately been put into practise, and this is quite understandable. The debate is presented to the general public using the deceptive phrase "test-tube baby."

In vitro fertilisation was first used because many infertile women had a great desire for children. Only married couples are now eligible for treatment in the majority of facilities. Given the prevalence of non-marital living partnerships, this rule appears a little out of date. On the other hand, allowing single women access to this technology will result in entirely new kinds of social interactions, the effects of which are utterly unpredictable at this point. The sort of mother who is alone after a divorce is no longer the subject of our discussion; instead, we are dealing withIntentional fatherless motherhood is a new phenomenon. Male sperm donation outside of any romantic relationships is assumed. In such case, there would be fatherless kids, whose parents would only be their mother and an unidentified sperm donor. In the end, this process would result in the retention of biological fatherhood and the elimination of social fatherhood leaving all the equally social issues of genetic paternity, such as descent, the inheritance of characteristics, claims for support and inheritance, etc., utterly unsolved.

When one thinks about the straightforward topic of how the embryos should be managed before to the implantation, an extra avalanche of issues is released. When is an embryo's development deemed "apparently normal," allowing for uterine implantation? When do the embryos cease to be embryos and when do they begin to contain human life? "In vitro fertilisation makes human embryos available outside the body of a woman, and that opens up a broad field of technical operations, some of which are already realisable and others which could become realisable through further development." Thus, deep-frozen embryos might be kept and sold in matching "embryo banks," following the pattern of the already-existing sperm banks. The availability of embryos gives scientists the long-needed "experimental objects" excuse my bad English for study in embryology, immunology, and pharmacology. The term "embryos," which refers to the beginning of human existence, may be repeated through division.

On the one hand, what seems equivalent advance in medical technology in this situation is used to produce something incomparable. One might concede that human evolution involves some degree of self-creation and self-change. It is clear that history assumes and cultivates the capacity to alter and shape human nature, to build culture, to control the environment, and to eschew the limitations of natural development in favour of artificial ones. However, this should not fool us into thinking that there are here being thrusts into new domains. Talk of "progress" assumes the

audience who will eventually profit from all of this. Unrestrained reasoning and behaviour in the realm of possibility are focused on the opposing idea, the goal, the control of nature, and the rise in societal wealth that it enables. The basic underpinnings of the progress model are thrown out when the principles of technical feasibility and arrangement impinge into the topics themselves in such manner. According to the popular conception of the division of labour in industrial society, the bourgeoisie's pursuit of its own interests ruins the circumstances of life for the citoyens, who are eventually expected to have all the democratic development's strings in their hands. The cultural norms of enlightened subjectivity that this mastery was initially intended to serve no longer exist, but covertly the mastery of nature transforms into technical control over the subject in the purest meaning of that term.

On the other hand, this covert goodbye to a period in human history occurs without the need to break through any permission restrictions.The number of infants born in vitro is increasing quickly even though expert commissions from all over the globe are still writing up their final report on the conceivable and unforeseeable effects of this move, which also implies that political and societal ramifications lie far in the future. More than 70 births were recorded in Germany alone between 1 978 and 1 982. There were already more than 500 people and more than 600 kids by the early 1900s. There are lengthy waiting lists at the in vitro fertilisation clinics[10], [11].

CONCLUSION

Political culture and technological growth are significantly correlated. The creation and use of technologies that benefit society may be encouraged by an environment-friendly political culture that values innovation, prudent decision-making, public involvement, and social benefits. Societies may use the potential of technical developments to alleviate problems, enhance quality of life, and drive sustainable development by fostering such a culture.

REFERENCES

[1] L. H. Gulbrandsen, T. H. J. Inderberg, and T. Jevnaker, “Is political steering gone with the wind? Administrative power and wind energy licensing practices in Norway,” *Energy Res. Soc. Sci.*, 2021, doi: 10.1016/j.erss.2021.101963.

[2] D. Lackaff, “Escaping the middleman paradox: Better Reykjavik and open policy innovation,” *eJournal eDemocracy Open Gov.*, 2015, doi: 10.29379/jedem.v7i2.386.

[3] Y. Zhao and B. Fan, “Exploring open government data capacity of government agency: Based on the resource-based theory,” *Gov. Inf. Q.*, 2018, doi: 10.1016/j.giq.2018.01.002.

[4] G. Shrestha, D. Joshi, and F. Clément, “Masculinities and hydropower in India: A feminist political ecology perspective,” *Int. J. Commons*, 2019, doi: 10.18352/ijc.920.

[5] S. J. Bell, “Frameworks for urban water sustainability,” *Wiley Interdisciplinary Reviews: Water*. 2020. doi: 10.1002/WAT2.1411.

[6] H. Al Nomani, E. Deakins, S. Dillon, and G. Vossen, “Achieving government-citizen dialogue in Arab nations via social media: Contextual considerations,” *Electron. Gov.*, 2016, doi: 10.1504/EG.2016.080439.

[7] J. Timmons Roberts *et al.*, “Four agendas for research and policy on emissions mitigation and well-being,” *Glob. Sustain.*, 2020, doi: 10.1017/sus.2019.25.

[8] T. J. Shaffer, “Democratic professionals in civic life: cultivating civil discourse in community development,” *Community Dev.*, 2020, doi: 10.1080/15575330.2019.1642926.

[9] D. Damayanti, “Human Resources Competency in the Era of Industrial Revolution 4.0,” *Econ. Bus. Solut. J.*, 2021, doi: 10.26623/ebsj.v5i1.3334.

[10] J. L. S. Sosa González, “Multidimensional diagnosis and morbidity of the production cooperatives in Mexico: A descriptive and explanatory study of the opportunity areas of the cooperatives of the Oaxaca coast region,” *Bol. la Asoc. Int. Derecho Coop.*, 2020, doi: 10.18543/BAIDC-57-2020PP309-350.

[11] X. M. Fu, N. Wang, S. S. Jiang, F. Yang, J. M. Li, and C. Y. Wang, “A research on influencing factors on the international cooperative exploitation for deep-sea bioresources based on the ternary fuzzy DEMATEL method,” *Ocean Coast. Manag.*, 2019, doi: 10.1016/j.ocecoaman.2019.01.019.

CHAPTER 9

A BRIEF STUDY ON DILEMMA OF TECHNOLOGY POLICY

Bhavana Chandran
Assistant Professor,Department of Law,
Presidency University, Bangalore, India.
Email Id:bhavana.chandran@presidencyuniversity.in

ABSTRACT:

The technology policy conundrum, which explores the difficulties and complications in creating efficient rules that control the creation, use, and regulation of technology. It explores the conflicts between encouraging innovation and dealing with possible hazards and social repercussions. The abstract identifies the essential factors in technology policy, including supporting responsible and sustainable technological progress, assuring inclusiveness and accessibility, and balancing economic growth with moral and social issues.

KEYWORDS:

Accessibility, Dilemma, Economic growth, Ethical concerns, Inclusivity, Innovation.

INTRODUCTION

One might assert that the political system's legitimacy serves as a justification for techno-economic sub-politics. There shouldn't be any debate about the fact that in the political system, no direct choices are made on technology. The consequences, for which there must be joint accountability, are not the politician's fault. However, the instruments of financial assistance, legislative channelling, and impact mitigation are at the power of technology policy. However, decisions about technological advancement and its commercialization are outside the purview of research policy. Industry has a dual edge over the government in terms of investment choices, as well as the exclusive right to use technology. Economic sub-politics holds the threads that regulate the modernization process in the form of economic planning, economic yield (or risk), and technical structure in the enterprises themselves. The state is discharged into numerous belatedness as a result of this division of labour in the power structure of modernization. It first has challenges keeping up with technical advancements made elsewhere[1]–[3].

Despite all of its funding for research, it has little impact on the objectives of technological advancement. The use and advancement of microelectronics, genetic technology, and the like are not voted on in parliament; at best, it may vote in favour of them to safeguard the nation's economic future (and jobs). Because of competitiveness, industries are compelled to create their strategies in secret. This is because technical advancement and investment choices are intimately linked to one another. As a result, choices are only made and then brought to the attention of the public and lawmakers.

Once judgements on technology advancements disguised as financial decisions have been made, they naturally acquire and gain a sizable weight of their own. They now enter the world with the

same restriction that investments do: they must generate profits. Fundamental objections would put money (and, therefore, employment) at peril. Anyone who now draws attention to the negative impacts endangers the businesses that have staked their future and the futures of their workers in these plans, endangering even the government's economic policies in the long run. Therein lies a two-fold restriction. First off, making investment selections under pressure to turn a profit puts pressure on side effect assessment.

Second, the difficulty in assessing the effects in any event and the lengthy implementation process for governmental countermeasures provide some relief. As a result, we find ourselves in the typical situation where "industrially produced problems of the present, being based on yesterday's investment decisions and the technological innovations of the day before yesterday, will at best meet with counter-measures tomorrow, which may become effective the day after tomorrow" (Jaenicke 1907: 33). Politics therefore becomes specialised in this sense by legitimising effects that it neither produced nor was really able to avert. Politics continues to have a dual responsibility for choices made in industry, per the architecture of the separation of powers. The industrial, pseudopolitical "sovereignty" in technical questions only has temporary credibility. It has to be repeatedly socially repaired in hindsight in the eyes of a critical public realm[4]–[6].

The political and governmental responsibility for consequences strengthens the necessity for the political justification of non-decisions.Thus, the division of labour gives the industries main decision-making authority but absolves them of side-effect liability, while politics is tasked with politically legitimating choices it hasn't made and "cushioning" technology's negative side effects.At the same time, the economic and economic policy interests that are engaged in the selected route of technological progress clash with the presentation of side effects at least at an early stage. The freedom of action for technology policy, which is caught between the millstones of a crucial public and economic priorities, narrows down the more adverse effects or public sensitivities to them) and the greater interest in economic recovery also in light of mass unemployment.

The progress model here provides relief. Progress is a genuine social transformation that does not need democratic political legitimacy. Voting is replaced by faith in progress. Additionally, it serves as a stand-in for queries and a kind of anticipatory permission for unstated and unintended goals and effects. As a political platform, progress is a clean slate that calls for complete acceptance as if it were the path to paradise on earth. The progress paradigm has flipped the basic requirements of democracy on its head.

Retrospectively highlighting even the fact that one is interested in social change is necessary. Officially, one is dealing with something quite different yet always the same, such as economic priorities, global market competitiveness, or employment. Social transformation only occurs in forms that have been displace. The reversal of rational activity as a "rationalisation process" is progress. It is the ongoing transformation of society into the unknowable without the aid of a plan or a vote. We presume that everything will work out and that everything we have brought upon ourselves may ultimately be transformed back into progress. But it is heretical to even

inquire as to why or why. Consent is required but not awareness of the reasons why. All other ideas are heresies.

It becomes apparent how counter-modern confidence in progress is. It is a particular kind of contemporary, secular religion. It has all the characteristics of a religious faith, such as trusting in the illusive and the irrational, or believing against one's better judgement, without understanding the path or the "how." Faith in progress is modernity's self-assurance in its own technology, which has evolved into creativity. Science and business have replaced God and the Church with the creative forces and those who create and manage them.

The more carefully one looks at the earthly design of the ersatz deity of progress, the greater interest it exerts on individuals in the age of industrial civilization. The implicit accountability of corporations, as well as the bare duty for the legitimacy of politicians, are equivalent to science's non-responsibility. Progress is societal change that has been institutionalised into an unaccountable position. However, the fatefulness of the belief in an unalterable necessity transformed into progress is contrived. An economy that leaves the social consequences to the latency of cost-intensifying factors, a science that introduces the process with the clear conscience of its theoretical attitude and wishes to remain oblivious to the consequences, and a government policy that can only give its blessing to prescribed decisions are all examples of the "anarchy of side effects." Whereas the non-politics of techno-economic growth turns itself into a subpolitics in need of legitimation, the belief in progress becomes a tradition of progress that subverts modernity just as it produced it.

DISCUSSION

The Sub-Politics of Industrial Automation

Functionalist and neo-Marxist analyses, as well as those of the sociology of organisations, continue to think in terms of the long-undermined 'certainties' of large organisation and hierarchy, Taylorism, and economic crisis. These have been replaced by advances in plants and the opportunities for enterprise growth. Uncertainty has even crept into the temples of the economic dogmas, along with the automation potential of microelectronics and other information technologies, the environmental concerns, and the politicisation of risks. The standardisation of wage labour in terms of time, space, and law (for a detailed discussion on this, see Chapter 6), the power structure of large organisations, and the potential for rationalisation are all becoming mobile and no longer adhere to the established plans and relations. They transcend the fixed boundaries of divisions, plants, and sectors; the structure of the production sectors can be electronically reconnected; technical production systems can be changed independently of human labour structures; notions of profitability are becoming more flexible in light of the demands for flexibility imposed by the market, ecological morality, and the politicisation of production; and new forms of "flexible specialisation" (Piore and Sabel 1 985) competitive

This abundance of options for structuring change does not necessarily need to be implemented as part of organisational policy right once, all at once, or in the near future. But despite this, the interconnected forces of environment, new technology, and an altered political culture have already had an impact on the present.

A wide variety of organisational and societal transformations are now made feasible by microelectronics. Although structural unemployment is a serious concern, it is only an intensification that still fits within the established categories for issue perception. The usage of microcomputers and microprocessors should in the medium term start to have similar weight to the conventional organisational foundations of the economic system. To put it simply, the introduction of microelectronics represents a level of technological advancement that technically disproves the idea of technological determinism. One reason is because computers and control devices can be programmed, making them useful in the widest range of circumstances, issues, and goals[7]–[9].

As a result, technology no longer explicitly dictates how it should be used; rather, this information may and must be input into the technology. The previously valid options for organising social structure in accordance with "objective technical constraints" are dwindling or even changing. To leverage the networking capabilities of electronic control and information technologies at all, one must be aware of the sort of social organisation one desires in both its horizontal and vertical dimensions. Microelectronics, on the other hand, enables the separation of labour and manufacturing methods. In other words, the systems of technology production and human labour might change independently of one another.

New patterns are becoming viable across divisional, plant, and sectoral borders in all organisational dimensions and levels. On this issue, the fundamental tenet of the industrial system is that collaboration is spatially constrained in a 'organisational framework' fulfilling that goal, but this tenet is losing the technological support for its need. That, however, suggests that the "building blocks" that conventional ideas and theories of organisation are founded on are changing. This opens up organisational flexibility on a scale that is yet beyond comprehension. They won't be fatigued overnight, but it is hardly the least significant reason why. The limits on trying out novel ways of living in the private sphere hardly take a backseat to the experimental era of organisational planning that we are now living in.Correctly evaluating the dimensions is crucial. Reflexive rationalisations aimed at the premises and invariants of change up to this point are replacing the paradigm of primary rationalisation, which is distinguished by changes in the categories of job, skill, and technical system. The prevailing governing principles of industrial society, such as the plant paradigm, the division of labour, and the restriction on mass production, may therefore be used to limit the developing possibilities for organisational layout.

In talks on the societal effects of microelectronics, a certain viewpoint continues to predominate in academia and the general public. It is questioned and explored whether or not jobs are lost in the ultimate analysis, if skill hierarchies alter, whether new professions emerge and obsolete ones disappear, and so on. People continue to conceive in terms of the good old industrial society and find it difficult to comprehend that they no longer accurately describe the new "possible realities." Such studies often conclude with something like to a "all clear bulletin" stating that changes in employment and skill sets are to be expected. The division and plant categories, the labour and production system assignments, and similar factors are all maintained throughout this procedure. However, the unique potential of "intelligent" electronics for automation, which is just now starting to become apparent, is outside the framework of how industrial society and

sociology conceive and conduct study. We are concerned with system rationalisation, which gives the appearance that organisational boundaries inside and across plants, divisions, sectors, etc. are changeable yet seeming to be quite stable.

the approaching waves of rationalisation are characterised by their capacity for boundary-crossing and boundary-changing. The structure of plant divisions, the interaction of organisation and cooperation, and the coexistence of plant organisations, in addition to the fact that entire divisions in assembly, for example, but also in administration, can be automated, brought together in data banks, and even directly connected electronically to the customer, are all up for debate. This conceals a significant potential for business policy to alter workplace governance while maintaining at least initially the same job structure. Under the (now more abstract) guise of the company, the intra- and interorganizational structure may be modified around the jobs, obviating the need for trade unions.

The organisational configurations that may be created in this approach are less "top-heavy," have fewer components, and may be recombined in very diverse ways at various times. Then, it's possible that each individual "organisational element" has relationships with the outside world and pursues a "organisational foreign policy" that is unique to its role. As long as certain outcomes (such as profitability, prompt adjustments to shifting market circumstances, and attention to market diversity) are achieved in a fashion that can be monitored, the specified aims may be pursued without contacting the central organisation in advance. Here, "dominance," which was arranged in the bureaucracy and huge industrial facilities as a chain of command that could be felt socially, is transferred to the combined functional principles and results. Systems emerge when perceivable "rulers" are becoming less common. The electronically monitored "self-coordination" of "functional elements" under presumptive and much more severely enforced efficiency rules is taking the role of commands and submission. In this sense, the transparent organisation with regard to performance monitoring and personnel policy may exist in the near future. This change in the monitoring mechanisms, however, is likely to be accompanied by a horizontal autonomization of subordinate, subsidiary, and coordinate organisations.

The direction and monopolisation of information flows will become a major issue in the "plants" of the future due to the microelectronic transformation of the control structure. It is possible for the plant to become "transparent" to the personnel and the surrounding community in addition to being "transparent" to the management of the plant. Information becomes the primary tool for facilitating the connection and coherence of the production unit when localization of production ages and frays. As a result, the issue of who receives what information, how it is obtained, in what sequence, about who and what, and for what reason, becomes crucial. It is not difficult to forecast that these power conflicts over the distribution and the distribution coefficient of information flows will become a significant source of conflict in the organisational issues of the future. The fact that as a result of decentralised production, first the legal ownership of the means of production and then the actual disposition over them are starting to differentiate and the control of the production process is starting to hang by the thin thread of the manageability of information and information networks emphasises the significance of this development even

more. As a result of control over an increasing amount of concentrated wealth, this would simply serve to further monopolise decision-making power.

With the aid of telecommunications, the ongoing restrictions in the direction of concentration and centralization may be captured and organised in a new manner. It is nevertheless true that modernity depends on concentrated decision-making and very sophisticated coordination possibilities to carry out its responsibilities and functions. However, they don't always have to be carried out by enormous organisations. ATDs are a good example of how they might be delegated using information technology, completed in decentralised data, information, and organisational networks, or offered by (semi-)automatic services in direct "interactive cooperation" with the receivers. A whole new trend that runs counter to accepted ideas emerges in this situation. Along with the concentration of data and information, hierarchically structured mega-bureaucracies and administrative infrastructure based on the division of labour are being dismantled. Debureaucratization and the concentration of information are intertwined. It becomes feasible for decision-making to be concentrated and for labour unions and service institutions to be decentralised. Regardless of distance, information technology has enabled video display terminals to provide "direct" contact between the "middle" level of bureaucratic organisations (in the administration, the service sector, and the production sphere). Even if all this means is that the "chaos of the administration" is transmitted in objectified form via electronic means directly to the "mature citizen," many tasks of the welfare state and the state administration, as well as of customer service, jobbing, and repair shops, can be transformed into a type of electronic self-service store. In this scenario, the person eligible for a service no longer communicates directly with an administrative official, customer advisor, or a similar party; instead, they choose the treatment, service, or authorization they want in accordance with a process whose guidelines may be searched up online. It's probable that for certain key service sectors, this objectification via data processing technology is not feasible, sensible, or socially realisable. However, it is not the case for a larger range of regular tasks, thus in the near future a significant portion of the administrative and service routine may be carried out in this manner - saving on human expenses[7]–[11].

CONCLUSION

Finding the ideal balance between encouraging innovation and addressing possible hazards and social ramifications is the central challenge of technology policy. To promote ethical and sustainable technological progress, effective technology policy must navigate difficult issues. Technological progress and economic expansion are driven by innovation. By creating a supportive environment for research and development, offering incentives, and promoting stakeholder participation, technology policy should promote and support innovation.

REFERENCES

[1] F. W. Geels, S. Sareen, A. Hook, and B. K. Sovacool, “Navigating implementation dilemmas in technology-forcing policies: A comparative analysis of accelerated smart meter diffusion in the Netherlands, UK, Norway, and Portugal (2000-2019),” *Res. Policy*, 2021, doi: 10.1016/j.respol.2021.104272.

[2] S. Greenstein, “Technology policy dilemmas in the new administration,” *IEEE Micro*. 2021. doi: 10.1109/MM.2020.3046135.

[3] P. A. Balland, R. Boschma, J. Crespo, and D. L. Rigby, “Smart specialization policy in the European Union: relatedness, knowledge complexity and regional diversification,” *Reg. Stud.*, 2019, doi: 10.1080/00343404.2018.1437900.

[4] E. Grande, “The erosion of state capacity and the European innovation policy dilemma: A comparison of German and EU information technology policies,” *Res. Policy*, 2001, doi: 10.1016/S0048-7333(00)00164-5.

[5] A. Genus and A. Stirling, “Collingridge and the dilemma of control: Towards responsible and accountable innovation,” *Res. Policy*, 2018, doi: 10.1016/j.respol.2017.09.012.

[6] B. Ribeiro *et al.*, “Introducing the dilemma of societal alignment for inclusive and responsible research and innovation,” *Journal of Responsible Innovation*. 2018. doi: 10.1080/23299460.2018.1495033.

[7] L. Straker, J. Zabatiero, S. Danby, K. Thorpe, and S. Edwards, “Conflicting Guidelines on Young Children’s Screen Time and Use of Digital Technology Create Policy and Practice Dilemmas,” *Journal of Pediatrics*. 2018. doi: 10.1016/j.jpeds.2018.07.019.

[8] A. Lupovici, “The dual-use security dilemma and the social construction of insecurity,” *Contemp. Secur. Policy*, 2021, doi: 10.1080/13523260.2020.1866845.

[9] G. Rowe and R. P. Watermeyer, “Dilemmas of public participation in science policy,” *Policy Stud.*, 2018, doi: 10.1080/01442872.2018.1451502.

[10] Y. Shi, B. Han, and Y. Zeng, “Simulating policy interventions in the interfirm diffusion of low-carbon technologies: An agent-based evolutionary game model,” *J. Clean. Prod.*, 2020, doi: 10.1016/j.jclepro.2019.119449.

[11] N. Kucirkova, L. Gerard, and M. C. Linn, “Designing personalised instruction: A research and design framework,” *Br. J. Educ. Technol.*, 2021, doi: 10.1111/bjet.13119.

CHAPTER 10

SCENARIOS OF A POSSIBLE FUTURE

Sofiul Ahmed
Assistant Professor,Department of Law,
Presidency University, Bangalore, India.
Email Id:sofiul.ahmed@presidencyuniversity.in

ABSTRACT:

Visualizing various future courses and results based on present trends and probable disruptions. It offers a hypothetical study of probable social, economic, technical, and environmental advancements that could have a significant impact on the future. The abstract emphasises the value of scenario planning for anticipating and preparing for a range of potential future outcomes, allowing informed decision-making and proactive adaptation.

KEYWORDS:

Future, Scenarios, Speculative Analysis, Trends, Outcomes, Social Developments, Economic Developments.

INTRODUCTION

No matter how paradoxical it may seem, the contemporary religion of progress has had its day and is still present in places where its promises are met with obstacles that impede their realisation. These class-based injustices, undeveloped productive forces, and actual material poverty were and still do influence political confrontations. This era came to an end in the developed Western nations by the end of the 1970s as a result of two historical events. While politics encounters intrinsic constraints as the welfare state grows, opportunities for social transformation arise through the interaction of research, technology, and science. In this manner, organisational authority moves from the realm of politics to that of sub-politics with institutional stability and unaltered jurisdictions. Nowadays, the "alternative society" is predicted to emerge through the use of microelectronics, genetic technology, and information media rather than from legislative deliberations on new legislation.

Political utopias have made way for concern about potential consequences.In line with this, utopias have become unfavourable. Instead of the parliament or political parties, research facilities and executive suites are where the future is being unconsciously and subtly constructed. Everyone else, even the most responsible and knowledgeable individuals in politics and science, mostly subsists on the information that leaks out of the technical sub-politics planning tables.Under the guise of normalcy, research labs and plant management in the future-focused businesses have transformed into "revolutionary cells."In this case, the parliamentary system is being ignored while the structures of a new society are being built with an eye towards the ultimate aims of scientific advancement[1]–[3].

With politics starting to lose its dominant position, things have the potential to go nasty. Politics is becoming into a publicly funded advertising agency touting the positive aspects of a development it is unaware of and cannot actively affect. Only the requirement it entails exceeds the overall lack of knowledge of this evolution. Politicians encourage the transition to an alternate society of which they have no idea by making gestures that maintain the current quo, while also blaming "anti-cultural agitation" for the systematically stoked anxieties about the future. Businessmen and scientists who spend their days formulating strategies to destroy the current social order by force maintain their innocence and impartiality by denying any responsibility for the decisions made in these schemes.

However, the role structure in which they are imprisoned as well as the individuals lose credibility. The naturalness of development becomes apparent with all of its hazardous nature when the side consequences become the scope and shapes of an epochal societal transformation. The power structure within the modernisation process is becoming more flexible. Future political arrangements are developing their grey zones, which will be summarised in three (not necessarily mutually incompatible) alternatives. Reindustrialization, the return to an industrial society, democratisation of technical change, and difference politics make up the first three.

Back to Industrial Society

Across party lines and international boundaries, the vast majority of people today are pursuing this choice in politics, the sciences, and the public domain. And in reality, it has a lot of strong supporting arguments. The first is its realism, which claims to have learned from the last 200 years of critique of development and civilization and is based on an analysis of unchangeable market restrictions and economic realities. According to this evaluation, arguing or acting in opposition to them presupposes extreme ignorance or masochistic personality qualities. In accordance with this perspective, we are now dealing with a resurgence of "anti-modernist" activities and ideas, which have always followed industrial growth like a shadow but were ultimately unable to impede its advancement. At the same time, any political wiggle space is severely constrained by economic needs like widespread unemployment or industrial competitiveness. The knowledge of "post-history," of the inevitable course of the growth of industrial society, seems to affirm that things will go in the same manner regardless (with a few "ecological corrective measures"). Even the consolation that relying on 'progress' has historically provided appears to support this choice. Faith in progress provides a solution to the question "What should we do?" which is posed by each new generation: "The same as ever, only bigger, faster, and more." In that regard, there is strong evidence to imply that we are dealing with the likely future in this scenario[4]–[6].

The situation that governs behaviour and cognition is obvious. It is a projection of the industrial society's experiences from the nineteenth century onto the society of the twenty-first. This play argues that industrialization's threats are not particularly fresh dangers. They mobilised fresh scientific and technical creative energies and, in this sense, represented rungs on the ladder of development. They were and still are the self-made challenges of the future. Many individuals see the commercial potential that are emerging in this area, but since they still adhere to the outdated reasoning, they write off the current hazards as technological challenges for the future.

In this case, they are mistaken about two things: first, the nature of industrial society as a semi-modern society; and second, the fact that the categories in which they think modernization of tradition and those in which we live modernization of industrial society belong to two different centuries, in which the world was transformed in ways never seen before.

To put it another way, they are unable to see how modernity, or the apparent consistency of advances, masks a qualitative discontinuity behind the garb of continuity. Let's start by considering the implications of continuing to think in the first century of modernity in the contemporary era.

Here, economic concerns take the stage. The other difficulties and challenges are all affected by their urgency. This is true even in cases when employment policy gives economic growth the priority. Now, this fundamental motivation appears to compel one to make investment choices in a blind march, setting and maintaining the technical and subsequently societal progress without giving one the chance to choose and without knowing why or where things are headed. Thus, two switches are thrown. The power potential to overthrow social conditions that Marx had once ascribed to the proletariat accumulates in the fields of technological sub-politics, except that it can be used under the protection of state power (and under the critical eyes of the labour union alternative power and an uneasy public). On the other hand, politics is relegated to the position of a legitimising guardian of outside choices that transform society top-down.

Under circumstances of widespread unemployment, this reduction to simple legitimation is strengthened. The more the plants' discretionary options grow and the less space there is for government intervention in economic policy, the more firmly economic policy determines the route and the more obviously the fight against mass unemployment gathers momentum. As a result, politics begins to slide down the slippery slope of se/jdisempowerment. Meanwhile, its inbuilt contradictions become more evident. Even with all of its democratic authority at its disposal, it restricts itself to the position of an advocate for a change whose official propensity for euphemism has consistently been called into question by the unassailable elemental force with which it sweeps society.

DISCUSSION

The hazards come into the purview of governmental action, which, if implemented, would need interventions in the industrial production settings from which they originate interventions one has just renounced as part of the coordination of industrial policy. As a result, one prior choice influences another, preventing the claimed existence of real existent hazards. A political requirement for study into risk reduction increases in direct proportion to the public's growing sensitivity to dangers. This is meant to ensure that politics plays a legitimate, representational role in society. The self-prescribed impotence of politics manifests itself publicly if threats persist despite the social process of origination (such as the vanishing woods) and the need for politically accountable solutions acquires a meaning that may determine elections. It consistently maintains the position with which it declares that it wants to develop a political solution. Numerous illustrative examples include the debate over the adoption of the catalytic converter,

speed restrictions on motorways, or laws to lower pollutants and poisons in food, air, and water[7]–[10].

The 'course of things' is not as unchangeable as is often claimed.The conflict between capitalism and socialism, which has dominated this and the previous century, also does not represent an alternative. Instead, what makes the shift to a risk society significant is that both possibilities and threats have been misconstrued. The 'basic fault' of the reindustrialization approach, which seeks to carry over the ideas of the nineteenth century into the twenty-first, is that the conflict between modernity and industrial society is still not acknowledged. The project of industrial society amounts to a bifurcation of modernity in many ways in the central areas, and the adherence to modernity's experiences and maxims provides continuity and the future, are both obstructed by the irreducible equation of modernity's developmental conditions in the nineteenth century, which are gathered together in the project of industrial society, with the programme of modernity's developmental conditions.

Concisely, this means that the demands of modernity are asserted against their bifurcation in industrial society even in those areas where new livable, institutionalizable solutions are not yet in the offing, as seen in the rush of women into the labour market, in the demystification of scientific rationality, in the disappearance of the belief in progress, and in the changes of political culture accomplished outside parliament. Even the risks that industrial society has purposefully created without any foresight or regard for the need for reason to which it is subject could pose a threat to imaginative fantasy and the capacity of humans to influence the course of the world if they were finally taken seriously.

This historical misinterpretation of circumstances and developmental tendencies is now manifesting itself in full force. The 'blind march' between business and politics that was previously noted may have been both conceivable and essential in the era of industrial civilization. Acting in this manner would entail misunderstanding a polynomial equation with the multiplication table fundamentals in the risk society. This would make the fundamental differences between circumstances across the institutional divide between business and politics as invisible as the unique interests of various sectors and organisations. Thus, it is difficult to talk of a consistency of economic interests with regard to the definition of hazards, for example. Risk interpretations, on the other hand, form a breach between the business camp. Risks always have losers as well as winners. However, it suggests that risk categories enable political judgements rather than deny us. They are a very powerful tool for choosing and guiding economic developments. In that regard, the statistically supported judgement is accurate in saying that perceptions of danger only sometimes conflict with economic objectives, making an ecological option less likely to fail due to its high costs.

Along the same lines, political and economic interests are divided in terms of risky circumstances. Politics, not business, is responsible for the dangers as side consequences. In other words, business is not accountable for what it causes, and politics is accountable for something it cannot influence. The adverse effects will continue as long as this holds true. This contributes to the structural disadvantage of politics, which not only has its frustrations with the

general public, health care costs, and other issues but is also constantly blamed for things that are harder to deny but whose causes and changes are outside of its direct control.

But this vicious cycle of diminished self-worth and diminished credibility may be overcome. The accountability for side effects is crucial in this situation. As an alternative, political activity becomes more influential concurrently with the identification and perception of danger. Risk definitions trigger obligations and produce regions of unjust systemic circumstances that scream for change in the public interest. With the aid of a science that is either blind or externally regulated, they do not therefore cripple political activity and need not be concealed at all costs against a consistently outraged public. Risk definitions, on the other hand, provide fresh political avenues for regaining and enhancing democratic parliamentary authority.

On the other hand, denial does not make hazards go away. On the other hand, what was meant to be a stabilisation strategy might very soon become a broad destabilisation. The hidden hazards themselves might suddenly transform into social risk scenarios of such gravity that it is difficult to fathom how the industrial society's lack of consideration could have been managed so inadequately, politically as well as technologically and scientifically. Demonstrations of political futility and cosmetic, symbolic operations cannot satisfy the sensitivity for proper action that has evolved as democratic rights have been internalised in the long term. Insecurity is rising concurrently in all spheres of social life, including marriage, the family, gender relations, and profession.

Political indifference and cynicism may spread quickly among the people as a result of such shock, and the already-existing divide between social structure and politics, or between political parties and the voters, can increase quickly. The rejection of "politics" may then have an impact on the democratic system as a whole, rather than simply certain representatives and political parties. Insecurity and extremism would once again work together. Once again, ominously, the need for political leadership would resonate. People would become more and more desirous of a "strong hand" as they saw the world crashing around them. The spectres of the past would return out of the need for consistency and order. Politics itself would be in danger from the negative impacts of a politics that overlooks negative effects. In the end, it could not be ruled out that Germany's still-unprocessed history would turn out to be a development choice for the future, although in a different shape.

The Democratization of Techno-Economic Development

The tradition of modernism, which attempts to increase the degree of self-determination, is connected. Starting point is the conclusion that options for democratic self-determination were institutionally reduced throughout the innovation process of industrial society. Techno-economic breakthroughs have always been denied access to democratic monitoring, dialogue, and opposition as a force behind long-term social transformation. As a result, the creative process is constructed with a variety of inconsistencies, which are now becoming apparent.

Modernization is seen as "rationalisation," yet something is taking place in this system that is beyond of our cognitive awareness and control. Industrial society can only be seen as a democracy on the one hand, but on the other, it has always carried the prospect that the society

may turn from the ignorance that propels it into the antithesis of its presumptive claim to enlightenment and development. To the extent that this poses a challenge, confidence and scepticism in the freed movement's progressivism clash with a social structure that, more than any other, has built its growth on the acquisition of knowledge and the capacity to do so. A societal evolution that had previously depended on the logical resolution of disagreements comes to be determined by doctrinal conflicts and the related tendency to label some as heretics and rebuild the heaps for burning them.

Science, which was instrumental in starting things off, has absolved itself of the repercussions and seeks sanctuary for its own role in the decision-making process, which modernity converts everything into anyway.

Making this base for decision-making publicly available in accordance with the guidelines laid forth for such things in the modernity's recipe book, democratisation, is thus what's important right now, the conclusion goes. The political system's tried-and-true tools must be used to situations outside of it. This is capable of many variations, many of which are being discussed. The range of ideas includes everything from parliamentary oversight of corporate technological development to specialised "modernization parliaments" where interdisciplinary groups of experts would review, rate, and approve plans, all the way to the inclusion of citizen groups in technological planning and the decision-making processes in research policy.

The fundamental idea is that science and research, the auxiliary and alternative governments of techno-economic sub-politics, may be subject to legislative oversight. Due to their freedom of research and investment, they should at the very least be required to defend their positions before democratic institutions on fundamental "rationalisation process" choices if they are to serve as an auxiliary government. But the core issue with this political and cognitive approach is right there in this oversimplified transfer. Even if the reindustrialization plan demands the contrary, it continues to be tied to the era of industrial society in its prescriptions. The concept of "democratisation" as it was understood in the nineteenth century presupposes centralization, bureaucratization, and the like, and ties to circumstances that have historically become rather outmoded and dubious.

CONCLUSION

Planning scenarios also promotes stakeholder participation and cooperation, establishing a shared knowledge of probable future course. This all-inclusive strategy makes it easier to create mutually agreeable future-focused visions, objectives, and plans of action. Even while hypothetical future scenarios cannot foretell the precise path of events, they are useful tools for enhancing readiness, agility, and resilience. They help decision-makers establish policies and strategies that can be modified to fit various future scenarios, allocate resources efficiently, and make informed decisions.In conclusion, hypothetical future scenarios provide a framework for planning for several conceivable outcomes. Decision-makers may foresee future difficulties, seize opportunities, and negotiate the intricacies of an unknown future by using scenario planning. To create a desired future and develop resilience in the face of change, proactive adaptation and well-informed decision-making are essential.

REFERENCES

[1] J. Bentham, "The scenario approach to possible futures for oil and natural gas," *Energy Policy*, 2014, doi: 10.1016/j.enpol.2013.08.019.

[2] T. B. Lauber *et al.*, "Using scenarios to assess possible future impacts of invasive species in the Laurentian great lakes," *North Am. J. Fish. Manag.*, 2016, doi: 10.1080/02755947.2016.1214647.

[3] C. Amorim Varum, C. Melo, A. Alvarenga, and P. S. de Carvalho, "Scenarios and possible futures for hospitality and tourism," *Foresight*, 2011, doi: 10.1108/14636681111109679.

[4] T. R. Robinson, "Scenario ensemble modelling of possible future earthquake impacts in Bhutan," *Nat. Hazards*, 2020, doi: 10.1007/s11069-020-04138-x.

[5] Y. Arushanyan *et al.*, "Environmental assessment of possible future waste management Scenarios," *Energies*, 2017, doi: 10.3390/en10020247.

[6] C. Dobler, D. Pfeifer, and W. Streicher, "Reaching energy autonomy in a medium-sized city – three scenarios to model possible future energy developments in the residential building sector," *Sustain. Dev.*, 2018, doi: 10.1002/sd.1855.

[7] M. Heemskerk, "Scenarios in anthropology: Reflections on possible futures of the Suriname Maroons," *Futures*, 2003, doi: 10.1016/S0016-3287(03)00050-8.

[8] A. D. Guglieri, "Strategic Design and reality levels: scenarios as prisms for creating possible futures," *Strateg. Des. Res. J.*, 2021, doi: 10.4013/sdrj.2021.143.06.

[9] K. Szocik, T. Wójtowicz, and M. Braddock, "The Martian: Possible Scenarios for a Future Human Society on Mars," *Space Policy*, 2020, doi: 10.1016/j.spacepol.2020.101388.

[10] A. Lecce, D. C. Di Gennaro, and M. Sibilio, "Work and disability during the Covid-19 outbreak: from the current scenario to possible future perspectives," *Form@re - Open J. per la Form. rete*, 2021, doi: 10.36253/form-10325.

CHAPTER 11

DIVERSE LOGICS OF RISK: YOUNG PEOPLE NEGOTIATIONS OF THERISK SOCIETY INCLUDING SOCIAL MEDIA

Pushpita Dutta
Assistant Professor,Department of Law,
Presidency University, Bangalore, India.
Email Id:pushpita.dutta@presidencyuniversity.in

ABSTRACT:

With an emphasis on the function of social media, this research project intends to analyse how young people negotiate and move through the risk society and examine the many logics of risk. The growing knowledge and perception of many dangers in daily life define the risk society. The research looks at the complex nature of risk and how it affects young people in modern society. It examines how young people perceive, understand, and react to hazards while taking into account the impact of social, cultural, and technological elements. The research investigates how social media affects young people's risk perceptions and risk-taking behaviours. This study offers insights into the many logics of risk and informs evidence-based decision-making and policies surrounding risk management and assistance for young people. It does so using qualitative research methodologies, interviews, and case studies.

KEYWORDS:

Risk Society, Young People, Risk Perceptions, social media, Risk Management.

INTRODUCTION

In the 2003 Thessaloniki Declaration, the European Union made clear its political stake in the Western Balkans (WB) area. The EU affirmed its "European perspective" on the area and offered these nations full membership once they have met the required standards, one of which is converting state broadcasting organisations into public service broadcasting (PSB). This change is seen to be essential for democratisation. The WB nations have sought PSB models and standards that are used in Western Europe in an attempt to comply with the requirement. Unfortunately, these initiatives have had underwhelming outcomes. The 'network paradigm' topic that serves as the book's foundation serves as the starting point for this chapter. This paradigm is widely regarded as being very important for an evolving media-society setting in which public service media (PSM) should function. This chapter examines how realistic or even plausible that paradigm isIn comparison to other parts of Europe, modernization in this area began in the eighteenth century. The most developed countries at the time were Croatia and Slovenia as a whole. The earliest newspapers were established in Croatia since it was the wealthiest country. Slovenia had the greatest rates of literacy and the biggest industrial output capability, followed by Croatia. Only 9% of people were illiterate, compared to 84% in Macedonia, 80% in the populations of what is now Bosnia and Herzegovina, 67% in Montenegro, 64% in Serbia, and 32% in Croatia . The fact that Croatia and Slovenia were formerly a part of the Austro-

Hungarian empire while the rest of the world was a member of the Ottoman Empire accounts for their superior condition[1], [2].

The second turning point was Yugoslavia's experience with socialism from 1945 to 1991. As a part of the non-aligned movement, Yugoslavia had a "lighter touch" in comparison to Albania under Hoxha and Romania under Ceaușescu, and was always seen as "a maverick state" that was neither firmly in the West or the East (Ramet 1995). Yugoslavian socialism was characterised by self-management, which enabled employees to take part in decision-making (although they were excluded from choices that had a fundamental impact, such as the appointment of Directors, which fell solely within the jurisdiction of the Communist Party). Although it was mistakenly believed that self-management at the firm level would promote decentralisation of decision making at the societal level, co-governing and consulting in decisions about firm operations are obviously not the same as participation in societal governance (Lydall 1989). However, Peruko (2016) believes that the socialist era had a unified impact on the political and economic circumstances for media development in the former Yugoslavian republics, which accounts for their relative higher technological sophistication and more critical orientation than other countries in eastern Europe at the time. Despite this, there remained significant poverty and the gap between the more developed Yugoslav republics (Croatia and Slovenia) and the others was widening.

The third turning point came after Yugoslavia's dissolution, when attention moved to attempts to democratise and join the EU. The deadliest wars since World War IICroatia 1990–95; Bosnia and Herzegovina 1992–95; Serbia and Kosovo 1999; and Macedonia 2001affected all except Slovenia during this time. State-controlled media continued to play a significant role in propagandising during this time of unrest, which badly harmed public confidence in these 6 provide two instances. Slobodan Miloevi's administration exercised strict control over Radio-Television Serbia (RTS) (Veljanovski 2005). RTS started a PSM transformation initiative after his downfall, but his severely damaged image has so far limited his achievements. During the war, the Democratic Union used a variety of tactics to maintain control over HRT in Croatia, imposing oppressive rules, installing politically appointed managers and editors, controlling the program's content, and prescribing guidelines for how journalists should cover the front lines (Thompson 1995; Kurspahi 2003). HRT effectively had a monopoly as none of the commercial TV channels had a significant viewer share. Any meaningful chance for changing state-controlled media only became a possibility following political upheavals in Serbia and Croatia in 2000. The legacy of the conflict was codified in Bosnia and Herzegovina in a public broadcasting organisational structure that reflects geographical and political differences. As a consequence, BHRT lacks political backing and is weak due to its significant financial debt. Two organisations, Federal RTV for Muslim-Croats and RTRS for Serbs, are directly dependent on their political allegiances for their validity. As a result, ingrained route dependencies and regional history are important variables that limit the growth of a public service orientation[3]–[5].

Technological underdevelopment

The necessity for a digital technical infrastructure, which is a need for creating a networked society, is highlighted by the second contextual component. This is a somewhat undeveloped

area in the WB. Despite the fact that investments made during the communist era produced a respectable technical foundation, the infrastructure was destroyed by conflict, and further progress was hindered. The Yugoslav Radio-Television (YRT) umbrella group coordinated programming exchanges between stations in the member states during the decentralised era of Yugoslavian broadcasting. Each exercised a great deal of independence in terms of personnel hiring, funds collection, and programming and production. The most advanced technological infrastructure was in Croatia. The HRT headquarters building was built in 1986 to serve as the Yugoslavia EBU exchange facility. The Serbian broadcaster RTS had a solid reputation for producing top-notch educational and documentary shows throughout the Soviet era. The Communist Party undoubtedly had an impact on the content that was chosen in all of these nations and had some control over the media, but Croatia was the only country to continue using the licence fee funding model after becoming independent.

Damage from the war and the ensuing hardship weakened the incentives for new media creation. The majority of WB broadcasters currently lack the resources to diversify their programming, and no indigenous technological firms are pioneers in establishing the standards for the sector. Mobile operators haven't made many demands to reserve spectrum space (Broughton Micova, upcoming). The International Telecommunications Union (ITU), the European Union (EU), and issues with signal interference from adjacent countries continue to be the primary forces behind digitalization and technological advancement Only Croatia and Slovenia successfully made the switch to digital broadcasting before the 2012 deadline set by the EU, but Bosnia & Herzegovina and Kosovo are yet to meet the June 2015 ITU date. These nations were particularly hard hit by war and lacked full independence for many years following. Both still encounter shaky state-building processes and are sceptical about the transition to digital terrestrial television (DTT) due to the complex experiences of their neighbours.

Support from the state or the EU is necessary for the transition. The receiver of assistance in Serbia, Macedonia, and Montenegro was a public network operator that was established after the sale of the previous connections and transmissions division of state broadcasting enterprises that were to become PSB. Although the DTT network operator is also a publicly traded firm, infrastructure in Croatia does not get any direct subsidies.Public network operators support efforts to meet requirements for universal coverage, particularly the need to connect with the 15% of Croats who reside in hilly locations. Where the financial value of DTT is minimal, public network operators provide access to digital signals to meet a legitimate public need. Many local and regional broadcasters in Serbia and Macedonia think it is not worthwhile to pay the expenses for free-to-air DTT broadcasting (Milosavljevi & Broughton Micova 2013). Given the region's poor media markets and minimal reliance on DTT, commercial companies should only show dwindling interest. However, according to Breton Micova (to be published), "the public interest in maintaining a publicly owned DTT network might warrant continued operation as a form of public service media provision.

Inequalities between wealth and clientelism

Clientelism, the third contextual component, is the strongest barrier to the development of networked communities in WB nations. Wars that have severely damaged infrastructure and

taken a huge toll on human life have seriously harmed the transition to liberal democracy. The state in this area has changed from being a reliable adjudicator of local disputes to serving as a resource for political parties and oligarchsThis explains why clientelism is so pervasive. According to Hallin & Papathanassopoulos clientelism is a sort of social organisation in which "access to social resources is controlled by patrons, and community resources are allocated to clients, in exchange for various types of support." WB nations score the lowest on all metrics of economic progress when compared to EU standards (Table 2). With the highest unemployment rate and net incomes that are four to five times lower than the EU norm, Kosovo has the lowest GDP rate of any nation in Europe.

Small market sizes and much lower total income availability and potential in WB media markets hinder economic growth. Croatia is the best off, but only in comparison.In the area, the state of the economy has two effects on public broadcasters. First, they must depend in part on commercial earnings and advertising revenue, both of which are subject to EU regulations on state assistance. Second, a significant number of residents are deterred by poverty from paying the licence fee or taxes required to support PSB. They explore alternate financing as a consequence, which is often commercial and goes against what many regard to be a crucial normative PSB premise. As a consequence of their strong dependence on advertising, public broadcasters are really subject to business and political pressures that serve to cement their relationships with ruling parties, state advertisers, and other media companies. For instance, the majority of media in Serbia, including RTS, sell advertisements via marketing firms, and significant members of these firms have connections to both the past and current Presidents of Serbia and their political parties The outcome is a large indirect political impact, which was made worse by direct state support for PSB from 2014 to 2016 for RTS. The same holds true for Montenegro and Kosovo[6]–[8].

The circumstance is comparable to what we've seen in recent years in Poland and Hungary, where "anti-system proto-hegemonic parties have taken offices" (Bajomi-Lazar, forthcoming). This is clear from the Vui administration in Serbia, the alliance of ethnic political parties in Bosnia and Herzegovina, and ukanovi's 27-year control of Montenegro. After winning the 2015 election, the conservative Croatian Democratic Union administration fired HRT's entire management team and editorial board and replaced them with "ideologically suitable" individuals. As a consequence, quality has declined, and confidence levels have decreased These instances show how PSB has strayed from its intended purpose of serving as a tool for managing conflict to one of reflecting and enhancing political and ideological disagreement. The condition is applicable to all seven of the WB region's nations.

The 'golden period' of media development occurred between 2001 and 2005, and it corresponded with political stability, sustained economic growth, and 'EUphoria,' according to statistics from the IREX Media Sustainability Index. As political and corporate actors have taken over all public and state resources, the situation is now in steep retrograde, which has decreased media freedom, degraded professionalism, and promoted stagnation rather than innovation. Political instability has been fueled by the global financial crisis since 2008, which has made the collapse more

noticeable. We are not just talking about an issue exclusive to WB nations; this deterioration has regional consequences and repercussions for the EU.

DISCUSSION

PSB institutions are in the forefront of attempts to systematically colonise public resources.Independence in public service television in particular has been compromised by the pervasiveness of political party influences, which is explained by the frailty of labour unions, professional associations, and civil society groups. Parties choose managers based more on political than on professional standards. As a consequence, public media managers are employed by parties rather than working as independent experts. Institutional safeguards are stated on paper to protect journalistic objectivity and political neutrality, but they are unsupported in reality. Political parties are primarily responsible for creating regulations, and formal laws often take a backseat to informal regulations. Public service television provides party customers with access to public resources, particularly for programming and advertising, in return for a variety of services.

The main issues are the continued dominance of a legacy broadcasting paradigm (i.e., the slow growth of digital networked media) and the absence of a genuine public service orientation (i.e., the lack of those values as a priority in practise). There was little to no public discussion when attempts to convert state broadcasters into public broadcasters were made, and there is still a lack of agreement on the founding ideals and essential values. A small number of concerned professionals and media specialists have made some modest attempts to identify basic principles. Priority values in these cultures are founded on conventional, conservative ideas that emphasise nation-building, ethnic self-awareness, and religious exclusivity—all of which have more often resulted in disagreement than agreement. Instead of being used by civil society to achieve these aims, public media are perceived as political tools. When it comes to important topics like the types of media required, individual actors' societal duties, or how to build a public orientation in media policy, local actors have often been unable to debate the problems and potential remedies

On a normative level, parties involved in decision-making often support norms based on Western democratic ideals such as pluralism, diversity, press freedom, open access to information, and competition. Democracy, however, is a dynamic system that calls for constant debate, conversation, and trade. These ideals are primarily "paper tigers" in reality since they haven't been extensively debated. The PSB idea was enforced by the international community on BiH and Kosovo, and it is unclear in other WB countries which principles are fundamental and which are not.Because of this, present PSB activities in the area do not carry out their specified mandates or execute their duties as public institutions serving the public.They are the target of stringent governmental control and instrumentalization instead of serving the public interest in the first place. With the expansion of networked communications, which are typified by online conversation and assisted by sources that provide domestic public and commercial media and have considerably better confidence and dependability among people, this catastrophe has become more apparent.

Problems in three levels for social risk society

The structural shift shows that Western PSB normative norms are absent.As a legacy of the communist era, public broadcasters in the WB area are arranged inside dated, huge, and inflexible systems. Most have excessively complex hierarchical management structures, which make decision-making more difficult, as well as excessive staff populations, which drive up expenses (numbers vary from 800-900 in Kosovo and Bosnia to 3,800 in Serbia). Because they were developed using the logic of mass production, silo organisations and budgets, and strong hierarchical divides in decision-making, these broadcasters confront major issues stemming from route dependencies.

The state media paradigm is reflected in the inherited values. There has been a little alteration in this, however. Public broadcasters in Croatia developed an ambitious strategy to reduce production costs and adapt internal structure to a new media logic. Few players, notably media and legal specialists, are pushing for a functional-institutional paradigm in Serbia as opposed to the solely institutional framework that has dominated media policy. But the efforts have been minimal so far, and the outcomes are still uncertain.

Digitalisation: Production, distribution, sharing

The lack of digitalization puts PSM production, dissemination, and audience engagement in a perilous situation. Production in this area is very fragmented, poorly coordinated, and lacks integrated newsrooms. Only Croatia's HRT has so far placed a deliberate emphasis on organisational reorganisation to establish integrated newsrooms. Although RTV in Serbia accepted the HRT concept in theory, a shortage of funding has prevented it from being put into practise. In all the WB nations, PSB falls short of private TV channels like N1 and Al Jazeera Balkans, which were started from scratch and employ professional managers and staff to produce a wide range of high-quality, distinctive programmes in comparison to commercial offerings. These channels use digital production technologies.

One of the main goals of the shift to PSB was to promote variety and plurality in public life. The democratising function of the media is meant to promote conversation in civil society and provide groups and people a platform to discuss and debate ideas while also benefiting from the exchange. However, because to a lack of public confidence and a lack of diversified programming, public broadcasters in the area have largely failed to fulfil this function. Even though some sources (like IREX MSI) believe that implementing the dual system of public and private media that is typical of Western Europe will contribute to the plurality of sources, this primarily affects external rather than internal pluralism, meaning more diversity between than within, which is a problem for PSB as a whole. In the WB, there is a rising propensity to prioritise governing party insiders who primarily serve the interests of the state. The second RTV station in Serbia, which airs programming for national minorities in nine languages, is a rare example of significant internal pluralism however whereverThe popularity of PSB has significantly dropped as a result of competition from the private sector. The primary drivers of any enduring appeal are not the exclusivity, uniqueness, or high quality of the material, but rather PSB's increasing commercialization.The online presence, audience, and dissemination methods

differ greatly amongst WB nations. The majority of PSB companies lack a strategic focus on creating online services. Only the RTS and HRT networks in Serbia and Croatia have created websites with notable appeal and reach. RTK Kosovo and RTRS in BiH are starting to see significant development. Online consumers are sticking with RTKlive.com, especially the diaspora audience, which makes up more than 60% of the user base However, online content is often created to supplement news that is mainly generated for broadcast networks. The only specialist platform is run by MRT Play in Macedonia and HRTi in Croatia. HRTi is widely used and works without a hitch. It is user-friendly and provides all kinds of programming, such as news, documentaries, shows for kids and teens, shows on religion, music, and culture.

Lessons learned Towards a functional paradigm

The 'network society' concept is not yet applicable in WB countries, taking into account both successes and problems in the challenging shift from state broadcasting towards public service media enterprises. The area is mired in broadcasting and has a classic mass media orientation that is outmoded and unable to keep up with the continuously evolving media landscape. These groups are not regarded as the most trustworthy information providers, and it is not clear how they support the expansion of democracy. There are many rationales that might apply:

1. The political climate does not favour the development of the networked society paradigm, therefore achieving PSM is not on the agenda. These possible changes are not seen as possibilities in societies that tend towards illiberal democracies with governments that strive to control all public resources, particularly the media. The essential ideals of a real public service orientation haven't been well addressed or articulated, on the contrary, they are often opposed to the deliberative potential of networked communications.
2. In the area of PSB reform, the methodology has been purely normative and ignores the contextual character of change, leaving particular historical legacies and legacy systems unaccounted for.
3. The normative approach seems appealing on paper, but in reality, it is a "empty shell" that cannot carry out its objectives. Discussions concerning PSB's functions in society's evolutiondiscussions that could induce a transition to an institutional-functional paradigmare seldom held.

All of these broadcasting companies inherited large infrastructure assets and reputable production cultures at the beginning of the 1990s. Few people have gained from either. Simply having institutions does not offer a sufficient foundation for effective growth in the absence of a supportive culture. Darendorf (1990) noted that since a "societal foundation" is necessary for defending newly established (or altered) institutions, it is critical to build on such foundation. The WB area has a solid basis for supporting PSB, much alone developing it. Milton (2000) contends that inherited institutions were fundamental to a prior system that remains (in heavier or lighter degrees) with characteristics that are difficult to "erase," making the transformation of these institutions from a prior system much more difficult and fraught with uncertainty than creating a new institution from scratch. This is undoubtedly the case with the former state-controlled broadcasters.

Furthermore, PSB has limited influence or potential since most WB nations are just now beginning to digitalize. The future of PSM in this area as a whole is imperilled by this failure. The areas that have seen the most change are Croatia and Serbia. The government of Croatia generously contributed to the construction of a transition network that would aid in the dissemination of digital signals, and HRT strategically seized the chance to increase its production capabilities. Many believe the procedure is moving too slowly, even if it is still in progress. Due to financial constraints and political stumbling blocks, particularly in BiH, official backing for the construction of a transmission network for digital signals has been virtually absent in other WB countries. The majority of governments do not see such a network as a resource or care that an independent public corporation must provide equal possibilities to everybody.

Finally, the reason why political players can colonise and manipulate public institutions so readily is due to economic instability and flawed financing models. This is a result of illiberal tendencies and the wider politicisation of the media environment. population media is under the influence of political elites, who utilise it to further their own agendas rather than that of the general population. In the face of populist and more authoritarian elites that modify laws to limit media as independent democratic actors, regulation and legal protection for media independence have proved ineffectual.

Given the expansion of online communication and digital communication technologies, it is a serious issue that public sector broadcasters in the WB area are unable to handle the difficulties and seize the potential presented by the network society paradigm. It is crucial since shifting habits and requirements are also present within WB populations, particularly among young people. Even in public broadcaster-related policies, these shifts have not been well covered. Public broadcasters in the WB are often not seen as trustworthy or unique, and they do little to advance democracy when combined with the three main contextual elements (the communist heritage, a deficient technological infrastructure, and economic disadvantages leading to clientelism).

In general, public broadcasters haven't given their position and duty enough thought to be really unique or pursued the greatness they might provide. Since most are rapidly falling behind commercial TV stations that are supporting digital production and delivery, this is an existential issue. These businesses developed integrated newsrooms and collaborative cultures based on principles that prioritise participation, production quality, efficiency, and innovation from the ground up with purpose-built organisational structures. Commercial media, like N1 or Al Jazeera Balkans, attracts more attention and inspires a lot more trust than PSB.

In the Western Balkans, public service media development is crucial since public institutions and media as a whole are losing public confidence. These public broadcasters must establish themselves as reputable builders of the online and offline communications infrastructure required for the growth of networked society. This indicates that media strategy must have a strong public service focus in the context of new media. As a prerequisite, the key players—not only political

decision-makersshould have a discussion about the principles that would serve as the foundation for such an orientation in this situation. Instead of another external push, as has been the case in the past, this should be implemented as a succession of home efforts.Second, public service media organisations need to think carefully about how they fit within Western Balkan countries. The primary goal cannot be their sheer existence.Their ability to make significant, quantifiable contributions as determined by their host countries is vital to their legitimacy as public media. For PSM to play a leading position in creating media innovations in service-related operations and uphold the highest levels of ethical values in production and distribution, a new management culture will need to be established.Social media significantly influences how young people perceive danger and approach risk-taking. It acts as a platform for the exchange of knowledge, establishing social connections, and expressing oneself. Social media does, however, also bring with it some new dangers, such as the spread of excessive expectations and cyberbullying and online harassment. Young people use social media in a variety of ways. Some use it to reduce dangers, while others discover that online influences make them more vulnerable to particular problems.

Case studies, interviews, and qualitative research techniques are all effective ways to comprehend the many reasons why young people take risks. Researchers may learn more about the complex nature of risk and contribute to the development of evidence-based decision-making and policy by probing participants' experiences, perspectives, and coping mechanisms.young people face both possibilities and problems as a result of the many risk logics in the risk society. For understanding the intricacies of risk negotiation among young people and successfully offering help and advice to traverse the risk environment, ongoing research, qualitative analysis, and policy interventions are essential. Policymakers and stakeholders may create a supportive environment that encourages informed decision-making, resilience, and wellbeing among young people by addressing the particular problems offered by social media and recognising the variety of factors on risk perceptions.

CONCLUSION

For young people, the many risk logics within the framework of the risk society have important ramifications. The purpose of this study was to investigate how young people deal with the difficulties of risk, with an emphasis on the function of social media. The research found that the risk society is characterised by heightened awareness and perception of a variety of dangers, ranging from worries about one's own health and safety to uncertainty in the economy and society. Particularly young individuals have special difficulties regulating and reacting to these hazards as they make the transition from childhood to adulthood. Numerous elements, such as social, cultural, and technical considerations, have an impact on the various logics of risk. Young people's perceptions of danger and behaviours are influenced by social varJiables including peer pressure and cultural standards. Different communities' perceptions of and approaches to managing risks are influenced by cultural influences, including cultural values and beliefs. Technological developments, especially social media platforms, add new dimensions to the risk environment and make it easier and more difficult for young people to negotiate risk.

REFERENCES

[1] L. Wu, P. Liu, Y. Lv, X. Chen, en F. S. Tsai, “Social co-governance for food safety risks”, *Sustain.*, 2018, doi: 10.3390/su10114246.

[2] F. Alves *et al.*, “Climate change policies and agendas: Facing implementation challenges and guiding responses”, *Environ. Sci. Policy*, 2020, doi: 10.1016/j.envsci.2019.12.001.

[3] H. Eakin en L. A. Bojórquez-Tapia, “Insights into the composition of household vulnerability from multicriteria decision analysis”, *Glob. Environ. Chang.*, 2008, doi: 10.1016/j.gloenvcha.2007.09.001.

[4] T. Rollo, “Back to the rough ground: Textual, oral and enactive meaning in comparative political theory”, *Eur. J. Polit. Theory*, 2021, doi: 10.1177/1474885118795284.

[5] D. M. Kahan, H. Jenkins-Smith, T. Tarantola, C. L. Silva, en D. Braman, “Geoengineering and Climate Change Polarization: Testing a Two-Channel Model of Science Communication”, *Ann. Am. Acad. Pol. Soc. Sci.*, 2015, doi: 10.1177/0002716214559002.

[6] S. Henly-Shepard, S. A. Gray, en L. J. Cox, “The use of participatory modeling to promote social learning and facilitate community disaster planning”, *Environ. Sci. Policy*, 2015, doi: 10.1016/j.envsci.2014.10.004.

[7] C. Hambloch, J. Kahwai, en J. Mugonya, “Contextualizing private sector-based seed system development: The case of sorghum in Eastern Africa”, *Outlook Agric.*, 2021, doi: 10.1177/00307270211056357.

[8] J. R. Vázquez-Canteli en Z. Nagy, “Reinforcement learning for demand response: A review of algorithms and modeling techniques”, *Applied Energy*. 2019. doi: 10.1016/j.apenergy.2018.11.002.