



**B. A. PART-I  
(SEMESTER - I)**

**POLITICAL SCIENCE**

**UNIT NO. I**

**SECTION-A**

**Department of Distance Education  
Punjabi University, Patiala**

(All Copyrights are Reserved)

**LESSON NO :**

- 1.1 : Political Science : Meaning, Nature and Scope
- 1.2 : Distinction between Political Science and Political Theory.
- 1.3 : Relationship of Political Science with Sociology, History, Economic
- 1.4 : State : Meaning, Definition, Elements
- 1.5 : Distinction from Society, Government and Association
- 1.6 : Theory of the Origin of State : Social Contract
- 1.7 : Theory of the Origin of State : Evolutionary

**POLITICAL SCIENCE: MEANING, DEFINITION, NATURE  
AND ITS SCOPE**

- 1.1.1 Objectives
- 1.1.2 Introduction
- 1.1.3 Meaning and Definition of Political Science
- 1.1.4 Nature (Characteristics) of Political Science
- 1.1.5 Scope of Political Science
- 1.1.6 Conclusion
- 1.1.7 Self Check Exercise
- 1.1.8 Some Important Books

**1.1.1 Objectives :** In this lesson we will discuss the meaning, definition, nature, scope and significance of political science. After going through this lesson a student will be able to:-

- \_ define political science
- \_ explain its nature
- \_ discuss its scope
- \_ explain the main characteristics of the various stages of its growth

**1.1.2 Introduction :-** Jean Bodin (1530 – 1596) a French political philosopher coined the term “Political Science”. Political science is a branch of social science. The study of Political science is of great significance and importance in the present day “Global village”. The foundations of political thinking were laid by the great Greek philosophers, Socrates, Plato and Aristotle. Plato was the author of the book “The Republic”. Aristotle the father of political science, firstly used the term 'politics' and converted the subject into an academic discipline. He published his book 'Politics' as a first systematic study of politics.

**1.1.3 Meaning and Definition of Political Science:** - The term 'Political Science' is a combination of two words, viz. Political and Science. The word 'politics' is derived from the Greek word 'Polis' which means the city-state. In ancient Greece, the basic unit of political organization was the city-state. Science is the systematic study of the structure and behaviour of the physical and natural world through observation, evidence and experiment. So political science is the branch of knowledge that deals with systematic study of the structure and behaviour of the state and political institutions through scientific analysis. Politics refers to the subject matter of our study, science denotes the methodology or the way of studying the process of politics. The first term seeks to answer the question "what is studied" and the second term refers to "how is it studied". Therefore, the political phenomenon which should be studied in accordance with a definite plan or system is called political science.

**Definitions:** The definitions of Political Science can be divided into two types, namely classical and modern definitions.

(i) Definitions of political science according to classical view of Political Science:

- According to Garner, "Political Science begins and ends with the state".
- Gettell defines political science as a historical investigation of what the state has been analytical study of what the state is and political ethical discussion of what the state ought to be.
- According to Leacock, "Political Science deals with the government only."
- According to McMillan Dictionary, "Political Science deals with the organisation and administration of government."
- Demock define political science as a subject which is concerned with the state and government.

(ii) Modern definitions:

- According to Herbert J. Spiro, "Politics is the process by which a human community as small as two persons or as large as the community of mankind, deals with its problems."
- Edward Banefield defines politics as an activity like negotiation, argument, discussion, application of force, persuasion etc. by which an issue is agitated or settled.
- According to David Easton, "Politics is the study of authoritative allocation of values".
- Harold Laswell defines political science as a study of influence and influential.

**1.1.4 Nature (Characteristics) of Political Science:** - The word 'science' literally means 'knowledge' which is gathering and organizing through systematic way. "Science is knowledge ascertained by observation and experiment, critically tested, systematized and brought under general principles." According to Garner, "Science is a knowledge relating to a particular subject acquired by systematic observation, experience, or study which have been co-ordinated, systematised and classified." Results in the science are based on experience and observation. The chief characteristics of science are universality, exactness, precision and predictability. It is studied by collecting and verifying data, formulating concise and standard principles and making predictions. Science is a systematic body of knowledge based on reason and evidence.

'Art' means 'skill' or 'a way of doing a particular thing in a particular way'. It can be improved by practice, guided by principles.

**Politics is a Science:** Politics is considered as science on the following grounds:--

- Politics can be studied in a systematic manner.
- It is said that experimentation is possible in politics.
- Political science, like other sciences, has absolute and universal laws.
- It is possible to make predictions in politics, but in a limited area.
- There are certain principles and methods on which political thinkers unanimously agree.
- Politics is a subject which has scientific nature.
- At present, politics has attained modernity.
- Aristotle called politics as 'Supreme Science'.

**Politics is not a Science:** James Bryce maintains that “politics can never become a science”. Catlin thinks that there is “no such thing as political science”. Buckle holds that “politics far from being a science is one of the most backward of all the arts”. G. Mosca holds that “political science in its present conditions has not yet genuinely entered upon its scientific state”. Maitland writes, when i see a good set of examination questions headed by the word 'Political Science' I regret not the questions but the title.” Auguste comte rejected to treat it a science on the following three grounds:-

- There is no consensus of opinion among the political thinkers as to its methods, principles and conclusions.
- It is impossible to foretell what is going to happen as Astronomy can tell us. In other words, it lacks the elements which constitute a basis of provision.
- It lacks continuity of development.

Politics is not considered as science on the following grounds:--

- Politics has no absolute and universal laws like physical science or exact sciences.

- It does not observe, the theory of cause and effect, which is the basis of all sciences.
- The subject of politics has not developed in a steady, regular and continuous manner.
- Scientific methods of observation and experimentation cannot be applied to politics because political conditions are ever changing and difficult to be experimented upon.
- The subject matter of politics is related to men in society and man's individuality, behaviour and opinions always go on changing and universal laws and principles cannot be formulated as in other exact science.
- The factors which influenced political conditions cannot be controlled for experimentation.
- In politics, there are no tools of measurement to ascertain results while observing political phenomena.
- The political investigator's biased views or feelings distort the reality which is to be understood in politics. Politics is subjective by nature and objectivity is not possible in politics.
- Political theories lack exactness since human nature and behaviour cannot be accurately studied just like some specimen or objects in a laboratory which are under the complete control of the researcher.
- The methods used in the study of political issues are uncertain, crude and undeveloped and results are not reliable.

**Politics is a Social Science:** It must be admitted that political science is not an exact science, as it falls short of the degree of the perfection and exactness attained by physical sciences. Passions, emotions and prejudices which influence political process defy absolute prediction. But still it is possible to study political science in a systematic and scientific manner.

Politics deals with social phenomenon. It has judiciously chosen different methods for studying different phenomena. For that matter no social science can demand absolute certainty on any social question. This is because the material it has to deal with is human beings, whose actions cannot be predicted with absolute certainty. In this regard the plight of political science is similar to other social science. Politics like economics, ethics, and sociology is a social science having characteristics of positive science.

**Politics is an Art:** An art is a system of rules for the attainment of a given end. Art is the practical application of knowledge for achieving definite end. A science teaches us to know whereas an art teaches us to do. Art is an action which purpose. It lays down precepts or specific solutions for specific problems. Some writers consider politics as an art because it deals with various aspects of life and explains the ways how political affairs are to be conducted. Gettell and Bluntschli say that politics bears the characteristics of art. Buckle regards politics to be “one of the most backward of all the arts”.

Prof. Cossa says, “Science requires art, art requires science, each being complementary to the other.” William Eslinger says, “Science and art need not be antithesis. Art can also be based on science.” Hence, politics is considered as an art as well as social science. Politics gives practical guidelines to the rulers and administrators along with citizens. Politics has been developing as systematic study of human relations in political State.

**1.1.5 Scope of Political Science:** - The term ‘scope’ refers to the subject matter or the boundaries of political science. The international Political Science Association at its Paris conference in 1984 discussed the scope of the subject political science and marked out the subject matter. But, now days, it is very difficult to determine the precise and definite boundaries of political science. It is wide and comprehensive subject and there is no uniformity among political scientists about its scope. It is the study of organizations and activities of the state, both at national and international levels. It also deals

with the distribution of governing power among several agencies by which the actions of the state are determined, expressed, and exercised and with the problems of international life. Yet some of the important subjects in the scope of political science are given below:-

### **1. Political Science is the Study of State and Government.**

In the political science we study about the theoretical, structural and behavioural aspects of organisation and forms of state and government. Bluntschli says "political science is a science which is concerned with the state, endeavours to understand and comprehend the state in its essential nature, various forms, manifestations and development." According to Robson, "the purpose of political science is to throw light on political ideas and political actions so that the government of man may be improved". The government is the agency of the state through which the purpose of the state is realised. It is the most lively and integral part of the state. According to Paul Janet "political science is that part of social science which treats of the foundation of state and the principles of the Government".

### **2. It is the study of Relationship between the Man and State.**

The scope of Political science also includes a study of the nature of relationship between the individual and the state. The process of men with the society is an important aspect of political science. The state guarantees certain rights and liberties to its citizens and at the same time impose certain reasonable restrictions on them. In fact, state exists for the welfare of the people. As an agent of the state, it is the function of the government to try to secure welfare for all who live within the territorial boundary of the state.

Again the government of any state greatly influenced by the thoughts and ideas of that state. Therefore, the study about the state and government is bounded to be inconclusive without the study of the nature of the people who constitute the state. It is in this connection Max Webber has stated that

political science is a descriptive and normative science and describes it as the study of human behaviour in the process of enquiry of justice.

### **3. Study of Political Theory.**

The theories are the results of the thoughts and research of many scholars and exponents of political science. Political scientists formulate various political concepts and establish theories. According to Gettle, "political science is concerned with the historical survey of origin, development of political theories and ideals, the analysis of the fundamental nature of the state, its organization, relation to the individuals that compose it and its relation to other states ". It is the study of the fundamental questions of the state, government, politics, liberty, justice, property, rights, law, the enforcement of legal code by authority etc.

It may be subdivided into political philosophy, legal political theory, the concept of sovereignty and legal controls for the exercise of political power, scientific political theory, consisting of empirical observations of political events etc. So a student of political science must start his study of the subject with the theories.

### **4. Study of Political Institutions.**

Political Science is also concerned with the study of political institutions and associations through with the state acts. It covers the study of the constitutions, comparative government, public administration and local government etc. It also deals with the nature of different political institutions including government, their structure such as legislature, executive and judiciary, its working, its merits and demerits etc. Further it studies about some informal groups like social, economic, educational institutions in a society.

**5. Study of Political Dynamics.**

Political dynamics examines the current forces which exert influence on the government and politics. Along with the change of habits also are bound to occur of men, social system also changes. This explains why the city states of ancient times are replaced by the nation states in the present century. The search for the cause of this kind of changes in the character of the state and government is the study of political dynamics. It covers a wide range and includes the study of political parties, public opinion pressure groups, lobbies, etc. The study of these political dynamics helps to explain the political behaviour of individuals and different groups.

**6. A study of International Relations, International Organizations and International law.**

Political science deals with the matters relating to the maintenance of international relations, the international law and the organization concerned with the maintenance of world peace and security. The human society is now thinking in terms of forming a world government in the near future. International law provides the framework within which the states should enjoy their rights and duties. This has made it necessary to include in the study of political science. It is related to the maintenance of international relations and different organisations connected with the maintenances of peace and security among the states of the world. The subject matter includes international law, international and regional organisations like UNO, European Union, NAM, SAARC and League of Nations, diplomatic relations, treaties and agreements, arms control, human rights, pollution control and global warming, sustainable development etc.

**7. Study of Political Parties and related Organizations**

In a democratic state, political parties play an important role in formation and functioning of government. They are regarded as an unavoidable and central

part for the successful working of democratic political system. Its studies are important for understanding the nature and working of political institutions of a country. The study of political science is also concerned with the study of informal institutions through which the state acts. ie. pressure groups ,interests groups and other related social, economic, educational institutions etc.

### **8. It studies of Past, Present and Future development of State**

The scope of Political Science includes the study of the past, present and future of states and its activities. According to Gettle, " In the historical aspects, Political Science deals with the origin of the state and the development of political theories in the past in dealing with the present it attempts to describe and classify existing political institutions and ideas. Political Science also looks to the future, to improving political organizations and activities in the light of changing conditions and changing ethical standards". so its scope is not restricted to the study of the past and the present alone , but it directs future course of the development of the state. The study is also helpful to improving the political institutions and modifying political activities in order to meet the changing national and international demands.

Broadly speaking, the scope of political science may be divided into three parts: 1) Scope of political science concerning the state; 2) Scope of political science with reference to human rights; 3) Scope of political science in relation to government.

1. Scope of political science concerning the state : Political Science covers in their scope the present form of the state, historical form of the state and ideal form of the state. In political science, we study the present form of the state. Its aims and objectives and the means adopted by the state to achieve its objectives. This aspect of the study of political science has been termed by Gettell as the analytical study of the state. The present form of the state is the

result of its historical development. Political science makes a historical analysis of the origin of the state and the theories of the state. The study of political science has to predict the future of the state that is how it ought to be. According to Gettell political science is a historical investigation of what the state has been an analytical study of what the state is and a politico – ethical discussion of what the state should be.

2. Scope of political science with reference to human rights: The citizens have their civil, political and economic rights. These rights have to be preserved and protected by the State for the welfare of its citizens.

3. Scope of political science in relation to Government : Stephen Leacock said that, political science deals with government. A state cannot exist without government. Government is the working agency of the state. The different forms of government, various organs of government, political parties, local self - government, judiciary, and internationalism are covered by the political science.

**1.1.6 Conclusion :-** In this lesson we have discussed meaning, definition, nature and scope of political science in ancient, and modern times. Political science is a branch of social science. The study of political science is of great significance and importance in the present scenario. Political science is the branch of knowledge that deals with systematic study of the structure and behaviour of the state and political institutions through scientific analysis. Politics refers to the subject matter of our study, science denotes the methodology or the way of studying the process of politics. political science is very significant as it is helpful to understanding study of state Government, provides philosophy regarding political institution, provides past, present and future development of state, it studies political parties and related organizations for the state and is helpful in finding solutions to problems of the modern state of political science.

**Self-Check Exercise-1**

1. What do you mean by Political Science?
2. Discuss any four characteristics of Political Science.
3. Write down the names of the supports of Political Science.
4. Is Political Science is a Science? Comment.

**Self-Check Exercise-2**

1. Mention any four definition of modern Political Science.
2. Discuss the scope of Political Science.
3. Write down the names of the supports of modern Political Science.
4. Which are the main goals of Political Science? Discuss.

**Important Books:**

- |                                                                      |                                      |
|----------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------------------|
| 1. Dr. S.R. Myneni                                                   | : Political Science for Law Students |
| 2. V.D. Mahajan                                                      | : Political Theory                   |
| 3. J.S. Badyal                                                       | : Political Theory                   |
| 4. O.P. Gauba                                                        | : Introduction to Political Theory   |
| 5. N.D. Arora and S.S Awasthy                                        | : Political Theory                   |
| 6. Andrew Heywood                                                    | : Politics                           |
| 7. <a href="http://jccc-ugcinfonet.in">http://jccc-ugcinfonet.in</a> |                                      |
| 8. <a href="http://www.jstor.org">www.jstor.org</a>                  |                                      |

## **DISTICTION BETWEEN POLITICAL SCIENCE AND POLITICAL THEORY**

1.2.1 Objectives of the Lesson

1.2.2 Introduction

1.2.3 Political Science: Meaning and Definition

1.2.4 Political Theory: Meaning, Definition and Development

1.2.5 Distinction between Political Science and Political Theory

1.2.6 Conclusion

1.2.7 Answers to Self-Check Exercises

1.2.8 Suggested Readings

### **1.2.1 Objectives of the Lesson**

In this lesson we will discuss the meaning and definition of political science; meaning, definition and development of political theory and mainly discuss the distinction between political science and political theory.

### **1.2.2 Introduction**

Political theory, which is a sub-field of political science is an effort to understand the political phenomenon in philosophical as well as empirical terms. Political theory is a theory about “what is political”. Political science has so many branches but political theory is the most important sub-field of political science.

### **1.2.3 Political Science: Meaning and Definition**

The terms ‘politics’, ‘political science’, ‘political theory’ and ‘political philosophy’ are sometimes used as synonyms though there is concrete difference in the shade of their meanings. *Aristotle*, the ‘father of political

science', used the term 'politics' for the first time in his masterpiece epic 'Politics'.

The term politics is derived from the Greek word 'polis' which means 'city state'. The term 'polity' is derived from the Greek word 'poletieia' meaning 'government' or 'constitution'.

According to *Garner*, "Political science begins and ends with the state."

According to *David Easton*, "Politics is the authoritative allocation of values."

According to *Bluntschli*, "Political science is the science which is concerned with the state, which endeavours to understand and comprehend the state in its fundamental conditions, its essential nature, its various forms of manifestations, its development."

According to *D.A. Butler*, "Politics is entirely concerned with people, with the way, in which they react to decision. It cannot usefully be studied except in the light of actual behaviour."

In the present scenario of 21<sup>st</sup> century, we can define political science as the study of formal structures (like state, government, and organs of state) as well as informal analysis of various socio-cultural and psychological concepts (such as power, influence, political behaviour, political culture and socialisation) and non-state actors (like international organisation, institutions, globalization, global economy, MNCs, terrorism, ethnicity, multiculturalism, etc.)

**1.2.4 Political Theory: Meaning, Definition and Development** Political theory is the branch of political science under which normative and scientific analysis is made of political institutions, political events, political ideas and political concepts etc. For example, political theory is concerned with the rational, systematic and scientific analysis of state, government, rights, liberty, justice, political ideologies, political parties, origin of political institutions, their organisation, working and their objective etc. The different political thinkers have given the following definitions:

According to *J.C. Plano* and *R.E. Riggs*, "Political theory is a body thought that seeks to evaluate, explain and predict political phenomena. Political theory is also a sub-field of political science, concerned with political ideas, values and concepts and with the explanation and prediction of political behaviour. Political theory in this broad sense has two major branches. One is political philosophy or *normative theory*, with its value, analytic, historical and

speculative concerns. The other is *empirical theory*, with its efforts to explain, predict, guide, research and organise knowledge through the formulation of abstract models and scientifically testable propositions.”

*Andrew Hacker* defines it as “a combination of a disinterested search for the principle of good state and good society on the one hand, and a disinterested search for knowledge of political and social reality on the other.”

According to *David Held*, “Political theory is a network of concepts and generalisations about political life involving ideas, assumptions and statements about the nature, purpose and features of government, state, society and about the political capabilities of human beings.”

From above analysis, we can say that political theory is the sum total of ideas, assumptions, statements, principles and conclusions, etc., on the basis of which political ideas can be properly explained and prediction could be made if need arises.

**1.2.4.1 Development of Political Theory:** Five major stages are mentioned for the development of political theory.

- a) Ancient Political Theory
- b) Medieval Political Theory
- c) Traditional Political Theory
- d) Modern Political Theory
- e) Contemporary Political Theory
- f) According to *Barker*, “*Political thought begins with Greeks.*” We cannot fully agree with this view because in India the tradition of political speculation dates back to 1500 B.C., i.e., the vedic era. It cannot be ruled out that other civilizations too might be having their own tradition of political speculation just like India, but since no evidence to this fact is available, the Western thinkers consider Greeks as the pioneers in the field of political theory. *Plato* and *Aristotle* are the two great thinkers of the **Ancient/Classical Political Theory**. The Roman and Christian like St. Augustine and Cicero of middle ages played a significant role in the development of **Medieval Political Theory**.

Traditional period is that period during which the new trends like, *liberalism*, *scienticism*, *Marxism* and *positivism* became popular in Europe. The long spell

of classical thinkers like, Plato, Aristotle, Saint Augustine, Cicero and the like, was broken in a number of ways after the twin revolutions of reformation and renaissance in 15<sup>th</sup> century Europe, coupled with industrial revolution later on. This period, called **Traditional Political Theory** started with the writings of *Machiavelli*, who was born in Italy in 1469. His ideas were very different from the thinkers of ancient period, he was called, '*The first modern political thinker*'.

When *Empirical* and *Behavioural* trends started in the beginning of 20<sup>th</sup> century, the political theory of the period before it started being designated as 'Traditional Theory', while the 20<sup>th</sup> century was called **Modern Political Theory**. Since the second half of 20<sup>th</sup> century the method of studying political theory from a single perspective, i.e., either from liberal or Marxist view was found inadequate to grapple with the kind of issues which have come to dominate the political scene. So positive, empirical and behavioural trends came to the fore. The supporters of these trends declared the traditional political theory as 'dull and irrelevant' and in the place of this approach gave another kind of political theory which is known as Empirical Behavioural and Scientific Political Theory. This approach has a long history but the credit of making significant development in this connection goes to American social scientists. In 1908, two writings one by an English scholar *Graham Wallas* (*Human Nature in Politics*) and another by American scholar *Arthur Bentley* (*Process of Government*) were published. The new approach stressed on the need straying political theory on the basis of facts. Modern political theory is also known as *Scientific Political Theory*.

Empirical political theory began to be criticised after 1960s, because of too much stress on methods, tools and techniques, on making the subject pure science, valueless politics and its failure to study pressing social and political issues. David Easton who had earlier come forward as the foremost supporter of 'Behavioural Movement' now criticized it for the above mentioned reasons and gave the ideas which are known as '*post-behaviouralism*'. During the debates in 1970s, it was admitted frankly that in every political structure, there are segments of human life relating to values and purposes, which are ignored by behavioural studies. During this post behavioural phase the ore issues of political theory like liberty, equality and justice were once again taken up by *Rawls*, *Nozic*, *Habermas* and others which signalled once again

the revival of normative theory. This new revival is termed as **Contemporary Political Theory**.

### ***Self-Check Exercise – 1***

- (i) Define political science.
- (ii) 'Political theory is the branch of political science'. Is it right or wrong?
- (iii) How many stages are there in the development of political theory?

### **1.2.5 Distinction between Political Science and Political Theory**

Following are the various points regarding the difference between political science and political theory:

**1.2.5.1 Political science is an independent subject whereas political theory is a part of it:** Political theory, political philosophy, political thought and politics etc. are not independent subjects rather all these are the branches of political science. Besides all this political science includes so many other things and is an independent subject. Political theory makes only an impartial analysis of political events, political facts etc. and lays down valid principles for political science.

**1.2.5.2 The scope of political science is much wider than scope of political theory:** In comparison to the scope of political theory, the scope of political science is much wider. We have read above that political theory, political philosophy, political thought and politics etc. are the branches of political science. All the subjects like the political systems of different countries and their working, international relations, international disputes and their solution, rights and duties of individuals, political behaviour of individual, political parties and pressure groups and their role etc. come under the scope of political science. Besides this the study of political thought, political philosophy, political theory etc. also come under the scope of political science. So we can see that the scope of political science is much wider than that of political theory.

**1.2.5.3 Political theory is a conceptual study whereas political science is an institutional study:** Political science is an institutional study as it makes the study of the state, government, political system and other political institutions, their organisation, functions and their legal and

practical aspects etc. For example political science make the study of the past, present and future of the state, its elements and functions etc. to which we call institutional study. In comparison to it when political theory after making the study of the past and present of the state and prepares an outline of an ideal state to this we can call conceptual study. So, the basic purpose of Political theory is theory building and in case it is not so, then that subject is not political theory.

**1.2.5.4 Political theory is the so what? department of political science:** According to Rodes, Anaerson and Christol, "Political Science is the so what? department of Political Science." It means that a political theorist collects material about various political institutions and political events, analyses the same and draws some conclusion. These conclusions are verified again and again and as a result of all this some universally accepted principles are laid down which become the part of politics. They become guide for the political scientists. On the basis of these principles he tries to find out answers to the questions like what it is? or why it is? Therefore, political theory is known as the so what? department of political science.

**1.2.5.5 Political theory makes political science a science:** For a subject to become science its method of study must be scientific. According to Huxley, "Science is a systematic body of knowledge based on reason and evidence." Political theory gets material from political science makes systematic study of the same and makes analyses of the different events and on the basis of all this some scientific principles are laid down which make political science a science. After making analytical study of various political events, the political scientists lay down certain trustworthy principles which become the basis of study for political scientists. It makes quite clear that if political science is included in the category of social sciences it is only because of political theory.

**1.2.5.6 The study of political science is explanatory whereas the study of political theory is analytical:** Political theorist takes matter from political science and then integrates the same type of political facts. Then he analyses these facts and draws some conclusions which take the form of theory and these conclusions are same under the same circumstances for all the times to come, In comparison to it, the political science is more explanatory as it explains the various events as they happen.

**1.2.5.7 Difference in their method of Study:** There is difference in the method of study of political theory and political science. The nature of ancient political theory is normative as the ancient political theorists are more concerned about the future. What type of an ideal state ought to be? What should be the functions of an ideal state? What should be the nature of an ideal state? etc. are the questions which are the subject matter of political theorists and to answer these questions they made use of normative method.

Whereas for the study of political science both normative and empirical methods have been used. The supporters of the traditional view of political science have used normative method whereas the political scientists of the 20<sup>th</sup> century have used empirical method. They laid emphasis on the study of actualities and are in favour of making political science value-free. But political theory cannot be made value-free.

**1.2.5.8 Difference in goals:** Political science is concerned with explaining and describing the realities of political behaviour, generalisations about man and political institutions on empirical evidence and the role of power in the society. Political theory on the other hand, is not only concerned with the behavioural study of the political phenomenon from empirical point of view but also prescribing goals which states, governments, societies and citizens should pursue. Political theory also aims to generalise about the right conduct in the political life and about the legitimate use of power.

**1.2.5.9 Theory building is the field of political theory, not of political science:** Trust-worthy theories are essential for the scientific study of political science and theory building is the function of political theory, whereas it is not the function of Political science. Political science makes the study of different political aspects on the basis of these theories.

### **Self-Check Exercise – 2**

- (i) Mention any two differences between political science and political theory.
- (ii) The scope of political science much wider than scope of political theory. Yes or No.
- (iii) Political theory is an independent subject whereas political science is part of it. Yes or No.

### 1.2.6 Conclusion

The famous political thinker, *John Plamentz* has said, “Political theory as distinct from political science is not fantasy or parading of the prejudices nor is an intellectual game. Still be is it linguistic analysis. It is an elaborate rigorous, difficult and useful undertaking. It is as much needed as any of the science.” There is no doubt that there are many differences between political science and political theory, but there is as close relationship between these two as there is between body and soul. Though political theory is not an independent subject, yet we can certainly call it the soul of political science.

### 1.2.7 Answers to Self-Check Exercises

#### **Self-Check Exercise – 1**

- (i) According to Garner, “Political science begins and ends with the state.”
- (ii) Right
- (iii) Five stages are there in the development of political theory:
  - (a) Ancient Political Theory
  - (b) Medieval Political Theory
  - (c) Traditional Political Theory
  - (d) Modern Political Theory
  - (e) Contemporary Political Theory

#### **Self-Check Exercise – 2**

- (i) (a) Difference in the goal of studying
- (b) Difference in their subject matter.
- (ii) Yes
- (iii) No

### 1.2.8 Suggested Books and Weblinks

- Andrew Heywood – Politics
- O.P. Gauba – Introduction to Political Theory
- Sushila Ramaswamy – Political Theory
- [www.cup.com](http://www.cup.com)
- [www.oup.com](http://www.oup.com)

**Relationship of Political Science with Other Social Sciences (Sociology, History, Economics)**

- 1.3.1 Objectives of the lesson
- 1.3.2 Introduction
- 1.3.3 Political Science and Sociology
- 1.3.4 Political Science and History
- 1.3.5 Political Science and Economics
- 1.3.6 Political Science and Psychology
- 1.3.7 Political Science and Ethics
- 1.3.8 Summary
- 1.3.9 Self-check Exercise
- 1.3.10 Suggested Readings

**1.3.1 Objective of the lesson :**

This lesson aims at acquainting the students with relationship of Political Science with other social sciences. After going through this lesson the student will be in a position to understand the following important aspects of the relationship Political Science with other social science :-

- What is interdisciplinary approach and how it has influenced the study of Political Science ?
- How the study of political science has been influenced by Sociology ?
- How has history influenced the study of Political Science and how history has been influenced by Political Science ?
- In what sense political science and economics are interdependent and how are they different from each other ?
- What is the relationship between Political Science and Psychology and how is the after useful for the study of the former.
- How is Ethics related to Political Science !

**1.3.2 Introduction**

With the advancement of scientific knowledge, new approaches and techniques have been evolved for the study of different subjects in social sciences. The emphasis has shifted from traditional to modern approaches. Another important shift has been the emphasis on inter disciplinary approach for the study of individual subjects. In fact, different social sciences study different aspects of human behaviour and are intimately related to one another. Political Science studies the political behaviour of men, economics their economics activities, history records important, events in life of a nation and Psychologist try to

understand how basic human urges influence, the behaviour of man. These different aspects of human behaviour are intimately related. If the insights gained from the study of one aspect of human behaviour are employed for the study of other aspects of his behaviour, meaningful results can be achieved. In the way political science can enrich itself and better understand the political behaviour of man by borrowing from Sociology, History, Economics, Psychology and Ethics. All social sciences are intimately related because they study various aspects of human activities. It is, therefore, imperative to understand the relationship of political science with other social sciences.

### **1.3.3 Political Science and Sociology**

Although sociology is most primary study of society, in the family sciences, it is rather a new-comer. Sociology deals with man in all his social relations. It studies how society has grown and what changes have occurred at different stages and their causes. As Ginsberg points out, Sociology is the study of human interactions and interrelations, their conditions and consequences. Thus conceived, it has intimate connections with Political Science which has for its central theme one agency of social control, the state.

In the early stages of development state was more of a social than political institutions. Sociology thus provides it the student of political science, the information regarding the genesis of political authority and the laws of social control. Similarly, adopted for the problems which governments face are social in nature and the policies adopted for the exploration of social motivations of the relevant group. For this reason, a new sub discipline in the study of Political Science has emerged which is known as **Political Sociology**. The purpose of such study is to view the phenomenon of politics in broader environment of society as it is to view the phenomenon of politics in its broader environment of society as it is one of the determinants of Political behaviour. **Max Weber, V.O. Key, David Easton**, etc. argue for this approach.

Sociology, also acknowledges its debt to Political Science. It derives political knowledge about the structure and operation of the state which forms the highest of all associations and regulates the outstanding, external social behaviour. The two sciences, however, differ in their approach and treatment. Political Science, as it is limited to the study of state, has a narrow area of investigation as compared to Sociology, which has all the agencies of social control within its area. Moreover, as man's social life precedes his political life, so sociology is prior to Political Science. Also Sociology is a generalized study of all human relations while Political Science is a specialized study of political relations of human beings.

### **1.3.4 Political Science and History**

The intimacy of Political Science with History cannot be denied. Opinions, however,

differ as to the extent of intimacy between the two studies. Some writers would find the study of History to be indispensable for a proper understanding of Political Science, while others recognize the necessity but not the indispensability of History as a guide to the study of politics.

The intimacy between History and Politics is well brought out in the often quoted couplet of **Seeley**.

**"History without Political Science has no fruit.**

**Political Science without History has no root."**

Political Science is immensely indebted to History for the material it supplies. Institutions grow and mature through a historical process. The information about this growth is recorded in History which is very useful for the Political Science. History provides raw materials to Political Science. Without History, Political Science would collapse into a mere speculative study. It is the task of political philosophy to draw upon the raw materials from History and to weave them into meaningful patterns. Thus to understand the working of parliamentary system in U.K., it will be necessary to refer to the historical background in which the system emerged and developed.

Conversely, History also acknowledges its debt to politics. It is the task of historian to comprehend the political implications of historical events. Without this the historical events from History and to weave them into meaningful patterns. Thus, to understand the working would appear drawn and meaningless. For example, the History of Indian independence is devoid of all logic if we do not sufficiently explain the political significance of various movements during the first half to present century. In the absence of any relation with Political Science, History would lose much of its significance.

In spite of this intimate relation between History and Politics, it should, however, be admitted that each forms an autonomous discipline and possesses an independent area of its own. Hence, it would be an exaggeration to state, as Freeman does, that History is past Politics and Politics is present history. A student of Political Science is not interested in the whole range of History which bristles with a variety of materials. He selects only those ranges which have a political bearing. Besides, Political Science unlike History, takes an ethical view of things and deals with the state as it were "the third dimension to Political Science". Lastly, History is more comprehensive because it deals with every aspect of social life, whereas Political Science is mainly concerned with the nature of the state and development of Political control.

### **1.3.5 Political Science and Economics**

Economics and Political Science were hardly differentiated in the early stages of social thinking. **Aristotle** clearly saw the relation between the two and treated Economics as an inextricable part of his political philosophy. **Adam Smith** in his

"Wealth of Nation" spoke of two important objects of **Political Economy**. First to provide adequate resources for the people and secondly, to supply the state that Economics and Political Science are two independent but auxiliary social sciences. According to **Karl Marx**, it is in fact, the economic forces and factors, which determine the nature of political system. Even if the deterministic point of view of Marx may not be acceptable, it cannot be denied that economic forces have a great hand in influencing and shaping of the political institutions. In the same manner the political organization of a country influences the economic life of nation. All economic activities are carried on within the state on conditions laid down by the state and the prevailing theories of the state or government profoundly affect the economic life of a country. Thus the problems of capital and labour are political economic life of a country. The topic of Public Finance has to be touched by both Economics and Political Science. In Economics we have to take into account the different principles of taxation while in Political Science we study the process of making financial laws and the extent of control of the legislature over public finance. All this shows a close alliance between Economics and Politics.

But this alliance does not involve a complete merger of one in the other. Both of them have their own distinct fields of investigation along with their own methodologies.

### **1.3.6 Political Science and Psychology**

Psychology is the science of mental attitudes, human behaviour, consciousness, experience, motives etc. All the knowledge's about man is concerned with his mental attitudes, behaviour and social circumstances and aims at the well being of man. Psychology studies sentiments, emotions and instincts of man. In the 20th century. It has been emphasized the scientific study of all social phenomenon must have psychological basis. **Graham Wallas** and **W.H. Rivers** emphasized the relationship of politics and psychology. So with the advent of behaviourism in Politics, Psychology has come closer to politics. **H.D. Laswell** emphasized that every political process and movement has psychological causes. Many studies of public opinion revealed the relationship between the masses and democracy and dictatorship. Laswell analysed the cause of social conflict in psychological tensions and maintained that behind every struggle there is castration complex. He gave the ideas of preventive politics on a psychological basis. Instead of recommending change in society and social environment, **Lasswell**, emphasized that the human brain should be influenced in such a way that it adjusts within the existing social framework so that status quo may remain intact. Instead of suggesting change in the social framework so that status quo may remain intact. Instead of suggesting change in the social order, the supporters of the psychological approach maintained that man should be

controlled and changed. In 1905 a new school of Psychology, named **Behavioural Psychology** began and according to this task of psychology is to study the material behaviour of man in society. Supporters of this view, Iron Pavlow, J.B. Watson and Thorndike emphasised that human behaviour cannot be disassociated from the social circumstances. Human nature and behaviour can be changed by changing the social environment of man. But contemporary behaviour studies in politics are more concerned with political culture and with ways and means to engineer political culture in such a way that it may help in maintaining equilibrium in society. In modern mass societies Goebbels' view that 'repeat a life 100 times and it will become a truth' is well accepted and rape of the masses through mass propaganda is going on in all the crisis-ridden societies. Propaganda has demolished in the 20th century what was built by education in the 19th century. The study of psychology and its use in politics reveals it. The present day need is that of consensus, which can be had by Golibazi (art of pleasing without doing anything) alone and this whole study of 'golibazi' forms the subjects matter of the interdisciplinary study of politics and psychology.

### **Difference between Political Science and Psychology**

1. Psychology is more concerned with human behaviour and its descriptions, while the politics is related with ideals and values of human behaviour.
2. Psychology is a study of attitudes, motives and instincts of man, but politics is concerned mainly with organizations and institutions of society.
3. Psychology studies human activities and behaviour but politics is concerned more with human relations in society.

### **1.3.7 Political Science and Ethics**

Ethics is concerned with 'good' and 'bad' aspects of human behaviour, it condemns the latter and appreciates the former ie goods. Every individual possesses a consciousness which enables him to differentiate between right and wrong, just and unjust and good and bad and they strive to stick to former which is desirable and positive quality and discard the latter, which is negative and thus undesirable. Ethics helps us realize the nature and content of our moral consciousness more clearly. We know that good and bad acts of individual have social sanction behind them, in the same way the activities, duties, rights and policies of state also have a sanction behind them and the basis of this sanction is moral values and ethical standards of the society in which it operates.

Since ancient times political and social the theorists have tried to integrate their ideas about different facts of man's life with certain ethical standards. **Plato** and **Aristotle**, for example, considered moral aspect of the state even more important than social and economic aspect. To them state was a supreme association having its end in the realisation of 'good life' ie life based on certain moral and

ethical values.

During middle ages theorists like Machiavelli tried to separate ethics from politics. **Machiavelli** discarded the place of values in politics, according to him there was no relation between ethics and politics. He was highly condemned for having such a view point and accused of vulgarising politics. In the modern times we may refer to the names of **Rousseau, Kant, Hegel Green, Bosanquet** and **Gandhi**, who appreciated the normative aspect of man's life in politics and held the view that ethics should be the basis of all political activity.

In an effort to convert the subject of Political Science into a pure science, a large number of recent political theorists known as behaviourlists lists have tried to present a value free Political Theory. Thus political theorists. Like Charles Merriam, Lasswell and Morgenthau, to quote a few, have preferred to make politics free from all ethical considerations. No doubt, this approach has led to the enrichment of the stock of empirical political science, but it was never the less condemned for making political science valueless.

In the post behaviourlist phase the trend towards reaffirmation of values has resurfaced, in adhering to the tradition of integrating with values and norms. It is a well accepted fact now that the basis of all politics and political theory should be ethical values, we can not deny that whatever is wrong ethically cannot be correct politically and political theorists have to keep ethical aspect in mind while expounding their views.

The Laws made by state are always based on the moral values of its people, infact when the well accepted moral and ethical values of a society are given legal sanction, (by the State) they are called laws.

Ethics too is dependent on political science, as the only way of enforcing ethical and moral standards in an organised society is through the laws framed by the state. Individual behaviour is certainly influenced by these laws.

As is clear from whatever we have discussed till now, despite being two different subjects Political Science and Ethics are closely related As Ivor Brown puts it, 'Ethical theory is incomplete without political theory, because man is an associative creature and cannot live fully in isolation; political Theory is idle without ethical theory, because its study and its results depend fundamentally on our Scheme of moral values, our conception of right and wrong.

### **1.3.8 Summary**

In this lesson we have discussed about the relationship of Political science with other social sciences. We have seen that being a social science it is closely related to all other social sciences like Sociology, History, Economics, and Psychology etc. because all of them study different aspects of human activities and man is a common subject matter in all of them. In the 20th century it has become clear that the study of complex society and its inter-related phenomenon cannot understand

society properly through different social sciences as each deals with only one aspect of the society. All the social sciences arrived at a solution on this in the form of inter-disciplinary approach to the study of social phenomenon. In view of this various branches are emerging in politics such as **political sociology, political psychology, political economy, political ethics, political history, Geopolitics** etc. A complex society cannot fruitfully be studied without mutual exchange among various social sciences. But the most important thing is the need of a commonly accepted outlook towards society or the need of a great theory.

### 1.3.9 Self-check Exercise

Answer the following questions :

1. What is inter-disciplinary approach ?  

---

---
2. Why is it essential to study other social sciences like sociology, economics, history and psychology for understanding Political Science ?  

---

---
3. Who said "History without Political Science has no fruit Political Science without History has no root."  

---

---
4. What is common between Political Science and Sociology and-how are they different from each other ?  

---

---
5. What is historical approach and how has it influenced the study of Political Science ?  

---

---
6. Describe the common points between political science and economics and also point out two main differences between them ?  

---

---

7. In what way Political Science is indebted to psychology.

---

---

8. Briefly describe the relationship political science with Ethics.

---

---

### **1.3.10 SUGGESTED READINGS**

1. S. P. Verma : *Modern Political Theory*
2. J. C. Johari : *Contemporary Political Theory*
3. S. S. Nanda : *Political Theory*
4. O.P Gauba : *Introduction to Political Theory*
5. Andrew Heywood : *Politics*
6. [www.oup.com](http://www.oup.com)
7. [www.cup.com](http://www.cup.com)

---

**LESSON NO. 1.4****DR. RAJINDER KAUR**

---

**STATE : MEANING, DEFINITIONS, ELEMENTS AND ITS DISTINCTION  
FROM SOCIETY GOVERNMENT AND ASSOCIATION**

- 1.4.1 Objectives of the lesson
- 1.4.2 Introduction
- 1.4.3 Meaning of the term 'State'
- 1.4.4 Definition of State
- 1.4.5 Essential Elements of State
- 1.4.6 Some non-essential elements of state

**1.4.1 Objectives of the lesson**

Traditionally, State has been the central theme of political science. The purpose of the present lesson is (a) to clear the meaning of state; (b) to define the state; (c) to discuss its essential elements; and (d) to distinguish state from society and government. After going through this lesson the students should be able to or (a) define the state (b) explain the essential elements and (c) distinguish it from government and society.

**1.4.2 Introduction**

Man is a social being by nature and necessity. Man cannot fully develop his personality in isolation with society. **Aristotle** has rightly stated that, **“A man who lives outside the polis (i.e. State) is either a beast or God”**. We know that society is a community of the people in which they live collectively and strive to satisfy their needs and fulfill their objectives. But, in society if there is cooperation on the one hand, there is conflict on the other.

Man wants a civilized life, which necessitates a permanent organization, which can mould the human character as per the common needs of society. Such organization is state, which is more stronger than social rules and regulations and is capable enough to provide better life to individuals. **Aristotle** has rightly stated that, **“State comes into existence originating in the bare needs of life and continuing in existence for the sake of good life.”**

**1.4.3 Meaning of the term 'State'**

For traditional political Scientist, Political Science is predominantly 'the science of state. According to **Garner**, *“Political Science begins and ends with the state.”* The English word “State” has been derived from the **Latin word “Status”**. Both in English and Latin status mean to be superior to others.

Therefore, etymologically State means to be higher in relation to other human organization. We also know that the ancient Greeks used to call the State as '**Polis**', which implied to the '**city-state**'. But, this term is not proper for the today's large sized nation states.

#### 1.4.4 Definition of State

After knowing the terminological meaning of the state, we would try to define it. According to **Aristotle**, the state is, "the union of families and villages having for its end a perfect and self sufficing life by which we mean a happy and honourable life." Although Aristotle's definition of state is quite clear about the objective of the state but it reduces state merely to an assembly of villages and families. Modern states include a number of political and other kinds of association.

According to **Bluntschli**, "The State is politically organized people of a definite territory". Bluntschli's definition clearly refers to 'government' and 'population' but lacks in pointing out 'sovereignty'. Similarly, **Hall's definition** refers to population, territory, government and external sovereignty as essential ingredients of states but wrongly excludes the internal sovereignty. And, in Holland's definition one is unable to find the reference of external sovereignty.

After studying the various definitions of state, one finds that Garner's and Gilchrist's definitions are more suitable. In the words of **Garner**, "State is a community of persons, more or less numerous, nearly so, of external control and possessing an organized government to which the great body of inhabitants render habitual obedience".

Similarly according to **Gilchrist**, "A state exists where a number of people living on a definite territory, are unified under a government which in internal matters the organ for expressing their sovereignty and in external matters is independent of other governments". It is evident from the above definitions that in order to constitute a State a community of people, more or less in number should be permanently settled over a definite portion of territory having a government which is independent of external control and is supreme in internal matters.

#### SELF CHECK EXERCISE-I

- a) Give answers to the following questions.
  - b) Check your answers with the answers given in the end of this lesson
1. Who said, "State comes into existence originating in the bare needs of life and continues in existence for the sake of goods life."

---

---

2. What was the meaning of 'Polis' for Greeks ?

---

---

3. What was the definition of state according to Aristotle ?

---

---

4. How has Gilchrist defined the State ?

---

---

#### **1.4.5 Essential Elements of State**

It is quite obvious from the above discussed definitions of the state that basically is state consists of four essential elements. These are : (i) Population; (ii) Territory; (iii) Government and (iv) Sovereignty. No state can come into existence in the absence of even any one of these elements. Now we would be like to discuss these elements in some detail.

**1.4.5.1 Population :** No state can be conceived without population. State is a human institution and has come into being to satisfy human needs. The worth considering question is that how much population is needed for a state ? Plato and Aristotle were in favour of smaller city-states. **Plato** fixed the population of the state at 5040. Later, **Rousseau**, the ardent supporter of direct democracy determined 10,000 to be an ideal number for the states. Time has left city-states for behind.

The modern tendency is however towards states with large population. The European countries including Russia are facing the problem of declining growth. However reverse is the case with India and China. India is unable to control the overgrowing population, which is resulting in widening the disequilibrium between the population and available means of production. China has a system of incentives and disincentives to observe a one-child-family norm and bring the population growth to zero.

It should, however, be pointed out that the size of the population is not criterion of the states. The population of States varies from crores to thousands. **India and China** for example, have population more than 100

crores each, while **Manaco** and **San-marino** have 22 thousand and 16 thousand population respectively. Increase or decrease in population make no difference in statehood.

The population problem should be considered in relation to available resources of a country. While the population must be sufficient to maintain a state organization, yet it should not be greater than territorial and resource limitation of the state.

**1.4.5.2 Territory :** There can be no state without a fixed territory. Territory provides the material basis for the existence of state population. International demands that fixed territory must be condition of statehood. For instance, before 1948 the Jews were scattered in a number of European countries and were unable to constitute a state due to lack of their own territory. However, in 1948 they acquired fixed territory in the name of Israel and thus were able to establish their own state.

The Jurisdiction of a state is fixed only with the demarcation of its territorial boundaries. Land, water and air space within the geographical limits comprise the territory of a state. The territorial sovereignty of a state extends to a certain portion of the sea adjacent to the coast line, the limit of which is determined by the international law. The territorial jurisdiction of a state also comprises the airspace above its territory.

As for the size of territory, like that of population, there is no fixed limitation. A country with smaller area can also become a state. For instance Monaco with only 50sq. miles area is recognized country. On the other hand, there are countries, like **Russia, U.S.A.** and India having their area extending to thousand sq. miles.

In the past, certain advantages were claimed for smaller states. For instance, an intimate relationship between the government and the governed could be best established in such states and the nearness to the seat of authority could enable the people to exercise strict vigil over government. But, the massive development in the communication technology have practically reduced the disadvantages of distance. The modern tendency is towards larger states. Smaller states have to face many difficulties. On the one hand, even their independent existence remain in constant risk and on the other, these states do not possess resources sufficient enough to make them self reliant.

**1.4.5.3 Government :** To constitute a state, the population, living over a definite territory, should be organized from the political and legal points of view. The political organization of the people is known as the government. In other words, government is a mechanism or organization through which

the will of the people is expressed and executed. It is the government through which common policies are determined and by which common affairs are regulated and common interests promoted. Without government people would be a chaotic mass of disconnected atoms with no cohesion and means of collective action.

The government may take any form, it may be unitary or federal, parliament or presidential. For instance, there is parliamentary government in U.K. and India, presidential in U.S.A. Similarly, there is federal government in U.S.A. and India and unitary in U.K. What is important is that the government should be strong enough to be able to promote law and order and promote security of her citizens.

**1.4.5.4 Sovereignty :** Sovereignty is the essence of state. Sovereignty means the supreme power over which there is no other power. The sovereignty resides in the state. It is the power through which state dictates its terms and can punish those who violate its orders. Sovereignty of the state has two aspects internal sovereignty and external sovereignty. **Internal sovereignty** denotes the supreme authority of the state over the individuals and the associations within its boundaries, **External sovereignty** means the independence of the state from all foreign control. In other words, state is free to maintain relationship with other nations as per her own will.

But, in the era of internationalization characterized by the independence of states, the external sovereignty of each state is less complete. The rules of international law and treaty agreements place practical limitations but do not mean lack of sovereignty. Still sovereignty lies with the nation states which are free to conduct their international relations as per the dictates of their national interests.

#### **1.4.6 Some Non-essential Elements of State**

Apart from above discussed four essential elements of state, there are certain other elements which are important for the state. It should, however be cleared that in the absence of any of these, a state does not lose its claim of statehood. We still discuss these non-essential but important elements of states as follows :

**1.4.6.1 International Recognition :** Some writers hold international recognition to be equally necessary for the existence of state. According to Oppenheim, "Recognition by other states is essential to achieve complete statehood. By recognition we mean formal recognition of the state existence, as a consequence of which, diplomatic and other relations are established with the new born state. Without this recognition, a state may exist but

it cannot derive full advantage of the membership of the international community.

**1.4.6.2 Stability :** States, as a rule, permanent. If a state is annexed by other state then it ceases to be a state. Its territory and population become that part of other state.

**1.4.6.3 Equality :** A state's position in the international community is unaffected by that fact of her being large or small in population or territory. The international rights and duties of larger or smaller states are alike. If a state lacks the status of equality then it is not a state.

**1.4.6.4 Unity :** It implies that the sovereign of the people living over a definite territory is one. In other words, they are under a single administration and are governed by basically a single law.

In the light of above discussed elements of the state, now we would like to **know whether the following international associations and areas are states or not:-**

- (a) **United Nations (U.N.) :** The U.N. is not a state. It is true that in its structure and organizational form, it is somewhat like the government of a state. It does not have its own population and territory. It also lacks sovereignty. The UN is a voluntary international organisation, which has certain definite objectives. Almost all of the world's independent sovereign national states are its members. The UN decisions are binding on member states only if they are willing to abide by them. It can, however, not be denied that the role of the UN in maintaining world peace and security is very important.
- (b) **Commonwealth Countries :** Commonwealth is a voluntary organization of those countries, which have been under the British in the past. At present, these are independent sovereign states. But, some of these have the dominion state. For example, some people do not recognize Canada, Australia, New Zealand, etc. as states since their nominal head is still British Monarch, who appoints the Governor Generals of these countries. However, these countries are states in the proper sense of world. These countries are practically fully independent from any external control and enjoy both internal and as well as external sovereignty.
- (c) **Units of Federal Countries :** The Units of any Federation are not states in the real sense of the world. Units have no sovereignty. For example though India, C.I.S. (Commonwealth of independent States), which is the Federation of former Soviet States, and the U.S.A. the constituting

units are called states yet these are not states. The units of federation are under the supreme power of their union governments. Therefore, despite having their respective population, territory and government, these are not states.

**Self Check Exercise:- II**

1. State the four essential elements of state and which one of these is most important in your opinion ?

---

---

---

2. How much population is needed for a state ?

---

---

---

3. In your opinion, how much area is desirable for a state.

---

---

---

4. Which form of government is desirable to constitute a state ?

---

---

---

5. What is meant by internal sovereignty and external sovereignty ?

---

---

---

6. Point out not-essential elements of state ?

---

---

---

7. Whether international recognition is a pre-condition for the organization of a state.

---

---

---

8. Why U.N.O. is not a state ?

---

---

---

9. Why California in U.S.A., Chechnya in C.I.S. and Punjab and Jammu Kashmir in India are not states ?

---

---

---

**Distinction of State from Government, Society and Association****Distinction/Difference between State and Society.**

The term state and society have often been interchangeably used. Plato and Aristotle did not make any difference between the two. According to them, there was not other social life without being the member of society. Hegel also held the same view. According to Laski also states and society share the same objectives as both aim at helping the individual to develop his personality. Similarly, the dictators also do not make any distinction between state and society since they claim the right to interfere in every aspect of social life. However, despite some similarities, state and society are different entities. MacIver is of the view that to consider state and 'society' as the same thing is a big illusion that will neither lead to correctly understand society nor state. The main points of difference between state and society may be summed up as follows :

**State indicates Political while Society indicates Social system :** As is evident from above discussion, state is a political where as society is a social organization. State deals with the political order and society deals with the social order. Society deals with the people who live in a socially organised institution of human beings whereas the state deals with the politically organised people. State is a political system whereas society is a social system. The origin of the state can be traced back to the tribe, which was once the political institution, whereas the origin of the society can be traced back to family, which is regarded as the first social institution.

**Social is prior to state :** Society has originated before state. In the primitive age, when state has not yet come into existence, society existed in one form or other. The social economic traditions and conventions of human life came prior to laws of the state. State came into being when people became politically conscious and they established the organisation of government to maintain peace and security in society and began to obey its rules and regulations.

**Society is wider than state :** As against that of society, the sphere of state activity is limited. Society deals with the various aspects of human life

including social, political, culture, religious, economic and ethical, etc. Society aims at overall well-being of the individuals whereas state is primarily concerned with the political aspect of human life.

**State Possesses Sovereignty but society does not :** State has supreme power. It can force individuals to obey its decision and orders. Who so even disobey state laws can be punished. But society does not possess any such power. "Society can only persuade the individuals to follow certain rules while distinguishing state from society, Barker states that "The area of society is voluntary co-operation, its energy that of good will, its method that of elasticity, while the state is rather that of mechanical action, its energy force, its method rigidity."

**Territory is essential Basis of State but not of Society :** Territory is one of the essential constituents of State. No state can exist without territory. The state rules supreme over the people living in its territory. But for society territory is not an essential condition. Society is the web of social relationships. The sphere of society may be extended to the whole world and may be limited to the family.

**Organisation is essential for State and not for Society :** Society can be both organised or unorganized. When men lived in families and tribes and even before the down of the state when men used to wander from one place to another, society existed though it was not in an organised form. The state or the government organised the society first of all. The state of the government cannot exist without social organization.

**State is only a part of society :** Like other institutions of society, state is also one of its institutions, It is the society that unites all such institutions as family, state, clubs, political parties and trusts, etc. Therefore, we should regard state only as a part of society.

**Distinction/Difference between State and Government :**The terms 'States' and 'Government' are often used interchangeably. But both are not the same. However, Hobbes employed that terms the state and the government as if they meant the same thing. John Locke attempted first of all to differentiate the state from government in nineteenth century. In his words, "While the government is a body of some citizens, the state consists of all the citizens. "The main differences between state and government may be discussed as follows.

**Government is only a part of the State :** It has already been discussed that state consists of four essential elements, viz; population, territory, government and sovereignty. State is thus a complete entity and government is one of its essential elements. Undoubtedly, government is

very important constituent of the state because State cannot operate without government.

**Government is an agent of State :** In the words of Garner, “Government is the agency or machinery through which the collective will of the people or state may be formulated, expressed and executed”. Laski also points out that government, “exists to carry out the purposes of the state. It is not itself the supreme coercive power. It is simply the mechanism of administration which gives effect to the purpose of that power.” Thus, government serves as an agent of the state. In other words, it is through the government that the state operates.

**Membership of State is Compulsory and not of Government :** Every person becomes a member of State by virtue of his birth or blood relations. But, it entirely depends upon the will of the person concerned to be or not be the member of the government.

**State has Sovereignty but Government does not :** State possesses the “supreme power. The Government exercises the power that is conferred by the state. Thus, government does not possess sovereignty. For example, in democracy public is regarded as the source of all power. The powers of state as enormous whereas government has limited powers which are generally enshrined in the constitution of country.

**Government changes Frequently but State remains, more or less, permanent :** Government change frequently. A government collapses due to certain legal or political reasons and the other parties get the opportunity to form their own governments. As a consequence, government changes and not the state. Sometimes democracy is replaced by dictatorship. Government changes its form and state continues to exist. However, a state comes to end only when it loses its authority to have a control over its population or its sovereignty is usurped by another state.

**State is uniform throughout but Government has many kinds :** Population territory, government and sovereignty are indispensable to constitute a state. Any human organization having all the four essential elements will enjoy the status of statehood. However, may have many kinds or types. For example, there is parliamentary government in UK and India and presidential in USA, etc.

**Territory is essential Element of State but not Government :** A State must have certain fixed territory, A government can function without territory. During the second world war, when certain countries were occupied by the Germany, the governments of these countries continued

to function from the territory of other countries.

**State is Abstract but Government is Concrete :** The state does not possess any form and is abstract. It has no practical concern either. So far as the government is concerned, it is practical and has its own practical shape and the will of the state is the people.

**Distinction/Difference between State and Association**

In spite of some similarities, both state and association differ from each other in the following ways :-

First difference is regarding the sovereign status. State is a sovereign association which has the capacity to take all decisions independently. Associations, on the other hand, are of non-sovereign nature.

Associations differ from state in regard to their life. State is a permanent institution. On the other hand, associations are comparatively of low life term.

Associations also differ from state in regard to their membership. Membership of state is compulsory while the membership of associations is voluntarily.

Both, State and Associations also differ from each other in regard to their respective goals and objectives. Aims and objectives of state are wider than that of the aims and objectives of associations.

**Summary**

In this lesson, we have dwelt upon the definition and elements of state and have tried to distinguish it from society and government. Since the time of ancient Greek political scientists, the state has been a very important theme of political science. State denotes a number of people living on a definite territory, unified under a government, which is supreme in internal matters and is independent of any foreign control in external matters. Thus population, territory, government and sovereignty are four essential elements of state. The size of population and areas of a state does not affect its equal status of statehood. Government is essential for a state. The government may be of any kind. Such government must possess external as well as internal sovereignty. It should be free from any external control and supreme in internal matters. State has certain other elements or features as well, viz, stability, international recognition, equality, unity, etc. But these are not pre-conditions for constituting a state, the United Nations, commonwealth or units of federal countries can not be regarded as state since they lack sovereignty. State is different from society and Government.

**Self Check Exercise : III**

1. What is meant by Society ?

---

---

---

2. Point out two differences between state and Society ?

---

---

---

3. Point out two differences between state and government.

---

---

---

4. In what sense government is an agency of State ?

---

---

---

5. How does individual automatically become a member of the state ?

---

---

---

**Answers to the Self Check Exercises :****Exercise No. 1 (Answers)**

1. These words were said by Aristotle.
2. For Greeks, the meaning of 'Polis' was 'city-State'.
3. According to Aristotle State is "the Union of Families and Villages having for its end a perfect and self-sufficing life by which we mean a happy and honourable life.
4. According to Gilchrist a state "exists where a number of people living on a definite territory are unified under a government which in internal matters is the organ for expressing their sovereignty and in external matters is independent of other government."

**Exercise No. 2 (Answer)**

1. Population, Territory, Government and Sovereignty are four essential elements of state. All the four are equally important for the state.
2. No limitation of population can be fixed for a state.
3. Area of a state should be sufficient enough to meet the needs of its populations.

4. Form of government does not matter to constitute a state.
5. Internal sovereignty means that state wields supreme power in respect to internal matters and external sovereignty implies that state is free of external control.
6. Recognition, stability, equality and unity are four non-essential elements of state.
7. Internal recognition is not a pre-condition for the organization of a state.
8. The U.N.O. lacks sovereignty. Therefore it is not a state.
9. California in U.S.A., Chechnya in C.I.S. and Punjab and Jammu-Kashmir in India are not states, as they do not possess sovereignty. They are units of these states, which have federal form of government.

### **Exercise No. 3 (Answers)**

1. Two difference between state and society are :
  - (i) State possesses sovereignty, society does not;
  - (ii) States needs organization, society does not.
2. Two difference between state and Government are :
  - (i) State possesses sovereignty not government.
  - (ii) Governments change frequently and state generally is not changed.
3. State is abstract. It is through government alone that state expresses and execute its will.
4. An individual becomes member of state by virtue of his birth or blood relations.

### **SUGGESTED READINGS AND WEB SOURCES:-**

1. Getell, R.G. : Political Science, chapter III
2. Garner, J.W. : Political Science, government chapter II, V
3. A.C Kapoor : Principles of Political Science
4. J.C Johari : Principles of Political Science
5. O.P Gauba : An Introduction to Political Theory
6. N.D. Arora : State
7. Andrew Heywood : Politics
8. [www.wikipedia.org](http://www.wikipedia.org)
9. <http://jccc-ugcinfonet.in>
10. [www.cup.com](http://www.cup.com)

---

**LESSON NO. 1.6**

**Author : Dr. Ravinder Kaur**

---

**SOCIAL CONTRACT THEORY OF THE ORIGIN OF STATE**

**Structure :**

- 1.6.0 Objectives
- 1.6.1 Introduction
- 1.6.2 Statement of the Theory
- 1.6.3 History of the Theory
- 1.6.4 Thomas Hobbes' Views on the Social Contract
- 1.6.5 John Locke's Views on the Social Contract
- 1.6.6 Rousseau's Views on the Social Contract
- 1.6.7 Rousseau's Theory of General Will
  - 1.6.7.1 Criticism of the Rousseau's Views on General Will
  - 1.6.7.2 Rousseau in relation to Hobbes and Locke
- 1.6.8 Evaluation of the Social Contract Theory
  - 1.6.8.1 Criticism of the theory
  - 1.6.8.2 Importance of the theory
- 1.6.9 Let us Sum up
- 1.6.10 Key Words
- 1.6.11 Answers to Self Check Exercises
- 1.6.12 Suggested Readings

**1.6.0 Objectives**

In this lesson you will be introduced to an important theory regarding the origin of state that is Social Contract Theory. We will also take up the views of three main exponents of this theory, i.e. Hobbes, Locke and Rousseau. After going through this lesson you will be able to :

- \* Differentiate between historical theories and speculative theories of the origin of state.
- \* Explain the meaning of the Social Contract theory.
- \* Point out how the Hobbes', Locke's and Rousseau's views were the product of their time.
- \* Understand the importance of the theory.

**1.6.1 Introduction**

Tracing of the origin of the state is indeed a difficult task. The modern origin sciences of Ethnology (the science that studies varieties of human race) and

Anthropology (General Science of man) have undoubtedly thrown much light on the dim past of human history, still the emergence of the state cannot be historically determined. This question has been opened to much of speculation and several theories have been put forth to explain the origin.

These theories are put in two categories : (a) **Speculative Theories**

(b) **Evolutionary or Historical Theories.**

As we all know history has an evidence to the fact as to when a particular state came into existence, for example We can say that the state of Pakistan came into existence in 1947, Israel in 1948 and Bangladesh in 1971. But when the state as an institution originated first of all, is a fact, which is shrouded in mystery we do not know exactly the source and time of the origin of state. As Gilchrist puts it, “Of the circumstances surrounding the dawn of political consciousness, we know little or almost nothing.” where history fails us, we turn to speculation and this is the recourse which early thinkers of political science adopted. A number of speculative theories were expounded by them. But most important among them are *Divine Origin Theory* and *Social Contract Theory*. Some traditional writers also include *Force Theory* in Speculative Theories, but in modern times force is considered a historical fact. The other Theories, included in the list of historical theories are *Historical/Evolutionary Theory* and *Marxian Theory*. Both these theories can be called a combination of historical evidence and history shows us that force has played an important role in the development of the institution of state and it bringing it into its present form.

An important fact that we must keep in mind is the speculative and historical theories try to find answers to two different sets of questions. While historical theories stress on the fact as to how state came into existence, speculative theories explain the need and importance of state. These theories do not explain the historical process of the advent of the institution called ‘state’, rather they speculate why state originated and why individuals should pay obedience to the state ? Their aim was to find answers to the question like why individual should submit to the political authority and also to which extent the authority of the state is justified. Though these speculative theories do not provided a satisfactory answer to the question, how the state is originated ? Still their study is imperative to understand the philosophical basis of political authority and submission by the individual to the will of state.

• **SELF-CHECK EXERCISE-I**

- Write your answer at the space given below :

Check your answers at the end of lesson.

1. Fill in the blanks :

(i) In which two categories can the theories of the origin can be placed.

a) .....

b) .....

(ii) Speculative Theories try to explain the.....

(iii) Historical Theories try to explain.....

### **1.6.2 Statement of the Theory**

The exponents of the Social Contract Theory hold that the state is the result of a deliberate and voluntary agreement on the part of primitive men. It assumes that there was a period in human history when there was no state at all and no political law. This pre-political or pre-social State of Nature came to an end when a political association was made by men through a contract means contract deals with the establishment of the state, the nature of the political authority which is established the relations between the rulers and the ruled.

### **1.6.3 History of the Theory**

The theory finds a prominent place in political thinking. **Kautilya's** Arthashastra made a pointed reference to it, while the **Sophists** described the State to be a product of contract among men. Plato and Aristotle dealt with the theory of social contract only to reject it. The **Roman jurists** stated that the power of the Roman Emperor was based on the consent of the people. The Biblical writers spoke about a Contract between King David and the Elders of Israel.

In middle ages also the idea of contract found significant place. **Manegold** was the first exilesiastic (priest) to give a definite statement of the contract theory. He held that if the king violates the agreement according to which he was chosen, reason dictates the people should have the right to depose the King. The oath of people to allegiance is conditional upto the king observing his own oath to maintain law and administer justice.

The theory also received wide-spread acceptance after the sixteenth century. Among several exponents of this theory during this period are George Bouchanan, Mariana Grotius, Richard Hooker, Hobbes, Lock and Rousseau. But the best known exponents of the theory are **Thomas Hobbes**, **John Locke** and **Jean Jacques Rousseau**.

### **1.6.4 Thomas Hobbes' Views about the Social Contract**

Thomas Hobbes, sometimes tutor to Charles II published a book. "**The Levianthan' in 1651**. In this book he gave a striking exposition to the theory of Social Contract. Hobbes had not intention to give the theory of the origin of State. His objective was to defend absolute powers of the monarch. He wrote while memory of the civil war and facing Charless I execution was still fresh to justify the rule of stuart who had come to power. He believed that England could be saved only by absolute monarchy and he used the doctrine of the Social Contract to support it.

#### **1.6.4.1 The State of Nature**

Hobbes began his thesis with the state of nature, which he characterised as the pre social phase of **human nature**. The state of nature, according to Hobbes was a condition of unmitigated selfishness and rapacity. Men had no sense of right and wrong and they fell upon each other with savage ferocity. There was a perpetual and

restless desire with them to satisfy their appetites and desires with a craving for gain and glory which came to an end only with their death. Man was not at all social; indeed he found “nothing but grief in the company of his fellows” — all being almost equally selfish, self seeking, cunning, egoistic, brutal, covetous and aggressive. The state of nature was a condition of perpetual at war, **“where every man is enemy to every man”** and where the rule of life was “only that to be every man's that he can get; and for so long as he can keep it” when men in state of nature were like hungry wolves each ready to devour the other, their lives were, **“solitary, poor, nasty, brutish and short.”** Might was considered right and liberty was nothing more than the liberty each man had to use his own power for the preservation of his own nature.

#### **1.6.4.2 The Contract :**

The conditions were really intolerable and it was not possible to let them continue indefinitely. So for peace and security and also for escaping from the misery and horror of their natural condition, they contracted among themselves to form a civil society or commonwealth, which would ensure to each security and certainly of life and property. By mutual consent or contract they agreed to surrender their natural rights into the hands of a common superior and obey his commands. The contract was of **each with all and of all with each**. Each man said to every other man : “I authorise and give up my right of governing myself to this man, or to assembly of men, on this condition, that they give up their right to him, and authorise all his actions in the like manner.....”

In this way individuals surrendered their natural rights to some man or this assembly of men. who became sovereign and the individuals who agreed to submit to the authority of the sovereign became his subjects. The individuals had an agreement between themselves. The Sovereign was not a party to the contract as he is a creation of the contract. As **Dunning** puts it, “A superior or sovereign, exists only by virtue of the pact, not prior to it.”

1. As sovereign was not a party to the contract, he was not subject himself to any conditions; his authority was absolute and unlimited. All his subjects should obey him, otherwise there would be conflict, war and a return to the wretchedness of the state of nature.
2. The individuals were left with no rights to themselves as a result of this contract except the right to self preservation as the contract became irrevocably binding on the community as a perpetual bond. If the sovereign is conquered by another, the subjects become the subjects of the conqueror.
3. Hobbes denied people their right to revolt against the authority of the sovereign even if he became arbitrary and despotic. Infact sovereign. According to him, can never be wrong and his actions could not be unjust.

4. Law was the command of the sovereign and he was the sole source of law, Liberty according to Hobbes consisted In (i) What the sovereign permitted; and (ii) The right of self preservation which was retained by people.
5. Hobbes thus gives to his sovereign absolute, inalienable, indivisible and unlimited authority. Hobbes's sovereign, so defined, need not necessarily be one man sovereignty may be located in an individual man a group of men, but his preference for rule by an individual i.e. monarchy was an admitted fact. Monarchy, in his opinion was not only the legitimate form
  - of government but it was the best form as well. In short Hobbes justified
  - absolute monarchy by propounding such theory.

### Self Check Exercise-II

Write your answer at the space given below :

Check your answer at the end of lesson.

Fill the Blanks

- (i) State of the nature was that stage when.....
- (ii) .....and.....are two main supporters of this theory
- (iii) Hobbes supported.....monarchy through his theory of social contract.

### 1.6.5 John Locke's Views on the Social Contract :

John Locke was also an English Philosopher who expounded his theory of social contract in his book. **“Two Treatises on Civil Government”**, This book was published in 1690 i.e. two years after the Glorious Revolution, in England, which saw the deposition of James II After deposing James II, the English people elected William III as the King of England. In this book, John Locke tried to justify the overthrow of James II who was an arbitrary ruler. The social contract theory was thus relied upon by Locke so as to justify that the government is based upon the consent of the people. Thus while Hobbes tried to justify absolutism by his theory of contract, Locke, on the basis of the same theory, justified **constituional government**.

Locke also starts with the state of nature but according to him it was not, as Hobbes had written, a state of law lessness or perpetual warfare. On the other hand, people were co-operative and mutually helpful in the state of nature which was marked by freedom and equality for all. There was “a state of peace, goodwill mutual assistance and preservation”. Men enjoyed certain **national rights** like **right to life, liberty and property**, but at the same time these rights entailed corresponding obligations. The **state of nature**, according to Locke, had some difficulties (i) Laws were not clearly defined; (ii) There was not way of enforcing the decision jointly taken by men; (iii) There was no independent arbitrator to settle the disputes.

In order to put an end to all this, men entered into a contract with one another and formed with all a society. As this contract was of with all, it was social contract.

In Hobbes's theory there is only one contract, in Locke's there are two. By making the **first contract**, the state of nature ended and civil society is born. The **second contract** was a government contract. **Civil society**, the product of the first contract created an authority to enforce decisions and thus a government was formed. People decided that one among them should be chosen a ruler and entrusted with the duty and responsibility of carrying on the government. The governmental contract which selected a ruler did not give him absolute authority; on the contrary, he did not exercise his authority in the interest of the people, they had right to overthrow him and install another ruler. Thus while Hobbes believed that people surrendered all their rights to the ruler and had therefore no right to rise against him even if he ruled arbitrarily. Locke maintained that the people never surrendered all their rights and had the legal right to revolt against the ruler who ruled arbitrarily.

1. According to Locke there were two contracts. The first ending the state of nature and second establishing a government.
  2. According to Locke this contract was not absolute instead people could change it.
  3. The ruler is not a sovereign, he works as an agent of the people.
  4. The wish of the people is the source of all government authority.
  5. • People have the legal right to revolt against the ruler who ruled arbitrarily.
- In brief we can say that Locke supported constitutional monarchy.

### Self Check Exercise-III

Write your answer at the space given below :

Check your answers at the end of lesson.

Fill the Blanks :-

- (i) John Locke propounded the theory of social contract of support.....monarchy.
- (ii) According to Locke there were two contracts. Through first.....and through second.....came into existence.
- (iii) Locke considers the ruler the agent of the.....his right to sovereignty is not absolute."

### 1.6.6. Rousseau's Views on the Social Contract

Jean Jacques Rousseau was one of literary giants of the eighteenth century France who can be called the spiritual father of the French revolution. Two of his books, '**Social Contract**' and '**Discourses on Inequality**' helped greatly in rousing those emotional forces which ultimately destroyed the corrupt monarchical rule in France. Rousseau's views on social contract are contained in the former book. Like Hobbes and Locke, he also believed that men formerly lived in a state of nature. But, according to him, the state of nature was of idyllic happiness. Rousseau's primitive man was a noble savage "Who lived a natural, innocent and simple life. Men enjoyed perfect happiness, freedom and equality. In fact, according to him the "natural man

was innocent and virtuous" and it is civilisation that has corrupted him of his freedom and happiness. **He said, "Man is born free but everywhere he is in chains."** The growth of population and the resulting complexities of life gradually forced man into the civil society. The civil society came into existence as a result of contract. By contract each man "puts his power in common under the supreme direction of the general will". Thus while Hobbes believed that each man surrendered his natural rights to a ruler, Rousseau maintained that he surrendered his rights to the community. It is the community which becomes the sovereign, and not the ruler.

The individual gave himself up to the control of all, but not to a particular person, Sovereignty is passed on to the community, of which individual is an integral part. Since each individual gives himself up to all, actually there is little he gives up. In fact he acquires over every associate the same right that is given up by himself. So in surrendering all his power the individual was not loser in any sense. As a member of the political community each individual retains an equal and inalienable position of sovereignty of the whole and remains as free as before.

### **1.6.7 Rousseau's Theory of General Will**

Hence through a contract the individual becomes the members of a civil society and thereby completely and unconditionally surrenders to the General will which is the will of the entire body of contracting members. This is the most distinctive contribution of Rousseau to political thought. The theory of General Will is a plea for **popular sovereignty**. Individual freedom and consent as the basis of political authority and sovereignty of state. According to Rousseau every man has got two wills '**actual will**' and the '**real will**'. Actual will is man's impulsive and unreflective will. It considers self interest and does not consider its relation to the well-being of the community at large. But the real will is free from selfishness. It is a good will and stands for common interest of common good, it expresses itself in the harmony between the individual and society.

It is upon the conception of real or goodwill that Rousseau has built the doctrine of 'General will'. General will can be defined as the sum total of the 'real wills' of the individuals comprising society. **Bosanquet** defines it as "will of the whole society as such or the wills of all individuals in so far as they aim at the common good." It is a common consciousness of a common end or good. The term General will suggests two ideas : the numbers voting and the common interest which it expresses. And according to Rousseau common interest is important. All this means that General will is not identical with majority vote or public opinion. So long as genuine public interest is present, general will may be expressed by the vote of the majority, or even by a vote of a single person. As **Rousseau** himself says, "**what makes the will General is, less the number of votes than, the common interest uniting them.**" But we may say that majority opinion is more

likely to be general than the will of a single person in practical terms. Hence the doctrine of General will leads to the democratic form of government. A democratic government is likely to be more truly expressive of community. Thus General will means the following things :

1. Through a contract individual becomes the member of the Civil Society and thereby completely and unconditionally, surrenders to the General Will, The General Will is not exactly the will of all. It is always the expression of "Inner will, a dictate of the conscience and is always right, altruistic and universal and considers only common interest."
2. It stands for the interest of the whole body and not for the interest of any particular individual.
3. The General will which is the real will of each individual, must be sovereign and it must be obeyed and followed by all.
4. If the individual does not follow the General Will he can be forced to follow it, the coercing authority is the General Will itself. When the General Will uses coercion power, it means the real will of the individual is acting and coming to the individual who is punished for not following the General Will. In reality he obeys himself in being punished because he is part of the sovereign which wills his punishment. Thus he forced to be free.
5. The individual has to be completely loyal to the General Will. Thus he advocates a case of complete loyalty to the State.

#### **1.6.7.1 Criticism of the General Will**

1. **Rousseau's Concept of General Will is Vague :** It is very difficult to discern the General Will in practice. It is not the totality of individual wills because individual will has both common and selfish interest. It is not the will of the majority, because majority is a part of the whole, and not the whole. How to determine this will, Rousseau does not offer any contract proposals.
2. **It encourages absolutism :** The General Will encourages absolutism. Man can even be coerced to, obey it in the name of freedom. It is never unjust and individual can never protest it.
3. **It is difficult to define common good :** It is not easy to define common good. More-over no one can give assurance that the General Will invariably will work for the good of all. Even a tyrant may justify his actions on the pretext of his being in common interest.
4. **Human will is Indivisible :** Rousseau says that man has got two wills actual will and real will. But this is not correct, human will is indivisible.

Yet Rousseau's contribution is undoubtedly great. He established the theory of

popular sovereignty on the basis of General Will. His concept that sovereignty lies with the people brought about a revolution in political philosophy. However vague the concept of general will may be, it clearly says in unmistakable terms that people are the sovereign.

### Self Check Exercise-IV

Write your answer at the space given below :

Check your answer at the end of lesson.

Fill the Blanks :-

- (i) Rousseau used the social contract theory to support.....  
.....form of government.
- (ii) Rousseau's general will is the sum total of the.....
- (iii) According to Rousseau every individual has two wills that  
is.....and.....

### 1.6.7.2 Rousseau in relation to Hobbes and Locke

Although all the three exponents of this theory held, that state is the outcome of contract, they differ in their view with regard to the state of nature, the nature of the contracts, and its consequences in several ways.

As for state of nature, Hobbes believed that it was a state of extreme insecurity, a state of war of all with all in which every man lived in constant threat of being killed by his neighbour. But Locke and Rousseau do not present such horrible picture as depicted by Hobbes. Both-Locke and Rousseau—held that people lived in peace and co-operation with one another. But, later on, due to certain factors men felt inconvenience and were miserable and therefore put an end to the state of nature by entering into a contract which brought a civil society.

As regards the contract, Hobbes held that a person's right to govern over himself was surrendered to a particular person or assembly of persons. This person or assembly became the sovereign. As the sovereign was not a party to the contract so Individual has not right to revolt against the sovereign even if the latter ruled arbitrarily. But according to Locke, there were two contracts and not one as the case with Hobbes. The two contracts of Locke were social contract and the governmental contract. Men in the state of nature first agreed to constitute a civil society and this they did.....by surrendering some of their natural rights to the society. Having formed a Civil Society they entered into a contract with a person, who was authorised to wield governmental powers, If this ruler violated the terms of the contract, he could be deposed by the people. The authority of the ruler was thus not unlimited. It was limited by the terms of contract. This view sharply contrasts with that of 'Hobbes' who believed that ruler's authority was absolute and unlimited. On the contrary, Rousseau held that there were not two contracts but one, which was social and governmental at the same time. From this point, the views of Hobbes and Rousseau are identical. According to Rousseau people

surrendered their right to the community . To quote his language, "Each individual puts his person and all his power in common under the supreme direction of the General Will." 'As a result of this contract it is community which become sovereign, and not any particular person. Kings and rulers are mere servants of the people, they are the creations of the popular will. The ruler exercises his authority because people have authorised him to do so. Hence Rousseau was an advocate of direct democracy, while Hobbes and Locke were in favour of absolute monarchy and limited monarchy respectively. **Sovereignty in Hobbes can be located in the monarch and in Rousseau it is with the people, but in case of Locke there is not clear conception of sovereignty.**

The powers which Hobbes's monarch exercises, are enjoyed by people in Rousseau's theory. According to Hobbes theory, the king is absolute while in Rousseau's General Will is absolute. Therefore it is said that Rousseau's General Will is Hobbes's Leviathan with its head chopped off."

### **1.6.8 Evaluation of the Social Contract Theory**

#### **1.6.8.1 Criticism of the Social Contract Theory**

The social contract theory has been vehemently criticised by various writer of Political Science. Maine pronounced it to be 'worthless', Woolsey declared it 'utterly false' and Green condemned it to be a 'fiction.' The arguments against the theory may be summed up under the following heads.

**1. Historically the theory is false :** History does not furnish a single example of primitive men having no knowledge of political institutions forming a state by entering into a contract among themselves. Example are often cited of states coming into being as a result of contract. But an examination of all such cases will show that the contract was made by men who were citizens of state and had knowledge of political institutions. May Flower compact is often cited as an example of a contract bringing a state into being. In 1620 a group of English puritans emigrated to America on a ship called May-Flower. They founded the first colony in America, the colony of New Plymouth. Before landing they entered into an agreement which has come to be known as the **May-Flower Compact**. This was a compact made by people who had been the members of well-developed state. Hence this cannot be illustrated as an example of men in the State of Nature forming a Civil Society by means of contract.

The theory assumes that primitive man was an individualist i.e. he was free to enter into voluntary agreement with other free men. But this is quite contrary to the researches on the individuals. Law was based on customs and the status of the individual was assigned to him by the Customary law. The idea of contract postulates that individuals who enter into contract are free to do things in their own way. But **Henry Maine** says that evidence of law and customs shows that primitive men had no such freedom. Hence in these circumstances of the free contracting of individuals

with one another in order to form a Civil Society looks absurd.

**2. The Theory is illogical :** It is illogical theory as it implies the possibility of rights and obligations being independence of Society. According to Locke, man had right to life, liberty and property and in Rousseau's state of nature there were natural rights and equality. But rights are possible only in a state and liberty is not possible except under law. Hence there could be neither liberty nor rights in the state of nature.

**3. The Theory is against Law :** From the legal point of view, also, the theory is faulty. A contract in order to be valid must have the force or sanction of the state. But for the social contract, there is not such sanction because it precedes and does not follow the establishment of the state. In the words of **T.H. Green**, "The covenant by which Civil power is for the time being constituted cannot be valid covenant, The men making it are not in a position to make a valid covenant at all."

Thus if the original contract i.e. illegal and invalid, All subsequent contracts based upon it are equally invalid and the rights derived from it have not legal Foundation. A contract is binding and only parties who enter into it. But the social contract was supposed to bind generations of men who had no say in matter at all. Hence, theory is a bad law.

**4. Theory is Philosophically Wrong :** The theory assumes that the relation between the individual and the state is voluntary one. But this is not so. We are members of the state in the same way in which we are members of a family. We are born in the state and we do not choose it and if later on we change our citizenship, we are still in the state. State is not voluntary. State ought not, therefore, be considered a mere partnership, an agreement like in trade matters. The individual is a born member of state and his obligations do not rest on a covenant.

#### **1.6.8.2 Importance of the Social Contract Theory**

Though as an explanation of the origin of the state the theory does not find support today, still it contains certain elements of truth. It laid down the fundamental truth of political obligation—that obedience rested upon the consent of the governed and sovereign had no right to act arbitrarily. No body bothered whether state really originated in a contract, but millions were powerfully stirred by the idea that people are the ultimate source of authority and state is an expression of the popular will. Rousseau wrote that people were the sovereign and the rulers were merely the creations of popular will. His theory created a psychological revolution which ultimately expressed itself in the great **French Revolution** that swept away the oppressive monarchical regime in France.

**The Idea of Consent :** The idea that the consent of the people is the source of all political authority also influenced the American minds and inspired the American struggle for independence. The preamble to the **American declaration of independence**

is an assertion of the idea of the Contract and the Principle of popular consent.

### 1.6.9 Let us Sum up

In this lesson, we have studied about the Social Contract theory of the origin of- the state. The exponents of this theory assume that there was a pre-political and prosocial state in history of man and call it the State of Nature. This State of Nature came to an end, when political association was made by men through a contract. This contract deals with the establishment of the State the nature of political authority established and the relations between the ruler and the ruled. The chief exponents of this theory are Hobbes, Locke and Rousseau. All the three of them believe that men lived in a state of nature before 'State' came into existence and also that state is an outcome of contract. But they differ about their description of the state of Nature and about the terms of the contract. In fact, they all favoured different systems of government and used the idea of contract for justifying the form they favoured. Thus Hobbes favoured absolute. Monarchy, while Locke favoured Limited Monarchy and Rousseau popular sovereignty. Though due to growth of scientific and historical approach the theory is not acceptable any more yet we can't deny its importance for giving the fundamental truth that popular consent should be the basis of all government.

#### Self Check Exercise-V

Write your answer at the space given below.

Check your answer at the end of lesson.

- (i) Point Similarities and Dissimilarities between Locke and Rousseau and Hobbes and Rousseau in four *five* lines in all.

.....  
.....  
.....  
.....

- (ii) "Rousseau begins as Locke and ends like Hobbes" — explain this statement in three to four lines.

.....  
.....  
.....  
.....

- (iii) Give four points of criticism of Social Contract Theory.

1. ....  
2. ....  
3. ....  
4. ....

(iv) Discuss the importance of Social Contract Theory.

1. ....
2. ....
3. ....
4. ....

### 1.6.10 Key Words

**Speculative** : not based on historical facts.

**State of nature** : The period when state or law were not in existence or presocial phase of human nature.

**Social Contract** : The agreement or covenant through which civil society was established.

**Absolute Monarchy** : Unlimited, inalienable, indivisible power of the Sovereign or King.

**Limited or Constitutional Monarchy** : The King is not absolute his power are limited by the law of the land.

**Leviathan** : It is name of the Hobbes' book —It literally means huge monster symbolising absolute and unlimited power of monarch.

**Civil Society** : Society established through social contract.

**Natural Rights** : The rights enjoyed by people in state of nature i.e. before the state came into existence.

**Actual Will** : Man's impulsive and unreflective will.

**Real Will** : It is a good will and stands for common interest or common good.

**General Will** : It is the sum total of the 'real wills' of the individuals comprising society.

### 1.6.11 Answers to Self Check Exercises

#### Self Check Exercise I

(i) (a) speculative (b) historical (ii) the need and importance of state (iii) how state came into existence.

#### Self Check Exercise II

(i) When state or law were not in existence (ii) Hobbes and Locke (iii) absolute.

#### Self Check Exercise III

(i) limited (ii) (a) civil society (b) government (iii) people.

#### Self Check Exercise IV

(i) democratic (ii) real wills (iii) (a) actual and real.

#### Self Check Exercise V

(i) Both Rousseau and Locke have identical views about the state of nature; both believe that in the state of nature individual was leading a peaceful life in accordance with laws of nature. But due to certain unavoidable circumstances this state could not continue for long and individual resorted to establishing the 'institution of state' through a contract. But they differ about the term of the contract which was entered

into. According to Locke these were two contracts, through the first one the 'civil society' was established, while through the second, the 'government'. Rousseau believes that there was only one contract, which was political as well as social. Again Locke supported 'limited monarchy', while Rousseau favoured 'democracy', through these contracts.

Hobbes and Rousseau have different views about the state of nature for Rousseau it was a state of peace and prosperity which could not continue forever due to certain reasons, while for Hobbes it was such a State in which there was a constant fear of violence and death and individual life was lonely, poor, brutish and short lived. Despite these differences about state of nature, they establish the form of government which is similar, despite its dissimilarities. Though social contract Hobbes entrusts without any pre-conditions all rights to such a ruler who has unlimited and absolute powers. Rousseau too entrusts all powers and rights unconditionally to the society, which too has absolute, unlimited and indivisible sovereignty. The only difference between the two is that while Hobbes subordinates the individual to the king, Rousseau subordinates him to the general will.

(ii) As we have explained above, Rousseau and Locke have similar views about the 'state of nature' that is why it is said that 'Rousseau begins as Locke' but since he considers sovereignty absolute, unlimited and indivisible and subordinates the individual completely to the sovereign which is general will according to him, it is said that 'Rousseau ends like Hobbes'.

(iii) (1) It is not based on historical facts. (2) It is illogical. (3) The theory is fallacious because rights can not be prior to the civil society. (4) It is a bad law because rights can not be prior to the civil society. (4) It is a bad law because contract is possible only in a politically organised society. (You can also write any of the points given in your lesson).

(iv) Its importance lies in pointing out the fundamental truth that popular consent should be the basis of all government.

#### **1.6.12 Suggested Readings :-**

1. J.C Johari : Principles of Political Science
2. O.P Gauba : An introduction to Political Theory
3. G.H.Sabine : History of Political Theory
4. Sushila Ramaswamy : Political Theory
5. Andrew Heywood : Political Theory
6. N.D. Arora : State
7. Andrew Heywood : Politics
8. [www.routledge.com/books](http://www.routledge.com/books)
9. [www.amazon.com/books](http://www.amazon.com/books)

**EVOLUTIONARY THEORY OF THE ORIGIN OF THE STATE**

1.7.0 Objectives of the Lesson

1.7.1 Introduction

1.7.2 The Evolutionary Theory — Meaning and Explanation

1.7.3 Factors Responsible for the Origin of the State

1.7.4 Importance of the Theory

1.7.5 Let's Sum Up

1.7.6 Self Check Exercise and Answers

1.7.7 Suggested Readings

**1.7.0 Objectives :** Dear Students, you have so far read about an important theory (i.e. the Social Contract Theory) trying to explain how state originated. There are other theories as well viz. Matriarchal and Patriarchal Theory and the Force Theory and the Marxist Theory. But none of these theory and the Marxist Theory. But none of these theories can be called correct and universally acceptable as each of them has certain fundamental weaknesses. However there is one theory which is accepted by almost all and that is the Historical/Evolutionary theory. The purpose of this lesson is to explain to you why this theory is the most acceptable and what does this theory say about the origin of the state. After going through this lesson you should be able to :

- \* explain the importance of Historical Evolutionary theory.
- \* understand the content of the theory.
- \* discuss the factors which have contributed to the origin and growth of the state.

**1.7.1 Introduction :** To trace out the origin of state is indeed a difficult task, because history throws no light on it. Where history fails, we resort to speculation. As we have studied in our previous lesson also political thinkers have, through the centuries, taken pains to dig out the secret of the origin of state. As a consequence, we have variety of explanations, commonly named as theories. However the various theories fail to give a satisfying explanation of the origin of the state. The basic flaw with each one of them is that every theory tries to focus only on one factor and then goes on to over emphasise the role of that factor in the origin of the state, whereas the origin of the state is not the result of any single factor of rather it is the result of a number of historical factors which collectively gave rise to the institution of the state. **Garner** says, **“State is neither the handiwork of God; nor the result of any superior physical force; nor the result of any agreement; nor the mere expansion of the family. It is a growth, an evolution.”**

In modern times Historical or Evolutionary theory is considered as the true explanation of the origin of state and now we shall discuss this theory.

### **1.7.2 Historical/Evolutionary Theory — Meaning and Explanation :**

The Historical and Evolutionary Theory presents comprehensive explanation of the origin of the state as fundamental, social and political phenomenon. It rejects the Divine theory of the origin of state, i.e., God is the creator of the state, Just as much as it rejects the Force Theory, i.e., force is the sole creator of of the state. It also rejects the idea propounded by the contractualists, Hobbes, Locke and Rousseau that the state is the result of a contract. It does not reject these theories as totally false but on the ground that they were partial in their approach and credited the origin of state to just one particular factor. A true explanation of the origin of state must necessarily take into account all the factors that have contributed to its development. Early sociologists like **Bagehot** and **Spencer** asserted that the state, like society itself, gradually evolved from simple and crude beginnings to the mature stage. Thus Bagehot pointed out three such stages, namely the first stage, which marked the absence of political authority, intermediary stage when rudiments of government appeared and finally when there emerged a fully developed political organisation. Modern sociologists do not subscribe to this point of view. According to them all societies possessed some system of government for regulating the relations of individuals and safeguarding the interests of the groups. Slowly and imperceptibly the state developed from a simple to complex type.

State, therefore, can best be understood as the result of a slow process of historical development in which several factors and forces have, either separately or, collectively, played their part. Someone or the other being more dominant than others at a particular stage in history; though they were all coexistent.

A complete account of the development of the state in different parts of the world would indeed fill many volumes. Nor will this account be the same considering the varied histories of the people of the world. However, it is not difficult to isolate a group of factors and forces that are a common feature of the development of various states, for the purpose of general theory. The Historical Theory combines the elements of all other theories. It does not reject other theories, it just points out that no one fact solely is responsible for the origin of state.

### **1.7.3 Factors and Forces responsible for the origin and development of the State**

#### **1.7.3.1. Social Nature of Man :**

According to Aristotle Man is a social being. By nature he cannot live in isolation. When man feels the need of living together. The need of state is ingrained in that. The state came into being for the sake of man's happiness. As **Aristotle** had said, **“The State organised for the sake of life, and it continued to exist for the sake**

**of good life.”** So the desire for state is in the nature of man. If the men were not social by nature then neither man would have shared the problems with others nor the state could come into existence.

#### **1.7.3.2. Kinship**

The most important and fundamental force that explains the unity and cohesiveness of any human group is kinship. **Blood relationship** is sole bond of unity among the people living together, Kinship does not explain the origin of the state as such. It merely emphasizes the importances of the anthropological fact of unity of a group of human beings held together by these biological ties, generating among them a common consciousness and common interest and the need for self-preservation. Kinship is manifested in all social organisations. In course of time kin groups have multiplied through clans and tribes and the kin sentiment has enlarged itself, leading to the recognition of the need for a common authority and obedience to it, for law and order and defence.

The kin sentiment was in recent years developed into a full-fledged theory of racial and biological superiority of the Nazi people by Hitler which acted as a powerful stimulus for his aggressive politics. Modern nationalism can also be described as a transformed expression of the old Kinship sentiment. For example, like the blood relationship, it is the most powerful cementing force.

But this does not mean that the State is the mere enlargement of the family. As Willoughby observes, “It would not be true to say that the state developed out of this small social unit. These two institutions are different in essence. In the family the location of authority is natural (i.e. in the father). In the state it is one choice. Subordination is the principle of the family; equality of the State. Further more, the functions or aims of the state are essentially different from, and even contradictory to those of the family.” However kinship everywhere provided the nucleus around which the successive organisation had developed.

#### **1.7.3.3. Religion**

Apart from kinship, the dominating force in all human societies of the past was Religion. In fact the history of all human societies has been the history of the involvement of Religion, both as a unifying force and as principle for organisation of authority. The bonds of kinship were strengthened by common belief and worship. And when the expansion of the family ties from clan to tribe tended to weaken the hold of Kinship Religion was the main directing force both in the social and political life of man. In the former it provided the code of conduct in marriage, in family and other ties; while in the later it provided the sanction for authority and obedience. This was a feature common both to the early primitive societies where Religion took the form of animism and ancestor worship, in the more advanced societies where religion was based on well defined and well defended dogmas and creed. The theory of Divine Origin of the state and of Kings is one manifestation of the hold of Religion on

human thought and practice. In China and India, religion has been the basis of the whole structure of their **civilisation**. The Dharam Shastra and other integrated with it of ancient India have laid out a complete code to guide the affairs of the state and of Individual. In Greece and Rome, despite their paganism (Belief in non-Christianity) and rational philosophy, the role of religion was significant.

The nation that rulers were Priests or voice versa was commonly accepted in the Islamic world as well as in China and Japan right up to recent times. Religion has only recently begun to play a subordinate role in the life of nations; more especially with the advance of science and technology and the rise of secular thining about polities, which in itself is a product of Rationalism. The newly emerged states of Africa still display the powerful influence of the twin force of Kinship and Religion, and their political life can best interpreted in the light of these.

#### **1.7.3.4. Force :**

Along with the unifying influence of religion and kinship, is the role of force. Force was necessary for societies united by Reglion and Kinship already, for the mere purpose of defence and protection. But force was the chief instrument in holding a people in obedience, where the state was established by the fact of conquest by stronger nation or tribe of a weaker one. Force was and still is a major factor in the organisation of the state. While we agree with the defenders of the Force Theory about the effective role of force, we disagree in giving it an exaggerated place, unless of course we interpret it in very genral terms. We can see it in the practice of moderm states. The democratically advanced states tend to minimise its exercises; while the dictatorial ones do not hesitate to utilise force to the maximum. There recognition of war as a legal institution continues to be an expression of the place of force in international relations.

#### **1.7.3.5 Economic Interest :**

A factor of great importance is the common property in land or in capital that has from the beginning of human society been an invisible but very powerful influence in litegrating the life of a people. All wars known in history, from tribal conquests to the establishments of Empires, have been motivated by the economic factors, Either the preservation and defence of what a human group has laboured to create for itsel for the conquest of the same by another. the emergence of the institution of private property and the continued concern of the state to develop their natural resources has not only contributed to the unity of the state, but has also it times been the casue of wars and First World War. The sanctity and inviabilityof state territories as guaranteed in international law is but a moderm expression of the old concern for the protection of the land which a people had inhabited and cultivated for their livings. To their relation of States it is perhaps the most important determining factor.

#### **1.7.3.6. Political Consciousness :**

Last, but not the least, of these factors is the slowly growing awareness among the

people regarding the need for preserving and defending the order of their organised life. It is difficult to say when this consciousness grew. It must have been the result of a slow process by which human beings began to be directly conscious of the need for organised life, i.e., of maintaining internal order and of facing external aggression and the necessity of a machinery that would ensure both. It was the result of centuries of struggle that man became fully conscious of his political life, before his instinctive urges were enlightened by a sense of purpose. Political consciousness is both an attribute and a mark of the advance that man had made since the dawn of history. It is this growing awareness that is responsible for much of the progress of man.

These, then have been the plurality of forces that have individually or collectively been responsible for the origin and development of the state. It would be a mistake to think of them as acting separately, though it would be difficult to deny that one or the other of them has played a more conspicuous role any particular time. It would, therefore, also be wrong to think that some of them have ceased to be effective with advance of history whether it is kinship or religion or custom and economic interest, or force, the general consciousness for order, security and preservation, they all have contributed and are continuing to do so in the development of the state.

#### **1.7.4 Importance of the Theory**

Thus the historical theory briefly takes into account all the relevant factors that have promoted the state from the earliest of times without exaggerating the role of any one of them. The Historical **Evolutionary** Theory is more realistic and takes a holistic view of the phenomenon of the origin of the state. State is certainly not an artificial institution created by a mere social contract or a divine institution created by the God. Though the factors of force, economic interests, social bonds all contributed to the creation of the state but only in collaboration with each other. The theory takes account the most important factor of political consciousness without which the state would have never come up and political consciousness without which the state would have never come up and political consciousness gradually and takes years. Hence the theory states that state originated gradually and evolved over a number of years. It is an evolution, adding something or the other gradually. We cannot give an exact date for the origin of the state. Once state came into being it grew from simple to complex like living organisms. Thus the theory is more in tune with the reality and hence **most acceptable explanation of the origin of the state.**

#### **1.7.5 Let us Sum up**

To sum up, evolutionary theory believes that like all human institutions, state also is a growing institution. It is a moving phenomenon that knows no finality. It clearly shows that state is neither the gift of God nor the deliberate work of man. The beginnings of the state are lost in the shadow of past in which social institutions were unconsciously arising and its development has followed the general laws of evolutionary growth.

**1.7.6 Self Check Exercise and its Answers**

- (a) What is Garner's statement regarding the criticism of other theories and importance of Historical Theory.  
 .....  
 .....  
 .....
- (b) Explain briefly what does the Historical Evolutionary theory mean ?  
 .....  
 .....  
 .....
- (c) Explain any two factors which contributed to the origin of the state  
 .....  
 .....  
 .....
- (d) Give the importance of the Historical Evolutionary theory. Why is it called the most accepted theory.  
 .....  
 .....  
 .....

**Answer to self check Exercise :**

- (a) State is neither a handiwork of God; nor the result of any superior physical force; nor the result of any agreement; nor a mere expansion of family. It is a growth and evolution.
- (b) According to this theory, state is the a result of a slow process of development in which several factors and forces, either separately or collectively, played their part. Someone or the other being more dominant than others at a particular stage of history; though they were all coexistent.
- (c) (i) Religion (ii) Economic Interests (you can choose any other two if you like)
- (d) This theory is the most realistic and takes holistic view of the phenomena of the origin of state and tells that state is a result of evolution and growth and many factors contributed to its origin.

**1.7.7 Suggested Readings :-**

1. O.P Gauba : An Introduction to Political Theory
2. M.P Jain : Political Theory
3. A.C Kapoor : Principles of Political Science.
4. J.C. Johari : Principles of Modern Political Science.
5. Sushila Ramaswamy : Political Theory
6. Andrew Heywood : Political Theory
7. N.D. Arora : State
8. www.wikipedia.org
9. www.cup.com
10. www.oup.com