

State



Discipline Course-1

Semester- 1

Paper : Understanding Political Theory

Lesson : State

Lesson Developer: Dr. Chetna Sharma

College/Department: Kamala Nehru College /

Political Science, University of Delhi

State

Table of Contents

Introduction

Tracing the origin---Brief History

Emergence of the Modern State

Theoretical Perspectives on Modern State

Liberal

Liberal Democratic

Marxist

Max Weber and others

Feminist

Anarchist

Challenges to the Modern State

State

Introduction :

The State is central to national and international landscape, political thinking, our lives and it is very difficult to imagine its absence. At the time of our birth, birth certificate is issued by the State and at the time of our death, death certificate is also issued by the State. The starting point of many of our day to day discussions is also related to the State. Discussion of all important concepts rights, liberty, and justice is also in relation to the State. One may say State influences our lives in many important ways sometimes even with our ignorance. The history of modern State is around 300 years old. With the development of European State system from 16th century State became central to modern political and social theory. It was a centralized State claiming impersonal and sovereign political authority with monopoly of law making and law enforcing power over unified geographical territory. This idea was absent in medieval political thinking because in such traditions religious, social status and property rights determined rights and duties. Idea of modern State is related to idea of rational autonomous individual as citizen and not as dutiful subject of monarch. With some important developments like Renaissance, spread of trade and commerce, struggle between State and Church and consolidation of National Monarchies in European countries like Spain, England and France notion of political life changed to set new limits of political authority and inter State relations. Thomas Hobbes (1558-1679), Niccolo Machiavelli (1469-1527), Jean Bodin (1530-96) discussed the similar developments in their works.

State

If State is central idea of modern World some important questions that deserve to be answered are what is a State? Why should I obey the laws made by the State? What could be the possible limits of the actions of the State? Am I supposed to follow all rules? What authority does the State has if I don't obey the laws? Who gave the authority of coercion to the State? How the authority of the State is affected by international power players? What is the relationship between State –Society, State – individual and what are the functions of the State?

In the following pages we will try to find the answers of the above raised questions by focusing on different traditions of analysis of State. But before that it is important to understand the origin of the idea in modern times.

In the first half of sixteenth century for all important discussions about state and government of Princes in no instance state is separated from the status or standing of the Prince himself. Crystallization of a recognizable concept of the State was one of the legacies of Renaissance political thought.

Tracing the Origin – Brief History :

Human History shows that there would have been times when the State as we know it today controlling all important aspects of our life did not exist but people use to live in a group formed on the basis of clan, kinship or tribe to maintain social order and control. But the State establishes a centralized supreme authority and rightful claim to obedience from its subjects. Even if the term State was not used for a long time, in an important sense organized public power existed for a long time. Idea of Democracy and Polis was prevalent in Greek City State. In the Greek City State citizens (excluding women, children, slaves and old people) were part of the assembly and use to take part in the functioning of the City State. When city States were conquered by the Athenian and other Empires this process of direct Democracy was halted. From the times of Alexander the Great nature of governance changed from Direct Democracy to rule by single ruler with a royal line of succession. In Rome rule was based on domination of aristocratic power later to be extended to incorporate consuls elected by

State

assemblies of whole people. Roman citizenship was defined by Law and not on the basis of territory. Roman law introduced the distinction between State and society where public meant anything pertaining to the State and public affairs and private meaning relation of private association and domestic life. Notion of State power founded in Law gave the basis for developing argument of rule of law and Constitutional government. With the decline of Rome a new system of laborers under direct patronage of agrarian land lords emerged to give birth later to Feudalism.

Feudal Economy was based on the relationship between lord – serf and political rule was established with the relationship between lord- vassal meaning leading warriors declared their loyalty to their lord to get protection. This resulted into fragments of large system into many smaller systems with overlapping sources of power and authority because while monarchy always attempted to establish its separate authority lords used their economic and military power to check centralization of authority. Another rival to authority of Feudal aristocracy was the Church with claims of authority of god. Conflict between Church and Monarch about the boundaries between spiritual and secular continued from 12th century to the reformation.

The Peace of Westphalia at the end of the thirty years war in 1648 concluded a series of religious wars among the main European powers also undermining power of the church, giving the king authority over his own realm.

Some new developments including decline of feudal serfdom, growth of commerce and trade, change from feudal military obligations to professional standing army and rise of taxation regularly by State led to crisis of feudalism and a new form of state emerged having seeds of modern absolutism in countries like France, Spain and England. This strengthened unified territorial rule with power under sovereign head weak and small State were absorbed into larger ones. In the Absolutist State, State acquired directive role and imposed uniform system of Law, order and administration and commercial enterprise as well as formalized system of inter State relations. Power of absolute monarch was defined by Jean Bodin with the

State

doctrine of "Divine rights of Kings". Concentration of power within one center that claimed its absolute authority paved the way for constitutional Bourgeoisie State. Urban artisans, labour and commercial classes challenged absolutism because bourgeoisie civilization was begging to emerge, social formation of society changed due to emergence of mercantile and commercial classes and so was started the struggle for 'share in power of State'. Revolution of 1644 gave birth to Parliamentary Monarchy in Britain later with demand to create full Democratic State and extension of franchise. Modern State with features of power sharing, constitutionally defined rights to participate in government, representation, secular State with sovereignty emerged very unevenly across Europe. Demands of rising classes and new economic developments, free trade, laws of the market contract shaped relationship between individual and State and thus idea of Social contract developed where basis of formation of State was consent and State was there to protect rights and liberties of the individual which were natural making individual a priori of the state. To protect these rights even State was under 'the rule of law'. State was assigned responsibilities of protecting individual's life and property but not interfering in the market forces. Initially it was not a Democratic State because majority could not vote. In later years of 19th century and early 20th century nature of State changed due to change in industrialization, increased miseries of workers and problems associated with it. More interventionist State was needed to act to solve new challenges. This State got support of workers because for them State would initiate needed reforms in industrialization that would also improve their living and working conditions. Starting with Britain by 1950s advanced capitalist societies became welfare State. What was promised included managed economies, State supported welfare benefits, housing, education, health services etc. Nature of citizenship widened with inclusion of social and economic rights. While this was the story of one part of the world the other part also saw the rise of Fascist State Mussolini in Italy, Hitler in Germany, Franco in Spain and Salazar in Portugal and communist State in Russia.

Liberal Democratic State became much more interventionist with greater involvement in almost all spheres. The State was no longer an impartial referee but became a self serving monster 'a nanny' State responsible for providing welfare and interfering in every aspect of life, pressure for subsidies, grants, public investments, higher wages, welfare benefits lead to the problem of overload and thus by mid 1970s the same interventionist State was criticized for too much bureaucratic interference and inefficiency.

State

Some even criticized it for being a threat to the rights and liberties of the individual, creeping totalitarianism and proposed solution was to 'roll back the State' meaning cut in State bureaucracy, State expenditure, welfare programs and restoration of free market, competitive individual with the beginning of 1980s. This was a neo Liberal State having ideals of classical liberal State in changed twentieth century conditions reflected in the writing of Nozick. Nozick's work *Anarchy, State and Utopia* (1974) was seen as right wing backlash against the post 1945 growth in State power. Rejecting all forms of welfare and redistribution as theft he supported a 'minimal state' and argued that property rights should be strictly upheld provided wealth has been justly acquired and transferred. Before discussing new challenges to the State in the changed scenario let's first discuss central perspective on the modern State.

Emergence of the Modern State :

State is central and supreme power in the land with its most fundamental function to rule and command obedience. With various forms Democracy, dictatorship, monarchy one element is common that is supreme power is with State. State frames the rules, and applies them. It also has the power to employ force to oblige conformity to rules. Thus Max Weber said, "Force is not the normal or the only means of the State but force is a means specific to the State." (Held, 1989: 15) State has power of legitimate violence, sanctioned domination and physical violence is extreme of it. State has authority to exercise power legitimately and legally. Modern State is closely tied up with notion of sovereignty meaning State is the supreme power externally and internally within a defined territory. Delegation of power within the State is by the State.

Sovereign authority means both the right to issue command and the correlative right to be obeyed. Sovereign States are distinguished from other authoritative bodies by their supremacy. Sovereign is vertically supreme because they command all bodies beneath them and no superior body commands them.

Another important idea of modern State is State as a 'public power'. Under absolutism ruler and State, person and public are often indistinguishable but

State

in modern State office and office holder can be distinguished meaning power of State is distinct from its actual incumbent. State has vast apparatus to put in practice abstract power and function.

State is associated with public affairs and in liberal tradition society is associated with private. Public here may be defined as something directly owned, organized or administered by the State. Private is considered something outside direct control of the State and left for voluntary non compulsory arrangements made between individuals. However this maintenance of public private separation is sometimes taken to exemplify the patriarchal aspect of the State because of understanding of private and its association with family where authority is unequally located in the male. But other understanding of private is domain of market and free economy. However this distinction of public --- private is not clear cut. For Example the idea of Public Schools but privately funded, similarly public opinion represents the public view of ordinary people yet not in the realm of the State. In contemporary times the term civil society has expanded to include different forms of voluntary associations not funded or controlled by the State. The idea of public and State arose in 18th century and from then the boundaries between State and civil society are constantly changing because the whole idea of describing public and private domain is not natural but result of social and historical construction. Thus many a times State expands it's reach and make it legitimate to intervene in areas which were earlier considered to be private because it is in constant interaction with society thus regulating and organizing it. The State cannot stand completely outside social, economic and cultural domain thus State provides particular set of social order with set of institutions, power relations, social and economic structure it is because of this that while State is not reducible to Society or economy a feudal society could not be governed by a capitalist form of State.

Theories of the State can be conceptualized as to how social interests and the State are conceptualized by them.

Theoretical perspective on Modern State :

Different agencies, departments with set of rules, purposes and objective at different level work in a State. According to David Held "any attempt to understand the State must consider its spatial and temporal dimension -the horizontal stretch of the State across territory, the depth of the state

State

intervention in social and economic life and the changing form of all these things over time" (David Held, 1989: 2) We may understand State by discussing the central perspectives on State, the analysis may differ in each of them but the central idea will remain the same.

Liberal Perspective :

David Held describes the ideas of Thomas Hobbes in Leviathan as "a point of transition between a commitment to the Absolutist State and the struggle of Liberalism against tyranny." (David Held, 1989: 13) Through human nature, hypothetical social contract Hobbes tried to answer why State is necessary. Hobbes's answer is, to avoid evils of disorder in form of civil war absolute and legitimate State is needed to provide order. Like a Liberal Hobbes explains State by reference to selfish, egoistic and self centered free and equal individual. Individual through consent form a contract to move out of state of nature which is war of everyone against everyone and where life is "solitary, poor, nasty, brutish and short" to form State to ensure peaceful and commodious living. But the State of Hobbes is all powerful that reflects illiberal position.

Through concepts of state of nature, law of nature and social contract Hobbes construct a systematic argument to create all powerful State. Hobbes define human being as selfish, self interested moved by desires and aversions and to fulfill their desires seek power that result in conflict because power gained by one is the loss of power for another. This struggle for self preservation and self interest is endless. Individual in state of nature is without the authority of the State. To ensure life and to avert death natural law of not doing something which you would not do to yourself is observed but these laws are ambiguous. To ensure peace and security individual form social contract and hand over their right of self government to an authority on the condition that every individual does the same and create all powerful sovereign because according to Hobbes 'men's ambitions, avarice, anger and other passions are strong the bonds of words are too weak to bridle them without some fear of coercive power" (Leviathan Chapter 14) (David held, 1989 :16) The sovereign is their representative :A multitude of men are made one person. According to Quentin Skinner " With Hobbes no less than with Bodin, Suarez, Grotius, and the whole developing tradition of natural law absolutism, we accordingly arrive at the view that the ends of civil or political association make it indispensable to establish a single and

State

supreme sovereign authority whose powers remain distinct not merely from the people who originally instituted it, but also from whatever office holders may be said to have the right to wield its power at any particular time".(Quentin Skinner, 1997 :16) Hobbes offered a strong secular State as effective and legitimate with important guidelines for sovereign "The sovereign should neither injure individual nor the basis of their material well being and should recognize that authority can be sustained only so long as protection can be afforded to all subjects"(Leviathan Chapter 11)(David Held, 1989 :17)

Hobbes analysis made some important points

- State is created by individuals and is required to provide conditions of existence
- Individual are self interested and power seeking thus power of State should be indivisible
- State is legitimate and can articulate general interest.

Hobbes views of human nature, all powerful sovereign and legitimacy were contested by next line of thinkers. Amongst them John Locke criticized the idea of self seeking individuals' trust in all powerful sovereign to take care of their interests and all powerful sovereign working to promote individual interest. Locke conceived State as an instrument to defend three natural rights of Life, Liberty and Property. Consent given to the State could be revoked if it fails to sustain "the good of the governed". Idea of social contract and state of nature was conceived by Locke as well but to construct a different position. Locke's state of nature was a state of perfect freedom within the bounds of Law of nature meaning basic principles of morality. But if it was not a State of war why State was created? According to Locke certain inconveniences in the state of nature like too many judges, conflict of interpretation about meaning of law, aggression and protection of property compelled equally free men to establish society and then political society by social contract. Transfer of law making and enforcement rights was conditional upon State performing its essential purpose of preserving life, liberty and property. Sovereignty ultimately remained with the people. State was there to safeguard the rights and liberties of citizens who were the best judge of their interests. Locke laid the foundation of Liberalism and representative government. Rights of individual, division of power within State,

State

constitutionalism became central to Liberalism in years to come. Locke was a Liberal but not a democrat and answer to many questions of democratic representative government, limits of state interference, conditions for civil disobedience, who to count as people, role of women were left for others to ponder upon but at the same time his work stimulated the development of Liberal Democracy.

Liberal Democratic Perspective :

From the Regulator and protector State the journey of State moved ahead in the ideas of thinkers like Jeremy Bentham (1748-1832) and James Mill (1773-1836) and took new directions with seeds of liberal Democracy. Democratic government was seen as an instrument to ensure accountability of the governors to the governed. Using various mechanisms like vote, separation of powers, competition between political leaders, freedom of speech and press, protective democracy was recognized as a device to ensure interest of the community. Criticizing the idea of social contract, and natural rights as philosophical fiction, Mill and Bentham used the thesis of 'how human beings act' to discuss the nature of State. Human beings' prime motive is to fulfill their desires, maximize satisfaction and happiness and minimize suffering and pain. Since society is constitutive of individuals striving to maximize happiness, conflict is inevitable and even the one who is there to govern has the same motive of maximizing happiness and minimizing pain, to check this government must be accountable to the governed and should also act according to the principle of utility, its aim is to achieve "Greatest happiness for the greatest number". According to Bentham and Mill government also exist to provide subsistence, produce abundance, favour equality and maintain security. In the works of Utilitarian's especially Bentham and Mill Liberal Democratic State provide the conditions necessary for individual to pursue their interest without risk of interference of the State. In the nineteenth century idea of State as umpire or referee was justified and Individual was free to pursue economic competition in free market and thus maximize benefit. However with some logic State intervention was justified to maintain social order. The coercive power of the State was used to enact and enforce Law and upheld utility. This was not an age of Universal Adult Franchise and many including women, labour were disenfranchised, idea also supported by Bentham and Mill, earning them the title of reluctant Democrat. Their ideas were best suited for a modern industrial society

State

free from absolute power and for individual committed to maximize private gains.

Liberal Democratic State

- Competition among individuals
- Freedom of choice to the individual
- Politics as an arena for maintenance of individual interests
- Protection of life, liberty, property
- Democratic State to articulate public interests

In the works of J S Mill for highest and harmonious development of individual Liberal Democracy was considered important. Giving due importance to the autonomy of the individual J S Mill justified social and political interference with individual liberty when an act concerned others and causes harm. In his work "On Liberty" Mill said "Over himself over his body and mind individual is sovereign" (On Liberty: 69) (David Held, 1989: 26) Human excellence is promoted when individual has liberty and it is in the Represented Government liberty and reason remain protected. Mill recommended plural system of voting meaning wiser and more talented

State

should have more votes than the ignorant. Developing the argument further and using the idea of social contract in the writings of Rousseau emerged the idea of participatory Democracy. Rousseau argued, due to some obstacles in the state of nature including individual weakness, natural disaster to their preservation, humans formed a social contract to establish Law making and enforcing body but the sovereign authority is with people "General Will". In this the governed should also be the Governors and idea of self government was an end in itself where General Will represented the publicly generated conception of the common good and not will of all which was merely aggregate of individual desires. Challenging Liberal Democracy and the idea of government being accountable to the citizen once in a while Rousseau presented the idea of self government and participatory Democracy. However excluding women from being Citizen Rousseau could not suggest in detail how self government could be effective in a large complex and densely populated societies.

Social contract was devised as mechanism to receive consent of the individual in Liberal Democratic State and ballot box is used to confer authority on the State by consent of the individuals in modern times.

Marxist Perspective :

Karl Marx (1818-83) attacked the idea of individual – State relations, idea of autonomous individual, liberal view of the State as a neutral arbiter among competing individual. According to Marxist individual exist in relation to others and their nature can be understood as social and historical product. To understand relations between individual it is important to situate it in the class structure because classes are creation of history. In a society division on the basis of class arise with generation of surplus because those who gain control of means of production form dominant class economically and politically. Workers sell labour power in the market to secure a living and surplus value --- the value generated by worker in the process of production over and above their wages is appropriated by the capitalist. Class relations are exploitative and generate conflict because interest of ruling and

State

subordinate class conflict leading to class struggle that form chief motor of historical development. Thus Marx said "History of all hitherto existing societies is the history of Class struggle". The relationship based on domination and subordination structure social, political and economic life. This understanding of social and economic structure shapes nature of State because according to Liberal Democratic tradition State claim to represent public interest but according to Marx this is illusion, State may not be neutral and the distinction of civil society and politics is also dubious. The division in society between capitalist and worker is not a result of free contract; State is embedded in social and economic relations and also linked to particular interests.

Two positions referring to class and State are clearly evident in Marxism.

State is not directly linked to particular interest or dominant class and retains degree of power independent of dominant class. It is relatively autonomous.

State and bureaucracy is an instrument to coordinate the interest of the dominant class.

According to Marxian analysis bureaucracy – a particular closed society within the State is "States' Consciousness" Marx wrote, "The bureaucracy asserts itself to be the final end of the State, the aims of the State are transformed into aims of bureaus or the aims of bureaus into the aims of the State"(Marx Critique of Hegel's Philosophy of Rights 46-47)(David Held, 1989: 34) In the Eighteen Brumaire of Louis Bonaparte Marx analyze rise of power of Louis Napoleon Bonaparte and the way power is accumulated in hands of the executive. Marx portrays State as an institution with the capacity to shape civil society and curtail control of bourgeoisie. His analysis show how State coordinate political life and also promote change, at the same time having a mechanism for surveillance and capacity to undermine social movement. Overall in the long run for the stability of the State, policies are designed to promote the interests of traders .In view of this analysis State is considered as superstructure developed on the foundation of economic and social structure. The direct dependence of the State on the economic, social and political power of the dominant class is very clear with the famous slogan of the communist Manifesto "The executive of the modern State is but a committee for managing the common affairs of the whole bourgeoisie". In the name of public or general interest overall interest of

State

Bourgeoisie is maintained by the State. One view in the writings of Marx conceives the State as relatively autonomous – power independent of class interest and the other view conceives the State as superstructure to uphold the interest of the dominant class. In the Marxian Analysis State is central to the integration of class divided society. Marx identified form of government where proletariat would govern and socialist State would create the conditions when State would wither away leading to eventual transition to Stateless and classless society.

In the writings of Lenin "State and Revolution (1917)" State was conceived as a mechanism for the oppression of one class by another. The alliance between dominant and ruling class exist because of dependence of the government on the stock exchange and corruption of ministers and officials in the system. Important work of the government is done out of public view through state bureaucracy. Rights available to the individual in a democracy like freedom of assembly, Freedom of press, Freedom of speech and expression exist to hide the interests of the dominant class because while State claims the independence of these institutions these are controlled directly or indirectly by the dominant class.

In the last few years interest in the analysis of State power has been revived among Contemporary Marxists. Important contribution has been made by Gramsci, Lukacs, Korsch and others. Gramsci emphasized that ruling class establishes its domination not only by open coercion but by elicitation of consent. Bourgeoisie had established 'hegemony' ideological leadership or domination and State plays an important role in this process. Nicos Poulantzas portray the State as a 'unifying social formation' able to dilute class tensions through spread of political rights and welfare benefits. Neo Marxist emphasis the class character of the modern State and the way it operates to promote long term interests of the capitalist and unequal class power.

Max Weber and others :

The Marxian view of State and bureaucratic organizations as "parasitic" entities is contested by Max Weber (1864-1920). Weber dismissed the idea of direct democracy and revolutionary transfer of powers and emphasized modern State monopolize the legitimate use of violence within a territory. Weber wrote "force is certainly not the normal or only means of the State – nobody says that –but force is means specific to the State". (David Held,

State

1989: 40) The idea of State's monopoly of physical coercion is legitimized by a belief in the legality of this monopoly. Modern State is not an effect of capitalism it preceded and helped promote capitalist development. Applying the concept of bureaucracy to include organizations like civil service, political parties, industrial enterprise, university etc, Weber gave the idea of how private and public administration are becoming more and more bureaucratized. According to Weber bureaucracy is completely indispensable because it is technically superior to any other form of organisation because of their expertise, information and access to secrets. To keep a check on unlimited bureaucratization he advocated a strong parliament which would create a competitive training ground for strong leadership and serve as a balance to public and private bureaucracy.

In the words of David Held "While Weber argued that progress towards the bureaucratic State is given an enormous impetus by capitalist development he believed that this very development itself, coupled with parliamentary government and the party system provided the best obstacle to the usurpation of State power by officials". (David held, 1989: 43). According to Weber analysis of class and economic relations covers only one aspect of the distribution and struggle for power, some other groups like political parties termed as "status groups" are also very important in determining power structure in society. The way Weber structures his argument that public and private administrations are similarly structured and not determined only by dimensions of class is very provocative analysis.

Despite the important analysis of bureaucratic power Weber's analysis missed important point of, how with the development of bureaucracy power of those in the subordinate position in the bureaucratic structure may also increase. Another important point missed by Weber is the relation of cultural, economic and technological advance and bureaucratic relations and how and to what extent bureaucracy may remain independent of capitalist developments. Connection between State, bureaucratization and capitalist development is left obscure.

Weber's idea of multidimensionality of power was taken as a starting point by exponents of Pluralism or Empirical Democratic theory. Pluralism developed in the writings of Laswell, Truman and Dahl in 1950s and 1960s. Class as the central structural determinant of State was challenged, Pluralists analysis focused on many determinants of the distribution of power

State

and many power centers where power was not hierarchically and competitively arranged. Different organizations like business, trade union, parties, ethnic groups, religious groups, and women's organisation represent different interests. Policies are made by government and executive trying to mediate and adjudicate between competing demands. According to David Held, "in this process, the State becomes almost indistinguishable from the ebb and flow of bargaining the competitive pressures of interests". Democracy ensures fair competition and government represent multiple groups referred as polyarchy or rule by many or minorities' government. Pluralism has been questioned by Elitist thinkers who believe that behind the façade of Liberal Democracy there lies the permanent power of the ruling elites. Power is exercised by elite with a little choice given to the electorate to decide which elite to be elected. According to Patrick Dunleavy "More recent neo pluralist work acknowledges the strength of elite theory and neo Marxist criticism about the under involvement of ordinary citizens and the structurally privileged position of business in Liberal Democracy" (Patrick Dunleavy, 1995: 614). At the same Point State autonomy is defended because of nature of State which is more complex and requires more specialization of labour. In the work of J.K. Galbraith and Charles Lindblom neo pluralist theory has been developed. According to neo pluralist in modern industrialized State all organized interests are not equally powerful, some groups like business has ability to shape public taste and wants through advertising and can also influence government bodies. Moreover because business groups are major investors and employers in society their influence on government is more as compared to other groups.

The most important critique of this position is that it doesn't ensure equality because government may not listen to different groups equally or different groups may not have the resources to compete equally in the national political arena.

While above mentioned all theories discuss groups bargaining within State, or individual - State relation, class structure, economy and State it is important to focus on the State in context of international scenario. Theda Skocpol's analysis focused on how conflicts among nations have important impact on the organisation and power of States. Rejecting society centered analysis of State and government where State responds to struggle of groups, movements or classes contending for advantages or needs of civil

State

society and economy State works under broader international system and pressures generated by it.

Feminist :

Feminist thinkers criticize existing approaches of State. Radical Feminist provides gender based analysis of the State, as a reflection of patriarchal nature of society. They question the liberal idea of neutrality of State because it is through Law, courts, welfare rules male power is instituted and women's subordination and silence is maintained. According to Mackinnon "The Weberian monopoly on the means of legitimate coercion, thought to distinguish the State as an entity, actually describes the power of men over women in the home, in the bedroom, on the job, in the street, throughout social life. It is difficult, actually, to find a place it does not circumscribe and describe. Men are sovereign in the way Austin describe Law as sovereign: a person or group whose commands are habitually obeyed and who is not in the habit of obeying anyone else. Men are the group that has had the authority to make Law, embodying H L A Hart's 'rule of recognition' that, in his conception, makes law authoritative. (Mackinnon, 1989, pp 165, 169 – 70) (Patrick Dunleavy, 1995:616)

Carole Pateman criticize social contract theory as the Fraternal social contract and writes "Political theorists argue about the individual, and take it for granted that their subject matter concerns the public world, without investigating the way in which the individual, civil society and the public have been constituted as patriarchal categories in opposition to womanly nature and the private sphere."(Carole Pateman, 1997: 45)

Liberal Feminist also criticizes the view of the State as impartial and neutral yet seeks the role of the State in promoting equality between men and women in form of certain reforms, welfare schemes, recognition of special status etc. Feminist theory includes variety of perspectives and this may be the reason Patrick Dunleavy writes "there is as yet no viable feminist theory of the State -----despite the potentially powerful apparatus of concepts assembled by feminist thought e.g. Patriarchalism, exploitation, false consciousness, phallocentrism, public /private sphere etc and despite the strong social, psychological and socio biological bases for characterizing key aspects of State behavior as gender specific" (Patrick Dunleavy,1995 :616)

Anarchist :

State

Anarchists condemn State power and believe the State and all forms of political authority are evil and unnecessary. They seek abolition of Law and government with the belief that more natural and spontaneous order will develop. They prefer Stateless society in which free individual manages their affairs by voluntary agreement without the coercive power of the State. Rejecting social contract argument of Liberals, anarchists argue individual become subject to State authority either being born in it or through conquest. Social order arise naturally because people have a natural propensity to organize their own lives and when people are linked together by values of humanity they have no need to be regulated by the State.

Challenges to the Modern State :

Modern sovereign State operates in a system of states yet having different levels of control over their own policy making due to size and influence in the international system. In the post cold war era apart from United Nations there are other global institutions like IMF, World Bank. In Western Europe European Union has emerged more than a confederation of state with progress towards common monetary system, foreign policy (with some exceptions) and standardization of social policy and environmental regulation. In future European Union may define citizenship collectively and the Member State may not enjoy sweeping sovereignty of the past. Does this imply change in the form of State? Are there other internal and external dynamics that may affect the State? Does globalization challenge the sovereignty of the State? In the last 20 years some new developments had taken place, the idea of national economy has changed due to development of world economy Multinational or transnational cooperation's are the new realities. Its mobility and supranational scale of operation enable it to dictate terms for the location of its industries and to evade control of the State, they can control the price and they have access to international finance, they operate on a world scale with no reference to particular national economy. Individual countries are relatively powerless because interest rates, price of commodities finance availability are determined in the international market. In times of worldwide depression, financial crisis, mass unemployment,

State

resource depletion; ecological decay National Economy alone has very little control.

The dimension of security and war has also changed because globe is shrinking in time and space, war at one place have immediate repercussions at another. Nuclear warfare is outside the control of any one nation and with technological advance in arms, ammunition and nature of war we constantly face the danger of mass destruction.

Nation State also face persistent ethnic tensions, internal violence and demand for self determination by smaller nationalities. State is under pressure from above due to globalization of capital, and from below due to continuous salience of ethnicity. Does this leads to the conclusion that modern State is towards its decline? Or Does this means evolution of new State with changing realities of the 21st century? Nation State has life because power of alternative popular forces is still relatively weak in relation

to the power of the State. In Fact State is the author of these changes in change circumstances and the impact of new developments differs making some more powerful as compared to the other because State operates in the international system where size and influence matter. The role and existence of the State is so important that we constantly seek its involvement in one form or other to protect our rights, provide welfare, accelerate development and address our problems be it is poverty or development or security.

State

Exercise :

1. Discuss the central perspective on State?
2. Discuss the challenges to the modern State?
3. Trace the origin of the modern State and give your views on its future?

State

Bibliography :

Beetham, David, The Future of the Nation State in G McLennon, D Held and S. Hall (eds.) The Idea of the Modern State, Milton Keynes: Open University Press, 1984

Dunleavy, Patrick, The State in Robert E. Goodin and Philip Pettit (eds.) A Companion to Contemporary Political Philosophy, USA: Blackwell Publishers Ltd, 1995

Hampton, Jean, Political Philosophy, Delhi: Oxford University Press, 1998

Held, David, Central Perspectives on the Modern State in G Mclennon, D. Held and S. Hall (eds.) The Idea of the Modern State, Milton Keynes: Open University Press, 1984

Held, David, Political theory and the Modern State: Essays on the State, Power and Democracy, UK: Polity Press, 1989

Mckinnon, Catriona,(eds.) Issues in Political Theory, Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2008

Pateman, Carole, The Fraternal Social Contract in Robert E. Goodin and Philip Pettit (eds.) Contemporary Political Philosophy An Anthology, USA: Blackwell Publishers Limited, 1997

State

Skinner, Quentin, The State in Robert E. Goodin and Philip Pettit (eds.) Contemporary Political Philosophy An Anthology, USA: Blackwell Publishers Limited, 1997

Wolff, Jonathan, An Introduction to Political Philosophy, Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1996

