

Please answer all four questions. Each question carries twenty marks and the break-up for each specific query is given in parentheses. Please structure your answers for which you might want to use a page for ordering your thoughts while keeping an eye on the time.

### Question 1

Write out brief notes on the:

- 1.1. Distinction between sex and gender (2)
- 1.2. Differences between the terms Dalit and Harijan (6)
- 1.3. Distinction between Liberalism and Socialism (6)
- 1.4. Significance of the Right to Information for Indian democracy (6)

### Question 2

Excessive intoxication and prolonged phases of lethargy are merely two signs of alienation of our times. What do you understand by the term 'alienation' in Modern times? (4) Elaborate an essay on how religion/God and Time (or how the tyranny of the clock) may have alienated human beings. (16)

### Question 3

Elaborate an essay in response to the following problem statement: How should governments deal with those who break the law non-violently on the grounds of conscience? Is breaking the law in such cases justified morally but not so legally? And if it is not legally justified, should they be tried, and if convicted, punished? You might want to use contemporary examples for substantiating your argument.

Given below are two passages, with opposing points of view, which allude to government, laws, rights, and non-violent civil disobedience as a form of political protest. The first passage is taken from Dr. B.R. Ambedkar's concluding speech at the Constituent Assembly delivered on 25<sup>th</sup> November 1949, while the second one is from a collection of essays contained in *Taking Rights Seriously* (1978) by Ronald Dworkin (1931-2013), an acclaimed American philosopher of law. Ambedkar pronounced against civil disobedience while Dworkin appears to have argued that the right of conscience-objectors to break the law as an act of protest must be recognized. From the point of view of this instructor, the problem is not open-ended because there is arguably an appropriate answer, which is not necessarily a via media between the two positions. Your essay ought to reflect your understanding of political concepts.

“If we wish to maintain democracy not merely in form, but also in fact, what must we do? The first thing in my judgment we must do is hold fast to constitutional methods of achieving our social and economic objectives. It means we must abandon the bloody methods of revolution. It means we must abandon the method of civil disobedience, non-cooperation and satyagraha. [...] These methods are nothing but the grammar of anarchy, and the sooner they are abandoned, the better for us.” (Ambedkar)

“[Governments] must dispense with the claim that citizens never have a right to break its law, and it must not define citizens’ rights so that these are cut off for supposed reasons of the general good. Any government’s harsh treatment of civil disobedience, or campaign against vocal protest, may therefore be thought to count against its sincerity. [...] the majority cannot travel as fast or as far as it would like, if it recognizes the rights of individuals to do what, in the majority’s terms, is the wrong thing to do. [But] if we want our laws and our legal institutions to provide the ground rules within which these issues will be contested then these ground rules must not be the conqueror’s law that the dominant class imposes on the weaker [...] The bulk of the law cannot [is not] neutral. It must state, [...] the majority’s view of the common good. The institution of rights is therefore crucial because it represents the majority’s promise to the minorities that their dignity and equality will be respected.” (Dworkin)

**OR**

#### **Question 4**

In a study that appeared in the *Economic and Political Weekly* (28 May 2011) not too long ago, Claude Alvares proffered a critique on the nature of knowledge in Political Science. A selection from his article is given below. After perusing the passage, please confront it with the **content** of ‘Modern Political Concepts’ and, proceed to provide a constructive epistemological<sup>1</sup> critique of this course in relation to the corresponding discipline and the higher educational system in India. (20)

Almost all political science courses have originated from Europe or more recently, the US. [...] In India and China, for example, we have several influential political treatises including the *Book of Mencius*, *The Analects of Confucius* and the *Arthashastra* of Kautilya. However, political students are fed solely on a diet based on the importance of Niccolo Machiavelli’s *The Prince*. It is incredible that epics like the *Ramayana* and the *Mahabharata*, two of the most extraordinary texts on political science, are nowhere to be found in India’s political science courses despite the fact that these texts are sources for discussions on philosophy, ethics and politics. In fact, in the *Mahabharata*, the discussion on the nature of violence takes place in the middle of the battlefield, with arrows flying about even while the main protagonists discuss finer points. [...] For credible and meaningful work towards a non-Eurocentric social science framework, a firm prior decision or commitment to intellectual delinking from the existing theories and the corpus of Eurocentric and European social sciences is required at the level of each academic council or university. [...] Mere tinkering with existing curricula here and there will enable us neither to get rid of Eurocentric influence nor bring the spirit

---

<sup>1</sup> Epistemology: study of knowledge, its nature, scope, limits, production...

of creative science to our academic institutions. Delinking from both Eurocentric social sciences as well as European university teaching models will at least guarantee the prospect of a new beginning in which the universities everywhere reappropriate their predominant function of being centres for the creation of knowledge that serves the real life concerns of all the diverse peoples and societies of the world.

### Question 5

5.1. From the extracts that you may have read from the *Leviathan* and *Second treatise of government*, please distinguish the social contract theory of Thomas Hobbes from that of John Locke. (10)

5.2. The passage given below are selected extracts from a study by Carole Pateman, "Women and social contract", *Political Theory*, vol. 8, no. 2, May 1980, pp. 149-168. In this study, Pateman examines the role of women and consent in the work of the classic social contract theorists, but especially, Locke and Rousseau. With your acquaintance of the classic social contract theory, please revise Pateman's interpretation of Locke and Rousseau from the extracts given below and respond to the following questions:

- (A) What is the status of women as individuals according to Locke and Rousseau? (4)
- (B) How do Locke and Rousseau understand women's consent and how do they view the relationship between men and women/ husbands and wives/ fathers and mothers? (6)

The state of nature is usually pictured as inhabited by patriarchal families. It was also widely argued that fathers of families entered the social contract, wives being "concluded by their Husbands." In Locke's conjectural history of the state of nature, fathers become monarchs with the "scarce avoidable" and tacit consent of their adult sons. Locke does not mention mothers in this context, but his unspoken assumption is that the wife and mother also gives her "consent" to this transformation of her husband. Indeed, such "consent" is part of the marriage contract, for Locke agreed with Filmer [author of *Patriarcha* against which Locke wrote his *First treatise of government*] that a wife's subjection to her husband had "a Foundation in Nature," and that the will of a husband should "take place before that of his wife in all things of their common Concernment." However, this means that women are excluded from the status of "individual" that is basic to consent theory; if a wife's subjection to her husband has a "natural" foundation, she cannot also be seen as a "naturally" free and equal individual. Only if women are seen as "free and equal individuals" is their consent relevant at all. [...]

Rousseau [...] is the most explicit about the reasons why women must be excluded from its scope [the scope of the social contract]. Rousseau accepted the patriarchal assertion that women were

“naturally subordinate to men”. [...] In Rousseau's participatory, voluntarist political order, women must remain excluded because of their "natural" moral characters and their deleterious influence upon the morals and civic virtue of men. In time honored tradition, Rousseau divides women into the good and the dissolute, or whores. Women can remain good only if they stay within the shelter of domestic life. Geneva, following the ancient world, provided an example of civic virtue because its *circles*, social and political clubs, were sexually segregated. The sexes were allowed to come together only where it was proper for them to do so; this is "the plan of nature, which gives different tastes to the two sexes, so that they live apart each in his [sic] way." In the *circles*, men are able to educate themselves for civil life. They "can devote themselves to grave and serious discourse without fear of ridicule" from women and without fear of becoming "feminized" and so weakened as citizens.

The successive transformations of human consciousness or "nature" that Rousseau charts in the *Discourse on Inequality* and the *Social Contract* are actually transformations of male consciousness. [...] Women, Rousseau declares, "must be trained to bear the yoke from the first . . . and to submit themselves to the will of others," that is, the will of men. The influence of women, even good women, always corrupts men, because women are "naturally" incapable of attaining the status of free and equal individuals, or citizens, and incapable of developing the capacities required to give consent.

Yet, at the same time, in sexual relationships, the "consent" of women is all-important. Moreover, their consent can always be assumed to be given-even though apparently it is being refused. According to Rousseau, men are the "natural" sexual aggressors; women are "destined to resist." Rousseau asks "what would become of the human species if the order of attack and defense were changed. Modesty and chasteness are the preeminent female virtues, but because women are also creatures of passion, they must use their natural skills of duplicity and dissemblance to maintain their modesty. In particular, *they must always say "no" even when they desire to say "yes."* And here Rousseau reveals the heart of the problem of women and consent. Apparent refusal of consent can never, in a woman, be taken at face value:

“Why do you consult their words when it is not their mouths that speak? . . . The lips always say "No," and rightly so; but the tone is not always the same, and that cannot lie. . . . Must her modesty condemn her to misery? Does she not require a means of indicating her inclinations without open expression?” (Rousseau, *Emile*)

A man must learn to interpret a woman's "consent" when, as in Locke's civil society, there are no obvious expressions of it at all.

“To win this silent consent is to make use of all the violence permitted in love. To read it in the eyes, to see it in the ways in spite of the mouth's denial. . . . If he then completes his happiness, he is not brutal, he is decent. He does not insult chasteness; he respects it; he serves it. He leaves it the honor of still defending what it would have perhaps abandoned.” (Rousseau, *Politics and the arts*)