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INTRODUCTION

CONCEPTUALISING CONCORDENCE OF POLITICAL PHILOSOPHY

"...and say: My Lord! Increase me in Knowledge."

(The Quran, 20:114).

The concept of concordance or harmonization is used as a tool to explore and explain political philosophy in the Quranic text. The idea to concord views, text, verses and references are philosophical. Philosophy is of academic as well as practical relevance. To philosophize is human. A vast fund of political philosophy is at our disposal. Arguably, it is most pertinent to introduce the concept of concordance in order to explain philosophy and political philosophy in this chapter. By unfolding the meaning and background of concordance as it is literally understood and relying on its particular sense of ‘harmony’, the chapter proceeds to present a comprehensive account of western political philosophy which is based on human reasoning. It would help to orient and rectify the apparently confused and non academic assumptions about the political philosophy of the Quran, discussed in the succeeding chapters to prove the soundness of divine wisdom, its application in this world for improvised human political endeavors.

WHAT IS CONCORDANCE

Concordance means “literally agreement, harmony, hence derivatively a citation of parallel passages, and specifically an alphabetic arrangement of the words contained in a book with citations of the passage in which they occur". In other words we can say that Concordance is harmony which means agreement of opinion. A concordance’s function is basically to bring together, in other words, to ‘concord’ passage of text which shows the use of a word. The
term 'concordance' is usually applied to literary and linguistic studies. Concordance is particularly useful for studying a piece of literature when thinking in terms of a particular word or phrase or both. A concordance is a comprehensive index of the words used in a text or a body of texts unusually there are also citations of the passages in which the words occur.

DEFINITION OF CONCORDANCE

Concordance literally means "harmony" or "agreement"; it is state of being concordant and "concord" refers to concurrence in opinion or sentiments, unanimity, accord a harmonious combination of tones sounded together. According to the Collins’ co build English dictionary, “a concordance is an alphabetical list of the words in a book or a set of books which also says where each word can be found and often how it is used.” Chamber 21st century dictionary says about concordance as a book containing an alphabetical index of principal words used in a major work, usually supplying citation and their meaning. It originated from Latin concordantia i.e. to agree. Merriam, Webster collegiate dictionary defines concordance as an alphabetical index of the principal words in a book or the works of an author with their immediate context.

According to Cambridge international dictionary a concordance is a specialized book or list which is an alphabetical collection of the words used in a writer’s work with information about where the words can be found and in which sentences. E.g. a Shakespeare/Biblical Concordance, a concordance of magazine articles, a concordance to Keats etc. According to concise Oxford English dictionary, concordance is an alphabetical list of the important words in a text, usually with citations of the passages concerned. Cambridge advanced learner’s dictionary defines concordance as a book or list which is an alphabetical collection of the words used in a book or a writer’s work, with information about where the words can be found and in which sentences: a Shakespeare concordance. Oxford Advanced Learner’s Dictionary says about
concordance as "an alphabetical list of the words used in a book, etc. showing where and how often they are used in Bible Concordance".12

Thus, a concordance is a list of the words used in a text or group of texts. The normal way of consulting a corpus is to look at concordance which shows words.13 It is a (usually alphabetical) list of words from a book or website indicating the locations at which they occur. A concordance differs from an index in that no attempt to filter the source material or sensibly collate the information has been made.14 It is an index of all the principal words in work, showing location in the text, and sometimes defining the words.15 It is an alphabetical index of the important words of a text, usually giving the context in which they are found.16 It is an alphabetical index of words in a book or in an author’s works with the passages in which they occur.17 It is an alphabetical index of Bible words and names, each word is followed by a list of one or more verses containing that word or name.18 A concordance is an index of all principal words in a work or in all the works of one author, e.g., Harvard concordance to Shakespeare, Dickens concordance.19 A concordance is an alphabetical list of the principal words used in a book or body of work, with their immediate contexts.20

A concordance is a special kind of index in which all the words used in a piece of literature is listed along with the place(s) used. Concordances are very useful tools for scholars because they make research in an author’s work easy. Concordances are available for many works of literature. One famous concordance was compiled for the Bible.21 Though in this thesis; the meaning of concordance is not taken as alphabetically, rather it is used in the context of harmony.

HISTORICAL RETROSPECT OF CONCORDANCE

Concordances date back to the middle Ages, when, like other massive undertakings like Gothic Cathedrals or the Bayeux Tapestry, they took up an unimaginable amount of person power. An early example of this according to
Tribble & Jones (1997) is the first known complete concordance of the Latin Bible, the work of some five hundred Benedictine monks working under Hugo de Sancto Charo. Biblical concordances are indexes comprising the words in the Bible and the location of the texts where they can be found. The Encyclopedia Britannica lists a number of early biblical concordances including that drawn up by Mercator, the 14th century cartographer. The other favorite corpus of texts for early concordances, at least in the English speaking world, is Shakespeare. Encyclopedia Britannica tells us that Bartlett, the American bookseller and editor best known for his familiar Quotations wrote, after many years of labour, a complete concordance to Shakespeare's dramatic works and poems (1894), a standard reference work that surpassed any of its predecessors in the number and fullness of its citations.

Because of the canonical status which they have in the culture of the English speaking world, Biblical and Shakespearian texts have two things in common: they need to be frequently and efficiently accessed and they have to be interpreted (and reinterpreted). So these early concordances functioned as archiving tools, answering the access need, and as text analysis tools, facilitating interpretation of meaning by bringing words and their contexts into closer proximity on the page, thus sharper focus.

Today's computerized concordances still fulfill these two functions, the practical and the scholarly professional archives, on the internet or on the intranet in libraries and companies, illustrate the more practical use.22

INTRODUCTION TO PHILOSOPHY

Philosophy is the mother of all knowledge.23 Philosophy is a study of problems which are ultimate, abstract and very general. These problems are concerned with the nature of existence, knowledge, morality, reason and human purpose.24 In other words the aim of philosophical inquiry is to gain insight into questions about knowledge, truth, reason, reality, meaning, mind, and value.25 It comprehends knowledge about the secret of life, the universe.
and beyond. It includes all the categories of social, religious, artistic, scientific, mathematical and logical thought. In other words; philosophy is a comprehensive system of ideas about human nature and the nature of the reality we live in. It is a guide for living, because the issues it addresses are basic and pervasive, determining the course we take in life and how we treat other people. It is distinguished from other ways of addressing these questions (such as mysticism or mythology) by its critical, generally systematic approach and its reliance on reasoned argument.

MEANING AND DEFINITION OF PHILOSOPHY

Everyone know that “Philosophy” comes from Greek word “Philosophia”. Philos or Philia means Friends or Friendship/love or lover and Sophia means wisdom. It means “Love of Wisdom”. But since “Wisdom” is even harder to define than “Philosophy”, Herodotus used the verb Philosophian in a context in which it means nothing more than the desire to find out. Briefly, then, philosophia etymologically connotes the love of exercising one's curiosity and intelligence rather than the love of Wisdom. Although Philosophers have often sought to confine the word “Philosophy” within narrower boundaries, in popular usage it has never entirely lost its original breadth of meaning.

According to Professor Bernard Gert, Philosophy, like all other fields, is unique. But the uniqueness of Philosophy seems more impressive. Philosophy, according to Plato, makes use of a method peculiar to it, which he calls “Dialectic”. The exact nature of the Platonic dialectic is absence, but this much is clear that: Philosophy proceeds by criticizing received opinions. Agn Raud said about Philosophy, that, “Philosophy studies the fundamental nature of existence of man, and of man’s relationship to existence. In the realm of cognition, the special sciences are the trees, but philosophy is the soil which makes the forest possible.”
Callicles, the sophist said that, “For Philosophy, Socrates, if pursued in moderation and the proper age, is an elegant accomplishment, but too much philosophy is the ruin of human life.” There are many things to be thought through, and philosophy may be defined as the art of thinking things through — or, if your prefer, it is the habit of trying to think things through. We can say that this is more technical language, Philosophy is the critical analysis of concepts and the discovery of relation between them, it thus hopes to integrate our knowledge, to unify and interpret it. So it comes out that logic is perhaps the most essential part of the Philosopher’s equipment.

Further, Philosophy is reaction of the whole mind to the whole reality which might attain its fullest comprehension and its complete end. Philosophy may provisionally be defined as an attempt to explain and appreciate life and the universe as a whole. Though some thoughts may be possible without language, philosophical thought is not as philosophy is essentially linguistic, it attempts to provide a clear, and acceptable view of the world. In a Nutshell, we can say that, philosophy is based on rational argument and appeal to facts. Philosophy is a knowledge of ultimate, when the shorter Oxford dictionary defines philosophy as “that department of knowledge which deals with ultimate reality, or with the most general causes and principles of things.”

Collins cobuild English language dictionary said that Philosophy is the study or creation of theories about the nature of existence knowledge, thought, etc or about how people should live and behave. Chambers 21st century dictionary says that Philosophy is, “The search for truth and knowledge concerning the universe, human existence, perception and behavior, pursued by means of reflection, reasoning and argument.” “Philosophy” according to the concise Oxford English dictionary is, “The Study of the fundamental nature of knowledge, reality, and existence of a set of theories of a particular philosopher – the study of the theoretical basis of a branch of knowledge or experience.”
Cambridge Advanced Learner’s dictionary define philosophy, as the use of reasoning in understanding such things as the nature of reality and existence, the use and limits of knowledge and the principles that govern and influence moral judgement. The New Lexicon Webster’s dictionary describe philosophy as the love or pursuit of wisdom, i.e. the search for basic principles. Traditionally, western philosophy comprises of five branches of study: metaphysics, ethics, aesthetics, epistemology and logic. Systematized principles of any subject or branch of knowledge, the philosophy of history attitude towards life.

The New Encyclopedia Britannica said about philosophy, “it is the critical examination of the grounds for fundamental beliefs and an analysis of the basic concepts employed in the expression of such beliefs”.

**POLITICAL PHILOSOPHY**

Political philosophy can be defined as philosophical reflection on how best to arrange our collective life – our political institutions and our social practices, such as our economic system and our pattern of family life. Thus it is also said that Political Philosophy is the study of fundamental questions about the state, government, politics, liberty, justice, property, rights, law and the enforcement of a legal code by authority. What they are, why (or even if) they are needed, what makes a government legitimate, what rights and freedoms it should protect and why, what form it should take and why, what the law is, and what duties citizens owe to a legitimate government, if any and when it may be legitimately overthrown – if ever. In a vernacular sense, the term “Political Philosophy” often refers to a general view, or specific ethic, belief or attitude, about politics that does not necessarily belong to the technical discipline of Philosophy.

The central concerns of Political Philosophy, have been the political economy by which property rights are defined and access to capital is regulated, the demands of Justice in distribution and punishment, and the rules of truth and evidence that determine judgments in the Law. In other words,
we can say that, Political thinkers have added to the store of knowledge by their deliberations on concepts like freedom, justice, liberty and rights. Plato, Aristotle, Machiavelli, John Locke, Rousseau, Mill and Karl Marx speaks of the way the state and society ought to be organized and the way the people ought to behave. The writings of these Philosophers throw useful light on a wide variety of matters. Moreover, these writings throw light on the events of the age in which they originated. As Alan Ball puts it, “we can learn a great deal of the English revolution of 1688, its origins, the character and political aims of the men who controlled and guided it, by reading the political philosophy of John Locke.”

Political Philosophy, is seen as that branch of knowledge which consist of moral philosophy on the one hand, and politics in the narrower sense on the other. Furthermore, due to the right of man to rule over man, Political Philosophy was born. Political Philosophy seek to establish basic principles that will, for instance justify a particular form of state, show that individuals have certain inalienable rights, or tell us how a society’s material resources should be shared among its members. This usually involves analyzing and interpreting ideas like freedom, justice, authority and democracy and then applying them in a critical way to the social and political institutions that currently exist. Some Political Philosophers have tried primarily to justify the prevailing arrangements of their society, others have painted pictures of an ideal state or an ideal social world that is very different from anything we have so far experience.

We can say that, the word 'Political Philosophy' can cover almost any abstract thought about law, politics, and society, particularly if it addresses normative questions about the way in which political power should be used or the way citizens should behave. Thus, democratic theory, jurisprudence, political morality, applied ethics, social theory, and political Economy have all been thought of as parts of Political Philosophy. A Political Philosopher might study subjects as diverse as punishment, representation, feminism, private
property, judicial review, economic inequality, civil disobedience, rational choice and the morality of abortion.

Political Philosophy has been practiced for as long as human beings have regarded their collective arrangements not as immutable part of the natural order but as potentially open to change, and therefore as standing in need of philosophical justification. It can be found in many different cultures, and has taken a wide variety of forms. There are two reasons for this diversity. First, the methods and approaches used by Political Philosophers reflect the general philosophical tendencies of their epoch. Development in epistemology and ethics, for instance, alter the assumptions on which political philosophy can proceed. But second, the Political Philosopher's agenda is largely set by the pressing political issues of the day. In medieval Europe, for instance, the proper relationship between church and state became a central issue in Political Philosophy; in the early modern period the main argument was between defenders of absolutism and those who sought to justify a limited, constitutional state. In the nineteenth century, the social question of how an industrial society should organize its economy and its welfare system came to the fore. In order to justify a set of collective arrangements, a political philosophy must say something about the nature of human beings, about their needs, their capacities, about whether they are mainly selfish or mainly altruistic, and so forth.

If we examine the main works of Political Philosophy in past centuries, they can be divided roughly into two categories. On the one hand there are those produced by philosophers elaborating general philosophical system's whose political philosophy flows out and forms an integral part of those systems. Leading philosophers who have made substantial contributions to political thought include Plato, Aristotle, Augustine, Aquinas, Hobbes, Locke, Hume, Hegel and J.S. Mill on the other hand there are social and political thinkers whose contribution to philosophy as a whole has had little lasting significance, but who have made influential contributions to Political
Philosophy specifically. In this category we may include Cicero, Marsilius of Padua, Machiavelli, Grotius, Rousseau, Bentham, Fichte and Marx. Two important figures whose work reflects non-western influences are Ibn Khaldhun and Kautilya. Among the most important twentieth century political thinkers are Arendt, Berlin, Dewey, Foucault, Gandhi, Gramsci, Habermas, Hayek, Oakeshott, Rawls, Sartre and Taylor.

In a nutshell Political philosophy is the study of government and the relationship of individuals and communities to the state. It includes questions about justice, food, law, property, the rights and obligations of the citizen. On the whole, theoretically political philosophy is that branch of Philosophy which discusses freedom, Justice, rights, democracy and other political issues. It is the philosophical study of the state, its justification, and its ethically proper organization. Moreover, political philosophy is the study of fundamental questions about the state government, politics, liberty, justice, property, rights, law and the...

NATURE OF POLITICAL PHILOSOPHY

Political Philosophy deals with the ‘Ideal’. It tries to determine what men and women ought to do in keeping up with the ultimate goal or purpose of human life. It is recognized by its “Critical function.” One may discuss the nature of political philosophy in two ways. One way is to try to identify in the acknowledged classics of the subject — Plato’s Republic, Aristotle’s Politics, Hobbes’s Leviathan, Locke’s Two treatises of civil Government, Rousseau’s Social Contract, Hegel’s Philosophy of Right, and so on the Principal recurrent problems and the methods used to deal with them. As D. D. Raphael (Problem of Political Philosophy) has significantly observed: “It is true that some of the classical Political Philosophers have set out ideal forms of society, but...this has not been their central concern. Even in Plato, the purpose of depicting an ideal society is to criticize existing society and to promote understanding of general social concepts such as justice. The other way is to begin with a preconceived idea of what constitutes a Philosophical inquiry, as distinct from
a scientific, theological, or aesthetic inquiry, and then consider how such an inquiry might be pursued in the field of Politics.  

The first way acknowledges that Political Philosophy is a tradition of inquiry, with its own characteristic forms of argument and conceptual models, a tradition in which every innovation emerges from a critical dialogue between the author and his predecessors. According to Raphael, the fundamental purpose of traditional Philosophy has been critical evaluation of beliefs: “Philosophy differs from science in that science seeks explanation while Philosophy seeks Justification”. The term ‘Justification’ implies the attempt to give rational grounds either for accepting or rejecting the beliefs which we normally take for granted without thinking of any grounds thereof.

Political Philosophy refers to that creamy layer of intellectual tradition which search for good Political order through a serious dialogue; a political philosopher enters with the fact around him. It is a rational synthesis of human speculation and information. It is re-enactment of the thought of the people in the mind of Philosopher. It is a re-enactment of a thought about the state, its nature, structure and its purpose. Mainly it has been the province of Philosophical writers, most of who were distinguished in Philosophy, literature, History, Plato, Aristotle, St. Augustine, Thomas Aquinas, Hobbes, Lock, Rousseau, Hegel and Marx are great names in the history of western Political Philosophy. All Political Philosophy is contemporary Political Philosophy. This means that the Political Philosophy is fundamentally the representative of his age – a watch dog, a super politician and critic of all that what he observes happening around him. He analyses the nature and functioning of different institutions and structures right from their emergence up to his own times with the sole objective to give a theory that he considers best for the society.

Good political philosophers have also future in their bones. Political Philosophy is essentially rooted in individual psychology, social Psychology, and history. Its first focus remains to understand the nature of man, his innate predispositions and wants – the unavoidable wants and the imbecile wants –
and the relationship they generate for common interest. While no political philosopher ignores the basic wants of humans, they differ in their approach — how to serve these differing needs. They, according to their understanding of humans in relation to the environment the knowledge based on personal experiences and insights drawn from different disciplines — have been engaged in building theories that serve as tools to analyses and reform political reality. It is, however, to be mentioned the political philosophy is not value free, which is its charm as it refers to the basic character of human society viz. heterogeneous human nature and that human beings are also conditioned by their respective environments.

No single fact can explain the complex human nature. While a political philosopher over emphasizes a particular fact by revolving around it, he underestimates the other equally important ones. However, the contribution of Political thinker lies in the fact that he invokes a new fact and makes it to speak. Good Political Philosophy is the one which in the words of Nietzsche is life furthering, life-preserving, species, Preserving, perhaps species creating. The validity of the Political Philosophy depends on the validity of the purpose. It may also be mentioned that there is no absolute Philosophy. The only absolute is change, Political Philosophy evolves changes and grows with the development in science, technology, Philosophy, psychology and other branches of human knowledge which create new problems as well as throw-up new mechanisms. Thus, the Political Philosophy marches with the march of times. Armed with the old and new experiences he adopts Political Philosophy to the emerging changing circumstances by producing a new treatise underlined by a new understanding and insight which is theory or generalization. As a matter of fact, Political Philosophy sharpens the wits, deepens the imagination and refines one's critical powers. It is the flight of imagination and prescriptiveness values that really leads us to some definite conclusions for public good. Furthermore, as rightly put by R.G. Collingwood, “if Political
Philosophers do not involve themselves in analyzing the problems of our society and have no commitments to them. Politics will be guided by fools.  

**SCOPE AND NORMS OF POLITICAL PHILOSOPHY**

All Political Philosophy aims at making human life better. It deals with the clarification of concepts used in the study of political life as well as the measures to make human life worth living. A Political Philosophy must say something about the nature of human beings, about their needs, their ethics, their capacities, about whether they are mainly selfish or mainly altruistic, and so forth. Scope of Political Philosophy deals with in a narrow sense, political Philosophy lends to undertake a philosophical scrutiny of political institutions and behavior; However, in a wider sense, political philosophy is concerned with all those aspects of social life which involve the use of power. Political Philosophy are concerned with the identification of political institutions which we should maintain in order to ensure good life for the members of society.

Norms signify the criteria of right conduct in a political situation. If the upholders of diverse ideologies continue to cling to the different criteria of right and wrong, the society will be reduced to an arena of constant conflict and cleavage, Political Philosophy must come to its rescue. It should analyses the position taken by all contenders and show the way to determining the right course.

**Ideology:** A set of ideas and arguments used to defend an existing or proposed distribution of power in society. These ideas are accepted to be true by their upholders without inquiring into their validity. The ruling class may propagate its ideology to strengthen its own position while its opponents may use their ideology to replace the existing order by a new one in order to achieve some great objective.

**TYPES OF POLITICAL PHILOSOPHY**

Very roughly speaking, these are four main types of political philosophy:
Libertarianism/classical liberalism/Liberalism: The term "liberalism" conveys two distinct positions in political philosophy, one a pro-individualist theory of people and government, the second a pro-statist or what is better termed a "social democratic" conception. Etymologically, the former is the sounder description since liberalism is derived from the word "liberty," that is, freedom and toleration rather than notions of justice and intervention that took on board in the Twentieth Century. Yet, the pro-statist connotation pervades modern thinking so much so that it is difficult to separate its notions from the previous meanings without re-classifying one or the other. The former is often referred to as 'classical liberalism'. It emphasizes 'negative' right, i.e, the right not to have certain things done to you (be killed, robbed, etc.). The role of government is to protect us from outside invaders and domestic criminals who would otherwise violate our rights, but otherwise to leave us alone. This is a somewhat old-Fashioned view, associated with the 17th century John Locke and the 19th century John Stuart Mill, but it has recently made a big comeback, especially because of Robert Nozick's book Anarchy, State, and utopia, perhaps the ultimate Philosophical argument for small government. Philosopher John Hospers has been the President for the Libertarian Party.

The Libertarianism described here is a pure or extreme version which does not necessarily conform precisely to the views of real-life libertarians, who are likely to make some concessions to the objections listed below.

1. Libertarians would allow anything between consenting adults, at least in private, including drug use, prostitution, hard-core pornography, Sodomy, Flag burning, etc. etc. Is this too much liberty?

2. Libertarians would not interfere with the economy at all. So they would allow monopolies, for instance, and would totally scrap welfare, Medicaid, Medicare, etc. would this be good for society?
3. Libertarians regard society as just a mass of individuals in the same place under the same government, ignoring common traditions, culture, religion etc. Does this ignore the value of Patriotism, community, etc.?

4. In a libertarian society, some people would end up with much more wealth than others, perhaps just by inheriting. Is this Fair?

5. In reality libertarianism as an impartial ideal of maximum freedom and justice seems to be a kind of fantasy. We are all born into a world in which property is neither evenly distributed nor freely available. This situation came about through history in which piracy, imperialism, genocide; slavery, etc. have all had an important part. No individual is free just to live their own life. Since (for instance) there is no free land to farm. We all depend on others especially if we are poor or handicapped by low social status, low intelligence, unpopular ethnicity, or disability, etc. A government that adopts a completely laissez faire approach effectively sides with the pirates, slave-owners, etc. and their descendants.

Socialism: This is exactly opposite of libertarianism. It values positive rights, such as the right to healthcare, food, shelter, work, etc. more than ‘negative’ rights. The economy would be run for the good of society as a whole. Very few people today are real socialists, but many agree with parts of this theory. Main objections raised against this philosophy are as following:

1. Would this be efficient?

2. Is it fair to violate some people’s ‘negative’ rights to provide for the ‘positive’ rights of others?

3. Does the so-called positive right exist at all? 74

Liberalism/modern liberalism: The "modern liberalism" is an easier term to wield and shall be used unless the emphasis is laid upon the socialist learning’s of such modern liberals. In a broader manner, presently popularly accepted term the modern liberalism accepts rights against the person and rights to
entitlements such as health care and education. It is a cross between libertarianism and socialism. Its most famous Philosophical defender is John Rawls. Rawls equates justice with fairness. He says that, “a fair distribution of rights and other goods is one that everyone would agree to form behind a veil of ignorance about their place in society. He calls this the original position. Rawls believes that in the original position people would support two fundamental principles of justice.

1. “Each person has to have an equal right to the most extensive basic liberty comparable with a similar liberty for others”. (i.e. freedom) and negative rights should be equal, and there should be as much freedom and opportunity as possible.

2. “Social and economic inequalities are to be arranged so that they are both (a) reasonably expected to be everyone’s advantage, and (b) attached to positions and offices open to all.” (i.e. all inequalities should be avoided if possible, unless they benefit everyone)

In other words he believes in the basic ideal of libertarianism but he also thinks people would prudently limit this, just in case they come up near the bottom of society, by adding some form of welfare. Inevitably some people will be worse off than others, but we should make them as well off as we can.

Objections are as given.

1. Is the best way to decide what justice requires imagining what people would agree to in certain fictional indeed impossible, circumstances?

2. Would such people in fact agree to precisely the combination of freedom and equality that Rawls comes up with?

Feminist Philosopher Susan Moller Okin objects that Rawls says very little about gender issues. Women, though, must be included in any satisfactory theory of justice, she says, current gender injustices seriously undermine equality of opportunity. Furthermore, the Family is where we learn our basic values, so the family must be just if society is to be just.
Communitarianism: It is a new (although it can be traced back to Aristotle) alternative to liberalism and libertarianism. Some communitarians are just moderate socialists, but others are nationalists or patriots. Communitarians value tradition, ethic, regional or national identity; and the common culture that comes from religion or shared moral values. They emphasize the importance of belonging to a certain community and sharing in its traditions, values and culture. They think that libertarians and liberals over emphasize the importance of the individual and stress that “no man is an island” and “it takes a village to raise a child”. Hegel can be thought of as a good example of this type of thinker.

Objections:
1. Even libertarians allow people the option of celebrating their heritage, culture, etc. but no one should be forced to do so.
2. Emphasizing the community is often a cover for socialism or nationalism, which in turn lead to communism and Fascism.
3. Communitarianism seems vague and a reaction against libertarianism than philosophy of its own.

Conservatism: Conservatism generally means sticking to the old ways of doing or thinking about things. Conservatives lend to be skeptical about theories of the kind outlined above. Instead they value the wisdom inherent in tradition and whatever institutions have evolved or arisen to meet the demands of each particular culture. If something clearly needs to be changed, they would say, then by all means change it, but do so cautiously. And if it isn’t broke, don’t fix it just to fit the theory that some Philosopher devised in his or her study. There is a similarity with communitarianism here, but in the USA the traditional political institutions, and the Philosophical justifications given for them, embody rather libertarian ideals.

The Philosophical division of libertarian/liberal/communitarian does not neatly fit the ordinary division of liberal/conservative or Republican/
Democrat. Basically almost everyone today is some kind of liberal, accepting some role for the state in providing goods such as education as well as protecting individual rights. Republicans tend to lean towards libertarianism, but most recognize that the theory has its flaws. That's why the libertarian party is its own organization. Democrats tend to lean more in the direction of Socialism, but again most are really liberals. Seeing that in practice, pure socialism tends to produce inefficiency and misery. On the whole contemporary "Socialists" in Europe are not really socialists at all. 76

HISTORY OF POLITICAL PHILOSOPHY

The History of Political Philosophy is the succession of notions about the actual and proper organization of men into collectivities and the discussion of those notions. It is philosophical in character, because it is concerned with obedience and justice as well as with description; the persistent preoccupation of political philosophers has been the definition of justice and of the attitude and arrangements which should create and perpetuate justice. 77

In other words, the history of Political Philosophy attempts to yield a connected account of past speculation on the character of human association at its most inclusive level. "History" or "philosophy" may be stressed depending on whether the organizing principle is the temporal sequence or conceptual framework of political thought. Anglophone work has increasingly been organized around distinctive political "languages" defined by specific vocabularies, syntaxes and problems, for example, classical republicanism, Roman law, natural law, utilitarianism. Chronologically, it has been usual to observe divisions between ancient, medieval, Renaissance, early modern and modern period of study. 78 The history of philosophy is customarily defined in several ways...

Ancient philosophy: Political Philosophy most broadly concerns the nature and forms of power; more specifically, it involves the principles for proper governance. As an academic discipline, political philosophy has its origins in
ancient Greek society, when city-states were experimenting with various forms of political organization including monarchy, tyranny, oligarchy, and democracy. Plato and Aristotle, from a detail of the school of Athens, a Fresco by Raphael, Plato’s Republic and Aristotle’s Politics secured the two Greek Philosophers as two of the most influential Political Philosophers. Plato and Aristotle, as the founders of the traditional Political Philosophy. Greek Political Philosophy is concerned with the Polis and that Modern Political Philosophy is concerned with the state. It deals with the city state, where as Modern Political Philosophy deals with the Nation.

Ancient Greece is the source of the earliest Political reflection, with a continuous history in the west. Here reflection on the nature and proper organization of political community stimulated inquiry into the difference between nature and convention, the public and the domestic realm, the distinctive character of political rule, the relationship between political life and Philosophy, the identity of justice and the taxonomy of state forms - as well as amore sociological investigation of the stability and decline of political regimes.

Medieval philosophy of Islamic civilization: The rise of Islam, based on both the Quran and Muhammad (PBUH) strongly altered the power balances and perceptions of origin of power in the Mediterranean region. Early Muslim philosophy emphasized an inexorable link between science and religion, and the process of Ijihad to find truth – in effect all philosophy was “political” as it had real implications for governance. This view was challenged by the Mutazilite philosophers, who held a more Greek view and were supported by secular aristocracy who sought freedom of action independent of the mosque. By the medieval period, however, the Asharite view of Islam had in general triumphed.

Islamic Political Philosophy, was, indeed, rooted in the very sources of Islam, i.e. the Quran and the Sunnah, the words and practices of Prophet Muhammad (PBUH). However, in the western thought, it is generally known
that it was a specific area peculiar merely to the great philosophers of Islam: al-
Kindi (Alkindus), al-Farabi (Abunaser), Ibn sina (Avicenna), Ibn Majjah
(Avempace), Ibn Rushd (Averroes), and Ibn Khaldun. The political
conceptions of Islam such as Kudrah, Sultan, Ummah, cemaa — and even the
“core” terms of the Quran, i.e. Ibada,din, rab and ilah — is taken as the basis of
an analysis. Hence, not only the ideas of the Muslim Political Philosophers but
also many other jurists and ulama posed political ideas and theories. For
example, the ideas of the khawaraj in the very early years of Islamic history on
khilafa and Ummah, or those of Shia Islam on the Quranic concept of Imamah
are considered proofs of political thought. The clashes between the Ahl-e-
sunna and Alihna-i-ashari in the 7th and 8th centuries had a genuine political
character.

The 14th century Arab scholar Ibn Khaldun is considered one of the
greatest political theorists. The British Philosopher — anthropologist Ernest
Gellner considered Ibn Khalduns definition of Government, “an institution
which prevents injustice other than such as it commits itself”, the best in the
history of political theory.

Muslim Political Philosophy did not cease in the classical period.
Despite the fluctuations in its original character during the medieval period, it
has lasted even in the modern era. Especially with the emergence of Islamic
radicalism as a political movement, political thought has revived in the Muslim
world. The political ideas of Abduh, Afghani, Kutub, Maududi, Shariat and
Khomeini has caught on an enthusiasm in especially Muslim youth in 20th
century.

Medieval philosophy: By the medieval period, however, the Asharite view of
Islam had in general triumphed and all philosophy was henceforth subordinated
to theology- a situation that persisted until the rise of modern Islamic
philosophy. Medieval political philosophy was characteristically preoccupied
with the relationship between pope and King, Church and regnum, but
philosophy as a discipline was subordinated to theology. This was challenged
by the rediscovery of Aristotle's self sufficiently secular political ideal, a
demand met for a while by Aquinas synthesis. However, the autonomy of
secular politics was continually reasserted by a sequence of writers – Bartolus
of Sassoferrato, Marsilius of Padua, Bruni and Machiavelli who revived and
reformulated classical republicanism using both Roman law and New
Renaissance techniques and insights.87

In other words, Medieval Political philosophy in Europe was heavily
influenced by Christian thinking. It had much in common with the Islamic
thinking in that the Roman Catholics also subordinated Philosophy to
Theology. Perhaps the most influential political philosopher of the medieval
period was St. Thomas Aquinas who helped reintroduce Aristotle's works,
which had only been preserved by the Muslims, along with the commentaries
of Averroes. Aquinas's used them to set the agenda for scholastic political
philosophy, and dominated European thought for centuries.88

Renaissance philosophy: During the Renaissance secular Political Philosophy
began to emerge after about a century of theological political thought in
Europe. While the middle ages did see secular politics in practice under the rule
of the Holy Roman Empire, the academic field was wholly scholastic and
therefore Christian in nature.89 Niccolo Machiavelli's was one of the most
influential philosopher during this burgeoning period. His work The Prince,
written between 1511-12 and published in 1532, after his death. That work as
well as the discourses, a rigorous analysis of the classical period, did much to
influence modern political thought in the west.90

A minority (including Jean Jacques Rousseau) could interpret, 'The
Prince' as a satire meant to give the Medici after their recapture of Florence
and their subsequent expulsion of Machiavelli from Florence. Though the work
was written for the Di Medici family in order to perhaps influence them to free
him from exile, Machiavelli supported the Republic of Florence rather than the
oligarchy of the Di Medici family. Machiavelli presents a pragmatic and
somewhat consequent view of politics, whereby good and evil are mere means
used to bring about an end, of securing and preserving a powerful state. Thomas Hobbes well known for his theory of the social contract goes on to expand this view at the start of the 17th century during the English Renaissance.91

**European Age of philosophy of Enlightenment:** During the Enlightenment period, new theories about human psychology, the discovery of other societies in the America, and the changing needs of political societies (especially in the wake of the English Civil war, the American Revolution and the French Revolution) led to new questions and insights by such thinkers as John Locke, Thomas Hobbes, and Jean-Jacques Rousseau known by most for his view of the "noble savage" and his promotion of a free trade idea.

These theories were driven by two basic questions: one, by what right or need the people form "states", and, what the best form for a "state" could be. These large fundamental questions involved a conceptual distinction between the concepts of "state" and "government". Basically "state" refers to a set of enduring institutions through which power is distributed and its use justified. The term "government" refers to a specific group of people who occupy these institutions, and exercise particular politics. This conceptual distinction continues to operate in Political science, although some Political Scientists, Philosophers, historians and cultural anthropologists have argued that most political action in any given society occurs outside of its state, and that there are societies that are not organized into states which nevertheless must be considered politically.

Political and economic relations were drastically changed by these views as the guild was subordinated to the free trade, and Roman Catholic dominance of theology was increasingly challenged by protestant churches subordinate to each nation-state and, which preached in the "vulgar" or native language of each region.92

**Industrialization and the Modern Era philosophy:** Through the 19th century and early 20th century, political philosophy was dominated by debates about
capitalism versus socialism, and religion versus science. After World War I, there arose an emerging concern with peace and war, as conflict grew increasingly destructive. The emergence of communism and fascism was the dominant concern of the west in this period. Karl Marx and his theory of communism developed along with Friedrich Engel is proved to be one of the most influential political ideologies of the 20th century. The industrial revolution produced a parallel revolution in Political thought. Urbanization and capitalism greatly reshaped society. During this same period, the socialist movement began to form. In the mid-19th century, Marxism was developed, and socialism in general gained increasing popular support, mostly from the urban working class. By the late 19th century, socialism and trade unions were established members of the political landscape. In addition, the various branches of anarchism and syndicalism also gained some prominence. In the Anglo American world, Anti-Imperialism and Pluralism began gaining currency at the turn of the century.

World War I was a watershed event in human history. The Russian Revolution of 1917 (and similar, albeit less successful, revolutions in many other European countries) brought communism and in particular the political theory of Leninism, but also on a smaller level luxemburgism (gradually) on the world stage. At the same time, social democratic parties won elections and formed governments for the first time, often as a result of the World War II.

In response to the sweeping social changes that occurred in the years after the war, ultra-reactionary ideologies such as fascism began to take shape. In particular, the rise of the Nazis in Germany would later lead to the World War II. All political thought was deeply affected by the Great Depression which led many theorists to reconsider the ideas they had previously held as axiomatic. In the United States, President Franklin D. Roosevelt introduced the New Deal. In Europe, both the extreme left and the extreme right gained increasing popularity.
Contemporary Philosophy: Much of contemporary political philosophy is centered around the debate between liberalism and communitarianism—the interplay between the rights of individuals and the interests of societies and communities as a whole. After World War II Political Philosophy moved into a temporary eclipse in the Anglo-American academic world, as analytical Philosophers expressed skepticism about the possibility that normative judgments had cognitive content and Political Science turned toward Statistical methods and behaviouralism. The 1950s saw pronouncements of the ‘death’ of the discipline, followed by debates about that thesis. A handful of continental European émigrés to Britain and the United States including Hannah Arendt, Karl Popper, Friedrich Hayek, Leo Strauss, Isaiah Berlin, Eric Voegelin and Judith Shklar encouraged continued study in the field, but in the 1950s and 60s they and their students remained somewhat marginal in their disciplines.

Communism remained an important focus especially during the 1950s and 60s. Zionism, racism and colonialism were important issues that arose. The rise of Feminism and the end of colonial rule and of the political exclusion of such minorities as African American in the developed world has led to feminist, post modernism postcolonial, and multicultural thought becoming significant. Soon after, there was a major revival of academic political philosophy as a result of the publication of John Rawls’s a theory of justice in 1971 is considered a milestone. Rawls also offered a criticism of utilitarian approaches to questions of political justice. Robert Nozick’s book Anarchy, State, and Utopia (1974) responded to Rawls from a libertarian perspective.

Contemporaneously with the rise of analytic ethics in Anglo-American thought, in Europe several new lines of philosophy directed at critique of existing societies arose between the 1950s and 1980s. Many of these took elements of Marxist economic analysis, but combined them with a more cultural or ideological emphasis. Out of the Frankfurt school, thinkers like Herbert Marcuse, Theodor W. Adorno, Max Horkheimer, and Jurgen Habermas combined Marxian and Freudian perspectives. Along somewhat different lines,
a number of other continental thinkers still largely influenced by Marxism—put new emphases on structuralism and on a "return to Hegel". Within the (post) structuralist line (through mostly not taking that label) are thinkers such as Gilles Deleuze, Michel Foucault, Claude Lefort and Jean Baudrillard. The situationists were more influenced by Hegel; Guy Debord, in particular, moved a Marxist analysis of commodity fetishism to the realm of consumption, and looked at the relation between consumerism and dominant ideology formation.

Another debate developed around the (distinct) criticisms of liberal political theory made by Michael Sandel and Charles Taylor. The liberalism-communitarianism debate is often considered valuable for generating a new set of philosophical problems, rather than a profound and illuminating clash of perspectives. Today most debates regarding punishment and law centre on the question of natural law and the degree to which human constraints on action are determined by nature, as revealed by science in particular. Other debates focus on questions of cultural and gender identity as central to politics.

**POSITION OF THEMES IN POLITICAL PHILOSOPHY IN GENERAL**

**Human Nature**

Human nature refers to the essential and immutable character of all human beings. It highlights what is innate and natural about human life, as opposed to what human beings have gained from education or through social experience. Most thinkers are clearly aware that human beings are complex, multifaceted creatures, made up of biological, physical, psychological, intellectual, social and perhaps spiritual elements. It is important to mention that in no sense is human nature a description or scientific concept. Even though theories of human nature may claim an empirical or scientific basis, no experiment or surgical investigation is able to uncover the human essence. A model of human nature is therefore normative; they are constructed out of philosophical and moral assumptions, and are therefore in principle untestable.
Endless discussions have taken place about the nature of human beings. In particular, are human beings naturally selfish and egoistical, or are they essentially cooperative, altruistic and sociable? Such considerations are crucial in determining the proper organization of economic and social life, including the distribution of wealth and other resources.\(^{100}\)

**Pluralism**

The term pluralism is used in two senses, one broader and the other narrower. In its broader sense, pluralism is a belief in or a commitment to, diversity or multiplicity (the existence of many things). As a descriptive term, pluralism may be used to denote the existence of party competition (Political pluralism), a multiplicity of ethnical values (moral pluralism) or a variety of cultural norms (cultural pluralism). As a normative term, it suggests that diversity is healthy and desirable, usually because it safeguards individual liberty and promotes debates, argument and understanding. More narrowly, pluralism is a theory of distribution of political power. It holds that power is widely dispersed in society rather than concentrated in the hands of an elite or a ruling class. In this form, pluralism is usually seen as a theory of group politics in which individuals are represented largely through their membership of organized groups, and all such groups have access to the policy process.\(^{101}\)

**Civil Society**

The term civil society has been defined in a variety of ways; originally it means a ‘political community’, a society governed by law, under the authority of a state. More commonly it is distinguished from the state and the term is used to describe institutions that are private in that they are independent from government and organized by individuals in pursuit of their own ends. Civil society therefore refers to a realm of autonomous groups and associations: business, interest groups, clubs, families and so on.

The term global civil society refers to transnational organizations, such as NGOs and social movements that are private, non profit making, self
governing and voluntary. The emergence of a new generation of social movements practicing new style of activism has significantly shifted views about the nature and significance of movement themselves. Nevertheless, the impact of civil society is difficult to assess because of the broader nature of its goals. However its influence over the process of public policy making cannot be ignored. 102

Government

In its broadest sense, to govern means to rule or control others. Government can therefore be taken to include any mechanism through which ordered rule is maintained, its central features being the ability to make collective decisions and the capacity to enforce them. A form of government can thus be identified in almost all social institutions: families, schools, businesses, trade unions and so on. However, government as opposed to 'governance' is more commonly understood to refer to the formal and institutional processes that operate at the national level to maintain public order and facilitate collective action. The core functions of the government are thus to make, implement and to interpret law. In some cases the political executive alone is referred to as the government making it equivalent to the 'administration in presidential systems. 103

War

War is a condition of open armed conflict between two or more parties (usually states). The term is also used in 'class war' trade war' and 'cold war'. The emergence of war as an organized and goal directed activity stems from the development of European states system in the early modern period. War has a formal or quasi-legal character in that the declaration of a state of war need not necessarily be accompanied by an outbreak of hostilities. The notion that war legitimizes unchecked barbarity is challenged by sometimes controversial concept of war crimes. In the post cold war era it has been common to refer to 'new' wars. These have bee characterized, variously as
being linked to inter-state ethnic conflict, the use of advanced military technology, and the challenges of dealing with non-state actors such as transnational terrorist organizations.\textsuperscript{104}

**Contract**

Literally contract means a drawing together of two or more minds to form a common intention giving rise to an agreement.

Every agreement is made of a proposal from one side and its acceptance on the other. An agreement is a promise and promise is an accepted proposal. An agreement is regarded as a contract when it is made for consideration between parties who are competent with their free consent and for lawful object. Thus every contract is an agreement, but every agreement is not a contract. An agreement grows into contract when the following conditions are satisfied:

i) There is some consideration

ii) The parties are competent to contract

iii) Their consent is free

iv) Their object is lawful

Thus, contracts originate from agreements which are intended by the parties to give rise to legal obligations.\textsuperscript{105}

**Justice**

Justice is a fundamental value of political philosophy. It has been a prime concern of philosopher of every age. It can most conveniently be divided into two aspects, ‘procedural’ justice and ‘substantive’, or ‘social justice’. Procedural justice is considerably easier to deal with as it involves relatively technical questions such as due process, fair trial and equality before law. Substantive justice refers to the overall fairness of a society, its division of rewards and burdens. Such division can be made on the basis of social efficiency, merit, desert, need or several other criteria. The principal meaning
of social justice is probably a matter of giving to people what they are entitled to or need in terms of basic social rights, food, clothing, housing etc. and therefore distributing any surplus in a fair and equitable way, and the criteria which is counted as ‘fair’ depends on previous ideological judgements.\textsuperscript{166}

Property

Property is an asset that possesses a deep and, at times almost mystical significance for conservatives. Liberals believe that the property reflects merit, those who work hard and possess talent will and should acquire wealth. Property therefore is ‘earned’.

Conservatives, however, are not prepared to go as far as laissez-faire liberals in believing that each individual has an absolute right to use their property however they may choose. While libertarian conservatives, and therefore the liberal new right support an essentially liberal view of property, conservation have argued that all rights, including property rights entail obligation. Property is not an issue for the individual alone, but also of importance to society.\textsuperscript{107}

Rights of Women

The idea of Women’s Rights is based on the assumption that the Human Rights initially developed with men in mind, so their concern should also be addressed. However, the idea of women’s rights may also be based upon the fact that women have specific needs and capacities which entitle them to rights which in relation to men would be unnecessary or simply meaningless. Such rights would include those related to child birth or child care, such as the right to prenatal maternity leave. More controversial, however, is the notion that women are entitled to a set of rights in addition to man in an attempt to compensate them, for their unequal treatment by society. For example social conventions that link child bearing and child rearing and to channel women into a domestic realm of motherhood and housework undermine their capacity to gain an education and pursue a career. In such circumstances, woman’s
rights could extend to a form of sever discrimination which seeks to rectify past injustices, by say, establishing quotas for the number of women in higher education and in certain professions. However the chief challenge to women rights movement today is their incoherence and disagreement.108

Ethics

Ethics is ordinarily regarded as a normative science, and its problem defined as the exact determination of the conditions which must be fulfilled if human violation and action are to be made moral. In this sense it can be said that the art of conduct is just as logical as the art of thought, since, however, the definition of the attribute moral cannot be purely arbitrary. Ethics at the same time has to take account of the historical development of moral judgments, and analyze the principles or ideals which it finds in actual life, to try and make its precepts rational and consistent, whether it performs this task well or ill. Ethics at any rate, always draws a distinction between conduct as it is and conduct which is enjoined, prescribed or at least desired.109

The concept of philosophy is defined variously by different thinkers ranging from love for wisdom to the rational agreement and appeal to facts. It is defined as an attempt to explain and appreciate life and the universe as a whole. Out of this broad base comprehension of the term philosophy is taken out a specific branch, termed as political philosophy. It is defined as philosophical reflection on how best to arrange our collective life.
References

2. worldnet.princeton.edu/perl/webwn
8. Frederick C. Mish, Marriam Webster Collegiate Dictionary, Encyclopedia Britannica (India) P. Ltd. Publisher, 10th Ed, USA, 2001, p. 239.
15. library.Fandm.edu/glossary.html.
17. www2.parc.com/istl/groups/hdi/sensemaking/glossary. html.


50. Ibid.


59. www.abdn.ac.uk/philosophy/guide/glossary.html
60. highered.Megraw-hill.com/sites/076742011xStudent/viewo/chapter1/glossary.html.
70. Edward Craig, *op.cit., p. 816.
72. Ibid., p. 6.
73. http://www.icp.utm.edu/polphil/
75. http://www.icp.utm.edu/polphil/
89. Ibid.
93. Ibid.


