


Part - II
Section - A

Question No 3

34

1 Introduction

Social contract theories were given by the philosophers to formulate states to protect the rights of the people. These theorists mostly arised during the period of Renaissance and enlightenment. However Utilitarianism came in response of existing social contracts. These theorists believe - that state must formulate useful laws and that laws can be guage through their impacts on people. According to utilitarianism the laws only applicable they are useful.



2 Understanding the term Utilitarianism and social contract

Utilitarianism is term in political science which means the usefulness

of any law. Basically, utilitarian philosopher suggested the parliament about law making. According to them, parliament must carry out law making which positively impact on people.

On the other hand, social contract means people and community formulate a law (state) for protection of their rights. This is called a social contract. In simple words, a contract between the people and a state authority is called a social contract.

3. Differences between Social Contract Theorists and Utilitarian philosophers

3.1) Human Nature

a) Social Contract theorist

According to social contract theorists, human nature is brutish, selfish, naive and even good. Different theorists described human nature differently. e.g. According to Hobbes human is

brutish and selfish while Locke said is civilized, good. ~~but~~ Similarly J.J Rousseau considers human nature not good nor bad but naive.

b) ~~Utilitarian~~ Utilitarian philosophers

Utilitarian philosophers such as Jeremy Bentham human nature is self and influenced by pain and pleasure.

3.2 state of Nature

a) Social contract theorists:- They gave different models of state of nature.

~~They~~^{Some} said state of nature was pre political and pre-social i.e. there was no norms, values or any law at the beginning. Others believe that state of nature was pre-social i.e. the norms and values have been existing even before the existence of state.

b) Utilitarian philosophers:

They did not discussed the state of nature as such but by default, according to them the state of nature was naive it was moulded by fear and love afterward.

3.3 Nature of Contract

a) Social contract theorist. Nature of contract of social contract differently given by social contract theorists such as Hobbes, Locke and Rousseau. In Hobbes contract, Leviathan was sovereign and contract was unilateral; however, Locke gave idea that contract can be reversed.

b) Utilitarian philosophers.

The philosophers like Jean Bodin and Jeremy Bentham the state i.e. social contract will only be valid if its laws are useful. In short, social contract in the eye of utilitarian philosopher only depends on its utility. Otherwise, contract will be reversed.

3.4 Thoughts on Sovereignty:

a) Social contract theorist:

According to these theorists sovereignty belongs to different entities e.g.

According to Hobbes, Leviathan was sovereign, and Locke says people are sovereign while Rousseau considers General will as the sovereign.

b) Utilitarian philosophers:

According to utilitarian philosophers, parliament is the sovereign for law making but people can make parliament accountable if its no utility remains.

3.5 Thoughts on government

a) Social contract theorists

Again different social contract theorists differently gave the idea of government. For example, According to Hobbes government is end not mean, while Locke made two stage contract for establishing government which is mean i.e. it has to protect individuals rights.


b) Utilitarian philosophers:

Utilitarian philosophers such as Jeremy Bentham says government is mean to achieve individual rights and protection. The utility of government is pre requisite otherwise government will be

will be finished.

4. Conclusion

Utilitarian philosophers focus on formulating laws which ~~are~~ were useful for people while the social contract theorists gave the concept of establishing a state-~~society~~ broadly. The people contacted and formulated contracts among-themselves to gain happiness, this is according to social contract theorists. The utilitarian philosophers suggest the parliaments to make good laws.



Question No. 4

I Introduction

Montesquieu is one of the greatest philosophers of political science who is also considered as the Aristotle of 18th Century. He gave theory of separation of power

for running a state smoothly. Montesquieu gave his theory of separation of power i.e. according to him a state must have three organs, the Executive, Judiciary and Legislature. Legislature will formulate laws, executive will implement while judiciary will interpret these laws.

2 Context:

In 18th century, there were significant changes taking place, The Monarchies were being replaced by parliaments. Thus, it was not clear as how to do law making for a parliamentary states. For example, The USA got independent in 1776, and similarly, kings and monarchs were being weakened. So, in this context came the Montesquieu who gave his theory of separation of power to run a state smoothly.

3. What was Montesquieu's theory of separation of power

According to Montesquieu, a state must have three independent organ in order to run smoothly.

3.1 Legislature:

Montesquieu says legislature will make laws for a state. These are elected people who have mandate of the people. Their work is to do legislation for a country. This is an independent organ of the state. Today, almost every country has a legislature with different names, for example, majlis-e shura in Pakistan and Islamic Consultative assembly in Iran. Similarly, parliament (Lok Sabha) in India and congress in the United States of America.

3.2 Judicature:

According to Montesquieu Judicature will interpret laws.

The legislature make laws and judiciary interpret these laws.

This is an independent organ.

Whenever or wherever a law

go against established contract

ie constitution, judiciary makes

sure that such a law can

be curbed (null and void). Today,

we can witness, each modern

state has an independent judiciary.

From United states to India

and from Turkey to France


every the concept of independent

judiciary exists.

3.3 Executive.

Montesquieu's third organ of the state is executive. He says, legislature do law making and independent judiciary interpret those laws but another branch called executive will execute

these laws. Today, executive exists in all states with different names. For example, Executive in the USA is president while in United Kingdom it is Prime minister. Similarly, in Saudi Arabia it is king while in Germany its Chancellor.



Montesquieu's theory of separation of power

of ~~Conclusion~~ /
Montes

4. Why ~~Aristotle~~ Montesquieu* is considered to be Aristotle of 18th century


Montesquieu is called Aristotle of 18th century because they both have worked realistically in the field of political science.

Aristotle practically read and observed different states and their constitutions and -thus separated different types of states. According to him there were six type of states such as Monarchy, tyranny, oligarchy, etc.

In a similar manner, Montesquieu practically observed and suggested separation of power inside a state for smooth working of state. That's why, Montesquieu is called or considered to be the Aristotle of 18th century.

5. Conclusion

Montesquieu was a great philosopher of political science. He gave his theory of separation of power which is accurately working even today. The similarities of working and thinking level makes him the Aristotle of 18th century. In fact, Had there been no power separation concept, there would have no smooth function modern state. Montesquieu's contribution in political science is worth important.




Section - B

Question No. 8

1 Introduction

Political parties and pressure groups are inter linked. Sometimes they complement ~~each~~ while sometimes they conflict each other. Political parties usually lead the state policies while they are in government. Pressure groups know the internal working of government. They sometimes even have members inside political parties. In short, political parties and pressure groups are inter-related with each other.



2 Understanding the term political parties and pressure groups

Political parties are organized and like minded people who have an ideology, purpose and a structure. On the other hand, Pressure

groups are small like minded group of people which works for a specific purpose.

pressure groups can be work for their self interests. Sometimes, they work for common cause of people. For example, Green Worker in the west work as a pressure group compell governments to work for climate change mitigation. In short, political parties and pressure groups are different entities but sometimes their interests can be similar and sometime they become opposing parties depending on the situation.

3 Relationships between political parties and Pressure groups

3.1 Membership

Both political parties and pressure groups have permanent members. The membership of political parties


are larger than that of pressure groups.

3.2 Ideology:

Political parties and pressure groups both have ideology, however, the pressure groups have limited ideology. They can change their ideology after getting some specific purpose.

3.3 Hierarchical structure:

Political system have a hierarchical structure while pressure groups mostly do not have this.



3.4 Purpose:

A specific purpose of both political parties and pressure groups exists. For example, to gain political power in a country is the main purpose of a political party.

3.5 Types

Both political parties and pressure groups have different types. This is another common relationship of these two entities. For example, conservative and democratic are different types of political parties. They have different ideologies.

4. How Political parties and pressure groups complement and conflict with each other.

A. Point of complements.

i- Vision and purpose.

When both political parties and pressure groups have same vision and purpose, then they complement with each other.

ii- Same Interest.

For the sake of same interests, both political parties and pressure groups help each other. For example, passing a bill from assembly which is suitable for both

then they complement each other in such a case.

iii- Same Tactics:

If both pressure group and political parties confluence in same tactics for a work which is in their interest then they both will complement each other.

iv- Lobbying for the same cause:-

Both pressure groups and political parties will lobby to pass such a policy which suits the cause of both equally. As is aforementioned, points, both political parties and pressure groups will complement each other.

B Points of conflict b/w political parties and pressure groups in policy making.

i- Different Interests:-

When the interests of both pressure group and political party become different, then conflict

arise between them during policy making process.

ii- Ideological conflict:

When a policy is ideologically conflicting with anyone's basic ideology. In such a ~~condition~~ situation pressure conflict arise between groups and a political party.

iii-

Sometimes, adversarial behaviours of leaders become the reason of conflict between a pressure group and a political party.

5. Conclusion

Political parties and pressure groups are closely linked but have wide differences as well. They complement each other during policy making process when their interests, ideology and vision confluence. However, conflict arise between them in policy making process when different interests and ideological

conflicts exists. Thus, pressure groups ⁱⁿ ~~exist~~ policy making sometimes complement while sometimes conflict with political parties.

Question No. 7

1 Introduction

Sovereignty has evolved in many ways. From ancient times, the concept of sovereignty existed. Aristotle called it the absolute power. Similarly, Jean Bodin and Thomas Hobbes advocated powerful and singular sovereignty. However, many modern philosophers like Jane Austin advocated pluralistic sovereignty. Therefore, evolution of sovereignty can be understood by understanding its evolutionary process.

3

Evolution of concept of sovereignty

3.1

Sovereignty in Ancient times

Sovereignty in the words of Aristotle is a supreme power.

In simple words, sovereignty in ancient time was a singular entity that had the absolute power.

3.2

Concept of Sovereignty by Bodin and Hobbes.

Jean Bodin and Thomas Hobbes advocated the power sovereign that was the head of state. For example, Hobbes called the sovereign a Leviathan who rule the state single handedly.

3.3

Islam's concept of sovereignty.

Islam says, sovereignty belongs to Allah Almighty alone.

The power given to ruler

are bestowed by Allah to man; The real sovereign is Almighty Allah

3.4 Concept of sovereignty in Modern times

The modern ~~pluralist~~ pluralistic theorist say there is no single sovereign. Now there are multiple sovereign entities.

For example, in this globalized world, a single government cannot do all things single handedly. Each department has sovereign with its own rule and regulation.

NGOs, INGOs and other international organization also negate the monistic theory of sovereignty.

4 Affects of Globalization on the Relevance of Absolute Sovereignty


4.1 Globalization itself negate concept of absolute sovereignty:-

A global world mean there is

no single power. e.g. European Union, no one is sovereign in EU mandates from among its members.

4.2 Global Trade:

No single country or entity is sovereign in trade matters globally.



4.3 Technology

Technology also negates the absolute sovereignty today, the world has become a borderless village.

4.4 Global Recession and Inflation:

No sovereign country or entity can stop a global recession or inflation because the world is interconnected.

The example of 2007 recession is a manifestation of this.

5. Conclusion.

Sovereignty was considered a single supreme authority in ancient times.

This concept, slowly and gradually evolved and today pluralistic theorists argue and globalization manifests that sovereignty is no longer absolute and single. It has been divided between different entities in this globalized world.

