



## **A study of political obligation in Maharashtra**

**Dr. Ashok Uttam Chothe**

Head of Dept. Political Science, New Arts, Commerce and Science College, Ahmednagar, Maharashtra, India

### **Abstract**

Whether political obligation is the central or fundamental problem of political philosophy, as some have maintained (e.g., McPherson), may well be doubted. There is no doubt, however, that the history of political thought is replete with attempts to provide a satisfactory account of political obligation, from the time of Socrates to the present. These attempts have become increasingly sophisticated in recent years, but they have brought us no closer to agreement on a solution to the problem of political obligation than the efforts of, say, Thomas Hobbes and John Locke in the seventeenth century. Nor have these sophisticated attempts made it unnecessary to look back to earlier efforts to resolve the problem. On the contrary, an appreciation of the troublesome nature of political obligation seems to require some attention to its place in the history of political thought.

**Keywords:** political obligation, political thought, widespread assent

### **Introduction**

To have a political commitment is to have an ethical obligation to comply with the laws of one's nation or state. On that point there is practically finished understanding among political savants. In any case, how can one secure such a commitment, and what numbers of individuals have truly done what is important to gain it? Or on the other hand is political commitment more a matter of being than of doing — that is, of essentially being an individual from the nation or state being referred to? To those inquiries numerous answers have been given, and none presently directions across the board consent. To be sure, various contemporary political scholars deny that an acceptable hypothesis of political commitment either has been or can be conceived. Others, notwithstanding, keep on accepting that there is an answer for what is generally called "the issue of political commitment," and they are by and by occupied with vivacious discussion with the cynics as well as with each other on the subject of which hypothesis, assuming any, gives the answer for the issue. Regardless of whether political commitment is the focal or key issue of political way of thinking, as some have kept up (e.g., McPherson), likely could be questioned. There is no uncertainty, in any case, that the historical backdrop of political idea is packed with endeavors to give an agreeable record of political commitment, from the season of Socrates to the present. These endeavors have turned out to be progressively modern lately, yet they have presented to us no closer to concession to an answer for the issue of political commitment than the endeavors of, state, Thomas Hobbes and John Locke in the seventeenth century. Nor have these advanced endeavors made it pointless to think back to prior endeavors to determine the issue. Despite what might be expected, energy about the irksome idea of political commitment appears to require some regard for its place throughout the entire existence of political idea.

This exposition starts, along these lines, with a concise history of the issue of political commitment. It at that point turns, in Part II, to the reasonable inquiries raised by

political commitment, for example, what it implies for a commitment to be political. In Part III the emphasis is on the doubters, with specific regard for oneself announced philosophical revolutionaries, who deny that political commitments exist yet would prefer not to nullify the state. Part IV studies the main contenders among the different hypotheses of political commitment currently on offer, and Part V finishes up the article with a concise thought of ongoing proposition for pluralistic or "various standard" approaches.

### **Political obligation in historical perspective**

The expression "political commitment" is obviously no more established than T. H. Green's Lectures on the Principles of Political Obligation, conveyed at Oxford University in 1879–80 (D'Entrèves, p. 3). The two words from which Green framed the expression are a lot more seasoned, obviously, and he clearly imagined that consolidating them required no detailed clarification or safeguard. Regardless, there was nothing novel about the issue Green tended to in his talks: "to find the genuine ground or support for compliance to law" (Green 1986, p. 13). Sophocles brought this issue up in his play *Antigone*, first performed around 440 BCE, and Plato's *Crito* describes Socrates' philosophical reaction to the issue, even with his very own passing, exactly forty years after the fact.

### **Philosophical anarchism**

The contentions of these philosophical rebels take either a "from the earlier" or an "a posteriori" structure (Simmons 2001, pp. 104–106). Contentions of the primary kind keep up that it is difficult to give an agreeable record of a general commitment to comply with the law. As per Robert Paul Wolff, the chief backer of this view, there can be no broad commitment to comply with the law in light of the fact that any such commitment would abuse the "essential commitment" of independence, which is "the refusal to be ruled" (1998 [1970], p. 18). As Wolff characterizes it, self-governance consolidates opportunity with duty. To be self-

governing, somebody must have the limit with regards to decision, and hence for opportunity; yet the individual who has this limit additionally has the duty to practice it — to act self-rulingly. Neglecting to do as such is to neglect to satisfy this "essential commitment" of self-governance.

### Conclusion

As yet there has been little reaction to these attempts to fuse approaches and draw on multiple principles in the attempt to provide a satisfactory theory of political obligation (but see Edmundson 2004, pp. 250–52). Those who doubt that such a theory can be constructed, however, are likely to say that combining principles, whether in hybrid or pluralist fashion, will not help, for combining a set of principles that are unsatisfactory individually will hardly produce a strong and satisfying theory (Simmons 2007, n. 17). On the other hand, those who believe that political obligation is fundamentally a problem of showing that those who live in a polity governed by the rule of law do indeed have a *general* obligation to obey its laws, rather than a bundle of obligations to obey its laws severally, in piecemeal fashion (e.g., Mapel 2005), are likely to see no need for a plurality of principles. Whether a plurality of principles is necessary or even desirable, in sum, remains one of many open questions with regard to the vexing problem of political obligation.

### References

1. Arneson, Richard. "The Principle of Fairness and Free-Rider Problems," *Ethics*. 1982; 92:616-33.
2. Bell Nora K. "Nozick and the Principle of Fairness," *Social Theory and Practice*. 1978; 5:65-73.
3. Carr, Craig. "Fairness and Political Obligation," *Social Theory and Practice*. 2002; 28:1-28.
4. Christiano, Thomas. *The Constitution of Equality: Democratic Authority and Its Limits*, Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2008.
5. Dagger, Richard. *Civic Virtues: Rights, Citizenship, and Republican Liberalism*, New York: Oxford University Press, 1997.
6. "Membership, Fair Play, and Political Obligation," *Political Studies*. 2000; 48:104-17.
7. McConnell, Terrance. *Gratitude*, Philadelphia, PA: Temple University Press, 1993.
8. McDermott, Daniel. "Fair-Play Obligations," *Political Studies*. 2004; 52:216-32.
9. Sartorius, Rolf. *Individual Conduct and Social Norms*, Belmont, CA, 1975.
10. Waldron, Jeremy. "Special Ties and Natural Duties," *Philosophy and Public Affairs*, 22: 3–30; reprinted in W. A. Edmundson (ed.), *The Duty to Obey the Law*, 1993.
11. "Kant's Legal Positivism," *Harvard Law Review*. 1996; 109:1535-66.
12. *Law and Disagreement*, Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1999.
13. Walker ADM. "Political Obligation and the Argument from Gratitude," *Philosophy and Public Affairs*. 1988; 17:191-211.
14. "Obligations of Gratitude and Political Obligation," *Philosophy and Public Affairs*. 1989; 18:359-64.
15. Walton, Kevin. "The Particularities of Legitimacy: John Simmons on Political Obligation," *Ratio Juris*. 2013; 26:1-15.
16. Wellman, Christopher Heath. "Associative Allegiances and Political Obligations," *Social Theory and Practice*. 1997; 23:181-204.
17. "Samaritanism and the Duty to Obey the Law," in C. H. Wellman and A. J. Simmons, *Is There a Duty to Obey the Law?* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2005.
18. *Liberal Rights and Responsibilities: Essays on Citizenship and Sovereignty*, Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2014.
19. Wolff, Jonathan. "Political Obligation, Fairness and Independence," *Ratio (New Series)*. 1995; 8:87-99.
20. "Anarchism and Skepticism," in J. T. Sanders and J. Narveson (eds.), *For and Against the State*, 1996.
21. "Political Obligation: A Pluralistic Approach," in *Pluralism: The Philosophy and Politics of Diversity*, M. Baghamrian and A. Ingram (eds.), London: Routledge, 2000.
22. Wolff, Robert Paul. [1970]. *In Defense of Anarchism*, 3<sup>rd</sup> edition, Berkeley: University of California Press, 1998. s