

INTELLECTUAL CITIZEN

Dr Gurudutta P Japee

Associate Professor, S. D. School of Commerce
Gujarat University, Ahmedabad-380008

Abstract

Human beings are the only beings in this universe that question the very basic existence of something by asking the “Why” question. To qualify someone as intellectual he/she must be critical. Fundamental question is How power governs our desire, our experiences? What are the conditionalities that generates society to be moulded in a certain way? What is the role of the intellectuals? How our assigned meaning changes by the power? All questions are answered in this paper with clear distinction between intellectual and intellectual slavery.

Keywords: intellectual, democracy, slavery, critical space, rationalism

INTRODUCTION

Democracy poses major problems; it has done from since the beginning of ancient past, and it still does today. The most important and difficult problems are of moral nature. One problem that always causes confusion and assumes the aspect of ‘people’s rule’. So many people think that this latter term is important for the theory of forms of state, which we in world today call democracies. It was all started from Greek, they gave various forms of state administration- evidently because they wanted to ask which of the possible forms of government was good or bad, better, or worse. They arrived at five names for constitutions, according to the moral qualities of the rulers. The idea was much used by Plato, who presented it in the following manner.

1 and 2 Monarchy: rule by one good man, and its distorted form, tyranny – rule by one bad man.

3 and 4 Aristocracy: rule by a few good men, and its distorted form, oligarchy- rule by a few not so good.

5 Democracy: rule by the people, the many, the multitude. In this case Plato identified only one form, which is bad because among the many there are always many bad people. Winston Churchill’s ironic jest is very fitting to the present circumstances of the democracy of the world. “Democracy is the worst form of government, except of course all the others forms of government”.

The difference between democracy as popular rule and democracy as popular judgement is by no means purely verbal but also has practical orientations. This can be seen in the fact that the idea of popular rule leads to support and proportional representation. The argument here in that every current of opinion, every small party, should be represented so that popular representation is a mirror of the people and the idea of popular government becomes as far as possible a reality. It is dreadful proposal to allow every citizen, simply pressing electric button, to vote directly on every point debated by his or her representative on a television screen. It is also said that, from the point of view of democracy as popular rule, citizen’s initiatives should be seen in a very positive light.

Democracy as popular judgement, however, the situation looks rather different. The proliferation of parties is a very bad thing, as so too is proportional representation at elections. The fragmentations of parties lead to coalition governments in which no one takes responsibility before the people’s court, because nothing is ever more than a compromise. It also becomes uncertain whether a government can be removed, because all a government has to do to stay in power is find another little coalition partner. If there are few parties, governments are usually majority governments, and their responsibility is clear for all to see. The strongest objection to the theory of popular sovereignty is that it promotes an irrationalism. For it is an authoritarian and relativist superstition that the people cannot be wrong or act unjustly. It is a vague assertion.

INTELLECTUAL CITIZEN

The idea of orthodoxy and heresy harbours the prettiest of vices- ones to which intellectuals are particularly susceptible, the vices of arrogance, thinking they are always right, pedantry, intellectual vanity. These are pretty vices, not as serious cruelty. But even cruelty is not altogether unknown among intellectuals. In this regard the entire role and responsibilities of the intellectuals is changed which they need freedom to prevent the state from abusing its power, and state to prevent the abuse of freedom. Irresponsible intellectuals have managed to see only evil in the world. They founded a new religion which teaches that our world is unjust and

will inevitably declining. They succeeded in overturning not only the evidence but the objective truth. Intellectuals should accept their responsibility for mankind and for the truth.

It is the dictatorial power that shakes intellectual to think or execute. To be a intellectual is capital for the society. To be intellectual is to be critical. Critical insight is not something apriori therefore it is not considered as context free. Any struggling point which subsumes democracy becomes the context for reflections or invites reflections. It involves people that becomes a struggling point to contemplate that injustice is done to the society and environment. To qualify someone as intellectual he/she must be critical.

Fundamental question is How power governs our desire, our experiences?

What are the conditionalities that generates society to be moulded in a certain way?

What is the role of the intellectuals?

How our assigned meaning changes by the power?

Intellectuals they try to understand the functionalities and conditionalities of assigned meaning and expression. Intellectuals are the one who finds the struggling points and finds how assigned meaning is changed by the power, that would become the content of contemplation.

Intellectuals finds legitimate contents by inquiring it in a rational manner. In short job of intellectuals is to question, power that, why and how assigned meaning of the thing is changed, because of change in assigned meaning, experience of people changes which is also noticed by intellectuals on an existential ground. Changes in experience leads to change in the expression of people. Power receives social authenticity, as mediocracy is more supportive to the power. These collectively formation is something, which is not singular but plural, this plurality results in contradictory versions. Contradictory versions refer to self and its relations, Self and society, Self and others etc. Ultimately, it will generate contradictory society.

To Understand, interpret, and act upon is the job of intellectuals in contradictory society. To be critical is not only to criticise but to construct. Constructive criticism is the job of intellectuals. To be intellectuals is not to be sophist. Intellectuals have to formulate culture of belief, culture of practices, culture of social relations to control the conduct of power.

Mission of intellectuals is to govern and nurture democratic society which takes seriously worship and execute equity, justice, shared values, and freedom. They have to produce or construct critical agents and critical mass. The said job is formative work of the intellectuals. Creating such masses are indispensable for democratic society to survive and will yield freedom. Power is necessarily vaded to triumphalism and the economic growth. Triumphalism and economic growth create hypnosis which negates reasoning and rationality of people, not only that the irrational claim would sound as rational by subsuming pseudo rationalism. it consumes collective freedom which is treated as victory or triumph. Will to power is the hardcore of consumed victory. And its claim is totalitarian. It opens the gate of totalitarian power as it is not shared power nor a judgemental power. They snub the people's voice and choice. It is a kind of subjugation of power, and that is the reason why intellectuals are required in society, because they will yield democratic reason where rationalism is liberal, where the voice of the other is an educative phenomenon, where the voice of the people is crushed under the power. This is the hope that intellectuals can create. This is the domain of constructive rationalism because it aspires for and give space to voice the other. They respect the non-singular panorama of thought. This is a creative space necessary for democratic discourse.

Role of an intellectual is two-fold one is to be critical about power and other is constrictive to have a non-marginal space. Intellectual has to create a democratic space. This is exactly the ethics of hope because it demands genuinity, and courage to think where in disagreement is or should be the voice of respect. Silence is not modus operendi of rationality but respecting the voice of the other is the prime essence of rationality and it ought to be a faith of intellectuals.

People should not be treated as cheerful robots which are vaded to instrumental rationality. It is a set of structure and more a skill to use about. Pre specified matter or material rationality (Instrumental rationality). It is a kind of skill to create an order which would provide a formal frame. Instrumental rationality will shun criticality, or it would debar critical space which is the basic demand of democracy. Intellectual has to provide critical space. Structured silence should also be removed from the democracy by the intellectuals else it will lead to dictatorship.

HOW INTELLECTUAL DIFFERS FROM INTELLECTUAL SLAVE

Despite of knowing the difference between questions of origin and questions of validity. Intellectual slave do not test the validity of an assertion or information by tracing its sources or its origin.

Intellectuals organize political institutions such a way that bad or incompetent rulers cannot do too much damage to society, however intellectual slave contributes to organizational/ institutional crisis, further they also not address legitimacy crisis.

Intellectual slave fails to distinguish 'critical rationalism' and 'uncritical rationalism' or 'comprehensive rationalism'. However, uncritical rationalism principle is inconsistent. It is analogues to the paradox of the liar and it can be defeated by its own chosen weapon, argument which remain absent in intellectual slave.

It is moral decision for intellectuals to adopt more or less radical form of irrationalism which is critical rationalism, this will deeply affect our whole attitude towards the problem of society. Intellectual and intellectual slave shows clearly by choice between critical rationalism and irrationalism.

There is a meagre difference among intellectual and intellectual slavery is that the later took choices unethically and immorally while the earlier is more critical and constructive both ethically and morally. Reflections are often considered accountable by the intellectual slave.

REFERENCES

- [1] Japee, G.P. (2017), The Class Act, Authors Press, New Delhi
- [2] Japee, G. P. (2019). Predicament of Knowledge Society: An Inquiry. International Journal of Interreligious and Intercultural Studies, 2(2), 60-67.
- [3] Japee, G. P. (2015). Building quality education in India-a review and conceptual model. ZENITH International Journal of Multidisciplinary Research, 5(12), 17-23.
- [4] Miller, David (1985), Popper Selections, Princeton University Press, New Jersey.
- [5] Pooper, K (2000), Lessons of this century, with two talks on freedom and the democratic state, Routledge, London and New York.
- [6] Pooper, K (2000), reflections on the theory and practice of the democratic state, Lessons of this century, with two talks on freedom and the democratic state, Routledge, London, and New York. Pg. 68-69
- [7] Pooper, K (2000), Freedom and Intellectual responsibility, Lessons of this century, with two talks on freedom and the democratic state, Routledge, London and New York. Pg. 84-90