

Chapter 1 : Project MUSE - Intelligent Uses of Engineering and the Legitimacy of State Power

Different Western states have different policies regarding ransom payments: the United States, Canada, and the United Kingdom refuse to pay ransom, whereas most European countries do. This discrepancy in policies among friendly nations often also leads to increased friction among allies.

The main function of political legitimacy, on this interpretation, is to explain the difference between merely effective or de facto authority and legitimate authority. John Locke put forward such an interpretation of legitimacy. The solution to this problem is a social contract that transfers political authority to a civil state that can realize and secure the natural law. According to Locke, and contrary to his predecessor Thomas Hobbes, the social contract thus does not create authority. Political authority is embodied in individuals and pre-exists in the state of nature. The social contract transfers the authority they each enjoy in the state of nature to a particular political body. While political authority thus pre-exists in the state of nature, legitimacy is a concept that is specific to the civil state. Because the criterion of legitimacy that Locke proposes is historical, however, what counts as legitimate authority remains connected to the state of nature. The legitimacy of political authority in the civil state depends, according to Locke, on whether the transfer of authority has happened in the right way. Locke understands the consent criterion to apply not just to the original institutionalization of a political authority—what Rawls It also applies to the ongoing evaluation of the performance of a political regime—Rawls. Although Locke emphasises consent, consent is not, however, sufficient for legitimate authority because an authority that suspends the natural law is necessarily illegitimate e. On some interpretations of Locke e. Pitkin, consent is not even necessary for legitimate political authority; it is only a marker of illegitimacy. Whether an actual political regime respects the constraints of the natural law is thus at least one factor that determines its legitimacy. This criterion of legitimacy is negative: When a political authority fails to secure consent or oversteps the boundaries of the natural law, it ceases to be legitimate and, therefore, there is no longer an obligation to obey its commands. For Locke—unlike for Hobbes—political authority can thus not be absolute. John Simmons uses them to argue that we should distinguish between the moral justification of states in general and the political legitimacy of actual states. I will come back to this point in section 3. Joseph Raz links legitimacy to the justification of political authority. According to Raz, political authority is just a special case of the more general concept of authority, . He defines authority in relation to a claim—of a person or an agency—to generate what he calls pre-emptive reasons. Such reasons replace other reasons for action that people might have. For example, if a teacher asks her students to do some homework, she expects her say-so to give the students reason to do the homework. Authority is effective, on this view, if it gets people to act on the reasons it generates. Legitimate authority satisfies what Raz calls the pre-emption thesis: There are limits to what even a legitimate authority can rightfully order others to do, which is why it does not necessarily replace all relevant reasons. When is effective or de facto authority legitimate? In other words, what determines whether the pre-emption thesis is satisfied? In full, the normal justification thesis says: The normal justification thesis explains why those governed by a legitimate authority ought to treat its directives as binding. It thus follows as a corollary of the normal justification thesis that such an authority generates a duty to be obeyed. Note that even though legitimate authority is defined as a special case of effective authority, only the former is appropriately described as a serving its subjects. Illegitimate—but effective—authority does not serve those it aims to govern, although it may purport to do so. William Edmundson formulates this way of linking authority and legitimacy via a condition he calls the warranty thesis: The idea expressed by the warranty thesis is that legitimacy morally justifies an independently existing authority such that the claims of the authority become moral obligations. As Leslie Green puts it: According to a second important interpretation, by contrast, the main function of legitimacy is precisely to justify coercive power. For an excellent discussion of the two interpretations of legitimacy and a defense of the coercion-based interpretation, see Ripstein ; see also Hampton On coercion-based interpretations, the main problem that a conception of legitimacy aims to solve is how to distinguish the rightful use of political power from mere coercion. One way to capture the thought is that, on these views, legitimacy relates to the way in which the

rightful use of political power creates or constitutes political authority. Again, there are different ways in which this idea might be understood. Both manners of creating a sovereign are equally legitimate. And political authority will be legitimate as long as the sovereign ensures the protection of the citizens, as Hobbes believes that the natural right to self-preservation cannot be relinquished Leviathan, chapter Beyond that, however, there can be no further questions about the legitimacy of the sovereign. It might even be argued that Hobbes fails to distinguish between legitimate authority and the mere exercise of power Korsgaard Another way in which the relation between legitimacy and the creation of authority may be understood is that the attempt to rule without legitimacy is an attempt to exercise coercive powerâ€”not authority. Rousseau contrasts a legitimate social order with a system of rules that is merely the expression of power. Coercive power is primarily a feature of the civil state. While there are some forms of coercive power even in the state of natureâ€”for example the power of parents over their childrenâ€”Rousseau assumes that harmful coercive power arises primarily in the civil state and that this creates the problem of legitimacy. Such a state would be legitimate. Legitimate political authority is created by convention, reached within the civil state. Specifically, Rousseau suggests that legitimacy arises from the democratic justification of the laws of the civil state Social Contract I: For Kant, as for Hobbes, political authority is created by the establishment of political institutions in the civil state. It does not pre-exist in individuals in the state of nature. What exists in the pre-civil social state, according to Kant, is the moral authority of each individual qua rational being and a moral obligation to form a civil state. It helps people conform to certain rules by eliminating what today would be called the free-riding problem or the problem of partial compliance. The civil state, according to Kant, establishes the rights necessary to secure equal freedom. Unlike for Locke and his contemporary followers, however, coercive power is not a secondary feature of the civil state, necessary to back up laws. According to Kant, coercion is part of the idea of rights. The thought can be explained as follows. Any right of a personâ€”independently of whether it is respected or has been violatedâ€”implies a restriction for others. Kant, Theory and Practice, Part 2; Ripstein Coercion, in this view, is thus not merely a means for the civil state to enforce rights as defenders of an authority-based concept of legitimacy claim. Instead, according to Kant, it is constitutive of the civil state. Legitimacy, for Kant, depends on a particular interpretation of the social contract. For Kant, the social contract which establishes the civil state is not an actual event. The criterion is the following: The social contract, according to Kant, is thus a hypothetical thought experiment, meant to capture an idea of public reason. As such, it sets the standard for what counts as legitimate political authority. Because of his particular interpretation of the social contract, Kant is not a social contract theorist in the strict sense. The idea of a contract is nevertheless relevant for his understanding of legitimacy. On the difference between voluntaristic and rationalistic strands in liberalism, see Waldron Kant, unlike Hobbes, recognizes the difference between legitimate and effective authority. For the head of the civil state is under an obligation to obey public reason and to enact only laws to which all individuals could consent. If he violates this obligation, however, he still holds authority, even if his authority ceases to be legitimate. Kant famously denied that there is a right to revolution Kant, Perpetual Peace, Appendix II; for a recent discussion, see Flikschuh This obligation is such that it is incompatible with a right to revolution. A right to revolution would be in contradiction with the idea that individuals are bound by public law, but without the idea of citizens being bound by public law, there cannot be a civil stateâ€”only anarchy. As mentioned earlier, however, there is a duty to establish a civil state. In particular, the obligation to obey does not cease when the laws are unjust. But Kant stresses that the head of state is bound by the commands of public reason. This is manifest in his insistence on freedom of the pen: While there is no right to revolution, political authority is only legitimate if the head of state respects the social contract. But political obligations arise even from illegitimate authority. In , Ripstein argued that much of the contemporary literature on political legitimacy has been dominated by a focus on the justification of authority, rather than coercive political power Ripstein In the literature since then, it looks as if the tables are turning, especially if one considers the debates on international and global legitimacy section 5. But prominent earlier coercion-based accounts include those by Nagel and by contemporary Kantians such as Rawls and Habermas to be discussed in sections 3. Let me briefly mention other important coercion-based interpretations. Her theory links the authority of the state to its ability to enforce a solution to coordination and cooperation

problems. Coercion is the necessary feature that enables the state to provide an effective solution to these problems, and the entitlement to use coercion is what constitutes the authority of the state. The entitlement to use coercion distinguishes such minimally legitimate political authority from a mere use of power. Hampton draws a further distinction between minimal legitimacy and what she calls full moral legitimacy, which obtains when political authority is just. Buchanan also argues that legitimacy is concerned with the justification of coercive power. Buchanan points out that this makes legitimacy a more fundamental normative concept than authority. Like Hampton, he advocates a moralized interpretation of legitimacy. Political authority, in his approach, obtains if an entity is legitimate in this sense and if some further conditions, relating to political obligation, are met. Stilz offers a coercion-centered account of state legitimacy that draws on both Kant and Rousseau.

Chapter 2 : Peter L. Lindseth's Power and Legitimacy: Reconciling Europe and the PDF - UFit2 E-books

Weber linked authority to legitimacy - different approach from others stating that legitimacy gave power authority. Weber - authority is important irrespective of how it's achieved. As long as there is the perception that authority is legitimate it's fine.

Divine right of kings , Mandate of Heaven , and Imperial cult ancient Rome In a theocracy , government legitimacy derives from the spiritual authority of a god or a goddess. In ancient Egypt c. The coat of arms of the Holy See , the seat of Papal government. In the Roman Catholic Church , the priesthood derives its legitimacy from a divine source; the Roman Magisterium dogmatically teaches that Jesus Christ designated St. Peter the supreme and infallible head of the entire Christian Church, and thus each bishop of Rome is sanctified, legitimate, and possesses these charisms as well. Civil legitimacy[edit] One measurement of civil legitimacy is who has access to the vote, including women are able to vote. The political legitimacy of a civil government derives from agreement among the autonomous constituent institutionsâ€”legislative, judicial, executiveâ€”combined for the national common good. One way civil society grants legitimacy to governments is through public elections. There are also those who refute the legitimacy offered by public elections, pointing out that the amount of legitimacy public elections can grant depends significantly on the electoral system conducting the elections. In the United States this issue has surfaced around how voting is impacted by gerrymandering [8] and the repeal of part of the Voting Rights Act in In the international system another method for measuring civil legitimacy is through accountability to international human rights norms. Fritz Scharpf introduced two normative criteria, which are output legitimacy, i. A third normative criterion was added by Vivien Schmidt , who analyzes legitimacy also in terms of what she calls throughput, i. From the NPL perspective, political legitimacy emanates from appropriate actions; from a PPL perspective, it emanates from appropriate actors. In the social contract tradition, Hobbes and Locke focused on NPL stressing security and liberty, respectively , while Rousseau focused more on PPL "the people" as the legitimator. Arguably, political stability depends on both forms of legitimacy. Instrumental legitimacy is very much based on the perceived effectiveness of service delivery. Conversely, substantive legitimacy is a more abstract normative judgment, which is underpinned by shared values. If a person believes that an entity has the right to exercise social control, he or she may also accept personal disadvantages. Max Weber proposed that societies behave cyclically in governing themselves with different types of governmental legitimacy. That democracy was unnecessary for establishing legitimacy, a condition that can be established with codified laws, customs, and cultural principles, not by means of popular suffrage. That a society might decide to revert from the legitimate government of a rationalâ€”legal authority to the charismatic government of a leader; e. That traditional authority has disappeared in the Middle East ; that the rule-proving exceptions are Islamic Iran and Saudi Arabia. Hence, the intellectually restrictive politics of dogmatism "My answer is right, and all others are wrong" , scepticism "All answers are equally true or [false]; everyone has a right to his own truth" , and eclecticism "Each meaning gives a partial view, so the more meanings the better" are inappropriate philosophic stances for managing a political term that has more than one meaning. Walter Bryce Gallie Establishing what qualifies as a legitimate form of government continues to be a topic of great philosophical controversy. Forms of legitimate government are posited to include: The legitimacy of a Communist state derives from having won a civil war , a revolution , or from having won an election, such as the Presidency of Salvador Allende â€”73 in Chile; thus, the actions of the Communist government are legitimate, authorised by the people. In the early twentieth century, Communist parties based the arguments supporting the legitimacy of their rule and government upon the scientific nature of Marxism. The modern political concept of constitutionalism establishes the law as supreme over the private will, by integrating nationalism , democracy, and limited government. The political legitimacy of constitutionalism derives from popular belief and acceptance that the actions of the government are legitimate because they abide by the law codified in the political constitution. The political scientist Carl Joachim Friedrich â€”84 said that, in dividing political power among the organs of government, constitutional law effectively restrains the actions of the government. In a

democracy, government legitimacy derives from the popular perception that the elected government abides by democratic principles in governing, and thus is legally accountable to its people. In the 1930s and the 1940s, fascism based its political legitimacy upon the arguments of traditional authority; respectively, the German National Socialists and the Italian Fascists claimed that the political legitimacy of their right to rule derived from philosophically denying the popular political legitimacy of elected liberal democratic governments. How can parliamentary government make for law and legality, when a 49 per cent minority accepts as politically legitimate the political will of a 51 per cent majority? In a monarchy, the divine right of kings establishes the political legitimacy of the rule of the monarch king or queen ; legitimacy also derives from the popular perception tradition and custom and acceptance of the monarch as the rightful ruler of nation and country. Contemporarily, such divine-right legitimacy is manifest in the absolute monarchy of the House of Saud est. Moreover, constitutional monarchy is a variant form of monarchic political legitimacy which combines traditional authority and legal-rational authority, by which means the monarch maintains nationalist unity one people and democratic administration a political constitution.

Chapter 3 : Legitimacy | Encyclopedia Princetoniensis

Anyway, are elected politicians so respected now that they would reinject legitimacy back into economic governance? Opinion polling suggests they are among the groups the public trusts least. Unelected Power engages an essential debate, however. There is a crisis of legitimacy in the western democracies.

It is not just multipolar, but multiconceptual. This creates new risks and uncertainties: International relations now play out in increasingly diverse ways: Assessing and mitigating risks across all these theatres of potential conflict will require careful horizon scanning and crisis anticipation by state and non-state actors alike. Actors with a global presence are likely to have to become increasingly adept at calibrating their responses across divergent political and legal systems. Four related developments stand out as potential sources of disruption over the short and medium term. The intensification of strong-state politics is affecting both large and small states, while global norms are eroding and tensions growing between major powers. These two trends fuel two others: State-centred politics At a time of geopolitical flux, re-establishing the state as the primary locus of power and legitimacy offers governments and citizens an increasingly attractive strategic anchor. In particular, nationalist agendas and the external projection of a strong state can be an effective strategy for governments seeking to redress perceived international humiliations, past or present. The intensification of nationalist and strong-state narratives creates risks both domestically and internationally. The profile of these risks will vary in each case, depending, among other things, on the way in which power is obtained and asserted, and on the ends towards which it is used. One domestic danger is that the interests of non-state actors will suffer. An extreme example is the flight of Rohingya people from Myanmar. Other recent examples include the purge in Turkey following the attempted coup in and clashes over the separation of powers in Poland. First, the danger of miscommunication and miscalculation between states is heightened by the absence of a clear rules-based international order or a settled balance of power. Concern about possible conflict involving North Korea is a prominent example: A second international risk relates to states interfering in the domestic affairs of other states. By undermining the non-intervention principle set out in the UN Charter, it also ratchets up the risk of retaliation and a slide into interstate conflict. Interference in the affairs of non-Western states has been one reason for the erosion of the US-led rules-based order; however, the wheel has turned and non-Western countries now appear to be increasingly active in this area. As each of these states becomes increasingly assertive of its own interests, consensus is fraying on the rules that govern their interactions and the directions in which the world might converge. As a result, there is evidence of a general breakdown in trust and an erosion of respect for global norms designed to govern peaceful international interactions. The United States has become less willing to act as enforcer of global norms at the head of a dominant coalition. This reflects, among other things, divisions within the United States over whether the benefits that flow from this global enforcer role are sufficient to justify its costs. As a result, rising and resurgent powers calculate that actions that may breach international law UN Charter , the law of the sea UNCLOS or international humanitarian law Geneva Conventions can achieve objectives without incurring unacceptable costs in terms of opposition or punishment. The emergence of cyberspace as an unregulated battlefield has also created new ways to advance state interests, allowing interference in domestic political or economic affairs that might be considered acts of aggression if pursued by other means. Strong trade and investment connections between the United States and China mean that, whatever their differences, a significant level of economic interdependence remains central to their relationship. However, as China exercises increasing power in the Western Pacific, confidence in the capacity of the United States to determine outcomes in the region is being gradually undermined. As has been seen in the North Korea crisis, the danger that long-term strategic rivalry could spill over and harm economic relations is becoming more real. Japan and India, for example, are exploring more structured forms of strategic cooperation in both economic and military affairs. This initiative could become more significant if additional partners such as Australia, the United States, or even European states were to take part. However, most of these countries are currently cautious and would be wary of allowing such a hedging policy to cause tensions with China. Meanwhile, Russia has

used its policy in Syria to reposition itself as a leading foreign policy actor, with the ability to shape military outcomes and geopolitical balances. Smaller states tend to benefit from the predictability that comes with rules-based order and they are among the most affected when rules erode and major powers jostle for position. These countries are particularly vulnerable to the weakening of security alliances they may previously have relied upon, as well as to subtle or overt pressures to adapt policy or strategy to conform to the interests of a major power or regional hegemon. The dilemma faced by smaller states, as they assess how best to recalibrate relations with larger states, was illustrated in Singapore last year. Compounding their exposure to changes in the geopolitical environment, smaller states are more vulnerable to potential second-order effects such as refugee and migration flows resulting from conflicts or recessions in neighbouring countries. Smaller states are not always passive objects of geopolitical disruption: A weak or collapsing state can become a locus of instability that radiates disorder or pulls in larger neighbouring states: Libya and South Sudan, for example, have caused instability in neighbouring countries, notably via flows of refugees and weapons. Elsewhere, for some years the near-collapse of the Greek economy was an ongoing source of existential risk for the Eurozone. Smaller states can also amplify geopolitical risk by actively asserting themselves on their neighbours: States have always used tools of economic policy and diplomacy to pursue their geopolitical goals. However, confidence in the mutuality of benefits has weakened. This is particularly true among Western countries, where the strongest geo-economic trend of recent years has been the erosion of support for globalization and growing support for protectionist policies. It is notable that two of the states that have traditionally been among the firmest advocates of global economic integration, the United Kingdom and the United States, have seen the most dramatic uncertainties emerge around their trade-related policies. In other parts of the world, plans to extend and deepen networks of economic corridors are spurring huge investments in infrastructure. Proponents of these infrastructure plans argue that they will foster peaceful relations by creating new links and patterns of cooperation. However, the ambitiousness of some of these plans has raised concerns that they might exacerbate rather than prevent tension. The geostrategic interdependence they create—both through the physical presence of assets and people on the ground and through patterns of increased indebtedness, which is a potential source of vulnerability for lower-income countries in particular—are more durable and difficult to unwind than mere trade agreements. This raises questions about potential implications if relationships between corridor partners were to sour in the future. In early there were signs of this in Sri Lanka, where violent protests erupted at a ceremony to mark the start of construction of a Chinese special economic zone. There remain strong incentives on all sides to avoid triggering trade wars, just as there are for all forms of conflict—but the risk of domestic political factors spilling over into disruption of the global trade system has risen sharply in recent years. Trade-related tensions could also create distractions and divisions that hamper the unity of regional or global responses to other geopolitical risks that might crystallize in the evolving confluence of strong-state politics, major power tensions and small-state disruptions in an increasingly disordered world.

Chapter 4 : Legitimacy (political) - Wikipedia

Legitimate authority is that which is recognized as legitimate and justified by both the ruler and the ruled LEGITIMACY Simply speaking, Legitimacy is the acceptance of people of the Authority of those in power to rule.

Distinguished with authority by power being the ability to do and authority right to do. Lukes sees power in three forms: Decision-making associated with liberal and pluralist perceptions focussing on who actually makes the decisions. Boulding argues decision-making influenced in three ways: Different groups have a say on different aspects. Elitist critiques argue this fails to understand unequal influence of key elites real decisions made by a fixed elite real power belongs to banks and military C. Advocates strong, monarchical government. Agenda setting Bachrach Baratz idea of non-decision making. Links to influential parties who collectively agree or just block discussion slight elitist theory. Elite tend to dominate flow of information and media and so use this to their advantage. Look at the way demonstrations are portrayed in the media. Thought control previous two assume that people and groups are rational and capable of knowing their own mind. The ability to manipulate human behaviour can be shaped some argue this is where the real power lies. Marxist ideas based on favouritism of state towards bourgeoisie and their power through economy and politics Gramsci and bourgeois hegemony bourgeoisie literally control popular culture and so control the way we think. Therefore we think life is only better with material goods so bourgeoisie benefit even more. New Left ideas and Marcuse link to totalitarianism but with media, TUs, adverts, culture replacing brutal coercion manipulating needs. Liberals reject this individuals are rational. Authority a form of rightful power. Weber linked authority to legitimacy different approach from others stating that legitimacy gave power authority. Authority seldom exercised in absence of power. Patriarchalism links to hereditary systems. Less relevant today, although evident in one form in theocratic states the resurgence of this type of authority can be seen as a response to the failure of other types in degenerative Western capitalism. Owes nothing to status, social position or office, yet can be used to promote the interests of society Rousseau and Law Giver. Charismatic has an almost messianic quality treated with suspicion Talmon and criticism of Rousseau. Legal-rational situation for most liberal democratic Western capitalist societies. Operates through a body of clearly defined rules linked to formal powers of office not office holder. Less likely to be abused than other 2 as the limit of authority is defined. Arises out of a respect for the rule of law and is evident in the constitutional framework of long-established states. Can be seen as de-personalising as there can be a relentless spread of bureaucracy e. De jure authority authority in law. Authority from an office. Operates according to a set of rules. Related to being IN authority. De facto authority in practice. Closely linked to charismatic. Authority by virtue of who they are being AN authority. Can authority exist without power? Weberian sense of traditional and charismatic forms all exert influence without the need to persuade. Legal-rational based on office and power invested in the office thus need power. Different views of authority Liberals authority instrumental, coming from below through the consent of the governed social contract. Do not want too much state involvement therefore authority is limited, rational and purposeful leading to preference for legal-rational. Conservatives comes from above from those with experience and wisdom. Benefits other but there are few limits leading to authoritarianism through charismatic. Essential for maintenance of order. Marxists authority manufactured to mask rule by the bourgeoisie. Expectation to give unquestioning obedience is wrong as it threatens reason Mill intellectual diversity. Legitimacy To be in a position to exercise authority. Links to power and authority by transforming the former into the latter turns naked power into authority. Moral right to rule Locke and consent social contract theory we consent to be governed. If there is a formal constitutional basis, we can see legitimacy. Hobbes social contract dictatorship could have legitimacy as it is meant to protect the individual the Leviathan state legitimacy comes about by preventing people getting harmed implied consent. For Rousseau the state is legitimate if it upholds the general will. Likes of Weber see a belief in legitimacy as important no matter how it is achieved. How do governments gain and maintain legitimacy? Locke challenged Hobbes as he believed a man could not give away more power over himself than he himself

has. Popular compliance – populace have a belief in the right to rule which in a democracy is based around the exercise of legal-rational authority. Constitutionalism – Beetham – legitimacy operating under existing established principles thus power exercised through the existing constitutional process if this adheres to the widely held beliefs and values of a society. Leaves the matter largely in the hands of the powerful, who may be able to manufacture rightfulness by public relation campaigns. Power is legitimate if it fulfils 3 criteria: Power exercised according to certain rules. Rules justified in terms of ruler and ruled – marrying the shared belief between government and people communitarianism. People must give consent – how much consent must people give to give something legitimacy? Legitimation crisis – neo-Marxist Habermas – legitimacy of a political system could collapsed because of the pressures created by democracy and capitalism. Democracy – voting becomes a means of consumerism. Legitimation crisis created after government intervention and conflict of free-market. Social contract – Giddens – communitarianism – Etzioni – taking social contract and trying to improve civic engagement through modern political systems. Ideological Hegemony – Conventional image of liberal democracies is that they enjoy legitimacy because they respect individual liberty and are responsive to public opinion. Marxists state that bourgeois ideology denotes sets of ideas which conceal the contradictions upon which class societies are based – ideology propagates falsehood, delusion and mystification. Ideology operates in interests of the ruling class. Modern Marxists – political competition does exist but this competition is unequal. Gramsci drew attention to the degree to which the class system was upheld not simply by unequal power but also what he called bourgeois hegemony. Legitimacy in a dictatorship Weber argues that traditional and charismatic authority can be legitimate if accepted by populace. Marx argued that a dictatorship of the proletariat would be legitimate as it was acting in the best interests of the masses; likewise dictators claim to uphold common good without popular approval. Traditional monarchs also claimed to be adhering to divine right as the best form of determining the common good.

Chapter 5 : Political Legitimacy (Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy)

Power and Legitimacy Reconciling Europe and the Nation-State Peter L. Lindseth. *Power and Legitimacy* is a novel legal-historical synthesis of European integration, grounded in an innovative theory of institutional change.

Nigeria QUESTION The relationship between the Concepts of Power, Authority and Legitimacy is believed by many scholars to be interwoven or in some cases even overlapping as the case may be, depending on the context or situation or condition or even circumstance. Prior to the modern day study of political science, an even earlier scholar hold such thoughts and believes. Though to the layman, these three 3 essential parts or aspects of every society seems ordinarily the same, but a scholarly look at these attributes in a conceptual form shows that; in as much as there are similarities, there are more disparities. In political science, Concepts are essentially integral in the study of every field or aspect. Concepts in simple terms refer to a general idea derived or inferred from specific instance or occurrences. While discussing the Concepts of Power, Authority and Legitimacy separately, one realises that, hardly can you talk of one of them digestively, without venturing on the others. At the end of your study, you will realise that they are linked like a WEB: **POWER** Power is the ability of a person to face or influence others to do what they would otherwise not have done. It is usually accompanied by the threat of sanctions. Power in any political system is in the hands of few people who use it either to reward or punish the people as they deem fit. Generally, in politics and social science, power is the ability to influence the behaviour of people. In the corporate environment, Power is often expressed as upward or downward. When a company exerts upward Power, it is the subordinates who influence the Decision of the leader. Therefore, each party should try to maximize and consolidate its power. The use of power need not involve coercion force or the threat of force at one extreme. Most of the recent sociological debate on power revolves around the issue of the enabling nature of power. A radical view where he discourses the dimension of power. Thus, power can be seen as various forms of constraint on human action, but also as that which makes action possible, although in a limited scope. Power affects more than personal relationships; it shapes larger dynamics like social groups, professional organizations, and governments. Simon defines authority as being in power. According to Michaels, in the Encyclopaedia of Social Sciences, authority is the capacity, innate or acquired for exercising ascendancy over a group. Other scientists argue that authority is not a capacity but a relationship. It is power that is sanctioned and institutionalized. Wikipedia the Encyclopaedia quoted several scholars with different definitions of the concept. Thus; The word authority is derived from the Latin word *auctoritas*, meaning invention, advice, opinion, influence, or command. In English, the word authority can be used to mean power given by the state in the form of Members of Parliament, judges, police officers, etc. The word Authority with capital A refers to the governing body upon which such authority with lower case a is vested; for example, the Puerto Rico Electric Power Authority or the Massachusetts Bay Transportation Authority. Weber defined domination authority as the chance of commands being obeyed by a specifiable group of people. Here, in giving the layman understanding of what legitimacy means, we can say that legitimacy is ruling the people base on their approval. In his sociology, Max Weber put forward a very influential account of legitimacy that excludes any recourse to normative criteria Mommson On the broadest view, legitimacy both explains why the use of political power by a particular bodyâ€”a state, a government, or a democratic collective, for exampleâ€”is permissible and why there is a pro tanto moral duty to obey its commands. On this view, if the conditions for legitimacy are not met, political institutions exercise power unjustifiably and the commands they might produce do then not entail any obligation to obey. John Rawls, in *Political Liberalism*, presents such an interpretation of legitimacy. John Locke put forward such an interpretation of legitimacy. However, their meanings differ: For example, while a mob has the power to punish a criminal, for example by lynching, people who believe in the rule of law consider that only a court of law has the authority to punish a criminal. Sociologists examine government and politics in terms of their impact on individuals and larger social systems. Max Weber studied power and authority, differentiating between the two concepts and formulating a system for classifying types of authority. Legitimacy is a socially constructed and psychologically accepted right to exercise power. A person can have legitimacy but no actual

power the legitimate king might reside in exile, destitute and forgotten. A person can have actual power but not legitimacy the usurper who exiled the king and appropriates the symbols of office. The role of Power becomes most effective when Power does not remain a source of coercion. In-fact after getting legitimized it becomes Authority. Means the stability of Authority depends upon legitimacy. So in short Authority is a quality or capacity of a person, institution, rule or order which becomes important in defining whether Authority is correct or authentic, so that people can follow the rules and regulation without any hesitation. Because of the use of Authority official Governmental policies, rules and regulations get accepted in the society. Authority has two main components: Legitimacy of a rule or a decision signifies the fact that people reckon the decision as fruitful and in welfare of the society. Thus they are always ready to follow the rule or decision. Demonstration of Power does not become necessary as long as Legitimacy is attached to Power. It only comes out as a symbol. Like a judge with his black gown or a policeman with his uniform. Just like beauty lies in the eyes of beholder, Legitimacy lies in the eyes of beholder. There is no question, that without Power it will be very difficult to implement the official decision as well as rules, but only by the fear of punishment or by the coercion authority may not prove successful as far as long term benefits are concerned. In fact such a step becomes tyranny and works as a catalyst for the rebellion. According to Wiki Answers, Worldly authority can be acquired by inheritance, wealth, or even notoriety but not spiritual authority. Authority that is spiritual in scope is given to us by God and operates according to His laws. Spiritual authority like worldly authority must have the power to act in order for authority to be genuine. We would say that this one is just a figure head that possesses no real power. This is why we must not just speak about authority but also power. CONCLUSION Having taken a close look at these three 3 Concepts; Power, Authority and Legitimacy with a view to see how they are interwoven and to some extent overlapping looking from different contexts, situation or in some cases circumstances, we conclude that, power, Authority and Legitimacy, do not only inter-related but largely depend on each other for their systematic existence. The able use of Power always gets support from legitimacy. Most of the society follows the rules on the basis of legitimacy therefore using Power does not become necessary all the time. No one will follow the rule or a regulation if the legitimacy of that rule is ruined irrespective of the Power of Authority. Easton David A frame work for political Analysis. Anderson, James E public Policy making, Praeger: Wikipedia the Encyclopaedia , Power, Authority and Legitimacy. Miliband, R The State in capitalist society. Enemo Elements of Politics. Lasswell who gets what, when and How?

Chapter 6 : Power, Legitimacy, and Order | The Chinese Journal of International Politics | Oxford Academic

He discusses the severe- and wanted- contrast among republican and democratic platforms of presidency, arguing that freedom can live to tell the tale in the United States provided that we go back to our republican roots.

Chapter 7 : Power, Authority & Legitimacy Theory - Politics Revision

In this provocative study, Franck employs a broad range of historical, legal, sociological, anthropological, political, and philosophical modes of analysis to unravel the mystery of what makes states and people perceive rules as legitimate.

Chapter 8 : power and legitimacy | Download eBook PDF/EPUB

Similarities between power, authority, and legitimacy: they all have to do with a level of power. Authority wields power to enforce various rules. Authority should ideally maintain legitimacy, with power; this power is given to them by a greater power, whatever that may be in different situations.

Chapter 9 : The Power of Legitimacy among Nations - Thomas M. Franck - Google Books

The politics of legitimacy is central to international relations. When states perceive an international organization as

legitimate, they defer to it, associate themselves with it, and invoke its symbols.