

Public Intellectuals And Free Speech In Democracy, And The Role Of Karl Popper's Critical Rationalism

Ali Ahmed¹, Dr. Samikshya Gohain²

¹Research Scholar,

Department of Philosophy

Cotton University, Guwahati, Assam.

Email- aliahmedassam786@gmail.com

²Assistant Professor,

Department of Philosophy,

Cotton University, Guwahati, Assam.

Email- samikshya.gohain@cottonuniversity.ac.in

Abstract:

The quest for knowledge has been perennial to mankind. Philosophical enquiries about the world, the after world has occupied interest of philosophers who are in search for deeper truths. After the origination of society, the emergence of political systems marked the evolution of the state. Political evolution came along with the biological evolution. As such Governments emerged naturally as an association of families, clans, and tribes. Starting from Greek city state to other forms of government like monarchy, aristocracy, oligarchy, democracy etc., it has been seen that their role and mode of operation has been various. As such question, it often come to the mind what is the best form of government? Is democracy the best form of government in the world today? If it is yes, then, how can a democracy be a healthy one which ensures participation of the public through reasoned arguments, use critical rationality to solve problems? How can dissent play a vital role alarming the government about the inadequacies of policies framed by the government? What can be the role of

Special Issue On Multidisciplinary Research

public intellectuals in making a democratic state worth living? What is the importance of free speech in a democratic state? What will be the role of Karl Popper's critical rationalism to encourage the free expression of public intellectual in democracy? These are some of the issues on which this paper would like to delve.

Democracy is a very popular form of government in the contemporary era. Defining the forms of democracy may be simple but in reality, it is full of problems to describe what democracy is? There are various forms of government are defined as democratic now. Therefore, the present study will enquiry into how critical rationalism of popper defense free speech and democracy in order to create grounds for an open and democratic society.

Keywords: Free speech, democracy, open society, public intellectuals, critical rationalism, Karl Popper.

Methodology:

To make this proposed research writing in a systematic method mainly based on the analytic, conceptual, and qualitative method is considered. Again, in this work in some areas the descriptive procedures are applied. The complete work is also including library work and various primary and secondary sources including books, periodical journals, articles, internet etc.

Objective of the Research:

Objectives of the research are as following:

1. To discuss the concept of free speech and its importance in democracy.
2. To discuss the idea of democracy.
3. To discuss about the role and responsibilities of public intellectuals in a democratic state.
4. To discuss the concept of Karl popper's critical rationalism.

Special Issue On Multidisciplinary Research

5. To discuss how popper analyses the democracy and open society by his critical rationalism.

Introduction:

The quest for knowledge has been perennial to mankind. Philosophical enquiries about the world, the after world has occupied interest of philosophers who are in search for deeper truths. After the origination of society, the emergence of political systems marked the evolution of the state. Political evolution came along with the biological evolution. As such Governments emerged naturally as an association of families, clans, and tribes. Starting from Greek city state to other forms of government like monarchy, aristocracy, oligarchy, democracy etc., it has been seen that their role and mode of operation has been various. As such question, it often come to the mind what is the best form of government? Is democracy the best form of government in the world today? What should be the function of a democratic government? Do the idea of justice, truth, freedom, equality, have any broad and fruitful definition or are they simply emphatic thought or emotive words that propagandists for democracy, dictatorship, and authoritarian rulers use in order to misrepresent and command us? The purpose of a government is to provide the necessities of life and living and for this purpose, the government has to frame public policies, rules, regulations and laws. These policies which are meant for the public should be uniform rules that govern everyone and has the same consequences for everyone. They can be described as rule of law which means that law is the same for everyone regardless of wealth or station.

Free speech is one of the popular debatable topics in contemporary society. In a democracy, free speech and the freedom of expression is very necessary. Because they promote a diversity of ideas and debates. Freedom speech and expression is one of the basic rights of the citizen of a democratic state. This

Special Issue On Multidisciplinary Research

indicates that citizens of a democratic state have the right to reveal their thoughts and ideas. Every citizen has different views and ideas and he or she should have the freedom to express themselves. Again, it determines if people are disagreeing with any policy made by the government or any organization then people are free to criticize them. They will not be abused or punished by the authority. Free speech is very necessary to express ourselves, to discovering the truth and for democratic self-government too. Therefore, the defense of free speech and freedom of expression is more significant for making democratic and open society, otherwise society will turn towards more closed society.

But how can a democracy be a healthy one which ensures participation of the public through reasoned arguments, use critical rationality to solve problems? How can dissent play a vital role alarming the government about the inadequacies of policies framed by the government? What can be the role of public intellectuals in making a democratic state worth living? These are some of the issues on which this paper would like to delve.

Karl Popper was one of the most influential political philosophers of the 20th century BCE. As an Austrian British philosopher, social and academic analyst, Sir Karl Raimund Popper (July 28, 1902 – September 17, 1994) was born in the Vienna. Popper applies the falsification method for the development of scientific research to the political and social system. Democracy for him is defined as discovering truth by trial-and-error method which we find in science. The basic question who rules the state is one of the relevant questions to Popper. The important question for Popper is how to get rid of a bad ruler or how to remove a bad leader. For him democracy and the open society is a perfect institutionalized way to do the same. Democracy do not prefer a particular social system; it is open and all the social system can be changed by democratic elections. Democracy

Special Issue On Multidisciplinary Research

emphasizes the rejection of any attempt whose aim is to make a preplanned social system imagined as “ideal.” Thus, in this case, democracy can help making a rational choice among multiple alternatives.

Critical Rationalism is one of the most important theories of Popper’s political philosophy. This theory is developed in the middle of 20th century. It is a naturalistic view of Popper that a society has progressed through a method of solving problems. Through this problem-solving method, Popper said that all the natural and social sciences have been discovered and developed through subjecting probable doctrines to strong experiment and criticism. Popper stated that falsified doctrines are rejected. For example, the statement that “all swans are white” can be falsified by perceiving a black swan. Popper is searching for a society which allows strong doctrines along with open criticism, a society which conducive to problem-solving method, a society in which there is actual probability of reformation based on criticism which he called an open and democratic society. The present study will enquiry into how critical rationalism of popper defense free speech and democracy in order to create grounds for an open and democratic society.

General Idea About Democracy:

The term democracy derived from ancient Greek word ‘demos’ and ‘kartin.’ Demos means ‘the people’ and kartin means ‘to rule’. Thus, the meaning of democracy is ‘rule by the people’. Who are the people and how do they rule and in what subject-matter? To what extent and by which institutions? To fulfil which aim? Is this an attainable system?

There are different ideas nature, scope, purpose, extent and attainability of the rule of democracy and there are many critics on practicing democracy. Indeed, sometimes democracy is called an ‘adjectival

Special Issue On Multidisciplinary Research

concept' democracy has been classified in endless and various kinds of models. For example, liberal and radical, direct and indirect, social, deliberative people's, pluralist and elitist, strong and weak and so on. For all of these, democratic system is the idea of popular power. According to *The Concise Oxford Dictionary*, Democracy is a process of government which is elected by the whole citizen of a state. Through the democratic rules all the organization is formed. A state so formed.

Democracy is a very popular form of government in the contemporary era. Defining the forms of democracy may be simple but in reality, it is full of problems to describe what democracy is? There are various forms of government are defined as democratic now. For example, Adolf Hitler called the German democracy is the true democracy. Benito Mussolini stated that the purest form of democracy is the Italian fascism. Communist system of government calls themselves as people's democracies. So, in this progressive world most of the dictatorship government demands to be democratic. Hence, then, what is called the democracy or democratic state? A very popular definition of democracy as given by Abraham Lincoln is that democracy is a government 'by the people, of the people and for the people. Therefore, public opinion, public reasoning and argumentation becomes important for the government and they become accountable to the public. 'Dissent' has been there in the history in different characters, may be political, religious, social. When people are dissatisfied with the prevalent norms and policies and makes their disagreement with the help of public opinion, protest, opposition, they can be called Dissenters.

'Dissent' is a very common character in a democratic country. If we talk about India then, we can find the idea of 'dissent' too. Because Indian constitution has labeled us with responsibilities, duties as well as rights

Special Issue On Multidisciplinary Research

which determines our right of becoming 'dissent.' Containing in three parts, it comes under the article 19(1) of the constitution of India. Clause (1), Sub-clause (a) of the article allows the right to freedom of speech and freedom of expression to all the citizen of India. Sub-clause (b) gives us the right to a peaceful assemble without any arms. Sub-clause (c) assures freedom of citizens to govern any association or union. All these three particular rights make capable the citizen to express their different view point to the rulers for the benefit of state.

Without 'dissent,' 'a healthy democracy' is not possible. Only when the inadequacies of deprivations are brought to the fore, can a nation be in the road to success. 'Dissent' has to be structured in the form of proper reasoned, arguments, which have to be critically, rationally assessed. Critical rationalism sets the ground for democratic policies as it talks about the freedom of individuals to think, speech freely, choose, and act. Critical rationalism encourages open mindness, helps us to challenge existing ideas and belief by questioning them. It encourages us to exchange our ideas freely and find out new ideas. Again, it encourages us to become anti-dogmatic, anti authoritarian. It encourages us to become democratic.

Free Speech and Its Significance in Democracy:

Freedom of speech is the right of a person to articulate opinions and ideas without interference or retaliation from the government. The term "speech" constitutes expression that includes far more than just words, but also what a person wears, reads, performs, protests and more. Freedom of speech and expression are necessary to democracy because they encourage a diversity of views and debate. Believing in free speech means not just the speech we agree with but supporting the idea itself too. we cannot only pick and select some speech which are worthy of protection. (But the actual support for free speech

Special Issue On Multidisciplinary Research

holds the support for the safeguard of every speech not just the speeches that we agree with. Noam Chomsky stated that "if you are really in favour of freedom of speech, then you are in favour of freedom of speech for precisely the views we despise. Otherwise, it does not indicate the support of free speech.

Free speech is not same as the extreme free speech. There are some boundaries and beyond that certain kind of speech should not be permitted which are encourages the imminent violence in society. It is necessary to set the principles to restrict such speech which cultivate violence. Therefore, all the hateful, unpleasant, or bigoted speeches should be preserved because no individual has the ultimate right to decide what speech should be permitted and what should be censored. Otherwise, the least powerful people and the most marginalized communities in the state will always be dominated and abused. If we protect free speech then marginalized and minority people will be benefited.

Establishment of free speech is a successful challenge to the power. We always have desire and aim for attaining or searching for a better and more just society. To attain such open and democratic society, it is very necessary to give values to the idea of free speech and freedom of expression. Without free exchange of ideas, it will not be possible to critique the power significantly and more fruitfully. With the idea of free and open engage with one another can think of a society which will be beyond from capitalism. Whenever, the freedom of expression is controlled by the state, shut down by online mobs, or examined for the self-censorship, it will largely work the status quo and the power. Free speech does not determine the extreme support for all speech. it is one of the general strong reasons against free speech. But in reality, all the followers of free speech support the limitation of free speech. All the ideas are fragile

Special Issue On Multidisciplinary Research

if unable to challenge withstand. Believing in our own thought does not need any authoritarian means to punch their acceptance. This will make people disinterest from the begins.

Free thought depends on free speech. Censorship leads to a cultivation of terror and panic, where individual learn to veil their views. Speech is not violence, it's a substitute to violence. Most of the followers of free speech does not refute the opinion that speech can be hurtful. According to them, in some situation free speech can be the cause of damage, violence and psychological trauma. It is not same with physical violence. Former ACLU (American Civil Liberties Union) president Nadine Strossen makes a significant point that unlike physical violence, the effect of speech depends on how it is perceived by the listener. The same words can literally have the opposite effort depending on who is hearing or reading then. Preservation for all the free speech is inherently anti-totalitarian.

Free speech or the freedom of expression is one of the most important groundworks of self-fulfillment. Free speech is very important for communicate freely with one another's thoughts and it is the dignity and worth of all individuals of a society. Again, it enables every individual to realize his or her potential as a human being. Because as we know that though man and women may different by nature but they are able to carry out their specific function according to their specific nature. Hence, Free speech or freedom of expression is an end in itself, and that is why it deserves the best shelter from society.

Enquiry of truth and achievement and development of wisdom is very important. Thus, the eminent 19th-century writer and civil libertarian, John Stuart Mill, stated that enlightened judgment is possible only if one considers all facts and ideas, from whatever source, and tests one's own conclusions against opposing views. Hence, all viewpoints, these may

Special Issue On Multidisciplinary Research

either good speech, or hate speech, which are harmful for society should be presented in society's 'marketplace of ideas.' Marketplace of ideas stated that truth will rise from the competition of free thought and ideas, transparent general speech, thought and ideas and at the ends, ideas and ideologies will be raised in accordance with their excellency or deficiency and mass acceptance among the people.

Public Intellectuals and Their Responsibilities in Democratic Society:

The function of public intellectual is concerned with basically knowledge and how knowledge is utilized in the public sphere. It is a function of the public intellectual to protect knowledge. But how knowledge become progressed? Answer is questioning. It is one of the essential ways to progress knowledge. Knowledge is neither a static concept nor a set of fixed packages. It can only be progressed by the continuation of asking the question to the existing knowledge in various angle on the basis of evidence and the area in which that knowledge can be used for. People are arrived in a position where there is a transformation from a colony then nation state and independent nation state. After that people should decide to go to advance knowledge through questioning it, advance knowledge to make sure that it reaches the public sphere. For this, it is extremely important to realize that in the past for many centuries ago, we have philosophers and thinkers or intellectuals who questioned orthodox knowledge, not just for making themselves as a public intellectual or but for valid reasons. They felt that questioning needs to be done and we should not think that these are the traditional thought and not the part of contemporary system. So, if we want to make public intellectuals as an independent figure in the future society, then, it is very important to bring up the children and understand them what the purpose of

Special Issue On Multidisciplinary Research

education is and how knowledge should be treated and how knowledge advanced. As we know that America was always laid presented as not just the democratic system but also a highly educated society. But what went wrong with our education system? What should be the content of education is a much more serious question now. In what process we need to teach the children? It is not the correct way to just giving information to the child and expecting the child to repeat and memorize that information, or giving a pre-determined question and answer. The essential quality of any kind of education is teaching a child to learn about the purpose of education, train people to think critically and ask question. If we train people to do so and produce such citizenship then it will be very difficult in the intelligent debate for the representatives is society in democracy. Therefore, it is important to discover truth and knowledge, discover existing knowledge moving on to asking question based on evidence and logical reasoning. Otherwise, knowledge cannot be advanced further.

There are two issues that bring up critical thinking very strongly -----

One is the whole question of the institution and structures of democracy. Have we come to a point today where we have to rethink what those institutions and structures should be? We have always based ourselves on things like elections, representation, how do we represent opinion and people and so on, the articulation of people's ideas for whole question of majoritarianism and so on. Is this sufficient or do we have to go beyond this now and consider the fact that there seem to be all these people coming into power on really a minority votes, means hardly one third is a majority vote. Here, Karl Raimund Popper suggests two party system policy in democratic state. In this political system, representative of a state can be elected by a clear majority vote in every election.

Special Issue On Multidisciplinary Research

Therefore, democracy is such type of basic institution, but how do we make it effective? How do we make it more representative? How do we encourage people to participate in democracy, come out and vote in an effective way? These are the question we have to address and try solve.

Here public intellectuals have an important role to play. But how do we define public intellectual? What are the responsibilities of public intellectuals? The public intellectual is an individual who respects in his or her profession. It is not just any individual or thinkers, but the thinkers who has the reputation to become good social thinkers, social scientist or philosophers for that matter are respected. The person is respected for the fact that the knowledge that he or she tries to convey to society is reliable knowledge.

The relationship between public intellectual and society is that public intellectuals must have a concern for civil society, the rights, duties, obligations of citizens to the state and it is really a fundamental duty and responsibility for a public intellectual, specially, in the circumstances where people face all kinds of dishonesties. Public intellectual, again, should be concerned about the movement and the growing level of responsibilities. Sometimes, public intellectuals try to express themselves beyond their limitation of mastery. There are lots of intellectual person lives in a society but someone likes to take such responsibilities and others denies it. For example, Albert Einstein, though internally a shy person but he always concerned about his self-confident and the position he occupies in the world and loves to take responsibility too. A public intellectual is always free to think critically, but he or she must be concerned, aware, of his degrees of knowledge and ideas. Again, he must be aware and responsible for the results of his speech, writings, and action that he does. He may ask the question for any bad consequences, because he is not beyond the laws

Special Issue On Multidisciplinary Research

and principles. When one represents his society in a large institution, becomes the public property. He himself becomes an institution from an individual, because he has enumerable strength to influence people and change the system. So, he must use that strength with respect. Again, public intellectuals should make aware themselves with the issues that are connected to the human rights and the system of society. They expected to choose an autonomous position of those in power and should enable themselves to arise critical questions with proper reason in debatable topic, irrespective of who cultivate such debatable ideas.

Morality of questioning and the public intellectuals:

To become a public intellectual, it is very essential for one is to think critically and ask critical question. An individual is called a public intellectual if he or she has the capacity to arise critical question for the public interest. But in what condition a public intellectual becomes a 'critical thinker'? can he ask question to another people while being uncritical regarding his personal position? Thapar's essay and the discussion on public intellectuals identifies various elements of what it is to be a public intellectual, ranging from criticism of authority to being involved in matters of social justice (Romila Thapar, P. 55). So, it can be considered that, being a public intellectual, it is very essential to combine all of these acts, roles, rules and principles of public intellectual together in a certain mode.

The morality of public intellectuals is that they should consider themselves first not as an intellectual but as a part of the public figure. In this idea of public intellectuals, there is an internal thought that though the public intellectuals are outside of public but they speak for the betterment of public. Therefore, it should be considered that they constantly remind their spirit of intellectual consciousness. Just as another representative of public, they speak for

Special Issue On Multidisciplinary Research

public and never demand anything from the common people more than they can demand from themselves.

Therefore, these are the way of knowing about what should be the role of critical enquiry in the public sphere is. Public intellectuals should encourage citizens to experiment critically their own thoughts and faiths. Again, other people should know the platforms in which the critical enquiry of the faith of the group of people and communities can be possible. Here, the public intellectual should follow such necessary principles under which they can question and these principles are not just political but epistemological and ethical too.

Popper's Doctrine of Critical Rationalism

The idea of critical rationalism has been started from the Würzburg School of Psychology. This school wanted to advance a deductive philosophy to enhance their reductivist psychology. In this working process Karl Popper introduced a non-justificationist method of scientific knowledge and described the enhancement of knowledge without evidence. Non-justificationism is a theory that cannot be proved by any theory, it is as ancient theory as Socrates. But Karl Popper's model of this theory is the first that can claim to describe the enhancement of knowledge too. Therefore, like other critical rationalist, Popper also brought a project to describe the enhancement of knowledge without justification. (Critical rationalism: Internet encyclopedia).

The concept of critical rationalism has been advanced by Karl Popper himself and also by various thinkers, as a method of falsification and as fallibilism, which means a statement concerning empirical knowledge will be accepted even though there is be no certainty to be proven. The term fallibilism associated with the father of pragmatism, Charles Pierce, who propounded it long prior to Popper started his career. Karl Popper's critical rationalism emerged by denying

Special Issue On Multidisciplinary Research

induction as a scientific method. The real process of science according to Karl Popper is a running method of conjectures and refutations. It is according to Popper the method in which knowledge developed, mainly scientific knowledge by unjustified expectation, by prediction, by provisional solution to the problems by conjectures and these conjectures are commanded by criticism which means by attempted refutations, that contain various critical experiments. They may go through various experiments but cannot be extremely justified. They can neither be grounded as absolutely 'correct' nor even as 'provisional (Popper K. R., *Conjectures and Refutations: The Growth of Scientific Knowledge*, 1963). Popper, Moreover, took this problem more briefly that 'all knowledge is hypothetical' (Popper K. R., *Objective Knowledge: An Evolutionary Approach*, 1972) or 'all knowledge survives conjectural' (Popper K. R., *Realism and The Aim of Science*, 1983), therefore, 'all knowledge if conjectural' and that is the spirit of his philosophy which influenced others too.

Originally, the idea of critical rationalism has been advanced by Karl Popper for the demarcation of science from non-science. According to him, scientific statements must be refutable to be considered themselves as knowledge. Scientific knowledge, in so far as presents to the practical world, they must be refutable, they are unable to refer to the world of experience, in so far as they are irrefutable (Popper K. R., *The Open Society And Its Enemies*, 1945). It follows that we can never attain certainty: "The quest for certainty... is mistaken though we may seek for truth ... we can never be quite certain that we have found it" (Popper K. R., *The Open Society And Its Enemies*, 1945). "No particular theory may ever be regarded as absolutely certain No scientific theory is sacrosanct ..." (Popper K. R., *Objective Knowledge: An Evolutionary approach*, 1972). "Precision and certainty are false ideals. They are impossible to

Special Issue On Multidisciplinary Research

attain and therefore dangerously misleading ..." (Popper, *Unended Quest: An Intellectual Autobiography*, 1974). He summed up with an of repeated aphorism: "We never know what we are talking about" (Popper, *Unended Quest: An Intellectual Autobiography*, 1974). Accordingly, Popper refused to grant any philosophical value to definitions: "Definitions do not play any very important part in science Our 'scientific knowledge' ... remains entirely unaffected if we eliminate all definitions" (Popper K. R., *The Open Society And Its Enemies*, 1945). "Definitions never give any factual knowledge about 'nature' or about the 'nature of things'" (Popper K. R., *Conjectures and Refutations: The Growth of Scientific Knowledge*, 1963). "Definitions are never really needed, and rarely of any use" Popper K. R., *Realism and the Aim of Science*, 1983). Although he held these positions all his working life, Popper did acknowledge that they were open to criticism: "nothing is exempt from criticism ... not even this principle of the critical method itself (Popper K. R., *The Open Society And Its Enemies*, 1945). Critical rationalism is the doctrine that Karl Popper presents to a common and self-critical rationalism. He contradicted this doctrine with extensive or uncritical rationalism and justificationist idea that a statement is acceptable if it is proved by experience and reason. Popper emphasized that extensive rationalism cannot describe how proof is plausible and that is why it turns to lack of consistencies and the contradiction. Popper's critical rationalism is now one of the significant doctrines to enlarge his approach to all the field of thoughts and practices. In every corner of this field, the main aim of critical rationalism is to substitute supposedly justificatory process with critical one.

Therefore, Popper discussed about critical the theory rationalism in his many treatise, including--- "The Logic of Scientific Discovery" (1934/1959), "The Open Society and its Enemies" (1945), "Conjectures and

Special Issue On Multidisciplinary Research

Refutations" (1963), "Unended Quest" (1976), "Objective Knowledge: An Evolutionary approach" (1972), "The Myth of the Framework" (1994), "Realism and the Aim of Science" (1983), and so on.

Popper's Open Society and Critical Rationalism:

To convince, attempt to create awareness, to solving problems as Popper remarks "All life is problem solving." He talks about open society where there is a possibility of carrying out philosophical ideas and debates in an unfettered way. Critical rationalism with the help of which we will accept only those which could be accepted with proper reason. All the theories under an investigation will be falsified. The autonomy to critical thinking is the main tool for achieving progress in any field of human thoughts. What Sen has pointed out, in his Argumentative Indian is quite akin to this. There has to be scope for better reason, scope for correction, for implementation of new ideas, only then we will move forward in our philosophical journey.

Basically, the ideology of democracy and totalitarianism are not similar. Popper stated that in democracy, the ruler of a state can be changed without any violence, on the other hand changes of ruler in a totalitarian or tyrannical state needs armed violence. Still there are so many differences than just this distinctive matter, because the violence as against to non-violence variation considers a basic distinction in the methodological level. This distinction is reflected on how political system, aims, methods, functions, and practices are reported by fallibilism and how critical investigation plays an important role as a response to public fallibility.

The rulers of a totalitarian state always invite historicism and try to exploit all the intellectual figures to protect their authority as the permanent rulers of the future and as representative of social policy. To accept to error is to invite criticism and so

Special Issue On Multidisciplinary Research

undermine the prophecy. The future-directed nature of historicism gives it means to forestall criticism by explaining away incongruities and possible refutations of the social framework because all errors will be reconciled in the future (John H. Seeski, P. 136). This makes obvious the way of the rulers who demand to understand the historical rules of destiny to govern state towards its final destination by the process of utopian engineering. The process of utopian engineering needs the unity of methodology, exercises, aims, functions, as the assistance of tribalism and hence, it is called a closed society. In fact, those people who assert the inevitability of totalitarianism argue that democracy in its fight against totalitarianism is forced to adopt totalitarian practices, thus, whether intended or not, end and practice merge (John H. Seeski, P. 136).

The methodological distinction between totalitarianism and democracy has been found in how the previous incorporates fallibility and a familiar critical mindset within the association among aims, methods, functions, and practices. The methods and practices of criticism will be allowed in totalitarianism only in so far as it is instructed towards the development of the goal. Here, in this process, the goal cannot be sustained for careful inquiry which accommodate it to be realized as erroneous. Democracy establishes the requirement of logical criticism at all kinds of social institutions and such criticism will be most fruitful if the results of our strategies are close to hand and do not exceed our capacity to command them.

The basic question who rules the state is one of the relevant questions to the Popper. The important question for Popper is how to get rid of a bad ruler or how to remove a bad leader. For him democracy and the open society is a perfect institutionalized way to do the same. Democracy do not prefer a particular social system; it is open and all the social system can be changed by democratic elections. Democracy

Special Issue On Multidisciplinary Research

emphasizes the rejection of any attempt whose aim is to make a preplanned social system imagined as “ideal.” Thus, in this case, democracy can perform if citizens are capable of making a rational choice among multiple alternatives.

Critical Rationalism is one of the most important theories of Popper’s political philosophy. This theory is developed in the middle of 20th century. It is a naturalistic view of Popper that a society has progressed through a method of solving problems. Through this problem-solving method, Popper said that all the natural and social sciences have been discovered and developed through subjecting probable doctrines to strong experiment and criticism. Popper stated that falsified doctrines are rejected. For example, the statement that “all swans are white” can be falsified by perceiving a black swan. Popper is searching for a society which allows strong doctrines along with open criticism, a society which conducive to problem-solving method, a society in which there is actual probability of reformation based on criticism which he called an open and democratic society.

Therefore, it is necessary to assess the role and responsibility of public intellectuals in democratic society. How can public intellectuals utilize critical rationalism to achieve a healthy open or democratic society.

With the emergence of fundamentalism, authoritarianism, dictatorship in the contemporary society, it is very essential to step out of the laboratory, understand it and to present a strong idea to challenge it. Karl Popper’s critical rationalism is one of the strong theories which makes an inaugural point for methodological, efficient, practical and fruitful overcoming of this phenomenon. Now I would like to discuss what should be the structure of democracy, its government and the role of citizen with Karl Popper’s doctrine of critical rationalism.

Special Issue On Multidisciplinary Research

Karl Popper believes in only one form of government called liberal democracy. For him liberal democracy permits institutional developments without any harm, cruelty, violence, conflict, murder etc. The book *Open Society and Its Enemies*, and *The Poverty of Historicism* of Karl Popper was very popular book, whose main aim was to analyse the origin and nature of totalitarianism and establish a democratic and open society. Totalitarianism, for Popper is not unique to the twentieth century. Rather, it “belongs to a tradition which is just as old or just as young as our civilization itself” (Popper, *Open Society*, Vol. I, 1).

Democratic idea of Karl Popper was straight, though not over straight, and minimalist. The question who should rule? is one of the fundamental questions of political philosophy. But set aside the question, Popper advanced a new question: “How can we so organize political institutions that bad or incompetent rulers can be prevented from doing too much damage?” (*Open Society* Vol. I, 121). Popper stated that this is a basically a query of institutional graph. Democracy happens to be the best type of political rule because it goes a long path toward finding out the answer of the question by providing an organizational, regular, and non-violent path to liberate from totalitarian rulers by casting vote out of official selection. Popper protected democracy on the principle of pragmatic or empirical field, not on the principles of essentialist that democracy means the rule of people. With this idea Popper proposed some questions of democratic concept, for example, on which fields are the people sovereign? Who shall figure up the people in exact number? How shall the people be represented? Popper said that the role of all individual is straight to provide a non-violent and constant path to get relief from worthless, unskillful, unfit, abusive, and corrupt rulers.

Therefore, According to Popper, people of a state should be allowed to remove and prevent the rulers

Special Issue On Multidisciplinary Research

if they do too much harm. But he always prefers a balance in the political institution. Democracy must look for institutional grab of the powers by balancing their strength against another strength. This idea is a significant element of the “new science” of 18th century politics. It is most popularly explained by James Madison in Federalist Paper: “A dependence on the people is, no doubt, the primary control on the government, but experience has taught mankind the necessity of auxiliary precautions,” Madison wrote. Thus, the government should be planned such type of goal who has the capacity to counteract another goal. Popper also one of the supporters of two-party systems democracy and argued that in this system it is very easy for voters to assign credit or failure to a certain political ideology. Under such a system, parties are from time to time forced to learn from their mistakes (Popper, *All Life Is Problem Solving*, 97). Hence, it can be considered on above reasons, democratic government in a two-party system is greater looking in the trial-and-error method that found in science and makes greater public policy. Proportional representation policy, according to popper formed multiple political parties and alignment government where no political party has the single authority to control of the government. In this situation voters are faced difficulties to assign liability for public policy and hence, elections are less significant and rulers are not so much respondent.

Therefore, the elimination of the unsatisfactory rulers in one of the important roles of citizen in Popper’s democratic state. Now the question arises is that how and who will implement the public policy? What will be the goals? Here, Popper emphasized the idea of “piecemeal social engineering” and this concept for is a superior approach compared to the utopian social engineering. Utopian engineering holds that all the rational works must have a particular, highly magnificent, and abstract aims, for example, real equality, ideal justice, maximum happiness etc. It is

Special Issue On Multidisciplinary Research

attractive and convincing. It is more dangerous because it is an alternative to a radical historicism which emphasizes that the course of history is unchangeable.

Apart from the utopian social engineering, for Popper piecemeal social engineering is a “small scale” which determines the focus of social reformation should be based on switching one institution at one time. Addressing the concrete social problems is the aim of piecemeal social engineering, for example, violence, poverty, unemployment, income inequality, environmental degradation etc. it does so by the invention of novel social institutions and reformation of the remain ones. Then, the novel or reformation institutions will be examined by the implementation and change accordingly and regularly based on their effects. in this position the social problems will be reduced and the gradual development of social institutions will be continued. Popper assimilated piecemeal social engineering to physical engineering and holds that like as physical engineers purify a device by a sequence or order of small coordination to existing models, social engineers develop social institutions step by step through “piecemeal engineering.” In this process, “the piecemeal method permits repeated experiments and continuous readjustment” (Open Society, Vol I., 163). According to Popper, only this type of assessment can product authentic response for social planners.

Conclusion:

In conclusion it can be considered that democracy has the universal acceptability in the world. Because it is such an amazing feeling good sign that almost all the rulers, though autocratic or fascist, thinks themselves as democratic. In fact, the measurement of a democratic state based on the element in which the people can impress the government. In a democracy, people are free and to criticize rationally against the

Special Issue On Multidisciplinary Research

government if rulers implemented any rules which are harmful for the society. People are open to exchange their ideas to discover new ideas. That is why Karl Popper called the democratic society as the open society. Democracies future can be considered as bright. Therefore, democracy is very popular and acceptable idea in recent society. There are many elements of a democratic state and the free speech or freedom of expression is one of the most important elements of them. Free speech encourages the diversity of ideas and debates among people so that we can discover a new idea or method for the welfare of society. Free speech is also one of the self-governing tools for citizen. It is an autonomy of an individual. Defense of the autonomy of free speech implies that state is responsible for the protection of free speech, because any restrictions on the free speech would break the principle of the autonomy of people. Though it is an autonomy for an individual, but he or she should take the responsibility of the consequences of his or her speeches. So, all the speeches, whether it is good or harmful should be protected by the democratic state because we can learn from both the results of good and bad speeches. Citizen will be rewarded for their good speeches and punished for their bad or hate speeches which are harmful for the society. But people should always be free to express themselves and it is fully possible in Popper's open society which is also called democratic society. Again, in a democratic society, Public intellectual plays an important role to make democracy more effective. Disparities, irregularities, inequalities in social policies invites public dissent and broadens its 'force and range' through argumentation aided by reasoned arguments with critical rationalism.

In a participatory democracy, the citizen can participate in the discussion making process and policy formulation and implementation. Public intellectual as well as the conscious citizens can

Special Issue On Multidisciplinary Research

participate through feedback systems, monitoring committees, use of applications of electronic and IT platforms about the government, social media platforms. They can provide inputs regarding better policy making and voice their opinions on issues which are unheard and neglected by the government.

Intellectual honesty on the part of public intellectuals, proper exercise of political liberty, guarantee of free speech can go a long way in achieving a meaningful participation in democracy.

Bibliography:

1. Arendt, Hannah, *The Origins of Totalitarianism*, New Edition, A Harvest Book Harcourt Brace & Company, San Diego, New York, London, 1951
2. Ahuja, Ram, *Social Problems in India*, (Fourth Edition), Rawat Publication, Jawahar Nagar, Jaipur, 1992, 2021.
3. Afisi, Oseni Taiwo, *Karl Popper's Critical Rationalism and the Politics of Liberal-Communitarianism*, University of Canterbury, 2015.
4. Arnaudo, Daniel. *Freedom of Expression, Privacy and Human Rights Report* Igarape Institute (2017) Stable URL: <http://www.jstor.com/stable/resrep20648.8>
5. Ash. Garton, *Defense of Free Speech More Important Than Ever for Open Society*, February 28, 2017. <https://www.ceu.edu/article/2017-02-28>
6. Bhargava, Rajeev. Acharya Ashok. *Political Theory: An Introduction*, Pearson, Seventeenth impression 2022.
7. Corvi, Roberta, *An Introduction to The Thought of Karl Popper*, Translated by Oatrick Camiller, Routledge, London and New York, 1997.
8. *Democracy*, Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy, July 27, 2006. <https://plato.stanford.edu/entries/democracy/>
9. *Freedom of Speech* (Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy), 2002. <https://plato.stanford.edu/entries/freedom-speech/#HarPriFreSpe>
10. Gauba, O., P., *Political Ideas and Ideologies*, (4th Edition), National Paperbacks, New Delhi, 2010, 2020.

Special Issue On Multidisciplinary Research

11. Harrison, Kevin. Boyd, Tony. Understanding Political Ideas and Movements, 2003.
12. Jha, Shefali, Western Political Thought: From Plato to Marx, published by Pearson India Education Services Pvt. Ltd. 2010.
13. Lea-Henry, Jed, The Politics of Karl Popper, July 2019.
https://www.researchgate.net/publication/334611690_The_Politics_of_Karl_Popper
14. Mukherjee, Subrata, A History of Political Thought (Plato to Marx), Second Edition, PHI Learning Private Limited, Delhi-110092, 1999, 2022.
15. M., Faizal, N., Critical Rationalism of Karl Raimund Popper, Department of Philosophy, University College, Tiruvanthapuram, 2003.
16. Ormerod, Richard, The history and ideas of critical rationalism: the philosophy of Karl Popper and its implications for OR, Journal of the Operational Research Society, April 2009.
https://www.researchgate.net/publication/233603945_The_history_and_ideas_of_critical_rationalism_the_philosophy_of_Karl_Popper_and_its_implications_for_OR
17. Popper, Karl Raimund, The Open Society and Its Enemies, Volume I and II, London, George Routledge & Sons, Ltd. Broadway House: 68-74 Carter Lane, E.G, 1943/ 1947.
18. Popper, Karl Raimund, Poverty of Historicism, Harper Torch books, New York and Evanston, 1957.
19. Popper, Karl Raimund, The Open Universe: An Argument for Indeterminism, Routledge Taylor & Francis Group, London and New York, 1982, 1988.
20. Popper, Karl Raimund, All Life is Problem Solving, Routledge Taylor & Francis Group, London and New York, 1999.
21. Popper, Karl Raimund, Logic of Scientific Discovery, Routledge, London and New York, 1935, 1959, 1992, 2002.
22. Popper, Karl Raimund, Conjectures and Refutations: The Growth of Scientific Knowledge, New York, London 1962.
23. Popper, Karl, Philosophy of Science, Internet Encyclopedia of Philosophy.
<https://iep.utm.edu/pop-sci/>
24. Shearmur, Jeremy and Turner, Piers Norris, Popper: After the Open Society, Special Indian Edition,

Special Issue On Multidisciplinary Research

Routledge, London and New York, 2008, Indian
Published 2013.

25. Shearmur, Jeremy, The Political Thought of Karl Popper, Routledge, London and New York, 1996.
26. Schilpp, Paul, Arthur, The Philosophy of Karl Popper, Book-I, La Salle, Illinois, Open Court, 1974.
27. Thapar, Romila. The Public Intellectual in India, Aleph Book Company, 2015.
28. Thorsen, Dag Einar, The Politics of Freedom: A Study of The Political Thought of Isaiah Berlin and Karl Popper, and The Challenge of Neoliberalism, University of Oslo, 2011.
29. Wilkie, Craig, Open Nationalism: Reconciling Popper's Open Society and The Nation State, The University of Edinburgh, 2009.