

POLITICAL ETHICS: AN ENQUIRY INTO ITS NATURE, SCOPE AND RELEVANCE

Deepanwita Dutta

Abstract

In this essay, an attempt has been made to discuss the complex rapport between ethics and politics. This paper has been divided into three sections. The first section seeks to discern the nature of the rupture between ethics and politics. The second section outlines the intricate relationship between ethics and politics in early Indian political thought. The third section addresses some pertinent questions that arise in studying political ethics. A conclusion has been drawn based on a critical survey of early Indian and Western political thought.

Key Words: *political ethics, individual morality, private morality, dirty hands, rājadharmā*

Section-I

The phrase "Political Ethics" is a conjunction of politics and ethics. Ethics is one of the significant branches of philosophy, which is primarily a normative discipline. However, it involves a great deal of meta-ethical and practical discourses. On the other hand, politics is a social scientific inquiry into the activities associated with the governance of a country and its policies. By applying empirical method, it seeks to describe and explain political phenomena. It is a systematic study of the processes of government, its organs and institutions. Although it is a descriptive study, it involves philosophical questions such as "How a society should be organized?" "Why do we need government?" "How ought the governance to be?" Hence, it also attempts to answer "Why" and "How" which inevitably entails "ought" questions. So, it includes a normative approach as well.

Moreover, the normative sections of politics call for meta-ethical enquiries. Meta-ethical reflection contains a conceptual analysis of political ideas and values such as duty, right, necessity, obligation, accountability, justice, and so on. The topic under discussion is basically discussed under the domain of political philosophy. Thus, political ethics is an ethical evaluation of government officials' political activities and policies (intra-national and international).

To examine the nature and scope of political ethics, we need to answer some central questions: To what extent do the ethical principles that govern public life differ from those that govern individual life? What constitutes the rationale for formulating state morality as distinct from private morality? Individual morality is basically the set of norms and values that an individual adheres to in his personal life while dealing with family, friends, relationships, etc. On the contrary, political morality is often interpreted as public morality. Administrators, government officials, or those in political power must recognize that every political activity has a long-term impact that profoundly affects the lives of the masses. Hence, those who hold administrative power must be morally accountable to the people they govern. Although the concrete reality of politics is intricate and full of conflicts, it is not devoid of ethics. However, it replaces the common man's normative principles with those that serve the state's interest.

In this connection, Prof. P. K. Mukhopadhyaya in his article “On Understanding Practical Philosophy”, pointed out that we must demarcate immoral from amoral in politics. He holds that in amorality, there is no harm if prudential considerations precede morality.¹ Now, the pertinent question is, how do we distinguish amoral from value-loaded areas? This distinction can be made on the basis of the following principle: Political matters that do not influence the public and the state's welfare can be considered amoral or value-neutral. On the contrary, political problems that are intimately tied to the public and the commonwealth's interests inevitably call for ethical scrutiny. Prof. Debasis Guha in his “A Defense of Political Ethics” observes that although some political issues may *prima facie* appear value-neutral, but an attentive inspection would unearth that they essentially call for ethical evaluation. Hence, many political issues, especially the core issue of state morality invite ethical inspection of political rights, duties and obligations.²

If we reflect on the cause of the origin of the state, we shall find several hypotheses. However, it is agreed upon that the state has originated due to a contract between the rulers and the ruled. Before the origin of a state, it is usually presumed that there was a condition called the state of nature. At this stage, men had unrestricted liberty. Even man was free to exploit or oppress others. Soon, it led to a moral degeneration where stronger people began to exploit weaker people, what we call ‘*mātsyanyāya*’ in Indian terminology. As a result, a chaotic situation began to prevail.

¹ Mukhopadhyaya, P. K. “On Understanding Practical Philosophy”. Source: Basak, Jyotish Chandra, and Bhattacharyya, Anureema (ed.) *Essays on Ethics and Politics*, University of North Bengal, Darjeeling, 2023, p. 49.

² *Ibid.* p. 173.

At this juncture, people started feeling the need for security, peace and order. So, the state came into existence as a result of an agreement among people to check the rampant moral decadence. Some argue that the contract was social, whereas others held it was divine. However, people agreed to accept some external restrictions upon their absolute freedom to preserve life and the common good. Thus, some constraints on man's autonomy become necessary conditions for man's general well-being. However, forming a well-ordered society presupposes the existence of a just person in power committed to dispensing justice by terminating anarchy. But the moot question is: What if the person in administration refuses to keep his oath taken at the time of his enthronement? In fact, history has witnessed innumerable examples of such hypocrisy, cheating and unscrupulous practices. Holding power, even by unethical means, has become their primary concern. Actually, it is a paradox—whereas state heads are conferred power to ensure common men's welfare, but they want to retain power even at the cost of public well-being. This tendency has become the cause of concern and moral decadence.

From the ancient period, thinkers have been concerned about the persistent moral decline in politics. From ancient to post-modern times, both Indian and Western thinkers viewed political ethics from various angles and they articulated it in many different ways. So, we get several accounts on this subject. They may be categorized into two main groups: one group contends that ethics and politics are inextricably connected. Ancient Greek philosopher Aristotle and seventeenth-century German philosopher Immanuel Kant advocated this view. Aristotle's *Politics* is a complementary work to his *Nicomachean Ethics*. The first line of *Nicomachean Ethics* tells us that every activity has a certain *telos* (end or purpose). In *Politics*, he narrates the form of governance that would best facilitate man to pursue the end described in *Nicomachean Ethics*. For him, politics is the prerequisite for securing the highest end of human life, i.e. *eudomonia* (happiness). Immanuel Kant's account of political morality is best found in his letters. He maintained that there can be no conflict between ethics and politics. His understanding of political morality aligns with his notion of pure ethics, known as "categorical imperative". He writes, "politics cannot take a step back without first paying homage to morals ... all politics must bend its knee before right."³ Hence, his idea is that politics is based on ethics. On

³ Cited in *Political Morality and the Problem of Dirty Hands: A Philosophical Critique and Re-interpretation*, a Ph. D thesis submitted by Demetris Tillyris to the University of Leeds, School of Politics and International Studies, December 2013, pp. 45-46. (Source: <https://etheses.whiterose.ac.uk/6810/1/D%20Tillyris%20PhD%20Thesis%20Political%20Morality%20and%20the%20Problem%20of%20Dirty%20Hands%20A%20Philosophical%20Critique%20and%20Re-interpretation%20.pdf>)

examining the relationship between ethics and politics, Prof. Guha remarked that they do not have any logical connection with each other because not all meta-ethical discussions need to be necessarily based on politics and not all talks in State governance need to be necessarily based on meta-ethics, though some meta-ethical talks involve politics and some political talks of governance involve meta-ethics. If this be the case, then neither ethics nor politics can be shown to be necessarily and sufficiently based on one another.⁴

Another group argues that politics is neutral to ethical considerations. It has nothing to do with conventional morality. Here, only prudence reigns over irrelevant everyday morality. Even the adoption of immoral means like hypocrisy, cheating, falsehood, betrayal, corruption, and even murder is fair in politics. Sixteen-century Italian diplomat Nicolo Machiavelli advocated a kind of state morality distinct from individual morality. According to him, the morality that governs commonwealth must be different from the morality that governs an individual's life. He argued in support of his contention that if one follows honest means in politics, that may lead to bad consequences, whereas if one resorts to dishonest means, that may lead to desirable ends.⁵ Hence, his notorious lesson in *The Prince* is that expedient and responsible politics requires its practitioners to master how not to be good. His account of state morality has been expressed through the concept of *virtù*. Though he never describes *virtù*, he does not opine it a conventional moral virtue. For him, *virtù* is the prudent precaution men must take to combat adverse situations. Machiavelli's political principle is irrelevant to binaries such as justice or injustice, kindness or cruelty. For him, “that alternative should be wholeheartedly adopted which will save the life and preserve the freedom of one's country.”⁶

Taking cue from Machiavelli's *The Prince* Jean-Paul Sartre coined the phrase “dirty hands”. His composition *Dirty Hands* 1948 is a political drama. The main thesis of dirty hands goes as follows: In extreme emergencies, political leaders might be obligated to dirty their hands and allow immoral actions for the greater good. The drama's main theme is that right political action can be incongruous with standard morality. The play's focal point is the tension between morality and effective political action. The ideological conflict between Hugo and Heoderer represents a difference in ethical grounds. Hugo is an absolute deontologist, while Hoederer is a consequentialist.

⁴ Guha, D. “A Defense of Political Ethics”. Source: Basak, Jyotish Chandra, and Bhattacharyya, Anureema (ed.) *Essays on Ethics and Politics*, University of North Bengal, Darjeeling, 2023, p.168.

⁵ Machiavelli, Nicolo, *The Prince*, Antonio Blado d'Asola Press, Italy, 1532, pp. 91-92.

⁶ Cited in “Political Morality vs. Political Necessity: Kautilya and Machiavelli Revisited” by Narasimha Prasad Sil, *Journal of Asian History*, Vol. 19, published by Harrassowitz Verlag, 1985, pp. 109-110.

Hoederer firmly believes it is impossible to govern innocently; it is inevitable to dirty one's hands in the merciless world of politics. His predicament is revealed when he utters, "I have dirty hands right up to the elbows. I have plunged them in filth and blood. Do you think I could govern innocently?"⁷

Thus, the contention between absolutists and relativists concerning dirty hands politics *per se* points to the debate between deontology and consequentialism. The debate between relativists and absolutist brings their logical grounds to the surface. To defend their position, relativists would draw our attention to the complex reality of politics. Unlike private life, they argue, real politics is characterized by conflicts and pluralism. Here, the necessity to manipulate, lie, breach, steal, and even murder may arise frequently. The realm of politics is weighed with much more significant consequences than private life. For example, the administration of a state involves defeating internal aggressors and external enemies, resolving conflicting interests of different groups and communities, policy-making (internal and external), etc.; all these indicate the fact that concrete and intricate realities of politics are far different from private life.

To counter relativists' logic, absolutists come up with their reasoning and argue that, in most cases, politicians use expedient measures just for self-aggrandizement in the name of political necessity. As a result, it gives birth to corruption. For instance, in a party system democratic government, party representatives make false promises, fool ordinary people, and manipulate votes using unethical means. So, their use of unjust means is neither for the common good's sake nor the state's welfare. Nonetheless, they defend their position saying that it is an obligation to dirty their hands to stay in power for a political party. They are entrusted with administrative power to secure public welfare and serve the state's interest. However, their logic for using wrong methods to stay in power at the cost of public well-being does not make any sense. Deontologist Immanuel Kant absolutely rejected consequentialists' standpoint because, according to him, it exists in "the self-seeking tendencies of men which we cannot call their morality. He asserts that contemporary politicians (or any public or private figure) cannot evade the thrust of the Categorical Imperative: they cannot get away from the idea of right. Nor must they dare to base politics on expediency and refuse obedience to the idea of right. Concerning the issue of lying, the maxim honesty is the best policy, for Kant, is the necessary condition of politics."⁸

⁷ Source: <https://astrofella.wordpress.com/2017/10/24/dirty-hands-jean-paul-sartre/>

⁸ Cited in *Political Morality and the Problem of Dirty Hands: A Philosophical Critique and Re-interpretation*, a Ph. D thesis submitted by Demetris Tillyris to the University of Leeds, School of Politics and International Studies, December 2013, pp. 45-46.

Section-II

We find a vast body of normative literature on political ethics in India. Politics has never been separated from religion and morality in India since ancient times. Ancient Indian political thinking aligned with the aims and objectives of social life. As a result, political activity is seen as an aspect of spirituality that guides man towards self-actualization or self-realization. The distinctness of Indian political thinking can be expressed in the following words: Indian political thought cannot be isolated from the main body of Hindu philosophy. In the West, the science of government rests upon an empirical basis. But the great works of Indian polity are based upon metaphysics and ethics which pose and interpret the very problems of human existence.

Although the *Vedas*, *Upaniṣads* and philosophical systems fundamentally deal with theology and philosophy, some significant political ideas are scattered across these literary works. However, *Dharmaśāstras*, *Arthaśāstras* and *Nītisāras* more intensely and systematically deliberated upon political problems and the science of governance. “In the *Śāntiparva* of the *Mahābhārata* we find political realism and speculative idealism of an advance level.”⁹ *Śāntiparva* comprises of three sub-*parvas*: *Rājadharmānuśāsana*, *Āpadadharmā* and *Mokṣadharmā*. Prominent *Dharmaśāstras* like *Manu Samhitā*, *Yājñavalkya Samhitā* etc. consist of ethical and legal norms or codes for regulating social and political life. *Arthaśāstra* stands for the science of governance. Although Kauṭilya emerges as a political realist, essentially, he was a moralist. Kauṭilya’s moralism follows the precept of traditional *rājadharmā*. The *Śāstras* prescribed a balanced pursuit of all four ends necessary in human life. Excessive indulgence of any one of the four goals becomes a detrimental factor. Besides the *Arthaśāstra* tradition, the *Nītisāras* contain a moral overtone. Political treatises such as *Arthaśāstra* and *Nītisāras* seek to offer practical lessons on how best to govern the state and, hence, are very helpful to monarchs in preserving humanity.

In the Indo-Aryan political system, the king was deemed the head of the state, vested with executive, legislative, judicial and financial powers. Hence, *rājadharmā*, or the king's duties, is the central theme of Hindu political thought. *Rājadharmā* encompasses certain duties and obligations on the part of the king and his administrative assistants. At one point, the *Śāntiparva* in 63.25 declares that all the *dharmas* are either derived from or merged back into *rājadharmā*. Hence, *rājadharmā* is the fountain of all *dharmas*. The primary duty of a king is to protect the law-abiding citizens and punish the wrong-doers. The concept of protection in Hindu polity is a

⁹ Verma, V. P. *Studies in Hindu political Thought and its Metaphysical basis*, Motilal Banarasidas Publishers, Delhi, 1974, p. 56.

very comprehensive idea. It presupposes the ideal of social and economic justice for the total well-being and happiness of all the subjects and security of the orphan, the aged, the widow, the sick and the poor. In dispensing justice, impartiality and fairness were to be upheld. The king protects his people with the help of *daṇḍa* (the rod of chastisement). *Daṇḍa* is the principal instrument of a state. Bhiṣma describes *daṇḍa* as “*jāgrati*” or vigilance which keeps an eye even over the king. It has two-fold functions—restrain and punishment. It is necessary for bringing about order and discipline. The application of *daṇḍa* must follow certain *nīti*. *Daṇḍa*, according to Kauṭilya, should be proportionate, neither too heavy nor too low. A proper thoughtful chastisement that is based upon the scriptures will righteously engage the people (“*suvijñātapraṇīto hi daṇḍaḥ prajādharmārthakāmairyojayati*”¹⁰). *Apraṇītaḥ daṇḍaḥ* or absence of punishment will produce *mātsyanyāya* (lawlessness). *Daṇḍanīti*, the supreme governing principle, is, therefore, equated with dharma.

Concerning the interstate policy, the four expedients (*upāyas*) of royal power—conciliation (*sāma*), giving gifts (*dāna*), force (*daṇḍa*), and creating dissension (*bheda*)—were a standard part of political discourse. Besides, we come across three more *upāyas* such as *upekṣā*, *māyā* and *indrajalām* in *Viṣṇudharmottarapurāṇam*, *Agnipurāṇam* and *Kāmandaka Nītisāra*.¹¹ The early Indian political system also delineates the six measures governing the conduct of international relations—namely, peace or making a treaty (*sandhi*), war (*vigraha*), staying quiet (*āsana*), marching (*yāna*), seeking shelter (*saṁśraya*), and the dual policy (*dvaiddhibhāva*) of simultaneously pursuing peace with one ruler and waging war against another. And regarding the destruction of internal and external enemies, the *Kauṭilyan Arthaśāstra* devotes an entire *adhikaraṇa* to describe the secret means such as *pralambhanam* and *adbhutapādanam* (magical contrivances) or *bhaiṣajyamantrayogaḥ* (medicinal charms). Actually, he encourages active and passive aggression only against an enemy. Hence, he insists that even with very great losses and expenses, the destruction of the enemy must be brought about. If necessary, he is ready to promote adopting foul means in a strategic battle (*kuṭayuddha*). He approves a fair and open fight (*dharmayuddha*), but a *kuṭayuddha* is permissible in extreme circumstances.

Although at times the Kauṭilyan king is misconceived as a Machiavellian despot, from the above, it becomes explicit that Hindu political thought portrayed the

¹⁰ Kangle, R. P. (tr.) *The Kautilya Arthaśāstra Part I*, I ii, iv, 11, Motilal Banarasidass Publishers Pvt Ltd, Delhi, 1965, p. 6.

¹¹ Joshi, Lakshman Shastri (ed.) *Dharmakoṣa*, Rājanītikāṇḍa, Vol. IV, Part IV, Prajñā Pāṭhśālā Maṇḍala, 1977, p. 15.

ideal of *rājarsi* or sage-king who is envisaged as a dutiful fulfiller of *rājadharma*. Several discourses on *Rājadharma* sum up the royal obligations of a ruler as greater in measure than mere collecting taxes or dispensing excessive punishment. *Rājadharma*'s categorical imperative is that the king, like a father, is the universal protector of the people, not their destroyer. One of the greatest threats to good governance is his own personal weakness and temptations. That is why, the necessity for sense control (*indriyanigraha*) and self-discipline (*vinaya*) are the recurring features of a king's duties. If a ruler is self-disciplined, these characteristics will automatically permeate to the lower level of society. Barring that, in the *Śāntiparva* of the *Mahābhārata*, we find a list of thirty-six norms or codes for self-regulation, which the king is expected to follow with diligence. "One of the enduring features of ancient Indian political thought is the idea of a strong relationship between the inner mental and emotional state of the king and the health of the state,"¹² writes Prof. Upinder Singh. Hindu political philosophy visualized the ideal of *rājarsi* or a saintly ruler who has attained saintly qualities, conquering six inimical tendencies (lust, anger, greed, pride and over-joy) and also acquired abilities for ruler-ship. In addition, an extensive education and rigorous training process have been prescribed for ruler-ship training as an aspect of good governance. The *Kauṭilyan Arthaśāstra* mentions four *rājavidyās* – *ānvīkṣikī*, *trayī*, *vārtā* and *daṇḍanīti* that a prince must master to be eligible for kingship.

So, as can be seen, the tone of early Indian political precepts is primarily didactic. Although the imperatives are straightforward, at least in their articulation, their application may present specific challenges due to contingencies of human situations.

Section-III

Thus, both in Indian and Western political thought we encounter abundant discussion on political pragmatism. The exponents of political realists legitimize the need for flexibility in politics. They maintain that the autonomy of politics rests precisely upon its intrinsically conflictive nature. Accordingly, the proponents of realpolitik do not hesitate to endorse the judicious application of treacherous means. Expediency as a necessary aspect of realpolitik raises several questions. These questions can be divided into at least four categories: normative, meta-ethical, virtue ethical, and practical ethical. However, these questions are not mutually exclusive. They are intertwined with each other. Normative questions, for instance, "Do expedient means possess any value at all?" "Are these measures useful to fulfill a desirable end?" "Are we permitted to attain goods by whatever means we can?" "Should means also be

¹² Singh, Upinder, *Political Violence in Ancient India*, Harvard University Press, 2017, p. 465.

essentially good if a good end is to be realized?" "Is purity of means an essential aspect of the way of the realization of a good end?" Which doctrine is ethically acceptable: "Means justifies ends" or "End justifies means"? These are precisely the questions that engage our attention in the philosophy of means and end.

The Machiavellian epithet is "end justifies means". Being a political realist, he holds that unethical means are conducive to sustaining virtuous political life: They support practitioners of politics to satisfy some of the political ends of their practice. This is the ethical stance maintained by consequentialists. However, deontologists discard consequentialists' standpoint. For them, the word "good" even etymologically has a reference to "end". According to Merriam-Webster dictionary, the word "right" means "according to what is just". Being "in accordance with what is just" has a necessary reference to the ways of operation and behavior, and, therefore, to means. That is why it is suggested that means and ends have a necessary relationship with each other. It is interesting to note Gandhi's thoughts on this issue. These two concepts have been the central theme of his thought. He gives very great value to "means". He says, "(T)hey say "means are after all means". I would say "means are after all everything." As the means so the end; there is no wall of separation between means and end. Indeed the creator has given us control (and that too very limited) over means, none over the end. Realization of the goal is in exact proportion to that of the means."¹³ If we carefully examine Gandhi's doctrine, we shall find merit in his view. We find that the end of any project is always beyond our control. What we have at our discretion is the means. We can manoeuvre only means and never the ends. Goodness or badness of an act depends on how I do it. Therefore, it follows that the means has to be the right one.

Simultaneously, it invites meta-ethical questions like "What does it mean by "political necessity", "political responsibility" "accountability" and "desirability"? "Under what conditions is a politician obligated to use immoral ways?" "What are the things called politically desirable ends"? Value absolutists present logic to show that no political necessity can obligate a political figure or public servants to adopt evil means. This necessity solely springs from their self-beneficial tendencies. Concerning political responsibility, we think that administrative figures are primarily responsible for creating such a socio-politic milieu where everyone can fully develop their inner potencies. And whatever is led to this direction is suggested as the politically desirable end.

13

Source:<https://www.mkgandhi.org/voiceoftruth/meansandends.htm#:~:text=Young%20India%2C%2011%2D12%2D,every%20nation%20is%20complete%20independence>.

Machiavellian thinkers hold that an expedient politician, even after using wrong means, can be considered virtuous because according to them, we often fail to understand a subtle distinction: A significant difference exists between righteousness, conceived as the absence of wrongdoing, and righteousness, conceived as a disposition or character. Thus, the application of treacherous measures need not malign the upright character of a saintly ruler since these remain confined to the diplomacy part for securing a state's interest. However, this again raises virtue ethical questions like "in realpolitik is virtue limited to intent or disposition?" "What sort of virtue is fit for the political realm?"

Relativists further attempt to corroborate their view, pointing to the moral dilemmas that constitute inescapable characteristics of politics. However, value monists contend that moral conflict might seem *prima facie* possible. Such conflicts are mere chimaeras: a supreme moral value suggests that these can be perfectly resolved. "Like an ordinary mathematical puzzle, there is always a solution to every moral dilemma. What we need is a super mathematician to work it out,"¹⁴ held Matilal. So, according to them, "fair is foul and foul is fair" is a misconceived idea. The contention also demands practical ethical evaluation. For instance, how far are the unjust means adopted by political figures successful in attaining good governance? What sort of impact do these immoral means leave upon society? Besides, many philosophers and thinkers draw our attention towards the significance of defending political ethics by citing many value-loaded contemporary political quarries related to freedom of expression, the right to information, the use of nuclear weapons in war, etc. Thus, political ethics has become a highly relevant study in administration discourse.

Furthermore, if we carefully examine, we shall find that the tension between ethics and politics arises from exercising power. Historically, violence has been inherent in the exertion of power. As a matter of fact, intense conflicts, violence and war pervade the political world. The peculiarity of politics is, in fact, based on the necessity of harmonizing collective decisions under conditions of conflict. Hence, at some point of time, both Indian and Western political theorists more and less recognized the ideal of supremacy of politics. The goal of political paramountcy is implied in the idea that self-preservation is the fundamental duty of a state. Besides, political life is dynamic. Here, time and place factors play a significant role. So, it has to consistently consider constraints or contingencies of human situations and look beyond them. In scintillating situations, rules of morality must not act as hindrances. Hence, envisioning political morality in terms of abstract and universal action-guiding

¹⁴ Matilal, Bimal Krishna (ed.) *Moral Dilemmas in the Mahābhārata*, Motilal Banarasidas Publishers Pvt. Ltd. Delhi, 2014, p. 1.

rules and principles may sometimes not be helpful to the concrete realities and requirements of politics. As a result, it recognizes the necessity of malleability, although this is no justification for opportunism or self-aggrandizement. Flexibility does not mean an 'anything goes' kind of morality. This need not allow one to seek power only for the sake of power. Power, as several studies reveal, might have a malicious effect. In recent years, a large body of research has demonstrated that power has deep transformative effects on human psychology. A sense of feeling powerful can trigger behavioral disinhibition. Consequently, this disinhibiting effect of power can lead the powerful person to act immorally. In addition, it leads them to focus more on the self and one's own needs and activities.¹⁵ Interestingly, Max Weber in his essay "Politics as a Vocation" argues that striving for power for power's sake makes politics a meaningless activity. Hence, applying treacherous means as proponents of realpolitik sometimes endorse, might have slippery slope effects. This means any attempt to attain a political end by evil means might lead to a much longer chain of immoral deeds than was originally intended or anticipated.¹⁶ Bearing this in mind, ancient Indian political theorists stipulated strict self-regulatory norms both for the monarch and his administrative assistants. Thus, one can find in Hindu political thought a consistent endeavor to synchronize the governance of the state and the governance of self from ancient times.

¹⁵ Lammers, Joris, "Power and Morality", published by Elsevier, *Current Opinion in Psychology*, 2015, pp. 1-2.

¹⁶ Datta, Amlan, "Assorted Essay", Amio Puspo Prakashani, Kolkata, 2006, p.27.