



Political Science Notes on Western Philosophers

Source: CSS Forum

CSS Exam Desk

www.CSSExamDesk.com
www.instagram.com/CSS_Target
www.facebook.com/CSSExamPoint



Plato

Q1) impacts on Plato

Introduction:

Plato was born in 427 B.C in an aristocratic Athenian family. Plato gave an philosophy in response to certain events which happened in Greece of those days. These events proved of a far-reaching importance on Plato's mind. The first of these events was the betrayal of Athenian Democracy by the politicians at home and the defeat of Athenian democracy at the Hands of Spartan oligarchy in the Peloponnesian war the oligarchic rule of thirty so established in Athens after its defeat turned out to be very tyrannical. this was the second event that disillusioned Plato. The third and final event occurred in the execution of Socrates at the hands of democracy that was reestablished in Athens after the fall of the thirty Tyrants. This was the greatest sin against philosophy.

Defeat of Athens (Peloponnesian war)

Plato grew in a city at war Peloponnesian war started in 430B,C and went in for three decades ending with the final downfall of Athens in 404B.C. He was born where Athens was a city at war. He matured when Athens was defeated. Plato was a witness not only to the defeat and humectation of Athens but also to the incompetence of the democratic rule. The defeat of Athens at the hands of Sparta(military oligarchy) mean incompetence of the democratic rule. It was but natural for Plato to deal with problems such as the decline of states and their causes. Conversely he was bound to deal with the problem of good government and its stability.

Rule of Thirty Tyrants:

After the Athenian fall, oligarchic revolution was staged and a commission of thirty was set up. These thirty began to settle the old scores against the democrats. They committed atrocities. This in fact proved as the 2nd land mark in the life of Plato. Plato writes that at their behavior. "My blood boiled" Plato was this disillusioned by the rule of oligarchy also. The rule of thirty lasted for eight months only. They were friendly driver out and Democratic constitution was restored.

Execution of Socrates:

It was from Socrates that Plato learnt the dictum, "Virtue is knowledge." Socrates believed that the cure of ignorance is knowledge. So, in question of knowledge he never ceased constant examination of himself and others. The regime of democrats otherwise acting with restraint brought Socrates to trial on charges of impiety and corrupting the youth.

The condemnation and execution of his mentor brought a complete disenchantment for Plato with politics. It was a turning point in Plato life. It was the third landmark in Plato life but more important than the first two. In way per's words. "his (Socrates) death was perhaps the most important event in Plato's life, turning him from politics to philosophy.

Influence of Pythagoras:

After the execution of his mentor Plato left Athens and travelled for about twelve years. In Italy , he studied Pythagorean society which stressed class structure and importance of mathematics. Pythagoras believed in immortality and transmigration of soul. Pythagoras influenced Plato very deeply. His belief in the immortality of soul and his scheme of communism of property were all due to the Pythagoras influence. Plato's views on justice and philosopher king were also because of Pythagorean influence.

Plato returned to Athens in 386 B.C and founded the Academy. Where he taught for the rest of his life. His Academy was a new type of school where politicians could be trained to become a philosopher ruler.

Q2) ideal state of Plato (or)

Plato's political philosophy as a response to the of Greek city-state.

Introduction: (as in Q.1)

Plato's disillusionment with politics

The condemnation of Socrates disillusioned Plato finally about eh contemporary politics and politicians. He realized that Athenian democracy was infected with two great and serious drawbacks. One was the rule of ignorant people who posed themselves as all knowing. The second was political selfishness. The people captured political offices for furthering their own interests. This led to chaotic conditions and divided every city into two hostile camps of rich and poor/oppressors and oppressed.

Plato got disenchanted with all the forms of government running in Athenian those days. He found the solutions of the ills of the city state in philosophy. He gave his views in "republic". In this way Plato's "Republic" is an indictment to Greek civilization.

Foundation the Academy

Under these circumstances Plato left Athens and travelled abroad. In Italy he studied the doctrine of mystic Pythagorean society. His interest in mathematics his belief in immortality of soul and his scheme of communication of society were all due to the Pythagorean influence. Plato felt convinced about the truth of the dictum "Virtue is knowledge", which he had learnt from his Master, Socrates . knowledge is something which can be learnt and taught

so, if virtue is knowledge, it can also be learnt and taught. For this purpose Plato founded the Academy in 386 B.c

Ideal state:

In his “Republic, Plato portrays ideal state. He considers ideal state as the panacea for the crisis he saw in city-state the ideal state is to be ruled by the philosopher king, which he conceived in his pursuit of reason. In the portrayed of the ideal state, he went wherever reason led him. He cared little whether such a state can ever exist since he wanted to give the model of the best state, he cared little whether it was only Utopia cut off from reality. His model state was meant to be a model for all times and all places. Plato himself admits that his ideal state is difficult of realization. Such a state has never existed in the past, nor does it exist now, nor can it exist in the future. Such perfection is impossible. But Plato was equally clear that an idea or form of state must be given to influence the construction of actual state. Following are the characteristics of Plato’s ideal state.

Division of labor:

The various cases in society satisfy the reciprocal needs. Everybody cannot meet all his wants and desires for lack of time and capacity. He has, therefore, to depend on others. Plato says “the origin of a city is, in my opinion due to the fact that no one of us is sufficient for himself but each is in need of many things so does the need of mutual cooperation among individuals arise. So, a socially resting upon the division of labor is the expression of man’s nature. In this way people come closer for the satisfaction of their reciprocal needs and form a state.

Functional specialization:

Some people have better aptitude for certain things depending upon the predominance of a particular element. They will show greater efficiency in those things which are after their nature. This depends upon the predominance of that particular element in their soul.

The soul consists of these elements of reason, spirit and appetite. Appetite is irrational, and an ally of pleasure and satisfaction from which spring love, hunger, thirst and other desires. The element of reason is superb insofar as it guides right action and creates bonds of union between members. It helps men to know the right path and forges love. Midway between the two comes the spirit. It represents chivalry, honor and pride. It inspires individuals for stakes and battles. All the three motivating forces are present in every individual. However they differ in dominance. One of them is always dominant. The other two are always sub-ordinate. In a society, man will group themselves according to the element predominant in them. In this way society is divided into three classes. The rulers have reason predominant. The warriors have spirit while the workers and artisan have appetite predominant.

If allowed continuously to work on the job, they would attain specialization of function. Plato believes that the specialization with deficiently work toward, bringing more unity in the state as the element of unlimited completion will be eliminated.

Justice in state:

Plato's theory of fictional specialization is direct corollary of his theory of justice. Justice means the efficient performance by the individual of his allotted task in society. Plato advocates that new and classes must be confined to their own specific functions to the state and their selfishness must give place to alter devotion of the state. This principle of specialization must be applied so as to prevent artisan from working in any other field of state the upper classes would not compelled to perform the tasks which are the proper functions of the artisans. If they people mind their own business and do not meddle with the affairs of other, justice in the state will prevail.

Theory of education:

That every individual must realize and devote himself to perform the duty allotted to him, could be realized, according to Plato, only through the state controlled system of education, he therefore, placed his main reliance upon education for the realization for the his ideal state to be ruled by philosophy. He attached paramount importance to it. In fact the role played by education in Plato's state is so striking that some philosophers call it to be the chief to pic of "Republic" that is why Rousseau said "Republic" is hardly a political word at all, but it is the finest treaty on education that ever was written.

The system of education is meant for both the sexes. Elementary education was open to all. It was at the end of the elementary education that a sorting out test was held. Those eliminated, formed the economic and producing class. They are not fit for higher education.

Aim of education:

The whole function of education is not to put knowledge into the sold to bring out the best things that are latent in the soul. The aim of education, in this way, is to make an individual a complete personality, a dutiful citizen and an able, efficient and public spirited administrator. The business of education is to develop character and to train the mind. Thus the only safeguard against the abuse of power lies in the character and minds of those who exercise it. So, Platonic education is an attempt to cure a mental malady by a mental medicine.

The second aim of platonic education is to adjust the curricular of education to the stage of intellect growth of the pupil.

System of education:

This system of education is divided two parts. The elementary and higher. The elementary starts from three and ends at seventy. The higher education begins at twenty and ends at thirty five.

Elementary education:

The elementary education begins at three and ends at twenty. It is divided into three sub-stages. The first-stages extend from the age of three to six. The children in this age group are to be imparted education through the narration of mythological stories which include certain moral and religious truths. The second rule stage extends from seven to eighteen. During these years, they are to be given the lessons of gymnastics in reading and writing, taught music, poetry and mathematics,. In the third rule-stage from eighteen to twenty, trainings in more gymnastics is to be imparted.

Higher education:

There was to be an eliminating test at the age of twenty. Those who failed were to become low rank soldiers and warriors. While the intellectually brighter are selected for carrying on the work of states crafts. Higher education is also subdivided into two stages. This first extends from the age of twenty to thirty and the second from thirty to thirty-five. In the first rule-stage emphasis is put on the study of mathematics and logic.

At the age of thirty another eliminating test is held. Those who secure less distinguished positions, enter the administrative positions as auxiliaries those who secure superior positions in that test, continue then study for another passed of five years in Dialectics and later in ethics. If the age of thirty five those who successfully complete their advanced education are assigned civil and military administration positions for fifteen years. This period of fifteen years is thus the apprenticeship period. At the age of 50, those who have demonstrated real ability and served with genuine distinction become the ruling guardians from here emerges the idea of philosopher king

Rule of philosophy:

In this way, the people who have got education up to thirty five and training for another period of fifteen years were to become the philosopher rulers. The aristocracy of intellect so trained is to be unchecked by any limitation whatsoever. He has to be above law service law itself flows out from him. He is the only drafts man of a constitution. Here Plato applies his favorite analogy of doctor and patient. Just as it is the function of the doctor to prescribe, similarly it is the function of the philosopher ruler to do whatever he considers fit and necessary.

Theory of communism:

Plato is not behind to reality that private interest and private affections take a man away from his duties to the community. For the guardian class perfect guardians and the auxiliaries— Plato introduced communism ensures that a guardian but a life of austerity and self-denial. The system of communism denotes communication of property and communism of family.

Communism of property:

The guardians were as such, not to have any private property whether landed or otherwise. They were to be provided everything by the state. Plato truly realized that the philosopher- ruler, who was to be given the monopoly of political power would become corrupt and demoralized if economic powers were also placed in his hands.

Communism of family:

Plato not only abolished private property for his classes but denied them families also. The children and wives, according to Plato, are the source of personal attachment and affections. They would stand in the way of proper discharge of functions on the part of the guardian classes. He would therefore, allow no such thing as family. By family Plato meant permanent sexual relations with one wife. But the production of children is so vital a matter. He, therefore, advocated state- controlled system of mating. Only the suitable parents would be mated. This is necessary with a view to produce the best type of children. Plato fixes even age limits within which mating would be allowed.

Criticism:

But the ideal state as portrayed by Plato has been described as only a utopia, impossible of putting into reality. Such a state has never existed in the history and never shall come to existence. His theory of ideal state has, as such, been subjected to various point of criticism as detailed below.

Ideal state a myth:

The very notion of the ideal state is regarded a myth by the modern social thinkers. They hold that the conception of society must have a scientific foundation. A metaphysical or mystic religious interpretation of society is nothing but abuse and unreasonable.

Watertight compartmentalization impossible:

Plato commends the division of society on the basis of functional specialization. But this watertight compartmentalization is impossible of realization in view of the complex personality of an individual and the changing circumstance.

Opposed to the development of personality:

The condemnation of an individual to the performance of only one function is opposed to the development of his personality. Human personality is a complex combination of all the three faculties of appetite. Reason and courage. Nevertheless, all the three elements are supposed to perform their function at the proper time in the life of a man in the context of the circumstances.

Absence of freedom and equality:

The ideal state stands for absence of freedom and equality. For this very reason Plato is turned as an enemy of free society.

Founder of totalitarianism:

Plato, due to his conception of ideal state, is said to be the founder of totalitarianism. He gives all the powers in the hands of philosopher ruler.

Narrow conception of education:

The platonic conception of education is narrow to the extent is obviously meant for the guardian classes. It gives no scheme for the education of economic or producing class.

Deplorable disbelief in the capacity of masses:

Plato disbelief in the capacity of masses to rule themselves is highly deplorable.

Philosopher ruler identifies self-interest:

The single or a few philosopher-rulers are more likely to identify their self interest with the public interest as man is after all man. Armed with unchallengeable power he is likely to stabilize his own position and power.

Philosophy and kingship cannot go together:

Administration requires practical insight into the complications whereas philosophy leads to abstract contemplation Sabine points out very rightly that the rule of such philosophers might easily become a rule of the saints:”

Educational curriculum insufficient for ruler:

The absence of the study of military training France, law etc would hamper his ability as a ruler. Mere philosophy is not match for the difficult and intricate “task of government.

Rejection of law is objectionable:

Plato’s rejection of law is highly objectionable as law represents the wisdom of accumulated over centuries. Plato himself realized the importance of law as evidenced in his later book. The laws in which he gives law its due place.

Acceptance of institution of slavery:

Plato’s acceptance of institution of slavery without any protest is a serious blot on his name. he is said to be an enemy of “open society “

His wrong analogies:

Sabine regards comparison of government to medicine and doctor to ruler wrong they have nothing in common.

Communism of wives impossible:

It will only debase the ages old institution of marriage which is the greatest link of human associations.

Development of children impossible:

In an ideal state regimented by the communism of family, the development of children is impossible. The requisite for a proper development of children is the affection of parent which Plato denies.

Ideal state inconceivably small in size:

Plato's state is basically city state. It is small in size as compared to the modern nation-states with populations of several cross. The laws and principles made applicable the small city-state cannot be successfully applied to the populous nation state.

Conclusion

It is however, unfair to hold that Plato preached utopia. What Plato gave was the ideal or form of the state. It was model for all times and countries, which the actual state should try to achieve the nearer the actual state is to this ideal, the better it would be.

Plato's influence on philosophy and social thinking is so profound that it is felt even in the modern age. Admittedly Plato has built up a utopia but it cannot be denied that he was great creative thinker as many of his ideas still haunt the philosophers of the world.

Q3) Education in the state of Plato. (or)

Republic- a finest treaty on education.

Introduction:

Plato attached paramount importance to education. To make society harmonious and to bring about unity in the state proper education is essential. It is a spiritual remedy for a spiritual disease. The major portion of "Republic" deals with education. Plato frankly admits that state is the first and foremost educational institution.

Ultimate function on state is pedagogic:

Pedagogy means the art of teaching and this is what the state does in platonic scheme of things. Platonic theory of education is a logical derivation from his first principles and his theory of justice. One of his first principle is that "Virtue is knowledge" knowledge is something that can be learnt and taught so, virtue can, therefore, be learnt and taught.

Education is also a logical corollary of Plato's theory of justice. Justice consists in the proper discharge of its functions by each class of the society. But unless the various classes are

trained in their respective functions, justice Impossible to realize so long as the ruler is not trained in the art of ruling, he cannot properly discharge his functions. Similar is the case with other classes. Hence, it is very correct to say that Plato's ideal state with its three classes and philosopher-king is the result of his educational theory.

Aim of platonic education:

The function of platonic education is not to put knowledge into the soul but to bring out the best things that are latent in the soul. The aim of education, in this way, is to make an individual a complete personality, a dutiful citizen and an able, efficient and public-spirited administrator.

Grafting Spartan over Athenian education system:

In his system of education, Plato grafted Spartan over Athenian methods. The methods of the both systems were diametrically opposed to each other. They invented their own methods best suited to their interest.

Athenian system of education:

In Athens education was controlled privately. The state did not interfere. The female were not given education. No training was given in the art of ruling. That is why Athens was being governed but ignorant.

Spartan system of education:

In Sparta, on the other hand, the system of education was under the complete control of the state. The female were also given the same education. Under state supervision the youth was trained into they had to identify their interests with the state interests.

Features of platonic education:

higher education an innovation:

Plato conclusions the Spartan with the Athenian method. He adds something of his own also. He makes an innovation in the field of higher education from the age of 20-35.

Balanced growth of human facilities:

Plato introduced both Music and Gymnastics. He considered gymnastics for the body and music for the soul, to bring about all-round development of personality. The two combined. Together produce the desired harmony of the soul, and make it both brave and gentle.

State-controlled education:

Anything of such crucial importance as education cannot be left to private initiative. It cannot be left to private initiative. It must be provided exclusively by the state.

Education for both the sexes:

Plato advocates that there is no difference of any kind between man and women.

Education for all the classes:

Some critics hold that Plato makes no provision for the education of lower classes. This contention is debatable. Plato's education appears to have also meant for the peasants and artisans. It is a fact that Plato never makes a clear mention in this regard. But by implication, it is an inescapable conclusion. Plato himself says: "men of copper can be turned into men of silver and gold"

Censorship of books and literature:

Curriculum must be controlled and defined by the state. This meant that nothing of laid moral influence might fall into the hands of the young. He had seen the influence of poetry and drama on the Athenian. Plato really realized the truth of his great saying "let me write the ballads of country and I care not who writes the laws"

Education

(A matter of life time)

Plato's system of education continues for the whole of the life. If it comes to an ends at the age of 35, it continues in the shape of apprenticeship upto the age of 50

Ideal state: product of education:

The basic principle of Plato's state is the rule of philosophers. Hence it is correct to say that "Plato's ideal state is the product of his education"

PLATONIC SYSTEM OF EDUCATION:

Platonic system of education performs two functions. Selection and training of the philosopher king. This system is divided into two stages.

Elementary education:

It begins at three and ends at twenty it is divided into 3 sub-stages. The first stage extends from 3 to the age of 6. Education through mythological stories with certain moral and religious truths is provided to children. The second sub-stage extends from 7 to 18. Reading, writing, poetry, music and gymnastic is taught in this stage. In the third sub-stage from 18-20 training in mere gymnastics is imparted.

Higher education:

There was to be an eliminating test at the age of twenty(20). Those who failed were to become low-ranked soldiers and warriors. While the intellectually bright are selected for carrying on the work state-crafts. Higher education is also sub-divide into 2 stages the first extends from 20-30 and the second from 30-35. In the first sub-stage, emphasis is put on the study of mathematics and logic.

At the age of thirty 30 another eliminating test is carried out. Those who failed enter the administration positions as auxiliaries. Those who secure superior positions in last, continue their study for another period of 5 years the age of 35, those who successfully complete their advanced education are assigned civil and military administrative positions for fifteen 15 years. This period of 15 years is thus the apprenticeship period. At the age of 50. Those who have demonstrated real ability and served with genius become the ruling guardians.

“Republic”: the finest treatise on education:

Education is thus the chief concern of “Republic. The scheme of education covers about one third of the book. There would be no exaggeration of we say Plato was the first to formulate that we today call a university course. Plato’s academy was the first university in Europe. It is on this account that Rousseau held that “Plato’s Republic is not a work on politics, but the finest treatise on education that has ever been written.

Criticism

Narrow conception of education:

Meant for the guardian-class only

Education co-existent with life:

The guardian have not time for anything but to acquire education throughout his life.

Education curriculum insufficient for ruler.

Education will produce ideal philosophers and not ideal men of action.

Censorship against modern beliefs.

It will only hamper the growth of literature and thereby of the intellect.

Minimizes the influence of literature:

Graft of Spartan over the Athenian system defective:

The Athenian system had created many philosophers like Socrates and Plato himself. While the Spartan system did not produce any.

System of indoctrination:

This system suits more the authoritarian rather than the democratic regimes.

Conclusion

It is a tribute to Plato's originality and philosophical genius that his theory of education is regarded as the greatest contribution to the science of pedagogy.

Q4) philosopher-king (or)

Influence of philosopher on politics.

Introduction:

The "republic" is in fact an indictment of Greek life. Plato was sick of amateurish meddlesomeness and political selfishness in the politicians. Plato realized that cure of all ills of society lay not in politics but in philosophy. The central doctrine of 'republic' is the theory of philosopher-king. Plato argued; "Until philosopher be kings and kings be philosophers cities and states will never cease from ills"

Basic assumptions of rule of philosophy:

Plato's conception of philosopher-rulers or perfect guardians with unlimited powers is the direct and logical result of the basic assumptions. These assumptions are:

The analogy between individual and state:

Plato arrived at the conclusion of the rule of philosophy firstly on the basis of analogy that he saw between individual and the state. He held that "state is an individual writ large" as the human soul consists of these elements of reason, spirit appetite, so does the state. The three classes in the state represent. Different elements.

Since reason is predominant in the soul of philosopher king thus they should be the guardian of the state.

Virtue is knowledge:

Secondly, from his teacher Socrates Plato has learnt the dictum "virtue is knowledge". It meant that virtue is something that can be learnt and taught so, virtue and knowledge, according to Plato, are identical. And that wisdom is a quality of greatest importance to the state. Without it, the ignorant people would govern and the whole citizen lot is bound to suffer.

It is, therefore, that Plato emphasizes that philosophers who know, should have the ruling power. The philosopher should rule, as such, is a direct corollary of his belief in functional specialization.

Device for the supply of philosopher-rulers:

System of education

System of communism

Limitations upon the philosopher-ruler:

he was to be above everything, even above law since law itself was to flow out of him. The philosopher was, however not to be absolute to the unlimited extent. He must respect the fundamentals of the society, which must not be changed radically at his will. These fundamentals relate to:

Regulation of wealth and poverty in the state.

The size of the state.

The rule of justice, and

The system of education

Features of Plato's Rule of Philosophy:

Most original concept:

Philosopher-king is the most profoundly original concept in the entire political philosophy of Plato.

Govt. by the Elite:

Scientific knowledge is the prerogative of very few. All do not possess the equal capacity for civilization of virtue or knowledge.

Philosopher-king includes both the sexes:

Philosopher is lover of wisdom:

He is a passionate seeker after truth

interest of philosopher-ruler is identical with state-interest:

philosopher – ruler-: product of his system of education:

philosopher-ruler is absolute:

philosopher above know what is good or bad and the remedy of the bad. Government by the philosopher is better than a government by law. The reign of law is less flexible than the wisdom of a philosopher.

Not unqualified absolutism:

Though Plato states very clearly that the philosophers should be free from the shackles of law and public opinion and customs yet they are not free from all restraints.

Ruling is an art:

The art of ruling must be practiced by those who have natural aptitude and ability>

Criticism

The platonic conception of rule of philosophy has been subjected to criticism from many quarters. Warner says that "Plato has no understanding of personality, of individuality.. of

democracy” some Marxists of the modern age called him “the intellectual spokesman of the conservative faction” Popper regards Plato as the “enemy of the open society. “Others criticize Plato due to following loopholes of his philosophy.

Reactionary philosophy
Opposed to liberal and Humanitarian ideas
Education scheme insufficient:
Excessive philosophy leads to eccentricity:
Applications of wrong analogies:
Kings not likely to become philosophers:
Plato had his own axe to grind:

Plato considered himself to be a fit philosopher-ruler:

Fundamental utopia:
Knowledge as the prerogative of a few is deplorable:
Advocates tyrannical rule:
Disbelief in democracy:

Conclusion

It cannot be denied that philosopher ruler is a mirage. Yet the importance of the fact that only competent persons should rule can never be over estimated. Plato has a logical reaction to the chaotic circumstances to give something ideal for all times and all states and therefore, went wherever reason led him. So, a person who possess scientific knowledge is the only competent ruler according to him. This is an individual conclusion.

Q5) Plato’s concept of Justice.

Introduction:

Republic or concerning justice:

The “republic” has also been given sub-title “concerning justice”

Meaning of Justice:

Right or righteous conduct of man towards others.

Plato’s theory of justice:

Through the mouthpiece of Socrates, Plato raises the question, what is righteousness or justice? Plato analysis justice by examining the prevailing theories of justice or morality. He rejects both the traditional and sophist theories of justice and finally gives his own. This he does through various stages.

Rejection of prevailing theories of justice:

The “republic” opens with a scene in the house of Cephalus, an old and wealthy resident who has turned to religion and philosophy to comfort his old age.

Traditional theory (as given by Cephalus Polymarchus)

In a brief conversation with Cephalus Socrates elicits his views which are based on traditional morality. He holds that justice consists of speaking truth and paying one’s debts. It means “Giving every man his due” but Socrates rejects it on the plea that it cannot be applied universally. To restore weapons to a man who has gone mad is not justice though theoretically the weapons are due to him.

Polymarchus, the son of Cephalus being faithful to his father elaborates his theory by giving new meaning to the word “due” he defined “Justice as an art of doing good with one’s friends and to harm one’s enemies” but Socrates rejects it on the following bases:

Appearance may be deceptive.

Doing harm to anybody whether your enemy, is not just.

It takes into account only the relations between two individuals and ignores the general social aspects.

Analogy of justice with art is wrong. Art can do harm if it can do good.

Sophists theory of justice:

At this point Thrasymachus, a sophist holds that “justice is the interest of the stronger”. Socrates obstructs him. But here Thrasymachus changes his position and says that “injustice is better than justice because the former brings wisdom, strength and happiness”

Socrates counters this by saying that it is justice instead which brings wisdom and happiness.

Plato’s belief in Organic conception of state:

He believes that there is a close similarity between state and individual. In order, therefore, to understand justice in the state. It is because state is bigger than the individual and it is easy to locate justice in bigger things

Plato’s principles of construction of society and state:

Similarity between individual and state.

Division of labor as basis of state

Functional specialization ensures justice.

Justice ensures prevalence of other virtues.

Justice makes a person an integral part of state.

Justice in individual:

As each person is dominated by one of the three basic impulses—appetite, spirit, reason justice will be secured if he lives a life in which his primary impulse is made to serve the community.

Criticism

Lacks legal enforcement:

Based purely on ethical and moral considerations.

Impracticable in modern state:

Opposed to the development of personality:

Water-tight compartmentalization impossible:

Disbelief in capacity of masses:

Advocate of totalitarianism:

Definition of justice is strange:

We mean by justice as “same kind of equality in the treatment of individuals” but Plato assigns privileges to every class:

Based on morality:

Sahine says “Platonic justice is a bond which holds the society together. The principle sounds very just but impossible to realization a modern nation state. Even then, it is one of the Plato’s greatest contribution for social philosophy.

CSS Exam Desk

www.CSSExamDesk.com
www.instagram.com/CSS_Target
www.facebook.com/CSSExamPoint



Q6) Indebtness to Socrates by Plato.

Introduction

Socrates influence on Plato:

Socrates' mission

to rouse his fellow men from their thoughtlessness and lead them to reflection on the meaning of life and their own biggest good” His method was dialectical.

Plato indebtness to Socrates:

following four doctrines enunciated by Socrates were borrowed by Plato:

Virtue is knowledge:

Theory of reality:

Reality resides in the ideas of things what is real is “the idea of thing” not the thing itself. “the idea of thing’ is the perfect, permanent, final and independent reality. The world of material in which we live is unreal “idea cannot exist without the object itself” there could not be the idea of a horse if not horse existed. However idea depicts something ideal. No actual house can be as perfect as the idea or form of a horse. So to know what as a good horse, we must discover how closely approximates the idea of a horse. The world of ideas is the real world while the world we live in is a world of shadows.

theory of knowledge:

two types of knowledge;

opinion of belief or guesswork:

apparently it is knowledge but in reality it is not.

Real knowledge:

Based on scientific knowledge, reason. Men should seek this type of knowledge.

Aristocracy of intellect:

Conclusion:

Basic ideas of Plato’s philosophy are Socratic. But Prof. Barker says ‘the unfolding of those ideas in their full form is Platonic’.

“the image of his teacher never faded from his mind,” says Sabine.

Q7) Virtue is knowledge:

Introduction

Virtue is knowledge

Implications of “Virtue is knowledge” In Plato’s philosophy:

Virtue can be learnt and taught:

Rule of philosophy

Functional specialization

Attack on democracy

Criticism

Reactionary philosophy.

Opposed to liberal and humanitarian ideas.

Kings not likely to become philosophers

Philosopher ruler: more likely to identify self-interest with the public interest.

Philosophy and kingship cannot go together.

Fundamentally utopian

Rejection of law is objectionable.

Deplorable disbelief in capacity of masses.

Water-tight compartmentalization impossible.\

Opposed to development of personality.

Conclusion

“the controlling thought of Plato’s philosophy was ‘virtue is knowledge is Sabine.

Q8) the father of totalitarian ideology:

Introduction:

Crossman considers Plato as a reactionary who encouraged dictatorship of the virtue our right”

Plato as totalitarian:

Advocates rule of few wise;

Subordinates law to philosopher-ruler.

Advocates inequality of man

Condemnation of individual personality.
Advocate state controls even in sex-matters.
Condemnation of woman.
Denial of family affection
Education- a prerogative of the few:
Advocate of censorship of intellectual activities:
Anti-equalitarian view:

Conclusion

Crossman says, “Plato’s philosophy is the most savage and a profound attack on liberal ideas”

Q9) “Republic”: not a utopia but the work on practical politics:

Introduction

Not utopia but deals with practical politics:

Based on actual conditions:

analysis of actual constitution of Greece:

portrays actual fact of Greek life;

Republic: meant to mould the actual life:

Communism

Portrayal of ideal:

Ideal leads statement towards good

Conclusion

Q10) Plato' "Republic" and "Laws"

Introduction:

While "republic" is a product of the years of Plato's early maturity and speculative vigor at forty, the "law" is a product of Plato's later age at seventy. It was the last of the Plato's dialogues published after his death. The "Laws" shows decline in Plato's literary talent. In the "Republic" Plato builds an "ideal state" ruled by the philosopher king. But in the "laws" he gives law its proper place.

Relation between 'Republic' and Laws"

It is difficult to determine relation between the "Republic" and the "laws". Eller considers these two books as opposite to each other in the "republic" the rulers are above the law while in "laws" they are under law.

If in the "Republic" Plato identifies virtue with justice, in the "laws" he identifies it with temperance. It is here that Plato shifts emphasis.

With this the Plato has brought the laws closer to the traditional Greek political conceptions. But it would be worthwhile to remember that Plato has not deviated from his basic assumption (Political selfishness and meddlesomeness) and the fundamental dictums (aristocracy of intellect and virtue is knowledge)

Modification in the ideas in the view:

The "Republic" was written by Plato in the vigor of youth with the burning ideal of a reformer when he was full of hopes and aspirations. The laws, on the other hand, reflects sobriety and maturity of judgment. It shows disillusionment with many things advocated in the "Republic"

The "Republic" is built on the paradoxes of the absolute of philosopher-ruler and communism of property and wives, the "laws" advocates the merits of a balanced constitution with both aristocratic and democratic elements. The "Republic" concentrates on the constitution of the ideal state and ignores laws, the "laws" concentrates on laws. Both the "Republic" and "laws" advocated a well regulated state-controlled system of education that in the Laws extends not only to the guardians but to all classes.

The state portrayed in the "Laws" is called the "2nd best state". Barker called it "A halfway house, as it were between the ideal and the actual" the changes introduced in "laws" from that of the Republic are;

Restores supremacy of laws:

In the ‘laws’ Plato assigns supreme place to law, which he had assigned to the Philosopher ruler in the Republic” Plato, in the “laws’ abandons his idealism and sees reality. He holds that among the men who are always imperfect, only law should regulate their affairs. The “laws” however, is an attempt to give law its proper place.

Plato was convinced throughout that philosopher-ruler is preferable to law but it is not practical. Only the second last state, that is ruled by law should therefore, follow as closely as it can, the principle of the ideal Plato held that if men are not restrained by law their selfishness would disrupt the community.

Abandons division of labor and functional specialization:

In the interest of unity and harmony in the country, Plato abandons in the Laws the principle of division of labor and functional specialization

the model state:

in the Laws also Plato Portrays the model state. But Plato describes clearly that what he is describing is the second best state. His best or ideal state always remains the one which is depicted in the “Republic” the ideal state is however, impossible of realization because of imperfection of human nature.

The number of citizens in the state according to Plato, should be 5040. The state is to be divided into 12 tribes and governed by a state council.

Property:

The state is divided into 5040 equal lots one for each citizen. The land is owned privately but the social purpose is admonished to every citizen. The citizens are to consume the product at the common table. The land cannot be transferred. Except through inheritance and cannot be divided each citizen is permitted to hold private property upto four times the value of his land. The wealth gained by a citizen in excess of four times the value of his landed property must be returned to the state. Plato’s underlying assumption was the same. He believed that private property had a demoralized effect.

Marriage and family:

In the laws Plato returns to the institutions of marriage and family. Marriage and family are to be regarded and supervised by the state. All marriage should be registered with the state. During holds that “Plato clings as far as possible to the broad principle of “Republic”

The communism of wives and children has no place in the laws as this is meant only for the perfect and ideal state.

Education:

The “Republic’ is essentially the greatest treatise ever written on education still the ‘Law’s doesn’t lag behind in any respect except that higher education has been omitted. Otherwise

the curriculum of education in both is almost the same. Both gymnastics and music are taught. Education is compulsory for both the sexes.

Mixed Government:

In the “Republic” Plato threw all the weight on the side of intellectual authority while in the ‘laws’ he seeks moderation between monarchy and democracy.

The entire citizenry is divided into four classes. The class designation is dependent upon whether a citizen owns personal property equivalent to one, two, three, or four times the value of his landed property. In ‘republic’ he had clearly stated that only the virtuous would rule, in the “Laws’ he finds this ability among those who have managed to accumulate most property.

Reversion to Authoritarianism:

Throughout the ‘laws’ Plato appears to be working towards a practicable form of “state in which people on the basis of merit are to perform the government functions. But this illusion tends to disappear in the twelfth the last book of the “Laws’ when he introduced “Nocturnal council” this council is to consist of ten oldest guardians of law. The minimum age limit is fifty while the maximum is 70. The council is a work of law. It is here that Plato again returns to the Authoritarianism of the Republic, Harmon’ says that “ Plato ends up with semi-theocracy a government at least partially composed to priests.

Conclusion:

It is quite clear that Plato could never forget the principle which he had learnt from his teacher Socrates that “Virtue is knowledge”. This means that men are never born equal. They differ in their capacity to learn knowledge. The “Nocturnal council’ overshadows all the practical insight if ever shown in the law. Barker rightly remarks” thus Plato is Plato still”

The “ideal state” of the Republic

(perfect but impractical)

Lawful States

(knowledge expressed by law is the directing force)

Monarchy: lawful rule of the one
(the best)

ii) **Aristocracy:** lawful rule of a few
---(the second best state)

Unlawful states

(the Directing force is arbitrary and is not restrained by law)

iii) **constitutional democracy:**

the lawful and moderate of many (the worst of the lawful states but better than unlawful state.

i) **Tyranny:** Unlawful rule of the one---
(the worst of all states)

ii) **oligarchy:** (unlawful rule of a few (next
to the worst of states)

iii) **unconstitutional Democracy:** the
arbitrary rule of many --- (unlawful and
bad less dangerous than tyranny or
oligarchy

Criticism of Plato by:

**Sabine
during
Harmon
barker**

Q11) “State Republic states man and the laws’

**introduction
state of the “republic’
readmission of law
“state of statesman”**

The statesman is a work written many years after the “Republic’ and many years. Before the “Laws’, the “statesman” generally represented an attitude toward democracy. Slightly less opposed and hostile than was demonstrated in “Republic”. But even than Plato rejects democracy in favor of a rule of an able and talented statesman. The main task of the statesman is to develop virtuous people as law is inferior to knowledge. But the statesman’ like the philosopher ruler is difficult of realization in the world.

In the “Statesman’ Plato deviates from the position taken from in the “Republic” in the “Statesman” Plato considers the “ideal state “ as something impossible of realization in this world. He gives more favorable treatment to democracy which he had ridiculed as a divine right of ignorant to rule the ideal state was placed at the top and the actual states were arranged as successive degeneration.

Aristotle

Q1) influences on Aristotle.

Introduction:

Every political philosopher is unavoidably the epitome of his time” he is always the product of the circumstances under which he lives. He cannot remain unaffected by his associates with the intellectual giants. Aristotle is no exception to this rule.

Factors which influenced Aristotle:

Aristotle's Association with Plato:

Aristotle was the greatest of Plato's pupils who studied in the "Academy" for 20 years. This association was the factor most important in the shaping of his philosophy. In following ideas, Aristotle is influenced by Plato.

The man is by nature social. Hence he must live an associated life. State originates in the needs of the men.

The state exists for the moral perfection of the individuals.

The educational role of the state in the cultivation of virtues in the individuals is of utmost importance.

The good life could only be lived in a city state of moderate size.

The right of exercising state-functions should be the monopoly of very few capable citizens

All manual labor should be done by slaves or non-citizens

Democracy is not an ideal form of government.

The virtue of the state is identical with that of the individual

A mixed state is the most practicable state .

Though Aristotle is influenced by Plato's these ideas, yet he is not a behind follower of Plato.

Influence of physician father:

The biological study of things thus, Aristotle inherits from his father. This led Aristotle to develop scientific method involving the techniques of observation, analysis, classification and comparison.

Influence of prevailing Greek- conditions;

Aristotle lived in Athens at one of the most traveled times in Greek history. There was lawless democracy and selfish oligarchy in most of the city states. This invoked his philosophical talents.

Influence Stagira – his home town:

There he imbibed the spirit of scientific and realistic investigation.

His association with Alexander the Great:

Influence of Greek Ideas:

He proved to be a typical Greek dukto:

His attitude toward slavery. Greeks justified slavery on the basis of that it was warranted by nature. Similar is the case with Aristotle who says that nature ordains that the slaves who were intellectually inferior to free man should be held by the later. The idea that Greek was superiors other nationals.

Another typical view of the Greek city state which Aristotle says is the best social and political organization ever thought of by human beings.

The belief that the “whole was prior to the part”. The society was superior and prior to the individuals. The individual could be sacrificed for the good of society.

Citizenship was the most important characteristic of a free man. Actually the main difference between the slave and a citizen was that the latter was the free man because of his citizenship.

Influence of personal experience:

Lastly, Aristotle’s successful and happy marriage accounts for his devotion to the institution of marriage and family and his opposition to Plato’s communism of wives.

Conclusion

Q) Aristotle’s criticism of Plato:

Introduction:

Plato is regarded as the first political philosopher and Aristotle as the first political scientist. The title of the “father of the political science” is thus exclusively for Aristotle. Aristotle’s approach is analytic, scientific and definite. It is on account of their diametrically opposed views on various matters that it has been said that you can be either a Platonist or an Aristotlean. Still no one can deny the fact that Aristotle built his philosophy on the basic principles when Plato had enunciated earlier.

Aristotle as a critic of Plato:

In the opinion of Harmon “Plato and Aristotle, teacher and pupil, disagreed on many points, but not on all.”

Aristotle’s criticism of the Republic:

Aristotle protests against Plato’s lack of practicability. The principle objective of the statesman should be, says Aristotle, the establishment of the best practicable state. It is from the angle of practicability that he criticizes the ideal state projected by Plato’s “republic”.

The criticism leveled against him and his ideal state is as under:

Unity of state;

Plato seeks to achieve unity to make the state more peaceful, purposeful and perfect. This conception of state, according to him, can be achieved if diversity in the state is eradicated. Aristotle criticizes the concept of unity advocated by Plato on the following grounds:

State is a plurality:

State is made up of so many ones of different natures.

Training of guardian classes will sow disunity.

The education of guardian classes will inculcate in them a feeling of superiority. This will create a gulf between the guardians on the one hand and the artisan classes on the other hand.

Rejection of platonic concept of origin of state in the Division of Labor:

The state is by nature clearly prior to the family and to the individual, since the whole is of necessity prior to the part.

Communism of family:

Abolition of political families will destroy the very basis of state.

Making a family of the whole state is impossible through communism of wives.

State control over sex is impossible

Child of all gets love from nobody

Leads to division among members;

Communism of property:

common property root of disputes

denial of private property opposed its human nature;

property is a source of pleasure'

property breeds virtue

quarrels not due to property but due to wickedness of human nature.

Communism may solve old problems but will create new ones.

Neglect of lower class:

Plato's neglect of lower class is so woeful that they are excluded altogether from his system of education and communism. Aristotle in this way holds Plato guilty of creating an unbridgeable gulf between the guardians and the non-guardians. Platonic system is therefore, equivalent to dividing the state into two hostile camps.

Rule of Philosophy:

Aristotle is also critical of Plato's advocacy of rule of philosophy. This in fact leads to the abandonment of the rule of law.

Aristotle's criticism of idea:

The fundamental difference between Plato's and Aristotle is that Plato is an idealism while Aristotle is a realist.

Aristotle's criticism of "the Laws"

Sincerity of Plato about supremacy of law is doubtful:

If Plato was sincere about the supremacy of law, he would not have reverted to the philosophers comprising Nocturnal council.

Conclusion:

From the account given above, it would thus be manifestly evident that Aristotle, the greatest of all the pupils of Plato, is the worst critic of his own master. But the criticism leveled against Plato is according to Dunning “at times distinctly unfair”

Difference in form and method of Plato and Aristotle:

Plato according to Dunning, is imaginative and synthetic, Aristotle is an analytic. Aristotle proceeding by extensive observation and minute analysis of objective facts worked out for each science an independent field. Aristotle

S method is no doubt inductive, but not purely inductive.

Inductive method means that the researcher or analyst does not have any prior notion, idea or value of his own. He would conduct research with an open mind. He would in this way arrive at a conclusion on the basis of scientific and empirical analysis. If Aristotle followed. Inductive method, Plato followed the deductive method. Deductive method means that the researcher or analyst has his own values, notions and presumptions. He tries to establish the truth of his own values and predetermined notions with the help of the institutions.

Q) Aristotle as the greatest Platonist

Introduction:

In spite of some differences in form and method and details, that were quite natural in thinkers coming of different lineages, Aristotle is regarded by Foster as the greatest Platonist. It is no doubt that Plato was an idealist while Aristotle an actualist. But there is no denying the fact that in Aristotle’s philosophy “there is no page which does not bear the impress of Platonism.”

The following concepts would clearly show that Aristotle was permeated by Platonism through and through.

Concept of the state:

Aristotle considers state as the highest level of community organization which many may employ in his struggle towards moral perfection. The state represents the highest manifestation of man’s nature in seeking to realize his nature of living in society. Man without state would no longer be a man but a beast or a God.

Even the concept of the state, Aristotle, like Plato could not get out of the Greek world. The ideal before them is the ideal of Greek city-state.

Concept of family:

Aristotle criticized Plato’s system of communism of family the most. Still he was influenced by Plato in this respect. Aristotle believed that “that the state must regulate marriage from the angle of age-limit for both the sexes. The state must also regulate population as any undue increase in population will tend towards disharmony. It should also be compulsory for the

state to ensure that the family members are educated properly. He essentially agrees with the basic principles of social restrictions advocated by Plato.

Concept of property:

Aristotle criticized Platonic scheme of communism of property. Still he came in his views nearer to Plato when he advocated private property with common use. He advocated that neither should have so much property that its accumulation promotes evil ideas. Property should be regarded as a means and not an end. Aristotle is as such neither a socialist nor a capitalist. He pleads that private property must exist but must not be unlimited. Since he was a realist he saw in property the actual fulfillment of individuality. But in its excessive amount the perversion of individuality.

Concept of justice:

Aristotle considered stated as association existing for a moral and intellectual life. A life of common action, says Aristotle, is impossible without justice. This principle is essentially Platonic in essence. Both Plato and Aristotle as such, aim at discovering unity and harmony. Both advocate giving a man his due in accordance with his capacity or nature. Both consider justice as functional and therefore moral.

Concept of education:

The aim of education according to Aristotle is to bring about virtue and happiness. The aim of education is not to introduce something new into the individual. Its aim is to awaken the sleeping faculties in man's soul. It should aim at training of not only soul but body also. Education to achieve these ends must be state-controlled. In all this, Aristotle was influenced the most by Platonic Philosophy.

Ideal state:

Aristotle tried to construct the ideal state on the lines suggested by Plato in his 'laws' it is certain that Aristotle was convinced of the fact that the ideal cannot be attained. Therefore, he appears to be more concerned with the ideals of the good state than with the elaborate formulation of a hypothetical and unrealizable perfect structure. Aristotle agreed with Plato that statesmen should try to construct the ideal state. In this, however, he counted the fact that Aristotle's time of arrival at the academy was quite significant. It was significant in the sense that the events and experience had convincingly a salutary effect on the views of Plato. He was by that time gathering material and writing the laws in which he came nearest to the approval of democracy and the rule of law.

Naturally, Aristotle was influenced more by the current thought of his teacher than that expressed by him earlier in the "Republic" it is therefore, aptly remarked that "what Aristotle called the "ideal state" is always Plato's second-best state/

vii) **Place of law:**

An ideal state, according to Aristotle, must give supreme place to law instead of personal and despotic rule of ever the most virtuous and leered person.

Conclusion:

Thus, it is evident that Aristotle accepted the influence of Plato to a very great extent. He built his philosophy on the fundamentals of his teacher Plato. It has very aptly been remarked that “in the fundamentals of his political philosophy, Aristotle was a faithful disciple of Plato.’ However, the influence of the “laws’ on Aristotle is more conspicuous than that of the “republic ‘, “notwithstanding his criticism of platonic conception of philosopher king and theory of communism of wives and property, Aristotle has been described of the greatest of platonics.

Q) Aristotle and Plato or education:

Introduction:

Aristotle, according to Dunning differs from his master Plato, much more in the form and method than in the substance of his thought” this apply equally well insofar as the system of education advocated by Plato and Aristotle is concerned. Both of them gave the first place to education in the scheme of their things. They pleaded that education should be essentially state controlled. It should be training-oriented, capable of producing good citizens so that political stability is guaranteed. But of them considered education as instrumental in training of character. It is according to them, a process through which light is not put into the eye is turned towards the light. Not something outward is put into mind but the inward feature that are lying dormant, are activated.

System of education compared and contrasted:

Aim of education :

Plato maintained that the aim of education was to divorce the innate elements in the individual. The aim of education in the individual. The aim of education is to make an individual a complete personality, a dutiful citizen and an able, efficient and public-spirited administrator

Aristotle also believes that the aim of education should be to make citizens law-abiding. Education should, in this way, aim at producing good citizens. It aim to bring about virtue and happiness.

Education to be state-controlled:

According to Plato, cannot be left to private initiative. It most by provided exclusively by the state. It must be state controlled. Its curriculum must also be controlled and defined by the state Aristotle, too, holds the same view.

Gymnastics and Music:

Plato believed in ‘healthy soul in a health body’. He introduced, for this purpose, both music and gymnastics in education. He considered gymnastics for the body and music for the soul. The two combined together produce the desired harmony of the soul and make it both have and gentle.

According to Aristotle, education should aim at eugenics also so that good children are born. It should teach the neither early nor late marriage has a healthy influence. Moreover, education must be non-discriminatory and universal in nature. Aristotle advocates that gymnastic for body and music for soul in necessary but balancing has to be attained for the proper education. Too much stress on gymnastics has to be avoided because the aim of education is to make a good citizen and not a good wrestler.

Stages of education:

Platonic system of education is meant for both the sexes. It is divided into two stages- the elementary and the higher. The elementary education starts from three to twenty while higher education which begins at twenty, ends at thirty-five.

Aristotle divides his system of education into three parts.

Cradle stage lasting upto the first 7 years

Primary stage lasting from 7-14, and

Secondly stage lasting from 14-21

Cradle Stage:

In the first stage, education must be mainly private, under the paternal guidance of the state. The child must be given proper diet consisting of milk and the like. For the first 5 years, the child may not be exposed to vigorous exercise though he should be accustomed endure severities. During this stage the child should neither study nor labor because it would shin his growth. He should he educated by telling stories but must be kept stranger to that is bad, and specially to things which suggest vice and hate.

Primary Stage:

This stage covers the age limit from 7-14. During this stage, the child should take light exercise to ensure good physical growth. He may be helped to learn reading, writing painting, music, but in mild form. He must be kept away from anything that deforms body or brutalism mind.

Secondary education:

This stage covers the age groups from 14-21. The mind is ripe for intellectual trainings. Education should aim at training in the forms of government under which one is to line. From 14-17 serious study in painting, music, reading, writing and Arithmetic should be made. Military training should be given from 17-21 and then the individual left alone to pursue his vocation of himself.

Balanced personality :

Education according to, Aristotle, has not only political aim, it has a social aim, also. Man is a combination of the beast and the God. Only education teaches balance between the two extremes.

Education teaches defense not aggression:

Both Plato and Aristotle that the aim of education is not aggression military training as it makes the people unfit in times of leisure and peace. As such, military service must be taught not with a view to enslave others but to defend oneself when worth defendable.

In spite of their similarities, there are certain dissimilarities also. Plato deals with philosophy, literature, mathematics more adequately than did Aristotle. Aristotle treatment of music is only partial. Plato's education meant for only the guardians while Aristotelian education is meant for all. Platonic education is life long.; while Aristotle discontinues it at 21.

Q) Aristotle and Plato on Justice.

Introduction:

Aristotle, according to dunning, differs to his master, Plato much more in the form and method than in the substance of his thought. This applies equally well in so far as the conceptions of justice, advocated by Plato and Aristotle are concerned. Both give justice the supreme. Place in the state. The "republic" is also known by the name "concerning justice" Aristotle also considers that the state should as such be an organization which can make possible a common life of action. A life of common action is impossible without justice. "According to Harmon both men sought justice, although each found it in a different place. This is the essential difference between the two: Plato found justice in the rule of men Aristotle found it in the rule of Law"

Platonic concept of justice:

Justice inseparable from ideal state:

The main argument of "republic" is a sustained reach of location and nature of justice. This Plato does with the help of his ideal state from which justice is inseparable. He portrays his ideal state. He holds that a state is "an individual writ large"

Division of labor as basis of justice:

Plato says that the soul consists of three elements of reason, spirit and appetite, all three motivating forces or elements are present in every individual in varying amount. But one of them is always predominant. In a society, men will group themselves according to the element predominant in them. In this way, society may be divided into three classes, namely,

the rulers(reason), the warriors(spirit), the artisans or workers (appetite), representing the unions of person having a particular element as predominant in them.

Functional specialization as the basis of justice:

Some people have better aptitude for certain things, they show greater efficiency in those things depending upon the predominance of that particular element in their soul. If allowed to work continuously on that job, to the best, he will definitely produce better quality and similarity with the statesman in his job. Thus specialization will definitely work towards bringing more and more unity in the state as the element of unlimited competition will be eliminated.

Justice in state:

Thus Plato's theory of functional specialization is a direct corollary of his conception of justice. This means the efficient performance by the individual of his allotted task in society. Plato held that the cause of the ills of the city was the amateurish meddlesomeness which he wanted to eradicate. If the people mind their own business and do not meddle with affairs of others, justice in that state will prevail.

Justice as the condition of every other virtue:

Justice, according to Plato, is the condition of every other virtue of the state and grows with the specialization of function.

Justice implies duties and not rights:

Justice, as such, means that all the classes in a state must act in such a cabinet way as do the various organs, tissue and cells perform their work for the perfection of the system of the body to represent as one unit. In this way the "justice of the state is the citizens' sense of duty.

Justice in individual:

Justice for the individual results from temperance (self-control). Each person is dominated by one of the three basic impulses appetite, spirit and reason. Justice will be secured if he lives a life in which his primary impulse is made to serve the community and the lesser impulses are strictly curbed.

Aristotle on Justice

Justice differs with the different forms of Govts.

Justice differs in different forms of states justice in an oligarchy implies the rule of wealth, in democracy the rule of free birth, and in aristocracy the rule of cultured, wise or virtuous.

Justice implies the rule of superiors over inferiors:

Justice implies in every case, in every form, the rule of the superiors over the inferiors, the rule of the superiors over the inferiors, the rule of capable over the incapable. In a household, justice means the rule of the household master over the incapable slaves and passionate woman. In a village justice means the natural leadership of the eldest male. In a well-ordered state, justice implies the rule of the educated, cultured and virtues in an oligarchy, the distinction between superior and inferior is based on qualification of property.

Justice is the basis of every state:

As such, it is justice which is the basis of every state and every association. Complete justice is however, available only in an ideal state. In actual states, only particular justice is available. Particular justice means the distribution of offices, honors, awards, and other good things of life among various classes proportionate to their strength for the cultivation of virtue.

Two kinds of justice:

Particular justice (justice in actual state) is of two kinds

Distribution justice:

Distributive justice according to Aristocracy, is the best preventive of revolutions. The offices of the state should be distributed among the citizens proportionally. Distributive justice assigns a man his due as a member of society and thus keeps him satisfied. Distributive justice thus, consists in proper allocation of reward to each person according to his worth

Corrective justice:

Corrective justice is however, a different thing. It is essentially negative. It can be called a principle of equity to remedy the imperfections of existing laws. Corrective justice is a moral principle of jurisprudence to correct the faults and the gaps operating laws. It is as such a part of legal justice.

Justice as a Golden mean to ensure happiness unity and harmony:

It is therefore, certain that no society can pull along in the absence of some form of governing principle of justice. It is because of the fact that justice not only corrects laws or distributors offices, it is also a way of life. Justice is the golden mean which makes possible the socio-political association, happiness unity and harmony.

Plato and Aristotle as justice: compared and contrasted

Both platonic and Aristotle justice have common areas of agreement. They aim at discovering a principle through which unity virtue, happiness and harmony is to be established. Both of them advocate giving a man his due in accordance with his capacity or nature.

It should however, be noted that Aristotle means “justice between fellow citizens, who are equal before the law” but justice to Plato means “functional” non interference governing the relations between unequal individuals and dissimilar classes”

Conclusion

Even though Aristotle is a scientist while Plato is only an idealist the fact remains that Platonic conceptions of justice is very valuable, it is applicable and must

Q6) Origin, function and nature of the state?

Introduction:

The fundamental characterized of state. According to Aristotle, is that it is an association of human beings. The highest form of association. Every associations aims at some good. The state, which is the highest association aims at the highest good. The other communities that were established to do some good to the individual are family and the village. They were established are family and the village. They were established chromatically period to the establishment of the state. But only a state makes possible a letter and fuller life.

“State aims at the highest good”

If we analyze the above statement, we find that there are three clear parts of it.

Firstly, that state is an association

Secondly, that state is the supreme association or the highest forms of community

Thirdly, the state exists for the supreme good. In other words its functions are moral in the sense that it has to enable the individual to lead the best moral life.

The state is an association:

Aristotle opens the “politics” with two important ideas:

It is the highest of all community and

It is the highest of all communities which aims at good. He says, the very first paragraph of the “politics” “the state is a kind of “ “koinonia”. Koinonia means community or association. But the community or association. But the community or association to which Aristotle refers is not the platonic state with dull uniformity. It is a fundamental unity of varied and reciprocal parts made one by the pursuit of a common aim.

State as an association o different people:

So, according to Aristotle, state is an association of different people, with different vocations. It is essentially a “plurality” this Aristotle concept resembles substantially Plato’s doctrine that the state originates in the reciprocity of services and division of labor. The difference between Plato and Aristotle becomes to the forefront when we find that the former doesn’t distinguish between the various types of associations or communities did not show how the state differs from them, while the latter very elaborately shows the nature of the state an association or “Koinonia” and distinction between it and other associations, e.g. the family and the village. According to Aristotle, the state is not an association of isolated individuals, but an association of individuals already united as members of smaller groups, i.e. it is an association of associations.

Family is an association prior to state:

Family is the precursor of the state. It is not of the families and the villages that state is formed. Hence, he not only retains family and other associations but also gives them a pride and place in the political scheme of his ideal state.

State as an association of dissimilar for a common life:

It is a sort of “living together” of men of different tastes for their common life. It is a partnership in every virtue, and in all perfection

The state is the supreme association:

According to Aristotle, ‘every association aims at some good. The state or political community which is the highest of all and which embraces all the rest, aims in a greater degree than any other, at the highest good. “ the state is supreme association due to two reasons.

Firstly, it stands the apex of social evolution

Secondly, man realizes the highest moral perfection of his nature in the state.

State : At the apex of social evolution:

The roots of Aristotle’s concept of state as the highest form of community lie in the social evolution of the state from family via village community. The state, according to him, is a community arising out of union of families and villages. The family is the first form of association, lowest in the chain of social evolution, and lowest at the ring of values because it is established by nature “for the supply of man’s everyday wants’ for the satisfaction of everyday wants the male and the female, the master and slave come together to form family of the household, as Aristotle call it. The household only satisfies only in racial production and economic spheres. The satisfaction is only partial to satisfy other needs, man moves into a bigger and more varied form of association, generally more complex than family and aiming at something more than the supply of daily needs. Village to be more satisfying than family. But the requirements of people become more complex with the passage of time so, they looked beyond the border of village in search of a still fuller and happier life. This leads to the formation of cities. So, the third and the highest form of association is the city state.

Family and village exist essentially for the preservation of life and the comfort of companionship, the state exists for the sake of a good life and not for the sake of life only.

However, this explanation takes only the order time into consideration. On the other hand, so far as the order of thought is concerned state is prior to the man himself. As we find it is in the state that man finds his complete satisfaction. It is because man is born incomplete. So, he wishes and tries to achieve perfect life. So long as he does not achieve perfection he is something of a beast. Aristotle says. “ without the civilizing influence of speech and organized association he would be merely an animal, not a rational animal.”

From the life of a beast, man moved slowly but surely towards a form of association that made him a perfect and complete man. This association was the state. So long as the state was not formed, he was less than a man. He became man only after the state had helped him become so, clearly, the state was prior to man. It is because state came first and man became real and perfect man from a mere animal only after the birth of the state.

Man realizes the highest moral perfection of his nature only in state:

Man thus presents a compound of qualities that are reflected in corresponding forms of association. His material appetites and biological urges, the lowest in the scale of value, are reflected in the family, his social sentiments, his desire of companionship and community is expressed in the village; his moral nature, the quality that makes more specifically human, is fulfilled in the state. Thus, according to Aristotle, the state is an association of men for the sake of the best moral life.

Functions of the state:

state comes into existence for the sake of life but continues to exist for good life:

as such, the state came into being for the sake of life as did the family or village but the state continues to exist for good life which implies moral and intellectual satisfaction.

Man has real meaning only in a state:

The subordinate associations are imperfect in themselves like parts of a body. A hand or an eye, to quote an example, had no meaning when separated from the body to which they....

State is spiritual association:

The function of the state is positive in as much as it develops the good qualities of man and virtues. State is not merely a territorial association. What differs state from other institutions is that it secures for man the highest moral purpose

Criticism

Origin of state unsatisfactory:

Aristotle begins from a civilized man who form a family consisting of himself, the wife and the slave. But the conditions prevailing before that have not been explained. The theory of origin of state is this incomplete.

Ambiguous theory:

Aristotle considers state as of prime importance in comparison to the individual. But at the same time, he considers state as an organ for the promotion of good life of the individual. His theory is as such ambiguous. It is not clear whether the state is an end or means.

Predecessor of totalitarianism:

Aristotle is predecessor of totalitarianism. He considers state as an association of associations, which only makes possible the individuality of man. It implies that man without state cannot develop his capabilities fully. This typical of the totalitarian theory which considers the state as all pervading and supreme to individual.

Conclusion

Whatever objections may be leveled against the Aristotelian conception of state as the highest association aimed at the highest good of the man, the fact remains that Aristotle to gave a principle to political science of everlasting importance. The state is indeed an end of an situational development over and above the state, the man has failed to build a world-state.

**Q) “Just as some are by nature free, so others are by nature slaves”
comment-or-**

Aristotle on slavery and citizenship-or-

Aristotle – a progressive conservative

Introduction:

Man, according to Aristotle, is the only animal endowed with the ability to reason and to communicate. the possession of these capabilities alone doesn't enable man to attain satisfaction. Thus, both reason and instinct impelled man to develop family as the first and the root-association. In the words of Foster, “individual is not self-sufficient is the very reason which makes the family necessary to him”

Slavery

Slavery as a living property of household:

Aristotle considers property as an essential instrument of family. This property includes both living and non-living things. It is the living property which he terms as slave who continues

one of the natural elements of the household. Aristotle justifies slavery on the universal principle of nature according to which men differ from one another in their capabilities.

Slave is inferior to the master in his capacity to employ reason:

Slaves are human beings only in appearance and not in comprehension. They are no doubt born of human parents but lack capacity to employ reason of their own. They are slaves by birth. They look at others for direction and command which they blindly obey. It means they understand other's reason. It is in this characteristic that they are superior to the beasts. They stand in-between beasts and freemen. Rather they are more nearer the beast than the freeman. It is because they can be used like horses, cows and dogs by their master. It is as just as the soul rules over body, reason over children and above all new our animals.

Justification:

However, Aristotle theory of slavery by nature is based upon four theories.

The theory of natural inequality.

The theory of Aristocratic government.

The theory of special function.

Slavery both advisable and just.

The theory of natural inequality:

That those who possess wisdom and reason are meant by nature to lead a free life while the idiots and appetitive are destined to a life of subjection and slavery.

The theory of aristocratic government:

As a corollary to the principle of inequality, there is a principle of rule and subordination. Which dominates both living and non-living objects. Nature marks out some to rule and others for living ruled.

The theory of specific function:

Everything in nature is required to do a specific function. The eye exists to see, the ear to hear, the intellect to direct action and to control the body and the body to act according to the orders of mind.

Slavery both advisable and just:

Slavery is as such advisable to slaves and masters. Slavery is expedient to the master because it makes for him the life of leisure possible. On the other hand by living with master, the slave can have an opportunity to cultivate the virtues practiced by his master.

Classification of slavery:

Aristotle makes a distinction between a natural slave and a slave by law. Natural slave is the one who is slave by birth. He is born inferior and has no capacity to develop superior virtues it means the nature intended him to be slave. But there may be cases where nature did not

intend a man to be slave. He was made or slave by man. He was made a slave by law. This happens when the prisoners of war are made slaves or sold as slaves. Slavery by law is not at all justified. It is based merely on force. Aristotle advocates for fully that the Greeks should not be made slaves even they are defeated in war because they possess superior excellence.

Progressive conservation:

It should be that the master should treat his slave as a living instrument of his family—his own body. The master must look after the physical comforts of the slave. The rule of the master over the slave is nobler and kind than that of the shepherd over his flock, but less noble than that of the statesman over the citizen.

All this shows that Aristotle was not only conservative as he gives justification for slavery but also progressive because he advocates for the emancipation of slaves if they behave and develop intellect.

Citizenship

State, according to Plato, is not an end in itself. It exists for the sake of good life for the citizens. Now the question that arises is if the state exists for promoting good life of the citizens, who these citizens are? Aristotle discusses this central and most fundamental question in 'Politics'

To arrive at proper definition of a citizen, Aristotle tells us what doesn't entitle a person to the citizenship of state.

Who are not citizens?

Residence in a state doesn't entitle a person to citizenship because resident aliens and slaves also residence in the same territory.

The right of suing and being sued does not make a citizen because even resident aliens may enjoy this privilege in consequence of a treaty

Birth from citizen parents also doesn't make a citizen.

Citizenship according to Aristotle should be viewed in terms of performance of functions. The Greek considered participations in the exercise of sovereignty or the performance of the civic functions as the essential characteristic of citizenship. However the form and extent of actual participation will differ, from state to state depending upon form of government. So, a basic minimum was essential.

Proper citizen: A juror and Legislator

The characteristic of a citizens proper is a share in administration of justice and the membership of deliberative assembly. This definition applies well to a democratic government but what about others forms of government. Citizenship as a concept differs in its meanings from state to state. In oligarchy, the attribute of citizenship may be property and

sometimes birth. So, Aristotle holds that citizen is one who is competent to rule and being ruled in term.

Citizenship means power to take part in judicial and administrative functions.

What Aristotle means is to capacity to take active part in the affairs of the state.

Poverty not suited to citizenship:

As such the person who have to take their livelihood with the sweat of their brow were not fit to become citizens. They were much busy in their worry for earning. They could spare no time for political activities.

In this way Aristotle pleaded citizenship only for the propertied class. It is because he believes property is essential not only to ensure proper leisure but also for a restricted citizenship.

Equality of citizenship:

Aristotle, unlike Plato, advocates equality of citizenship. This is evident from the fact that he believes the basic qualification of citizenship is that he is able to rule and be ruled.

Good citizen renders unconditional obedience:

This is what distinguish a good citizen from man. This is because a man who has never learned to obey cannot be a good commander.

Criticism

Nowhere the scientist in Aristotle is so dead as in his treatment of slavery. It would be no exaggeration to say that Aristotle did not hesitate to employ nature for un-nature ends, and to employ scientific method for the unscientific conclusions.

To the laboring and toiling classes Aristotle denies the right of citizenship as he considers them no more than instruments for production and not as members of the state.

Aristotle's theory is subject to various criticism.

Typically Greek:

his conception of slavery and citizenship is essentially Greek in nature.

Characteristics of ruler and slave not universal:

Aristotle holds that the slaves have naturally robust physique while the master has robust mind. But this characteristic is not of universal application.

Contradictory theory:

Aristotle holds that the slave has no reason but has only a bit of reason to understand what is reason. If there is a bit of reason, it can be trained.

Smacks of rural prejudice:

Aristotle advocates that the Greeks should never be made even legal slaves if defeated because they present better intellect.

Advocates exploitation

No line of distinction between slave and free manual worker:

Theory inconsistent:

Aristotle holds that the slave capable of partnership and friendship with his master but on the other hand he says that slave is naturally inferior.

Double Standard:

On the one hand he desires the master to be kind to their slaves. But on the other hand, he himself regard the slave as nothing more than a beast.

Qualities of citizens not of universal application

Opposed to organic conception of state:

Aristotle presents state as an organic whole but excludes bulk of the population consisting of artisans and mechanizes from becoming a part of the whole.

Inapplicable in modern states:

Question of state into too halves:

Conclusion:

There is no denying the fact that Aristotle ceased to be scientist in the treatment of slavery and citizenship but it cannot be denied that he aspired to be progressive.

Q) Aristotle's classification of state:

Introduction:

Aristotle is that most lasting classification which is very even today regarded as the most valid basis of differences of one government from the other. His classification is based on the thorough study of all the constitutions and political systems of his time.

Identification of state with constitution:

Aristotle identifies 'state' with constitution the same classification which is valid for the former is also valid for the latter. In Aristotle own words "constitution and government have

the same meaning. We moderates distinguish the government from the state. For Aristotle, the three constitution, state and government were identical.

Basis of classification:

There are two major bases of Aristotle's classification of states: first which can be termed as quantitative basis and second is qualitative basis. The first is the mere number of those in whom sovereign power is vested whether one, few or many. The second basis is the end which the government seeks to serve. If the government whether of one, few or many aims at the common interest of all the people, it is a pure form of government. On the other hand if the government services the private or self interest, it becomes perverted or corrupt.

Classification of states:

According, pure governments are there Monarchy Aristocracy and polity. If one perform rules for the good of community under law the government is monarchy. Monarchy, Aristotle, is the best form of government. If a few people rule for the good of all it is aristocracy. Then again if many persons rule for the interests of all, it is polity.

Each form has its perversion, which are also three: Tyranny, Oligarchy and democracy. The perverted form also run according to the same numerical formulae. This is if one person rules for the selfish interests of his own the rule is tyranny. Again if a few (wealthy) for the private class interest the government is oligarchy. Lastly, if many people (poor) rule for their interests, not the interest of all, it becomes democracy this classification in Tabular forms can be shown as:

Rule of	pure form	corrupt form
One	monarchy	tyranny
Few	aristocracy	oligarchy
Many	polity	democracy

This classification of states is mainly borrowed from Plato's statesman. But as Rose says "the principle of division there is different. The states are classified by Plato on the basis of their law abidingness or otherwise. If the state is law abiding and is ruled by one, it is monarchy, and if again it is ruled by few, it is law abiding, it is Aristocracy. Then again if the state is law abiding but there is a rule of many, it is moderate democracy. If there law-abiding state become lawless, they turn into tyranny oligarchy and extreme respectively. This six-fold classification is more or less same as has been put forward by Aristotle. But the basis of division has been changed. For Plato it is whether the state is law-abiding or lawless; in Aristotle it is the end they serve.

Form of Government of which Plato uses the term 'Moderate Democracy', Aristotle uses 'polity' or constitutional government. Similarly, the form of government for which Plato was the word 'Extreme Democracy' Aristotle uses the word 'democracy if should be added here that what we call 'Democracy' today is referred to by Aristotle as 'polity'

Identify between Platonic and Aristotelian classification:

Beyond the above points of distinction, Aristotle classification of states is identical with Plato's. the former, is really indebted to latter in this respect.

Aristotle goes into detail of his classification of states.

Monarchy:

Monarchy is, the rule of one perfect man who should not be made subject to law. Such a one man truly be deemed. A God among men. Here Aristotle conception of king is almost similar to Plato's conception of philosopher king.

Tyranny:

Monarchy is however an ideal form of government which is practically impossible. Its place is taken by tyranny.

Aristocracy:

For, Aristotle, Aristocracy is a government formed of the best men also lately working for the interests of the public as a whole.

Oligarchy:

The perverted form of Aristocracy is oligarchy in which the government by the wealthy is carried on for their own benefit rather than for that of the whole state wealth is the basis for selection in oligarchy. But Aristotle holds, that wealth has no absolute claim to power as virtue has, but he doesn't ignore its claim altogether as property has some moral consequences which cannot be neglected.

Polity:

Aristotle, as we know, defines polity as the state in which the citizens at large administer for the common interests. It is an attempt or uniting the freedom of the poor and the wealth of the rich, without giving either of them predominant position. It is best practical because it is ruled by the middle-class and the moderate qualities.

Democracy:

The perverted form of the polity is democracy. It is government for the poor and by the poor only first as tyranny is government by one for his own interest and so on.

Cycle of states:

According to the famous state-cycle of Aristotle, Government are not static but dynamic according to this cycle, the first form of government to come into being in history was Monarchy. One perfect man ruled for the interests of all. Having tasted the point of power, the monarch is bound to fall prey to greed, selfishness and arrogance and gets degenerated into tyranny. Tyranny remains for sometime but it also is succeeded by Aristocracy at its turn. A few good people overthrow tyranny and rule for the interests of all. Aristocracy too gets perverted into oligarchy. A few such start ruling for their class interests. Oligarchy is over-thrown by many patriotic persons who govern for the good of all. So, comes policy. Policy too in its turn becomes corrupt. The many poor people capture power and start ruling for the interest of poor only. The result is democracy. Democracy continues for some time. A time comes when one perfect, benevolent, virtuous person rises, overthrows democracy, establishes monarchy and starts ruling for the good of all. And thus the cycle order of governments goes on.

Criticism:

The classification is out of date from over point of view. It does not cover a number of governments which exist today. E.g. limited monarchy, totalitarian government, dictatorship, representative democracy, parliamentary system, federation and soon.

Second, modern writers tend to reject Aristotle's thesis that democracy is the government by many poor people. There is a possibility that the majority of people in a given country are rich and prosperous.

Conclusion:

His classification is even today valid with few amendments.

Q) Polity (Govt. by middle-class) as the best government:

Introduction:

Criticizing of best practicable:

Aristotle advocates that moderate men or average should be the criterion for the realization of the best practicable or attainable state.

Policy as the best practicable state:

It is in the polity that the golden mean and moderation is realized. Polity is ruled by the middle is realized. Policy is ruled by the middle class. Middle class is in between the extremes of wealth and poverty which are two greatest evils, in society. Moreover, both the rich and the poor develop a feeling of enmity between themselves, which is against stability of the state.

Qualities of politics:

Polity---a mixed state:

In polity, Aristotle combines the oligarchic and democratic elements while avoiding the extremes of both.

Polity-----strikes balance b/w quantity and equality:

There are, according to Aristotle, two containing forces in society- quality and quantity. Quality implies wealth, birth, social position, education, etc and therefore, in what constitutes the oligarchic factors of community. Quantity.. on the other hand, represents numbers or masses what constitute the democratic force. A state dominated by either would be a state, unlawful, instable and selfish. These two factors, however can neither be removed nor ignored. The best process under these circumstances is therefore, to balance each against the other so as to negate the worst features of each and thereby achieve stability that is a result of the balance. From the practical aspect, in order to hold in check the disruptive forces of extreme oligarchy and extreme democracy, stability can be achieved only by placing power in the middle class.

Polity represents the principle of Golden mean and moderation:

Polity---the best state:

Aristotle never advocated that the state run by the middle class is the ideal state. Rather he called it the best on the average. It is the best out of the practicable, the actual states. It is first the golden mean aimed at to avoid the extremes. Moreover historical evidences are, also there which show/prove the success of middle class phenomenon.

Essential conditions for the best state:

The essential conditions of Aristotle best state can be divided into two categories. The first category comprises of external conditions of the state that are more favorable to it but are determined more or less by chance. The second category consists of the most effective methods for beading the character of the people. This includes regulation, education and marriage both the conditions are discussed.

Morality:

An ideal state, according to Aristotle, should conform to the idea of morality and good life. Good life has three ingredients “extreme goods, goods of the body and goods of the soul’. A happy ad well-balanced person required all the three but it is the good of the soul that is truly important and constitute the true end of human concern.

Population:

An ideal should have a certain maximum that good government becomes impossible.

Territory:

The ideal state should be large enough to ensure a free and leisured life, and not so large as to foster luxury. So in terms of territory also Aristotle maintains that the principle of moderation must be maintained.

Location:

An ideal state must enjoy both military and commercial advantages insofar as its location is concerned. The state should be so situated as to enjoy strategic location. At the same time, it must enjoy access to the sea.

Performance of services:

The best arrangement insofar as performance of services is concerned he will allocate defense to the younger citizens. Governing to those of middle age and religious functions to the aged. In this manner, each citizen will perform all functions. But only at that period of his life when he is best qualified for his duty.

Land ownership:

Each owner should hold two plots of land one near the city and the other in the frontier. The purpose of this arrangement is to achieve unity of purpose in case of border warfare.

Internal ordering of city:

State must have sound internal order with particular attention on arrangement against attack. Both walls and citadels he regards as indispensable

Place of law:

An ideal state must give supreme place to law.

Plato's sub-ideal state: Aristotle's ideal state:

In this way we see that Aristotle's ideal state is Plato's sub-ideal state depicted in the "laws"

Conclusion:

All said and done, the fact remains that Aristotle dwelt upon the most valuable remedy in suggesting middle-class rule as the best criterion for obtaining stability in the state. This principle has universal appeal.

Q) Aristotle on Revolution/political change:

Introduction:

People naturally get tired of the practices of their government and set to revolution which he found in abundance the Greek.

Meaning of Revolution: Revolution has two fold meanings for Aristotle;

First-----Any small or big change in the constitution meant revolution to

Him. Even if oligarchy has become less oligarchic or democracy

Less democratic, a revolution, is deemed to have taken place.

Secondly----If the constitution remains the same and the ruling power has been transferred from one man to another revolution is supposed to have taken place.

Cause of Revolution:

General causes of revolution:

“the most general cause of revolutionary movement according to Aristotle is the craving of men for equality” the masses are ever. Seeking for absolute equality- for the same privileges and powers that are enjoyed by the few.

Particular causes:

Universal craving for privilege and prerogative.

Arrogance of rulers or ruling classes

Undeserving importance of certain individuals.

Election intrigues

Dynastic and family feuds are quarrels

Struggle for power between rival forces.

There are certain other cause which comprise a long list.

Causes of revolution in particular kinds of state;

Each kind of state has particular causes of revolution. Democracy has its own causes and oligarchy its own and so on.

Prevention of Revolutions:

Aristotle holds that how poor a state may be, it is always better than anarchy because it ensures at least some progress. He therefore, urged that every state must be preserved and the stability of its constitution must be assumed. He gave certain preventive measures.

General Preventions:

First offices of the state must be open to all the virtuous citizens. No class or section of the people should enjoy monopoly of offices.

Second the most important thing is to maintain the point of obedience to law lawlessness must not be allowed even the smaller matters.

Third the state should never rely upon device for deceiving the people, which have been proved useless by experience.

Fourth the citizens must be educate in the spirit in the constitution.

Fifth both the rich and the poor should die set to check each other and power should be given to middle class.

Sixth the rulers should not have opportunity of making money out of their office.

Seventh the rulers should also keep before his people the danger of foreign attack this will tend to make them united and avoid revolution.

Eighth the ruling class must preserve by all means, its own solidarity.

Ninthly the accounts of treasury should be made public.

Finally every government should be moderate in the exercise of its power.

Particular preventions:

Aristotle passes on to particular means for preserving particular forms of governments. However the nature of prevention recommended for each is determined by the nature of causes which tend to change it. The main cause of revolution is a 'polity' is the improper blending of democratic and oligarchic elements. Accordingly Aristotle suggest that special care must be taken in this regard.

Conclusion

The whole account of diagnosing the causes and preventions of revolutions is strikingly unsurpassed. It is one of the great attributions made by Aristotle to political thought.

Q Aristotle First Political scientist:

Introduction:

The capital significance of Aristotle" according to Dunning,' in the history of political theories, lies in the fact that he gave to politics the character of an independent science" he continues to say that Aristotle 'differs from his master, Plato, much more in the form and method than in the substance"

Plato and Aristotle compared and contrasted:

Plato and Aristotle are the fathers of two different systems in the world of politics and philosophy. Plato is the father of idealism. Aristotle is the father of realism. The major difference between Plato and Aristotle is the difference of methodology. Most of the ideas which seen characteristically Aristotelian are to be found in Plato. The difference comes in the manner they are presented. The Platonic expression of those ideas is poetic, imaginative and Aristotle. The Aristotelian expression of those ideas on the other hand is generally scientific, realistic and analytic.

Now the main question arises why Aristotle is regarded the father of the political science? Why Plato is not given the honor of being the first political scientist? The simple answer to this questions lies in the definition of “science”. Science, as we know, is an organized mass of knowledge based on observation the facts of which have been coordinated, analyzed and synthesized. A scientist would first observe the fact of life, then he will collect the data and at the end he will derive his conclusions from the data collected so far and from the new fact which he finds later on his method is essentially inductive. Moreover a scientist would never go into the realm of idealism. He could not start from the things as they ought to be’. On the other hand he will start from “The things as they are” in other words, his approach to the problems is essentially realistic.

Plato not a scientist :

Plato would start from the “Things as the ought to be” his approach to the problems is a painter’s approach. A painter would like to paint an ideal picture. Plato’s method is deductive in the sense that he deduces all his main ideas from abstract notions like virtue and the idea of the Good. Plato never gave an independent status to politics. For him politics was only a sub-division of Ethics.

Aristotle as scientist:

Aristotle is a scientist in the sense that he observes certain facts. As he did in the case of his research of 158 constitutions. Science implies observation of facts. Analysis, tabulation, coordination and then synthesizing the whole observation into conclusion. So did Aristotle in his work “Politics” as would be clear from following facts.

Form and method:

Aristotle proceeding by extensive observation and minute analysis of objective facts, marked out for each science an independent field. Aristotelian method is thus inductive.

Realism:

The conclusions drawn by Aristotle are based on realism and not on idealisms. There is no denying the fact that both Plato and Aristotle are the products of the same troubled conditions. But the approach of Aristotle is essentially more realistic and empirical. The intelligence with which Aristotle developed the theory of the middle-class state is without parallel in the annals of political philosophy .

Aristotle greatest legacy, a valuable one indeed, is constitutionalism. The rule of law and not of force should govern ‘he rightly believed that governments must in some way, be responsible to those whom they govern.

Creation of science of politics:

Aristotle was the first writer to give to politics the character of an independent science. He did so by separating politics and ethics.

Synthetic aspect:

Plato pleads for an ideal state that has no touch of reality in it. He rather criticizes all the ages old institutions and develops altogether novel institutions. But Aristotle holds that “the experience of the ages should not be neglected “political science should, as such, not start afresh, from every point. It should take into account the experience gathered in the course of political experimentation being conducted through ages.

Analytical aspect:

Not only does Aristotle enjoy the reputation of a synthesizer, he is also an acute analyst of the political institutions.

Criticism

Although Aristotle is a first political scientist, in many respects he is equally accused of being conservative and dogmatist as in his treatment of slavery which he justifies as natural and essential for the existence of man

Conclusion;

MONTESQUIEU (1689-1755)

Introduction:

Montesquieu political philosophy was affected by the spirit of rational liberty which characterized French thought in his days and which represented a reaction against the absolutism and general conditions prevailing in the age of Louis XIV. The best of his publications are:

The Persian letters

Considerations on the greatness and decay of Rome

The spirit of laws.

The Persian letters' of Montesquieu was a brilliant satire on the existing political religious and social institutions in France.

Montesquieu visited England. What influenced him most in England was the practical enjoyment of liberty by Englishmen and the working of English constitutional machinery. It was the study of the Roman history and of contemporary English institutions which determined the purpose as well as the content of Montesquieu political philosophy. These two sources gave him the conception of liberty which forms the control scheme of his speculations.

Montesquieu and Aristotle:

Montesquieu was Aristotelian and not Platonic in his work though his point of view is often Platonic. His method was inductive the indebtedness of Montesquieu to Aristotle obvious. The method of treatment of both is empirical. Aristotle hints at separations of powers, Montesquieu develops the theory. Both dilate on the influence of geography on the forms of government. Both classify government on the basis of law. Both uphold monarchy as the best form of government.

Liberty: the central theme of Montesquieu:

Montesquieu wanted to reform political life in France by infusing in it British sense of liberty and by introducing into the French constitution the principle of the separation of powers.

His spirit of laws "studies the inter relations between the various factors which moved the life of a nation, i.e. social, economic, political and religious institutions, racial effects and effects of climate and other natural phenomenon.

Relativity of human institution:

There is both uniformity and diversity of behavior in the world. There is diversity on the surface but beneath the surface, there is uniformity of behavior provided by the laws of nature. Uniformity is provided by the universal law of self-preservation, and diversity by the variety in customs, conventions, moral codes and institutions arising out of differences in environment, climate, soil and genius of the people etc.

“Laws are any necessary relations arising from a thing’s nature. In this sense all beings have their laws. The material world its laws, the beasts their laws, man his laws... “Before these laws were there man was guided by the laws of nature. The first law of nature enjoined on him. The necessity of self-preservation, peace and security.

Law is always related to social environment. There is no such thing as universal positive law based on natural reason because a number of influences determine the nature of legislation and various institutions of a people. Law is a rule of action based on social relationships, social experiences and social adjustments and its penalties should be based on the necessity of social life. Law is rooted in the society and varies with the different types and structures of society.

Montesquieu on Kinds of Law:

To Montesquieu man in the state of nature was a timid creature. He was not an intelligent creature as Locke conceived him to be nor a willful brute of Hobbes. He followed the laws of nature with the formation of societies and increase in knowledge, man lost his timidity and equality sought for dominion over others and inaugurated a state of war. There began a conflict in two directions i.e.; between individuals and human societies this gave rise to the +ve laws which are of three types corresponding to the three sets of relations. Relations between nation and nation (law of nations), between ruler and ruled in society (political law), and between individual citizens belonging to a commonly (civil law). The “law of nations’ is common to all nations but the political and ‘civil’ laws vary with different nations. The political laws must have a relation to the character of the people so, also the civil laws’ must be related to topography, climate size of the population, religion etc of a people. Further, these three types of laws must have a relation with one another. All these various relations in their totality constitute what Montesquieu designates the spirit of laws,

Origin of state and classification of Government:

Montesquieu repudiated the contractual theory of the origins of the state. The state was not a result of a contract between individuals. It was product of environment and was organic not conventional in nature.

He classifies governments as

- Monarchy:** which represents the rule of an individual based on law
- Despotism:** meaning the rule of an individual without law. And

Republic: which could be further classified into aristocracy and democracy as: Aristocratic or democratic republic.

Basic principles of Government:

The classification of Government of Montesquieu is based partly on the number of those who hold political power and partly on the manner in which that power is exercised. Montesquieu attaches more importance to the principle on which a government is based than to its nature. By nature he means the peculiar structure and the location and manner of exercise of the sovereign power, while by the principle of a government Montesquieu means the human passions which make it act. Montesquieu assigned a particular basic principle to every form of Govt. the principle of democracy was “virtue”, of an aristocracy ‘virtue term moderation’ of monarchy “honor” while that of despotism was “fear”

Montesquieu was so obsessed with liberty that he practically ignored the concept of sovereignty.

Virtue of a Govt. relative.

Montesquieu believed that no type of government was inherently good or bad in itself. The goodness and badness of a government was relative. A form of government suiting one set of conditions would be bad in a different environment .

Form of a Govt. religion and size of the state:

According to Montesquieu certain religions have a definite affinity for certain types of government eq.

Protestantism:	goes well with republican form of Govt.
Roman Catholic:	with monarchical form
Muhammadans:	despotic govt.

To Montesquieu, the size of the state gives another basis for the classification of government.

Small size:	republican form
Moderate:	monarchy
Big size:	must have despotic govt.

Change of size was attended with the change in the type of government. Real democracy was only possible in a small city state. France of Montesquieu's times was too large for a republic. Monarchy would suit her best. Since a large state must have a despotic govt. which he declared to be the worse form of govt. Montesquieu unlike Machiavelli was against a policy of expansion and aggrandizement. To prevent small states from being absorbed by the bigger ones he favored the principle of Federation, a hind adopted by Americans. Division of power in Federation insured liberty. Which Montesquieu valued so highly. In a large area democratic institutions could only be maintained through a system of decentralization which is of the essence of federation.

Montesquieu concept of Liberty:

The most significant of the political contributions of Montesquieu is his conception of liberty which pervades through his “spirit of laws.” Liberty may be conceived in absolute or relative sense. Absolute liberty is the unrestricted liberty of the individual to do what he is pleased to do whereas relative liberty, which alone is a rational form of liberty is the equal liberty of all to do that which is not forbidden by law. Montesquieu sharply distinguished political liberty from civil or individual liberty.

To Montesquieu, political liberty conneted a relation between the subject and the state. It means the right of doing all that the law permits. If an individual violated law he could not retain liberty, because then everybody would be liberty for none. Political liberty is to be gained by conforming to laws and not by violating them. It means freedom of action in accordance with and under the protection of the laws. It follows naturally that if in a state an individual or a body of individuals are above the laws, there can be no liberty Montesquieu chief aim was to discover a governments organizations that would best secure political liberty because of its system of checks and balances

Separation of powers to ensure individual Liberty:

Liberty lies in subjection to law instead of subjection to persons, secured best by separation of powers. Montesquieu subjected the constitution of England to a critical examination with a view to finding out a machinery of government which would best ensure liberty. He began by pointing out that liberty was possible in a country where all parts of government were subject to law and control. He found in the separation of the three powers of government, i.e. Executive, legislature and judicial the best guarantee for liberty.

If the legislative power is united with the executive power in the hands of one person or of one body of officials, there can be no liberty; nor can there be any liberty if the power to judge is not separated from the legislative and executive powers.

Montesquieu reading of the English constitution is not correct. In the Englishs constitution the powers are not separated but diffused.

The legislature must check to executive and the judiciary and be checked by them.

Montesquieu instance on the separation of powers was his main contribution to political philosophy and this instance was no lost sight of when the constitution in USA and revolutionary France were framed.

It should be observed that Locke had used the idea of separation of powers as a democratic measure against absolutism, and had, therefore, placed the executive and federative powers in definite subordination to the legislature. Montesquieu used the theory of separation of powers no in furtherance of democracy but in order to ensure personal liberty of individuals. He instead, therefore, that all the three branches of the government should be coequal and in separate hands. Montesquieu like Locke, had no theory of sovereignty

Montesquieu distinguished between political and civil liberty. The later grows out of relative between man and man is against slavery. To him, the system of slavery, founded on a conception of inequality of men was inhuman. Superiority of one people to another was no justification for slavery he would not allow prisons of wars (POWs) to be reduced to slaves. Slavery violated the law of nature according to which all men are born equal. Montesquieu even suggested an international convention for the purpose of stopping slave trade.

Influence of physical phenomena on National life:

Montesquieu dilated on the influence of physical environment on the social, economic, religious and political institutions of a country. Intellect and passions of nations vary according to climate. People of cold climate are restless and irritable and independent in spirit. Then again from different wants in different climates arise different ways of living and these different ways of living result in different kinds of laws. According to Montesquieu, there is a direct relation between climate and liberty. To Montesquieu, the English constitution is primarily the result of English climate. Hot climate breeds despotism and slavery. The cold climate, as of Europe makes for the virtues of strength self-reliance and frankness and these virtues produce political and civil liberty.

Geography plays an important role in the formation of national institution. You will have liberty in the hills while are difficult of cultivation as well as of conquest, and despotism in the plains which are more easily cultivable and conquerable. Again, the larger the area of a country, the smaller the chance of a constitutional government and political liberty there. Montesquieu hated religious cruelty and favored religious toleration.

State and the church:

Montesquieu was strongly secular in his attitude towards the church. He was for a national and not for a universal. Christen church. Montesquieu, like Machiavelli, thought of the church as a department of the state. He considered the power of the church very useful for the state and also for the people. The church strengthened the government as well as ensures liberty to the people by opposing arbitrariness of the government.

Conclusion:

Montesquieu pointed out that history was not merely a record of facts but a stud of causes and relations. He changed not only the method but also the ideals of history and political philosophy.

Montesquieu cared little for the dogma of natural rights. To him all laws and institutions were relative, his rational the friends drew from nature rules of universal validity.

Rather neglected in his own country he was deeply respected elsewhere. He was read and admired in England and USA. The framers of the constitution of America learnt from him the extreme advisability of brining about the separation of powers.

NICOLO MACHIAVELLI (1469-1527)

Q) Theory of preservation of state rather than a theory of the state.

- **First realist in politics**
- **Philosophy was both narrowly local a narrowly Lated.**

Introduction:

In no system of political philosophy, the influence of environment is more manifest than in that of Machiavelli. He is concerned with the art of state craft. He deals in both of his books with the rules of acquisition, expansion and maintenance of power. The subject matter of both of his books—“the prince’ and the discourses’ is thus the same, the promotion of a more scientist state craft.

Machiavelli’s Times:

In order to understand property why Machiavelli was obliged to give a theory of the preservation of state on the art of scientific statecraft we should know the circumstances and the times in which Machiavelli gave his philosophy.

Impact of Renaissance and reformation.

Modern period of history was brought about by two forces at work in Europe in the 15th century. These two forces were renaissance and reformation. Renaissance meant rediscovery of incant pagan ideas, thought, learning, beliefs which Christianity had conquered and suppressed. Machiavelli was very much a creative of this renaissance because his native place, Florence was the never centre of Italian renaissance. He stood on the border-line between the middle and the modern ages.

The significance of Machiavelli’s thought consists in the fact that he was at the parting of the ways in political philosophy. In him meet both the old and the new.

Age of Bastards and adventures:

In brief, it was a society intellectually brilliant and artistically creative. At the same time it was a victim to the worst political corruption and degeneration. Cruelty an murder were normal methods of government.

Age of masterless man:

Italians were leaderless. Hence the remark of Sabine that “Machiavelli in peculiar sense is the political theorist of Masterless man” Italy was divided into five states, i.e. Naples, Milan, Venice, Florence and the Papal State. No ruler was able to consolidate the whole of Italy under his power. There was internal disorder and internecine wars among these states.

Degrading state of church:

There was moral of popes during this period. Like most Italians of the day, Machiavelli held the church to be particular responsible for the bad state of affairs. The popes of the century look most interest in politics than in preaching’s.

Machiavelli’s books reveal real conditions of statesman:

It was in this atmosphere lived and wrote his books. This embarrassing and depressing state of affairs of Italy could not leave a sensitive patriot and keen observer like Machiavelli uninfluenced and unmoved. His important works are “the prince” and the discourses”. These books show that he was fully conscious of the fact that the contemporary politics was based on violence and fraud and not on good Christian ethics. These books reveal Machiavelli as a practical states man concerned about mechanism of government and how it can be made strong.

Machiavelli’s spiritual ancestry and method:

Influence of Aristotle:

Machiavelli was largely influenced by Aristotle. He has followed Aristotelian classification of govts as being monarchy, aristocracy and constitutional democracy with its respective degenerated forms of tyranny, oligarchy and democracy. He abandoned deductive reasoning and abstract principles. Human nature, according to Machiavelli, has always been selfish. In this Machiavelli is very close to Hobbies.

Historical Method:

He claimed that he was the first to see the true relation between history and politics. His conclusions were reached empirically.

Other influences:

Certain other ideas also colored Machiavelli’s thought. Firstly it was said of him that he possessed the instinct of hero-worship. During his life-time he possessed a blind administration of Caesar Borgia, the ruler of Romagna. Secondly, he had also a nostalgia(sentimental linking) for the pagan civilization. It was for this reason whatever fact he borrowed from history to prove his principle were from this period.

Machiavelli's Philosophy (His theory of preservation of state)

Machiavelli gives a system of rules for the acquisition expansion and maintenance of power. This he does in both his books “the discourses and “the prince” “the discourses is a free commentary on the history of the Roman Republic and full of lessons and maxims for the guidance of the popular government “the prince’ is an exhaustive book on the art of absolute government. Study of Machiavelli becomes complete only when we study both of his books. Machiavelli is a republican or democrat at heart. Still he recommends primarily or monarchical type of government for Italy of those days. It was because of political corruption and selfishness prevalent in Italy of those days. Machiavelli fully realizes that monarchical governments cannot last long. Only republican types of governments ruled by the will of the people can last longer. It is his recognition of the fact that different forms of circumstances require different forms of government. Still, both these forms face difficulties. He has given certain rules and maxims that provide for the preservation of state in both the forms. The common features which reveal Machiavelli's theory of preservation of state are:

First realist in politics:

Machiavelli was mainly a student of practical and not a speculative politics. He was not concerned with political philosophy as such. He was a foremost realist in politics. He was an empiric rationalist in his thought. Still, the primary aim of Machiavelli was not to enunciate any philosophy of the state but to solve problems of state craft. He was not a theorist or a philosopher, but a practical realist. Whatever political theories we find in his writings were developed in the process of answering practical problems, in the form of observation in concrete situations. His main interest was to offer maxims useful to the states man. He came to the conclusion that what Italy needed was a strong and unscrupulous ruler or tyrant. The sode end of the prince is to him, to make the country strong and united, establish peace and order and expel invader. For this noble and any means would be satisfactory.” He was indifferent to the question of means. To him end justified the means. It implies the separation of politics from ethics, which is the essence of Machiavelli's and which makes him belong more to the modern than to the middle ages.

Theory of govt. than the theory of state:

Machiavelli gave the theory of the art of government than a theory of the state preservation of the state rather than the excellence of the constitution was his chief consideration. He has nothing to do with the abstract principles, but was mainly concerned with the actual working of the governmental machinery. He saw everything from the point of view of ruler and not of the ruled.

No reference to church father:

No made no reference to the opinion of the church fathers and the medieval philosophers. His work was completely discover needed from the long accepted political theory.

Politics as an end in itself:

He regarded politics as an end itself. This is his most conspicuous quality. He often discussed the advantages of immorality used to gain a ruler's end. This made him responsible for the evil repute that came to be attached to his name Machiavellianism. His separation of politics from religion and morality makes him modern. No earlier thinker, ancient or medieval, went so far in keeping ethics and religion out of politics.

Double standard of morality:

He prescribed a double standard of morality. One for the ruler and other for the private citizens. The ruler was above law and morality. The state was a non-ethical entity for Machiavelli. Its rightness and wrongness was to be judged by one angel only and that was the safety of the state.

Unreligious in approach:

He not only separated morality from politics. But relegated religion to a very subordinated position in his scheme of things. He looked upon religion as a useful weapon in the hands of a statesman to be skillfully used in furtherance of the ends of the state.

His concept of human nature:

Like Hobbes, he regarded man as essentially selfish and bad. There is no inherent goodness in man. He regarded selfishness, egoism, vanity and lust for power as the motives of human conduct. Fear is the dominating element in human life. The ruler must, therefore, be feared rather than loved. But he must not be hated.

Necessity of force on the part of government:

Men agree to be restrained by law only because of their selfish interests of security of their life and property. Security is possible only when government is strong.

Force, not will, basis of state:

One implication of Machiavelli's concept of nature of man is that man would never behave well towards others unless forced to do so, and that human nature remains unchanged at all times and places is that man is an animal that cannot be reformed. He did not believe in the moral progress of man.

Tips to the ruler:

The prince should never depend upon mercenary soldiers but should establish a national army.

A prudent ruler shall abstain from property and women of his subjects.

Machiavelli advised the prince to respect the established institutions and customs of the people, to patronize talent in art and encourage trade and agriculture.

Machiavelli's prince is meant to be a benevolent despot.

He recommended that the two means of success for the ruler are law and forces. He should regard his neighbors as like enemies and keep on guard and attack before the other is ready. Machiavelli would like a prince to be cool and ready to sin boldly for the sake of stability of the state. He said state must expand or expire and force of arms was necessary **“prince” for the critical time but favors republic.**

Machiavelli adopts Aristotelian classification of governments into monarchy, aristocracy and constitutional democracy and their perverted forms into Tyranny, oligarchy and democracy. But he discuss only two forms of government at length== the monarchic form in “the prince” and republican form in ‘the discourses’. It is wrong to assess Machiavelli from “the prince” only that he was a strong supporter of monarchy and so a staunch enemy of republican form of government. The fact is that Machiavelli was a republican at heart. He regarded the republican form of government the best and the most stable for country where there was economic equality and the people were united strong and independent.

Excellence of law:

A, republic, according to him, is more stable and ensure more universal prosperity and individual liberty than monarchy. He declares that the preservation of state depends upon the excellence of law.

Caution against designs of nobility:

he had a very low opinion of aristocracy and nobility which led to factions, quarrels and civil disorder. He said the nobility was against both the monarchy and the middle class and so they must be suppressed.

Unification of Italy his supreme concern:

He fully recognized that Italy of the day needed an elective monarchy which could rid her from foreigners—German, French and Spanish. This is the reason behind his idealization of absolute and south less power in “the prince”

Importance of legislator:

His republican principles made him attach great importance to the legislator or the law giver. The whole moral or social constitution grows out of law and thus the wisdom of the law-giver. Thus Machiavelli gives supreme importance to the law-giver in society.

Machiavelli’s inconsistency:

If, according to Machiavelli, man is inherently selfish, unsocial and incapable of doing good, how can he agree to subordinate his private interests to public interests. Machiavelli’s double standards of morality one for the statesman and the other for the common man, had made him suffer from the odium of “Machiavellianism

Machiavelli's indifference to the truth of religion became a common characteristic of modern thought but it was emphatically not true of two centuries after he wrote. In this sense, his philosophy was both narrowly local and narrowly dated.

Machiavelli: First modern thinker:

He is the father of modern political thought in many respects. It was Machiavelli who divorced ethics from politics and again it was he dimly perceived the rising national sentiments. His concept of a sovereign territorial and secular state led to the theory of legal sovereignty later developed by Bolin, Grotius and John. Austin Hobbes built up his conception of human nature and thereby his theory of absolute sovereignty on the basis of Machiavelli's ideas. Thus Machiavelli is the first of modern totalitarian thinkers, who like Greek philosophers advocated the complete absorption of individual by the state.

Machiavelli is the first exponent, with his theory of agreement of the modern theory of power-politics on which much has been written by thinkers. Again it was he was inspired. Marx in his materialistic conception of history.

His influence and contribution:

Machiavelli left a tremendous influence on the modern age. One of the greatest contributions of Machiavelli lies in the fact that he united. Political theory with political practice. His greatest contribution to modern political thought is his separation of religion from politics, which entitles him to be called the first modern political thinkers. He is one of those who are chiefly responsible for the growth of modern nationalism.

Q) The prince. a book on the art of Government rather them the theory of state:

Introduction:

The prince: on the art of Govt. rather a theory:

“the prince” is by far rather known for its unqualified advocacy of an all powerful ruler whose actions are to be unrestricted by moral considerations. It is a guide for a prince to be a successful ruler. It has not stated anywhere anything about the theory of the state. Rather it has given tips to the prince to retain his power. These tips are:

To use force ruthlessly:

Force brutal force, may be necessary but it should be used intelligently and not senselessly.

To use Persuasion artfully:

Force is also expensive as a long term weapon. There are then many other devices for bulling the people into peace and submission without. Making any real concessions to them. These

are propaganda and religion. He elaborated that the Roman policy was nicely furthered by skillfully plain upon the religious feelings of the people.

To act decisively:

Ruler must not hesitation the implementation of his decisions.

To maintain strong national army:

To be expert in the art of war:

The chief foundation of all states, whether old, new or mixed are good was and good arms. The ruler must be well versed in the use of good arms. He should also be a master in the art of keeping up the morale of forces and chalking out the strategy of warfare.

To be popular among people:

Better to be feared than loved:

It is much safer for a ruler to be feared than loved. But care should be taken that fear is not taken to the extent of being hated.

To abstain from property and women of subjects:

This is the safest way to avoid being hated. Machiavelli said “men more rapidly forget the death of a father than the loss of a patrimony”

To avoid free spending:

To act as a father:

He must always bear in mind that his prime duty is to hold the state together.

To act as Fox and Lion:

Like cunning as a fox and brave as Lion.

To act as a great pretender:

He should appear merciful, faithful, humane and religious

To pose as courageous:

To play the Balance-of-power game:

In case of war between his neighbor the ruler must side one or the other party, if possible, he should play the balance of power game by supporting the weaker against the stronger. He should avoid neutrality because this policy will bring hi no dividend. He would be hated by both the countries. At the end of war, he will be at the mercy of the victor.

To make wise selection of officers

To avoid flatters

Flattery has the same intoxicating effect as alcohol.

To choose councilors:

The prince must choose his own counselors who inform and advise him on important matters. He should not listen to every Tom, Dick and Harry.

To be an expansionist:

“every government must either extend its authority or perish”

to possess virtue:

the meaning of virtue as far as the prince is concerned is the combination of will and intelligence.

To be an opportunist:

He should always bear in mind that there are no permanent friends or enemies. It is the selfish interest of a particular person in a particular set of circumstances which determines whether one is a friend or an enemy.

to be extreme towards a friend or enemy:

he should do everything to help his friend and everything to ruin his enemy.

To observe utmost secrecy:

To create public spirit:

Conclusion:

Machiavelli has become to be regarded as the tutor of tyrants. The rules laid down in “the prince” are followed in spirit by the successful rulers in our own days.

Q) The discourses” and “the prince” on theory for state and the other for revolution:

Introduction:

Both “the prince” and “the discourses” read together reveal Genuine Machiavelli:

Machiavelli is one of the most misunderstood or abused thinkers in the history of political thought. He is condemned for certain views which are wrongly stated to have originated from his brain. Very few people have read complete works of Machiavelli. They know him only by his misleading book ‘the prince’. But in order to understand his thought in totality, one must not lose sight of ideas expressed in his book. “discourses’ wrong inferences have been drawn by his critics because the ‘prince’ as separate from “Discourses’ is considered to be the representative of his thought.

If one were to know Machiavelli only by the “prince” one would regard him as the advocate of monarchical or Despotic or Arbitrary form of government. If on the other hand one was to judge him only by his ideas expressed in the “Discourses” one would regard him as the champion of the republican or democratic form of government. Some critics would try to find contradiction in the views expressed in the two books. But actually, there is no such contradiction. Only what is required is to understand his ideas in the proper context and perspective. “the prince” has to be interpreted by the light shown by “the discourses”

Machiavelli wrote “the prince” and “the discourses” more or at the same time. “the subject matter of both the books, as Sabine says, is the same, i.e. the causes of the rise and decline of states and means by which statesmen make them permanent. Nevertheless there is a difference in the sense that the “prince” deals mainly with monarchy or absolute government and “discourses” mainly with the expansion of Roman Republic. The difference is on account of emphasis on the Monarchy in “the prince” and the republic in “the discourses” though the qualities for which Machiavelli is known are common in both the books----such as indifference to the use of immoral means for the political purposes and the belief that the government depend largely on force and craft yet the “prince” lacks that genuine enthusiasm for population government which is predominantly apparent from even a casual reading of the ‘discourses’:

“The prince” for troubled a revolutionary time:

“The Discourses” for settled times:

“The discourses” deals in the like manner with the republican government. It is longer and discursive than the “prince”. But its content is closely related to that of “the prince”. It represents another and integral phase of Machiavelli theory. In tumultuous times no doubt, there is a dire necessity of a ruthless prince playing fox and lion to establish a state, but when the matters are settled, the rule of tyrant cannot continue for long the long time survival of the state depends upon the support of the many.

And this support can be had only through a republican form of government. He considers people wiser in things which are more conducive to the preservation of the state “if princes show themselves superior in making of laws and in the forming of civil instructions. And new statutes and ordinances; the people are superior in maintaining those institutions, laws and ordinances which certainly place them on a par with those who established them” He truly considered the voice of the people as the will of God.

In “the Discourses” Machiavelli makes a distinction between the free and un-free states. Free states are those in which people possess high degree of what Machiavelli calls “Virtue” by ‘virtue’ in this context, Machiavelli means a vigor in the people, spirit of law abidingness and trustworthiness in public duties. If the people possess this virtue, the state is healthy and free.

A republican government is no possible until conditions have become settled. Hence, republican government must follow, not precede, monarchical government. Once established on a firm foundation, however, it is more likely to endure.

Both “Prince” and “discourses” plead the same cause’

Following facts will establish that Machiavelli pleads for the same cause in both the books although this emphasis vary according to the different circumstances.

Both “the prince and “discourses” concerned with the development and maintenance of Italian unity,

In the “Prince” says Harmon, “he deals with the problem from the view point of its solution through the agency of an absolute government; in the discourses “Machiavelli uses the Roman republic as to democrat the superiority of a republic providing the character of the populace will permit that form of government.

Subject matter of both essentially same--- the theory of preservation of state

Both portray the theory of the preservation of the state. The only difference is in the conditions in which both the princely and republican forms of government as advocated in his two books ‘the prince’ was specially meant for the disorderly people while the “Discourses” for the orderly people.

Conclusion:

it is evident that Machiavelli was a staunch apostle of power politics. ‘He writes about nothing and thinks about nothing except state craft and the art of war’ the role aim was the achievement of national unity. To this end, Machiavelli was willing to subordinate every means. He was not interested in philosophy or theory of state what he stated were the means by which the state could be preserved both in the Monarchical and republican form. “he is according to Dunning, ‘in the fullest sense a student of practical politics, and he seeks to determine the workings of a real not an ideal political life “the subject matter of both the treaties is essentially the same except that as Sabine says “He has one theory for revolutions and the other for government.

Q) Machiavelli: First Modern thinker

Machiavelli: Ends medieval and begins the modern era.

Introduction:

“Machiavelli is the first genuinely modern political thinker,” says foster. He introduces a new set of ideas which have been current in modern Europe ever since, and which were foreign to Medieval times. Living at a time when the old political order was collapsing and new forces emerging in state and society, he endeavored to interpret the logical meaning of events.

“He has been represented”, says Sabine, “as an utter cynic, and impassionate patriot, an ardent nationalist, a convinced democrat and an unscrupulous seeker after the favor of the despots in each of these views, incompatible as they are, there is probably an element of truth.

Machiavelli as a modern thinker:

The first secular thinker:

“the church has kept and still keeps our country divided

Rejection of Doctrine of Natural law:

Doctrine of natural law was prevalent in the middle ages according to which the virtue of man was judged by the measure which his conduct confirmed to the certain eternal principle of the right conduct. But virtue, near Machiavelli, meant the ability to attain power on fame.

Advocate of philosophy of state and sovereignty:

He writes about nothing except politics, state craft and art of war. He is the first to introduce the concept of sovereignty, though he didn't use the expression as such. Nothing so clearly separates the medieval from modern theory as the concept of sovereignty .

Method and style:

Historical method

Practical approach to politics:

He doesn't believe in what ought to be.

Exponent of nationalism:

A true patriot. He is rather the first thinker to refer to this concept.

Advocate of national army:

Separation of ethics from politics:

Double standards of morality:

Theory of imperialism:

“the state must rather expand or perish:

Believe of the public opinion:

He is the first political psychologist.

He suggest to the ruler, in order to keep himself in power, he should read the psychology of the subjects and form policies accordingly.

Conclusion:

he makes a clear break with the past and forges a new link with the present. Dunning says, “Machiavelli is sometimes called the first modern political philosopher. It is quite as accurate to say he ends the medieval era as that he begins the modern”

Q) There are no moral in politics”

Introduction:

Throughout the ancient and medieval age, politics remained the handmaid of Ethics. A very lukewarm attempt was made by Aristotle to separate politics from ethics but he too was no fully successful. It was destined for medieval to be champion in completely separating politics from ethics. He considered the both as two different sciences

Ends justify means:

If the end is to safeguard the interest of the state, then Machiavelli would recommend any means whatsoever. Treachery and even massacre are or may be necessary for political success.

Individual morality differs from state morality:

For an individual morality means goodness in behavior and action. For a ruler morality consists in preserving of the state even if he has to use force, deceit and hypocrisy similarly, the ruler can break premise Machiavelli no doubt, believes that a ruler must be good still.

Separation of Ethics and politics:

Machiavelli no immoral but immoral:

“He is not immoral but immoral in politics” Dunning

Machiavelli was like a physician of the state. The physician doesn't bother of the ethics of man. He wants to set the body right.

Criticism:

It puts premium on the misdeeds of the politicians

There is no guarantee that interests of ruler and public would be the same.

This theory, “Ends justify means goes directly against – Gandh’s theory of “Means justify the ends

His judgment of human nature was surely profoundly at fault.

Conclusion:

Critics on Machiavelli:

Dunning

Sabine

Harmon

Foster

Jeremy Bentham(1748-1832)

Important works:

Fragment on government

Defense of usury

Manual of political Economy

Introduction to the principle of morals and legislation

Q) Benthamite Utilitarianism/pleasure pain:

Introduction

The school of thought linked with the name of Jeremy Bentham is described differently as Benthanism, utilitarianism, philosophical Radicalism utilitarianism is indeed a movement that dominant British political thought from about the middle of the eightieth to the middle of the ninetieth century (1750-1850). After that, interest in utilitarian school of thought decreased. But this school of thought has now regained importance. It has now been realized that utilitarianism never died. It only changed its emphasis according to the changed times. The doctrine of social welfare state and democratic socialism are the creations of this very movement. It is because the basic principles of utilitarianism have always been humanism, liberalism, rationalism.

Development of Bentham’s utilitarianism:

It is quite interesting to note that Bentham who is regarded as the prophet of utilitarianism used this term only twice in his writings. It was in fact J.S. Mill who popularized his concept. In fact the principle of Utility was first described by hobbes, he held that man obeys a ruler not because of legal or moral obligation but only because it is in their interest to do so. This idea was further elaborated by Hume who held that; Men seek pleasure and avoid pain.

Bentham was greatly influenced by Hume’s discourse and accordingly set out to reform the various institutions of England. In the meanwhile, Bentham happened to find a book which

contained the phrase structures. To find new relationship, Bentham made a strong plan for reforms of law, judiciary, jails, public administration, Local government, franchise and parliament. Bentham had in this way a twin job before him. On the one hand, he had to demolish old institutions and, on the other hand, to construct new ones. He was concerned with the demolition of the fiction of social contract s given by Hobbes. Instead, he gave theory of the principle of utility as the basis of state. The state, according to Bentham, is a group of persons organize for the promotion and maintenance of utility, that is happiness.

Importance of utility:

In his “Fragment on Government” he states the only principle through which a government can be judged is that of utility. A government which fails to enact laws securing the greatest happiness of the greatest number will only invite resentment and breed revolution. It will be of no importance as how the government is constituted. His second book “the principles of Morals and legislation” opens with the famous words;

“nature has placed mankind under the governance of two sovereign masters, pain and pleasure. It is for them alone to point out what we ought to do, as well as determine what we shall do.....they govern us in all we do, we say, in all we think; every effort we can make throw off our subjection, will serve but to demonstrate and confirm if”

Utility defined:

Utility according to Bentham, means all that is good, pleasant useful, agreeable, advantageous and beneficial. Summed up one word utility thus means pleasure.

To do doctrine of utility is as such hedonistic. The hedonistic doctrine states that every action of men is motivated by the desire to obtain as much pleasure and avoid as much pain as possible. This is a universal doctrine. All other manifestations of man’s conduct, according to Bentham, are merely the doctrine of utilitarianism in disguise>

Pleasures, pains, and their source:

Bentham holds that there are four sources of pleasure and pain:

- Physical (nature)
- Political
- Moral
- Religious

He has enumerated 14 simple pleasures of

Sense
Wealth
Skill
Amity
Good name
Power
Piety

Benevolence
Malevolence
Memory
Imagination
Expectation
Association
Relief

There are, according to him twelve 12 simple pains of

Senses
Privation
Awkwardness
Enmity
Ill name
Piety
Benevolence
Malevolence
Imagination
Expectation

Bentham held that by means of computation the formula of the greatest happiness of the greatest number can be establish. What gives maximum possible pleasure to the maximum possible numbers of persons should prevail. A piece of legislation should secure the greatest happiness of the greatest number, a legislator must consider, among other thing, such matters that how intense is the happiness, as how long it lasts and how many people are affected.

Assumptions of Bentham:

Bentham assumed that happiness of greatest number.

----the pleasures of one man are as important as of another. It means utilitarianism is the principle of equality.

....there is no conflict between the interests of the individual and of the community as a whole because the interest of the community is nothing more or less than the sum total of the interests of the members who compose it.

Implications of principle of utility:

Hedonistic doctrine:

His principle of utility is essentially a hedonistic doctrine which means that every man tries to avoid pain and get pleasure.

Quantitative hedonism:

It considers only the quantity of happiness obtained. There is no such thing as quality.

Universalistic doctrine:

Bentham gave felicific calculus to establish the formula of greatest good of the greatest number. What gives maximum possible pleasures to the maximum number of person should prevail. In doing so Bentham made his utilitarianism universal. Bentham felt that the happiness of one individual was not separable from the happiness of others. So, whenever there arose the possibility of any conflict between the happiness of the individual on the one hand and many on the other hand the formula of the greatest happiness of the greatest number would help.

End justifies the motive:

The doctrine of utility is only concerned with the end and not the motive. Motive is irrelevant. What matters is the result in the achievement of the greatest happiness of the greatest number.

Consequences are primary and secondary:

The pain undergone by the man who has been robbed is primary because he feels sad at the loss of his money. It is secondary to all other holders of money. They feel alarmed at the fear of their money also being robbed.

It is objective, fair and clear:

The doctrine of utility, says Bentham is objective, fair and clear. Everyone knows as to what happiness or pain is. On the other hand the theory of justice is abstract. Goodness is always goodness and cannot be understood.

No respect for antiquity:

The theory of utilitarianism has no respect for antiquity ancient post. It was no consideration of Bentham whether a law or institution has been in existence for many centuries. The only touch-stones of goodness is happiness.

Role of utilitarianism in development western thought

by his theory of utilitarianism, Bentham took to himself the role of a powerful spokesman of the middle class or Bourgeoisie in England during the 19th century. His advocacy of laissez faire helped the Bourgeois class to earn huge profits and the establish their industries as they liked.

His pleadings of universal suffrage, annual elections to parliament, eradication of rotten, boroughs the introduction of secret ballot were all directed towards bettering the economic

and political status of the middle class or bourgeoisie which did not have any representation whatsoever.

It was in pursuance of Bentham efforts that the reform act of 1832 was passed. He however, died a day earlier than the passage of the act, although the act could not succeed in achieving thorough going democracy, it cannot be denied that it provided a substantial beginning.

Criticism:

Wrong analysis of Nature:

The nature of man is a complex phenomenon. It is not confined merely to seek pleasure and avoid pain and advocated by Bentham.

Wrong calculus;

It is not possible to measure pleasure or pain.

Materialistic theory:

It believes in seeking pleasure while leaving no room for morality. Morality is to be considered good only if it produce the greatest happiness of the greatest number. It is better that pleasure should not be pursued if contentment in life is to be attained.

Pleasure is not universal:

Pleasure differs from man to man. What is pleasure for one may not be for another.

Pleasure is both qualitative and quantitative:

In actual practice, quality is more important than quantity.

Matter too much over-simplified:

The classification of pleasure and pain, putting them into Tabular form and the analysis of human nature have all been over simplified.

Ignores the influence of Habits:

Bentham appeared to have ignored the influence of habits altogether in believing that man is always motivated by a desire to seek pleasure and avoid pain.

All men are not selfish:

Man is essentially a compact of evil and good. It is another matter that one out of two may be predominant. But there is not always the absence of the second.

Society under-estimated:

Bentham has underestimated society as he has laid importance only on the individual pleasure.

Impracticable theory:

The theory of the greatest happiness of the greatest number has never and can never be realized, at least on the surface of this earth. Hundreds and thousands of years have been rolled by in which different forms of government have been tried. But it has always been seen that happiness of the ruling elite has been secured and that also at the cost of common man.

Conclusion:

about Bentham, Wayper remarks that;

“he was not an outstanding philosopher, though paradoxically he occupies an important place in the history of philosophy. “ he adds that “he took his theory of knowledge from Locke and Hume”

Allen remarks that “Bentham is no political philosopher or a thinker at all, he is at best, theoretical reformer” his greatest contribution in the field of reforms enable him to stand in the front ranks of the fathers of a welfare state when the legislators and the rulers are always to bear in mind the common yard stick of the greatest happiness of the greatest number in all they do and all they think

Dicey said “ History of legal reform in the 19th century in the history of the shadow cast by one man, Bentham.”

Q) Bentham’s state and Reforms:

Introduction:

It has been a problem for political thinkers since ages that how to define the nature of the state. Its nature scope and functions have been defined by various philosophers in different ages according to needs of the time. The utilitarianism conception of the state is that it is a machine to promote the greatest happiness of the greatest number.

Bentham state;

Bentham believed that state was a group of persons organized the promotion and maintenance of utility in terms of the greatest happiness of the greatest number. Following are the implications of Bentham state:

State as law making agency (law of today)

State is sovereign

No right of resistance against state

State as source of rights

Duty to ensure equality

Liberty not end of state;

State as a machine not natural

Bentham's reforms

Legal reforms:

he opposed the customs and challenged the utility of the Monarchy and the house of lords on the plea that they went against the interests of common man.

Dicey remarks "History of legal reforms in the 19th century is the history of shadow cast by one man Bentham."

Judicial reforms:

In the absence of a comprehensive statutory law, the judges had created their own laws, that benefitted none but the judges themselves. Bentham pleaded for cheap and expeditious administration of justice. He opposed death sentence for crimes other than murder.

Jail reforms:

All kinds of criminals should not be kept together. They should be treated kindly. They should be educated and trained to become good citizens.

Theory of punishment:

Punishment should be preventive and creative rather than revengeful.

Educational reforms:

Poor children should be educated by state and students should be taught what is useful to them for making a career.

Criticism:

A negative state:

Has no relation with the moral life of the citizens.

Impracticable theory:

Greatest happiness of the greatest number's impracticable.

Role of law over-emphasized.

a materialistic theory.

Leaves no room for morality

Ignores historical influence:

Sovereignty of state over-emphasized

Theory of opposition to state doubtful:

Attack against natural rights self contradictory:

Conclusion:

Bentham's attacks on English legal system for reserved against Blackstone's conservation. Blackstone believed in the credibility of the English institutions as acknowledge and that English laws one good that are misunderstood.

We should not concern ourselves with the fact, that how long the laws have been established.

A law is good if it brings happiness and vice-versa.

Bentham has also supported Adam Smith's views (laissez faire) that public interest contest be served if people or at liberty in pursuing their economic interest.

John Stuart Mill (1806-1873)

Q) Mill's Modification of Benthamism:

Introduction:

Among the liberal thinkers of the 19th century England. J.S Mills occupies a very important place. Bentham the founder of utilitarianism called as his intellectual grandson.

Mill's restatement of utilitarianism

Trained and educated under the strict supervision of his father, John Stuart Mill found in utilitarianism "a creed, a doctrine philosophy, a religion". However in the cause of time, the principle of Benthamite utilitarianism came to be criticized on two grounds.

It no doubt helped the capitalist class in making rapid progress in industry. It created many problems for the working poor people. The policy of Laissez faire advocated by utilitarianism helped in multiplying the distress and exploitation of the working people.

The utilitarianism dogma for pleasure and avoidance of pain became a subject of criticism at the hands of anti-hedonistic, movement.

In order, therefore to uphold the theory of utilitarianism, against to establish by his restatement that utilitarianism is elevating and not degrading. But in making modification and reformation utilitarianism lost its original character.

The father by control was so strong that the son could not make himself a declared utilitarian until the father died. However, Mill's utilitarian. He is only a reformer. He agrees basically with the principle of utility but interprets it in a way that conclusion drawn goes astray. The points at which Mill restated utilitarianism are:

Stress on quality of pleasure;

He criticized Benthamite view that pleasure and pain differ only in quantity and not quality. Mills held that pleasures differ in quality also. Some pleasures are of higher quality than of others. He further considers that a happy life is a moral and intellectual life and not the one filled with the moments of pleasure of the senses.

The sole function of the state, according to, Utilitarian's is to secure to greatest happiness of the greatest number. But Mill wishes to ask the state to remove obstacles in way of the progress of individuals. Unlike Benthamism, Mill considers property not essential for the security of individual. Rather he considered landed property as unjust. In fact, he advocates a kind of socialism. In fact, he advocates that factory legislation. He advocates that factory legislation should be enacted at least for the children. He advocates monopolies to be controlled by the state. He advocates the fixing of the working-hours. All this means intervention on the part of the state as against Laissez faire advocated by Bentham.

Justification of democracy:

Bentham holds that any other form of government will be a govt. only to serve the interest of the governing class. Mill says that all people are not fit for democracy. He clearly says that democratic institutions are not fit for the people who lack of quality of character.

Criticism:

While Mill tried to save the face of utilitarianism by altering with a view to saving it from criticism current in his days,

Conclusion:

In the words of Weyper "in his desire to safeguard utilitarianism from the reproaches leveled against it, Mill goes for towards over throwing the whole utilitarian position"

In fact, Mill's study of Wordsworth, Coleridge' and Goethe made him realize that Bentham's philosophy had touched only the surface of the things. In order to touch the deeper aspect he introduced in his theory elements which were inconsistent with Benthamism.

Q) Mill on liberty / Father of empty

Liberty and abstract individual

Introduction:

The reformist activities carried out by Benthamites resulted in two opposite things.

On one hand, extension in the sphere of the state activity and

On the other hand, great emphasis came to be laid on individual activity by introducing reforms in different sectors.

These two opposite things had to be reconciled. In this reconciliation, the extent of the individual liberty was to be found out. Mill stood forth as the advocate-in-chief of individuality, of the supreme importance in developing the individual in all the completeness of his being so that his active and intellectual natures might their utmost scope and reach their highest- efficiency. In his essay “on liberty”, Mill deals with the question of the liberty of the individual in society.

Mill’s idea of individuality:

“it is the harmonious development of individuality” says Mill, “that leasded to social progress” he felt that with the growth of industrialization, mass society and all-powerful governmental machinery, individual is likely to be lost. Mill was so fond of individuality and variety that he was even opposed to state education because it reduces the students to a dull uniformity. State education , according to Mill, destroyed originality>

Extent of liberty:

Mill regarded liberty as the most important principle of protecting and promoting individuality. Closely related to individual is mills definition of liberty as the sovereignty of individual over himself. Liberty to him meant “being left to oneself” . but Mill realized that absolute freedom of individual in society is impossible. He was worried as to the limits where a line should be drawn to determine what a person is entitled to do and what society is entitled to prevent him from doing.

Mill divides the action of the individual into two categories. The action which concern only the individual performing them are self-regarding action. The actions which affect other are others regarding actions. Mill asserted that individual should be free or rather sovereign over reactions which affect himself alone. He should be restricted only from those actions which affect others.

Liberty obtains in democracy;

It is only in democracy that man gets the right to defend his rights. But mill is not blond to the drawbacks of democracy. He points out to the existence of Tyranny of majority” and the “despotisms of numbers”

Five fundamental liberties:

In order that individuality may get chance to develop, Mill pleaded that the following five fundamental liberties must be granted to the individual.

- Freedom of conscience
- Of thought
- Speech and opinion

Personal life
Association

Importance of freedom opinion/ Expression:

Freedom of expression should always be absolute. He asserted

“ if all mankind minus one were of one opinion, and only one person was of the contrary opinion, mankind would be no more justified in silencing the one person”

The reasons why the absolute freedom of opinion should be allowed are;

Silencing opinion would mean robbing mankind. There are three possibilities in case of a suppressed opinion

If the silenced opinion is right, the loss to mankind is obvious.

In case it is partly true, it is of some value that should be given its due.

In case it is wrong, it has the chance of creating controversy out of which the truth would emerge victorious.

By silencing an opinion we cannot assume that truth always triumphs in the end. Truth needs constantly to be attacked in order to preserve its vigor's.

Implications of Mill's Liberty:

Liberty is essential to enrich personality

Mill justifies liberty on his division of human activity into two parts self regarding and other regarding. The self-regarding actions which do not harm others, should not at all be restrained.

Through his discovery of liberty, Mill still retains the touch of utilitarianism. He means that the function of the state to enhance liberty otherwise it has no justification.

Mill is frightened by the majority tyranny or the oppressive weight of public opinion.

He wants to uphold individual dignity.

Mill as prophet of empty liberty and abstract individual:

Barker said that “Mill was a prophet of empty liberty and abstract individual.” He was a prophet of empty liberty because he had no clear philosophy of rights which alone could give his concept of liberty a concrete shape. Unlike Hobbs, Locke, Rousseau and Athens he doesn't concern himself with the nature of rights and the sanctions behind them. Neither does he believe in the theory of nature rights, nor does he accept the Bentham's view that rights are created by law and therefore by the state. Being an individualist he does not try to correlate society with the right of individuals.

Barker is right when we consider by Mill, as discussed below.

Mistaken view of actions:

Mill divided the actions of individual into self-regarding and other-regarding. The individual was completely sovereign over the self-regarding actions while over impose restrictions. But

Mill never an several as to who is the arbiter to decide between the two actions, the individual or society,

Advocate of state interference:

He says that “individual must not make himself a nuisance to other people, “tends to give a good amount of power in the hands of society to curb the activities of individual. The state in this way would become autocratic when it would interfere in the name of safeguarding liberty.

Emphasis on individuality misplaced.

Mill holds that opinion of even one dissenter should not be suppressed. As it would lead to robbing the whole of society. He forgets that the opinion of that one person can be lacking strength of character.

Rule of liberty over-emphasized:

By advocating the fundamental freedom of conscience, thought, speech, personal life and association.

Practical aspect of liberty untouched:

When he makes no mention of the people who misuse their liberty. How to deal with such people?

Encouragement to imperialism:

By refusing to extend his doctrine of liberty to backward people.

Exposition of liberty faulty:

He has been quite liberal in defending liberty of thought and expression and his emphasis on other liberties is far from satisfactory.

Conclusion:

Many have a word of praise for Mill for his treatment of liberty. He says, “Mill’s chapter on freedom of thought and discussion is one of the finest things on that subject in the political literature.

He never understood that rights are maintained by the society. That is why he is said to be the father of empty liberty and abstract individual.

Q) Mill on representative Government:

Introduction:

In the middle years of 19th century, England was faced with problems that have arisen out of rapidly developing industrialization and democracy. They were confronted with the same old political problem of liberty versus authority. Mill was less optimistic than Bentham and follows, in the efficacy of democratic government as evidenced by the view expressed in his “representative Government.”

Importance of representative government:

In his “representative Govt.” Mill praises the virtues of democracy but strikes a warning note about its inherent dangers also. He is all praise for democracy so far as it secures freedom of the individual. He considers it as the best form of government. More than any other system it contributes to the improvement of man. He is of different views on democracy, than Bentham. Bentham’s advocacy for democracy lay in the fact that it secured the greatest happiness of the greatest number while Mill considered democracy as the tool to make men better. Mill holds that in a democracy men are free to pursue their own interests. If the people were wise, they will try to secure their own interests through the fulfillment of social interest. But there is an inherent disadvantage in democracy that majority is incapable of displaying this sort of foresightedness.

Dangers of representative democracy:

The majority on the other hand tries to put its own view point before the people. Majority becomes oppressive. The tyranny of majority is very great. There is no escape from it. Mill calls it a “democracy of numbers” it is more a “despotism of number” it is a false democracy because it is wrongly based on the belief that every man should count for one and none for more than one. This principle puts men of different caliber at par. True democracy on the other hand distinguishes between men of caliber on one hand and men of ignorance on the other.

Three levels of representative system:

In order that the majority work in the true interest, all men must be permitted a degree of participation in their government. This can be secured by three levels of representative system of government the people, their elected representative, and a policy-making body. The people should have the right to choose their legislative representatives through the system of election. It is in fact the people who are the true Pillars of a representative system. These elected representative will have better knowledge, understanding and judgment than the people who elect them. But nevertheless, they cannot have the ability to frame intricate legislation. For the purpose of legislation, a superior body composed of experts is required. The elected representatives should have the authority to remove the member of the policy body as they can be removed themselves by the people.

Safeguards against dangers of representative government:

Mill remarks that the system of representative democracy cannot be uniformly and equally applied to all people. The backward and colonial people did not have the capacity of intelligence to have smooth running. In order to remove these dangers he suggests a number of measures.

Proportional representation:

The most glaring danger was domination of majority. In order to remove this evil, Mill advocated the system of proportional representation. Through this system, a minority would be as fully represented as the majority.

Plural voting:

Mill considered that a system of voting in which one wants for one is selfish. This system puts men of different caliber at par. He suggested that the value of votes should not be equal. Those who have better abilities should be given the right of plural voting. He went even to the extent of advocating a scheme of grading citizens in different classes on the basis of mental culture and moral qualities.

Qualification of voters:

Mill stood for extension of franchise but he insisted that voters must have certain basic qualifications. Only those who pay taxes should have the right of vote from educated ones.

Public voting:

Mill ridiculed the idea of secret ballot and advocated public ballot.

Right of women:

He advocated their cause in and outside the parliament. He advocated the right of vote for women for the first time.

Role of parliament:

The proper office of the representative assembly is the watch and control the working of the government.

Criticism:

Idea of true democracy outdated:

It is impossible to give due weight to all the different elements of the society.

Qualification of voters unsound:

Plural voting is unjust:

Public voting ill-conceived:

While advocating public voting, Mill appears to be behind to the dangers of bribery and influence of threats.

Thomas Hobbes (1588-1679)

Q) Hobbes' philosophy and English civil war:

Leviathan represents Modern state:

Introduction: Contract of Hobbes theory:

Sabine believes that the philosophy of a political thinker can best be understood if we try to understand the circumstances in which he lived. Thomas Hobbes was appointed as tutor to the Cavendish Family of Devonshire. Thus he established a lifelong connection with this distinguished family with whose influence he would not have come into personal contact with great minds like Johnson, Bacon and Galilees. In the controversy between the king and the parliament for supremacy, he took the side of the king as all his personal interest attached him to the Royalist party.

Hobbs' Writings occasioned by the civil war:

The accession of James I, the 'Wisest fool in Christendom' in 1603 to the throne brought about a long period of violence in England,. James didn't live long but his son Charles I paid a heavy price. The root of trouble was both religious and economic. Charles had to sign the petition of Rights of 1628. He came to loggerheads with parliament. Thus the civil was stated in 1640 which had a profound influence on Hobbes.

The "Leviathan" represents modern state;

The treatise the principle of absolutism and de fact government. In the leviathan he discusses the nature of man and justifies the omnipotent and sovereign state. The leviathan thoroughly discuss the philosophy of the state, the modern state in all its aspects. In fact, Hobbes' Leviathan represents what is called the modern state.

The nature of man and the state of nature:

Hobbes has tried to develop new system of knowledge that is all inclusive. It combines natural science, psychology and political philosophy into one system. Hobbes himself admits in the "Leviathan" that he was building his philosophy on natural sciences. He derived his conception of the nature of man from facts of natural science.

Hobbes as a scientist:

He believed that a science of society could he developed as of Geometry. He considers that man a representative of the great universe. The behavior of man, according to Hobbes, is a product of external forces operating upon his organs of sense. "what we are and what are do are primarily the consequence f our reaction to the forces in which we live. In this way, Hobbes tended to see all human behavior including sensation, feeling, perception and thought in the context of ideas of motion. He took each man as something of a human machine in motions.

Hobbes as a utilitarian:

Thus we invariably respond positively towards things that are desirable and negatively towards things that are undesirable. What man desires, he calls it good and pleasure is the movement in his mind that accompanies it. What he dislikes he calls it evil, and the movement in his mind is pain. As such good and evil differ from man to man. The whole philosophy of Hobbes is centered round the fact of what came to be known as the principles of utilitarianism at the hand of Bentham.

Self-preservation – chief object of man:

The chief object of man's desire is self-preservation. So, the thing he most desires to avoid is the loss of life. Thus security is the greatest good, and insecurity the greatest evil.

Men equal physically and mentally:

this results in making the struggle for power complicated as the man enjoys relative equality—both physical and mental. Equality doesn't mean absence of differences from man to man. Some people possess greater muscular power while others are more cunning. Equality thus refers to equal capacity to kill, equality of experience and equal capacity for nationality.

Equality makes man individualistic, elf-seeking. Fearful, competitive and combinative:

So, this equality of man is a source of difficulty and not satisfaction. Hobbes says, "From this equality of ability arises equality of hope in the attaining of our ends. An if any two men desire the same thing—they become enemies and in the way to their end Endeavour to destroy or subdue one another. So, man is individual, self-seeking, fearful and competitive.

life in the state of nature is solitary, poor, nasty, brutish and short:

society is an aggregate of individuals each of whom seeks his own advantages at the cost of others. Their condition in the absence of a civil power to regulate their behavior is "a war of every man against every man"

so, life in the state of nature would be intolerable. It is not important for Hobbes to prove that man once actually lived in a state of nature. Hobbes was not much interested in the actual history of state of nature. He is interested only in demonstrating what life would be in the absence of government. He says, "in such a condition, there is no place for industry because the fruit thereof is not certain and which is worst of all, continuous fear and danger of violent death; and the life of man solitary, poor, nasty, brutish and short"

Role of law of nature:

there are two stages involved in the argument put forth by Hobbs. The first is the contention that by following the laws of nature men could live with peace and harmony. These have greater utility for self preservation than violence and general competition. The second

contention is that men are for the intemperate and short-sighted to follow these rules of their own accord. It means that men can avoid attacking others and start co-operating for natural self-preservation only when there arises powerful sovereign authority with overwhelming power to enforce these rules.

Establishment of leviathan as Modern state:

Hobbes, therefore, argues that Leviathan (Leviathan means moral God which implies state, ruler and government) is everywhere a product of contractual relationship born out of man's will to give a part of his liberty and set up a common power to preserve the liberty of all.

Leviathan for self-preservation:

Leviathan was, therefore, created purely from the angle of self-preservation. "for the sake of self-preservation therefore, man have been driven to set over themselves a common authority, veritable leviathan, that can retain their anarchical impulses and lift them out of the miserable condition of plunder, association, and fear that is the natural state of man outside the bounds of the organized society. For this purpose men have created commonwealths and appointed rulers to have domination over them" the people took upon themselves this authority simply to preserve themselves this authority simply to preserve themselves against selfish and competitive nature of men.

Contract is fully binding:

It is a fully binding contract, and can only be discharged by performance or mutual release. "it is therefore, evident that for Hobbs political society is an institution founded upon a social contract that men have been obliged to make so as to escape the reign of terror and violence"

Authority of state justified for the attainment of security:

it is therefore that Sabine holds that "Hobbs was at once the complete utilitarian and the complete individualist. The power of the state or the authority of the law are justified only because they contribute for the security of the individual human beings; and there is no rational ground of obedience, and respect for authority except the anticipation that these will yield a larger individual advantage than their oppositions.

Leviathan is a sovereign:

"covenants, without the sword," says Hobbes are but words, and of no strength to secure a man at all." Security depends upon the existence of the government having the requisite force to keep peace and to apply sanctions necessary to curb man's innately unsocial inclinations. It implies clearly that Hobbes identifies government with force. Rulers are born as a result of the contract and are fully invested with authority and power to compel the parties to perform their obligations. It must be born in mind that the ruler are not party to the contract. It is essential to have coercive compressive power over all persons.

Command of sovereign is law:

What sovereign command is law and law must be obeyed on that account. The sovereign is, however, not subject in any manner to law. For “he that can bind, can release, and therefore he that is bound to himself only, is not bound”

No limitation upon the sovereign:

There is no limitation upon the sovereign of any kind whatsoever like natural law, common law prescriptive law and customary law.

People need not obey if sovereign commands a man to kill himself:

There is indeed, only one limitation upon Leviathan’s powers. He cannot command a man to kill himself. To do so would be equivalent to the breach of the contract because the man bound himself to the contract only with a view to safeguard his life. In fact, a sovereign who cannot protect his subjects is not sovereign at all.

Still people have no right to Revolt:

Individuals can resist the sovereign if their lives are in danger. So, great care should be taken in making resistance because it is equivalent to revolution. It would result in the destruction of sovereign power and reversion to the state of nature which is worse than anything. Man has to choose between absolutism and anarchy. And a rational individual would always prefer the former. According to Sabine “on utilitarian grounds government any government is better than anarchy.” In this way Hobbs would grant only “a limited right of revolution.”

Contract is permanent and irrevocable:

When the contract has been completed, no subject is justified in complaining of injury committed by the sovereign. The sovereign is not a party to the contract. The people are themselves the authors of the sovereign power and consequently responsible for whatever is done.

Complete authority of sovereign:

The authority of the sovereign over all governmental functions is complete. In addition to his authority to make and enforce law he is also chief judicial authority. He is the supreme commander of the military and also levies taxes. He chooses his counselors who are but his servants. He has the responsibility for keeping peace and order and should therefore, control the means to that end.

Sovereign is individual and inalienable:

Sabine says “sovereignty is individual and inalienable, for either his authority is recognized.

Leviathan has no passion for undue interference:

Hobbes never intended that his sovereign would be tyrant. The leviathan uses law only to regulate and make convenient the transaction of affairs. Hobbes realized that it would be unwise and impractical for a ruler to interfere with those details of the lives of the subjects which have nothing to do with place and utility of the common wealth.

Leviathan is not totalitarian:

The leviathan has certainly the right to command men's behavior that but not enquire into private belief. "Leviathan" Hobbes wrote "cannot oblige me to behave" "thought, he said, is free

Advocacy of absolute monarchy:

Still there are some aspects of the state advocate by Hobbes, which are not modern in essence. They are advocated in consequence of the lawlessness witnessed by Hobbes during the English civil wars. These are:

No mixed or limited government;

The power of the sovereign is indivisible and a mixed state can, therefore, not exist Hobbes was of the firm opinion that the false opinion about the divisibility of sovereignty among kings, Lords and commons led to civil wars. There are only three forms of government. Monarchy aristocracy and democracy. These three form of governments will respectively be by one man, a few man or by many. It cannot be mixture or combination of all three. There are no perverted forms of governments. One who dislikes monarchy calls it tyranny; and unpopular aristocracy is termed oligarchy and so on.

Unlimited monarchy:

Only a government in which the public and private interests are closely united is most likely to be able to keep peace. It is only the monarchial form of government where public and private interest are united a king cannot be rich, glorious or secure in his people are poor or work. The ambition of monarch lies in strengthening the state According to Wayper, "his is a doctrine of absolute state, not of the absolute king. So long as it is admitted that leviathan possesses absolute power, whether Leviathan be one, few or many is a minor matter"

Minor aspect of Leviathan:

In addition to discussing major aspects of the state, Hobbs goes on the minor details also. He in fact, discusses modern state in all its aspects in the Leviathan:

Ownership of property can be regulated by state:

There is no inherent right to property, and that it is the function of the state and also its necessary duty to regulate the ownership and distribution of land, to control and regulate

foreign and domestic commerce, to control the coining and circulation of money, and to levy tribute upon wealth for the support of the common wealth”

Causes leading to dissolution of state:

The lack of energy, aggressiveness, and mastery which causes some rulers to fail to seize and exercise the full power necessary to the proper government and defense of the commonwealth.

It is an erroneous doctrine to consider that every individual is a complete judge of good and civil actions

Nothing causes more distribution and disorder in a commonwealth than a body of men obsessed with the notion that God has inspired them and revealed his truth to them “According to Harmon, “Hobbes’ most bitter attacks upon organized religions were reserved for the Roman Catholic Church.

Conclusion:

We find that Hobbes was greatly influenced by a number of thinkers and ideas and incidents in the shaping of his political philosophy. He drew conclusions from the chaotic and anarchical conditions of English civil war and created Leviathan, a state with modern concepts, that could be made applicable universally

Features of the contract of Hobbes’s Theory”

Introduction:

Nature of man.

Equality of man in state of nature and pursuit of power.

Danger of violence in the state of nature.

Need of a civil power to regulate the behavior of human beings.

Self-preservation the chief object of man:

Social contract (establishment of leviathan)

Features of the contract(power of leviathan)

Criticism

Conclusion

Hobbes on sovereignty

Introduction:

The most controversial and yet the most established fact of political significance of state is the concept of sovereignty. It distinguishes and signifies the state from other human associations. Sovereignty makes the state all-powerful over the individuals and organizations. Sovereignty refers to the supreme unrestricted authority of the state to frame laws and regulate behavior of every entity under its jurisdiction and to enforces its will by force, if necessary. This concept for the first time in its modern meaning was coined by Hobbes to whom goes the credit of being called the father of the modern sovereign state” the concept however, had began to take shape earlier.

Development of concept of sovereignty:

The chief characteristic of muddle as well as the ancient ages was that concept of sovereignty was absent. It was only with the advent of modern age that this concept emerged. Nothing so clearly separates medieval from the modern theory as the appearance on the scenes of the concept of sovereignty. The first modern thinker is the Machiavelli who looked forward to the concept of sovereignty introducing an all powerful sovereign government. Next to him Bodin defined sovereignty as “the supreme power over citizens and subjects, unrestrained by law “he is regarded as the father of the doctrine of the sovereignty but he laid certain limitations on the sovereign power. Sovereign, according to Jeam Bodin, was limited by natural law, law of God and customary law. The next in line is Grotius who followed Bodin to great extent. The greatest thinker who made sovereignty a concept having modern meanings and relieved it of the disabilities of the natural law, law of God, customary law, was Hobbes.

Contributions of Hobbes to the concept of sovereignty:

Man in the state of nature.....

Hobbesian sovereign:

- Leviathan as the sovereign
- The command of the sovereign is law.
- No limitation upon the sovereign
- People need not obey if sovereign commands a man to kill himself.
- Still, people have no right to revolt.
- Contract is permanent and irrevocable
- Authority of sovereign omniscient
- Sovereignty is individual

Criticism:

- Justifies de facto government.
- Contradictory theory
- On the one hand, he makes his sovereign absolute and omnipotent, but on the other hand he gives his subjects the right to resist.
- Portrays democracy but advocates monarchy
- Pictures unselfish ruler in opposition to his conviction of evil nature of man.

Contradiction in concept of nature of man.
For from reality.

Hobbes's theory of political obligation

The individuals in the state of nature, according to Hobbes, were basically involved in a continuous struggle for power. In this pursuit of power each individual had equal capability, if not capacity. So there was a war of every man with every other man and a continuous fear and danger of violence. As a result the life of the individual was solitary, poor, nasty, brutish and short, it was to end. This state of nature that individuals contracted with each other to create the civil state.

Political obligation based on contract:

The sole reason for political obligation of men was that their fathers had contracted with one another to end the state of nature". This was what was believed by the scholars after the death of Hobbes. But modern scholars say that contracted was not the only basis of political obligation.

Political obligation based on Moral considerations.

There are certain scholars which believe that the basis of political obligation in Hobbes is moral. These scholars have derived this conclusion from the very sentences of Hobbes where he states that men ought". To obey the state. They hold that the word "ought" has different meanings from should' "ought" has essentially moral implications.

Modern thinkers however, lay stress on the state of man's nature described by Hobbes and argue that moral obligation alone is not a correct interpretation of Hobbes.

Political obligation based on prudence:

Modern thinkers believe that political obligation in Hobbes is based on prudence (rational self interest)

Conclusion:

In this way, all the three bases-physical, prudential and moral hold good as the reason for political obligations. Men obey because it is in their interest to obey. All human behavior is motivated by self-interest. The most important consideration for political obligation is nothing but the anticipation that obedience of state will yield to the individual large advantage than if disobedience

Q) "Hobbes starts as an individualist but ends as an absolute" Discuss

- individualism and absolutism in Hobbes

- Leviathan: the first democratic attack on democracy.

Introduction:

Hobbes philosophy rests upon two important concepts of absolutism and individualism. He has made his ruler an absolute sovereign. It is on this account that Hobbes has been regarded as the first exponent of the theory of the absolute powers of the sovereign.

Individualism in Hobbes:

Individual's security is the central point round which the all other political ideas of Hobbes revolve. Everything in Hobbes political philosophy is for the individual, of the individual and by the individual and there is nothing beyond the individual.

Since his critics never penetrated deep into his theory, they go the superficial impression that absolutism was the central part of the system but actually absolutism was only an accompaniment, a subservient idea of another idea that is individualism.

Did Hobbes as an individualist and end as an absolutist?

In Hobbes philosophy, everything is for the individual of the individual, and by the individual and there is nothing beyond the individual/

Hobbesian absolutism and individual are complementary:

His absolutism doesn't destroy individualism. They are rather complementary to each other.

The absolute sovereign, according to Hobbes is a means to an end, not an end in itself. The state is not the end of the individual, but the individual is the end of the state the sovereign individual was created to provide sufficient security to the individualist life. Since the absolute is reduced to a utility, a servant in the cause of individual security, a means to an end, it doesn't destroy individuality

Sovereign gets absolute power only with the express consent of the individual. He is their representative. And would not destroy the individuality of his constitution. His sovereign and absolute powers are derived from the consent of the governed.

Even after the creation of the absolute sovereign, the individual is not completely swallowed by it, the individuals have liberty of thought, belief, trade, education, art and literature etc. so long as law doesn't forbid the individuals are free to do anything.

Individuals have the right of resistance as well which clearly shows that individual still retains individuality.

Hobbes as the greatest individualist:

Wayper has, therefore, correctly said "Hobbes so frequently portrayed as the great absolutist is perhaps the greatest individualist"

Conclusion:

We can as such conclude by saying that Leviathan was the first democratic attack on democracy “we already know that Hobbes has no liking for democracy. He was definitely an individualist. He attacked democracy with the instrument of democracy itself. Democracy is normally defined as “government of the people, for the people and by the people” Hobbes government can be said to be government of the individual, for the individual and by the individual. It is anti thesis of the democratic government.

Hobbes, as we know, never allowed the associations or institutions of individuals to be formed best they should oppose the sovereign. He also did not give the right of opposition to any section of the population. He thought that sovereign has the power to punish any seditious activity best it should lead to the dissolution of civil society. In this way he uses the most democratic method for crushing democracy. He uses the theory of consent. It is the individuals themselves, who have, by their willing consent, instituted the sovereign, transferred their natural rights to him and empowered him to act on their behalf. What else is meant democracy?

Q) Is Hobbes father of Totalitarianism?

Introduction:

Some thinkers take Hobbes as the father of what has come to be known as the totalitarian school of thought. Totalitarianism refers to the system of government in which all the aspects

of life of man including such personal thoughts as marriage etc, are controlled by the state, such writers connect to the rise of German and Italian Totalitarianism to Hobbes' concept of absolutism . but in our view they are sadly mistaken.

Difference b/w Totalitarian and Hobbsian Absolution;

Slightly deep analysis of the two doctrine reveals the following differences.

According to Hobbes his sovereign or absolute government is based on the consent of the people. Hobbes state is based on the contractual relationship and there is definitely a democratic element which is more than apparent. While on the other hand, there is no such thing is Totalitarian themselves.

According to Hobbes, the main business of the state is to maintain order and security for the protection of the life of the Individual. But a totalitarian state exists for the collective purpose of the "race" eq; in Germany

Hobbes' state is authoritarian but it is not totalitarian. Hobbes' sovereign is supreme in political matters only.

According to Hobbes' the sovereign may be located in one person, a few or many, of course, for practical reasons, he has preferred monarchy. I.e the rule of one man. All the same, his sovereign remains an ordinary human being.

In Hobbes we do not find any glorification of war. Totalitarianism and communism behave in the inevitability of war.

Hobbes' sovereign doesn't have any control over the personal life, the faith and beliefs and the inner feelings of individuals.

Hobbes' state doesn't completely swallow the individual.

Q) Hobbes as pioneer of modernity.

Hobbesian Revolution in thought

Introduction:

The early modern thought is said to begin with Machiavelli as he gave many concepts which are modern in nature. Then comes Bodin who further claims to be modern in many respects. The position of Machiavelli and Bodin is doubted by many. But Hobbes, is by all standards, considered to heralds modern era. He heralded modern era by various concepts which he gave to the theory of western political thought.

Hobbes as pioneer of modernity:

Concepts which brought Hobbesian revolution include:

Scientific materialism:

In the 'Leviathan' Hobbes launched his enquiry into the nature of the state by a study of nature of man as a scientist. Hobbes was the first political thinker to think of political theory only as a part of all embracing system of philosophy formed on scientific materialism.

According to him everything which exists consists of particle moving in accordance with deterministic Machiavelli laws. There is no difference, in principle, on this view, between the behavior of billiard-balls colliding and rebounding on a billiard tables and the behavior of plants, animals and indeed of man. Everyone we are confronted, according to Hobbes' with the same fundamental law of behavior" thus everything in the universe, every physical article man and state is a mechanism resulting from the movements of particles.

This principle of universal applicability was borrowed by Hobbes Galilees. The originality of Hobbes lies in the fact that he basis his concept of human nature, the formation of civil society, and all possible human relationship on this principle. "The universe for Hobbes" says Wapyer, "is a machine made up of particles moving according to mechanical law. This movements, or motion as he calls it, is the principle of universe. "he therefore, believed that a science of society could be developed as in geometry, where the simplest proposition could be used as a basis on which more complex structure could be built in a step by step procedure. He as such, adapted this view to what he conceived to be science of motion he considers man as a reprehensive of the great universe. the behavior of man, according to Hobbes is a product of external forces operating upon his organs of sense. What we are and what we do, are primarily the consequences of our reactions to the forces in which we live. In this way, Hobbes tended to see all human behavior including sensation, feeling, perception and thought in the context of the ideas of motion. He took each man as something of a human machine in action.

Sovereignty:

His theory of absolute sovereignty.

Secularism:

Hobbes was the first political thinkers to conceive of a state in whose creation God did not have direct or indirect hand. Prior to him all political thinkers with the exception of Machiavelli believed in divine interference in the affairs of the state. Hobbes sets politics above religion.

Utilitarianism:

Sabine holds that "Hobbes was at once the complete utilitarian and the complete individualist. The power of the state and the authority of the law are justified only because they contribute to the security of individual human beings, and there is no rational ground of obedience and respect for anything except the anticipation that these will yield a larger individual advantage than their opposites" Benthan got this idea from Hobbes .

Individualism:

Repudiation of classical doctrine of law of nature:

According to Maxey, “By repudiating the classical doctrine of the nature and making clear that only man made law can be effective in human affairs, Hobbes did much to pave the way for Bentham and the great movement for scientific legislation of which he was the guiding genius”

During the middle ages, right down to Bodin and Grotius, natural law was understood to mean certain ethical principles which were power to and above the enactment of earthly states.

A great service, by making the laws of nature as dictates of human reason, was rendered by Hobbes. The sovereign is also not bound, as in the classical concept, to obey the laws of nature which were considered as binding on all men and constituted also a standard by which the validity of the laws of the state could be tested.

Idea of contract --- an innovation:

Dunning regards the idea of the control of individual with individual as the most distinctive of his innovations—this new form of the old contract idea was destined to a distinguished career in later political philosophy.

Criticism:

Little favorable reponse:

Leviathan’ was not with little favorable response on its publication. This was due to Hobbes’ materialism and atheism.

No immediate following:

The next thinker of importance was John Locke who regulated him on every point.

Overnight transformation of individuals is impossible:

Erroneous to hold terror as the only bond:

Pernicious theory:

The individual is left with no right to resist even tyranny. The individuals are in fact reduced to slaves.

Hobbes’ method is outdated:

Social sciences, particularly the science of politics, cannot be based on Geometry>

Prejudiced and biased theory:

In favor of absolutism

No distinction b/w state and society:

In a normal process, it is society which comes first and then the state and the government. But Hobbes puts the cart before the horse. He creates the sovereign government out of which are produced the state and society.

One-sided picture of human nature:

Conclusion:

Jones says, “Leviathan is one of the greatest books ever written by an English man:”

We can conclude with the remarks of Dunning that “Hobbes is the first English man to present a system of political philosophy that can stand among the great systems of history. His work placed him at once in the front rank of political thinkers and his theory became from the moment of its appearance the centre of animated controversy and enormous influence throughout western Europe, so conspicuous concepts of current political thought in his system and adopted them. To his ends, that philosophers of all schools were forced to a recognition and discussion of his doctrine, whether by way of approval or by way of condemnation.

Critics on Hobbes:

Sabine
Dunning
Harman
Wayper

John Locke (1632-1704)

Q) Locke Vs. Hobbes on:

Human nature

State of nature

Natural law

And contract.

Introduction:

Locke, after Hobbes, is the greatest figure in the history of English political thought. Strikingly enough, their careers are parallel. For though their views of human nature were not too dissimilar, their conclusions were widely divergent. Locke, Like Hobbes, starts from analysis of human nature and the state of nature. “Locke and Hobbes, says Johns” agree about the end for the sake of which state exists, it is the peace security and well-being of individual members. But they disagree fundamentally about the way in which this end can be attained because their conceptions of human motivation differ so profoundly’

The nature of man and state of nature;

Human Nature:

While Hobbes man is moved solely by animal considerations of bodily comforts, Lockes man, at least sometimes, hears the voice of duty. And while Hobbes’ man is always utterly selfish Locke’s man is sometimes really altruistic. For Hobbes’ man is merely an animal, a creature of nature, for Locke he is a member of moral order and subject to a moral law.

State of nature:

Moral law is however only an “ought” it states not the way in which men behave, but only the way in which they ought to behave. Locke was not behind to the fact that men do not always or even very often do what they ought. But this in itself is enough to distinguish man from the brutish animal of Hobbes.

In the Lockean state of nature, men are free to act as they think fit and are equal. It is not a state of war of everyone against every other man. All the men are equal in a state of nature and are free to act as they deem fit with the only obligation to respect the same freedom in others.

Lockean state of nature has two characteristics.

That is a state of perfect freedom in which men do as they like but within the limits imposed by the law of nature.

Men are equal not in capacity but in rights they possess. These rights are conferred by the laws of nature which are capable of being understood by rational men.

Locke was perfectly a rationalist and therefore he thought it proper and advisable to take the middle course. Clearly lockean state of nature is the anti-thesis of Hobbesian state of nature.

Laws of nature:

Man in the state of nature was governed, according to Locke, by the laws of nature. The law of nature recognizes equality of personal independence. It is the birth-right of everyman. This quality of independence embraces life, liberty and property. These are inherent and natural rights of man.

Like Hobbes, Locke makes the law of self-preservation as the first law of nature. “everyone, as he is bound to preserve himself unlike Hobbes, however Locke broadens the law of nature and makes his natural man a social animal. he says, “one ought also as much as he can, to preserve the rest of mankind” Natural law not only confers right, it imposes duties also.

Inconveniences of state of nature:

Law needs force for enforcement and this authority of the state of nature rests in the hands of everyone. So the Lockes’ state of nature thought not a state of violence and anarchy as in Hobbes’ was attended with many inconveniences. It is a state in which peace is not secure and is full of fears and continual dangers. Because of differences of understanding, of moral standards and of personal interest, disputes were bound to arise even though men may sincerely desire following the law of nature, specifically there were three inconveniences;

The lack of an establish, settled and known law. Law in the state of nature is sufficiently unclear. Every individual interprets it in his own way which leads to confusion.

The lack of known, indifferent and impartial judge.

Lack of an executive power to enforce just decisions.

Social contract:

In other words, Locke is sounding the necessity of the three organs of the government i.e. the legislature judiciary and executive. It is in order to remove these inconveniences that the individuals enter into contract and create the state. There is a fundamental difference between the notions of the contracts of Hobbes and Locke. Hobbes contract is a hard necessity as the lives of the individuals are not secure or rather they are in imminent danger. With Locke, the contract is only a sort of convenience which may be entered into just to remove certain difficulties. There was no pressing necessity for it. Hence the nature of the state that follows the contract in the two cases is basically different. In Hobbes it has to become an absolute sovereign while in the case of Locke it remains a limited sovereignty with a number of restriction. To get out of the inconvenience of Lockean state of nature, the free and equal men consent to surrender their natural liberty. No one is compelled to be a party of this contract. Those who do not wish to form a community simply remain in the state of nature. It is a contract of all. According to Dunning, “each individual contracts with each to unit and constitute a community. It is not contract made with a government. The right is surrendered not to a particular person, or a group of persons as in Hobbes, but to the community as a whole. Thus, the society becomes by the act of individuals who form it, vested with charge of the determining and punishing the breach of law.

The compact doesn't involve an element to surrender all natural rights except that of executing the law of nature and redressing one's own wrongs. In Hobbes on the other hand, people surrender all their rights except the right to life which also can be taken away under due process of law.

According to Dunning "the end for which this agreement is made is the protection and preservation of property, in the broad sense of the word that is life, liberty and estate, against dangers both from within and without the community. "the function the political society so created was to preserve not invade the natural rights of life, liberty and property.

In the Lockean contract, those who have entered in the compact, agree to be governed by majority decision. Contract, both in the case of Hobbes and Locke, once made is irrevocable.

For Hobbes the contract is binding on all generations. However in Locke it is a contract to which each generation must give consent for "a child is born a subject of no country or government.

Nature of social contract;

For Locke it is a political, rather than a social contract. Unlike in the case of Hobbes, society or to put it more correctly an organized society already existed.

Locke assumes two contracts one between the individuals giving rise to community, and other between the community and the government. But Hobbes, on the other hand, creates everything with one contract. For Locke the contract to create society is rather the first step to the drawing up of a trust. They must turn their attention to the creation of the instrument that may be used to solve the problems experienced in the state of nature. The people must constitute a government. Govt. is not a party, consequently the government should not exceed its power beyond a certain limit laid down. The government is the trustee which functions for and is responsible to the people who create the trust. This government acts only as an agent to fulfill the obligations.

In Locke's contract the community is thus both the creator and beneficiary of the trust.

At the time of the original contract, the individuals hand over certain rights to the community which thus becomes the beneficiary of the contract. Subsequently, at the creation of the government the community makes no contract with the trustee who accepts a unilateral obligation towards it. The acceptance of the trust by the government is at the same time its undertaking not to exceed the limits laid down by the trust.

The importance of law of nature is enhanced by the institution of the state. It is for the protection of natural rights, which are themselves the gift of nature.

Locke's contract, unlike that of Hobbes' is not a bond of slavery but a chapter of freedom. By the contract, the individuals do not lose anything. Their difficulties in the enforcement of their rights are sought to be removed by this contract.

Criticism:

Locke probably did not realize that majority could also be tyrannical. The rights in his case are transferred to the majority of people instead of one person as in the case of Hobbes. It is not better for individuals to be deprived of their individual rights by majority than by a single tyrant.

Conclusion:

Locke upholds the theory of contract as did Hobbes but they differ widely as to the nature of man and the conditions prevailing in the state of nature. They, no doubt, agree about the ends of the state; peace, security and the well-being of its individual members.

The concept of Locke in depriving state of nature as pre-political rather than pre-social is more conducive to the creation of state than that of Hobbes' it is difficult to imagine how Hobbesian individual, depicted as selfish and animal like, can think suddenly of creating a state. It is therefore right to hold that the contract idea is a sham in Hobbes' theory, it is essential to that of Locke.

Q) Locke's theory of Natural law and Natural rights vs. His Empiricism:

Introduction:

Locke, like Hobbes, starts from the analysis of human nature and the state of nature. He states that desire is the spring of all human action. Everyone wants to substitute pleasure for pain. But the behavior of every human being is governed by the law of nature which everyone follows as a rational being. The law of nature is a kind of eternal law, which sets two standards of good and evil by reasoning. In following the law of nature, men are basically decent, orderly, socially minded and human. They hear and care the voice of duty and tend to be sympathetic in contrast to Hobbes' man who is moved solely by animal consideration of bodily comfort.

Theory of natural law:

State of nature governed by law of nature:

In the state of nature men are equal and free to act as they think fit, within the limits of law of nature.

Spirit of justice, Friendliness, goodness and, mutual helpfulness grows from law of nature:

According to Locke, "the state of nature has a law of nature to govern it, which obliges everyone and reason which is that law, teaches all mankind who will but consult that being all equal and independent no one ought to harm other in his life, health and possession.

**Law of nature is implanted in every heart and continues to govern civil society:
Law needs force which in state of nature rests with everyone and leads to
inconvenience.**

Though rational man are not perfect so, differences of interpretations are but natural because men are after all a bit selfish, and some of them more than a bit.

“the state of nature’ says Dunning ‘as conceived by Locke is pre-political rather than a pre-social condition. It is not a state in which men live in brutish reciprocal hostility but one in which peace and reason prevail. It is not a lawless states”

Still law of nature regulated freedom and ensured equality:

Locke was perfectly a rationalist and therefore he thought it expedient to take the middle course.

Law of nature ensures right to life, liberty and property:

Differences of understanding Natural laws moral standards and personal interests to inconvenience:

There were inconveniences:

There is no established settled known law.

The state of nature lacks a known and indifferent judge, to settle disputes which arise under the law of nature.

In a state of nature there is no executive power to enforce judgments.

Man surrenders only one right to execute the law of nature to safeguard life, liberty and property

The compact to enter into society does not involve the agreement to surrender of any natural right except the right to execute the law of nature and redress one’s own wrongs.

Implication of Natural rights:

Rights are only of the individual and not of the government. The individual has the right to overthrow government if it is tyrannical.

Rights are held by all the individuals without any exception. Everyone is equal in this respect.

Rights are innate, they are conferred on man by God. Individuals will continue to have than under any circumstances whatsoever.

State doesn’t create rights they are only upheld by the state. State must give them official protection;.

Theory of Natural Law inconsistent with Locke’s Empiricism:

The theory of natural law is inconsistent with his empiricism. Empiricism means getting knowledge out of experience. According to Sabine, “Everyman according to him, wants to get rid of evil and get pleasure. This is the philosophical position taken by Locke. But then in his political theory, he pictures man as guided by reason which seeks the well being of all. This is a great philosophical ambiguity of Locke “he could not unit his political theory with his general philosophical position.

Locke holds that man desire pleasure but then expects man in a state of nature and otherwise to act so as to produce public or general happiness.

His theory of natural law in paradoxical because. He holds that the mind of a person at the time of his birth is like a Tabula Rasa (clean state, or a white paper one which nothing is written). Whatever the mind requires is through the sense organ by sensation and experience. But on the other hand he holds that man is endowed with certain inherent and innate rights. This is but a paradoxical

Conclusion:

In this way, Lockess version of nature law is a continuation of the classical philosophy of natural law and not a deviation from it as it is in the case of Hobbes.

Q) Locke and concept of property:

“the reason why man enter into society is the presence of property; Locke
The presentation of property is the chief end of the state” Locke

Locke and “capital appropriation:”

Introduction:

According to Locke, the right to private property arises only when man mixes his labor into the object, it is through labor that he extends his personality into the object produced.

Rights prior to society and claims on society:

Right is prior to society. Society doesn't create rights. Moreover society cannot regulate rights except within limits. Rather society and government are created to protect these rights of special importance among these rights in the right to property. The work property has however a very broad meaning for Locke. By property Locked means the right to life, liberty and estate.

Surrender of only one right to preserve the right of property:

According to Dunning, “the end for which the contract is made is the protection and preservation of property i.e. liberty and estate. The function of the political society so created was to preserve, not hinder, the natural rights of life, liberty and estate”

Contract involves rule by law of nature which gives every men the right to life, liberty and estate:

Life, liberty and estate means right to property in broader sense:

State removes inconveniences and protects natural/individual rights through natural law.

Property necessitates society”

Locke says, “the reason why men enter into society is the preservation of property”

Locke and private property:

“before commonly held property can be used, it needs appropriation by an individual it must become a part of him. It means that commonly owned goods must become private property before they can be consumed. This can be affected when an individual mixes with anything, his labor. This is the basis of Locke’s labor theory of value’

Capitalist appropriation of property unjustified:

This is Locke labor theory of the origin of private property which he expands into a labor theory of value. “it is “ he says, labor that determines the value of goods. The greater the amount of labor expended on raw materials the more valuable they become.

Although Lockes expands the labor theory of value, he is against unlimited right to property (capitalist appropriation). It is explained as under:

private property is natural but right to unlimited property.

No equality in property holding.

Some men are more industrious than others.

Limitations to the right of appropriation:

There are some limitations to the right of appropriation. But these limitations are, however, surpassed by the invention of money.

Limitation of spoilage:

Acquired things must be put to proper use but not be spoiled since “nothing was made by God for man to spoil or destroy”

Limitation of sufficiency:

An individual may appropriate only as much as leaves enough and as good’ for others because each man has a right to preserve himself and needs necessities of life fulfilled.\

Conclusion:

But the basis of private property, for Locke, remains the labor force spent upon a common thing. This labor theory proved to be very valuable in subsequent centuries. Harmon says, “Adam Smith followed Locke case of labor theory of value, and Marx elaborated it to

produce the theory of surplus value which he employed to attack the foundation of capitalism.

Q) Liberalism in Locks' writings

Not a theory of Govt., a theory of Rebellion.

State and consent of individuals.

Introduction:

In the opinion of Locke the government is subordinate to the community

Locke gave not a theory of Govt. but a theory of Rebellion and Liberalism:

Both legislative and executive are bound to act for the benefit of the community from whom their authority is derived. It is indeed the first striking example of the principle of liberalism. It means the theory of "Limited government" it was when absolutism was the order of the day, the political philosophy of Locke advocated strongly that the foundation of the government is to remove oppression and increase liberty. This is illustrated in Locke's philosophy of Locke advocated strongly that the foundation of the government is to remove oppression and increase liberty. This is illustrated in Locks' philosophy from the concepts.

The theory of supremacy of community

Theory of consent

Theory of state

Theory of Revolution.

Locks' theory of supremacy of the community:

The individuals, of course, do not transfer all their rights to the community. Hence, even the community of Locke is not sovereign or supreme in all respects. But it is supreme in the spheres in which the individuals hand over their powers. To refute Hobbes' theory of absolute sovereignty, Locke holds that the true sovereign of civil govt. in the individual.

Lockes' theory of consent:

The political authority in Lockean system was the product of the voluntary consent of the individuals who constitute the state. The govt. remains in office only so long as the consent of the ruled is forthcoming.

Locke was the champion of the theory of consent to such an extent that he thought to get the consent of the people of every generation in order to validate the original contract.

In Locke, theory of state:

In Locke, we find that the state is created to remove certain inconveniences of the law of nature. Its feature are:

It is composed of three powers; legislature, executive and federative. Legislative power is the most important.

It exists for people who constitute it. They do not exist for it.

It is founded on the consent of the subjects.

It is constitutional and not arbitrary

It is limited and not absolute.

It is a tolerant state,

It respects all difference of opinion Locke wrote an essay Toleration in which he propounded the theory of secularism and toleration.

It is a transformer state.

It transforms selfish interest of the individuals into public good.

His theory of Revolution:

Locke clearly advocates that if the state doesn't serve the people or if it doesn't depend upon the consent of the people or it goes beyond its constitutional powers, it can be overthrown.

Though a revolutionist Locke was no radical. He was a typical Englishman who is at the most progressive and very particular about his rights, particularly the rights of property.

Q) individual in Locke's political theory;

Introduction

Locke as an individualist:

Equality ensures protection of the right to life, liberty and property:

State created to protect Natural rights effectively:

Consent of the individuals as a foundation store of state:
Theory of private property;
Concept of law of nature;
Theory of Revolution:

Individualism vs. collectivism:

Some critics regard Locke a collectivist also.

Conclusion:

Locke was an individual out and out. His whole thesis originates and revolves round the individual which is supreme and sovereign. In his efforts to uphold individualism, he gives the individuals the right to rebellion against the Government if it fails to discharge property the trust placed in it. On account of the assimilation of ideas he advocated, in the constitution of America Locke his rightly been referred to as America's philosopher

Jean Jacques Rousseau (1712-1778)

Q) "Social contract" of Rousseau Hobbes' Leviathan with its head Chopped off.

Rousseau's attempt at reconciliation between Locks' individualism and Hobbes' absolutism.

Introduction:

In his Discourses on science and Arts, Rousseau repudiates science and art and charges them with corrupting men and society. He says as the conveniences of life increased, as the arts are brought to perfection, and luxury spreads, true courage flags, the virtues disappear, and all this is the effect of science and arts. Truth however, is discovered by reason and intelligence. The role of science is limited. It can only describe the outward "manifestations. Truth must be found, therefore, through reliance upon instinct, feelings and emotions and not upon the preachments of the philosophers. The proper standard for it is that of the natural man, uncorrupted by the vices and luxuries of civilized living. Rousseau attempts to provide an explanation of the origin of inequality among men in his "discourses on the origin and foundation of inequality.

State of nature of and nature of man:

Like Hobbes and Locke Rousseau employ the state of nature as a device whereby the nature of men may be determined.

Inequality in the state of nature consisted of difference of age, health, bodily strength, qualities of mind but inequality in civil society comprises of being more rich, more honored, more powerful

In the state of nature one man may be stronger than the other. But this never will create the relationship of master and slave. It is found only in the civil society. In the state of nature, he who is abused can simply run away.

Hobbes is wrong in assuming that inequalities of civil society are carried over from state of nature.

Both Hobbes Locke wrong a in attributing social vices and virtues to man in state of Nature:

Life in the state of nature, according to Hobbes “was solitary, poor, nasty, brutish and short’ Locke however held that the state of nature was normally peaceful and pleasant. But even then there were certain inconveniences.

Rousseau holds that the natural man is not the aggressive brute so portrayal by Hobbes. He is rather timid and fearful and more likely to avoid quarrel than to seek it. There are only two instincts that make up man’s nature. The first in self-love or the instinct of self-preservation while the second is sympathy. Since these instincts are more beneficial than harmful, it follows that man is by nature good.

State of nature was a state of peace where men were leading solitary happy, free and independent life;

No social evil had as yet crypt in unlike that of Hobbes’ it was state of peace. Where man was leading a solitary, happy free and independent life. But unlike that of Locke, it was neither organized nor moral. The life of the individual was, however, self sufficient. There was not law, so morality, no family.

Inequality arose out of comparison and competition

Rousseau describes the condition which probably gave rise to society. He holds that there arose inequality on account of comparison and competition. whoever song or danced best, whoever was the most handsome, the strongest came to be of more consideration, and this was the first step toward the inequalities and at the same times towards vice. Thus was born in earliest society.

Concept of private property, the biggest cause of inequality:

In the birth of this society, private property also played an important role. The first man who having enclosed a piece of land, the thought himself of saying, this is mine and found people simple enough to believe him, was the real founder of the society “ allied with private property came the use of iron and the development of agriculture. This gave rise to an interdependent and property was introduced, work became indispensable, and vast forest became smiling fields which man had to water with the sweat of is brow and where slavery and misery were room to germinate and grow up with the crops.

Property state of nature ideal while post property state of nature wretched:

in Rousseau's state of nature these were two stages; property state of nature was ideal while post property state of nature was wretched. The rich and the property owners tended to be master and there crept in evil/vice.

Social contract:

Protection of private property led to the creation of political society:

Motivated by their selfish interest, the rich persuaded poor to join the creation of a power which would protect each and thus restore peace. The rich sought to deceive the poor into erecting institutions of law and government. The poor succumbed gladly. It bound new fetters on the poor and gave new powers to the rich which destroyed natural liberty and eternally fixed the joint of property and inequality

General will makes society blessing:

This gives the impression that society is based on a receptive trap laid down by the rich for the poor. But Rousseau removes the curse in the social contract wherein society is painted as a blessing, which gives to the actions of man a moral basis; which was lacking of man a moral basis; which was lacking in the state of nature. Rousseau tried to accomplish this through a contract to which all gave their consent. Rousseau in his social contract states that "Each of us puts in his person and all his powers in common under the supreme direction of general will and in one corporate capacity, we receive each member, as an individual part of the whole

In contract individual becomes Zero, society becomes political supreme and organic in Nature

Rousseau's concept of the social contract is however, a kind of mixture of the view of Hobbes and Locke while at the same time is an improvement over both of them. He adopts the method of Hobbes in as much as all the individuals surrender their rights completely to the body politic. The individuals become complete zero. They merge their will in the will of society. Rousseau combines this method of Hobbes with the substances of Locke. As a result of Lockes' as well as Rousseau contract what emerges is the political society and not society as much. The society existed even before. The improvement made by Rousseau on the ideas of Hobbes and Locke is that, according to Rousseau, what emerges as a result of this contract is, an organism with a will as against the ideas of Hobbes and Locke of an artificial thing a mechanism, a machine. "the body politics he says "is also a moral being possessed of a will " such a will Rousseau calls as the "General will"

Organic state so created is ruled by sovereign General will:

The organic theory of Rousseau repudiates the individualism of Hobbes and Locke. According to Rousseau, the state is rather a "living body" a "public person" a moral being

and it is governed by particular will but by a “general will” the individual is capable of morality only a member of this body politic out of which he is a cipher. Thus is the group, not the individual which is important.

Position of government:

Through the contract only political society or state comes into existence. No government is created. Government is only a serving agent of society which is brought into existence only to implement the decision of the state. In this respect,, Rousseau with both Hobbes and Locke.

Establishment of society for perfect freedom:

Rousseau doesn't offer to build a society which will not constitute 'chains. He merely hopes to discover legitimate chairs.

Sovereign of the General Will:

Men central into the society and merged their wills into the general will which is the concrete manifestation of sovereignty. There is now born a “public person” which, in its “passive role” is termed s state, and in its “active role, as the sovereign. The people have also a dual role. When the exercise their sovereignty through the determination of public policy, they are citizens, when they only, they are subjects.

“General will” is the expression of the public mind. It emanates from all and is at the same time directed to all. It is invariably good for all the members of the community. It is the only authority that legitimately coercek me in as much as it is my own will coming back even though I don't always recognize it as such. I obey only myself.

The “General will” is also inalienable and indivisible and cannot be represented in parliamentary institutions. “As soon as a rather appoints representatives” he says, “it is no longer free, it no longer exists” England according to him, was free only during election time and not afterwards.

General will is always right and tends to the public advantage.

Rousseau's sovereign is Hobbes' Leviathan with its head chopped off:

Rousseau's sovereign, namely General will, is an absolute sovereign having autocratic control over its constituents though Rousseau has given the semblance of popular government, yet in practice it would be no less than a dictatorship. In Rousseau's words, “whoever refuses to obey General will, shall be compelled to do so by the whole body” Rousseau's ideas lead logically to the theory of absolute government. The sovereign General will cannot tolerate defiance of its commands and dictates. Rousseau tries to strengthens his idea of popular sovereignty by saying that “the General will” is always right and tends always to the public advantages’. In other words, in Rousseau's scheme of things there are no limits to the absolute powers of the sovereign “General will”.\

Hobbes' theory of leviathan is an absolute ruler wielding all-pervasive power over all walks of individual's life. Hobbes's Leviathan is one single individual, preferably a monarch. The powers of Hobbes' Leviathan are more or less the same as have been attributed by Rousseau to his sovereign "General Will"

The only difference in Rousseau's state and Hobbes' state is that in the latter the head of the state is one monarch and in the former, there is no such head of the state.

Conclusion:

Rousseau starts like Locke but ends by reaching different conclusion. He in fact, wanted to reconcile Locke's individualism by upholding the dignity of man and fostering thereon the absolutism of Hobbes in making general will as the sovereign body. In this attempt, Rousseau is as despotic as Hobbes. But he differs essentially from Hobbes in the sense that Hobbes made the ruler the true sovereign while ruler in Rousseau is only an agent of the sovereign, the General will, the people. It is therefore quite apt to say that "Rousseau's social contract is Hobbes Leviathan with its head chopped off.

Q) "Man is born but is found everywhere in chains' Explains Rousseau's attempt to bring about reconciliation between liberty and authority"

Introduction:

The opening paragraph of the social contract contains the key to the understanding of the political philosophy of Rousseau. It runs as follows:

"Man is born free and everywhere he is in chains. Many a man believes himself to be the master of others, who is no less than they, a slave. How did this change take place? I do not know. What can make it legitimate? To this question I hope to be able to furnish an answer."

The subject matter of political science in general and political thought in particular is the coordination between the individual and the state. There are two characters on the stage- the individual and the state. The mission of Rousseau was to get the best performance from these character to reconcile the claims of the individual with those of the corporate to show that the one cannot live without the other and to establish that full development of man's faculties is possible in and through organized fellowship with other men.

Men free in state of nature but in chains in state:

Freedoms to act according to the dictates of instincts seem to be, according to Rousseau the birth- right of man. The earliest of all societies and the only natural one is the 'Family. Up to this stage of development, everything was natural and man remained as free as he was born. Beyond this stage, everything becomes un-natural and "man is everywhere in chains'. Man was born good but the wrong social customs and institutions made him corrupt, and when his evil part became more powerful, he had to be subjected to the rigors of the state/

The basic problem of Rousseau has been to reconcile liberty with authority in as much as he considers man in the state of nature as completely free but in chains in the political society.

Reconciliation of liberty with authority:

Rousseau doesn't offer to build a society which will not constitute chains. He merely hopes to discover legitimate chains. In a political society, according to Rousseau, it is a poor bargain to surrender one's freedom in return for security.

The conciliation of liberty and authority was possible through the social contract' of Rousseau. The object of the contract was "to find a form of association which will defend and protect with the whole common force, the person and goods of each associates, and in which each, while uniting himself with all, may still obey himself alone, and remain as free as before'

Liberty given not to any particular human superior but to the General will:

The people by mutual contract had alienated all their liberties but not to any definite human superior. They had transferred their freedom from themselves as individuals to themselves as a collectively.

Individual absorbed in the state still remains free because the state and the individual are inseparable:

In Rousseau contract, nothing is lost but a great deal is gained. In return for his license, the individual gains civil liberty and legal rights and these are guaranteed and protected by the whole community. The individual though utterly absorbed in the state remains still free because of the very fact that the state and individual are inseparable. The contract overcomes the handicaps suffered by the weak in the state of nature. Their inequality, in the state of nature. Their inequality, in the state of nature, meant constant fear, degradation and loss of property. In a civil society they are equal under law. No one loses anything rather gains security. Rousseau says 'in short, who gives himself to all, gives to none'

Conclusion:

The basic problem of Rousseau has, therefore, been to reconcile liberty with authority because he considered man in the state of nature as completely free but in chains in the political society he tried to set up a community which is ruled by the general will so that each man may remain as free as he originally was.

Q) General Will/ totalitarian Democracy:

Introduction:

Rousseau's concept of social contract is a mixture of the views of Hobbes and Locke, while at the same time an improvement over both of them. The improvement made by Rousseau, on

the idea of Hobbes and Locke is that, according to Rousseau, what emerges as a result of contract is an organism with a will, as against the ideas of Hobbes and Locke of an artificial thing. Rousseau laid the foundation of an organic state which repudiates the individualism of Hobbes and Locke. It is rather a “living body” a “public person” a moral being’ and it is not governed by “particular wills’ but by “general will” the body politic” he says “is also a moral being possessed of a will” such a will Rousseau calls general will.

“General Will”

Rousseau says, “there is a difference between the actual will and the real will. The actual will of an individual is his impulsive and irrational will. It is based upon self interest and is not related to the well-being of society. On the other hand, the real will of the individual is a rational will which thinks more of common good or interest. It is based on reason. An average man has both actual and real will. The general will is the sum total or rather the aggregation or synthesis of the real will of individuals in the society as citizens. The general will is for the general good of the community, not for the private benefits of various members.

What is important about General will is that it with general interest and that it is willed by generality or merely by the majority.

General will in the expression of the public mind. It emanates from all and is directed towards all. It is invariably good for all.

Rousseau general will is announced through voting and every citizen enjoys vote equal to others. In voting the citizen is required to abstain all communications which would encourage the formation of groups. One must consult only one’s own conscience and ask oneself what the general will, which is one’s own real, will require. Rousseau assumes, that lack of communication will not prevent the citizen being adequately informed to make a sound judgment. All decisions are to be taken by a majority. Rousseau says that minority must simply suppose that they were mistaken.

Sovereignty of General Will

In Rousseau’s political order, sovereignty and general will are interchangeable concepts. They mean one and the same thing. Men entered into the social pact and merged their will into the general will which is the concrete manifestation of sovereignty. There is now born a “public person” which in its “passive role’ is termed as state and in its ‘active role’ is the

sovereign. The people have also a dual role. When they exercise their sovereignty through the determination of public policy they are citizens, when they obey, they are subjects. Each person acts in both capacities. It is possible that an individual may enjoy his rights as citizen without fulfilling his duties as a subject. To avoid this, it is important that the body politic operate on the basis of general will.

General will can legitimately compel one to obey it. It is the only authority that can legitimately coerce me because it is my own will coming back to me even though I don't always recognize it as such. In obeying it, I obey only myself. According to Rousseau, whoever refuses to obey the General will shall be compelled to do by the whole body.

Characteristics of General Will:

General will isn't will of all' it represents only a part of community, majority or minority:

General will can compel an individual to obey because submission to it is submission to one's own self:

General will is not necessarily the will of majority it may be represented by one single individual who wishes common good.

General will is individual and not capable of represented:

General will cannot be delegated:

The moment there is a master, there is no longer sovereign'

General will is infallible:

Because it always seeks the general good.

General will is not the executive will because executive (Govt.) is the agent of the sovereign

Theory of General will makes Rousseau totalitarian:

The salient features of General will are, therefore sufficient to convince that Rousseau was a great exponent of Totalitarianism. Woughan says, "Rousseau is a determined foe of individualism.

Rousseau advocates the supremacy of the state over the individual and did not leave any scope for defiance of the state by the individual.

“Even an out and out absolutist like Hobbes gave his individuals the right of disobeying the state if his life was put to danger on account of the obedience of the commands of the state. But Rousseau, the so-called democrat and the propounder of the popular Govt. doesn't allow his individuals even that right”

Criticism:

Fore-runner of totalitarian:

Concept of General will not clear:

Sometimes it is will of all, sometimes will of the majority and sometimes the will of single individual.

Contradiction of freedom;

Rousseau advocates compulsion.

Wrong to hold that General will cannot be represented.

Inapplicable to big states.

Impracticable theory:

Conclusion:

There is no denying the fact that Rousseau's concept of General will is inadequately described and surrounded by contradictions. But it is a fact that this is Rousseau's most profound contribution to political theory.

According to Dunning” through Rousseau' concepts a way opened by which the unity and solidarity of a population became necessary. Rousseau, thus, contributed largely to promote the theory of nation state.

Rousseau's political philosophy contains seeds of socialism, absolutism and democracy:

“Beginning as an anarchist in revolution against all social coercions, Rousseau came in time to a conclusion which made state everything and the individual nothing” he started by pleading against the authority of the state but tended in the end to exalt the political entity to a collectivist state. He is a mixture of individualist and collectivist elements and doesn't reach a

definite conclusion. His philosophy is all a combination of democracy, absolutism, socialism, collectivism, utilitarianism and idealism.

democrat in Rousseau:

she had immense faith in liberty and equality of individuals. He had strong belief in the political competence of the masses to determine and decide their own affairs. It is significant in his philosophy that he places sovereignty in the community. He also is an ardent advocate of popular sovereignty.

Absolutism:

Since the state in his scheme of politics is the true representative of the General will, it comes to occupy a position of infallibility. The salient features of the General will are, therefore, sufficient to convince that he was a great exponent of absolutism.

Socialism:

His emphasis that property is a social and not natural right and is therefore subject to social regulation in the general interest, has long been accepted by the exponents of socialism and modern welfare state. He discusses the bad effects of the institution of private and recommends a collective ownership of land.

Collectivism:

Vaughan says that Rousseau is a determined foe of individualism. He advocates the supremacy of the state over the individual and did not leave any scope of defiance of the state by the individual.

Idealism:

Rousseau influenced idealist school of thought by his concept of General will.

Utilitarianism:

He gave an objective standard of judging what is good and bad in life. This his greatest contribution to the science ethics. The concept of common good later on, gave birth to the concept of “Greatest good of the greatest number” adopted by the utilitarian thinkers like Bentham and Mill.

Q) Rousseau: as despotic as Hobbes.

Rousseau: a collectivist.

Rousseau: begins with Locke and concludes with Hobbes.

Introduction:

Rousseau is one of the most controversial figures in the history of political Thought. This is due to the fact that he had inspiration from different philosophers like Plato, Aristotle, Locke, Montesquieu and Hobbes. he could not help producing a philosophy leading to different directions since he was to make reconciliation between their divergent views.

Rousseau begins with Locke ends with Hobbes:

Locke was more inclined towards asserting the supremacy of the individual. Hobbes, on the other hand, wanted to assert the royalist powers. Hobbes was the product of English civil war, who wanted to uphold the theory of absolutism and monarchial form of government. Locke wanted to uphold the Revolution of 1688.

Rousseau labored hard to reconcile the absolutism of Hobbes with the individualism of Locke, it is said that before the French revolution in 1789, every freedom lover of France had in his house the books of Rousseau, Vattel and Montesquieu.

Rousseau was according to Jones, “profoundly influenced by Locke. But while Rousseau starts like Locke and ends by reaching a very different conclusion. Rousseau came to a conclusion which made the state everything and the individual nothing. He is indeed a mixture of individualism and collectivism and doesn’t reach any definite conclusion.

Rousseau: a collectivist and absolutist:

Rousseau’s philosophy is absolutist, authoritarian and collectivist. He is a stern assertor of the state. The salient feature of the general will are sufficient to convince that Rousseau was exponent of absolutism. Roughen says that Rousseau is the determined foe of individualism.

Even an out and out absolutist like Hobbes gives his individuals the right to disobey the state if his life was put to danger on account of the obedience of the commands of the state. But Rousseau, the so-called democrat and the propounder of popular government doesn’t also his individual event that right.

Rousseau: an individualist:

Prof. Alfred Cobban holds that Rousseau was an individualist out-and-out, on the following grounds.

Rousseau is primarily a moralist. He is mainly concerned with individual’s life. Rousseau’s political thought starts with the individual. Individual is more important and state is created by individuals and exists for them and not they for it.

Rousseau starts with the individual and not with the state. The state of Rousseau doesn’t have any and other than the moral and material well-being and happiness of the individuals.

Conclusion:

To do full justice to a dynamic personality like Rousseau it would not be proper to place him in either of the two water tight compartments of individualism or collectivism. His philosophy was all-pervasive. “He was neither an individualist nor a collectivist, yet at the same time he was both. A stern assertor of the state on one hand, a champion of the individual on the other, Rousseau could never bring himself wholly to sacrifice the one ideal to the other.

Q) Hobbes, Locke and Rousseau on Revolution:

All the three philosophers of the theory of social contract have different versions about the right of the people to stage a revolution.

Hobbes:

There is indeed one limitation on Leviathan’s power. Individuals can resist the sovereign if their lives are at stake because the purpose of Leviathan is to preserve the lives of the individuals. Great care should be taken in making resistances because it is equivalent to revolution. It would result in the destruction of sovereign power and reversion to the state of nature which is worse than anything.

Locke:

“the state, then, should exist for the good of the people, it should depend upon the consent of the people, should be constitutional and limited in its authority. If it is not for the people’s good doesn’t depend upon their consent. It is not constitutional or if it exceeds its authority it can, “Locke says, “be legitimately overthrown” he gives this power to the majority of the people and says, “there remains still in the people a supreme power to remove or alter the legislative when they for legislature act contrary to the trust reposed. ‘Revolution should never be staged by a minority.

Rousseau:

Rousseau doesn’t give any theory of revolution directly but impliedly pleads for revolution. Rousseau draws a clear line of distinction between sovereignty which always and wholly reside in the people, and the government which is but a temporary agent of the sovereign people.

General will, as it is clear, is always right and always tends to the public advantage. Since what is right is always true and what is true is always unquestionable.

Rousseau thus exhorted that the final authority lies with the people who are always to exercise sovereignty while government is thing more than an agent of the general will, people were considered as authority to determine the form of the government. It clearly means that he was for the right of the people to charge the government whenever necessary.

Conclusion:

Rousseau, too, exhorts the people to revolution and sets a stage for the French Revolution. It has rightly been said that there would have been no revolution in France, had there been no Rousseau.

Karl Marx (1818-1883)

Q) Mark's dialectical Materialism:

“I found Highchair dialectics standing on its head. I put it down on its feet” (Mark)

Introduction:

No other thinker has aroused controversy so greater influence on future generations as Karl Marx. He is worshiped by millions. Admired by millions and almost hated by millions. In his days Europe was undergoing a revolution of industry. The industrialists (bourgeoisie) stood to gain and the labor (proletariat) stood to lose and the labor (proletariat) suffered. They were exploited. They were treated no more than cattle. Marx was greatly moved by the alienation of the individual.

Dialectics:

Marx borrowed from Hegel the concept of “Dialectics” and made it a major spring board of his philosophy. It was a method of argument. The argument involved three stages. A statement was followed by objection and criticism out of which a sort of synthesis emerged.

Hegelian Dialectics:

Hegel applied the dialectical method for a rational explanation of philosophy or course or movement of history. Through dialectic, Hegel developed philosophy of history which claimed that progress in the world occurs as a result of dialectical clash of ideas in a sequence of thesis, antithesis and synthesis. By thesis, he meant an idea at any given time in the world history. This thesis or idea is a lesser or incomplete manifestation of the totality of the ultimate truth towards the world spirit is moving. In the course of time the thesis gives rise to another and contradictory idea called antithesis. The two survive together for sometime but in opposition to each other. Consequently, conflict occurs. In the conflict, neither thesis nor antithesis is wholly destroyed nor does either emerge unhurt. As a result of this clash, a higher idea or synthesis emerges which represents the valid points of both. The synthesis, in return, represents a new thesis against which a new antithesis arises and the cycle continues in ideas to reach the final stage. Hegel, therefore asserted that the material manifestation of this conflict of ideas is manifest in states. The march of progress cannot be hated. But the basic faster in this process of change and progress in idea’

Hegelian Dialectic Turned upside down by Marx:

To both, Hegel and Marx, motion of history is made possible by the conflict and clash of opposites. But Marx differed from Hegel radically. For Hegel universal substance is spirit while for Marx it is matter.

Marx, no doubt, borrowed from Hegel the dialectical method, he turned it upside down. He in fact reversed it. Hegel held the views that conflict lies in the world of ideas and the material forces are only reflections thereof. Marx on the contrary, asserted that there is a conflict of material forces, and ideas are only the products of material environments in which men lived. In this way Marx behaved that it was the material conditions which provided momentum to social history in contrast to Hegel who believed that ideas provide the moving forces his history Marx said; "I found Hegelian dialectics standing on its head, I put it down on its feet".

Dialectical materials:

Instead, of the metaphysical abstraction of Hegel, Marx stressed materialist interpretation in order to make possible a scientific study of history. Marx's "Materialistic interpretation of history" (the term used by Marx instead of dialectical materialism) emphasizes that social development is caused and determined by economic forces. Marx has given a good account to explain how economic forces determine the course of history and how every stage in history itself provides conditions which lead to its disaster.

Forces of production determine relations of production.

In every society, the determinants of all other developments, according to Marx, is the force of production. The forces of production are the raw materials or the natural resources and the techniques with the help of which those materials are converted into the consumable goods. The forces of production give rise to certain "relations of production." The relations of production manifest as social relationship, the most typical of which is the class structure. This relationship is determined, primarily by the property factor. Property is owned by certain people while others do not own it. Those who do not own, operate the means of production owned by the "haves". This relationship of the 'haves' and 'have-nots' takes the form of command and obedience. The operation always benefits the "haves" this leads to enmity between the classes involved in the productive process.

Forces of production and relations of production make economics as the basis of every society:

Both combine to form the economic foundation of every society. Since these are material factors, the basis of society is itself material. It means that only economic activities determine the shape of everything else. All political, cultural, religious and legal institutions are determined by economic activity.

Over the economic formation of society is formed a super-structure to enable this system to continue:

It was the economic base of the society which determined its social super structure. The superstructure is represented by laws, moral codes, religion art, governmental forms the

supporting theories and the like. This super structure. Helps the system to continue by helping the commanding class of society in providing basis and justification for their position, and by keeping the “have-nots’ suppressed.

Change is obvious in superstructure with the change in foundation:

Since the elements of super structure depend upon the economic foundation, a change in foundation will accordingly reflect a change in the superstructure itself.

Period of social revolution:

Marx says, “then comes the period of revolution, with the change of economic foundation the entire immense superstructure is more or less rapidly transformed”.

Dialectical process notable ensures revolution but also evolution for better future:

In this period of social revolution, class realignment takes place with the result that a new superstructure is established to meet the needs of new situation. The dialectical process which takes place this way is both revolutionary and progressive.

Recurrence of social revolution:

Marx holds that the phenomenon of social revolution has occurred several times in history of mankind.. has been a history of class struggles, conflicts between exploiting and exploited, ruling and oppressed classes,. “it means that every major era in history is characterized by the dominance of an economic class. This yields place to another era in which the economic class which was exploited in the preceding era triumphs over its erstwhile exploiters. This triumph is however obtained after a hard struggle there have been as such 4 stages. Or eras in the history of mankind the first stage is the primitive communist or Asiatic stage in which the forces of production are simple and at the same time communally owned. The other three stages are the ancient, feudal, and capitalist, after the primitive communist stage, every stage of history is dominated by a particular class which exploits the rest. It is always the class owning the means of production which dominates. The present age is dominated by the capitalist. But this stage will also not last long as the process of dialectic is also inherent in it as well.

Conclusion:

The progress of development continued without a break. It was a movement caused without a break. It was a movement caused by the process of action and reaction. The conflict gave birth to a third position which was more adequate than the contending tendencies. “Historical materialism is the heart of Marx’s theory.

Marx's Economic Determinism (or) Materialistic interpretation of history:

Introduction:

Historical materialism as the application of dialectical materialism to the development of society:

Dialectical materialism is in fact a kind of preliminary pattern to prepare the mind for historical materialism. Historical materialism or materialistic conception of history, in this way, is the direct application of the principle of dialectical materialism to the development of society. The word 'historical materialism' used by Marx actually the phenomena of history are determined by economic conditions.

'Materialistic conception of history' characterized as 'economic determinism'

The theory of 'Materialistic conception' of history states that economic activities are the real basis of political, cultural, religious and legal institutions. This view of Marx has been characterized by critics as 'Economic Determinism' since it advocates that all forms of law are determined by the economic factor.

Marx believed that religions or spirit didn't change the course of history but economic factor only changed the history. Cultural life was dependent on the economic life of a nation. He went to the extent of believing that even justice, love, charity and humanity were all inter-linked with the forces of production.

Economic determinism leads to the formation of various stages in history:

Aristotle (primitive communist) stage, ancient, feudal, and capitalist stage.

Means or forms of production cause economic changes which effect social change;

The class owning the means of production always dominates.

State; a tool in the hands of dominating class:

"state changes with the change of condition of production:

The cultural of society is super-structures. Reared on the basis of its economic life. With the change of conditions of production, the collapse of the old order and the arrival of new is inevitable. This will result after the conflict between the old and the new.

The theory of "Surplus Value"

The class struggle in the modern age has appeared in the shape of capitalist versus proletariat. But this too will not last long because the process of dialectic is inherent in it also. The opposition between the capitalist and proletariat class results from the contradictions inherent in the economic foundation of capitalism.

To explain this, Marx borrowed from Ricardo's "labor theory of value". It means that value of a commodity is created by the amount of labor spent on it. This also explains that if different things have different values, different amounts of labor have been put into them. Marx held that all value belonged to the labor. Marx this a "theory of subsistence wages" and gives his theory of "Surplus value"

By surplus value, Marx means that the worker produced more than he received in the wages. It was labor which created all value but it got only fraction of what it produced. The fraction was limited to worker's subsistence." The difference between what labor produced and what it received Marx called surplus value"

"surplus value "was the basis cause round which the tension of capitalist society developed. Both laborer and the capitalist were always trying to increase their share. The action of "the capitalist was however self-destructive. He wants to enhance his own profit and to reduce the wages of the worker. But in reducing the wages of the labor, he unwillingly reduces the purchasing power and therefore reduces the market. This leads to depression, unemployment and poverty. This would lead to the precipitation of class struggle between the capitalists and workers.

Emergence of classless society:

In the clash of the capitalists and proletariat, a synthesis will emerge in the shape of classless society. This state of classless society will, however, be preceded by a transitional period known as "Socialism". In the state of socialism, there will be the dictatorship of the proletariat in order to socialize natural resources and to weed out the remnants of capitalism. The people will receive good according to work done by them. Socialism will grow into communism under the loving care of dictatorship of proletariat. It will be a classless society. The necessity of class will punish and with it the state.

Criticism:

Inadequate explanation of historical movement:

As it ignores the part played by non-economic factors. It never takes into account the part played by human passions, sentiments, emotions, religion, etc.

Incapable of universal application:

Balkan nationalism and Indian separation has little to do with economic factor.

Illogical theory:

The theory holds that only the economically strong class will wield power. Brahmans in India never were economically strong.

Various interpretation of History:

In addition to economic interpretation, there is an ethical, political, linguistic, religious and aesthetic interpretation of history.

Ignores role of man and ideas:

Had there been no Gandhi, Quadi, Mas, Lenin and their ideas, the history of whole world would have been quite different.

Conclusion:

Despite various limitations in Marx's analysis it cannot be denied that there is a certain relationship between economic and political power. No other philosopher saw as clearly as Marx the intimate relationship between economic and political power

“Marx on class Struggle”

Introduction:

Theory of class struggle;

In every system, according to the society tends to split up into two hostile camps with conflicting interests. The motion of history is made possible due to these contending oppositions. It has always been there except the stage of primitive communism.

In ancient stage: conflict between the slaves and master

In feudal era: conflict between feudal lords and serfs.

In capitalist era: conflict between bourgeoisie and

Proletariat class.

Class struggle of today based on economic forces.

Class struggle leads to social revolution:

Challenges the super-structure. Changes modes of relations as well.

History of mankind: history of class struggle:

Four eras of historical development.

Role of state in class struggle:

State is a tool of “haves” to exploit have nots”

Class struggle in the modern age:

Capitalists vs. proletariat.

Results of modern class struggle:

Emergence of classless society and disappearance of “state”

Criticism:

Teaches hatred among various classes in society;

Theory: a myth:

Solidarity among working class impossible for the purpose of overthrowing regimes.

Ignores influence of other factors:

Conclusion:

Marxism is the official ideology of millions have embraced it without compulsion but still there are certain flaws in the theory of class struggle. Weyper says,

“classes are not fixed and rigidly maintained blocks, there is constant movement from class to class.”

Still, the border outline of the theory of class struggle is a reality that will continue in the times to come.

Q: Marx on State

Introduction:

Marks on character of state:

“State is a class organization which reflects ideas of dominant class in society. It is a tool in the hands of dominant to serve their own interests. It is an executive committee of Bourgeois.

State after proletariat Revolution:

“Between capitalism and communism lies the period of the revolutionary transformation of one into the other”

“socialism’ into ‘communism’ under the proletariat revolution and state will disappear in the consequent classless society.

Marx on democracy;

Democracy is a device which helps capitalists to remain in power. Working class should win the battle of democracy. Capitalists should not be given an opportunity to misuse democratic institutions.

Withering away of state:

in the classless society.

Criticism:

Against the classical theory of state

Disputes can be peacefully settled in a state;

No guarantee against future:

Underestimation of peaceful means;

Supports revolution.

Conclusion:

His advocacy of armed revolution is against the cooperation of modern days. Revolutionary and counter revolutionary forces bring instability in society. His theory of state is not sound.

Nicolat Lenin

1870-1924

Marx's theory after him:

Splits: - Revolutionists

- Revisionists
- guild socialists
- social democrats (orthodox marxists)

Russian Revolution:

Against Russia:

Land-owning class exploited the peasants

Nominal reforms were introduced by Alexander II in 1850s

By early 20th century different revolutionary movements had been established.

Marxist group (social democrats) was prominent among them.

Russo-Japanese war (1904-5) w.w.I weakened the Czarist regime and ignited the flames of rebellion in Russia.

Revolution started in Feb, 23, 1917 and revolutionists govt. was established until elections.

Different Soviets (Councils) were established by workers, peasants, soldiers etc. which were dominated by Mensheviks.

Bolsheviks in the mean time, under the leadership of Lenin established control of Soviets and overthrow provisional govt. in October and established official govt. of Russia.

Lenin and Russian Revolution:

Played vital role in carrying the Revolution to the establishment of official govt.

He organized "Union for the Liberation of working class" and was exiled in Serbia by Czarists. He then, went to Switzerland where he published a revolutionary paper Iskar (the spark)

He soon rose to the position of leadership among the social Democrats due to his revolutionary views. Social democratic party was divided into Bolshevik and Menshevik factions. Bolsheviks believed in Revolution and were headed by Lenin.

When revolution began in Russia in 1917, Lenin returned- to Russia and assumed the leadership of Bolsheviks

In October, Lenin became head of the govt. and made peace with Germany.

He died in 1924 and his place was taken by Joseph Stalin.

He wrote;

The development of capitalism in Russia

What is to be done?
Imperialism the final stage of capitalism
State and Revolution.

CSS Exam Desk

www.CSSExamDesk.com
www.instagram.com/CSS_Target
www.facebook.com/CSSExamPoint



Lenin's philosophy:

The organization of the proletariat:

Introduction: Leninism as a body of theory, is a revision of Marxism to account for developments which Marx did not foresee or foresaw in accurately and an adaptation of Marxism to the necessities of the Russian Revolution of 1917 and the following period.

Marx had evolved a doctrine applicable to an industrial country. Lenin had to apply this doctrine to agrarian Russia entering the stage of industrial capitalism. Lenin was a political activist rather than a theorist. Thus, he suggested tactics to apply Marxist theory in Russia.

MARX and organization of Proletariat:

“Marx had stated that the course of historical development would create conditions which would make revolution inevitable. He stated that workers would become concentrated in Urban areas, learn to operate the instruments of production, develop class consciousness which would ultimately lead them to revolt, destroy the bourgeois state, and create their own state, the dictatorship of the proletariat, the rule of the vast majority. This, Marx believed, was a process which though inevitable, could not be artificially accelerated. No system would give way to another until all the potential for development within had been exhausted. Nevertheless capitalism was in the twilight of its existence, and the time for the revolution of workers was close at hand”.

Conditions which had developed in several western countries since this expression Marx's views gave little support to his theory.

Thus, the majority of socialists tended to a reinterpretation of Marx's ideas.

Lenin on organization of proletariat:

Lenin's experience was with the oppressive Czarist regime and he had little cause to believe that democracy could do much to mitigate the harshness of the regime in the foreseeable future. These factors led to the formation of “Lenin” theory of party organization and a new and different status and role for the proletariat which set him apart from the more moderate school of social thought. He was interested in Revolutionary qualities of Marxism.

Marx had erred” Lenin said, “in assuming that the proletariat would develop a revolutionary class-consciousness. Which would carry them into conflict with the capitalists without leadership, assistance or stimulation from any outside source. A revolutionary class-consciousness must be implanted in the mind of the proletariat by the revolutionary intellectuals. The workers' movement was outlined in his “two tactics of social democracy in the democratic revolution”

The Russian Bourgeoisie, he said, was so unstable, so dominated by the Czarist regime that it could not be trusted to carry through its own revolution and subsequent phase of control. There was great danger that the bourgeoisie would return power to their erstwhile master

through fear of opposition at left. To prevent this an alliance of workers and peasants must capture control of the bourgeoisie revolution and govern the subsequent bourgeois state.

It is a severe distortion of Marx's theory. Lenin had justified a premature assumption of power by the proletariat. Lenin was scored by Trotsky.

Trotsky's doctrine of Permanent Revolution:

He said that Russian workers must stir up, after their assumption of power in Russia, proletarian revolution in the capitalist-countries. Those countries are ready for the transition to proletariat control.

Lenin accepted this theory in the beginning years of Revolution of 1917

Lenin on state;

Lenin wrote 'state and revolution' to show what kind of state would emerge from the proletarian capture of the power. In the respect,. He supported the ideas of Marx and Engels.

The concept of "Withering away of state'

Lenin's most bitter attacks were upon distorters of Marxism who believed the state could be used to reconcile class- differences.

The state, he said, is always an organ of the ruling class and used by it to secure its own interest. Class interests can never be free until it crushed its oppressors. The proletarian state, like all states, however is an instrument of a class. Through it proletarian destroy the remaining elements of bourgeois culture. As the bourgeois culture is rooted out and destroyed, the state declines in strength, it withers away.

two stages of communist society:"

"there will be two stages of communist society Lenin says, the first is the phase of socialism. Here the means of production are publically owned; classes still exist but in the process of disappearing so too is the state. A kind of equality exist in the sense that each contributes "according to his ability" and receives 'according to themselves are too involved with the day to day progress of making a living. This task should be undertaken by the "vanguard of proletariat" consisting of highly disciplined group of professional revolutionaries who could be capable of operating secretly"

Lenin's theory is less democratic than Marx's

Revolution and revolutionary state:

No part of Marx's theory had appeal more firmly established than his statement that no phase of historical development could succeed another until that other had fully exploited all its inherent possibilities for development. Accordingly logical succession of stages feudalism to capitalism to socialism had to be followed. It would be impossible to eliminate any one stage since each prepared the way for its successor.

Lenin on Organization of proletariat:

Lenin replied the idea that operation of capitalism would itself result in the development of necessary revolutionary class consciousness of the proletariat. He advocated the idea of an elite leadership to establish the state of proletariat. This view was an alteration of Marx's theory.

Russia and Proletariat Revolution:

As a Russia revolutionary Lenin was reluctant to endorse any plan that would require a lengthy period of capitalism prior to a revolution or dictatorship of proletariat. He sought a plausible interpretation of history. Which would permit a more speedy assumption of power by the workers but which would not at the same time, outrage the principle of historical materialism. His solution to the process his work”

In the second stage, classes and state disappear. Production is vastly expanded, and human behavior achieves a degree of sociability that enables man to live without state imposed authority.

imperialist capitalism:

as time passed the works apparently moved farther still from revolution. The revisionists attributed this development to the success that the proletariat had enjoyed in using democracy to secure their ends. Lenin could not accept it.”

Equally appalling, to Lenin, was the nationalism displayed by the members of the working class at the outbreak of w.w.i. again Marx's theory seemed defective. The Marxian assumption had been that the growing class consciousness of the proletariat would weaken and break the bonds of nationalist sentiments that tied the workers to their country. Patriotism was merely one of the super structural elements, employed by the bourgeois to control the oppressed class. The proletariat would, Marx believed, eventually come to realize the strategy of the bourgeoisie and defeat this effort by giving their loyalty to their fellow workers irrespective of national boundaries. Marxism, in this respect, was an international movement which proposed an ultimate brotherhood of men without the artificial separation that is a concomitant of the nation-state system

The war impelled Lenin to evolve one of his most noted adaptations the highest stage of Capitalism', he attempted an explanation of the phenomenon noted above, that the proletariat appeared to be growing less, rather than more revolutionary.

Marx, Lenin said, had been unable to foresee the development potential of capitalism. He states that the process has developed beyond the point which Marx could predict.

Policy of imperialism:

Lenin says, surplus capital is exported for investment in the backward countries of the world. New productive faculties are created here where the cost of labor and raw-material is low and profits are high. This is the policy of imperialism. It has been followed for some years now, and the underdeveloped areas are now mainly controlled by the imperialist powers, the advanced capitalist countries of the world.

The profits from these exploited areas are so great that part of them can be used, and are being used to bribe and corrupt the 'upper strata of the proletariat of the imperialist countries. They join with those masters to exploit their fellow workers. These workers are deluded into believing that their improved states results from the beneficent working of democracy and capitalism. Thus, they lose their revolutionary will and class consciousness.

Imperialism highest stage of capitalism:

This situation, Lenin asserts will not endure forever. Imperialism is the highest stage of capitalism; it is also the final stage. It is no less true in this phase of economic development than in previous phases that the commanding class is digging its own grave. Investment in backward areas spreads the evil of capitalism. A proletariat in those areas is becoming established and is experiencing the problem of hardships which workers have everywhere suffered. At the same time they are learning how to operate instruments of production and preparing themselves for the ultimate revolution. Lines of communication are being established that will enable them to act in conjunction with the proletariat in advanced capitalist countries. Imperialism expands capitalism. It also advances proletarians and creates worldwide problems. Where before the problems were national in scope. Imperialism is parasitic capitalism.

Capitalism in its final stage grows more rapidly than ever and has great power. Nevertheless. Lenin believes w.w.i to be the beginning of the end for capitalism. It will be followed, he says, by others wars, all of which will be fought for the same purpose to secure a more favorable distribution of backward areas. These wars will make the proletariat increasingly revolutionary and will speed the historical process to the final stage of revolution.

Lenin has always been more interested in action than in doctrine. As a Marxist he could not ignore theory complexity, but he paid less attention to it than formerly.

STALINISM

(1879-1953)

“Joseph Stalin”k came into power after the death of Lenin in 1924. He was far more a quoter of Lenin an Marx than an originator of theory. Stalin was able to destroy his opposition and became the first of the absolute dictators of the 20th century. If under Lenin, the party became the “Vanguard of the proletariat” under Stalin the dictator became the vanguard of the party.

Stalin’s five years plans achieved the rapid industrialization of the country. Stalin also outlined the plan for world revolution more clearly than Lenin had done. He combines Trotsky’s theory of permanent revolution with Lenin’ theory of imperialism and proposes that the attention of the revolutions be directed to the denial areas of the world. Rather than to the advanced capitalist countries.

Criticism:

Lenin’s declaration that future would involve a struggle among the capitalist nations is erroneous. Today, the most outstanding characteristic of international tension is the antagonism between capitalist and communist nations.

Lenin was convinced that the final phase of capitalism would imperialist nations for the redvision of colonial countries. In refuting this change one might point out granting of independence to Philippines by US or to the wholesale liquidation of colonialism by the British.

The increasing level of prosperity of the working class continues to be a bone in the throat of the dogmatic Marxist.

If the dire predictions concerning the fate of capitalism, made by Lenin and Marx, have failed to materialize so too have their optimistic prophecies with regard to the future of the communist state.

Under Stalin, the proletarian dictatorship became the personal rule of the despot.

A class society has failed to disappear it is acknowledge that class do exist in the soviet union.

Communists do not practice what they preach.

MAO TSE-TUNG

1893-1976

Mao's major contribution to Marxist Leninism undoubtedly was adjusting it to fit Asian culture. To accomplish this he made certain modifications in the theory itself, focusing on the central concept of social class. An agrarian country lacking even the small industrial base available to Russia in 1917 China was overwhelmingly rural. Following are the principles of Maoism:

Populism;

Mao and others realized that the future of the Chinese Revolution was in lands of peasantry. This inspired Mao to develop a unique variation on the Marxist theme.

During the second half of 19th century the Chinese peasants has a special place in society. Mao believed their simple, pure character, unblemished by the evil influenced of urban sophistication, was the bulwark of Chinese strength. Later, during the cultural Revolution 1966, Mao's red Guard allies spoke out against government Bureaucrats for betraying the revolution. "Learn from the people" was the slogan as students, managers and townspeople were forced to return to the farm to reborn basic value. Today, though the moderates are firmly in power since Mao's death, all normal people are still expected to return to the collective farms every four years to help with the planting or harvest. Though it is officially a duty and honors, many people oppose the idea of returning to the farm for spiritual renewal.

Mind over matter:

Much less and economic determinist than Marx, Mao argued that ideological purity was more important than economic comfort and that the proletarian mentality could be developed through intellectual as well as economic stimulation. Hence, he maintained that the peasants might be proletarianized by being taught the socialist ethic but they need never leave the farm to complete the transformation. This "Mind-over-matter" occurs again and again in Mao's thought.

Peasant oriented as he was, Mao remained true to the basics of Marxist Leninism though the peasants gave meaning to the society. They do not lead it. That task is left to the communist party of China (CPC). The peasant may be the drive and will behind the revolution, but the party (or the vanguard) actually directs it.

Khrushchev, after Lenin, focused on economic competition claiming that a general engagement with capitalism was no longer possible with modern weapons. Mao however, was never a moderate. He argued that revolution was a means by which people achieved their goals. The road to socialism, he claimed must be constantly punctuated with violence. This conflict, after all, is the essence of the dialectic.

These can never be permanent peace or a permanent accommodation with capitalism because the two systems directly contradict each other. Violent struggle between these two antagonistic systems is therefore unavoidable. Peaceful co-existence is a fantasy that can be pursued only at the risk of betraying the revolution itself. But though Mao's ideas about inevitability of violent conflict between capitalist and socialist societies is strong, they are not rigid. Indeed, as circumstances changed, Mao showed that he could be quite flexible.

Mao's attitude towards the Bourgeoisie:

When the communists came to power in 1948-49 the economy was in a sorry state. Though the merchant class was not large, Mao and his advisers knew it was not important to the economic stability of China, making its immediate elimination unwise. Hence, they decided that, at least for a time, some members of the bourgeois class had to be tolerated in China.

By contrast, the evil elements in the society were these that exploited the Chinese people; the Landlords and the imperialist capitalists (capitalists with foreign ties). Imperialism is a major theme in Mao's philosophy, as in Lenin's though their definition differ. To combat the evils of imperialism Mao turned to Nationalism. Never greatly appreciated, capitalists who showed loyalty to the Chinese state were tolerated, while those with foreign connections were considered the worst evils in China.

Guerilla Warfare ;

Perhaps the Maoist idea that is most widely applied today is the theory of Guerilla warfare. Both Marx and Lenin believed that power could be seized at a single stroke. They differed only on timing. Marx believed the revolution would happen by itself. Lenins supporting a professional approach. Mao, by contrast argued that revolution in the less developed world would have to cover a long period.

In his book, Yu Chik Chan (Guerrilla Warfare) Mao divides guerrilla warfare into two basic parts: military and political.

Military guerrilla warfare:

It has three distinct phases:

During the first phase, the soldiers concentrate on building secure lash on safe-zones in which to rest, refit and train their troops. A great effort is made at this point to befriend the local people, thus gaining support for the cause.

The second phase involves numerous small groups attacking the enemy by means of ambush and other guerrilla activities.

The final phase begins only after victory is certain and consists of large troops maneuver and battles similar to those of a conventional war.

The military of a guerrilla warfare is very clear. "the first law of war" Mao wrote," Is to preserve ourselves and destroy the enemy" Mao clearly works against seeing territorial gains as a major goal. The only real objective must be to destroy the fighting capacity of the

opponent. With this in mind, Mao also warned that a guerrilla force should carefully choose when it fights, avoiding any battle it is unsure of winning. The only territory essential to guerrilla is the safe zone or zone. In a guerrilla warfare these should be no defensive battles. If an area is given up to a superior force, with patience and cunning it will be regained later. This strategy is most clearly expressed in Mao's famous dictum

“when guerrilla engage a stronger enemy, they withdraw when he advance; harass him when he stops; strike when he is weary, pursue him when he withdraw;

Of greater importance is guerrilla's constant field position, from which they always put pressure on enemy. Never destroyed, always there, the guerrilla give an appearance of invincibility, humiliating the enemy in the eyes of the people.

Political guerrilla warfare:

More important to Mao than military operation are the political activities of guerrilla force. His often quoted statement “political power comes out of the barrel of a gun” should not be taken too literally. Though he was a violent revolutionary Mao understood the importance of non violent political the importance of nonviolent political power. A more helpful quotation in this regard in “the most important victory is to win over the people”

Mao fully expressed and expected every soldier to do more teaching than fighting the war would be won by convincing the peasants of the rightness of the cause rather by defeating the enemy military. His strategy in this respect was to “surround the cities with the countryside”. Mao said, the soldiers must set or good example. Mao, therefore banned the opium use in army and insisted that the troops treat the local people with respect. He also commanded that the officers live no better than their troops.

When a guerrilla unit first occupied an area, it was to gain the confidences of the peasants by helping them erect local governments. This would weaken their political loyalty to the enemy. The guerrilla would constantly teach the peasants the goals of the revolution pointing out its benefits and reminding them of the enemy's evil policies.

By such means, Mao believed the guerrilla force would build an invincible base of support. As peasants support grew, supplies and information about the enemy would increase, strengthening the guerrilla units. At the sametime, the enemy would grow increasingly isolated and weak as the ring around the cities became tighter and tighter which ultimately caused the collapse of the enemy.

Not only successful in china, Mao's ideas on guerrilla warfare were applied throughout the developing world. Adapting Mao's military ideas to Latin American conditions fidelk Castro seized power in Cuba and developed a unique variant of Marxism.