

WESTERN POLITICAL THOUGHT

M.A. POLITICAL SCIENCE, I SEMESTER

PAPER-I



Director, I/c

PROF.V. VENKATESWARLU

MA.,M.P.S., M.S.W., M.Phil., Ph.D.

CENTRE FOR DISTANCE EDUCATION

ACHARAYA NAGARJUNA UNIVERSITY

NAGARJUN NAGAR – 522 510

Ph:0863-2346222,2346208,

0863-2346259 (Study Material)

Website: www.anucde.info

e-mail:anucdedirector@gmail.com

M.A. POLITICAL SCIENCE

(I, II, III & IV SEMESTERS) - *political Science & III and IV semesters - Public Administration*

101PO21-PAPER I: WESTERN POLITICAL THOUGHT

UNIT - I

Greek Political Thought

1. Plato: Justice, Critique against Democracy
2. Aristotle: State, Constitution, Citizenship, Justice, Virtue

UNIT - II

Medieval and Early Modern Political Thought

1. St. Augustine: The Self, City of God, City of Man
2. Nicolo Machiavelli: Virtue, Fortune, Republicanism

UNIT - III

Social Contract Theory

1. Thomas Hobbes: State of Nature, the Social Contract State, Political Obligation
2. John Locke: Equality, Natural Law, Property, Consent and Government
3. J.J. Rousseau: The General will

UNIT - IV

Liberalism and its Critique

1. G.W.F. Hegel: Freedom, Civil Society and State
2. J.S. Mill: Liberty, Individuality, Utilitarianism
3. Karl Marx: Alienation, Human Emancipation, Surplus Value, Ideology.

Recommended Books:

1. Sukhbir Singh, *History of Political Thought*
2. G.H. Sabine, *A History of Political Theory*
3. V. Krishna Rao, *Paschatya Rajaniti Tatvavicharamu* (in Telugu)
4. John Plamenatz, *Man and Society*
5. Ernest Barker, *The Political Thought of Plato and Aristotle*
6. C.B. Macpherson, *The Political Theory of Possessive Individualism*
7. Shlomo Avineri, *The Social and Political Thought of Karl Marx.*
8. Iain Hampshire – Monk, *A History of Modern Political Thought.*

*128
20/2/21*

Head
Department of
Political Science and Public Administration
Acharya Nagarjuna University
GUNTUR

CONTENT

L.No	Lesson Name	Page No
01	Plato-Justice, Critique Against Democracy	01-19
02	Aristotle-Theory of The State, Constitution, Citizenship, Justice, Virtue	20-38
03	St. Augustine - The Self, The City of God, City of Man	39-47
04	Niccolo Machiavelli - Virtue, Fortune, Republicanism	48-59
05	Thomas Hobbes-, State of Nature, The Social Contract State, Political Obligation	60-71
06	John Locke –Equality Natural Law, Theory of Property, Consent And Government	72-82
07	Rousseau- The General Will	83- 88
08	G.W. F Hegel- Freedom, Civil Society and State	89-99
09	J S Mill – Liberty, Individuality, Utilitarianism	100-110
10	Karl Marx – Alienation, Human Emancipation, Surplus Value, Ideology	111-129

LESSON-01

PLATO-JUSTICE, CRITIQUE AGAINST DEMOCRACY

1.0 Objectives:

1. Students would be able to understand the life of Plato.
2. Students would be able to learn Plato's political thought.
3. Students would know about the concept of justice, ideal state of Plato
4. Students would know about the concept of Plato's critique against democracy

Structure:

- 1.0 Objectives
- 1.1 Introduction
- 1.2 Sources of Plato's Political Thought
- 1.3 The Method of Plato:
- 1.4 The Republic or Concerning Justice
- 1.5 Plato's Concept of Justice
- 1.5.0 Grounds on which Plato Rejected Prevailing Theories
 - 1.5.1 Traditional theory
 - 1.5.2 Radicalist Theory
 - 1.5.3 Pragmatic Theory
- 1.6 Concept of Justice by Plato
- 1.7 Criticism of Plato's Concept of Justice
- 1.8 Theory of Education
 - 1.8.1 Education Methods
 - 1.8.2 Features of Platonic System of Education
 - 1.8.3 Education and Curriculum
 - 1.8.4 Critiques of Plato's Scheme of Education
- 1.9 Communism of Wives and Property
 - 1.9.1 Communism on Property
 - 1.9.2 Criticism of Communism of Property
 - 1.9.3 Communism of Wives
 - 1.9.4 Common Reasons on Wives
 - 1.9.5 Criticism
- 1.10 Comparison of Plato's Communism with Modern Communism
 - 1.10.1 Resemblances
 - 1.10.2 Dissimilarities
- 1.11 Origin and Nature of State
- 1.12 The Ideal or Just State
 - 1.12.1 Philosopher King
 - 1.12.2 Plato's Rule of Philosophy and Features
 - 1.12.3 Criticism
- 1.13 Ideal State and Liberty
- 1.14 Ideal State and Equality
- 1.15 The Statesman

- 1.16 The Laws:
 - 1.16.1 Differences of Republic and Laws
 - 1.16.2 Philosophy Explained in the Laws by Plato
 - 1.16.3 Views on Political Aspects
 - 1.16.4 Views on Social Structure
 - 1.16.5 Views on Education
- 1.17 Plato's Critique against Democracy
 - 1.17.1 The Rule of the Ignorant Majority
 - 1.17.2 Excessive Freedom and Its Consequences
 - 1.17.3 The Psychological Basis of Democratic Decline
 - 1.17.4 Epistemological Concerns
 - 1.17.5 Democracy as a Precursor to Tyranny
- 1.18 Conclusion
- 1.19 Model Questions
- 1.20 References

1.1 Introduction:

Plato was born in Athens in 427 B.C., one year after the death of Pericles and he was breathed his last in Athens in 347 B.C., ten years before the battle of Chaeronea a battle which enabled king of Macedonia Philips, to bring the whole Greek world under him. It was the period when Athens was observing the decline of the democratic institutions. Plato was born into a family, one of the most eminent family on both sides in Athens. It was anticipated that, Plato would lead an active life in the services of state. In fact what he had imagined. In the "seventh letter", he had written 'when I was young man, I felt as many young men do, I thought that very moment I attained my majority, I should engage in public affairs'. Such an opportunity presented itself before Plato, when a revolt over threw democracy in Athens. Among them were Plato's Kings Men, asked him to join them. Thinking in his own words that, 'politics and I were a fit match'. But Plato could not resolve himself with their activities which he writes that 'my blood boiled at it' for 'as I looked I saw those man in a short time make the former democratic government seem like a 'golden age'. Another revolt soon brought the democrats to power. Though the new democratic government in the beginning was able to win his sympathies, it dedicated an act which isolated him from dynamic political life. It implemented his teacher and friend Socrates on a charge of corrupting the youth of Athens.

The execution of Socrates filled Plato's heart with scorn and dislike for democracy – a feeling which he nursed throughout his life; he left Athens to live in Magava. He visited Italy, but it was not certain he took journey to Egypt and Cyrene. When he was in Italy he was drawn towards Pythagoras. He also went to Sicily where he made friendship with Doin, a member of the court of Dionysius I, who was the ruler of Syracuse. In 386 B.C. he came back to Athens, where he founded the first University of the Ancient Greece known as the Academy and where he taught until his death.

Plato had nursed a hope with Dionysius help he would flourish in conveying essential reforms in the government of the city. But his hope was ruined and his effort gave little achievement. This was the only effort made by the philosopher to effect politics, after his failure he devoted himself to teaching and encouraging knowledge. Plato had represented, an amalgamation between a poet and a philosopher, his dialogues were a medium of expression both of truth and beauty. He was written a number of dialogues which are listed under.

Crito, Apology, Ruthyphora, Laches, Lysis, Charmides, Phaedo, Gorgias, Meno, Protagoras, Symposium, Duthydemus, Republic, Theactetus, Pormenides, Philebus, Sophist, Statesman, Timaeus, Laws, and half-finished Critias. For the students of political philosophy only three book are important – Republic, Statesman and the Laws.

1.2 Sources of Plato's Political Thought:

The political thought of Plato was resulted partly from current intellectual climate and principal political conditions and partly from the ideas from Pythagoras, Parmenides, Heraclitus and Socrates. In fact no political philosophy intelligible save in the context of its time, and this was true about Plato's philosophy as well.

After the death of Pericles in 429 B.C., the Athenian leadership had destroyed to a low level. The execution of Socrates made Plato to reconsideration, he took the task of rebuilding philosophically the moral fiber and political organization of Athens and to achieve this end, he agreed certain solutions which were observed as the most inspiring and excellent ideas in the history of political thought.

If Plato was influenced by the conditions at that time, among the Greek thinkers, Pythagoras, Heraclitus and Socrates influenced him. From Pythagoras he learned the theory of Tripartite Man, which says human mind made of three elements. The appetite, the spirit and reason. Socrates had the utmost influence on Plato's life, he was influenced by Socratic theory of knowledge, he advanced it into a system of Metaphysics. It says, each theory which we observe in this world in an imperfect imagination of a perfect original called the 'Idea' or 'Form'. There seeming 'Dualism' i.e., there are two worlds – the world of being and the world of becoming. The world of being is a static world of perfection or an ideal world, which is real because it is ideal or perfect. The world of becoming which is an active world of imperfection, a world of particular things, which is imaginary because it is imperfect. The former is world of reason later is world of sense – perception.

Plato was also obligated to Socrates for his identification of virtue with knowledge. Socrates said that, there could be no 'virtue' or 'excellence' without knowledge. Storage of facts is not knowledge. Socrates said knowledge and morality are identical. Knowledge influenced the total personality, hence, all qualities are inferior to knowledge. In fact, the proposal 'virtue is knowledge' is the important idea of the Republic. The entire theme of Rule of Philosophy which Plato build up in the 'Republic' based on Socrates proposal that virtue is knowledge.

1.3 The Method of Plato:

The system adopted by Plato had also an individuality of its own, like his philosophy. We have definitely agreed procedures to study the social and political phenomenon. These methods either overlap or supplement each other, or mutually oppose. For science there is a method, which is based on observation and conclusions through hypothesis and verification. This method is also known as inductive method, there is another method deductive method which is just opposite to inductive method. Besides, there is also historical method, which established on experience and which will be distinguished to the analytic method that divides the ingredients of a phenomenon and studies at segregation from other related phenomenon. Plato had used all these methods even though they looks to be contradictory. His method can be said to be logical because his ideas proceed from the 'ideas archetype' or universal to the particular, which were imperfect models. It will not be wrong to label his method as inductive, because his nature of state was based upon an opinion of the qualities of an individual. His method would have historical proof as well because in the Republic he had

given a possible historical advancement of state through four main stages. 1) the stage of articulate speech, 2) the state of natural economic dependence 3) the stage of war and war chiefs and the final stages of government 4) his method in analytical also, because he divides individual into three components parts to find his principal nature.

1.4 The Republic or Concerning Justice:

The republic or regarding justice, was one of the greatest works of Plato, which represents his thoughts fully. When he was at the age of 40, he wrote the book, which indicates the maturity of his ideas and philosophy. This book deals with both political and moral principles and it consists of 10 books. It also includes the metaphysical, educational, and sociological and host of other problems. A prominent philosopher Nettleship said, "The whole Republic is really an attempt to interpret real nature, psychologically; its methods can be observed in all the institutions of society, class organization law, religion soon are ultimate products of human soul and inner principle of life which works itself out in these outward shapes". Prof. Barker also said "It is an attempt at a complete philosophy of man... But man is a whole, his actions cannot be understood apart from his thinking and therefore the Republic is also a philosophy of man in thought and of the laws of his thinking".

The Republic of Plato starts with the proposition (propose), what is a good man, how he can become so. Plato said that, a good state should have a king who must be a philosopher (Philosopher king), and must have information of good and reality. Plato supports the instrument of education which produces good citizens and solves many of our social and economic problems. The Republic of Plato starts with ethics and enters in the domain of politics, sociology, metaphysics, education etc., he could able to deal with so many subjects in republic, because there was no separation of subjects during his time. The Greek cities states were so much combined that there was no difference between politics and religion. The dialectical method and dialogue system helped him to cover different subjects in his discussions.

The Organic view of the state was taken by Plato, found no battle between ends of the state and those of the individual. Plato tried to 'rehabilitate a strong and impartial authority which should mean, not the rule of rich over poor, or of the poor over rich, but something either above or at any rate combining both'. He measured an ideal state must consist of their classes, each performing a special or appointed functions, the three classes were i) economic class ii) military class iii) ruling class.

The economic class was accountable with creation of wealth when he said, men having iron in their nature. The warrior class comprised of persons who protect the community, said to be men having silver in their nature the ruling class was mainly in charge for the governance of the country, said to be gold in their nature. Even though each class was significant within its respective place, Plato considered that ruling class was more important than other classes. Because they had accountability for making and unmaking of the country which was rested on their shoulders. He tried to raise ruling class. To recognize the philosophy of Plato fully, it was suggested to examine his views on justice, education, Rule of Philosopher king and communism of wives and property.

1.5 Plato's Concept of Justice:

Plato had given great prominence to the concept of justice, it was clear fact that he subtitled his book of 'Republic' as 'Concerning justice', the nature and occupancy of justice was the important issues of Republic. Plato while explanation of his theory of justice, he

observed different prevailing theories of justice, after rejecting them he proposed his own views on theory of justice.

1.5.0 Grounds on which Plato Rejected Prevailing Theories:

The following theories of justice were rejected by Plato.

1.5.1 Traditional theory

This theory was produced by Cephalous, and his son Polemarchus, they defined justice as speaking truth and paying what was due to Gods and men. It was considered that, good is done to friends and harm to the enemies. Plato disallowed this theory because justice means doing well to all and harm to none, which depends upon the principles of morality. He further said, it was not possible to distinct between enemies and friends because the appearance would be often deceiving. Another flaw of his theory was, it treat justice as an individualistic rather than social concept. Justice cannot differ from person to person and it must have universal application. This theory was not tolerable because it is handmaid of those in power and gives sufficient scope for misuse.

1.5.2 Radicalist Theory

This theory was linked to Sophists and produced by Thrasymachus, preserved justice as the interest of the stronger. It trusts in the principle of might is right. When the government strongest, it makes laws to the suitability of the rulers and justice for the people, seeking the interest of the ruler rather than follow their own interests. Sophists said that injustice better than justice every person would like to promote his own interest would go against interest of ruler. Therefore, Thrasymachus claims that, injustice is better than justice and unjust man is wiser than the just.

Plato had disallowed this theory of justice because firstly, Justice can never be the interest of stronger. The government is an art and it must aim at the perfection of the material viz., the subjects rather than its own faultlessness. A ruler must be selfless in his duties as ruler, must work for the progress and governed. Secondly, justice is always better than injustice because a just man is wiser, durable and better off than an unjust man and knows his limitation. He tries to work within limits and does his appointed purposes. Thirdly, Plato condemns the extreme individualism of the Sophists and holds that individual is not an independent unit but a part of an order. Fourthly, there cannot be dual standards for Justice one for the ruler and the other for the subjects. Thrasymachus could not give any rational justification, this concept had no universal application.

1.5.3 Pragmatic Theory

This theory is proposed by Gloucan, he stated that, justice is an artificial thing, a product of social agreement. Justice is the child of fear and is founded on the need of the weak. Therefore, justice is not the interest of the stronger but it is the necessity of weak. Plato left out and condemned this theory because it considers that justice is something external or an importation. He said that, justice is rooted in human mind.

1.6 Concept of Justice by Plato:

After rejecting those prevailed concepts of Justice, he proposed his own concepts of justice. He opined that, justice must be present both in individual and in society. He thought that justice in the state existing in bigger and much noticeable form, he tried to put it with the help of state. According to Plato, there are three constituents in human mind namely reason, spirit and appetite, which are presented by the rulers, soldiers and farmers. He opined that each of these three makes a valuable contribution for the creation of the state. Justice can be done if the each group performs their duty without interfering each other. Justice is a bond which holds a society together, pleasant union of individuals, each of whom has found his life work in accordance with his natural fitness and training, it is both public and private virtue. Plato's concept of justice was explained by Barker as, social justice may be defined as the principle of society, consisting of different types of men (producing type, military type, ruling type), who have combined with each other to perform their own duties.

Hence, the concept of justice by Plato, based on three principles. First it works as functional specialization like giving a definite function to each one according to his capacity and merit, second, it works, noninterference of different groups. So that they can concentrate on their own duty. This sort of work required for the unity and welfare of all the members of state. Third, it implies harmony in between the three classes (groups) representing wisdom, courage and temperance respectively.

1.7 Criticism of Plato's Concept of Justice:

The concept of justice by Plato has been exposed to criticism, the following charges are leveled.

First, the concept of justice by Plato is mainly grounded on moral principles. Which lacks legal sanction, hence, is not enforceable. It is based on self-control and self-rejection in the interest of society. At any stage of history more moral sanction cannot protect the social good.

Second, Plato's theory of justice could be practical only in the city-state. It toughly enforce the principle of division of labour and expect everyone to do his allotted duty to satisfy society. In the present context, it is not possible nor can be fixed. If duties can be given to the members of each class because the population has increased so much.

Third he said that, each individual owns qualities like, reason, spirit and appetite, he wants each individual must contribute to the development of only one faculty. He wants ruler class to develop faculty of reason. The soldier class to develop faculty of spirit or courage while appetite for the peasant class.

Fourth, his concept of justice gives absolute power to one class like, the philosophers, because they have lot of wisdom. Thus, there is a scope for inequalities of power and privilege in his concept of justice. However, he failed to realize grant of absolute power in the hands of any person or class of persons though morally and spiritually trained lead to degeneration and corruption.

Fifth, to spot the misuse of power by ruling class, he pleaded for communalism of property and wives in complete violation of human psychology.

Sixth, Prof. Popper, said that, Plato's concept of justice gives rise to totalitarianism and it ignores the humanization principles like equality, freedom and individualism.

Seventh, Plato subordinates individuals completely to the state and shows him a meagre means for the promotion of the interest of the state.

Eighth, his justice gives rise to a class-state in which ruling is the privilege of a particular class.

1.8 Theory of Education:

Plato's theory of education is connected to his theory of justice, education act as an important role to bring harmony according to Barker, and unity in the society. According to Barker "An attempt to cure mental malady by mental medicine". Plato trusts that, most of the evils in the society can be removed by providing education and he asserted that it is a spiritual medicine. Plato gave significance to education and connected to his ideal state, and gave prominence to his second book of Republic. Plato believed that knowledge is virtue and it is the duty of state to provide knowledge. Plato asserted that the three classes in the state must be properly trained and educated so that they can do their duties with efficiency. That means state should give priority to education.

Plato always believed that education is related to individual and societal characteristics, in fact it gives individual to understand knowledge which is equivalent to virtue, it can throw a light on soul to know the truth as well. It is the social method by which society can become quick to respond about the consciousness and can learn to do their duties effectively in the society. Plato very effectively mixed these two concepts of education and justice.

1.8.1 Education Methods:

During the time of Plato, education system was entirely reverse trend they were Athenian and Spartan types. The system of Athenian was in primarily with private people and left with the parents to educate children by the way they think will be the best. In the Spartan system of education which was in control of the state, and parents separates their children when they attain four years and they will send them to be taken care by the perfects and state take care of their education and involvement of parents in this regard was not there. State provide education in harmony with social conditions. Plato's education system of education designed to promote social welfare and help individuals by understanding the reality.

1.8.2 Features of Platonic System of Education:

The important characteristics of platonic or spiritual education are here under:

- Plato stressed that all concerned be communicated for proper education. He believed that education is a kind of positive measure by which ruler can mould the characters of the people, he never supported the idea of keeping education with private hands and stressed the need of keeping education with state only.
- Plato never accepted to keep the education options with parents and stressed the need to make it obligatory. He stated that education should made obligatory to all the citizens of the state, so that they can develop their mental faculties and can become respected units of state.
- Plato did not accepted the barring of women from education on the Athenian system, both men and women must be given education
- The education of Plato was for artisans and also for the peasants. He stated that, "Men of copper can be made into men of silver and even of gold, if they possess their attributes".
- Plato was in support of firm censorship of all literary and artistic works to make sure that, youth did not come under bad influences.
- Plato insisted that education must provide moral and physical improvement of the child, he said that healthy mind can only reside in the healthy soul.

- The important aspect of his education was to prepare the philosopher king. The philosophers after passing through a rigorous education would be able to run the government.

1.8.3 Education and Curriculum:

Plato's educational curriculum consists of two stages, elementary and higher stages. The first stage starts from birth to the age of six years, during this stage both boys and girls were to be given education of languages, the children were to be given basic education on religion. The second stage from 6 to 18 years, and child should be given education on music and gymnastics. The music would give necessary development of soul and gymnastics would provide growth of body. The third stage was prolonged from 18 to 20 years, both of them must be given military education during this stage.

The stage of higher education starts from 20 to 35 years, by the end of 20 years was to be taught those who have interest in science and philosophy. The higher education again can be divided in to two sub-stages, the first ranging from 20 to 30 years, second stage from 30 to 35. In the first stage subjects like mathematics, Astronomy, Logics and other Sciences and said that geometry must be taught. During the second stage stress must be given to dialectics, and this stage of education is required for the production of philosopher king. King was to rule from 35 to 50 years after 50 years king had to retire and start study of God.

1.8.4 Critiques of Plato's Scheme of Education:

His scheme of education had been criticised severely, the following charges have been levelled:

- 1 Plato's scheme of education was for the guardian class other classes like peasant and artisan were not covered.
- 2 His scheme of education was a lifelong procedure
- 3 The Plato's suggestion for censorship of art and literature was extremely critical
- 4 The Plato's education system was not logical there was no relationship from one stage to the other stage. The philosopher king who administer the state does not have the necessary training in administration and other problems.
- 6 His pattern of education was opposing to human psychology and conflicting to rich society which depends on the variety of growth.

1.9 Communism of Wives and Property:

An important aspect of Plato's political thought was communism of wives and property. The concept of communism was not known to Greeks, but both in Athens and Sparta a little of communism can be seen. He thought that, Guardian class must be free from physical uncertainties, so they can focus on public service. He asserted that, during the acquisition of property and family would stand in the way of philosopher king to take proper decision about the community. Plato said that, mixture of political and economic power was restricted to lead to corruption and deprivation in the state and an operative system of administration could operate only when economic power was absolutely separated from political power. Baker said that, the think of communalism by Plato was an important step in his thinking. According to Prof. Sabine "So firmly was Plato convinced of pernicious effect of wealth

upon Government that he saw no way to abolish the evil except by abolishing wealth itself, so far as the soldiers and rulers are concerned”.

1.9.1 Communism on Property:

Plato understood that, private property was a hesitant piece in the way of the unity of state, he wanted to abolish by Communism of Property. He was afraid that, having private property would promote selfish thoughts and diverge the devotion of philosopher ruler from public service. Hence he gave two ruling classes the right to have private property. It was noted that the communism was only for the guardian class expect them to make rejection of private property. The guardians reject the property and family for the good of the society.

1.9.2 Criticism of Communism of Property:

Aristotle his student, criticized Plato's concept of communism of property are here under:

- 1 With the doing away of the private property there would barely be any encouragement for hard work and the healthy struggle, which is so important for the growth of society.
- 2 His communism was only for the ruling class and workers and peasant were exempted, who were from the majority of the society. Any scheme which excludes majority of people in the society, failure of freedom would arise.
- 3 The elimination of institution of private property will end the charity and generosity thoughts would be abolished.
- 4 His communism of property was bound to result in loss of production.
- 5 The distinct interest of individuals would effect on the development and progress of the society. His communism prevents from happening which would give richness to life.
- 6 Plato was criticized by Aristotle for providing material remedy to the spiritual disease through communism.
- 7 He was completely neglected the slaves, who were the distinct portion of the Greek population and part of Greek economy.

1.9.3 Communism of Wives:

His thought of communism of wives was the extension of his communism of property. He was of the opinion that, man always give importance to his family and children, over the interest of nation, hence, he gave greater importance to communism of wives.

Plato's communism of wives was based on certain principles which are mentioned below:

- 1 The scheme also for the sake of guardian class only, like that of communism of property, and majority of artisan and present class were excluded from it.
2. Communism of wives sure to control the thoughts of selfishness and free the women from the labour of home which allow them to work for the cause of state.
3. There was no system of lasting wedding between the guardian class and women were shared for all men.
- 4 All the guardian have to live both men and women were to live together and share barracks

5 It was the obligation of state to organize a brief mating between best men and best women for one year to yield best children to increase the population of the state.

6 After the birth of children all of them must be separated from their mothers, no child must know their parents and the duty of rearing lies upon the state nurses. State, to provide the best education to them to nurse them as best citizens.

7 The entire guardian class was transformed into big family and children born in a specific season must be treated as brothers and sisters.

8 The weak and disfigured children must be killed as soon as they born so that their birth should not be burden on the state

9 He showed dissimilarity in communism of wives, he said that, guardian people to reject the property, but in the case of wives he said that, women were given the common ownership to the guardians.

1.9.4 Common Reasons on Wives:

The reasons to have common wives were, he wanted to create unity in the state, and Plato thought that family was the main reason for the blockade of any development in the state. He wanted family at public level and abolish family at private level.

2 Plato was quite worried by the unacceptable plight of women in Athens wanted that, the talent of the women should be utilized for the benefit of the society. He thought that women has same talents like men.

3 He was of the opinion that the temporary marriages by the state would produce better intelligent race among the newborns. He also asserted that, “the improvement of race demands a more controlled and more selective types of union”.

1.9.5 Criticism:

His concept of communism of wives was criticised severely even Aristotle criticised, his criticism as follows:

1 He treated state as a bloated version of family, he stated the organic concept and did not find any variance between family and state. In reality there is big difference between these two and they are not identical.

2 Communism of wives inevitable to lead social disagreement and causes much damage to the society, distributing one female is not wife for all guardians.

3 Children cannot grow into balanced way because they will not get care and nourishment which is required in a family. In fact nobody can take the responsibility of the children, something for all, not the responsibility of none.

4 It is ridiculous to apply similarity of animals to humans and asked the state to measured reproducing.

5 The suggested reproduction or mating is not practical and it is not possible to bring mating of best women with best men.

6 one can observe that, communism of wives applicable to guardian class only and most of the other sections of people not covered. It stresses too many sacrifices by the guardian community.

7 He incorrectly treated the marriage process as mechanical one, marriage is a social process than mechanical, and it needs clear understanding of wife and husband in the act of marriage which can be lacking in this case.

1.10 Comparison of Plato's Communism with Modern Communism:

It is required to realize the significance of present communism to that of Plato's communism. Modern communism illustrated by Karl Marx and improved by Stalin and Lenin which is grounded on the theory of class struggle. It measured state as device of mistreatment and holds that the class struggle will conclude in the takeover of the present capitalist system establishment of totalitarianism of grassroots.

1.10.1 Resemblances:

There are several similarities between present and Plato's communism.

- 1 In both, they wanted to develop society on the basis of social service and dislike differences based on birth or wealth.
- 2 In both, they wanted to eradicate the resistances present and differences in the society by brining unanimity and solidarity.
- 3 In both, society made of several classes, whereas Marx trusts in two classes like haves and have-nots.
- 4 Both opposed the holding of private property, but in modern community this applies to all classes of the society.
- 5 Both gave great importance to the education controlled by state.

1.10.2 Dissimilarities:

In spite of the similarities there are major variances in them. It is because of the different circumstances under which the two communisms developed. Plato's communism is mainly based on the conditions prevailed in 4th century B.C in Athens and the modern communism is based on the post-industrial revolutions mainly the exploitation of capitalists on working class.

- 1 Plato's communism can be applied to the guardian class only and modern communism based on vast majority of the workers and peasant class.
- 2 Plato's communism is mainly based on political nature and targets at unity of the state, whereas modern communism aims at economic and political power for the working classes.
- 3 Plato's communism do not want to influence any change in the present economic structure and leaves classes intact, but in the modern communism it influences the change in the economic structure of the society.
- 4 Plato's communism gives priority to the guardian class to own the private property, but in modern communism it gives the fruits to be enjoyed by the whole society.
- 5 Plato's communism mainly, aims at Greek city-states but modern communism focuses at the national states and throughout the world and for the sake of workers.

1.11 Origin and Nature of State:

In the Republic, Plato has written ‘A state arises out of the needs of mankind; no one is self-sufficient all of us have many wants. As we have many wants, need helper for that purpose and another helper for another, when these partners or helpers are joined together in one habitation, this habitation is termed a state. In the beginning the state, was brought for the satisfaction of human wants, food, shelter and clothing. In every state it is a must to have a farmer, a builder, a weaver and a cobbler. These men do not have same capacities, hence, one man could able to do what he capable off is. This means, there is a division of labour and specialization. In the course of time the population has increased and consequently the needs of human as well. There is need for additional land to feed surplus mouths and to protect additional land (territory) need for extra army. The main job of soldiers is war and they are selected from among men who have spirit in them and they must be like watch dogs, they must have good physical strength, speed and sharp sightedness in them. Then the governance would be the prime responsibility of philosopher kings.

1.12 The Ideal or Just State:

Its clear that the state is the highest means and with the help of state highest good can be done. There may be some states which are not ruled by reason; but they deny rather than fulfill the individual. The main condition of the ideal state is that it must be run properly. In fact the proper leadership can come when a person have knowledge and wisdom. The person having knowledge may be less but, such person’s rule will be the best.

The Philosophers do not rule the ideal state, it should be defended by those who have courage. The courage should not remain uninstructed because it will be like a wild beast or of a slave. The training in gymnastics and music must be given the soldiers. The hostile wars will never be the part of ideal state, rather, it pursue a policy of soothing in relation to other states, and it also limit the population.

The ideal state cannot maintain itself if it, not properly fed and needs not catered. The needs of the state mainly rest on the shoulders of commercial, industrial and agricultural population to meet the task of feeding and fulfilling the material needs. The agricultural people will retain private property; they will have private mates and families. But trade and industry will be controlled by guardians to prevent excessive individual wealth or property. The communalism of the guardians is not applicable to them. Plato firmly believes that economic man is unfit to rule a state.

The perfect or an ideal state consist of a state in which each unit would be doing the work to which its nature and aptitude best adopted it, there would be no interference by any class or individual but everyone cooperates to produce an efficient and harmonious state. That is justice-performing one’s own duties and not being abuses body.

1.12.1 Philosopher King:

Plato divided human mind into three elements such as Reason, Spirit and Appetite. He gave position of pride to elements of reason in mind and organization of the state. He understood that “virtue is knowledge” and these two must work together like hand in glove. Plato asserted that, state could be correct by wise people if they get proper training to rule the nation. He said that, “Until philosophers are kings, or kings and princes of the world have the spirit and the power of philosophy, cities will never rest from their evils”. He was not impressed with the Athenian exercise in which rulers would be designated by the draw of lot. Plato’s opinion was that, if anyone want to become a carpenter he needs some training in that

area, and to become ruler simple draw of lot could be sufficient. He asserted that only knowledgeable and capable people must rule the state.

1.12.2 Plato's Rule of Philosophy and Features:

1 Plato did not in support democratic structure of government, in which everyone has the right to join in the activities of the state, he criticized it as a government of ill-informed. He desired to give full power to the philosopher king in his ideal state and was in support of government by the elite. He said that all the people do not have the similar powers to produce virtue so every one cannot participate in government activities, only few people have the capacity to run the government.

2 Philosopher king must have love for wisdom and love seeker for truth, so that he can determine what must be best suited for the state and society.

3 His philosopher ruler get strenuous training for 35 years to get better administrative capacity to rule

4 The philosopher rulers allocated absolute powers by him and they were not responsible to public opinion

5 He said that, even though they were given absolute powers, he enacts limit on their power by holding that they must respect fundamental articles of constitution and should not change them.

1.12.3 Criticism:

His concept of philosopher ruler has been criticised and they are here under:

1 By giving absolute powers to the philosopher king which lead to dictatorial government and runs concepts of democratic government

2 Only few people are capable of running the government who undergone the system of Plato's education.

3 According to him 'knowledge is privilege', he observed that, the group of people are not capable of ruling themselves, only those who have more wisdom than the philosopher is certainly superior to the philosopher king.

4. He rejected laws his laws, on the basis of state had been convicted, he realizes his mistake and accept position of pride to laws in his later book The Laws.

5. His concept of philosopher king runs against the principles of democracy

6 The system of education guided for his philosopher rulers was very faulty in nature

7 His assertion of no contradiction between the interest of philosopher ruler and public interest was also unsafe.

8 He said that, "if philosophers were needed as permanent rulers, there would be no need for the educational system to produce new one".

Though, criticized of his concept but no one can denied and it was the most intensely made original concept in the political thought.

Depending upon the Ideal state two questions will crop up in the mind of modern student, 1) Whether the ideal state as consider by Plato would guarantee liberty to the individuals or not? 2) Second question, whether the society in this state would be based on the principles of equalitarianism – Let's try to answer these questions.

1.13 Ideal State and Liberty:

Plato thought that, liberty of an individual could be possible, if he subordinated himself to an organic whole i.e., the state. He thought that, liberty does not lie in the capability of a person to do as he likes, but in emerging one's special ability to do such functions of best fitted. The political philosophy of Plato, liberty does not find appearance in elaborate list of rights, but it expressed in an unending series of right actions in accordance with virtue- the supreme virtue that is justice.

1.14 Ideal State and Equality:

Plato was known for the fact that, any two persons could not be equal in respect of physical or intellectual or moral qualities, hence, he proposed two principles for his ideal state; 1) 'The right man in right place' and 2) 'The best man in the highest place'. This does not mean to say that he pleaded for 'the privileged man in privileged place', only a plea for legitimizing the tyranny of many over few.

The principle of equality starts from demand for justice, but it establishes the most unjust inequalities as it subjects quality to sheer quality. But this does not meant that Plato opposed to all forms of equality. He did appealed for equality within the classes not vis-à-vis them. The philosophers were the governing choice, soldiers their auxiliaries (helpers). The governing elite possesses knowledge of what good and virtuous. It is obvious that, this class, in a better place to rule, because its members know what is just. Non-elite group have no objection to submit before the rulers, this submission may out to freedom and equality.

1.15 The Statesman:

Plato considered as idealist than realist, in Republic, it did not exhibit the actual philosophy of Plato but it expressed the evolution of his philosophy. During his last period he wrote Politics or Statesman in which, we observe maturity in his philosophy, the theory in these books was contrary to Republic. In Statesman he abandon the ideals and tries to project realities. The ideal can only be seen in heavens and not possible in reality on earth, hence, he concentrated on the issues which are practicable on earth. A significant change can be noticed in his philosophies towards democracy and laws. He destined democracy and favoured the idea of giving responsibility to the philosopher king in his Republic, but where as in Statesman, he gave preference to democracy based on laws. Another important factor discernable in Politics or Statesman though he thinks that, the rule of philosopher king, better than rule of law, he recognized the need of law and agreement in political life.

Plato also pronounced the problem of constitution he made the alteration of law abiding state and law-less state, he divided into three categories, law abiding states, healthy and can be recognized well and gave them due importance, on the other hand law-less states have no respect for the laws. Therefore, he says if one man rules according to law it is Monarchy; but if he contempt law it is Autocracy or Tyranny. If some of people run the government in accordance with law it is Aristocracy but if they violate the law it is Oligarchy. If a large number of people rule according to law it is good democracy, but if they violate the laws it is bad democracy this can be best explained in the form of following chart

Number of persons exercise power	Law abiding State	Lawless State
One	Monarchy	Tyranny
Few	Aristocracy	Oligarchy
Many	Good Democracy	Bad Democracy

According to Plato law- abiding state, better than a lawless state, the good democracy which is law-abiding must be graded superior to Oligarchy which is lawless. Among the lawless forms bad democracy is ranked superior to Oligarchy. In short, it reads democracy as the worst of the law abiding but the best of the lawless states.

1.16 The Laws:

The Laws, was the pinnacle of the expansion of Plato's political thoughts, he wrote this book in the later years of his life and shows his maturity and judgment which was missing in his republic. It was noticed that, his thoughts were practically implemented and his ideas were left an impact on later generations to come in his second book Laws. Barkers rates the last four books of his laws "among the finest writings of Plato". Prof. Sabine said that it was very difficult to overstate the importance of laws.

1.16.1 Differences of Republic and Laws:

There are ultimate differences in the approach in Republic and The Laws, it was important to note that, Plato wrote Republic when he was so young and had high ambitions and when he wrote, The Laws, he was matured and had different thoughts which impressed because of his soberness and maturity of his judgment.

1 In Republic, he rest on for everything on the ideal of the philosopher king and said that, he only knows about what was required for man and state. During the later stage Plato was disappointed with his concept of philosopher king and restored to Law the place which it occupied in the Greek city state.

2 In the Republic he projected himself as a radical doctrinaire, who wanted to bring radical changes in the society. Where as in Laws, he comes to realize the value of aged persons with experience and restores law to a significant position, which shows the collective experience of the community.

3 Plato in the Republic opined that, communism of property and wives for the sake of guardian class only, he thought that, the mixture of economic and political powers could be great risk to the community. His opinion in the Laws was changed and allowed private property and family, though he pleads they must be retained to limited extent.

4 In Republic, he subordinates self-control to justice, he said that, justice is virtue and self-control. In the Laws, Plato appealed for the subordination of justice to self -control.

5 In Republic, Plato visualizes a monarchical or despotic rule of the philosopher king. In the Laws, he clearly stated the prominence of democratic values in the state.

6 Plato adored in Republic, about war and force and said that, state should try to get what they can by force. In Laws, he asserted that state must try to leave in peace with others and try to understand its aims and objectives through peaceful approaches.

7 Regarding the education, in Republic, he said that it was an instrument for teaching the philosophers the virtue of wisdom, in his Laws, he said that education aims at teaching the citizens the virtue of self-control, education is compulsory for all citizens for both men and women. Women were imparted education on equal terms with men.

8 In Republic he did not see any battle between the interests of individual and the state, whereas in Laws, he opined that, there can be occasions when the interests of the individuals and state may clash.

9 Plato gave significant position to the philosopher king and completely ignores the value of various classes in the society. Whereas in the Laws, he understood that, better to develop harmonious relations among various classes rather than subordinate them.

10 Plato did not give any place to the constitution in Republic, but in Laws, he stressed the need of the constitution which could check the actions of the state and extremists tendencies.

1.16.2 Philosophy Explained in the Laws by Plato:

Plato wrote Laws at a mature age of 80 and his ideas were represented age long experiences and maturity. He abolished his idealistic philosophy and came very near to the realities of life, in Republic, he was quite incapable of realizing in actual practice he tried to depict the second best ideal state in the Laws, it was not like his ideal state of Republic.

1.16.3 Views on Political Aspects:

The state combines the monarchical aspects of wisdom with the democratic aspects of liberty or freedom. He suggests that, the Laws are important because they make the person to develop self-sufficient and control for the social life. Plato also envisages the existence of Popular Assembly consists of all citizens of the city state, he divides them into four types on the basis of their property. It is essential for the electorate to undergo military training and hold arms. The important act of the popular assembly, to elect 37 Guardians of Law and 360 members of the council, the council members elected on the basis of classes, whereas, Guardians of Law elected on the basis of the triple ballot. In addition to the election of the Guardians of Law and councilor expected to do some other functions. The people between the ages of 50 to 70, to be taken for the Guardians of Law, they hold office for the term of 20 years.

Regarding the judicial organisation, proposes three types of courts such as voluntary courts or boards of arbitration courts, tribal courts and courts of selective judges. The voluntary courts consists of neighbours or friends, supposed to have best information about the dispute. The tribal courts consists of judges, elected by lots, so that all can have a role in judicial administration. The courts of selected judges, elected from, among the Magistrates or Guardians of law for one year period. In addition to the political structure he envisages different institution called as nocturnal council, it consist of 10 eldest members of the 37 guardians of law.

1.16.4 Views on Social Structure:

Citizens, divided into four classes on the basis of the amount of personal property. The first class consists of persons whose property is equal to the value of their land. The second class consist of the persons whose personal property is more than their land values but does not exceed twice the value of their land. The third class consists of whose personal property is three times the value of their land. The fourth class consists of whose property is four time

more than the land value. Plato authorizes the citizens to hold their land and confines the amount of personal property. They cannot keep gold and silver nor can lend money on interest. Plato announced new type of division of labour, not like in Republic where he classified into three classes based on psychological aspects, the fourth division of labour, valid to all people. Agriculture only for the slaves, trade and industry to class of aliens' political activities to all citizens. Plato's acknowledges that, the communism of wives though a quite arrogant ideal, difficult to reach and permits the family. He stressed the need to have family and those with more than 35 years bachelors must be prosecuted. He gave the equal position to women in the society and to have uniformity in education.

1.16.5 Views on Education:

Education, given a prominent position by Plato in his Laws, though his objective changes. In republic it aimed at improvement of virtue of wisdom but in Laws he says about the citizen self –control. He expressed that, education system must be with mature persons only, they must be elected from the Guardians of Law by an electoral system, it is the duty of chief magistrate to organize gymnastics in education. He should take the responsibility of private schools and paid teacher staff for primary and secondary education. He stressed the need of universal and compulsory education for both men and women and, not in favour of co-education after the age of six. The education scheme consists of two stages such as primary and secondary education. The primary education starts from cradle to age ten, children up to the age of three must dance with some music, children from three to six must play games, the physical education starts from the age six and from then they must be separated. The secondary education starts from age ten to sixteen, children must be taught literature, music, astronomy, geometry and arithmetic. He emphasized the military training which was most important for the Defense system of the state.

It is clear that, above statements the second best state of Plato is more realistic, though the aspects of idealism dominantly present here also. Infact it is the Laws, rather than Republic which has an impression on political thought in coming years.

1.17 Plato's Critique of Democracy:

Plato's critique of democracy is rooted in his broader philosophical concerns regarding justice, governance, and the nature of human knowledge. His arguments are primarily articulated in The Republic and further supplemented in The Laws. Plato, deeply disillusioned by the political turmoil of Athens and the execution of his mentor Socrates under democratic rule, questioned the competence of ordinary citizens in governing the state. He believed that democracy, while appealing in its ideals of equality and freedom, was fundamentally flawed because it entrusted political power to the unwise majority rather than to the knowledgeable few.

1.17.1. The Rule of the Ignorant Majority

Plato argued that democracy grants political authority indiscriminately, without consideration of wisdom, education, or virtue. He compared democratic governance to the operation of a ship: if unskilled sailors were allowed to steer the vessel, chaos would inevitably ensue. Similarly, when untrained citizens, driven by personal desires rather than rational deliberation, direct state affairs, governance degenerates into disorder. For Plato, true political authority should be entrusted to those who possess knowledge of the "Form of the Good"—philosopher-kings—who alone are capable of discerning what is genuinely just and beneficial for society.

1.17.2. Excessive Freedom and Its Consequences

Plato criticized democracy for its excessive emphasis on freedom, which, he argued, often leads to lawlessness and moral decay. In his view, when individuals prioritize personal liberty above collective order, they begin to reject all forms of authority and discipline. This unrestrained freedom results in social fragmentation and undermines the cohesion necessary for a stable polity. Plato warned that such conditions pave the way for demagogues—charismatic leaders who manipulate public opinion for personal gain—ultimately leading to tyranny.

1.17.3. The Psychological Basis of Democratic Decline

Plato also provided a psychological explanation for the inherent instability of democracy. He associated each form of government with a corresponding type of individual. The democratic individual, according to Plato, is characterized by unregulated desires and a pursuit of pleasure without restraint. This disposition reflects a lack of philosophical self-control and undermines the virtues required for responsible citizenship. Consequently, democratic societies become vulnerable to internal conflicts and are predisposed to transition into tyranny, as citizens seek a strong leader to restore order amidst growing chaos.

1.17.4. Epistemological Concerns

Plato's epistemological critique is central to his rejection of democracy. He asserted that governance requires specialized knowledge, analogous to medicine or navigation, where expertise is indispensable. In contrast, democracy operates on the assumption that all citizens are equally capable of political judgment, an assumption Plato regarded as dangerously false. For him, the majority's decisions are often guided by opinion (*doxa*) rather than true knowledge (*episteme*), leading to misguided policies and unstable governance.

1.17.5. Democracy as a Precursor to Tyranny

Plato identified a cyclical degeneration of political systems, in which democracy inevitably precedes tyranny. The unrestrained pursuit of freedom under democratic regimes fosters social disorder, inviting authoritarian figures who promise to restore stability. Such leaders exploit popular discontent and gradually consolidate power, transforming democratic freedoms into instruments of oppression. This dynamic, Plato argued, demonstrates democracy's inherent self-destructive tendencies.

Plato's critique of democracy is both philosophical and practical, grounded in his concerns about human nature, epistemology, and political order. While his preference for rule by philosopher-kings reflects an elitist vision, his analysis remains significant for its insights into the vulnerabilities of democratic governance. His warnings about demagoguery, the dangers of uninformed citizenry, and the tension between freedom and order continue to resonate in contemporary debates on democracy's strengths and weaknesses. Ultimately, Plato's arguments challenge us to reconsider the relationship between knowledge, virtue, and political authority in sustaining a just society.

1.18 Conclusion:

The political thought of Plato has the deep impact of Greek ancient times. He was a philosopher and contributed in many fields. He wrote Republic and mentioned about the ideal state and how it should work for the cause of society. He wrote this book at the early stage of life and he himself observed some mistakes in his philosophy of state about the philosophical King, on property, communism of wives, education, concept of justices and he was criticised

by many philosophers one among them was his student Aristotle. In the subsequent years he found the mistakes in his book Republic and at the mature age of eighty and he wrote this book with his past experiences to judge his previous mistakes. He rectified all the flaws founded in Republic particularly about his ideal state, the role of king, role of citizens towards the state, types of education required for the people, types of classes on the division of labour, three types of courts for the people to settle the issues, communism on wives and property, how much private property to be owned and how much they can have, how the children grow etc., how to run, and the structure of political system, social structure. Though there are some mistake but he rectified them in the Laws, and his idea of ideal state can be found in Laws, which is more realistic and his political thoughts definitely will have an impact on the generation to come.

1.19 Model Questions:

1. Describe about the sources of Plato's political thought?
2. What is republic or concerning justice? Write Plato's views on concept of justice and write a critical note on Plato's concept of Justice?
3. Write about the ideal or just state proposed by Plato?
4. Write on Plato's Critique against Democracy?

1.20 References:

1. D.C. Chaturvedi, Political Thought, Meenakshi Prakasham, New Delhi, 1981.
2. Johns Dryzek and others, Political Theory, Oxford University Press, 2008.
3. C.L. Wayper, Political Thought, B.I. Publications, New Delhi, 1979.
4. R.G. Mulgan, Aristotle's Political Theory, Clarendon Press, Oxford, 1977.
5. William Ebenstein, Modern Political thought, IBH publishing Co, 1970.
6. David Boucher & Paul Kelly, Political Thinkers, Oxford University Press, 2009.

Dr. C. Vinod Kumar
Lesson Writer

LESSON-02

ARISTOTLE-THEORY OF THE STATE, CONSTITUTION, CITIZENSHIP, JUSTICE, VIRTUE

2.0 Objectives:

1. Student would be able to know about the life of Aristotle.
2. Student would learn Aristotle's political concepts.
3. Student would understand Aristotle's Theory of states and Revolutions
4. Student would understand Aristotle's Constitution, Citizenship, Justice, Virtue

Structure:

- 2.0 Objectives
- 2.1 Introduction
- 2.2 Early Life
- 2.3 Works of Aristotle
- 2.4 Influences on Aristotle
- 2.5 Theory of State
- 2.6 Aristotle's Views on State
- 2.7 Functions of State
- 2.8 Views of Aristotle on Slavery
- 2.9 Criticism on Aristotle's Views- Slavery
- 2.10 Views on Citizenship
- 2.11 Criticism on Aristotle's Views- Citizenship
- 2.12 Aristotle's Views on Property
- 2.13 Types or Kinds of Property
- 2.14 Views on Justice
- 2.15 classification of constitution
 - 2.15.1 Principles for Classification of Constitutions
 - 2.15.2 Criticism on Classification of Constitution
- 2.16 Ideal State of Aristotle
 - 2.16.1 Features of Ideal State
- 2.17 The Best Attainable/Practicable State or Polity
 - 2.17.1 Justification of Polity by Aristotle
- 2.18 Revolutions
- 2.19 What is Revolution?
 - 2.19.0 Causes of Revolution
 - 2.19.1 General Causes of Revolution
 - 2.19.2 Particular Cause of Revolution
 - 2.19.3 Revolution in a Particular Kind of State
 - 2.19.4 Oligarchic and Democratic Elements
 - 2.19.5 Prevention of Revolution
 - 2.19.6 General Means of Prevention

- 2.19.7 Particular Methods for Prevention of Revolution
- 2.20 Aristotle and the Concept of Constitution
 - 2.20.1 Definition of Constitution
 - 2.20.2 Classification of Constitutions
 - 2.20.3 Polity as the Ideal Constitution
 - 2.20.4 Relevance of Aristotle's Constitutional Theory
- 2.21 Aristotle and Citizenship
- 2.22 Aristotle and Justice:
 - 2.22 1. The Nature of Justice
 - 2.22. 2. Types of Justice
 - 2.22. 3. Justice and Law
 - 2.22.4. Justice in the Context of the Polis
 - 2.22.5. Relevance and Critique
- 2.23 Aristotle and Virtue
- 2.24 Conclusion
- 2.25 Model Questions
- 2.26 References

2.1 Introduction:

“The Politics of Aristotle is the richest treasure that has come down to us from antiquity, it is the greatest contribution to the field of political science that we possess”. - Zeller.

Aristotle was one of the prominent political thinker of Greek ancient time, he was the student of Plato and considered as the gem of political thought because the political thoughts mainly based on his prime ideas only. He contributed in several fields of sciences as well. He was the father of the Political Science.

2.2 Early Life:

Every political philosopher is the ‘epitome of his time’. Aristotle the gifted student of Plato, was born at Stagira in the Aegean Sea in 384 B.C. thus he was not an Athenian by birth. His father was a physician who worked for king of Macedon. This gave him an opportunity to know about procedures of the Royal Court, his understanding of the state. Since his childhood he developed an analytical and scientific set of mind. The most usually accepted view is that Aristotle came to Athens at the age of eighteen and joined Plato's academy. Where he stayed for twenty years till the death of Plato in 347 B.C.

After the death of Plato, Aristotle left Athens and spent almost thirteen years visiting different parts of the world and studying in different political institutions. In 342 B.C. he was called to Macedonia and become tutor of young Alexander. In 335 B.C. Aristotle setup a school known as Lyceum, to preach his ideas, thought and philosophies. After the death of Alexander he fled to Chalcis and died the same year.

2.3 Works of Aristotle:

Aristotle wrote on the subjects like metaphysics, psychology, rhetoric, poetry, biology, moral science and politics etc., some of the early writings has been perished. The only important work which has with us and provides valuable information about his political philosophy is 'politics', this work also not available in complete form. According to Prof. Bowels "of all the books on the subject the politics is the most influential and most profound. It is the book which must be mastered before others".

2.4 Influences on Aristotle:

It is very much significant to know several factors which influenced his thinking.

1. In the first place Aristotle was significantly influenced by his father, his biological outlook and scientific method to the problem.
2. The dominant anarchy in Athens also greatly influenced the thought of Aristotle. He persuaded that anarchy, lawlessness and unsettled state of affairs was due to the fact that rulers were dreamer rather than realists.
3. Aristotle's thinking was also influenced by his pre-conceived idea about the dominance of Greek philosophy.
4. His personal experience of a married life, which proved quite pleasant, also influenced his thinking.
5. His practical knowledge greatly influenced his thinking and philosophy.
6. Finally, Aristotle felt –deep impact of his teacher Plato.

2.5 Theory of State:

Aristotle started the 'politics' with two important ideas. 1) That the state is a community and 2) that is the highest of all communities, which in his own word, "embrace all the rest, aims at good in a greater degree than any other and at the highest good". The first thesis, quite understandable, because his 'politics' was a city-state having small area and population, and in which the individual unable to think of any other presence for himself except as one being a part of a collectivity.

He was not the first thinker to view such an idea. But he was the first to define it properly, he laid the foundation of organic concept of a state. He imagined the state as 'natural' in two ways; first, he briefly delimits the evolution of social institutions from the family, through the village to city –state. Accordingly, to him the survival of state was due to the union of those people who cannot exist alone, but live together such as male and female. They must unite together to give their species out of this relation family earnings.

Second, the state is natural, because social life is natural to man and the state represents the highest development of social life, though it is natural it is not autonomous of human desecration. He has observed the state not only from the historical angle, but he describes it as natural in the logical and philosophical aspects. It is natural because in it the family and the society can develop themselves to the fullest possible degree. The aim of human life is, the enjoyment of good life means of freedom and is possible only in a state. The state does not exist only to protect the life and property of the individual, in the same way it cannot be said, just for exchange of goods does not, if exist for the hindrance of crime alone. It occurs to meet all these purposes without any doubt, but it does not exist for them

only. It exist to make individual self- sufficient. It is clear that Aristotle's state is a positive one. A state not concerned with the good of the individual is not a genuine state.

2.6 Aristotle's Views on State:

Aristotle also rejected the view of Sophists like Plato.

1. Aristotle opined that, state developed from the family to satisfy the needs and desires of the people.
2. The individual can attain self-sufficient only in the state.
3. Aristotle assorted that true nature of man could be realized only in the state, since the man is a rational being, the state is rational institution.
4. Aristotle emphasized the organic nature of state and assert that a man finds his true meaning and importance of his life only in and through relation to the state. Aristotle held that the state is a natural community; an organism with all attributes of a living being.
5. Aristotle considers state as a supreme association because it is the highest of all associations. He considers the state as an association of man for the sake of best moral life.

2.7 Functions of State:

1. The main objective of the state is to promote perfect and self –sufficing life, by which Aristotle meant a happy and honorable life.
2. For this purpose he wanted the state to create essential conditions for mental moral and physical development of the people.
3. He did not want to limit the functions of state to more protection of rights of members or preservation of life and property of the members.
4. He allocated the state with most positive function of promoting the good.
5. Should give proper education to the members for proper performance of their duties.
6. State should train young brains in the way of righteousness and make the life of citizens supreme and moral.
7. He considered the state like a mother to its citizens and its actions could lawfully extend to all concerns of the individual. He consider state as a supreme association whose chief function is to make man moral.

2.8 Views of Aristotle on Slavery:

Aristotle is in favour of slavery, he thought that it is very important for the faultless functioning of the family, Aristotle asserted that, slave is a living possession and property of his master. Though they have the power to understand, they have to follow his master, because, they have very less capabilities and must bow to those who have more abilities. It is acceptable to Aristotle, slavery on three important factors such as, natural, usefulness and expediency. He does not accepted the views of radical, Sophists and said that, slavery is dissimilar to nature because, nature has created everyone as equal. He says that, all men does not skilful by nature with similar capabilities and nature awards different abilities to different persons and orders that superior must rule over the inferior person. He took slavery as a general rule and inferior must be ruled by superior person only. He said that, in the state those, who have more reason has to expertise and direct those who have little ability and those who commands are by nature masters and later as slaves. He asserts that, to lead a good life by the household, is not possible without slave.

2 He account for slavery on the grounds of usefulness, he said that, it is necessary to have slaves by the masters so that they can be free from the physical worries and they can work for the betterment of public in the society. He believes that, it is useful to be slaves because they can share the qualities of his master and can be raised, the association with their masters brings “derivative excellence”.

3 He explains, the slavery on the grounds of usefulness, the slavery played an important role in the maintenance and operation of the Greek economy. Majority of population residing in the city-state, their liberation would disappointed the balance of power in the city-state, this would give social complaint.

4 It is observed that, he did not suggest unqualified explanation of slavery and permitted in certain conditions. First, he preferred the enslavement of those who are mentally not sound, but he never preferred the enslavement of war prisoners. Second, stressed that their masters must treat them properly, if they have not done so, then state has the right to punish such master who are harsh with slaves. Third, he opined that, those who displays good behavior and improve ability for reasoning must be liberated from slavery.

2.9 Criticism on Aristotle’s Views- Slavery:

His view on slavery has gone through severe criticism and they have shown the following flaws on his views:

1 His is of the opinion that, some of them are born to rule with the intelligence and knowledge they possess which is very wrong. The modern view says that, all are born equally but some possess and improve knowledge to rule on others.

2 Aristotle’s idea, if admit, that the superior ruler rule over inferior by the nature’s order is not correct because there are many classes in the society which are superior to other. He believes only in two classes of master and slave.

3 His theory of slavery is mainly based on the fact that, he thinks the Greeks are superior and non-Greeks are inferior, and he did not accept the enslavement of them.

4 He thinks that slavery is a hereditary process and believes that, some are by nature slaves.

5 His theory of slavery shows contradictions, he says that, man is good by nature and attains excellence in the society, on the other hand he did not shown the way for their development, of the slavery society which is very significant in number, hence, and theologically his explanation is not right.

6 He thinks the slave as living creature, who is unable to put on reasons, if the same concept is applied to the modern day context of industrial workers, who works hard did not show any initiative would be treated as slaves.

7 His slavery theory is opposing the concept of social justice, he considers that, slavery is necessary for the masters to perform their duties in good manner, but he did not mention any support or reward for their services to masters, it is a clear abuse, in the view of social justice.

Even though he met severe criticism from the modern political philosophers, it cannot be judged the condition during the times of Greeks and slavery is required by that point of time to give stability to city-state.

2.10 On Citizenship:

Regarding the views on citizenship he, was basically, traditional thinker and wanted to conserve the present institution of citizenship. In the ancient Athens, the citizens were honored class people who held the public offices in the state. Citizenship was based on the heredity such as sons of the citizen can become the citizens. The majority of slaves and resident aliens were not given this privilege and were treated as inferior to citizens.

He defines a citizen as a person who participates in the administration of justice and in legislation as a member of the deliberative assembly, these being the two essential functions of sovereignty. In other words, a person holds office as judge enjoying membership of the popular assembly is a citizen. Along with these two conditions he claims there are other conditions like, residence, enjoyment and legal rights of suing and being sued, and ancestry from citizen. Person without any of these two qualities cannot be a citizen. Person who has to occupy himself in handwork labour to provide his requirements of life, cannot make a good citizen, and only who dynamically share in the government of the state are citizens. He omitted the slaves, the resident aliens who engaged in trade and business, foreigners, mechanics and labourers from the group of citizenship. He did not include the old people and children in the list of citizenship because the former are physically weak and later are do not have skills of mature judgment in the dealing of the state.

2.11 Criticism on Aristotle's Views- Citizenship:

His views on citizenship are severely criticized by the modern thinkers:

1 He gave priority to the people who can hold the citizenship are from aristocrat class and did not include classes like, children, women, old men and manual workers.

2 He believes that, only those who possessed the property can become citizens and can acts as legislators or jurors, which gives rise to the class people's government and majority people are neglected.

3 He does great discriminations to the non-leisured classes by not giving political rights and rights for education and pushed them in everlasting degradation.

4 He denied the citizenship to the majority class and promoted the feeling of lack of direct involvement in any activities which is not effective process in the development of state affairs. It also leads to affects the unity and harmony of the state and society.

5 His explanation of citizenship is different from that of modern times. Presently all the adults except some who are disqualified, are treated as citizens whether they work with hand or brain.

6 His concept of citizenship is not matched with the modern explanation. He stressed the direct involvement of the citizen in legislative and judicial activities. This may be possible in his times because the number of citizens were very little. In modern time it is not possible because the population of the states are very high in numbers and they cannot involve in all activities of state.

7 His concept of citizenship cannot fit in the modern day democracy, in which citizens are unable to take part in state's affairs directly.

8 In his theory he exempted the majority classes such as, commerce, trade, and people from other economic hunts. It is against the states belief where individual considered as part of state.

9 His concept of citizen boosts rule by class and disregard the welfare of the majority.

Lastly, he was criticised for his conservative thoughts because his concept of citizen tries to save the state of affairs prevailing in contemporary Athens.

2.12 Aristotle's Views on Property:

Aristotle's Views are quite different from that of Plato's views. He has drawn his views on property while he criticizing Plato's views. Plato stated that it is not good for the unity of state and restricted it from the guardian class. Whereas, Aristotle reflects property as necessary for the normal functions of household and social growth. He explains the possession of property as follows:

1 Aristotle says that, "The institution of property is good for the individual and for the society. It gives individual encouragement to work and donate to the social growth".

2 Having property, is basis of self-respect, pleasure and self-love. It can be used for the improvement of the society.

3 The qualities like generosity, liberality, hospitality and righteousness can be encouraged by the property, which plays an important role in the human personality.

4 The usefulness of property has well-known due to its presence for long time and survived different disturbances in human history.

5 Owning of the private property, supports in the improvement of virtues such as skills of management and vigilance and would be useful in the management of state affairs.

6 The owning of private property creates the sense of civic duty, and he will take interest in the state affairs, money raised from taxes can be used correctly for the benefit of community. He would make sure for the protection of his own property, and the people who do not have property would spent much money of the state.

7 It is the natural character of man to have property, any effort to abolish the property shall result in disharmony.

Aristotle suggests very good explanation about the owning of property, he also asserted the holding and using property which determines the healthy or un-healthy results of the property. There are three methods to hold and use of the private property like, a. some people may own but its produce must be used by the community b. the use of property and common ownership c. common ownership but private use of property.

2.13 Types or Kinds of Property:

Aristotle differentiated property into two groups 1. Animate and 2. Inanimate. He referred slave as animate device, the other property as inanimate device. Whatsoever be the kind of property, it is healthy if it helps person in leading good and healthy life. He did not favour the disproportionate amount of property, he asserted that acquire sufficient wealth to lead good life.

He also asserted about the two different methods of wealth 1. Natural and 2. Unnatural wealth. The natural methods are cattle rising, agriculture and hunting which helps in obtaining required maintenance, unnatural method are procurement of property include trade, tenancy of life but endless growth of wealth.

His views on property are very important, he justified for the holding private property and also stressed that, endless amount of wealth is bad for the society. But his views on property are not up to date. No one can deny that his views on private property are on the basis of complete philosophical and logical. The justification given by him in this regard 2000 years back and still it hold good even today.

2.14 Views on Justice:

Aristotle gave very good importance to the concept of justice like other Greek philosophers. He gave two types of references to justice 1. Complete justice and 2. Particular justice, the first one concerns with the moral virtue, with guideline of public and social relations. This suggests, completes submission to law and is likely in an ideal state. Particular justice, related with the distribution of offices and observance of rules of proportionate equality, it point towards distribution of wealth, honour and goods.

He further divided particular justice into two groups such as, 1.Distributive justice and 2. Corrective justice. The distribution justice, gives importance to the proportionate allocation of office depending upon the value of individual with political honours. It is most powerful device for the prevention of revolution because it gives assurance of what he needs and keeps him satisfied.

The corrective justice related with negative in character and concerns about the commercial transaction, it is expected to restore back every person what he has lost due to social injustice and stops on each -others rights.

His concept of justice has many defects, he claims that, virtuous must rule because he can contribute most to the welfare of the state.

Secondly, there is an evident contradiction in the views of Aristotle, he appeals that, cultivation of virtue is the standards for the distribution of office, at the same time he claims that, masses must not be ignored.

Thirdly, his concept of justice, related to particular and distributive justice, are not accepted by modern thinkers. It is difficult to understand how these offices can be distributed among all citizens.

Finally, we can say that Plato's views on justice, well enough even today whereas Aristotle's views are not favoured by the modern thinkers.

2.15 CLASSIFICATION OF CONSTITUTION:

Aristotle considers the character of the state, determined by the constitution, or the 'polity', and change in the constitution, to the change in the state. He considers constitution is an important factor which determines the character of the state. He defined constitution as, arrangement of magistracies of the state, especially of the highest office, Aristotle emphasized that state changes its identity when the constitution changes. According to him no constitution in the world is either absolutely good or bad but it is only comparatively good or bad.

2.15.1 Principles for Classification of Constitutions:

His classification, based on two principles like quantitative and qualitative. Quantitative means, takes into account the number of people in whom the sovereign power

conferred whether it be one, few or many. The second one, qualitative, means takes into account the end which a government serves. If the government serves for the common interest of the people it is pure form of government. On the other hand if the government serves the private and selfish interests of the ruling class it becomes a corrupt or perverted government. There are three pure forms of governments like Monarchy (one person) Aristocracy (few persons) and Polity (many persons) in which power rests. These three pure forms of government have three perverted forms like Monarchy – Tyranny; Aristocracy – Oligarchy and Polity- Democracy.

According to Aristotle, the polity is the best and the most feasible form of government because it controls a healthy combination of liberty and wealth. He says that, no form of government or constitution is permanent or eternal and the different forms of government keep on changing.

2.15.2 Criticism on Classification of Constitution:

Aristotle's classification of state has been steamrolled by the following criticism.

1. His classification is not valid to the present times as it does not cover a number of governments which are in present form of presence, like limited monarchies, totalitarian government, parliamentary government, federalism etc.
2. He considers democracy as a degenerate form of government in which government is run by many poor people, it is difficult to admit this concept because majority of people in a given society may be prosperous. In modern times democracy makes no reference to the qualification of poverty of people and it based on the principle of equality.
3. Aristotle considers democracy as degenerate or perverted form of government, but in present times we consider it as the best form of government in which the individual gets maximum opportunity to develop his personality.
4. Aristotle mainly offers classification of governments and not states, in this regard he is guilty of confusing the two terms like government and state during his times the distinction between these two was not present.
5. It is said that the classification, not based on any scientific principles. It is quantitative rather than qualitative. The distinction between Aristocracy and Polity is mainly based on numbers.

In conclusion it can be said that his classification of states has met with severe condemnation at the hands of modern scholars and his ideas are not fully acceptable, but it cannot be denied that his classification has proved most lasting. Most of the political thinkers followed the basis adopted by him. Present day thinkers attempted merely improve on Aristotle's classification rather than a new classifications.

2.16 Ideal State of Aristotle:

His political thought, is a mixture of the elements of political ideals and political actualities. His books II, III, VIII of politics deal with political ideas whereas books IV, V and VI deals with political actualities. In the description of his ideal state, Aristotle clearly felt the impact of Plato's laws rather than his Republic. Sabine says that what Aristotle calls the ideal state is always Plato's second best state. Before dealing the ideal state of Aristotle, it may be noted that, he not an absolutist like Plato. For example, if a community has a single outstanding person with predominant virtue – Monarchy shall be an ideal government. If it possesses a few men of virtue –Aristocracy is best suited government. If it possesses many people have the ability to rule the best government is Polity. If we look at all these

observation of Aristotle, we conclude that he rules out Monarchy as an ideal state because in it the 'god among men' cannot be subjected to law.

2.16.1 Features of Ideal State:

His view about ideal state is present in the books III, VII and VIII of his books, and they are not present in a systematic manner. The features of ideal state are as follows.

1. His ideal state is the small city-state consists of small and intimate group of citizens, whose social life overlaps the interest of family, or religion and of friendly personal inter –course.
2. In his ideal state, law occupies predominant position. He does not favour the personal and despotic rule even the most virtuous person, who has wisdom of community.
3. The Ideal state of Aristotle is an ethical institution, which aims to bring about moral improvement amongst the citizens. He opined that, state can provide individual to achieve the highest type of moral development. Ideal state according to him provides a good and happy life, which he meant a virtuous and a moral life.
4. In the ideal state of Aristotle, education played an important role in making citizens virtuous. He insisted compulsory state regulated education to inculcate good habits of moral and intellectual aspects this scheme of education was only meant for citizens only.
5. The ideal state of Aristotle, the right to private property was considered, he thought that, it was a natural institution must be preserved. He appealed for the equal distribution of land to all the citizens. He permitted ownership of personal property and its value should not be more than four times of the value of original land.
6. Another important feature of Aristotle was division of labour in Ideal state. He assigned agriculture to the slaves' commerce and trade to resident aliens and political functions to citizen. The leisured class would actively participate in the exercise of sovereignty.
7. His Ideal state was neither too small nor too big. He did not mention any maximum or minimum number of citizens to constitute an ideal state. He insisted that the population should be manageable.
8. In regard to territorial size in Ideal state he insisted that it must be such that to make possible for the people to live free and leisure life. It must have enough economic resources to meet the needs of population. He wanted territory should be small so that it can be watched carefully.
9. Ideal state must be self –sufficient, it should concentrate on fullest development.
10. The ideal state of Aristotle was dominated by middle class, this class alone can provide stability to the state because they have two qualities of obedience and command.
11. Ideal state must have good access to sea, so that it can import he also told that the state should not be so close to sea that its defense poses a problem.
12. Ideal state should have temperate climate, congenial to both mental and physical activities.
13. The citizens of Ideal state must have combination of spirit and courage with intellectual keenness.
14. Ideal state must have six classes like agriculturists, artisans a war- like class, leisured class, priests and administrators. He did not consider the first two classes' agriculturist and artisans as citizens, hence, he did not have any share in administration of the state. The last four classes considered as citizens and enjoy the exclusive prerogative to exercise all political power.

2.17 The Best Attainable/Practicable State or Polity:

Though, Aristotle devised an Ideal state he realized that it is not attainable and provided details about how should be practicable ideal state. Aristotle used the word 'polity' in two different senses 1) General and 2) Particular. In the general sense he used for constitution whether it may be Monarchy, Aristocracy, Oligarchy or Democracy. He used it for the fusion of the democratic and oligarchy elements, by avoiding extremes. In democracy on the other hand, poor dominated the affairs of state. The offices were distributed on the basis of lot and every one would have a chance to rule and be ruled in turn. The real problem with democracy was how to base the government on popular support and give intelligent administration. He said that such a middle class dominated the state as polity.

2.17.1 Justification of Polity by Aristotle:

"..in all the states there are two or three elements; one class is very rich another very poor and third very mean it was admitted that moderation and the mean are the best, and therefore, it will clearly be best to possess the gift of fortune in moderation; for in that condition of life men were most ready to listen to reason".

The following implications of Aristotle's thought can be highlighted.

1. Excessive richness give arrogance and disobedience of authority because the rich do not know how to be ruled.
2. Extreme poverty would lead to subsection of the people completely, because poor people do not know how to rule.
3. The middle class people who were neither rich nor poor knew how to rule and be ruled in turn.
4. The best practicable/attainable state, with more middle class people. Larger number than the rich and poor or larger than either class when taken separately.
5. In middle class dominated society, greater chances of stable government and less chances of revolutionary activities.
6. The policy avoids the oligarchical defect or irresponsibility of the rulers and unintelligent poor selected on the basis of lot. In polity middle class provides a popular touch to the government and avoids the evils of mob rule.

2.18 Revolutions:

The theory of revolutions by Aristotle, was a discussion on politically in stabled state. He not only discussed the causes and occasions of revolution, he gave remedies to all the internal ills of the society. His theory of revolution was part of his theory on government and constitution, as it was related to lawlessness and over turning the existing constitution of a state. His discussion on revolutions essentially scientific, he tried to study the reality, though he did not like to justify the imperfections of status quo. He had suggested the rulers, the various methods to be adopted to save the imperfect status quo. It did not mean that Aristotle was a champion of those imperfections.

2.19 What is Revolution?

Aristotle opined that, a revolution did not purely an inference of armed conflict among the citizens of a state, unless, it reversed the constitution of a state and replaced with another principle of particular justice in the place of existing one. Revolution means a complete change in the spirit of a state's constitution, and it involves new method of

administration and a new principle of distributary office. A constitution which contains with in itself a particular economic order, a social order, an administrative order and a judicial order. Therefore, revolution means either a reversal of these orders or radical change in them. If such change brought about we call it a complete revolution.

But there are revolutions which are incomplete and partial. Such a revolution takes place when there is a change in the personnel of the holders of political power, though the basic principles under lying the socio- political order remain unaltered. If the change has been brought about without any armed encounter, it is called bloodless revolution, failing which it is called armed or bloody revolution.

2.19.0 Causes of Revolution:

The causes of revolution mentioned by Aristotle, as follows:

2.19.1 General Causes of Revolution

According to Aristotle one of the major general cause of revolution was the natural desire of people to be treated equal. They always against the privileges and superior position of the few and want to do away with the existing system. The some of the general causes like, absence of balanced equality, no fair deal, and lack of justice splits the city into factions. There can be no fellow feeling where one section influenced that their rights suppressed and felt justice not been done to them, then, every possibility of revolution. Aristotle proclaimed that more the equality more the stability. He considered that state with more middle class people shall be less inequality, hence very little chances of revolution.

2.19.2 Particular Cause of Revolution

Aristotle had a great vision into the basic causes of revolution, during analyzing the general causes of revolution. Aristotle had numbered following particular causes.

1. There was demand with those in authority for social, political and economic equality, while those who were in power want to get more privileges, which would bound to result in revolution.
2. Grant of unnecessary importance to some people, which result in enlistment of public opinion would lead to serious threat to the unity and solidarity of the state.
3. Power approved to one or few people, would bound to be signified by those who were deprived of power. This would lead to tyranny of few against vast majority and ultimately resulted way for revolution.
4. Misuse of authority by those in power and attitude of defame and disgrace. People adopted towards the opponents were resented and likely to promote the spirit of evolution.
5. Unbalanced increase of any part like territorial, social, economic or otherwise of the state.
6. An effort on the part of those guilty of doing wrong deeds to cover their actions, create displeasure and dislike among the people when misdeeds exposed. The bitterness finds in revolt to over throw these people.
7. Careless admission of corrupt and unfaithful officers to civil and military parts can generate revolution.
8. The use of dishonest methods in elections for capture of power leaves bitter taste and people bound to react at earliest available opportunity for the fraud played on them.
9. The rivalry among the members of several races living in a state leads to irreconcilable interests and bound to have serious consequences.
10. Excessive and irrational use of forces to dangerous in so far as people may tolerate it for some time but ultimately they bound to rise against authority.

11. Dynamic clashes also pave the way for revolution.
12. The neglect of minor changes can sometimes leads to revolution.
13. Free flow of immigrants can also lead to revolution because this bring nation in contact with those persons who have different system of justice and code of law ultimately end up in revolution.
14. The conquest of one nation by another nation also contains seeds of revolution.

2.19.3 Revolution in a Particular Kind of State:

Aristotle also discusses the causes of revolution in particular of state like democracies, oligarchies, aristocracies and polities. According to him in Democracies revolutions, caused because of excessive use of power and unwarranted condemnation of rich by the demagogues.

In oligarchies revolutions take place either due to rivalry and dissensions among ruling oligarchies or due to oppressive and dictatorial nature of their use.

In Aristocracy the revolutions spearheaded by those who denied honours which are conferred only on the few.

In polity the revolution caused because of defective balance of the different elements in the constitution, revolutions in polity are due to mal-admixture of the oligarchic and democratic elements.

2.19.4 Oligarchic and Democratic Elements:

Revolts in monarchy and Tyranny are caused by two factors like hatred and dislike in the minds of people due to oppressive behavior of the rulers; personal insult caused by rulers on some notable persons; or influence of the foreign state of opposite character.

2.19.5 Prevention of Revolution:

Aristotle not only mentioned the causes for revolution. But also outlines the measures that can help in preventing revolution. The study of measures shows his knowledge of the existing constitution and desire for stable government. He suggested two methods for checking revolution 1) General 2) Particular. The following are his suggested measures.

2.19.6 General Means of Prevention:

1. A serious effort must be made to gain the confidence of all the sections of society by eliminating injustice and treating all classes with consideration. All the officers must be open to all on the basis of merit and not treated as monopolies.
2. Cultivate and maintain spirit of law abidingness among the citizens. Violation of law should be treated seriously.
3. Citizens must have necessary education in the spirit of constitution to know how the constitution works, if they knew they would adjust according to the constitution and little possibility of revolution.
4. Even the unimportant probabilities in the status quo must be seriously observed and attended to, because their neglect can result in complete revolution.
5. No person or class of persons must be allowed to assume too much of power. This likely to encourage him to neglect the interest of weaker sections.
6. The government offices should not be permitted to become sources of gain. Efforts must be made to check bribery and other illegal methods.

7. Public officers should not be granted on permanent basis and higher offices should be awarded for short duration, because retention of power for long time can prove dangerous and security of the country, less important offices for reasonably longer periods.
8. Regarding the promotions to political posts must be gradual because quick and sudden promotions likely to lead to resentment.
9. Important positions (posts) should not be given to outsiders and strangers because they cannot feel much concerned about the welfare of the state as native.
10. Efforts should be made to keep the spirit of patriotism alive among the citizens.
11. Inequalities of wealth and honours, drive men to rebellion, the rewards and offices should be distributed as widely as possible. Nobody should feel the honours and political offices are not meant for them and it can be attained only on merit.
12. The details of administration, particularly those of public finance should be open to public security. This gives lot of popularity to the government and gives a feeling that officials are not exploiting their position.

2.19.7 Particular Methods for Prevention of Revolution

Aristotle suggested to prevent particular methods for the prevention of revolution in different forms of Government. In democracy the rich should be made to feel that their property and estates shall not be redistributed. They must be allowed to participate in administration of the country.

In Aristocracy and Oligarchy the people must be treated with fairness and no single or group of persons should be permitted to become too powerful. Administration must be done by the poor people.

In Polity revolution can be prevented by the proper mixture (blend) of democratic and oligarchic elements.

Under the Tyranny the following methods must be followed to check the revolution.

1. By providing good espionage system which includes women spies.
2. By following policy of aggression and expansion
3. By creating a constant threat and danger from the powerful enemy among the masses
4. By developing intellectual life of the citizens.
5. By keeping people busy with non-political activities, hence, they may not find time to indulge in political activity.
6. By keeping people poor so that they constantly face economic problems.
7. By creating sense of hostility and distrust on various sections of the people. So that they would busy in mutual wrangles cannot think of revolving against ruler.
8. By participating in public worship and religious ceremonies of people by showing respect for their religious sentiments.
9. By enlisting as large social support as possibly
10. By earning reputation for military virtues.
11. By creating an awe in the minds of people by leading luxury life and glamour.
12. By showing favours personally but punishing through others.
13. By personally bestow favours on others to gain popularity.
14. By chopping off the heads of inconvenient powerful leaders.

In the above study of Aristotle shows his in-depth knowledge and insight into the human mind and offered the most penetrating analysis of the causes and methods for prevention of revolution.

2.20 Aristotle and the Concept of Constitution

Aristotle, one of the most influential philosophers of ancient Greece, made significant contributions to political theory and constitutional thought. His work, particularly in *Politics*, presents a systematic study of the state, governance, and the nature of constitutions. Aristotle viewed the constitution (*politeia*) as the framework that organizes the offices of the state and defines the distribution of political power. For him, the constitution was not merely a legal document but the embodiment of the political organization and moral character of a community.

2.20.1 Definition of Constitution

Aristotle defined the constitution as “the arrangement of magistracies in a state, especially the highest of all” (*Politics*, Book III). It represented both the legal and ethical order through which the state operates. He emphasized that the constitution reflects the soul of the state, as it determines who rules, how they rule, and for whose benefit the governance is carried out. Thus, the constitution served as the foundation of political life, linking the ethical purpose of human beings with the functioning of the state.

2.20.2 Classification of Constitutions

Aristotle classified constitutions into six forms, divided into two categories: pure (correct) and perverted (deviant) forms. The pure forms include Monarchy (rule by one for the common good), Aristocracy (rule by the few virtuous), and Polity (a mixed constitution governed by many for the common interest). The perverted forms include Tyranny (selfish rule by one), Oligarchy (rule by the wealthy few for their own advantage), and Democracy (rule by the many poor in their self-interest). For Aristotle, a constitution is just or correct if it seeks the welfare of all citizens, while it is perverted if it serves only the rulers.

2.20.3 Polity as the Ideal Constitution

Aristotle favored Polity as the best practicable constitution. He rejected extreme forms of democracy and oligarchy, instead advocating a mixed system that combined the virtues of both. Polity emphasized a middle class that could balance the extremes of wealth and poverty, ensuring stability and moderation in governance. This preference reflected Aristotle’s belief in the principle of the “golden mean,” wherein virtue lies in moderation.

2.20.4 Relevance of Aristotle’s Constitutional Theory

Aristotle’s constitutional theory remains relevant in modern political science. His emphasis on the rule of law, the ethical purpose of governance, and the importance of a balanced polity laid the foundation for later ideas of constitutionalism. Modern democracies embody his notion of governance aimed at the common good, with checks on power to prevent tyranny or oligarchic dominance. Furthermore, Aristotle’s focus on civic virtue and active citizenship continues to inform contemporary debates on participatory governance.

Aristotle’s study of constitutions represents a profound intersection of ethics, politics, and law. His definition and classification of constitutions provide a normative framework for understanding governance. By advocating for a polity rooted in moderation and the common good, Aristotle established enduring principles that continue to shape constitutional thought and democratic practice.

2.21 Aristotle and Citizenship

Aristotle's conception of citizenship is central to his political philosophy, primarily discussed in his seminal work, *Politics*. For Aristotle, citizenship is not merely a legal status but an active role that involves participation in the political and judicial functions of the state. He defines a citizen as "one who shares in the administration of justice and in offices" (Aristotle, *Politics*, Book III). This definition emphasizes that true citizenship is inseparable from engagement in the governance and collective decision-making of the polis (city-state).

Aristotle views the polis as a natural entity, arguing that human beings are inherently "political animals" whose fulfilment is achieved only within a political community. Citizenship, therefore, is both a privilege and a responsibility, grounded in virtue and reason. He rejects the notion of citizenship as a mere right conferred by birth or residence. Instead, he insists that citizenship entails active participation in the civic life of the community and requires the cultivation of moral and intellectual virtues necessary for governance.

Moreover, Aristotle distinguishes between good citizens and good persons. A good citizen fulfils the duties of citizenship by adhering to the constitution and laws of the state, while a good person lives according to universal moral virtues. Ideally, in a well-ordered state, these two coincide; however, Aristotle acknowledges that this harmony may not always be realized in imperfect political systems.

Aristotle also limits citizenship by excluding certain groups, such as slaves, women, and manual labourers, whom he considered incapable of participating in rational political deliberation. This exclusionary stance reflects the hierarchical nature of his society but also reveals the tension between his theoretical ideals and practical realities.

In essence, Aristotle's theory of citizenship underscores the interdependence of individual virtue and political participation. His model advocates for an engaged citizenry whose moral and intellectual development contributes to the stability and flourishing of the state. Despite its limitations, Aristotle's concept remains foundational in the discourse on political theory, influencing subsequent debates on civic responsibility, participatory democracy, and the ethical dimensions of political life.

2.22 Aristotle and Justice

Aristotle's conception of justice occupies a central position in his ethical and political philosophy, particularly in his seminal work *Nicomachean Ethics*. For Aristotle, justice is not merely a legal or institutional principle but a virtue deeply connected to the moral character of individuals and the harmonious functioning of society. He considers justice as the "complete virtue" because it encompasses the good of others as well as oneself, thereby linking individual morality with social order.

2.22 1. The Nature of Justice

Aristotle defines justice as a disposition that leads individuals to act rightly in relation to others. Unlike other virtues that pertain primarily to an individual's moral conduct, justice is inherently relational and social. He famously states, "Justice is the whole of virtue in relation to others," implying that it is the virtue most concerned with the common good. This perspective aligns justice with the ethical goal of eudaimonia (flourishing or well-being), suggesting that a just society is essential for the realization of individual and collective happiness.

2.22. 2. Types of Justice

Aristotle distinguishes between two main types of justice:

- **a. Distributive Justice:**

This form of justice is concerned with the equitable distribution of resources, honors, and wealth within a community. Aristotle argues that distribution should be based on merit and proportional equality, meaning that individuals should receive benefits in proportion to their contributions or status. This principle rejects strict equality and instead supports fairness grounded in relevant distinctions.

- **b. Corrective (or Rectificatory) Justice:**

Corrective justice applies in transactions or interactions between individuals, particularly in cases of wrongdoing, disputes, or unfair exchanges. Its primary aim is to restore balance by rectifying harm or loss through compensation or punishment. This form of justice is arithmetical, focusing on restoring equality between parties regardless of their social status or merit.

2.22. 3. Justice and Law

Aristotle closely connects justice to law, asserting that laws are the instruments through which justice is realized in a political community. However, he acknowledges that written laws cannot anticipate every circumstance. Thus, he introduces the concept of **equity** (*epieikeia*), which serves as a corrective to the rigidity of law by allowing for flexibility in cases where strict adherence would lead to unjust outcomes. Equity reflects the idea that true justice sometimes requires consideration beyond formal legalism.

2.22.4. Justice in the Context of the Polis

For Aristotle, justice is inseparable from his vision of the polis (city-state). He maintains that humans are inherently political beings, and justice provides the ethical foundation for civic life. A well-ordered political community must cultivate virtue in its citizens and establish laws that reflect a shared conception of the good. Thus, justice is both an individual virtue and a structural principle that ensures the stability and flourishing of the political community.

2.22.5. Relevance and Critique

Aristotle's theory of justice has been influential for centuries, shaping Western political thought and ethical discourse. However, it has also faced criticism, particularly for its acceptance of social hierarchies and exclusionary views regarding citizenship, women, and slaves. Despite these limitations, Aristotle's emphasis on proportional equality and the interplay between morality and law continues to resonate in contemporary debates on distributive justice, legal interpretation, and the role of virtue in politics.

Aristotle's treatment of justice presents a nuanced and enduring framework that bridges ethics, law, and politics. By framing justice as both a personal virtue and a societal imperative, he offers a vision of human flourishing grounded in fairness, reciprocity, and the common good. His insights remain foundational for understanding not only the nature of justice but also its indispensable role in sustaining a just and virtuous society.

2.23 Aristotle and Virtue

The study of Aristotle and virtue holds a significant place in the field of philosophy and ethics, as it provides a foundational framework for understanding moral character and the cultivation of a good life. Aristotle's virtue ethics, articulated most prominently in his work *Nicomachean Ethics*, emphasizes the development of personal character and moral excellence (*aretē*) as central to achieving *eudaimonia*—a state of human flourishing or well-

being. Unlike deontological or consequentialist ethical theories that focus primarily on rules or outcomes, Aristotle's virtue ethics underscores the importance of habitual practice, moral education, and the formation of virtuous dispositions that guide individuals toward ethical behavior.

Aristotle proposes that virtue lies in the "Golden Mean", the desirable balance between two extremes of excess and deficiency. For example, courage is the mean between recklessness and cowardice, and generosity lies between prodigality and stinginess. This approach highlights that virtue is not innate but cultivated through deliberate practice and rational choice, shaping individuals into morally responsible agents. Aristotle thus connects virtue directly with practical wisdom (phronesis), which enables individuals to discern appropriate actions in varying contexts, integrating intellectual and moral development.

From an academic perspective, studying Aristotle's concept of virtue is crucial for several reasons. First, it provides insights into the relationship between ethics and human nature, illustrating how moral behaviour is intertwined with rationality and purpose-driven living. Second, it bridges ancient philosophy with contemporary ethical discourse, influencing modern virtue ethics theories proposed by scholars like Alasdair MacIntyre and Rosalind Hursthouse. Furthermore, Aristotle's virtue ethics offers practical implications in fields such as leadership, education, and applied ethics, as it focuses on character formation, personal responsibility, and the pursuit of moral excellence in daily life.

Engaging with Aristotle's theory of virtue allows scholars and students to critically examine how moral character is developed and sustained in society. It also invites reflection on contemporary moral challenges, encouraging the application of ancient philosophical principles to modern contexts. Ultimately, an academic inquiry into Aristotle and virtue not only enriches the understanding of ethical philosophy but also fosters the cultivation of virtuous individuals who can contribute meaningfully to personal, social, and civic well-being.

3.24 Conclusion:

Aristotle was the student of Plato and the political thought of Aristotle has the deep impression, of Greek ancient times. He was a philosopher and contributed in many fields. He wrote many books on metaphysics, psychology, poetry, biology, moral science etc., He gave valuable information about his political philosophy is Politics, he was influenced by Plato, his views on state, and mentioned about the state developed from family to satisfy the needs and desires of the people. The self-sufficiency can be attained by individual only through state. He also asserted, how state must work for the cause of society and the functions of the state. He gave emphasis on the constitution and classified the constitutions as well. He talked about the slaves and justified his notion on three grounds like, natural, usefulness and expediency. He asserted that, slaves have less capability and he must obey the master because he has more knowledge than slave. He was criticised for notions on slavery. His views on citizenship had the impact of conservative look, he said that, only the person who involves in administration of justice and in legislation as the member of the deliberate assembly can be the citizen. He was criticized by modern political thinkers. He also explained his views on property and who must hold and the kind of private property. Aristotle also expressed his views on justice he gave much importance to justice he made the references of justice in types and he further divided particular justice into two more groups. Though there are some mistake, still it is more realistic and his political thoughts definitely will have an impact on the generation to come.

3.25 Model Questions:

1. Give a brief note on Aristotle's early life, his works and influences on him?
2. Describe about the following
 - a) Aristotle's views on state b) Functions and classification of constitutions c) Criticism on Aristotle's constitution classification d) Ideal state of Aristotle e) Best attainable or practicable state or polity.
3. Define revolution? What are the causes of revolution? What are the methods suggested by Aristotle to prevent revolution?
4. Write on Aristotle views on Constitution and Citizenship.
5. Write on Aristotle Views on Justice and Virtue.

3.26 References:

1. D.C. Chaturvedi, Political Thought, Meenakshi Prakasham, New Delhi, 1981.
2. John Dryzek and others, Political Theory, Oxford University Press, 2008.
3. C.L. Wayper, Political Thought, B.I. Publications, New Delhi, 1979.
4. R.G. Mulgan, Aristotle's Political Theory, Clarendon Press, Oxford, 1977.
5. William Ebenstein, Modern Political thought, IBH publishing Co, 1970.
6. David Boucher & Paul Kelly, Political Thinkers, Oxford University Press, 2009.

Dr. C. Vinod Kumar
Lesson Writer

LESSON-03**ST. AUGUSTINE - THE SELF, THE CITY OF GOD, CITY OF MAN****3.0 Objectives:**

1. Student would be able to know about Church fathers' political thought.
2. Student would be able to learn about St. Augustine's life and his ideas.
3. Student would be able to understand Church and State.
4. Student would be able to understand St. Augustine's concepts of the self, the city of God, The city of Man.

Structure:

- 3.0 Objectives
- 3.1 Introduction
- 3.2 Influences and Basis
- 3.3 Implication of the Christian Doctrines
- 3.4 Contribution of Church Fathers to Political Thought
- 3.5 Early Life and Influence of St. Augustine
- 3.6 Main Ideas of St. Augustine
 - 3.6.1 Political Ideas
 - 3.6.2 Philosophy of History
- 3.7 Views on the State
- 3.8 Views on Justice
- 3.9 Views on Peace
- 3.10 Views on War and Conquest
- 3.11 Views on Slavery
- 3.12 Views on Property
- 3.13 St. Augustine's Evaluation
- 3.14 St. Augustine and the Concept of the Self
 - 3.14.1 The Inner Self and Introspection
 - 3.14.2 The Self in Relation to God
 - 3.14.3 The Role of Memory and Consciousness
 - 3.14.4 The Restless Self
- 3.15 St. Augustine's City of God
- 3.16 St. Augustine's "City of Man"
 - 3.16.1 Contrasting Human Society with Divine Order
 - 3.16.2 Explaining the Nature of Earthly Power and Conflict
 - 3.16.3 Encouraging Spiritual Perspective Amid Political Crisis
 - 3.16.4 Integrating Christian Theology with Political Philosophy
- 3.17 Conclusion
- 3.18 Model Questions

3.19 References

3.1 Introduction:

“The belief that the empire of Rome was divinely founded and hence eternal was also careful and with the added Christian idea that the kingdom of Christ was to rule the whole world led to a spiritual conception of the world empire which was embodied in the organized Church and Papacy”. –GETTELL.

The advent of Christianity was a significant occurrence, because it left a deep impact on the Western politics as well as political philosophy. It added a number of new aspects to the political thought. Which were quite different and separate of those contributed by the ancient Greeks and Romans. The Christianity borrowed thoughts from the stoic philosophy, especially, the concept of universal brotherhood, it also gave a new concept that every individual has two –fold nature... body and soul. The interests of body are different from soul or spirit. For the fulfillment of his body needs pleasure of sense, worldly power and prosperity, for satisfaction soul he seek redemption from sin and salvation.

Thus, Christianity detached the realization of spiritual values beyond the jurisdiction of the state and there by liquefied the unity of social structure, which was the feature of the Greek-Roman culture.

3.2 Influences and Basis:

The Christian fathers of earlier times were, immensely influenced by the stoic as well as Roman philosophy. The principles of universal brotherhood; equality of man; subjection of law and government to universal justice etc., were taken from stoics. The idea of state of nature forward to the formation of civil government; the freedom and equality of all men; distinction between natural and civil laws etc., were borrowed from the Romans.

The Philosophy of early church fathers were before the Pharisees. A man is complete if his physical and spiritual improvement takes place. There are two separate organization to take care of physical and spiritual attention of individual. The state chiefly anxious with the physical aspects of man's life and nothing to do with his spiritual improvement. The expansion of spiritual faculty was the accountability of church. The Christian fathers highlighted that, it was the duty of an individual to be submissive to the state because it divinely intended and the ruler resulting his authority from God by execution obedience to ruler they render obedience to God. In case of struggle between loyalty to the state and the church, the church fathers appealed that the laws of church should be preferred over the laws of the state, because they were focused on the spiritual salvation of the individual and the spiritual salvation more preferred to physical salvation.

3.3 Implication of the Christian Doctrines:

The following points were laid down by the Christian doctrine.

1. Christian Doctrine disallowed the argument of Plato and Aristotle, because they said, individual finds fullest manifestation only in state, they detached spiritual life from political life. Church an independent organization and not sub-ordinate to the state. Other hand church fathers recommended the role of the state and overestimated that of the church.
2. They (Christian fathers) recognized the concept of law of nature and identified with the divine law which is unalterable.
3. They accepted the concept of equality but did not in favour of abolition of slavery, which according to them, only a physical and spiritual condition of man.

4. They gave a dynamic outlook and highlighting the eventual goal of human life is attainment of God.
5. The Christian fathers denied the contractual basis of the political obligation and emphasized that kingship is established by God for maintenance of justice.
6. They tried to revive the holiness of family life. Under the Roman life marriage measured as legal contract which can be dissolved at the will of the parties. On the other hand, they stressed marriage as ceremony which could not be dissolved. They gave the father full authority and control over the children.

3.4 Contribution of Church Fathers to Political Thought:

1. The Christian thinkers agreed the dissimilarity between the spiritual and the temporal interests and contributed to the growth of papacy.
2. Another important involvement of the Christianity, stress on spiritual element of life. They were the first to highlight the importance of salvation. The spiritual element was not existed in the Western political thought of earlier period.
3. The Christian fathers highlighted the importance of man and treated him as an end rather than means.
4. They stressed the principle of universal love and one world.
5. Finally, the creation of church a distinct organization of look after the spiritual interests, was one of the most important contribution of the Christianity.

3.5 Early Life and Influence of St. Augustine:

St. Augustine considered as the greatest father of Western Church, he was the son of a Pagan father and Christian Church. He lived between 354 and 430 A.D. The defeat of Roman Empire was attributed by the contemporary writers to the rise of Christianity. St. Augustine asserted that the ruin of Rome was the result of divine will and Christianity alone could save the world from the destruction. He stated great work of *De Civitate Dei*, (City of God) started in 413, and completed in 426, in which he developed great ideas. He devoted 10 books to defend Christianity and 12 books in the construction of God. They were 22 books in total (Treatise).

Augustine was greatly inclined by number of writers, which include Plato, Cicero, Stoics and Christianity. He borrowed ideas from those writers, and changed them according to his necessities. He borrowed the concept of justice from Plato, he did not confine it simply to secular field. He prolonged it to cover the relation between man and God. Similarly, he borrowed the concept of common wealth of world, Cicero altered it. Similarly, he borrowed the idea of universal brotherhood from Stoics, as well as that, the man is the citizen of two states viz. the city of his birth and the world at large. According to this he must obey the laws of the state as well as the universal laws. However, Augustine gave these concepts a Christian connotation.

3.6 Main Ideas of St. Augustine:

St. Augustine was not a political thinker and his philosophy revolves around three main ideas of cosmology, epistemology and ethics. In the first place he held that God is present in everything in varying degrees, and everything had varying degrees of goodness. He held that sources of knowledge did not lay outside but within. We will be able to regulate our life and achieve happiness or well-being was the universal desire of humanity. He believed in the principle of subordination to the lesser good to the greater good and pleaded

for subordination of the body to the spirit and spirit to God. He associated supreme good with universal good and proclaimed that the supreme good cannot be achieved if we work only for our private good. He therefore, appealed that we should “love each other as god loves us and this we can do if we derive the power of love from him, and not from lesser goods”.

3.6.1 Political Ideas

We can deduce the political ideas of Augustine from the above principal of his philosophy.

3.6.2 Philosophy of History

Augustine pronounced history, the unfolding of the divine will and accredited the rise and fall of the empires to a divine plan. He said that a continuous struggle was going on between the forces of horsy and truth in which the later was bold to triumph ultimately. Thus he rejected to accept the argument that the Pagan Gods were responsible for the fall of the Roman Empire. He asserted that the fall of Roman Empire was due to divine will.

Another feature of his philosophy of the history, belief in the doctrine of two cities. According to him, the individual, member of the earthly city (Kingdom of Satan) as well as divine city(Kingdom of God). The former look after the appetitive and greedy desires of the individual and it is temporary and perishable. The later indicates that, it is heavenly peace and spiritual salvation and is divine, permanent and imperishable. The history denoted the continuous struggle between these two cities which would lead to the demolition of the former because it is short-lived in nature and latter is on the account of virtue and permanent character. The earthly city is dominated by principle of self- love to the point where God is held in disapproval. For its devotees materials are important than the spirit. The heavenly city dominated by principles of the love of God for them spiritual things are highest important.

Prof. Sabine says that, Augustine’s concept of earthly city, or city of God cannot be identified with any existing human institutions. He did not associate the church with the kingdom of God or state with earthly city. But it cannot be denied that Augustine certainly condemned the authority of the secular state in comparison with the Church and introduced new feature in the political though by exalting the authority of church over the state.

3.7 Views on the State:

Augustine accepted that Christian Doctrine, that state as a divine institution created by God to remedy the human sins. He stressed that, authority of state must be respected because it maintains peace and protects property and other belongings of citizens. Obedience to the authority of state, also observed because it is based on divine sanctions and contributed to the remedy of sins of the people. Thus, he subordinated the state to the higher authority of the God and obedience to the laws and authority of state, justified as long as it did not conflict with the duty towards God’s. It is because that man obey the civil laws because they are sanctioned by God. He also said that Emperor must guard the church, he did not accord any authority over spiritual matters. On the other hand he said that citizens should not accept civil authority when it conflict with spiritual authority. He wanted both the state and church must work together with mutual understanding.

3.8 Views on Justice:

Augustine hold that justice can be possible only in the city of God and it could be possible in the Christian state. He articulated justice in spiritual sense and described it as “conformity to order and respect for duties arising from this order”. He allocated justice in a wider meaning than assigned by Plato. Augustine regarded the state as simply a part of the higher society (Kingdom of God) considered justice as domination to universal order as told by the will of God. Therefore, he resolved that Justice can be possible only in Christian state. In a Pagan State only relative justice could be possible. Augustine stated that, “If Justice is the characteristic of a society, no pagan people have the right to be called just society. Justice is that virtue which gives every man his due and thus where is the justice. St. Augustine asks, when a man desert true God and yields himself to impure demons”. For this reason the city of ungodly...”

3.9 Views on Peace:

Augustine hold that, peace is a fundamental virtue of a good state and can be attained in the city of God. To him peace has different notion, it does not mean the absence of war or social strife. But peace means positive relation of love which comprised all human beings. He considered that, peace provided by state is a temporary calmness and relative peace. He considers that, universal peace genuine and it could be achieved only if all acted in accordance with the universal order and common love to God. In which all men united with one another by their common love for God. It is different from the peace produced by a system of legal relations as in state.

3.10 Views on War and Conquest:

His views on peace, are the same and connected to the views on war and conquest. Augustine emphasized that war can be fought to protect the Christian social order and justified the use against pagans. According to them the group which have threat to the security of Christian society is unorthodox groups, they could encourage people with discreet reasoning and false interpretation. He justified that Christian state can wage wars to suppress the heretics and saving its loyal people. Augustine gave the classification between just and unjust war and he described the wars waged by Christian rulers against pagans as just wars, because they offer an opportunity to convert or include them into Christianity.

Augustine did not in favour of war to conquest territories he held that, the territories acquired by wars did not give happiness to the king or the conquered people. Conquest lead to fear, hatred and vicious slaughter are the causes for unhappiness, in the states based on conquests there can be no justice and which can lead to robberies in such states.

3.11 Views on Slavery:

Augustine also defended slavery like Aristotle. He did not consider slavery as a natural institution, and did not support it a realistic grounds. He treated slavery as punishment from God for his original sins. Another important fact about him, he never deprive the slave of the status of a human being and treats master and the slave as fellowmen who are boded each other by a bond of fraternity in the kingdom of Christ, even they are not equal in terms of human law. Hence, his advises the slaves to remains near their masters to seek purification because master is one, purer than slaves.

3.12 Views on Property:

Though, he did not consider private property as a natural institution but gesture justified it. He was against the excessive accrual of property and stressed that, one should not have more property than what was need to him for his legal and reasonable needs. He admitted that the some private property was needed for the proper performance of one's duties. He emphasized that rich people must distribute some of their property to the poor.

3.13 St. Augustine's Evaluation:

While evaluating his political ideas one should understand that he was not a political philosopher but he was a theologian. He presented his ideas which were borrowed from the early church fathers in the Christian tapestry. His writing suffered from number of destructions and discontinuations, there was so much vagueness and variability in his writings and his conclusions still subject to criticism. For example his theory Dualism is quite confusing, sometimes he express about two-cities. The city of God and city of Satan are purely abstract terms. This lead to confusion and inconsistency in his political philosophy. His justification of war, especially by Christians against pagans is very dangerous and it is the threat to the world peace. He was criticized more because he described the state as an adjunct of the church, because this left a clear handle for his successors to justify the absolution of the papacy.

In spite of the above shortcoming in his philosophy he wielded tremendous influence on contemporary thinks as well as thinkers of succeeding generations. According to Prof. Sabine "His philosophy was only in a slight degree systematic, but his mind had encompassed almost all the learning of ancient times and through him to a very large extent, it was transmitted to the middle ages. His writings were mines of ideas in which the later writers, catholic and protestant have dug".

His contributions to the later thought can be recounted as follows.

1. He was considered as the father of the Christian Commonwealth, which can be known as Holy Roman Empire, and Holy Roman Empire was built and taken from his Civitate Dei.
2. The basic concept of Augustine's thought was universalism which was the key note of medieval thought.
3. The subordination of the state of Church, which was live issue during the middle ages, which was indirect contribution of him. He did not develop the theory of ecclesiastics' domination in clear terms but he certainly implied it. If the civil authority over steps it sounds and interferes in religious matters, then individuals can restrict the state authority. Thus, he asserted that political authority was not absolute and Church authority, mightier than state. He also emphasized the importance of the Church.

In view of the above contributions of St. Augustine it can be said that he wielded greater influence on political thought of medieval Europe than any other Christian Writer before him St. Paul.

3.14 St. Augustine and the Concept of the Self

St. Augustine (354–430 CE), a prominent philosopher and theologian, developed one of the earliest systematic explorations of the "self" within a Christian framework. His understanding of the self was deeply rooted in his theological beliefs, particularly his interpretation of human nature, sin, and the relationship between humanity and God. Augustine's view of the self integrates philosophy and spirituality, emphasizing self-awareness, introspection, and divine dependence.

3.14. 1. The Inner Self and Introspection

For Augustine, true knowledge of the self is achieved through inward reflection. He argued that human beings must turn inward to examine their own consciousness and seek truth within their rational and spiritual capacities. This introspective method was influenced by Neoplatonism, which encouraged looking beyond the material world to discover immutable truths. Augustine maintained that self-knowledge is inseparable from the knowledge of God, asserting that the human mind is illuminated by divine truth.

3.14.2. The Self in Relation to God

Augustine believed that the self is fundamentally incomplete without God. He posited that human beings are created in the "image of God" (Imago Dei) and, therefore, their ultimate purpose is to unite with their Creator. According to Augustine, alienation from God through sin leads to a fractured self, characterized by disordered desires and moral weakness. Redemption and self-realization are possible only through divine grace, which restores the self to its proper orientation toward God.

3.14.3. The Role of Memory and Consciousness

Augustine also connected the self to memory and consciousness. In his *Confessions*, he described memory as a "vast palace" where experiences, knowledge, and emotions are stored, forming an essential part of identity. Through memory, individuals can reflect on their past and recognize the continuous narrative of the self, which, for Augustine, ultimately points toward God's presence in human life.

3.14.4. The Restless Self

One of Augustine's most famous assertions is that "our hearts are restless until they rest in You [God]." This statement captures his belief that the human self is in constant search for meaning and fulfilment, which can only be attained through divine love. Thus, self-knowledge and knowledge of God are deeply intertwined, and the journey of the self is both intellectual and spiritual.

3.15 St. Augustine's City of God

St. Augustine's *City of God* (De Civitate Dei), written between 413 and 426 CE, serves as a profound response to the theological, political, and cultural crises of Late Antiquity. Its academic purpose lies in defending Christianity against pagan critics who blamed the faith for the collapse of Rome, while simultaneously offering a systematic Christian philosophy of history, society, and ultimate human destiny.

Augustine distinguishes between two symbolic societies: the "City of Man," rooted in pride, self-love, and temporal power, and the "City of God," grounded in humility, divine grace, and eternal salvation. Through this contrast, he reframes historical events not as chaotic or purely human but as manifestations of divine providence guiding humanity toward a transcendent end. The work rejects the cyclical pagan view of history and introduces a linear, teleological understanding where history progresses toward God's ultimate plan.

Academically, *City of God* establishes foundational principles of Christian political theology, arguing that secular states, though necessary for order, remain subordinate to the divine order and lack the capacity to deliver ultimate happiness. Augustine critiques Greco-Roman philosophies—particularly Stoicism, Platonism, and civic paganism—highlighting their

moral insufficiency without divine grace. Furthermore, the text engages in ethical debates about justice, virtue, and the nature of the "ideal commonwealth," positioning God as the true source of justice rather than human institutions.

3.16 St. Augustine's "City of Man"

St. Augustine's concept of the "City of Man", as articulated in his seminal work *De Civitate Dei* (The City of God), serves as a critical framework for understanding human society in contrast to the divine order represented by the "City of God." The primary purpose of this concept is to illustrate the transient, flawed, and self-centered nature of earthly political and social structures while situating them within a broader theological and eschatological context.

3.16.4 Contrasting Human Society with Divine Order

Augustine developed the notion of the City of Man to distinguish between human political systems rooted in pride and self-love, and the divine community founded on humility and love of God. The City of Man symbolizes societies and institutions driven by temporal goals, power, and material interests. Its purpose is to underscore the moral and spiritual deficiencies inherent in worldly kingdoms, thereby emphasizing the need for divine redemption.

3.16.5 Explaining the Nature of Earthly Power and Conflict

The City of Man is characterized by its dependence on human ambition and its tendency toward division, violence, and domination. Augustine employed this concept to explain why earthly societies are marked by conflict, corruption, and instability. It serves as a theological critique of the Roman Empire and worldly governance more broadly, demonstrating that secular power, despite its achievements, remains imperfect and ultimately subordinate to divine authority.

3.16.3 Encouraging Spiritual Perspective Amid Political Crisis

Written during the decline of the Roman Empire, Augustine's theory provided comfort and perspective to Christians disillusioned by Rome's fall. The City of Man offered a lens through which believers could interpret political collapse not as a loss of divine Favor, but as evidence of the impermanence of earthly structures. Its purpose was thus pastoral and philosophical, guiding believers to reorient their ultimate loyalty toward the eternal City of God.

3.16.4 Integrating Christian Theology with Political Philosophy

By juxtaposing the City of Man with the City of God, Augustine bridged theology and political thought. His purpose was not to reject the legitimacy of earthly rule but to contextualize it within a higher spiritual order. He affirmed that while the City of Man has a role in maintaining temporal peace and order, its authority is limited and provisional compared to the eternal sovereignty of God.

3.17 Conclusion:

The emergence of Christianity played an important role in the western politics as well as on political thinking and included number of aspects into political thought and they were quite different and from those contributions during the time of ancient Greek and Roman

Philosophy. Christianity borrowed thoughts from stoic philosophy, specially the concept of universal brotherhood. St. Augustine was influenced by Plato, Cicero, Stoics. Christian thinkers contributed for the growth of papacy. He believed there are two cities like city of God and city of Satan. On state he asserted that, the state is divine institute created by God to remedy the human sins. On justice he said that, justice would be possible only in the city of God and could be only possible in Christian state. He regarded peace as a cardinal virtue of a good state and can be achieved in the city of God. On war and conquest, war can be fought to protect the Christian social order and justified its use on pagans. On slavery he said that, slavery is not a natural institution, he treated slavery as punishment from God for his original sins. On property, he never considered property as natural institution, and stressed that one should not have more property than what is need for him. He was criticized for his political thoughts, we must understand that he was not a political philosopher, but was theologian. His ideas were borrowed from church fathers in the Christian tapestry. Even though, it can be sad that, he left greater influence on political thought of medieval Europe than any other Christian writer.

St. Augustine's conception of the self bridges philosophy, theology, and psychology. His emphasis on introspection, memory, and divine dependence laid the groundwork for later philosophical inquiries into identity and consciousness. For Augustine, understanding the self is inseparable from understanding one's relationship with God, making his perspective both deeply personal and spiritually transformative.

In the broader intellectual tradition, City of God serves as a cornerstone for medieval Christian thought, influencing Scholasticism, natural law theory, and early modern political philosophy. Its dualistic vision of human society also shaped later discussions on church-state relations, eschatology, and the moral responsibilities of rulers. Thus, its academic purpose is not merely apologetic but transformative: it redefines historical interpretation, political authority, and human purpose in light of Christian theology, creating an enduring framework for the study of faith, reason, and civilization.

The purpose of Augustine's concept of the City of Man is fundamentally to redefine human history and politics in light of Christian theology. It exposes the inadequacy of earthly kingdoms when measured against divine standards, directs believers to prioritize their citizenship in the City of God, and provides a moral framework for navigating the imperfections of worldly society. Through this distinction, Augustine sought to offer both a critique of secular ambition and a vision of ultimate hope rooted in the divine order.

3.18 Model Questions:

1. Describe about the church fathers Political Thought.
2. Write about St. Augustine life, Contributions and his Ideas.
3. Write St. Augustine concept of the Self, City of God, City of Man.

3.19 References:

1. D.C. Chaturvedi, Political Thought, Meenakshi Prakasham, New Delhi, 1981.
2. John Dryzek and others, Political Theory, Oxford University Press, 2008.
3. C.L. Wayper, Political Thought, B.I. Publications, New Delhi, 1979.
4. R.G. Mulgan, Aristotle's Political Theory, Clarendon Press, Oxford, 1977.
5. William Ebenstein, Modern Political thought, IBH publishing Co, 1970.
6. David Boucher & Paul Kelly, Political Thinkers, Oxford University Press, 2009.

Dr. C. Vinod Kumar, Lesson Writer

LESSON-04**NICCOLO MACHIAVELLI - VIRTUE,
FORTUNE, REPUBLICANISM****4.0 Objectives:**

1. The students would know transition of political thought from Medieval to Modern thought.
2. Student would learn about Machiavelli and his modern political thoughts.
3. The students would know Machiavelli Virtue, Fortune, Republicanism

Structure:

- 4.0 Objectives
- 4.1 Introduction
- 4.2 His Early Life
- 4.3 Influences on Machiavelli
 - 4.3.1 Conditions in Italy
 - 4.3.2 Impact of Republic
 - 4.3.3 Emergence of Strong Monarchies
- 4.4 Method of Machiavelli
- 4.5 Machiavelli as a Modern Thinker
- 4.6 Political Ideas of Machiavelli
 - 4.6.1 Machiavelli on Human Nature
 - 4.6.2 His Views on Morality and Religion
 - 4.6.3 His Theory of State and Its Preservation
 - 4.3.4 Suggestions to the Prince for Retention of Power
- 4.4 Machiavelli's Political Thought
- 4.5 Shortcomings in Machiavelli
- 4.6 Niccolo Machiavelli and Virtue
- 4.7 Niccolo Machiavelli and the Concept of Fortune
- 4.8 Niccolo Machiavelli and the Theory of Republicanism
 - 4.8.1. Foundations of Machiavelli's Republicanism
 - 4.8.2. Liberty, Virtue, and Civic Participation
 - 4.8.3. Institutional Design and the Mixed Constitution
 - 4.8.4. The Relationship Between Republicanism and The Prince
 - 4.8.5. Machiavelli's Legacy in Republican Thought
- 4.9 Conclusion
- 4.10 Model Questions
- 4.11 References

4.1 Introduction:

Like the human life, political thought is also a constant procedure and it is tough to draw a line difference between the medieval and modern political thought. Most of the scholars pronounced that the political thought of middle ages is fairly not the same from modern thought. The middle age thought was theological, dogmatic, allegorical, universal and uncritical as equated to the modern that which consist of objective, rational, scientific, secular and national. The Medieval thought was not new but it was a constant procedure of the Hellenic and Roman ideas, to which new ideas of Germanic and Christian traditions were contributed.

Modern thought was the result of the Regeneration Movement of 14th and 15th century, in which humanistic principles and scientific viewpoint came to dominate the western political thought. There was an upsurge of literature in which more importance was given to study of relations between man and man, rather than man and God. This sort of studies rested the foundation for a new chapter in political thinking in 17th century. The world now witnesses the main components of modern political thought such as secularism, tolerance, emphasis on rights, individual happiness and liberty, popular sovereignty, representative government, contract, private property, international and peace etc., were not known to the ancient and medieval thoughts.

Most of these concepts initiated with ancient political thinkers, and were established by medieval thinkers and were further advanced by the modern political thinkers. The Regeneration and Reformation thinkers like Machiavelli, Luther, Clavin etc., gave protruding place to these concepts through their writings and contributed to change from medieval to the modern period. Niccolo Machiavelli was one of the best thinkers of this change. Machiavelli sets a new chapter in the improvement of political philosophy. He was more of a politician rather than political thinker /philosopher. His thoughts were principally determined by the historical background of his life.

4.2 His Early Life:

Niccolo Machiavelli was born in Florence, Italy, in 1469, in a modest means of family. His father was a jurist. He could not get proper education during his childhood, under the direction of his father he studied the Latin Classics, especially on Roman history. Then he joined the government of Florence as the Secretary of Chancery as he grew up. In this capacity he got an opportunity to deal the departments of war and interior. Diplomatic correspondence used to pass through him. He was put in jail on the charge of conspiracy, his failure to side with new rules with the change of power. He wrote master piece the prince in 1513, eight years later he wrote Discourses.

4.3 Influences on Machiavelli:

The factors which influenced the thinking and philosophy are hereunder:

4.3.1 Conditions in Italy:

During his time the Italian Peninsula was separated into a number of small independent states which fought wars continuously. They had dissimilar forms of governments; while some were republics, others were ruled by despotic rules. Some sort of consolidation of these states had been achieved by the beginning of 16th century still they were divided into five groups like 1) Kingdom of Naples, 2) Territory of Roman Catholic

Church 3) The Duchy of Milan, The Republic of Venice and 5) Republic of Florence. Distant from interior fights amongst these states there was a severe threat from France and Spain on the borders. Machiavelli wanted to unite these combatant states and make them self-sufficient and strong so that they could handle with them efficiently. He wrote a books like Art of War, The Discourses on Livy and the Prince, in this book he wrote the principles, which he wanted these states to follow so that they could flourish and thrive. He appealed to the strong ruler who could unite the country and oust foreign invaders. He practically observed papacy as a greatest difficulty in way of secular integration.

4.3.2 Impact of Republic:

The Renaissance Movement which was for the stimulation of ancient values and culture, had the effect on him, because it was sturdiest movement in Florence. The movement recharged the ancient and had been elapsed the medieval period but also created perception of life, a new prospect of life and freedom. Man become centre of all studies and God was related to background. This was the revolt against the authority of church, this made the gradual transfer of power from church to state.

4.3.3 Emergence of Strong Monarchies:

The arrival of strong monarchs who took the complete political power in their hands, which was with feudatories and corporations, was left an impression on him. He was significantly influenced by the writings of Aristotle and Marsiglio. He learnt the idea of separation of ethics from politics from Aristotle and also the idea of state as the highest organization of human, and also influenced by the division of Monarchy, Aristocracy and Democracy. He was influenced by Marsiglio, of secularism and political unity of religion are concerned. It was correctly said that he was the epitome of his times.

4.4 Method of Machiavelli:

The approaches assumed by him were positive and negative aspects in his thinking's, the positive side of thinking, he carry out the Aristotelian process from the particular to general. His technique was realistic method of observation followed by historical method. On contemporary politics he made an analytical study. On conclusion he took the help of history of authenticate them. The historical method practically suited him, because he was mainly student of practical not speculative politics. He was a experimenter, he had not used political philosophy. His writings were treatise on the art of government rather than the theory of state. The historical approaches he used a sort of peculiarity in theory. Historical method to politics comprises criticism of instances in history. Prof. Dunning pointed out that his historical method was more in appearance than reality. Thus it may be conclude that his method was inductive Sabine puts it, "His empiricism was based on commonsense practicality". From this Sabine had concluded, 'His method in so far as he had one, was observation guided by shrewdness and common sense'".

On the negative side, he totally rejected the theory of Divine law. In other words we can say that, he had no faith in the cardinal doctrine that man was able to predetermine to a supernatural end. Since there was supernatural end, there was no need for divine law. He also rejected the natural law as well.

4.5 Machiavelli as a Modern Thinker:

He was a modern thinker only in the sense that, he used certain new ideas which were symbolic of modern age. Some of them here under:

1. He rejected the Idea of natural law and created his entire thinking basically on the bad nature of human beings.
2. He completely rejected the fundamentals placed by medieval thinkers, he considered state, to provide security and peace to the people.
3. He underlined the secular character of the state and overlooked the principle of 'divine law' which was popular in medieval times.
4. He, for the first time, supported the idea of national territorial and state which was independent of pope.
5. Unlike medieval thinkers, he made use of inductive method along with historical method.
6. He did not give importance to ethical factors, instead he gave for material motives
7. The important factor which separates him from medieval thinkers that he separated ethics from politics.
8. His thinking of separating politics and morality also give a separate look when compared with medieval thinkers.
9. He essentially mentions to all those features of the state which were progressed during the next two or three centuries like state, a secular institution and church should be subordinate to it.

4.6 Political Ideas of Machiavelli:

He was not a methodical political thinker, he uttered separate views in his works. We can associate his ideas in a systematic manner and study them.

4.6.1 Machiavelli on Human Nature:

He conveyed his opinions on human nature in his 'Prince'. According to him human beings are very selfish, wicked, degenerate, Unscrupulous and opportunists. He says that man is not social but anti-social and tries to encourage his own interest every time. To endorse he can do whatever he wants. He says that men love their property than their kiths and kins, a person can readily pardon the murder of his father than the seizure of his patrimony. His description of human nature is wrong. Human beings all are not wicked. They are neither completely good nor completely bad. He said that, human beings cannot be reformed at all. Anti-social elements criminals can be mitigated.

4.6.2 His Views on Morality and Religion:

He varied from the earlier thinkers, he tried a formal and conscious separation between politics and morality. He observed politics and ethics as instituting one whole science. He made a thoughtful and complete separation between ethics and politics. He rejected the cultivation of virtues like humanity, submissiveness and disapproval for worldly things on which medieval thinkers laid so much stress and consider quest of well beings in the life as the sole objective. For attainment of these objectives he even allowed the use of immoral means like fraud, forgery, trickery, breach of faith, violence etc. by the prince. To achieve the unity of the country he was willing to through the principles of morality to the wind.

It is obvious that he suggested two dissimilar values of morality one for the ruler and other for the private citizens. The first is arbitrated by the success in keeping and increasing power. The second by the strength which his conduct imports to the social group. He openly condemned for open support of immorality in public life. However, it cannot be denied that his views on ethics and politics suffer from numerous shortcomings. His views have been acknowledged by most of the clear minded political thinkers in the successive centuries and they have understood that the individual and the state cannot be exposed to the same rules of morality. Lord Acton has said that, “the authentic interpretation of Machiavelli is the whole of later history. We find everybody using Machiavelli and still denouncing him”.

4.6.3 His Theory of State and Its Preservation:

Machiavelli well thought-out state as the highest connotation and all the subjects must submit to state. State be present to check the selfish interests of human beings and it is artificial creation. State estimated to create and promote materials of prosperity to the people. The prosperity of people specifies the success or failure of the state. According to him a successful state, originated by single man and laws which made by him replicates national character of state, he favored Monarchy and completely disliked Aristocracy.

He classified states into two types 1) Normal and 2) Perverted. According to him Normal State is the one in which citizens were faithful and law abiding. They are ready to safeguard their motherland because they have spirit of patriotism. In the perverted state above qualities would not be present. He said that normal state tendency to grow when compared to perverted state. Machiavelli laid down detailed rules and preservation to strengthening of state. They are as follows.

1. State must have a dependable army poised of native troops and should not depend on foreign acquisitive soldiers.
2. He considers Republican state as the best, but under the, then prevailing conditions he favored Monarchical State. He says “The only way to establish any kind of order there is to found a monarchical government; for these the body of people is so thoroughly corrupt that the laws are ineffective for curb, it becomes essential to establish some superior power which, with a royal hand and with full and absolute power, may put a curb upon the undue desire and corruption of the powerful”.
3. His state is completely secular in so far as he does not attribute any unearthly reason to its presence.
4. The state has a natural predisposition to expand or grow in power.
5. Law occupies a dominant position in the state. Though he observed force and fear as important aspects in administration, yet he also reflects the good laws as the foundation steps of the state.

4.3.4 Suggestions to the Prince for Retention of Power:

Machiavelli was not a political philosopher, but he was chiefly concerned with art of government. Thus, he made contributory references to the theory of state and at length with the principles which the prince should observe to maintain himself in power. They are as follows:

1. The prince should crush all opposition to his authority with an iron hand and should make use of aggressive force.
2. He holds that a thoughtful use of these devices can avoid the need of force. He wants the rulers to be both fox and lion.
3. The prince should try to take speedy and firm decisions because hesitation can prove harmful.

4. A good prince try to uphold peace in the country so that the people can lead a comfortable contended life.
5. He should maintain a well-trained regular national army of his own citizens and should not depend on mercenary soldiers.
6. Prince must be a good soldier commander, he must have thorough knowledge of war strategy.
7. Prince must try to uphold his popularity with the people and earn their love and affection.
8. Prince should try to nurture public spirit and patriotism among his citizens through education, religion and propaganda
9. Prince should be better feared than loved because people love a ruler as long as they receive or expect certain benefits.
10. The prince must maintain utmost secrecy in the conduct of State's affairs.
11. It is not important for prince to be honest always. The prince should not mind in violating his promises for the good of the state.
12. The prince should not touch the property and women of his subjects, because people are very touchy about these things.
13. Prince should be a good showman and project himself with qualities like generosity, kind heartedness, chivalry, mercy, sincerity, bravery and religiousness.
14. He should avoid the company of praises, because it effects his sense of judgment.
15. He should not have permanent friends or enemies.
16. The prince must collect information about strength of his enemy.

In addition to above, he made number of other suggestions for state craft. Machiavelli is the most universally reprobated figure in the history of political literature which are regularly followed in practice.

4.4 Machiavelli's Political Thought:

His main contributions to the history of political thought has left a deep influence on the political thinkers of following centuries.

1. He completely disallowed the feudal conception of a hierarchy autonomous entities and predicted a territorial, natural and sovereign state.
2. He deserves the credit for acquittal politics from the churches of ethics, before to him politics, under the churches. He said that there are two distinct standards of morality for the state and individual.
3. He was first thinker to definitely condemn the authority of the church and tried to reduce it a subordinate position to the Government.
4. He, for the first time offered materialist clarification of the origin of state, and collectively overlooked the metaphysical or supernatural elements. Though his views in this regard, not identical with Karl Marx but these views profound influence on Karl Marx.
5. He was the first exponent of the principle of 'power politics' and propounded the theory of aggrandizement which insisted that the statement either expand or perish.
6. His historical method was another important contribution to the history of political thought.
7. He was a great pragmatic thinker.
8. He attached great importance to study of human psychology and advised his rules to formulate his policies, keeping in view of people's wishes and sentiments.

In view, of his contributions to the political though much praise has been bestowed on Machiavelli.

4.5 Shortcomings in Machiavelli:

He is one of the misjudged political thinker, according to Sabine, “He has been represented as an utter cynic, an impassionate patriot, an ardent nationalist, a political Jesuit, convinced democrat and an unscrupulous seeker after the favour of deposits. In each of these views, incompatible as they are, there is probably an element of truth. What is emphatically not true is that no one of them gives a complete picture either of Machiavelli or his thoughts”. He has contributed many thoughts which are new, and consist of number of faults and is been under severe attack. Some of his contradictions and defects are here under:

1 There is contradiction about his hypothesis about the nature of human and reasons which monitor him as sketched in Prince and Discourses. He said in the Prince, man is selfish fundamentally and not able to do good unless appreciative to do so. Whereas in Discourses, he said that, men are neither absolutely bad nor faultlessly good, human character is more complex. If we think that man is selfish it is very difficult to clarify how he works with others to form a state. He also prefers the republic form of government because it can work successfully if the people ready to sacrifice their selfish ends for the upliftment of the society.

2 It is criticised because some of his ideas are shallow and unsuccessful to accumulate proper political concepts. He missed logical and philosophical aspects to his theory, Sabine said that, “he was perhaps too practical to be philosophically profound”. He is not considered as political thinker instead he considers as person with practical question of politics. His writings are mere diplomatic literatures.

3 The philosophy explained by him only just local narrowly dated, he is seen people behaving very crooked and thought that all human are bad. It is not good to analyze the whole human society on the basis of Italian grounds. Allen said about him that, “His judgment of human nature was surely, profoundly at fault. May it not be said that he lacked understanding of just what he most of all needed to know”.

4 The principle of “ends justify the means” has been criticised severely, one of the writer said that, “what is morally wrong can never be politically wright”. The crimes based on politics can lead to counter offences and more crimes are expected from it. His policy corrupted public opinion and encouraging dishonest political practices all over the world.

5 Machiavelli gave unnecessary status to the role of force in keeping people united. He did not estimate the importance of willing cooperation of the people forcing unity to work effectively in the state.

6 He has given more importance to the rulers or the law givers in molding the moral, religious and economic life of the people, the statement seems to be incorrect and he seems to be guilty reserving the “sane order of values” and useful order with casual efficiency. He says that law giver is the architect of the state and society, in fact the society comes first and other latter.

7 He is unable to recognize that prince as a human being may try to encourage his self-interest at the cost of public interest.

8 There has been contradiction between appreciation of monarchical government and his republican government. Sabine said that, “his judgment was swayed by two admirations for the resourceful despot and for the self-governing people which were not consistent. He patched the two together rather precariously”. If we accept Machiavelli’s statement, the only possibility is despotic monarchy and the republican government is ruled out, republican

government encourages public spirit among the citizens. It is not possible to do everything by the prince.

4.6 Niccolo Machiavelli and Virtue

Niccolo Machiavelli introduced a new way of understanding "virtue" in politics through his idea of Virtue. Unlike the traditional meaning of virtue, which was linked to morality, goodness, and ethics, Machiavelli's Virtue was about practical skills and qualities that help a leader gain and keep power.

In his famous work, *The Prince* (1513), Machiavelli described Virtue as the ability of a ruler to be smart, bold, and adaptable in dealing with challenges. For him, a successful leader must act according to the situation, even if it means using force, deception, or actions that might not be considered morally good. Virtue is not about being morally perfect; it is about being effective and strong enough to control events rather than being controlled by them.

Machiavelli also connected Virtue with fortuna (meaning fortune or luck). He argued that while luck can affect political events, a skilled leader with Virtue can control or overcome luck through wise decisions and quick action.

This idea was very different from earlier thinkers, such as Aristotle, who linked virtue to ethics and good character. Machiavelli's Virtue focused on results: a good ruler is one who keeps the state stable and powerful, even if that requires tough or unpopular choices.

Machiavelli's concept of Virtue changed the way people thought about politics. It showed that leadership is not just about being good or fair but also about being practical, determined, and willing to do what is necessary to succeed.

4.7 Niccolo Machiavelli and the Concept of Fortune

Niccolo Machiavelli's political thought is deeply intertwined with the notion of Fortune (Fortuna), a concept he employs to explain the unpredictable and contingent nature of human affairs. In his seminal work, *The Prince* (1513), Machiavelli conceptualizes Fortune as an external force that influences political success and failure, often beyond the control of individual agency. However, rather than resigning to fatalism, he advocates for an active and pragmatic engagement with Fortune, thereby integrating it into his broader theory of political virtue.

Machiavelli portrays Fortune metaphorically as a capricious woman who must be dominated through decisiveness and boldness. He asserts that while Fortune governs roughly half of human actions, the remaining half is determined by individual virtue, a quality encompassing prudence, courage, adaptability, and shrewdness. This dual framework reflects his departure from classical and medieval notions of divine providence, emphasizing instead a secular and human-centered understanding of politics.

Furthermore, Machiavelli likens Fortune to a flooding river: when unrestrained, it wreaks devastation, but through foresight and preparation, its destructive potential can be mitigated. Thus, political leaders must anticipate crises, adapt swiftly to changing circumstances, and exploit opportunities presented by Fortune. For Machiavelli, success in statecraft depends not merely on chance but on the ability to channel Fortune in one's favor through calculated and audacious action.

In essence, Machiavelli's treatment of Fortune underscores his realist perspective: political life is shaped by an interplay between unpredictability and human initiative. By advocating for proactive leadership rooted in virtue, he redefines political success as a dynamic negotiation between chance and agency, laying the foundation for modern political theory's secular and pragmatic orientation.

4.8 Niccolo Machiavelli and the Theory of Republicanism

Niccolo Machiavelli (1469–1527) remains a pivotal figure in the development of modern political thought, and his engagement with republicanism is central to understanding his broader intellectual project. While Machiavelli is popularly associated with *The Prince* (1513) and its advocacy of political realism and strategic statecraft, his republicanism emerges most explicitly in his later work, *Discourses on Livy* (1517). Here, he offers a sustained reflection on the Roman Republic as a model for political organization, civic liberty, and institutional durability, thereby situating himself firmly within—and simultaneously transforming—the tradition of civic humanism that characterized Renaissance political theory.

4.8.1. Foundations of Machiavelli's Republicanism

Machiavelli's republicanism is deeply rooted in his historical study of ancient Rome, which he interprets as a paradigm of a free and enduring polity. For Machiavelli, a republic represents a political order in which liberty (*libertà*) is preserved through a balance of competing social and political forces. He rejects the idea of absolute harmony, emphasizing instead that conflict—when properly institutionalized—serves as a generative force for republican vitality. This is most evident in his claim that the Roman Republic derived its strength from the “tumults” between the patricians (elite) and the plebeians (common citizens), as these struggles produced laws and institutions that safeguarded popular freedom (*Discourses*, I.4).

This analysis marks a departure from classical and medieval political thought, which often sought concord and hierarchical stability. Machiavelli instead contends that managed political conflict, rather than consensus, is the true guarantor of liberty. In this respect, his republicanism is inherently dynamic and historically grounded, challenging the idealized visions of civic harmony promoted by earlier humanist thinkers such as Leonardo Bruni or Bartolus of Saxoferrato.

4.8.2. Liberty, Virtue, and Civic Participation

Central to Machiavelli's republicanism is his conception of virtue, a term that signifies not only individual excellence but also collective civic energy. He argues that a republic's endurance depends on an active citizenry, capable of defending its freedom against both internal corruption and external domination. For Machiavelli, liberty is inseparable from military independence: he insists that republics must rely on citizen militias rather than mercenary armies, which he views as corrupting and dangerous. This emphasis on self-reliance reflects his broader concern that dependence—whether on foreign powers or private armed forces—inevitably undermines civic freedom (*Discourses*, II.20).

Machiavelli thus articulates a republican ideal in which citizens are not merely subjects of law but active participants in governance and defense. This aligns him with the civic humanist tradition, yet he diverges from its moralistic orientation by focusing on the

necessity of political strength and institutional durability over moral virtue in the classical sense.

4.8.3. Institutional Design and the Mixed Constitution

A distinctive feature of Machiavelli's republican thought is his advocacy of a mixed constitution, drawing inspiration from Polybius's analysis of Rome. He proposes that republican stability arises from a balanced interplay between monarchical (the consuls), aristocratic (the Senate), and democratic (the tribunes) elements. Such a framework institutionalizes social conflict, channeling it into legal mechanisms rather than allowing it to destabilize the state.

Moreover, Machiavelli introduces a cyclical theory of political development, arguing that all states are subject to corruption and decline. He asserts that republics must undergo periodic "renewals" through institutional reforms or the intervention of exceptional leaders who restore their founding principles (Discourses, III.1). This historical realism distinguishes Machiavelli from normative theorists and underscores his belief that republican freedom is precarious, demanding continual vigilance and adaptation.

4.8.4. The Relationship Between Republicanism and The Prince

While some commentators view *The Prince* as fundamentally at odds with *The Discourses*, many scholars argue that Machiavelli's realism underpins both texts. *The Prince* addresses the exigencies of political survival in a fragmented Italy dominated by foreign powers, whereas *The Discourses* presents Machiavelli's preferred model of governance: a self-sustaining republic capable of resisting tyranny and external domination. J.G.A. Pocock (1975) and Quentin Skinner (1996) have both emphasized that these works are complementary rather than contradictory, reflecting Machiavelli's attempt to reconcile the demands of realpolitik with his republican ideals.

4.8.5. Machiavelli's Legacy in Republican Thought

Machiavelli's republicanism had a profound impact on subsequent political theory, influencing early modern thinkers such as James Harrington and shaping the "neo-Roman" tradition that underpinned revolutionary movements in England and America. His redefinition of liberty—not as mere non-interference, but as freedom from domination secured by robust civic institutions—anticipates modern republican theories advanced by scholars like Philip Pettit (1997).

In this sense, Machiavelli serves as a bridge between classical civic humanism and modern republicanism, grounding liberty not in moral virtue or natural law but in historically contingent, conflict-driven, and institutionally mediated forms of political life. His republicanism is thus both realist and participatory, privileging the active maintenance of freedom through civic engagement, military self-reliance, and the prudent design of political institutions.

4.9 Conclusion:

Machiavelli, belongs to the new phase in the development of political philosophy, he was more a practical politician rather than political thinker and philosopher. He studied Roman history under the guidance of his father who was a jury. He wrote *Prince* and later *Discourses* two important books of his life. He was very much influenced by the prevailing situations in Italy where state were fought wars consistently. In his methodology he was greatly influenced

by Aristotle, he was considered as the modern political thinker and brought some new ideas which are considered in the modern period. His political ideas are not systematic, he explained his views on human nature in his Prince, he said that, human being is selfish, wicked and degenerate and opportunist, he said that, man is not social but anti-social. He deferred on religion and morality with earlier thinkers, attempted a formal and conscious separation between politics and morality.

His views on state and its preservation he said the success and failure of the state depends on the prosperity of the people. He classified states into normal and perverted. He suggested Prince how to preserve the power.

He was criticised by many political thinkers of the modern times. Some says that he was totally misunderstood political thinker. His assumption about the nature of man where he said that, man is selfish, wicked and degenerate and opportunist, he said that, man is not social but anti-social. His ideas are superficial and hallow and failed to build proper political theory. His principle “ends justify the means” has been criticised severely political crimes can never lead to anything except counter offence. Machiavelli recommended Princedom for forming new state. It is not possible to do everything by the prince, his approach in this regard is highly illogical.

Machiavelli’s concept of Virtue changed the way people thought about politics. It showed that leadership is not just about being good or fair but also about being practical, determined, and willing to do what is necessary to succeed.

Machiavelli’s treatment of Fortune underscores his realist perspective: political life is shaped by an interplay between unpredictability and human initiative. By advocating for proactive leadership rooted in virtue, he redefines political success as a dynamic negotiation between chance and agency, laying the foundation for modern political theory’s secular and pragmatic orientation.

Machiavelli’s republicanism represents a radical reconfiguration of Renaissance political thought. By reconciling liberty with conflict, virtue with pragmatism, and institutional design with historical contingency, he forged a vision of republican governance that was both rooted in antiquity and attuned to the political crises of his own time. Far from being an idealistic or purely moralistic doctrine, his republicanism is inseparable from his realist understanding of power and his insistence on the necessity of active, vigilant citizenship. It is this synthesis of classical inspiration and pragmatic innovation that secures Machiavelli’s place as a foundational theorist of modern republicanism.

4.10 Model Questions:

1. Explain briefly about a) modern political thought 2) Early life of Machiavelli c) Machiavelli as Modern thinkers
2. Describe the views of Machiavelli about the state and its preservation?
3. Explain the contributions of Machiavelli to political thought?
4. Explain the contributions of Machiavelli the concept of Virtue, Fortune, Republicanism.

4.11 References:

1. D.C. Chaturvedi, Political Thought, Meenakshi Prakasham, New Delhi, 1981.
2. Johns Dryzek and others, Political Theory, Oxford University Press, 2008.
3. C.L. Wayper, Political Thought, B.I. Publications, New Delhi, 1979.

4. R.G. Mulgan, Aristotle's Political Theory, Clarendon Press, Oxford, 1977.
5. William Ebenstein, Modern Political thought, IBH publishing Co, 1970.
6. David Boucher & Paul Kelly, Political Thinkers, Oxford University Press, 2009.

Dr. C. Vinod Kumar
Lesson Writer

LESSON-05

THOMAS HOBBS-, STATE OF NATURE, THE SOCIAL CONTRACT STATE, POLITICAL OBLIGATION

5.0 Objective:

1. Students would know about Thomas Hobbes and his Political Ideas.
2. Students would learn about human nature, methodology, state and Sovereignty.
3. Students would learn about Hobbes- State of Nature, the Social Contract State, Political Obligation.

Structure:

- 5.0 Objective
- 5.1 Introduction
- 5.2 Works of Hobbes
- 5.3 Hobbes Methodology
- 5.4 Views on Human Nature
- 5.5 Views on Social Contract
 - 5.5.1 The features of social contract here under
- 5.6 Views on State on Nature
- 5.7 Views on Sovereignty
- 5.8 Criticism of Sovereignty
- 5.9 Hobbes Individualism and Absolutism
- 5.10 Estimate of Hobbes
- 5.11 Shortcoming of Hobbes
- 5.12 Hobbes-Human Nature in the State of Nature
 - 5.12.1 The War of All Against All (Bellum Omnium Contra Omnes)
 - 5.12.2 Absence of Rights and Property
 - 5.12.3 Reason and the Need for a Social Contract
 - 5.12.4 The Role of the Sovereign
- 5.13 The Social Contract

- 5.13.1 Voluntary Agreement Among Individuals
- 5.13.2 Establishment of Sovereignty
- 5.13.3 Surrender of Rights
- 5.13.4 Irrevocability of the Contract
- 5.13.5 The Nature of the State (Leviathan)
- 5.13.6 Hobbes on Law and Authority
- 5.13.7 Criticisms of Hobbes' Theory
- 5.13.8 Legacy and Influence
- 5.14 Hobbes and Political Obligation
 - 5.14 1. The State of Nature and the Need for Obligation
 - 5.14. 2. The Social Contract
 - 5.14. 3. Nature and Scope of Political Obligation
 - 5.14. 4. Justification of Authority
 - 5.14.5. Criticism and Legacy
- 5.15 Conclusion
- 5.16 Model Questions
- 5.17 References

5.1 Introduction:

Thomas Hobbes was born in 1581, in the family of Anglican Clergyman, and he lived till he gets 99 years. He witnessed the most blustery period of English history. He received his early education at Malmesbury, then he went to Oxford for his higher studies at the age of 15. After finishing his University education he was appointed as Tutor to William Cavendish, had a lifelong connection with his family and it provided him a chance to travel extensively and establish personal contacts with great personalities like Ben Johnson, Bacon and Galileo, and they left an impact on his political thought.

He witnessed civil war in England between supporters of Monarchy and Republicanism and he took kingside in that war, Charles-I was beheaded and monarchy was abolished. Despite the fact he witnessed the whole bloody drama of civil war which left a profound effect on his thinking. He was persuaded that man is an animal inspired by thought like fear and self- interest. He was also influenced that a strong and stable civilized life was the basic need and this could be delivered only by an absolute monarch and strongly appealed for monarchy.

He also felt impression of other political thinkers, scientists and mathematicians thus he took the idea of socialist contract form Plato and Hooker, the impact of Machiavelli can be noticeable in Hobbes representation of human nature. He borrowed the concept of the law of nature form Grotius, Sovereignty form Bodin and he enhanced it. His philosophy was borrowed from Galileo, for his acquisitive theory and scientific methods form Descartes. Thus the philosophy of Hobbes was a mixture of different influences of his time which left on his mind.

5.2 Works of Hobbes:

The main works of him are 'Deceive' wrote in 1642. The 'Leviathan' which he wrote in France while he was in exile and was published in London after his return 1651; the De Corpore in 1655 and De Homine in 1658.

5.3 Hobbes Methodology:

He familiarized scientific methods to the political theory, and tried to draw inferences from axioms, assumptions and established truths. Though Plato applied scientific method to political theory but Hobbes was the first thinker who asserted that political theory was based on the presence of matter and motion. Hobbes based his concept of human nature, formation of civil society and possible human relationship on this principle.

There are three different parts of Hobbes philosophy, the first dealing with physical phenomenon called 'physics' the second dealing with mental phenomenon called 'psychology' and the third civil philosophy, the third part is most complex of all. According to him, all the three parts of philosophy are the outcomes of moving particles. He tried to integrate psychology and politics extract Physical Science. By applying Geometric method to the science of politics, is built upon psychology and psychology is based on physics, which is derived from the motion of particles. Thus, this method is clearly logical. It is pointed out that he completely failed to deduce his psychology from physics and could not live up to his idea because it is impossible. In spite of these deficiencies, the recognition of Hobbes is that he prepared politics more scientific and modern. His methodology has three fold significance.

1. He completely disallowed the medieval conception of the existence of soul or spirit and tried to interpret everything in materialist terms.
2. His method tangled the denial of medieval theory that, the state is the result of orthodox tumble.
3. His method provided to the distinctive method of thinking, he initiates with individual ends with individuals. In fact no better individualistic theory could be promoted.

5.4 Views on Human Nature:

Contrasting the earlier philosophers he marks the individual the mechanism to his thoughts. He give the individual, not as a rational being but attachment of desires, feelings, and wishes. According to Hobbes, what a man wishes, he sounds well and what he hates, he appeals evil. At hand no absolute end or good of life, thus, all men attempts to achieve those things which he needs and man is self-interested. According to Prof. Sabine that, "the rule behind all behavior is that the living body is set instinctively to preserve or heighten its vitality. In a word, the psychological principle behind all behavior is self-preservation and self-preservation means just the continuance of individual's biological existence. Good is what conduces to this end and evil what has the opposite effect".

He trusts that, by birth men are alike, certain may have improved mental faculties, while others may be physically greater. On the whole they are significantly identical. Yet, the aspiration to have something carries them in clash with each other. He says that opposition, brilliance and variances make people brute and argumentative. He puts this point thus: "nature has made men so equal with faculties of body and mind, as that though there be found one man sometimes manifestly stronger in body, or of the quicker mind than the other, Yet when all is reckoned together, the difference between man and man is not so

considerable, as that one can thereupon claim to himself any benefit to which another may not pretend”.

He further says that, every single individual has a perpetual and restless desire of power, after power only death. Hobbes says that, man is basically selfish, contentious, quarrelsome, mean, wicked, non-altruistic, non-rational, impulsive and self-centered. In this high opinion his visions are quite thoroughly connected to that of Machiavelli. The only difference between them is that, Machiavelli did not allocate any reason for the bad nature of man. Hobbes tries to give it in scientific terms.

Though, his understandings on human nature have been extremely criticized. In the first occurrence, it is said that, man is neither so reasonable nor as unreasonable as he displays him while painting the picture of state of nature and the assumption of the deal for the creation of the state. He said that man is extremely unreasonable in the state of nature, but abruptly allots him the faculty of reason which urges him to heap the state: secondly, he portrays human being as anti-social, self-centered and egoistic. By what means such persons could develop social and take advantage in the evolution of the civil society. Thirdly, he assume atmospheres and insights from the motion of particles. Finally, his assertion that, all men are the same in esteem of their physical and mental powers, is contrary to our actual experience.

5.5 Views on Social Contract:

Hobbes trusts that, the state has its start in the expectation of men in their own defense, the well-adjusted wish to spurt from the natural conditions of war. The constant struggle and distress are expected, as long as men absorbed by the orders of hunger, they could escape from it only by setting up a common power which could at the same time restrain and protect each person. Hobbes said that, each person says to others “I authorize and give up my right of governing myself to this man or to this assembly of men, on this condition that thou give the right to him and authorize all his actions in the like manner”.

5.5.1 The features of social contract here under:

1 The sovereign is not a party to the contract but rather contract is the product of it. He tries to justify complete or tyrannical rule and rejects all rights of resisting the state to the individual. One writer asserted on Hobbes “instead of becoming a character of human freedom the contract becomes in the hands of Hobbes a bond of human slavery”.

2 The State or commonwealth is mainly founded on reasons, not on distress, people concentrate on obedience to the authority of the state because of the rational apprehension that the end of self-protection is better attended within the state. Hobbes himself says “Covenant without sword are but words”.

3 It cannot guilty of contract because sovereignty is not a contract. Justice lies with obedience to the contract and sovereign cannot be just.

4 The contract cannot be cancelled once the contract is decided, because the individual surrender to his wills to the will of the sovereign and do not have any right to pull out or cancel it without the approval of the sovereign.

5 In the sovereign the majority has rights and minority has no right to object to the choice of majority. By which minority will become a part of the Commonwealth, silently they have to accept the will of majority.

6 To guard the individual's life contract has been established, it indicates that, the individual has surrounded all his rights to sovereign, except the right to live in the state.

7 The people are supposed to submit all their rights to the state or the ruler and they do not possess any right against sovereign. He did not acknowledge to the people to conquer the obedience to the sovereign under certain circumstances.

5.6 Views on State on Nature:

Hobbes opinions on state on nature concluded a period of human history prior to the creation of the civil state, are an addition to his view of human nature. He holds that entire men are by nature identical in powers, no one of them are so sturdy as to be safe contrary to the other. They have some thirst, like aspiration for wellbeing desire to gain desire of glory. The desire to gain hints to violence when the object of desire can neither be divided nor enjoyed in common. Obviously, the human beings develop disbelief towards each other.

Certainly, under the situations that state of nature is a state of war. There is no place for industry in such circumstances, because the fruits there of are ambiguous and subsequently no culture of the earth, no direction finding, no arts, no letters, no society. In short, the life of man solitary poor, nasty, brutish, and short. As there is no mutual greater which could hold all the people in crisscross endless war of all against all. According to him there could be no dissimilarity between right and wrong in the state of nature, because such a difference take as fact the presence of common standards of conduct, a common law to judge the conduct and common law giver. There is no division between just and unjust in the state of nature because there is no common superior (sovereign) or Law. When there is no law there can be no justice. There is no right to private property in the state of nature, because the control of a thing depended upon the power of a person to keep it.

5.7 Views on Sovereignty:

Sovereign was bent as a result of the bond and enjoys all the powers which were enclosed by the people at the time of ending the contract. Sovereign enjoys the power to govern on behalf of the entire community as to what should be done to maintain peace and order and promote their welfare. In short, Hobbes confers the sovereign with absolute and supreme powers. The Sovereign power cannot be dared by the people, because they willingly give up their rights to him, once they have surrendered their rights to him, without condition, they cannot claim back.

According to Hobbes, the individuals cannot legally enter into a new contract to create a new Leviathan, because the agreement determined by them with the first sovereign is unchangeable. As the sovereign was not a party to the contract it cannot be quoted against him without his own endorsement. The Sovereign enjoys complete powers to make laws and this power of the sovereign is not incomplete by any human authority, superior or inferior. The sovereign was not assured by the opinion and wishes of the people because they have made a complete surrender of their power to the sovereign. It was not only the principal foundation of all laws but also one and only explainer. Even the laws of nature do not establish any curb on the power of sovereign. Even the laws of God does not limit the authority of the sovereign because he was the only explainer of these laws. Thus, he provided sovereign complete powers and rules out all the restrictions in the nature of laws of nature, or laws of God.

The Sovereign is the cause to single out between good and bad, moral and immoral, just and unjust. These differences does not happen in the state of nature and occurred only after the formation of the civil society. Sovereign to elect what is moral and what is immoral.

Even right to property shaped by the Sovereign. The Sovereign is the foremost foundation of justice and have special powers to declare war and make peace. Hobbes gives to the Sovereign all sorts of authority like Executive, Legislative and Judicial and thus, totally disagreements the theory of separation of powers. Another significant feature of Hobbes Sovereign is that he confers it with undividable, attached and inexpressible powers. He does not allow the sovereign to share its powers with others. Hobbes also does not acknowledge to his subjects only rights against the Sovereign. People cannot call him to account, threaten to punish or overthrow him and choose another ruler in his place or put him to death. Hobbes created an absolute, indivisible in alienable sovereign.

5.8 Criticism of Sovereignty:

His theory of Sovereignty has been criticized on the following grounds:

1. His theory is dreamlike and incorrect evidences. No definite sovereign has exercised such complete and limitless powers as he attributed to his sovereign. Absorption of such power is certain to give rise to hindrance at one stage or the other.
2. Vaughan discards the theory as 'Pernicious' and 'impossible'. It is malicious because it leads to despotism pure and simple, it gives the subject no right to protect themselves against unfair and tyrannical rule and lessens the whole heard slavery. It is difficult because the single bond of combination between the members of Leviathan is common terror.
3. Hobbes grants rights or confrontation to the individual in extreme cases. According to Prof. James the grant of these rights to the individual is unpredictable with the guideline of absolute sovereignty.
4. The right of confrontation approved by Hobbes to the individual is nothing but capacity to resist. Hobbes leaves the individual totally free to decide whether to submit sovereign or resist. This can be possible only in a democratic government which Hobbes never estimates.
5. Rousseau described Hobbes theory of sovereignty as both self-contradictory and revolting.

In spite of these short comings in his theory of sovereignty we have to accept with Sabine that his theory of sovereignty the most revolutionary theory, at the time of its beginning and one of the most significant contribution to the political thought.

5.9 Hobbes Individualism and Absolutism:

Hobbes was considered as the individualist, the theory of absolute sovereignty was named after him and this itself was an achievement by any individual in the political history. Commenting on this Prof. Sabine said that, "Individualism is thoroughly modern element in Hobbes and respect in which he caught most clearly the note of coming ages, Hobbes was at once the complete utilitarian and a complete individualist. It is his clear cut individualism which makes his philosophy the most revolutionary theory of his age".

Hobbes in fact made a theory about absolutism, but the foundation of absolutism was based on the peace and security of the person and property of the individual, which gives the theory of Hobbes the touch of individualism. Hobbes gave prominent position to individual, he gave the individual the right to fight the sovereign if it attacks his life, for whose protection the contract was made. The centre of thought was individual, he thought that, if any individual was not in proper check it would cause demolition and problems to the civil society which leads to anarchy. Hobbes felt the necessity to check such happenings, need of a supreme power and will have all powers to take act and stop from destruction of individual. He believed that, Agreements without swords were but words, to make sure the covenants were witnessed by the people, he gave absolute authority to sovereign.

He not only gave absolute powers to sovereign and ensured to prevent his use of selfish ends. He gave power to make laws and rules by that he can understand what is just (fair) and unjust (unfair) and what is good and bad. The laws were made for the benefit of individual and subject to the judgment of individualism, by this way he prevented the right of absolutism.

5.10 Estimate of Hobbes:

Since his publication of the book Leviathan, he became the debatable person and it would be difficult to estimate Hobbes contributions on political thought. No giant has been abused more by pigmies”. Though he was criticized but there were many who admired him. Depending upon his works on political thought it becomes difficult to give fair estimation and rate him.

Prof. Sabine described him as “probably the greatest writer on political philosophy that the English speaking people have produced”. Prof. Dunning said that, “Hobbes’s works placed him at once in the front rank of political thinker and his theory became, from the moment of its appearance, the centre of animated controversy and enormous influence throughout the west Europe”.

5.11 Shortcoming of Hobbes:

The shortcomings on political thought of Hobbes, were severely criticized by Vaughn. And following defects were observed by him:

- 1 The gross materialism, atheism and despotism under severe criticism and they failed to address his contemporary and succeeding generations.
- 2 It was noticed that, the unexpected conversion of the individual from violent to the civilized looks very illogical.
- 3 His principle found incorrect, he stressed that the sole bond of union among the individuals was common terror.
- 4 His theory produces the despotism and individual was reduced to the position of slave with no right to offer resistance to the sovereign.
- 5 He said that, used scientific method to his thoughts but the modern thinkers were unable to apply them properly. They were unable to apply geometry with politics.
- 6 His philosophy was based on personal guesses and partialities. He was motivated to defend the royal absolutism.

5.12 Hobbes-Human Nature in the State of Nature

Hobbes had a pessimistic view of human nature. He argued that individuals are inherently self-interested and driven by desires for survival, power, and resources. In the absence of a common authority or law, these competing interests lead to continuous conflict and insecurity. Hobbes famously described life in this condition as:

“solitary, poor, nasty, brutish, and short.”

This phrase captures the chaos and violence inherent in the State of Nature, where there are no moral or legal constraints on human behaviour.

5.12.1 The War of All Against All (Bellum Omnium Contra Omnes)

In Hobbes' view, without a governing authority, there is a perpetual state of war—what he called “a war of every man against every man.” Since everyone has equal capacity to harm others, fear and suspicion dominate human relations. There is no concept of justice or injustice in this state because these arise only within a civil society governed by law.

5.12.2 Absence of Rights and Property

In the State of Nature, there are no established rights, property, or justice. Every individual has a natural right to do whatever is necessary for their own preservation, even if it harms others. This unrestricted liberty leads to constant insecurity, making peaceful coexistence impossible.

5.12.3 Reason and the Need for a Social Contract

Although life in the State of Nature is perilous, Hobbes believed that humans possess reason, which enables them to recognize the need for peace and order. Through reason, individuals agree to surrender some of their natural freedoms and consent to the creation of a social contract. This contract involves transferring their rights to a sovereign power (the Leviathan) in exchange for security and protection.

5.12.4 The Role of the Sovereign

For Hobbes, the establishment of a powerful, centralized authority is essential to escape the State of Nature. The sovereign enforces laws, prevents conflict, and ensures peace. Without such authority, society would regress into the chaotic State of Nature.

5.13 The Social Contract

Hobbes' concept of the social contract involves the following principles:

5.13.1 Voluntary Agreement Among Individuals:

In the social contract, individuals mutually consent to transfer their natural rights to a central authority (the sovereign). Unlike later thinkers (e.g., Locke and Rousseau), Hobbes emphasized that the contract is between individuals themselves, not between the ruler and the ruled.

5.13.2 Establishment of Sovereignty:

The collective transfer of rights results in the creation of a sovereign power or Leviathan, an entity capable of enforcing laws and ensuring peace. This sovereign represents the collective will and is endowed with absolute authority to govern.

5.13.3 Surrender of Rights:

To secure peace, individuals must give up their unlimited natural rights, retaining only the right to life and self-preservation. In return, the sovereign guarantees safety and order.

5.13.4 Irrevocability of the Contract:

Once formed, the social contract cannot be revoked. Hobbes rejected the notion of rebellion or resistance against the sovereign, arguing that any challenge would risk returning society to the chaos of the state of nature.

5.13.5 The Nature of the State (Leviathan)

Hobbes metaphorically described the state as a "Leviathan", a powerful artificial entity created through the collective agreement of individuals:

- The Leviathan (sovereign state) is the ultimate authority, embodying the combined will of all citizens.
- It possesses absolute and indivisible power to legislate, enforce laws, and administer justice.
- Its primary duty is to protect life and maintain internal peace; thus, Hobbes prioritized security over liberty.

For Hobbes, sovereignty could take various forms—monarchy, aristocracy, or democracy—but he favored monarchy as the most efficient and stable form of government. He argued that centralized and undivided power was necessary to prevent conflict and enforce compliance.

5.13.6. Hobbes on Law and Authority

In Hobbes' view:

- Law originates from the sovereign's command.
- Justice is defined not by moral principles but by obedience to the laws set by the sovereign.
- Any division of power (as in checks and balances) would weaken the state and risk disorder.

Thus, Hobbes advocated for a legalistic and authoritarian state where law and order are paramount, and individual liberty is subordinate to security.

5.13.7 Criticisms of Hobbes' Theory

Hobbes' social contract theory has faced several criticisms:

- **Pessimistic View of Human Nature:** Critics argue that Hobbes exaggerated human selfishness and ignored altruistic tendencies and cooperation in human societies.
- **Absolute Authority and Tyranny:** His endorsement of an all-powerful sovereign raises concerns about tyranny and the suppression of individual freedoms.
- **Lack of Popular Sovereignty:** Hobbes denied the right of resistance or revolution, which contradicts modern democratic ideals.

Despite these criticisms, Hobbes' ideas remain influential as they present a realistic and pragmatic justification for political authority.

5.13.8 Legacy and Influence

Hobbes' social contract theory significantly influenced later philosophers and political theorists:

- John Locke adopted the idea of a contract but emphasized limited government and individual rights.
- Jean-Jacques Rousseau reinterpreted the contract as an agreement to form a democratic community governed by the "general will."
- Modern political realism, legal positivism, and theories of authoritarianism also draw from Hobbes' insistence on order and security.

5.14 Hobbes and Political Obligation

Thomas Hobbes (1588–1679), an English philosopher, is one of the most influential figures in political philosophy. His theory of political obligation—the moral duty of individuals to obey the state—arises from his social contract theory, as outlined in his seminal work *Leviathan* (1651). Hobbes sought to explain why individuals must submit to political authority and what legitimizes this obligation.

5.14 1. The State of Nature and the Need for Obligation

Hobbes begins with the concept of the state of nature, a hypothetical condition where there is no political authority or law. In this state, individuals are free and equal, but they are also driven by self-interest, competition, and fear. Hobbes famously described this condition as a "war of all against all," where life would be "solitary, poor, nasty, brutish, and short."

Without a central authority, there would be no security, justice, or social order. This chaotic condition compels rational individuals to seek peace and stability, leading them to agree upon a social contract.

5.14. 2. The Social Contract

Hobbes' social contract is an agreement among individuals to surrender their natural rights (except for the right to self-preservation) to a sovereign authority in exchange for protection and order. Unlike later thinkers such as Locke and Rousseau, Hobbes' contract is not between the ruler and the ruled, but among individuals themselves. They collectively authorize an absolute sovereign—whether a monarch or an assembly—to enforce laws and ensure security.

By entering this contract, individuals create a political obligation: they are morally bound to obey the sovereign because they have consented to transfer their rights for the sake of peace.

5.14. 3. Nature and Scope of Political Obligation

Hobbes argues that political obligation is absolute and unconditional, as long as the sovereign provides security and order. Since the sovereign's power derives from the collective agreement of individuals, resisting authority would mean breaking the very contract that protects society from returning to the state of nature.

However, Hobbes recognizes a limit: individuals retain the inalienable right to self-preservation. If the sovereign threatens their life directly (for example, by ordering them to commit suicide or face execution without cause), they are no longer obligated to obey.

5.14. 4. Justification of Authority

For Hobbes, the legitimacy of political authority rests on two grounds:

- Consent: Individuals have voluntarily entered into a contract authorizing the sovereign.
- Necessity: Without authority, anarchy prevails, and survival becomes impossible.

Thus, political obligation is justified not by divine right or moral ideals but by the rational necessity of maintaining peace and security.

5.14.5. Criticism and Legacy

Hobbes' theory has faced criticism for endorsing absolute sovereignty, which risks justifying authoritarianism. Later thinkers such as John Locke argued that political obligation is conditional upon the sovereign's respect for natural rights. Nevertheless, Hobbes' work laid the foundation for modern political thought by grounding political authority in human reason and consent rather than divine command.

5.15 Conclusion:

He was born to an Anglican family, he had connections with great minds like Ben Jonson, Bacon and Galileo, left a deep impression on his political thoughts. He was of the opinion that man is an animal motivated by two considerations such as fear and self-interest, he is convinced that, the basic need of the civilized society is the stable government and this could be possible with an absolute monarch. He wrote books like *De Cive*, *Leviathan*, *De Corpore* and *De Homine*. Hobbes used scientific methods to his political thought, he applied it for the first time in Social sciences. On human nature he said that, he treated individual not as a rational creature but a picture of passion, emotions and desires. On state of nature he said that, all men are equal by nature in powers no one is strong as to be safe against each other. Regarding social justice he said and tries to justify complete or tyrannical rule and rejects all rights of resisting the state to the individual.

On sovereign the proposed theory produces the despotism and individual is reduced to the position of slave with no right to offer resistance to the sovereign. He was criticised by many writers one of the critique was, the gross materialism, atheism and despotism are under severe criticism and they failed to address his contemporary and succeeding generations. Another was, his philosophy was based on personal guesses and partialities. He was motivated to defend the royal absolutism

Hobbes' State of Nature highlights the necessity of political authority for human survival and social order. His theory underscores the idea that, without a strong government, human existence would descend into violence and fear. Although criticized for its bleak view of humanity, Hobbes' concept remains foundational in political philosophy, illustrating the importance of law, order, and governance in civil society.

Hobbes' work remains crucial in understanding the philosophical foundations of the modern state, sovereignty, and legal authority.

Thomas Hobbes' theory of the social contract state provides a rational and secular explanation for the origin of political authority. By grounding his ideas in human nature and the fear of anarchy, Hobbes argued for the necessity of a powerful sovereign to maintain order. Although his vision prioritizes security over liberty and endorses absolute power, it laid the groundwork for subsequent debates on governance, authority, and individual rights.

In essence, Hobbes envisioned the state as a necessary construct to rescue humanity from its own destructive tendencies, establishing peace through a binding contract and an unchallengeable sovereign authority.

His concept of political obligation continues to influence debates on the nature of authority, legitimacy, and the rights of citizens in contemporary political theory.

Hobbes' notion of political obligation emerges from his pessimistic view of human nature and his belief in the necessity of a powerful sovereign to prevent chaos. By linking authority to a rational social contract, Hobbes transformed the understanding of political duty from a theological to a secular, consent-based framework. Though controversial for its absolutist tendencies, his theory remains central to discussions of why individuals obey laws and accept political authority.

5.16 Model Questions:

1. Write about Hobbes early years and influences, works and methodology
2. Discuss about Hobbes on Human nature? And state nature?
3. Write the views of Hobbes on Sovereignty and Criticism?
4. Write the views of Hobbes on Nature of State, Social Contract and Political Obligation.

5.17 References:

1. D.C. Chaturvedi, Political Thought, Meenakshi Prakasham, New Delhi, 1981.
2. John Dryzek and others, Political Theory, Oxford University Press, 2008.
3. C.L. Wayper, Political Thought, B.I. Publications, New Delhi, 1979.
4. R.G. Mulgan, Aristotle's Political Theory, Clarendon Press, Oxford, 1977.
5. William Ebenstein, Modern Political thought, IBH publishing Co, 1970.
6. David Boucher & Paul Kelly, Political Thinkers, Oxford University Press, 2009.

Dr. C. Vinod Kumar
Lesson Writer

LESSON- 06

JOHN LOCKE –EQUALITY NATURAL LAW, THEORY OF PROPERTY, CONSENT AND GOVERNMENT

6.0 OBJECTIVES:

1. Students would be able to know about the John Locke's early life and his political thought.
2. People would be able to understand his theories on natural law, property, consent and Government.

Structure:

- 6.0 Objectives
- 6.1 Introduction
- 6.2 His Writings
- 6.3 Influences on Locke
- 6.4 Locke on Human Nature
- 6.5 Views on State of Nature
- 6.6 Views on Law of Nature
- 6.7 Views on Social Contract
- 6.8 Views on State
- 6.9 John Locke and the Concept of Equality
 - 6.9.1. Natural Equality
 - 6.9.2. Equality Before the Law
 - 6.9.3. Equality and Political Power
 - 6.9.4. Limits to Locke's Equality
 - 6.9.5. Legacy of Locke's Egalitarian Thought
- 6.10 Natural Law
 - 6.10.1 Definition of Natural Law
 - 6.10.2 Locke's State of Nature and Natural Law

6.10.3 Natural Law vs. Positive Law

6.10.4 Significance of Locke's Natural Law Theory

6.11 Locke's Theory of Property

6.11.1 Boarder Sense

6.11.2 Narrow Sense

6.12 Locke's Consent and Government

6.13 Locke on Revolution

6.14 Locke as an Individualist

6.15 Conclusion

6.16 Model Questions

6.17 References

6.1 Introduction:

John Locke was born in 1632, in the family of a puritan Somerset Lawyer. He got his initial education at West Minister and Oxford. After his accomplishment of M.A. Degree he worked as tutor at Oxford. He did not like teaching and he gave up to study Medicine. After two years of apprenticeship he was recognized as an eminent medical practitioner. He came in contact with Lord Ashley and became his personal physician and later considered as secretary. Locke's close relation with Lord Ashley, delivered him to meet with all great men of the times in politics, science and letters. He also led a refuge life in Holland. During that time he met William of Orange. In the wake of Bloodless Revolution of 1681, when William of Orange was asked to occupy the throne of England, he also returned to England when King James II was dethroned. He was appointed as Commissioner of Appeals, he died in 1704, and he was the contemporary of Hobbes and was witness to, restoration of Charles II in 1660 and Bloodless Revolution of 1688 of which he became the theorist.

6.2 His Writings:

He wrote 35 books which deals with different walks of life. The important book which provides insight into his philosophy and political thought. Essays Concerning Human Understanding in 1690, his letters on toleration in 1689, 1690 and 1692, the treatises of government in 1690, fundamental constitution concerning California, it was observed that his fourth letter on toleration and fundamental constitution concerning California was published in 1706.

6.3 Influences on Locke:

He was influenced by number of contemporary thinkers like Earl of Shaftbury (Lord Ashley) had boundless inspiration on him. This relationship gave him direct experience of practical political thinking. He was also influenced by Glorious Revolution which caused in the replacement of absolute monarchy by responsible Government. He was educated from the revolution that men, "basically decent orderly". Social minded and quite capable of ruling

themselves. He was influenced by Filmen and Hobbes by their writings and philosophy. He was also inspired by Sydney's 'Discourses Concerning Government' published in 1683. In this book he said that Government was formed by men for their own security and interest and it breaks on the accord of the people. Locke offered these ideas more methodically and offered a positive theory of state and government. He was also prominently influenced by Hooker and borrowed the theory of consent and theory of contract.

6.4 Locke on Human Nature:

Locke did not express his views on human nature systematically, and his views assembled from the Essay Concerning Human Understanding and the Second Treatise, where he dispersed his views. He says that human beings are decent and have been capable with natural social makeup, they love peace and do not quarrel and are not selfish always. Locke considered all the human beings as equal in the moral sense and enjoy definite natural rights like right to life, liberty, property. The views of Locke are just opposite to the views of Hobbes, like Hobbes unable to give any scientific reason for his views on human nature.

6.5 Views on State of Nature:

His views on state of nature are extension of his logical thought of human nature, he did not considered the state of nature as the state of war of each against all, he thinks that it is a period of peace, good-will, mutual assistance, and preservation. He thinks that state of nature is not pre-social but a pre-political condition. The state of nature was not for the war but for peace.

6.6 Views on Law of Nature:

His concept on law of nature inhabits an important place in his thoughts, he asserted that, it governs the life of men and civil society and refrain men from conquering each other's rights and the law of nature is observed, the execution of law depends upon the community members. Every member has the right to punish those who is an offender of natural law and maintain it properly.

6.7 Views on Social Contract:

He did not give any logical answer and said that, the deficits in the law of nature make the man to leave the nature of state and get into an agreement for the formation of the state, the deficiencies are, lack of an established, settled and known law, which can be understood by each individual by his way and lead to misunderstanding. And the third, is lack of an executive organ which enforce a just decision. This is a contract of each with all: it is a social contract by which every individual decide to surrender to the community as a whole. The individual yields the right to understand the law of nature for themselves. Unlike Hobbes who gave absolute powers to sovereign ruler, Locke give only certain powers to community. Locke asserted that, sovereign as a party to the contract and much confined by the understanding of natural law as members. He was so persuaded that monarch hurt from the touch of love and did not give absolute powers to monarch.

The other important feature of his contract is that it is undisputed, men have freedom and independent in the state of nature, nobody can forced to join the politics against his will. His contract is mainly based on approval of the people. The contract is irrevocable, once the people enter the contract means they cannot reverse it except by the government.

6.8 Views on State:

The views of Locke on state are quite different from that of Hobbes, Hobbes stated that, it as a requirement to guard the life of individual and gave absolute powers to it. Locke stated that, law of nature, to remove some suspicions and he gave different way of thought to it.

1 He stated that, state to have three types of powers such as, legislative, executive and federative powers. He declares that the legislative powers are most vital and elected it as "Supreme power of the Commonwealth". Though he gave supreme powers to legislature he did not give absolute powers. He stated that the relation between community and government is lies with trust between each other. The executive power which consist of judicial power, and very important for the government to run and he gave subordinate position to it, he limited its power it depends on the legislative power. He separated the powers of legislative and executive powers. His apples for constitutional or limited government as against the despotic or absolute rule.

2 He did not spare on the classification of government, divided it into three groups like, monarchy, aristocracy and democracy. He suggested the democracy the best government it gives good rule, and secures everything for the society.

3 He stated that state occurs for the people who constitute it.

4 He put the state on the consensus of the people, the consent may be voiced or implicit.

5 His state is made by the constitution and government take care of law, in case of urgency he permits to use prerogative.

6 Locke did not gave absolute power to the state like Hobbes, he limited its authority by number of factors, is controlled to the purpose for which it is formed. It is limited by law of nature, the natural law of individual confine to government, government cannot increase taxes without the permission of people.

7 His state acts on the principles of religious tolerance and divergent to all types of religious harassment.

8 His state is mainly allotted negative functions, it merely concerned to stop the violation of rights by the different members of the community.

9 As Wayper says about the Locke's state is a transformer's state, it transforms the individual' self -interest to public interest.

6.9 John Locke and the Concept of Equality

John Locke (1632–1704), a prominent Enlightenment philosopher, is widely regarded as the "Father of Liberalism" for his profound contributions to political theory and the philosophy of rights. His ideas on equality are foundational to modern democratic thought, shaping principles of liberty, justice, and governance. Locke's conception of equality is deeply rooted in his belief in natural law and the intrinsic dignity of human beings.

6.9.1. Natural Equality

Locke argued that all individuals are born in a state of nature where they are "equal and independent." According to him, no person has a natural right to rule over another, and no one is inherently inferior or superior. This equality stems from the belief that all humans are created by God and are His property. Therefore, they share the same natural rights to life, liberty, and property, which must be respected universally.

"All men are naturally in...a state of perfect freedom...within the bounds of the law of nature, without asking leave or depending upon the will of any other man." – Second Treatise of Government

6.9.2. Equality Before the Law

Locke maintained that equality is not merely a moral principle but also a legal one. In a civil society governed by a social contract, all individuals must be subject to the same legal standards and protections. The laws of a legitimate government must be impartial and designed for the common good, ensuring that no one is placed above the law, including rulers themselves.

6.9.3. Equality and Political Power

Locke strongly opposed the idea of absolute monarchy and inherited political privilege. He believed that political power must arise from the consent of the governed, reflecting the equal status of all individuals in forming a government. This view laid the foundation for popular sovereignty, democratic representation, and constitutionalism.

6.9.4. Limits to Locke's Equality

Despite his advocacy of equality, Locke's views were not entirely universal by modern standards. For instance, his writings did not explicitly challenge social hierarchies based on gender or property ownership, and he held complex views on issues like slavery and colonialism. Nevertheless, his philosophical framework provided the intellectual basis for future movements demanding broader social and political equality.

6.9.5. Legacy of Locke's Egalitarian Thought

Locke's theory of equality profoundly influenced later political revolutions and documents, such as the American Declaration of Independence and the French Declaration of the Rights of Man and of the Citizen. His belief in natural rights and equal human dignity remains central to contemporary discussions of democracy, justice, and human rights.

John Locke's concept of equality was revolutionary for his time, challenging feudal hierarchies and authoritarian rule. His insistence that all individuals are naturally equal and entitled to fundamental rights continues to shape modern legal and political systems. Although his ideas had historical limitations, Locke's egalitarian principles laid the groundwork for the universalist ideals of liberty and equality that define modern liberal democracies.

6.10 Natural Law

John Locke (1632–1704), a prominent English philosopher and political theorist, played a crucial role in shaping modern liberal thought. Central to Locke's philosophy is the doctrine of Natural Law, which he regarded as the foundation of morality, political authority, and individual rights. Rooted in reason and divine will, Locke's conception of natural law sought to establish universal principles governing human conduct and social order.

6.10.1 Definition of Natural Law

Locke defined natural law as a rational principle inherent in human nature and discoverable through reason. According to him, it is a moral order established by God, binding upon all individuals regardless of culture, religion, or political institutions. Unlike positive or man-made law, natural law is immutable and serves as the standard by which the legitimacy of human laws can be judged.

Key Features of Locke's Natural Law

1. Rooted in Divine Authority and Reason:

Locke believed natural law emanated from God, the "Author of nature," but it was accessible to human beings through the faculty of reason. This made natural law both theological and rational in character.

2. Universality and Equality:

Natural law applies equally to all individuals because all are created by God and are fundamentally equal. Locke emphasized that no one is born with inherent authority over another.

3. Foundation of Natural Rights:

From natural law flow natural rights—namely the rights to life, liberty, and property. These rights are inalienable and exist prior to the formation of governments.

4. Moral Obligation:

Natural law imposes a moral duty on individuals to respect the rights of others. Locke maintained that reason teaches mankind not to harm another in "life, health, liberty, or possessions."

5. Basis of Political Authority:

Locke argued that legitimate political authority is grounded in the consent of the governed and must operate in accordance with natural law. Any government violating natural rights loses its legitimacy and may be resisted.

6.10.2 Locke's State of Nature and Natural Law

Locke's concept of the state of nature is central to his theory. In this condition, individuals live freely and equally under natural law without a formal political authority. While the state of nature is characterized by liberty, it is not a state of license. People remain bound by natural law to respect each other's rights. However, because individuals act as judges in their own cases, conflicts arise, necessitating the formation of a political society to enforce natural law impartially.

6.10.3 Natural Law vs. Positive Law

Locke distinguished natural law from positive law (laws created by governments). Positive laws are valid only if they align with natural law. If human laws contradict natural law, they are unjust and lack moral authority. This principle profoundly influenced later ideas of constitutionalism, rule of law, and human rights.

6.10.4 Significance of Locke's Natural Law Theory

Locke's doctrine of natural law laid the philosophical foundation for:

- Modern liberal democracy and constitutional government.
- The social contract theory, emphasizing consent and limited government.
- Universal human rights, influencing documents like the U.S. Declaration of Independence and the Universal Declaration of Human Rights.

By grounding natural law in both divine will and reason, Locke bridged theology and secular rationalism, providing a universal moral framework for politics and ethics.

Locke's theory of natural law remains a cornerstone of political philosophy. By affirming the inherent equality and rights of individuals, Locke rejected absolute authority and legitimized governance based on consent and the protection of natural rights. His vision of natural law not only reshaped 17th-century political thought but also continues to inspire debates on justice, law, and human dignity in contemporary society.

6.11 Locke's Theory of Property:

It is imperative to note that he used the term 'property' in two intellects. In the broad sense he suggests by it the right to life, liberty and estate. In the narrow sense he uses it for the right to possess and retain one's estate.

6.11.1 Boarder Sense:

In the broader sense Locke uses the term property to contain three natural rights of life, liberty and property. At a number of places Locke states that, the persons enter into contract and institute the state to reserve property. Here he is evidently using the term in the broader sense of the three rights mentioned to above. Thus, Locke foresees that property occurred in pre-civil society and the institution of state formed to preserve the right. It is not the state which makes the right to property (Life, Liberty and Property) but is itself created to protect this right. The state can guard the property of individual through explanation of law of nature through application of this interpretation between the members of the society and compulsory of this interpretation between the members of the society and implementation of this right thorough use of its authority for resisting the violence.

6.11.2 Narrow Sense:

In the narrow sense he says that in the state of nature people obsessed property in common and insignificant person originally had private property. As he places it "property is without only express compact of all the commoners. The earth, and all that is there in, is given to men for the support and comfort of their being. And.... All the fruit it naturally produces and beasts it feeds, belong to mankind in common, they are produced by the spontaneous and of nature and nobody has originally a private dominion". Locke says that, in addition to this external property which is possessed in common by all the persons, every person has his private property which cannot be taken away by anybody. The private property is a property which a person crops by his labour or sweat. Locke clarifies this point thus, "every man has property in his own person. Thus, nobody has any right to but himself. The labour of his body, and the work of his hands, we may say a property his. What so ever,

then he removes act of the state that hath provided and left it in, he hath mixed his labour with, and joined to it something that is his own, and these by makes it his property. For this labour being the unquestionable property of the labourers, no man but he can have a right to what that is once joined to". In short, Locke says that, the individual's property contains of only thing with which he has mixed his labour. This labour theory of Locke finally became the foundation of modern socialism. It may be distinguished that Locke does not recommend any limit for the private property a person can own, except that he contends that he should not spoil or destroy it. This concept of property however, imperfect in so far it can apply only to a simple and agrarian society and does not appropriate in well with modern difficult economic system.

Locke declares that, the right to property has established the support and consent of the society in so far as it has occurred for such a long time. According to Locke "property is legitimate because men who must live in its midst have consented to its existence... Rousseau insists that accord must be a dynamic course, one transformed each day in men's lives, while Burke will asserted that, genuine consent is found in the well-known customs, which men involuntarily improve over generations and centuries. Further, Locke protects property through consent only part of the way; he has also said that, property is authorized by God and earned by men".

Locke measured the institution of private property as an assurance for individual liberties. He proclaimed that only those people have agonized under tyrannies who did not own private property. According to Maxey "Guarantee every man freedom of property and according to the Lockean theory, there would be little cause to worry about his other liberties. He would be amply able to take out for himself".

6.12 Locke's Consent and Government:

Locke's opinions on state are dissimilar from the views of Hobbes on state. Hobbes preserved it as the need for the safety of life of the individuals, and allotted it absolute powers, but Locke says that, it is created only to eradicate definite inconveniences of the law of nature, he allotted it a different role. His assessments on Government are as follows.

1. He accepts that State/Government is poised of three powers like Legislative, Executive and Federative. He considers the Legislative power as the most important one and entitles it as "the supreme power of the Common Wealth". He gives highest power to the legislature but does not implant it absolute powers. Its power is limited by the acts of the community and the people can restrain its power if it acts opposing to the trust rested on it. Though normally, the community does not proclaim itself but if the legislative power break the rules, the community asserts its authority. Locke pronounces the association between the community and Government as a belief with a view to stress the subordinate position of the government to the community. In this way, says Prof. Vaughan "Locke makes very fair provision not only for popular control of government -but also-what is at more important for progressive extension of that control as experience may dictate".

The executive power, which also comprises the judicial authority, though pretty vital to the operation of the government is rendered a subordinate position to the legislature by Locke. He allots it the duty of imposing the law of nature and the statutes made by the legislative wing and permits it to execute necessary penalties in accordance with the laws. Locke confines the power of executive wing by making it reliant on the legislator. The third power of state is selected by Locke as federative power, which comprises of the duty to guard the interest of the community and single citizens in relation to other communities and citizens. It also comprises state's external affairs. It may be noted that while, Locke asserts on the need of separation between the executive and legislative purpose, he does not contend

on the separation of the executive and the federative powers. Another point which deserves attention is that, Locke considers the Legislative branch as highest because it is representation of the majority and can act as eventual guardian of those natural rights, for whose security the original contract was made. In this way Locke becomes the philosopher of Parliament Government. However, he is not willing to give it absolute or arbitrary and places abundant limitations on its authority. By which, power can be workout for the purpose for which it is established and it can also exercise power over jurisdiction committed to the government by the community. It cannot makes laws opposing to the laws of nature, and it cannot withdraw the people of their property without their consent, and cannot accept power to rule through astonishing decrees. Hence, he made a strong plea for constitutional or government as against despotic or absolute rule.

Secondly, Locke does not dedicate much consideration to the classification of government and simply dedicates a short chapter to this problem. This was perhaps due to the fact that he was more interested in the principles of government rather than institution. Like, Aristotelian custom Locke divided the governments into three categories like, monarchy, aristocracy and democracy depending upon the number of persons exercising Legislative powers. Thus, if the legislative authority is exercised by one man, it is monarchy. On the other hand if the Legislative power is vested in few selected persons and their heirs the government is aristocracy. But if the community retains the Legislative power in its own hands and merely appoints a few officers to execute these land, the government is democracy. Locke well thought-out democracy as the best government because it delivers suitable protections of a good rule and best sources the observance of the principle consent.

Thirdly, Locke holds that the state survives for the people who constitute it takes a purely mechanical view of the state and asserts it is “an artifice which is created and it continues to exist, for the better living of the individuals”.

Fourthly, the state according to Locke rests on the consent of the people. As already pointed out this consent may be expressed or implied. He said that, people follow the state because they have given their accord to be ruled by it at the time of original conduct. This implies principles of majority rule.

Fifthly, Locke's state is a constitutional state in which government moves on according to law.

Sixthly, Locke's state is not like Hobbes absolute one, on the other hand its authority is limited by a number of factors. In the first instance it is limited by the purpose for which it was formed. If it fails to achieve objective, the people shade over through it. Secondly, it is limited by the law of nature. If it performs centrally to the laws of nature it shall lose its legitimacy. Thirdly, the natural rights of the individual also confine the authority of the state. Fourthly the government cannot raise taxes without the consent of the people either direct or indirect.

Seventhly, Locke's state functions on the principle of religious tolerance and is disparate to all type of religious persecution. He wants the state to neutral in the religious matters.

Eighthly, Locke's state is allotted purely negative functions. It simply worried with the hindrance of violation of right by the several members of the community and protection against external aggression.

Finally, as Wayper says, Locke's state is a transformer's state. It transforms the individual's self- interest into public good.

6.13 Locke on Revolution:

Locke as one of the great defender of the Magnificent Revolutions, he justified the right of the people to revolt against the sovereign. He opined that, the trust of the people is government and is set up to fulfill the objectives, if it fails to reach those objectives, the people has the right to revolt against to change it, likely if the government transgresses (misbehaves) and violates basic rights which the people have the right to revolt. The supreme power remains in the people, can remove or alter legislative., he also said that, “Government is dissolved when the legislature so transformed as to bring the law making power into the hands of other than those to which it was entrusted by the community and its organisation or when either legislature or executive acts contrary to its truths”.

How to judge that, government has betrayed the confidence of the people or not, he gives explanation by saying it has to be decided by the society and decision as a whole is final and unquestionable. The views of Locke on the rights of people to revolt against the government, he did not frame theory of government but a theory of rebellion. Locke further said that, the right of revolt against government, is lies only with majority and minority has no right to revolt against the government. The revolution is acceptable only when a change is required and operative in the legislative power or the trust, which the people reposed in the sovereign is dishonored. The revolution is justified only when the change is very operative in the legislative power. Prof. Sabine says, “Any invasion of the life, liberty or property of subjects is ipso facto void, and a legislature which attempts these rights forfeits its power”. Hence, Locke put it: when the legislature, or the prince, either of them act contrary to their trust, by breach of trust they forfeit the power of the people had put into their hands for quit contrary ends, and it devolves to the people, who have a right to resume their original liberty, and by the establishment of a new legislature, provided for their own safety and security, which is the end for which they are in the society’.

6.14 Locke as an Individualist:

Locke with his writing he expressed that he was systematic individualist.

1 He accords an essential place to innate and natural rights in his scheme and stated that the natural right of life, liberty and poverty belonging to individual due to his personality, he said that natural rights are vital to the state.

2 For the protection, natural rights and for happiness of individual the state is formed, he wanted the powers to be given to all men without any distinction.

3 The Locke’s government is mainly depended upon the consent of people in the state, he asserts that the government based on consent of people is legitimate.

4 He gave state only the negative functions, it obstructs only when the rights of individual are in danger. Or else, individual is free to follow his moral, material and intellectual quests.

5 His views on Property makes him as a total individualist. He says that property owned in common becomes private property of an individual after he blends with labour, which gives individuality to common object.

6 He gave important position to the law of nature and stressed that the state law must confirm it.

7 He expressed his strong individualist unfair views on revolution, he gave permission to individual to revolt against the state, if it crosses limit or fails to carry out its obligation.

8 His theory of philosophy starts with his faith in the pleasure and faith theory and is an important point in his individualism.

9 He advocates division of power because he believes that it is necessary to have this power to preserve the rights of individual freedom.

6.15 Conclusion:

John Locke born in 1632, after his degree in M.A, he worked as tutor and later gave up and joined in Medicine, and become medical practitioner, he was associated with Lord Ashley he was the physician of Ashley. He wrote number of book around 35, some of them provide his insight into philosophy and political thought. He was influenced by contemporary thinkers of his time. He did not express his views on human nature systematically, had to assemble his ideas from different works of him. His views on human nature, humans are basically decent have social instinct. His views on state of nature, thinks that it is pre-political rather than pre-social. His views on social contracts, , the deficits in the law of nature make the man to leave the nature of state and get into the an agreement for the formation of the state, the deficiencies are, lack of an established, settled and known law, which can be understood by each individual by his way and lead to misunderstanding.

His views on State, the views of Locke on state are quite different from that of Hobbes, Hobbes stated that it as a requirement to guard the life of individual and gave absolute powers to it. Locke stated that, law of nature, to remove some suspicions and he gave different way of thought to it.

His views on Revolution are, Locke as one of the great defender of the Magnificent Revolutions, he justified the right of the people to revolt against the sovereign. He opined that, the trust of the people is government and is set up to fulfill the objectives, if it fails to reach those objectives, the people has the right to revolt against to change it, likely if the government transgresses (misbehaves) and violates basic rights which the people have the right to revolt. Locke's Individualist views are, Locke with his writing he expressed that he was systematic individualist. He accords an essential place to innate and natural rights in his scheme and stated that the natural right of life.

6.16 Model Questions:

1. Write about Locke's early life and his influences?
2. Describe about Locke's theory of property?
3. Describe about Locke's consent and government?
4. Describe Locke's equality and natural law?

6.17 References:

1. D.C. Chaturvedi, Political Thought, Meenakshi Prakasham, New Delhi, 1981.
2. Johns Dryzek and others, Political Theory, Oxford University Press, 2008.
3. C.L. Wayper, Political Thought, B.I. Publications, New Delhi, 1979.
4. R.G. Mulgan, Aristotle's Political Theory, Clarendon Press, Oxford, 1977.
5. William Ebenstein, Modern Political thought, IBH publishing Co, 1970.
6. David Boucher & Paul Kelly, Political Thinkers, Oxford University Press, 2009.

Dr. C. Vinod Kumar, Lesson Writer

LESSON-07**ROUSSEAU- The General Will****7.0 Objectives:**

1. Students would be able to know about the early life of Rousseau.
2. Students would be able to describe about Rousseau's The General Will.

Structure:

- 7.0 Objectives
- 7.1 Introduction
- 7.2 Influences on Rousseau
- 7.3 Views on Human Nature
- 7.4 Views on State of Nature
- 7.5 Views on Social Contract
- 7.6 Views on General Will
 - 7.6.1 Characteristics of General Will
 - 7.6.2 Critiques on the Theory of General Will
- 7.7 Views on Popular Sovereignty
- 7.8 Conclusion
- 7.9 Model Questions
- 7.10 References

7.1 Introduction:

Rousseau was born in Geneva, in the year 1712, in a middle class French family. His mother died while giving him birth and the burden of rearing the child fell on his father. His father being unbalanced man he could not give appropriate devotion to the education of Rousseau. His father flown from Geneva and the 10 year old Rousseau delegated under the care of his uncle. At the age of sixteen he left his home and took to life of wanderer. Thus, unlike Hobbes and Locke he could neither receive proper education nor find a supporter. He led a life of poverty and deprivation.

Rousseau made his mark in political thought in 1749, when he wrote an essay "Has the Progress of Sciences and the Arts helped to Purify corrupt morals" for the Dijon Academy which not only won him the first prize, but also made him well known in the literary circles of Paris. After five years he wrote "Discourse on the Origin and Foundation of Inequality", in which he relentlessly criticized the institution of private property and held it accountable for the inequality in the society. The other imperative works of Rousseau include an article on political economy which he contributed to the French Encyclopedia in 1755; The social contract or the principles of political rights published in 1762, La Nouvelle Heloise published

in 1761; the *Emile* (a treatise on education) published in 1762; *The Confessions*, *Dialogues* and *Reveries*. The last three books were produced during the period 1762 and 1778. It may be witnessed that he was a widely held writer in his own times as well as in the later years. His writings have great mass appeal because he stood for the abolition of rights for the privileged classes and favoured their extension to the middle and lower middle classes.

7.2 Influences on Rousseau:

The political thought of Rousseau reflects the influence of prevalent surroundings as well as the innumerable political philosophers who had headed him because of the hard life he had led. He could well raise the value of the problems and difficulties of ordinary men and developed a philosophy to suit them. Maxey told, that “Lowly origin and his humble, mendicant way of life” was a source of his power. “He was not merely the people’s advocate, he was bone of their bone and flesh of their flesh”. His long relationship with Geneva was responsible for his love for democracy and democratic institutions. Among the political philosophies, he was intensely influenced by Plato, Locke, Montesquieu, Hobbes etc.

He was appreciative to Plato for basic ideas, like political subjection, basically ethical and that the community itself the chief moralizing intervention and hence embodies the uppermost moral order and value. The main moulding influences on him through Locke. He was very much influenced by Locke’s concept of natural rights, the Sovereignty of community theory of consent etc. Rousseau started with the same principles as Locke did, but he reached at dissimilar conclusions. He tried some of the irregularities and abnormalities, present in the thought of Locke. Rousseau’s teachings only an expansion of the network excavated by Locke.

7.3 Views on Human Nature:

According to Rousseau man is basically good and his wrong actions make him wicked, he stated that man governed by two instincts, self-love and mutual aid or sympathy, man prefers to attend his own presentations; his first cares are those which he obligates himself. His second instinct is less important but is important and encourages us to do more good than harm. He says that, when self-interest goes off track it gives rise to pride; and his pride is the cause for the evils. If get rid of this pride and ends all evaluations with other men we reach our goal. Wright says that, “we can renounce a lot of imaginary desires and hold fast to the true things, needful cast away a world of illusion and discord our own self. We can be meek, and inherit our soul. In a word, we can return to nature. This is all the famous phrases means”.

7.4 Views on State of Nature:

His views on state of nature are quite different from Hobbes and Locke, in his state he said that all men are equal and lived peaceful life and the property has the joint ownership, people led simple life. They are not in organized structure even though they lived in peace atmosphere, they led solitary, happy, free and independent life, no law and morality were existed. These institutions understood the reality of reason and could not exist due to its noticeable absence.

The instinct of the social activities forced man to give up their solitary life and to start to live in groups. According to Rousseau, “The first man, having enclosed a piece of ground, he thought himself of saying ‘This is mine’ and found other people simple enough to believe

him, was the first real founder of the society". He stressed the need not to have private property because "the scrambled for the land and other private property resulted in war, murder, wretchedness and horror. The capacity of individuals to own and produce being different there came into existence inequality in every sphere of life". Rousseau visualized two stages of the status of state such as, pre-property state and post property state. The pre-property state of nature considered as an ideal state and the post property state as wretched.

7.5 Views on Social Contract:

Rousseau's thoughts were same like that of Hobbes and Locke, he thought that, entering into social contract was to get out of shameful and intolerable conditions of the post property stage. The finalized contract of him, "Each of us puts his person and all his power in common under the supreme direction of the general will, we receive each individual as part of whole. At once in place of the individual personality of each contracting party, this many members as Assembly contains votes and receiving from his act and unity, its common identity, its life and its will. Yet each person in the state, possessing equal and inalienable position of the sovereignty of the whole, gains back under state protection the rights he has given up". Consequently he combines individual in the state and made a political society which was based on the agreement of all the members. The contract was dual sided, his individual as a part of sovereign, was guaranteed to other individuals and as part of the state he was assured to sovereign.

7.6 Views on General Will:

Rousseau encouraged the theory of General Will, he pronounced that it is the most revolutionary, unique striking and influential doctrine. The main problem with his theory was "to find a form of association which will defend and protect with that whole common force the person and goods of each associate, and in which each, while uniting with all, may still obey himself alone, and remains as free as before". To make this association possible every individual puts himself and his power together under the supreme direction of General Will. The result of this act to form association a moral, combined unit having its own identity, life and will is created, he defines it as General.

Before understanding his concept of General Will, one has to understand the difference between actual will and real will. He asserted that, actual will is based on selfish, irrational and thought of the good of individual alone, without caring for the society and the real will is, higher, nobler, and supreme, which encourages the person to think of welfare of all not his own interest. It is more social than anti-social, collective and personal, it is for the individual as well as the society. It is mainly based on reasons and it is not temporary but it is permanent. Hence, his General Will consists of sum of 'real wills' of the individuals which are based on the reasons and forethought of every person.

Rousseau differentiated General Will from the Will of all, he says that it is a majority will and considers only for few people, where as General Will is for the communities good. The main difference of these two wills are explained by him "There is often a considerable difference General Will and Will of all, the former aims at the common interest, the latter aims at private interest and is these wills is only a sum of particular wills. But if we take away from the various particular interests which conflict each other, what remains as the sum of difference is General Will".

7.6.1 Characteristics of General Will:

Rousseau's General Will have some of the interesting attributes they are as follow:

- 1 Like personality of a person cannot be divided, it also cannot be divided. If it is divided it ceases General Will and becomes sectional will
- 2 It cannot be represented by anyone, like the human will
- 3 No one can break the rules of General Will, whosoever refused to obey shall be compelled to do so by whole body...he will be forced to free.
- 4 It is a single unit and cannot withdrawn, alienated it equivalent to its death
- 5 He believed through General Will as direct democracy and it cannot be representable.
- 6 General will is at all times correct it always talks about the good of community, though we are unable to see it. It is based on reason, wisdom and experience and could not be influenced by present times.

7.6.2 Critiques on the Theory of General Will:

His theory has been criticised for the following defects

- 1 The concept of Will is quite unclear and puzzling, he uses the term general will at different senses at different places, he recognizes it, as good for all and at the same time he talks that it is the will of majority, at the same time he equates it with wise legislature.
- 2 He says that his Will is different from others, it is not possible to draw a line between the two.
- 3 He tries to divide individual into two parts like essential and non- essential. The essential is rational and the other is selfish, but the individual's will is corporate and it is not possible to divide it into two parts.
- 4 He asserts that General Will coincides with justice, by this he makes the thing more difficult, it not possible to reunite two concepts of General Will and Justice.
- 5 He flagged the way for the rise of dictatorship by giving all powers to his General Will. It gives enough time for individuals or groups to promote his own interests.
- 6 His General Will gave the position of super entity to the state different form its organic elements, the individuals
- 7 Rousseau says that, through General will only liberty of an individual possible, if any one against to the will he will be forced to imprisonment or death, it is very difficult to understand how both liberty and force can be together.
- 8 He says that General will is representable, and it implies direct existence of direct democracy. It cannot be applied in modern days
- 9 It expects too much from human nature, it is well known that men are selfish.
- 10 He did not mentioned how to put it in real practice though he made several suggestions to his will.

11 His theory can be considered as contrary to the theory of social contract.

It is fact that, his theory of General Will suffers from many paradoxes and short comings, but it has been observed as the most philosophical contribution to the political thought.

7.7 Views on Popular Sovereignty:

While formulating the contract he vested the sovereignty not in any single person or group of individuals but in the community as a whole, through the medium of the general will. Thus, he gives the impression that, he believes in the Sovereignty of the people. But a deeper study of his writings shows that, he merely gave the appearance of popular government, but in reality he gives absolute powers to the ruler. He says “whoever refuses to obey the general will, shall be compelled to do so by the whole body”. Thus, he vested the General will with absolute powers. He with a view to import popular character to the sovereign he asset that the general will is always right and tends always to the public advantage”. As the general will operates to the general welfare, people are morally committed to carry out its verdict. Legally also people are expected to render free obedience to the general will at the time of contract they surrendered all their rights to the general will without any condition. He argues that, “as nature gives to everyman an absolute power over all its members, the social pact gives to everyman an absolute power over all its members”. In short, in his scheme there are no limitation on the authority of the sovereign general will.

Thus, the sovereign of Rousseau is as absolute and the sovereign of Hobbes with the only difference that while Hobbes confers all the powers in a single person, Rousseau vests the sovereign power in the community or the General Will. However, the sovereigns in both the cases are vested with absolute powers and their authority cannot be defined under any circumstances. It is in this sense that it has said that “Rousseau’s sovereign is Hobbes Leviathan with its head chopped off”.

Sovereignty could be assumed the entire power of the state, the total force belonging to the political association as such, might and power of the political community. This is the field by which the early protectors of popular sovereignty fought many battles, and by which the organic theory again conducted war. The political power of the state, they held, must be generated by the people as a whole, and not individual and the state is for the people’s welfare only. The sovereignty means neither international independence, nor the whole power to the state, but have the relation between the ruling structure in the state and the other members, the relation of the king.

Sovereignty is a definite mark of the State, which is an essential and vital quality. There could be any State which is not a sovereign State. This idea is highlighted from the earlier years of the century to the starting of the trouble. Ancillon said that the “essence of every political association consisted in the sovereignty.” Waitz held that “every true State must be a sovereign State;” Held maintained that sovereignty denotes the specific, free, independent essence of a State. The important feature of the State is that, it differentiated from all other associations. Sovereignty, then, in this sense, of the whole force of the political association, can be treated as a unit.

Rousseau says, “Whoever refuses to obey the General Will, shall be compelled to do so by the whole body”. By this he gave absolute powers to General Will. Nevertheless, with a view to impart popular character to sovereign, he says that General Will every time right and every time likely to be the advantage of the public. About the legal aspects he says that all the people are supposed to render their obedience to the General Will because at the time of contract they surrendered their rights to the General Will without any condition.

7.8 Conclusion:

Jean Rousseau, was born at Geneva in 1712 in French middle class family, he wrote many books on political thought, but he became prominent personality in 1749, when he wrote “Has the progress of the sciences and the Arts helped to purify corrupt morals”. He was influenced by political philosophers like, Plato, Locke and Hobbes.

On human nature he said that, man is basically good and his wrong actions makes him wicked, he stated that man is governed by two instincts, self-love and mutual aid or sympathy, man prefers to attend his own presentations; his first cares are those which he be obligated himself.

On state of nature he said that, all men are equal and lived peaceful life and the property had the joint ownership, people led simple life. They were not in organized structure even though they lived in peace atmosphere, they led solitary, happy, free and independent life, and no law and morality were existed. These institutions understood the reality of reason and could not exist due to its noticeable absence. About the social contract he said that, “Each of us puts his person and all his power in common under the supreme direction of the general will, we receive each individual as part of whole.

On General Will he said that, it is the most revolutionary, unique striking and influential doctrine. The main problem with his theory was “to find a form of association which will defend and protect with that whole common force the person and goods of each associate, and in which each, while uniting with all, may still obey himself alone, and remains as free as before”. To make this association possible every individual puts himself and his power together under the supreme direction of General Will. The result of this act to form association a moral, combined unit having its own identity, life and will is created, he defines it as General.

7.9 Model Questions:

1. Write about the early life of J.J. Rousseau and his influence?
2. Describe about Rousseau’s popular sovereignty?
- 3 Describe Rousseau’s General Will?
3. Describe about Rousseau’s Social Contract?

7.10 References:

1. D.C. Chaturvedi, Political Thought, Meenakshi Prakasham, New Delhi, 1981.
2. Johns Dryzek and others, Political Theory, Oxford University Press, 2008.
3. C.L. Wayper, Political Thought, B.I. Publications, New Delhi, 1979.
4. R.G. Mulgan, Aristotle’s Political Theory, Clarendon Press, Oxford, 1977.
5. William Ebenstein, Modern Political thought, IBH publishing Co, 1970.
6. David Boucher & Paul Kelly, Political Thinkers, Oxford University Press, 2009.

Dr. C. Vinod Kumar
Lesson Writer

LESSON-08

G.W.F HEGEL- FREEDOM, CIVIL SOCIETY AND STATE

8.0 Objectives:

1. Students would be able to learn about the early life of Hegel.
2. Students would be able to understand his political thinking.
3. Students would be able to know about state and civil society.

Structure

- 8.0 Objectives
- 8.1 Introduction
- 8.2 Influences on Hegel
- 8.3 Hegel Views on Human Nature
- 8.4 The Nature and Ethics of Civil Society
- 8.5 Civil Society
- 8.6 Need of a System
- 8.7 Administration of Justice
- 8.8 Hegel Views on State
- 8.9 Government Agencies and Private Corporations
- 8.10 Freedom Views of Hegel
 - 8.10.1. Freedom and Rationality
 - 8.10.2. Freedom as Self-Realization
 - 8.10.3. Ethical Life as the Realization of Freedom
 - 8.10.4. Freedom and the State
 - 8.10.5. Historical Development of Freedom
 - 8.10.6. Freedom vs. Arbitrary Will
 - 8.10.7. Critical Evaluation
- 8.11 Hegel Views on Constitution
- 8.12 Hegel Views on War
- 8.13 Conclusion

8.14 Model Questions

8.15 References

.

8.1 Introduction:

George Withelm Friedrich Hegel was born in 1770, at Wurttemberg in Germany. His father was a civil servant, the ruler of Wurttemberg. He joined the University of Tubingen after his initial education, but had to leave the same because he was stated 'deficient in philosophy'. He worked as private tutor then as lecturer at Jena University, Head Master in Nuremberg. After that he became the professor of philosophy in Heidelberg. It was there he produced Encyclopedia of the Philosophical Sciences which controlled the fullest behavior of his general Philosophical System. From Heidelberg he was shifted to Berlin University, where he stayed till his last breath. He was grown to the position of president and also performed as the official philosopher of Prussia in Berlin. He wrote philosophy of right and delivered lectures which were brought out in the shape of a book after his death under the title philosophy of History. Prof. Wayper says about him as "the most outstanding advocate of the organic state" and one of the most powerful thinkers in history of modern political thought.

8.2 Influences on Hegel:

During the days of French Revolution, he was influenced by the happenings and he described it a magnificent mental beginning, and it was greatly responsible for making him conventional and he began to escalate the rationality of the existing institutions. He was very much influenced by Plato and Aristotle. Hegel was also influenced by Home's concept of natural law, Rousseau's romantic individual and Kant's science and morals and tried to bring about synthesis of these three ideas in his political philosophy.

8.3 Hegel Views on Human Nature:

Hegel also said similar to Aristotle, man is social by nature as well as necessity, he attains his best only with the support of others. To serve his sensory need he established family and presented protection with the passing of time he understood that family is not enough of his best self and created civil society, which is regarded as by struggle for development. Certain laws which are developed by civil society are unnecessary. This point is underlined by Hegel "The whole process of trade and industry in the bourgeois society becomes a new organization for the supply of human needs. So that man in the society is producing for his family, satisfying his own wants and at the same time serving his fellows, which makes bourgeois society evolves laws even though not necessarily just laws; it creates police force and becomes more and more like in form".

8.4 The Nature and Ethics of Civil Society:

In Hegel's political thought, it was important to note the role played by nature, Hegel assumed the unity of nature and freedom also attempted to diagnose the natural substantiality which apprised individual's free will. Hegel proclaimed in, The Philosophy of Right that, the justification of the free will assumed his explanation of partiality in the Encyclopedia. In this Encyclopedia we found that Hegel opposes "mind has for its presumption Nature of which it is the truth".

Hegel evidently distinguishes that the concept of nature compete with the concept of free will when nature is considered as mechanism. It is vital, to understand that when Hegel expresses of nature in his political philosophy, he aims nature as thoroughly spiritualized in the human will. The whole viewpoint of objective spirit is away from the dualism of mind and nature; in the concept of the free will, which Hegel's political philosophy everywhere supposes, this dualism is understood as indirectly overwhelmed. In the Philosophy of Right, Hegel reviews the row of his 'Psychology' that the free will knows itself implicitly as the understanding of nature. According to Hegel the will is a thoughtful will and thus thought and will are not two separate faculties.

The basic or immediate institutional expression of the unity of nature and will is the family. The family is both a natural institution and an applicable ethical commencement in that it shares the instant starting point of abstract right. On the other hand providing an objective ethical institution which can be recognized as basis of the subject's moral freedom and as assumed by such freedom. It is presupposed by freedom first, may be immediate or natural way. The identity of family members is facilitated by relation to others like parent to child, husband to wife, and sibling to sibling, husband and wife together throughout their life become a unit, distributing their understanding and also the self-image of child is determined by the one's relation to one's parent. Integrity is determined by the moral attacks of parents and one feels guilty when one opposes parent directions. This properties finds severe criticism of the guess that the free individuality upon which civil society rests is something given and interceded. Individual freedom which is the basis and reasoning of civil society and state is not simply given but rather has been arbitrated through the ethos and discipline of family life.

The family is, though a restricted form of ethical life because individuals cannot progress to their full potential if they are dependent on parents; and the drive of the family is to advance the individuality of children to the extent that they can leave their natural family members behind. To make their life better children has to leave their family members for their growth and ethical life in its instant union of universal and particular ends, consequently divided into a circumstances where the individual outlines himself in contradistinction to the universal. According to Hegel, the more progress of individuality takes place in civil society which he calls "ethical life in its stage of division" because in it the individual assists the universal good to his own private interests. Hence the family element liquefies through the working of the principle of individual personality and in civil society individuals are not treated as loved family members but as independent persons connected to each other through self-interest and law.

It is the demand of the subject, the actual freedom of individual, the harmony of his social and particular ends, be represented in an unchanging and uninterrupted method. This unity is prolonged all through the dominion of civil society by two institutions 1. Government agencies such as, municipal, provincial and 2. federal and private corporations.

According to Hegel, the drive of government agencies and other official bodies is a middle term between the individual and the common goods and occasions which society pay for. One of the important functions of the government agencies is to uphold the mutual capital and general values. Government organizations are apprehensive with quality control and price fixing of essential services and goods. Hegel claims that "goods in absolutely daily demand are offered not so much to an individual as such but rather to a universal purchaser, the public". Government procedures protect that the public is not deceived or taken benefit of by particular interests. Nevertheless, even lawful activities may obstruct with the freedom of

others and Hegel opposes that government agencies also try to eradicate unintended burdens to the rights of the individual and the public.

In addition, government is also accountable to safeguard that the inequalities in the system of needs do not encroach on the universal right to contribute in the common good. Hegel meant, the luxury of the free market causes failure of those who do not have skills of ability cannot contribute fully in the market. As members of civil society they are encouraged to symbolize themselves through work, and are prevented from this by the very system which encourages the desire. Because the deprived cannot fully contribute in the benefits and openings of civil society, they feel this limitation as anger of those who have disproportionate wealth is one of the cause of their poverty. Hegel argues that government has to stop the growth of this class and prefer the welfare to those who are deprived.

8.5 Civil Society:

Hegel stated that, an individual's specific acts are personifications of his freedom, not simply of his particular economic freedom (freedom of choice or freedom from obstruction) but of a more universal freedom, facilitated by awareness of law and established life. Hegel opposes, in emerging its potentialities, "particularity passes over into universality and attains its right". Hence, the procedure of civil society is an education of specific individual from his own self-interest and more universal ethical life, the progress of the contained universality of the moral will. With the help of education, the individual is socialized and develops the social elements like, talents, personality, and habits take on. There is doubt that social institutions arise from these interrelations, relatively, the disagreement of 'Civil Society' can be seen to expressive, in its most general sense institutions are legitimate so far as economic and moral freedom accept them.

The argument of Hegel, develops in two ways, one, through the actions and interactions of self-interested individuals and the interchange of individual and social interests an impulsive structuring of this interrelation occurs, and the structures of civil society develop as personifications of the subject's free will. The structures which develops serve discipline the subject's interests so that, become universalized and enact rather than oppose the interests of the community. The principle of modern political life, is legitimated only when willed by an ethical community, institutions discipline the individual will and represent the universal relations of this will. The division present in civil society is not due to the fact that the individual has no universal interests, but people work to provide for their families and as members of corporations. However for Hegel these universals are melt down comparatively particular in relation to the state because it fits to their principle to be in struggle with each other in the civil dominion.

8.6 Need of a System:

According to Hegel the individual is a self-conscious subject associated to his own desires as a free member of a society. Human in the civil society gives a clearly rational institutional form to their needs and desires. For Hegel, the subject's relation to desire and is hence not conflicting to reason but in fact, is resolute by reason and the needs are not gratified through simply natural things but through the artificial products of human action. In the place of natural desires we produce our own second nature; our desires and consumption are not incomplete to the yields of nature and, in fact, for the most part we munch the products of human work. In fact our particular desires are often means to more social desires such as the desire for status. Hence it is wholly abstract to describe our appetites as given by nature.

Human desires are produced through social interaction, like the objects of desire are produced by society and the value of these objects are determined by human labour.

The social organization is collection of two elements: I. a universal or common possession of general resources and skilled labour and II. A division of classes. The principle of common capital, general resources etc., is relatively clear. Hegel's concept of class division requires further clarification. The aggregation of particular skill and the universal will (the social will of particular individuals) is resolute as the type of work they do, he divided the class depending upon their works such as, 1 primary labour such as, farmers and fishers, 2 industrial and market labour, and 3 professional labour such as, doctors, lawyers, teachers, civil servants. According to Hegel, the development of such objective classes is a necessity, but he argues that "the ways and means of sharing capital are left to each man's particular choice" and that the classes are the root which "connects self-seeking to the universal". The significant feature of division of class is that, in it, there is a unity of the interests of society with the interests of individuals. Individuals from these classes come into associate each other, as the need of the system is to system of needs prompts interdependence in the different classes, and becomes essential to know the developments of many different classes if it has to work in civil society.

8.7 Administration of Justice:

Hegel stated that, the administration of justice is mainly based on universality that means, everyone seems to be equal and rights of individual are recognized not by the class they belong to, but by the virtue of universal personhood. Hegel states: "In the administration of justice ... civil society returns to its concept, to the unity of the implicit universal with the subjective particular". Hegel understands the law of the actual life of a people and realizes the role of government to express these developments. The system of law, tells about the reason and is real and determine by the society. The relations of social aspects remain to understand clear and independent reality. There are two noteworthy limits to the administration of justice. 1. it remains in a convinced sense only a comparative union of universal and particular interests because, though it brings all individuals under the law, it be likely to somewhat to defend the individual's universal interests as against his merely personal interests. There are two noteworthy limits to the administration of justice. 1. it remains in a convinced sense only a comparative union of universal and particular interests because, though it brings all individuals under the law, it be likely to somewhat to defend the individual's universal interests as against his merely personal interests. 2 because the actuality of the union of universal and particular conclusions occurs only in single cases of violation of the law, justice is not a systematic unity of universal and particular rights. Hegel openly validates the limits of civil law and demonstrates that, civil society develops in tangible universality, which educate the individual that he distinguishes in a more clear form that the will of the courts.

8.8 Hegel Views on State:

Hegel designated state as the March of God on this Earth, because he thinks state as divine organization and by God. He never accepted the social contract theory because it says that, state is the result of contract and it came into existence due to spirit involved in it. To quote him, 'the state is divine will as a present spirit which unfolds itself in the actual shade of an organized world. In simple words he considers the state as a handiwork of God and an embodiment of reason. It possessed a will and personalities of the individual ls which composed it. It was an end itself and was the sole agency which worked for the moral

upliftment of mankind. It contributed to the enrichment of the individual's personality by purging him of petty and self-elements". In the words of Prof Dunning, Hegel regarded "the state as perfect rationality- in the sense that man has ethical status only as a member of state and that highest duty of man is not to develop his individual faculties, but to be a member of the state and faithfully fulfill his allotted functions therein".

Hegel understood state as being with usual development, it is superior to the parts which are essentially associated to it and have significance only in so far as the whole gives them meaning. The state is real person and "its will is the manifestation of perfect nationality – the synthesis of universal and individual freedom". According to Prof. Wayper 'In all essential his is the most complete organic view of the state. It is a natural growth. It is a whole greater than the parts which are intrinsically related to it and which have meaning only in so far as the whole gives them meaning. It is an end itself'.

Hegel thought that the individual has no right contrary to the state, and the autonomy for the individual consisted in blind submission to the commands of the state. On the organic nature of Hegel, Prof. Gooch commented, "The state is not formed by a grant of certain arbitrarily selected from the individuals but taking up unto itself the whole circle of his life. The individual on the other hand cannot be conceived apart from the community. He is what he is, as a member of it, his whole life physical, moral and intellectual is drawn from it".

He reflected, the state is the architect for all rights and individual does not have any right on state. He gives individual as a representative of the union of the universal and the individual will and entirely dependent to the state. Hegel understands the state as an end and the individual as a means for the fulfillment of that end. He considered state as an epitome of the highest social morality which laid the standard morality for the members in the state. Hegel thinks that society is less important than state in the same manner like society is more important than family.

C.E.M Joad stated that, "Just as the personalities of all individuals in the state are transcended by and merged in the personality of the state; so the moral relations which each citizen has to each other, citizen are merged or transcended by the social morality which is vested in the state. But this does not mean that the state is itself moral, or that it is bound by moral relations in its action". The three elementary ideologies of Hegel are summed up by Joad are here under.

1 State can never act dishonestly as it replicates actual will of the individuals. There is whole credentials between freedom and law, actual liberty being achieved through submission to law which is expressed of will.

2 Man is fundamentally social he cannot will with himself, he can will himself with other individuals which is essential part of his personality.

3 The social morality of all its citizens comprises and represents within the state itself. But itself above it. That means its relations to its subject and to other states cannot be made object of moral judgment.

4 Hegel's views on state suffers from number of defects, it shows the tendency towards Autocracy. He recognizes freedom with law and replaces discipline for equality. He combines the individual in the state and evaluate the virtue of the state according to power. He elevates war and denies ambitions towards human brotherhood.

8.9 Government Agencies and Private Corporations:

The actual freedom of individual, the harmony of his social and particular ends, be represented in an unchanging and uninterrupted method. This unity is prolonged all through the dominion of civil society by two institutions 1. Government agencies such as, municipal, provincial and 2. federal and private corporations.

According to Hegel, the drive of government agencies and other official bodies is a middle term between the individual and the common goods and occasions which society pay for. One of the important functions of the government agencies is to uphold the mutual capital and general values. Government organizations are apprehensive with quality control and price fixing of essential services and goods. Hegel claims that "goods in absolutely daily demand are offered not so much to an individual as such but rather to a universal purchaser, the public". Government procedures protect that the public is not deceived or taken benefit of by particular interests. Nevertheless, even lawful activities may obstruct with the freedom of others and Hegel opposes that government agencies also try to eradicate unintended burdens to the rights of the individual and the public.

8.10 Freedom Views of Hegel:

Hegel thinks that, freedom is an indispensable and it is the spirit of man, and its denial to a man equivalent to denial of his personality and humanity, he said that freedom is positive marvel rather than negative concept of freedom. His phenomenon is a social one than individualistic in the moral life of the community. He declared that freedom could be conceivable only within the state because it inevitable willing is rational. He says that, giving total submission to the state and the performance of one's duties is freedom.

According to Prof. Barker the freedom of Hegel "Expresses itself in a series of outward manifestations first the law then the rules of inward morality; and finally the whole system of institutions and influence that make for righteousness in the national state".

Hegel conceives freedom as a positive, rational, and social phenomenon. For Hegel, true freedom is not mere arbitrariness but the realization of rational self-determination within ethical and social structures. His philosophy transforms freedom from a subjective right into an objective principle grounded in reason, ethical life, and the state.

8.10.1. Freedom and Rationality

Hegel maintains that freedom is inseparable from rationality. He argues that human beings are free only to the extent that their will aligns with reason:

"The will is truly free only when it wills the rational." (Hegel, Philosophy of Right, §29)

This implies that freedom is not the capacity to act arbitrarily but to act in accordance with universal rational principles. In Hegel's dialectical framework, freedom involves overcoming purely subjective inclinations and elevating oneself to the standpoint of the universal or objective will.

8.10.2. Freedom as Self-Realization

Hegel defines freedom as "being with oneself in the other" (bei sich selbst im Anderen sein). This reflects a dialectical process wherein the individual finds self-fulfillment not in isolation

but through participation in broader ethical and institutional orders. Thus, freedom is realized through:

1. Subjective Spirit – the development of individual self-consciousness.
2. Objective Spirit – the institutional embodiment of freedom through law, morality, and ethical life.
3. Absolute Spirit – the highest realization of freedom in art, religion, and philosophy, where self-consciousness recognizes its unity with universal reason.

8.10.3. Ethical Life as the Realization of Freedom

Central to Hegel's political philosophy is the concept of ethical life, which transcends mere abstract morality. Ethical life represents a concrete social order where individuals internalize universal ethical norms through participation in family, civil society, and the state.

- Family: Freedom begins with immediate unity and natural ethical bonds.
- Civil Society: Individuals pursue their private interests within a system of rights, markets, and legal institutions.
- State: The state embodies the rational unity of the universal and particular wills. It is not merely a coercive apparatus but "the actuality of the ethical Idea".

Through these stages, Hegel argues that freedom matures from subjective independence to its highest form: rational integration within ethical and political institutions.

8.10.4. Freedom and the State

Hegel's view of the state is often misunderstood as authoritarian. However, Hegel sees the state as the ultimate realization of freedom because it reconciles individuality and universality. Unlike contractualist theories (e.g., Locke or Rousseau), Hegel rejects the notion that the state originates from individual consent. Instead, he views the state as a rational and historical manifestation of the ethical spirit:

- The state is not opposed to individual freedom; rather, it provides the institutional conditions in which true freedom becomes possible.
- Law and rights within the state limit arbitrary will, thereby enabling rational self-determination.

In this sense, freedom is not "freedom from" but "freedom through" law and social institutions.

8.10.5. Historical Development of Freedom

Hegel adopts a historical perspective, asserting that freedom unfolds dialectically across history. He famously states:

"The history of the world is none other than the progress of the consciousness of freedom."

Ancient societies, in Hegel's view, recognized freedom only for a few (e.g., masters in slavery-based systems). Christianity and modern European states, by contrast, gradually universalized the recognition of individual rights and freedom. For Hegel, modern

constitutional monarchies represent the culmination of this historical progress toward freedom.

8.10.6. Freedom vs. Arbitrary Will

A key distinction in Hegel's thought is between "true freedom" and "arbitrary will":

- Arbitrary Will: The capacity to choose based on desires or inclinations, often associated with liberal individualism.
- True Freedom: Acting in accordance with rational, ethical laws that one recognizes as one's own.

Thus, freedom is not the unrestricted satisfaction of desires but the self-conscious acceptance of rational and ethical constraints.

8.10.7. Critical Evaluation

Hegel's theory of freedom has been both celebrated and criticized:

- Positive Contributions: His integration of freedom with rationality and social institutions offers a holistic alternative to atomistic individualism.
- Criticisms: Some critics argue that Hegel's glorification of the state risks subsuming individual autonomy under political authority. Others view his historical teleology as Eurocentric and overly deterministic.

Nevertheless, Hegel's conception profoundly influenced later thinkers, including Marx, Kierkegaard, and 20th-century communitarian philosophers, shaping modern debates on freedom and society.

8.11 Hegel Views on Constitution:

Hegel specified that, states formulate itself in a constitution or internal law. Which makes the government to work. He separated the powers of government into three categories 1. Legislative 2. Administrative 3. Monarchic. He favored monarchic power as noteworthy because it unites the state. While the other two legislative and administrative categories according to him represents thesis and antithesis. The monarchic powers represent synthesis. Hegel favored constitutional monarchy because perfect rationality could be obtained, it supervises other two groups of government and brings harmony in the state.

He asserted that sovereignty belonged to the state as a whole, but in actual rehearsal it is determined by most active element in every state, the assignment of sovereignty to the monarch not to the people. Legislature meant by him which included prince, the administration and people. He said that the responsibility of the legislature was to make principles and execution of principles by the prince. According to him constitutional monarchy only gives true freedom.

8.12 Hegel Views on War:

The essential feature made by Hegel was fight amongst the states, which was for the divine purpose. To achieve the perfection and individuality, one had to be in good relation with other state. The war was considered as the best illustration of the flight of the individual

spirit in its outward movement. The political strength of the nation could be shown by the war. He said that, war would help in discover of the world spirit.

8.12.1 Hegel on Dialectic:

The one of the significant political philosophy of Hegel Dialectic method. This idea was inspired by Greek thinkers who held that each force give birth to an opposite force. He was also influenced by Fichte in this respect. Hegel considered that dialectic is not purely a process by theological ideas established, but It is a process by which all ideas in the world are developed. The progress of human civilization is not in a positive and straight line instead it is in zig-zag manners. The procedure of evolution must have followed certain principle. Hegel used the philosophy of dialectics to explain improvement of society and its institutions. Prof. Wayper told about Hegel's dialectic as "a new system of synthetic logic replacing the old system of analytic logic a principle of self -movement through contradiction towards the final goal of perfect realization spirit".

8.13 Conclusion:

Hegel was born in 1770 in Germany, his father was civil servant, he was influenced by Aristotle, and Plato, Rousseau and Kant. On human nature he said that man is social by nature as well as necessity, man can grow with the help of other members. He considered state as essentially a divine institution and described it as March of God on this earth, he rejected the social contract theory. On freedom he said that, freedom is the essence of man, denial of it is denial of humanity. He considered war as struggle amongst states is an essential feature. On nature and ethics of civil society he said that, it was important to note the role played by nature, Hegel assumed the unity of nature and freedom also attempted to diagnose the natural substantiality which apprised individual's free will. About Civil society he said that, an individual's specific acts are personifications of his freedom, not simply of his particular economic freedom (freedom of choice or freedom from obstruction) but of a more universal freedom, facilitated by awareness of law and established life. Hegel opposes, in emerging its potentialities, "particularity passes over into universality and attains its right". Hence, the procedure of civil society is an education of specific individual from his own self-interest and more universal ethical life, the progress of the contained universality of the moral will. On needs of system he said that, the individual is a self-conscious subject associated to his own desires as a free member of a society. Human in the civil society gives a clearly rational institutional form to their needs and desires. On administration of justice he said that, the administration of justice is mainly based on universality that means, everyone seems to be equal and rights of individual are recognized not by the class they belong to, but by the virtue of universal personhood on government agencies and private corporations he said that, The actual freedom of individual, the harmony of his social and particular ends, be represented in a unchanging and uninterrupted method.

8.14 Model Questions:

1. Wrote about the early life of Hegel, his writings in influences?
2. Describe about Hegel's political throughout on human nature, ideas on state, constitution, war and dialectic?
3. Describe Hegel's views on Freedom?

8.15 References:

1. D.C. Chaturvedi, Political Thought, Meenakshi Prakasham, New Delhi, 1981.

2. John Dryzek and others, Political Theory, Oxford University Press, 2008.
3. C.L. Wayper, Political Thought, B.I. Publications, New Delhi, 1979.
4. R.G. Mulgan, Aristotle's Political Theory, Clarendon Press, Oxford, 1977.
5. William Ebenstein, Modern Political thought, IBH publishing Co, 1970.
6. David Boucher & Paul Kelly, Political Thinkers, Oxford University Press, 2009.

Dr. C. Vinod Kumar

Lesson Writer

LESSON- 09

J S MILL – LIBERTY, INDIVIDUALITY, UTILITARIANISM

Structure:

9.0 Objectives

9.1 Introduction

9.2 Early Life

9.3 Social Reforms

9.4 His Works

9.5 On Liberty

9.6 J.S. Mill's Views on Individuality

9.6.1. Individuality as the Core of Liberty

9.6.2. Individuality and Self-Development

9.6.3. Individuality and Social Progress

9.6.4. Limits and Conditions of Individuality

9.6.5. Critiques and Contemporary Relevance

9.7 J.S. Mill's Views on Utilitarianism

9.7.1. The Principle of Utility

9.7.2. Qualitative Hedonism and Higher vs. Lower Pleasures

9.7.3. The Role of Competent Judges

9.7.4. The Relationship Between Utilitarianism and Justice

9.7.5. Rule vs. Act Utilitarianism

9.7.6. Moral Motivation and Internal Sanctions

9.7.7. Criticisms and Responses

9.7.8. Legacy and Significance

9.8 Representative Government

9.9 Conclusion

9.10 Questions

9.11 References

9.0 Objectives:

1. Students would be able to know about the life of J S Mill.
2. Students would be able to learn about Liberty stated by J S Mill.
3. Students would be able to understand what is representative government.
4. Student would be able to understand Individuality and Utilitarianism

9.1 Introduction:

John Stuart Mill was born on 20th May 1806, in Penton Ville, London, United Kingdom, he was the eldest son of utilitarian social thinker and economist James Miller. He was educated by his father and he received the advice and guidance from Jeremy Bentham and Francis Place. He was British philosopher, economist and civil servant, he also worked at social theory, political theory and political economy. During the 19th century he was considered as the most influential English speaking philosopher. The beginning about the idea of liberty by J S Mill, can be widely acceptable.

9.2 Early Life:

J S Mill was remarkably a gifted child, he stated about his education in his autobiography, when he was 3 years old he was taught Greek, by the age of 8 he had read Aesop's Fables, Xenophon's anabasis and the entire Herodotus and was well versed with Lucian, Diogenes Laertius Isocrates and six dialogues of Plato. He was also educated history in English, learned arithmetic, physics and astronomy. He also studied political economy of Adam Smith and David Ricardo along with his father and finally completed their classical economic views of factors of production. His regular economy lessons of comptes rendus in 1821, helped his father while writing "Elements of Political economy" which was a text book to promote the views of Ricardian economics. At the age of 14 years, he stayed with the family of Sir Samuel Bentham, brother of Jeremy Bentham, in France for a year, he joined the winter classes on Zoology, Chemistry and Logic of Faculte Des Sciences, and course in higher mathematics.

As an unconventional, he rejected to contribute to the 39 articles of the Church of England, and was not qualified to study at the University of Oxford or Cambridge University. He started working along with his father for East India Company till 1858, later he joined University College for the lectures of John Austin in Jurisprudence, and in 1856 he was elected as the honorary member of American Academy of arts and sciences.

9.3 Social Reforms:

He had done great work for the women's rights, during 1865-68 he was the Member of Parliament for city and Westminster for Liberal Party, when he was the M P, he supported easing the burdens on Ireland, in 1866, he was the first M P to raise the voice for the sake of women in Parliament and demanded for the right of vote for women, he was very strong supporter of social reforms like, labour unions and farm cooperatives. On Representative Government, he advocated for many reforms of Parliament and voting mainly "Proportional Representation", the "single Transferable Vote" and extension of 'suffrage'.

9.4 His Works:

The most important works of J S Mill include, “On Liberty”, “Utilitarianism”, and “Considerations on Representative Government”. His one of the works on women was earned well fame the book in 1861 he wrote “The subjection of Women” it was published in 1869. Mill wrote mainly to save the utilitarianism of Bentham and James Mill, from the charge brought against it by Carlyle and others: that, the philosophy which is so highlighted quantitative happiness is a doctrine worthy only of swine. After some introductory remarks, he stated the following conclusion of utilitarianism:

“The creed which accepts as the foundation of morals, Utility or the Greatest Happiness principle, holds that actions are right in proportion as they tend to promote happiness, wrong as they tend to produce the reverse of happiness. By happiness, I intended pleasure and the absence of pain; by unhappiness is intended pain, and privation of pleasure”.

9.5 On Liberty:

The opinions of John Stuart Mill about ‘liberty was influenced by Joseph Priestly and Josiah Warren. According to him, liberty means, the person must be free to do whatever he or she wishes unless they causes harm to others in the society. Individuals have sufficient logic, while, they make decisions about their good, at the same time, government must interfere when it is for the security of the society. JS Mill stated that, the only end for which men folk are justified, independently or mutually, in meddling with the liberty of action of any of their number, which is self-protection. The only determination for which power can be lawfully work out over any member of a civilized community, against his will, and is to avert injury to others. His own good, whichever physical or moral, is not adequate. He cannot correctly be constrained to do or refrain because it will be better for him to do so, because it will make him more contented, because, in the opinion of others, to do so would be wise, or even right...The only part of the conduct of anyone, for which he is agreeable to society, is that which concerns others. In the part which just concerns him, is his independence, of right, absolute. Over himself over his body and mind the individual is sovereign. Mill also stated that: “Despotism is a legitimate mode of government in dealing with barbarians, provided the end be their improvement, and the means justified by actually effecting that end. Liberty, as a principle, has no application to any state of things anterior to the time when mankind have become capable of being improved by free and equal discussion”.

One of the most renowned book of J S Mill is “On Liberty”, and it stayed as the most read book till today. In this classic book, he stated, about the liberal individualism it shaped more of stir during his time than any other of his writings. J S Mill stated that, liberty is required to follow our own good in our own way providing that we do not hinder other people’s determinations to do that, even it be, a government or individual, has the right to stop speech publication or behaviour of anybody for any reason other than to stop harm to other people; and by harm Mill meant practical and quantifiable harm. The harm principle is good to deal easier to state than it is to apply is a problem of which Mill looked unconscious. He also stated that, no one has the right to stop anyone from harming himself. It is observed that it is virtuously self-interested activities as different from social activities do not permit meddling from others.

Mill explains his concept of individual freedom within the context of his ideas on history and the state. On Liberty rest on the impression that, society improves from lower to higher phases and the advancement ends in the advent of a method of representative democracy. It is

within the background of this form of government that Mill envisages the progress and advance of liberty.

J S Mill describes civil liberty as the boundary that need be fixed on society's power over each person. Mill assumes a historical evaluation of the concept of liberty, starting with ancient Greece and Rome and continuing to England. Previously, liberty meant mainly to guard from tyranny. Over the periods, the meaning of liberty altered alongside with the part of rulers, who came to be seen as servants of the people rather than masters. This evolution brought about a new problem: the tyranny of the majority, it powers a democratic majority's will on the minority. This state of affairs can work out a tyrannical power even outside the political dominion, when forces such as public opinion suppress individuality and rebellion. Mill sees liberty can be separated into three categories, each one must be known and esteemed by any free society. First one is, the liberty of thought and view, the second one is the liberty of tastes and pursuits, or the freedom to plan our own lives and the third one is the liberty to join other of one mind individuals for a mutual aim that do not hurt anybody. Every one of these liberties contradicts society's inclination to force obedience.

He also stated about the examples where society can lawfully border the personal liberty. Mill discards the concept of the social contract, because people has to accept, to be a portion of society and identify that society can suggest definite methods of security although requesting for definite methods of obligations. Yet, he did propose that, society deals security, people are obliged to act in a definite way, and every member of society need to shield and defend society and all members from injury. In short, society necessarily be given power to restrain conduct that harms others, but certainly not more.

The main concept of "On Liberty", liberty is vital to guarantee succeeding growth, for both the individual and the society, chiefly because the society becomes more significant than the state. The affairs of the state would be achieved in the form of representative democracy where the opposition between the rulers and the ruled vanishes, where the rulers only signify the interests of the ruled. That type of democracy would make the liberty of the individual likely, but it would not assure it. When society develops free of the restraints of government, it initiates to establish the interests of few top quality and powerful individuals, which intimidates individual liberty in a novel method. J S Mill contends with the difficulty of envisaging of society developing in such a way, as to stop the suppression of the individual by the authoritative and self-confident majority. The progress of the society can only take place if its restrictions are positioned on individual liberty, but it also requires the liberation of the individual from such restrictions.

J S Mill avoids this problem by investigating about moral theory, where the most significant thing of individual is happiness and such happiness might be achieved in a civilized society, and people are permitted to involve in their own welfares, with all their abilities and competencies and they have established and improved through the good method of education. Accordingly, J S Mill pressures the essential worth of individualism of individual improvement, equally for the individual and society for future development. According to J S Mill, a civilized person is the one who performs on what he or she comprehends and who does all in his or her power to know. J S Mill advocates, individual initiative over social control, he emphasizes that things completed by individuals can be done better than those completed by governments. Besides, separate action, progresses the mental education of that person, and government action cannot do, for government action at all times positions a danger to liberty and necessarily be observed sensibly.

9.6 J.S. Mill's Views on Individuality

John Stuart Mill's conception of individuality is one of the central pillars of his political and moral philosophy, particularly articulated in his seminal work *On Liberty* (1859). Mill's defense of individuality is grounded in his broader utilitarian framework but transcends mere hedonistic calculations, evolving into a vision of human flourishing, self-development, and autonomy. He argues that individuality is not merely a private concern but a public good, indispensable for social progress and collective well-being.

9.6.1. Individuality as the Core of Liberty

Mill's notion of individuality is intimately tied to his concept of liberty. He distinguishes between negative liberty (freedom from external constraints) and positive liberty (the cultivation of self-directing capacities). For Mill, individuality is the freedom to think, act, and experiment with ways of living, provided such actions do not harm others—a principle formalized in his Harm Principle.

- Mill asserts: "Genuine freedom consists in doing what we like, subject to such consequences as may follow, without impediment from our fellow creatures so long as what we do does not harm them."
- Thus, individuality is not mere license or anarchic behavior; it is the self-directed pursuit of the good life, rooted in rational deliberation and moral responsibility.

9.6.2. Individuality and Self-Development

Mill's defense of individuality is deeply perfectionist: he views it as essential for the development of higher faculties such as critical reasoning, moral judgment, aesthetic sensibility, and autonomous choice. His argument rests on several key points:

- Higher Pleasures and Human Excellence: As elaborated in Utilitarianism, Mill differentiates between higher and lower pleasures. Individuality, for Mill, allows individuals to cultivate their intellectual and moral capacities, leading to a more elevated form of happiness.
- Experimentation and "Experiments in Living": Mill conceptualizes individuality as a social process wherein diverse lifestyles act as "experiments in living." Through such diversity, society gains empirical evidence about the worth of various modes of existence.
- Resistance to Conformity: Mill is particularly critical of the "despotism of custom," wherein social norms stifle originality, creativity, and moral courage. Individuality is thus framed as an antidote to social stagnation.

9.6.3. Individuality and Social Progress

Contrary to purely atomistic conceptions of liberty, Mill underscores the social value of individuality. He contends that diverse and autonomous individuals are engines of societal advancement:

- Innovation and Cultural Enrichment: Independent thinkers and non-conformists challenge prevailing dogmas and drive intellectual, scientific, and cultural innovation.

- **Moral and Political Vitality:** Societies that encourage individuality avoid the ossification of values and maintain a dynamic capacity for reform and self-correction.
- **Utilitarian Rationale:** Mill integrates individuality into his utilitarian framework by arguing that fostering autonomous, rational agents maximizes long-term social utility.

Thus, individuality is not opposed to collective welfare; rather, it is its necessary precondition.

9.6.4. Limits and Conditions of Individuality

Mill's advocacy of individuality is not absolute; it is bounded by his Harm Principle:

- **Non-Harm to Others:** Individual autonomy is legitimate only insofar as it does not inflict harm on others or infringe upon their rights.
- **Competence and Maturity:** Mill excludes children and those lacking "mature faculties" from full exercise of individuality, reflecting his belief that autonomy presupposes rational self-control.

This conditional defense avoids a libertarian excess and grounds individuality within a framework of civic responsibility and moral discipline.

9.6.5. Critiques and Contemporary Relevance

- **Critiques:** Some scholars (e.g., Isaiah Berlin) argue that Mill's synthesis of liberty and utilitarianism is unstable, as collective utility could in theory justify constraints on individuality. Others contend that Mill's emphasis on "higher faculties" introduces an elitist, perfectionist dimension inconsistent with pluralistic liberalism.
- **Contemporary Significance:** Despite criticisms, Mill's conception of individuality continues to influence debates on liberal democracy, multiculturalism, and rights discourse. His emphasis on resisting conformity is particularly relevant in the age of mass media and algorithmic culture, where social pressures toward homogeneity intensify.

Mill's views on individuality represent a profound synthesis of liberal autonomy and utilitarian ethics, aimed at reconciling personal freedom with social welfare. By linking individuality to both personal self-realization and collective progress, Mill establishes it as a cornerstone of modern liberal thought. His vision remains enduringly relevant, providing a philosophical foundation for defending diversity, critical dissent, and the cultivation of autonomous selves in pluralistic societies.

9.7 J.S. Mill's Views on Utilitarianism

John Stuart Mill (1806–1873), a prominent British philosopher and political economist, is regarded as one of the foremost defenders of the utilitarian ethical framework initially articulated by Jeremy Bentham. Mill's work "Utilitarianism" (1861) represents both a refinement and a critical re-examination of Benthamite utilitarianism, elevating it from a mere quantitative hedonistic calculus to a more sophisticated moral doctrine grounded in qualitative considerations of pleasure, human dignity, and moral development.

9.7.1. The Principle of Utility

Mill defines utilitarianism as "the doctrine that actions are right in proportion as they tend to promote happiness; wrong as they tend to produce the reverse of happiness." Here, happiness is understood as pleasure and the absence of pain, while unhappiness entails pain and the deprivation of pleasure.

- Unlike Bentham's purely quantitative hedonism, which evaluates pleasure solely in terms of intensity and duration, Mill introduces a qualitative distinction, emphasizing that some pleasures are intrinsically superior to others.
- He argues that intellectual, aesthetic, and moral pleasures—those of the "higher faculties"—are of greater value than mere bodily or sensual pleasures. According to Mill, "it is better to be a human being dissatisfied than a pig satisfied; better to be Socrates dissatisfied than a fool satisfied."

9.7.2. Qualitative Hedonism and Higher vs. Lower Pleasures

Mill critiques Bentham's "hedonic calculus" as inadequate for addressing the complexities of human experience. His qualitative hedonism differentiates between:

- Higher Pleasures: Intellectual, moral, and aesthetic pursuits (e.g., literature, philosophy, art) that engage rational capacities and foster human flourishing.
- Lower Pleasures: Basic, bodily, and immediate gratifications shared with animals (e.g., food, physical comfort).

He posits that individuals who have experienced both higher and lower pleasures invariably prefer the former, even if they involve greater effort or occasional dissatisfaction. Thus, Mill's utilitarianism incorporates a hierarchical conception of happiness grounded in human dignity and the development of reason.

9.7.3. The Role of Competent Judges

Mill introduces the concept of "competent judges" to resolve disputes over the comparative value of pleasures. Competent judges are those who have had extensive experience of both higher and lower forms of pleasure and are thus qualified to assess their relative worth. Their consistent preference for higher pleasures validates Mill's claim that such pleasures are objectively superior.

9.7.4. The Relationship Between Utilitarianism and Justice

Mill addresses a major criticism of utilitarianism: its perceived incompatibility with justice. He argues that justice itself is rooted in utility, as it derives from the social necessity of protecting individuals from harm and ensuring fairness. Rights, therefore, are not innate or absolute but are grounded in their utility for promoting the greatest happiness.

- He asserts that a "sense of justice" emerges from two psychological elements: (i) the natural human impulse to retaliate against harm (self-defense), and (ii) the social feeling of sympathy for others, both of which are cultivated within civil society.
- By integrating justice within the utilitarian framework, Mill seeks to reconcile individual rights with the collective good.

9.7.5. Rule vs. Act Utilitarianism

Although Mill does not explicitly formalize a distinction between act and rule utilitarianism, his writings often suggest a rule-based utilitarianism. He argues that adherence to general moral rules, such as truth-telling or promise-keeping, is justified because such rules have proven conducive to happiness in the long run. However, in exceptional circumstances, these rules may be overridden if greater happiness can be achieved, illustrating Mill's nuanced and flexible approach.

9.7.6. Moral Motivation and Internal Sanctions

Mill emphasizes the internal sanction of conscience as the ultimate binding force of morality. While Bentham grounded moral motivation primarily in external sanctions (e.g., legal or social consequences), Mill insists that the "feeling for humanity" and the internal sense of duty, cultivated through education and socialization, serve as powerful incentives for utilitarian behavior. This focus on internal moral psychology reflects his concern with character formation and the cultivation of higher faculties.

9.7.7. Criticisms and Responses

Mill's refinement of utilitarianism was both influential and controversial:

- **Criticism of Subjectivity:** Some argue that Mill's reliance on "competent judges" introduces elitism and subjectivity into what is supposed to be an impartial ethical theory.
- **Potential Conflict with Rights:** While Mill grounds rights in utility, critics contend that utilitarianism can still justify sacrificing individuals for the greater good, raising concerns about its consistency with liberal individualism.
- **Defense Against "Pig Philosophy":** Mill's qualitative distinction between pleasures was intended precisely to rebut the accusation (common in Victorian England) that utilitarianism is a "doctrine worthy only of swine."

9.7.8. Legacy and Significance

Mill's version of utilitarianism represents a transition from classical to modern ethical thought, incorporating elements of moral psychology, qualitative value judgments, and liberal political philosophy. His synthesis of utility with notions of individual liberty (as further articulated in "On Liberty") situates utilitarianism within a broader humanistic and progressive framework, making it more compatible with concerns about rights, justice, and personal autonomy.

Thus, Mill's utilitarianism is not merely a calculus of pleasure but a comprehensive moral doctrine emphasizing human dignity, intellectual and moral cultivation, and the intrinsic worth of higher forms of happiness.

John Stuart Mill's Utilitarianism provides a richer and more nuanced account of moral philosophy than Bentham's original formulation. By distinguishing higher and lower pleasures, incorporating moral psychology, and reconciling utility with justice and rights, Mill elevates utilitarianism into a doctrine that accounts not only for the quantitative aspects of happiness but also for its qualitative dimensions. His views remain central to contemporary ethical debates, influencing both consequentialist theory and liberal political thought.

9.8 Representative Government:

It is all about an argument for representative government, where J S Mill proposed and the perfect system of government according to his view, he put very worthy ideas and stated that it is not the main job of the of the government representatives to make legislation but he advises that the bodies of representatives like, Parliaments and Senates are best suited to be places of public debates on different views held by the population and to perform as the watchdogs of the professionals who create and administer laws and policy. He stated it as, “Their part is to indicate wants, to be an organ for popular demands, and a place of adverse discussion for all opinions relating to public matters, both great and small; and, along with this, to check by criticism, and eventually by withdrawing their support, those high public officers who really conduct the public business, or who appoint those by whom it is conducted”.

J S Mill said that, the representative government is the best form of government, for those who are civilized and cultured enough and capable to take accountability for its own matters. While he talks about representative government which meant by him, parliamentary government where the representatives elected and they are very much accountable to the parliament, by doing so they are responsible to the people. J S Mill thought that there are some concessions where criminals, incompetent and uneducated backing them, he believed that all adult, male or female must have at least one vote, he emphasised the necessity to include to vote otherwise it would be illogical, and as it would be to eliminate the male who have red hair. J S Mill opined that the representative government is the best form of government because it inspires and replicates the criticism, it also encourages the participation and accountability by the common citizen. At the same time the government such as despotic brands such thing to inactive and apathetic and such government attend to create self-reliant, tough- minded persons, alert, and moreover, society with such type of people is assured to be one in which order, where development and steadiness displays. But the government of representatives is also liable to infirmities and dangers.

Whereas, JS Mill was very anxious and worried about the dominance of tyranny, he thought that if the government rest on the wish and will of few members then cultivation and enlightenment would be certainly conquest by the mediocrity or unevenness and illiteracy and unawareness. It will also be certain that government will make such policies that would satisfy the majority in the assembly, whatsoever be the inherent advantages of such policies. Therefore, he stressed that, the political empowerment must work hand in glove with political education. It might be ridiculous to have entirely empowered electorate whose members too unaware to cast their vote sensibly. J S Mill thought that there must be a method for plural voting connected to educational achievement and a system of public examinations for which people may pass in order to deserve that they ask for extra votes. He was the first supporter of proportional representation as a means of acquiring the operative representation of minorities. In 1859, Thomas Hare, an eminent lawyer based at London developed a multifarious method that he preferred. J S Mill stylish prose every now and then covered illogicality and superficiality of thought he was, during the course of his life, he was the target of his own extreme policy and unbending education; but he, considered as one of a many syndicate of writers, fellow members being John Rawls and Robert Nozick whose involvement to political thought lies as much as anything in the discussion and image that their works have inclined to sponsor.

In the brief, obvious that, a testimony to his mental constitution that, after the childhood described in his autobiography, 'The Adults', it was observed that he was able performs intellectually. He himself agreed that he is a complex personality he completed his education by the system crippled him emotionally, however, filled with a number of strong, intellectual and not always steady desire. JS Mill not once reasonably bring himself to reject utilitarianism; nor, yet, can he fight reinventing it in a way that makes desire mean the kind of activities of which Mill supports. J S Mill always favoured unlimited freedom, but at the same time he took it for granted that unlimited freedom will harvest the results that he appreciated rather than disorderliness and disarray. He highly praised the representative government which ethically stimulating outcome that he understands it would have on ordinary citizens, but he desired to organize substances so as to safeguard the constant effect of an intelligent and ethical choice.

Some of the Important Quotes Stated by J S Mill about Representative Government, which indicates that how much he was involved and much desired to have such government because it will be accountable to the parliament and at the same time to the people as well.

1. JS Mill, in his book Representative Government, he stated about Representative Government as: "To think that because those who wield power in society wield in the end that of government, therefore it is of no use to attempt to influence the constitution of the government by acting on opinion, is to forget that opinion is itself one of the greatest active social forces. One person with a belief is a social power equal to ninety-nine who have only interests".

2. He also gave an elaborate measures of a good form of government for this he said that the government must have to observe the following things, "We need not understand that when power exist in an exclusive class, then that class will knowingly and deliberately sacrifice the other classes to themselves: it suits that, in the absence of its natural protectors, the interest of the left out is always in danger of being ignored: and, when looked at, it is seen with very different perceptiveness from those of the persons whom it directly worries".

3. He also asserted about the democracy where it could be true or false democracy he stated about it as, "In a really equal democracy, every, any section would be represented, not disproportionately, but proportionately. ... Unless they are, there is not equal government, but a government of inequality and privilege: one part of the people rule over the rest: there is a part whose fair and equal share of influence in the representation is withheld from them, contrary to all just government, but, above all, contrary to the principle of democracy, which professes equality as its very root and foundation".

9.9 Conclusion:

John Stuart Mill was born on 20th May 1806, in Penton Ville, London, United Kingdom he was the eldest son of utilitarian social thinker and economist James Miller. He was educated by his father and he received the advice and guidance from Jeremy Bentham and Francis Place. J S Mill was remarkably a gifted child, he stated about his education in his autobiography, when he was 3 years old he was taught Greek, by the age of 8 he had read Aesop's Fables, Xenophon's anabasis and the entire Herodotus and was well versed with Lucian, Diogenes Laertius Isocrates and six dialogues of Plato. He had done great work for the women's rights, during 1865-68 he was the Member of Parliament for city and Westminster for Liberal Party, when he was the M P, he supported easing the burdens on Ireland, in 1866, he was the first to M P to raise the voice for the sake of women in Parliament and demanded for the right of vote for women. The most important works of J S Mill include, "On Liberty", "Utilitarianism", and "Considerations on Representative Government".

According to him, liberty means the person must be free to do whatever he or she wishes unless they causes harm to others in the society. Individuals have sufficient logic while they make decisions about their good, at the same time government must interfere when it is for the security of the society. JS Mill stated that, the only end for which men folk are justified, independently or mutually, in meddling with the liberty of action of any of their number, is self-protection. The main concept of “On Liberty”, liberty is vital to guarantee succeeding growth, for both the individual and the society, chiefly because the society becomes more significant than the state. The affairs of the state would be achieved in the form of representative democracy where the opposition between the rulers and the ruled vanishes, where the rulers only signify the interests of the ruled.

About representative government, It is all about an argument for representative government, where J S Mill proposed and the perfect system of government according to the his view, he put very worthy ideas and stated that it is not the main job of the of the government representatives to make legislation but he advises that the bodies of representatives like, Parliaments and Senates are best suited to be places of public debates on different views held by the population and to perform as the watchdogs of the professionals who create and administer laws and policy. J S Mill said that the representative government is the best form of government, for those who are civilized and cultured enough and capable to take accountability for its own matters. While he was talking about representative government which meant by him was parliamentary government where the representatives are elected and they are very much accountable to the parliament, by doing so they are responsible to the people.

9.10 Questions:

1. Write about the J S Mills early life, education and his important writings?
2. Describe about liberty stated by J S Mill?
3. Discuss about the representative government described by J S Mill?
4. Describe on J S Mill ideas on Individuality and Utilitarianism?

9.11 References:

1. Michael Rosen and Jonathan Wolff, Political Thought, Oxford University Press, New York, 1999.
2. R.K. Misra, An Introduction to Political Thought, Pearson, Delhi, 2012.
3. David Boucher and Paul Kelly, Political Thinkers, from Socrates to the Present, Oxford University Press, New York, 2009.
4. Thomas Landon Thorson, A History of Political Theory, Oxford & IBH Publishing Co., New Delhi, 1973.

Dr. C. Vinod Kumar
Lesson Writer

LESSON-10

KARL MARX – ALIENATION, HUMAN EMANCIPATION, SURPLUS VALUE, IDEOLOGY

Structure:

10.0 Objectives

10.1 Introduction

10.2 Early Life

10.3 Early activism and Hegelianism - 1836-43

10.4 Influences on Karl Marx

10.5 Critique of Capitalism

10.6 Karl Marx's Views on Alienation

10.6.1. The Philosophical Roots of Alienation

10.6.2. Alienation in the Context of Labour

10.6.3. Alienation as a Structural Feature of Capitalism

10.6.4. Overcoming Alienation

10.6.5. Contemporary Relevance

10.7 Karl Marx's Views on Human Emancipation

10.7.1. Introduction: Contextualizing Marx's Conception of Emancipation

10.7.2. Political Emancipation vs. Human Emancipation

10.7.3. Alienation and the Basis of Emancipation

10.7.4. Communism as Human Emancipation

10.7.5. The Critique of Rights and Liberalism

10.7.6. Historical Materialism and the Path to Emancipation

10.7.7. Conclusion: Human Emancipation as the Realization of Species-Being

10.8 Theory of Surplus value

10.9 Karl Marx's Views on Ideology

10.9.1. Introduction to Marx's Concept of Ideology

10.9.2. Materialism and the Basis of Ideology

10.9.3. Ideology as "False Consciousness"

10.9.4. Key Texts and Theoretical Development

10.9.5. Ideology, Class Struggle, and Power

10.9.6. Beyond Determinism: Later Marxist Interpretations

10.9.7. Criticisms of Marx's Theory of Ideology

10.10 Revolution

10.11 Conclusion

10.12 Questions

10.13 References

10.0 Objectives:

1. Students would be able to know about the life of Karl Marx.
2. Students would be able to learn about the critique of capitalism.
3. Students would be able to state about his revolution.

10.1 Introduction:

Karl Marx was born on 5th May 1818, Trier, Kingdom of Prussia in Rhineland, German Confederation, and he died on 14 March, 1883 in London. He was very renowned German philosopher, sociologist, journalist, economist and most importantly was revolutionary socialist. He was born in a rich middle class family, he completed his education in the universities of Bonn and he got the interest in the philosophical ideas of the "Young Hegelians". When completed his education he started writing for a radical newspaper in 'Cologne' and stated to work on the theory of 'materialist conception of history'. In 1843, he moved to Paris where he started working for the radical newspapers and later he met Friedrich Engels, who became his close associate throughout his life. He was later exiled and he moved to London, in 1849, along with his family and there he continued his writings and framed his theories about social and economic actions. He canvassed for the socialism and became an important personality in the 'International Workingmen's Association'. The works of Marx in economics gave the position on the roots of the present understanding of labour and its relation to capital, and successive economic belief. He is regarded as one of the founders of sociology and social science, he published number of books in his life time but most noteworthy books are 'The Communist Manifesto' which was written in 1848, and the "Das Kapital" was written from 1867-94.

10.2 Early Life:

About the early life of Karl Marx was known very little, he was the third child out of nine to Heinrich Marx and Henrietta, in August 1824, he was baptized into Lutheran Church. He was educated privately by his father Heinrich Marx until 1830, later he joined in Trier High School, the Head master Hugo Wyttenbach was the friend of his father. Most of the teachers in the school were 'liberal humanists' Wyttenbach suffered the anger of the local conservative government, as a result school was raided in the year 1832, and founded the literature backing political liberalism, was circulated among the students. Seeing such material distribution was a seditious act (rebellion act), the government introduced reforms and replaced most of the staff.

At the age of 17, in the year 1835, Karl Marx joined in the "University of Bonn" in order to study 'literature and philosophy', anyhow, his father claimed to join in law because of more practical field and because of his weak chest he was excused from the duty of Army when he became 18. Marx associated with the poets' club when he was in the Bonn University, the club consisted of group of radicals who were consistently monitored by the police. Marx also joined the Trier Tavern Club drinking society, known as 'Landsmannschaft der Treveraner', he was involved in some of the disputes which turned to be very serious: he joined in a duel with a member of the university's Borussia Korps, though he got good grades in the first term, they were worsened soon, this led his father to force a transfer to much serious about his academics later he joined in "University of Berlin".

10.3 Early activism and Hegelianism - 1836-43:

Karl Marx became more serious about the studies and his life, he was engaged to 'Jenny von Westphalen', an educated personality, a ruling class of Prussia and was known to him since childhood, their relationship was socially controversial because of the differences between their ethnic and origin of class, but he was so friendly with her father also who was a liberal aristocrat, known as 'Ludwig von Westphalen, to whom he later dedicated his thesis. Though he was doing law, but he was charmed by philosophy and he searched to combine these two, he said that, "without philosophy nothing could be accomplished". Karl Marx had been influenced by the German philosopher G.W.F Hegel, the ideas of Hegel were very much discussed in the Europe's philosophical personalities. In Stralau, during a rehabilitation he joined the Doctor's Club, where a group of students debated about the views and thoughts of Hegel, in 1837, by then he associated with a group of radical thinkers who were called as "Young Hegelians"; they gathered around 'Ludwig Feuerbach and 'Bruno Bauer', through them, Marx developed a close friendship with 'Adolf Rutenberg'. Along with Karl Marx, the other young Hegelians were also very critical about the 'Metaphysical Assumptions' of Hegel, but they adopted his 'dialectical method' so that they can criticize established society, politics and religion from the perspective of leftists. The other significant contribution to Marx's revision of Hegelianism was from the book of Engels "The Condition of the Working Class in England in 1844", which led Marx to observe as the historical dialectic in standings of class conflict and to see the modern working class as the most liberal force for revolution.

His philosophy and political thought, was polemic with other thinkers often occurred through critique, and hence, he, called as 'the greatest user of critical method in social sciences'. He criticized speculative philosophy, equating with ideology. He adopted the above methods by doing so, he tried to differentiate the important findings from ideological biases, and this gave him a special position among different contemporary philosophers.

10.4 Influences on Karl Marx:

The thoughts of Karl Marx proves the influences of many thinkers and most prominent among them are as follows:

- George Wilhelm Friedrich Hegel, his philosophy
- Adam Smith and David Ricardo, the classical Political Economy
- French socialist thought, in particular the thought of Jean-Jacques Rousseau, Henri de Saint Simon, Pierre Joseph Proudhon and Charles Fourier
- Earlier German Philosophical materialism, particularly that of Ludwig Feuerbach, the working class analysis of Friedrich Engels.

10.5 Critique of Capitalism:

The classic book by Karl Marx in 1867, *Das Kapital*, it is generally known as the “The Bible of the Working Class”, which is a critical analysis of political economy which deals about the patterns of economy which focuses, the capitalist way of production. In this he suggests the inspirational force of capitalism is nothing but mistreatment of labour, the surplus value results in profit, mainly because of the unpaid works of the labour, and they have detailed meaning for Karl Marx. The employer always talks about the rights for his profits because he/she owns the productive capital assets which means production and these are being safeguarded by the capitalist states by means of ‘property rights’, the historical segment displays how this right attained in the first place, mainly by stolen goods and overthrow and the actions of the merchant and middleman. While creating ‘capital’ (money) and ‘commodities’ (goods and services), the workers of organization put their labour constantly to generate the economic positions. Capital suggests and clarification of the ‘laws of motion’ about the method of capitalistic economy from the roots of its origin during its course of future, by the forces at work building up the capital, in this process increase of wage labour, the transformation of the work place, the concentration of capital, commercial competition, the banking system the decline of profit rate, in of the, land rates etc., regarded as the main concerns.

The economic theory, lacking of moral and conceptual arguments, being mainly continued fight about fundamental catastrophe lying nature of the capital system. In the later works of Marx, did not give up, like Capital, his previous notional deliberations of the character of human isolation and the meaning of liberation; fairly he silences the philosophical measurement and intensifies the specific experiential and theoretical analysis of capitalism in order to improve a model of capitalist crisis and social transformation. In the German edition of 1873, Marx, concisely condenses the dialectic process and highlighting its alterations from idealism of Hegel and Marx methods has three important aspects, they are:

1. It undertakes the unavoidable downfall of the present social order.
2. It understands each social system as exist in watery drive, identifying the historical origins of modern social actuality.
3. Finally, it ‘lease’s nothing levy upon it’, presence of radical in essence and focused on the integration of theory and praxis.

Marx accomplishes by presenting that capitalism is a self-contradicting manner of making. The growth of capital, he has claimed, inevitably makes a great form of unemployed workers as the organic arrangement of capital changes, substituting variable capital (wages) with continuous capital (plant and tools). The result of the Marx’s dialectic process is the

conclusion that capitalism cannot continue, loaded as it seemingly is with serious and enduring flaws.

The capitalist assumption, is the outcome of the capitalist style of production and it crops capitalist private property. This is the first denial of individual private property, as established on the labour of the proprietor. But capitalist making causes with the inevitability of a law of nature, its own denial. This does not regenerate private property for the producer, but it gives him inseparable property founded on the attainments of the capitalist period: which means on assistance and development in common of the land and of the means of production. The alteration of distributed private property ascending from individual labour, into capitalist private property is obviously a procedure, excellently more protected, ferocious and difficult than the alteration of capitalist property, previously almost resultant on socialized productions, into socialized property. In the case of former, we had the expropriation of the mass of the people by the forthcoming usurpers; in the latter, we have the expropriation of a few usurpers by the mass of the people.

10.6 Karl Marx's Views on Alienation

Karl Marx's concept of alienation is one of the most critical aspects of his critique of capitalism, developed primarily in his "Economic and Philosophic Manuscripts of 1844". Alienation describes the estrangement of individuals from their human essence, labour, products, social relations, and ultimately from themselves, caused by the socio-economic structures of capitalist society. Marx's theory is deeply rooted in his materialist conception of history and his understanding of labour as the fundamental characteristic of human existence.

10.6.1. The Philosophical Roots of Alienation

Marx's theory of alienation draws heavily from Hegelian philosophy and Feuerbach's materialism:

- Hegel viewed alienation as a process inherent in the development of the self-conscious spirit (alienation from oneself as part of a dialectical progression towards absolute knowledge).
- Feuerbach, however, reinterpreted alienation in materialist terms, especially in religion, arguing that humans project their own essence onto a divine being, thereby alienating themselves.
- Marx critically synthesized these views and "inverted" Hegel, grounding alienation not in abstract consciousness but in material, socio-economic conditions.

10.6.2. Alienation in the Context of Labour

For Marx, human beings are essentially "species-beings": creative and social creatures who realize themselves through conscious, purposeful labour. Under capitalism, however, labour is no longer a means of self-fulfilment but becomes coerced, external, and dehumanizing. Marx identifies four interrelated dimensions of alienation:

a) Alienation from the Product of Labor

- In capitalist production, the worker does not own the goods they produce. The product becomes an alien object, controlled by the capitalist, who sells it for profit.

- The more a worker produces, the less they own, resulting in a paradox where increased productivity deepens their dispossession.
- Thus, the product embodies "objectified labour" that confronts the worker as a hostile power, exemplifying the inversion of subject and object.

b) Alienation in the Process of Labour

- Labor under capitalism is forced and external: it is undertaken not to satisfy intrinsic needs or creativity but to earn wages for survival.
- Work becomes a means to an end rather than an end in itself, reducing labour to mere physical exertion, devoid of self-expression.
- This transforms labour into a source of suffering rather than self-realization, robbing it of its humanizing potential.

c) Alienation from One's "Species-Being" (Human Essence)

- Marx contends that humans differ from animals because they engage in "free, conscious, universal labour" that reflects their rational and social essence.
- Capitalist labour denies this essence by reducing human activity to repetitive, fragmented tasks (e.g., in factory production), stripping labour of its creative, purposeful character.
- Consequently, humans are estranged from their "species-being"—their capacity for communal, self-directed production and their broader human potential.

d) Alienation from Other Human Beings

- In capitalism, social relations are mediated by commodity exchange rather than direct human connections. Workers compete for wages, and relations between individuals become impersonal and transactional.
- The capitalist-worker relationship embodies exploitation: the capitalist appropriates the surplus value generated by the worker, reinforcing class antagonism.
- This transforms human relationships into relations between things (reification), epitomized by the "fetishism of commodities."

10.6.3. Alienation as a Structural Feature of Capitalism

Marx argues that alienation is not merely psychological or accidental but is structurally embedded in the capitalist mode of production:

- Private property and the division of labour institutionalize alienation by separating workers from the means of production.
- Labor becomes commodified, valued not for its human significance but for its market price.
- Alienation, therefore, is both the cause and effect of exploitation, perpetuating class divisions and reinforcing the capitalist system.

10.6.4. Overcoming Alienation

For Marx, alienation can only be overcome through the abolition of private property and capitalist relations of production:

- In a communist society, the means of production would be collectively owned, and labour would be self-directed and intrinsically fulfilling.
- Production would be organized to meet human needs, not profit, enabling individuals to develop their full capacities and realize their species-being.
- Marx famously envisages a society where labour is no longer coerced: “In the communist society... labour has become not only a means of life but life's prime want.”

Thus, the resolution of alienation is inherently revolutionary: it necessitates a radical transformation of social and economic structures, leading to the reunion of individuals with their labour, their products, their fellow humans, and their own essence.

10.6.5. Contemporary Relevance

Marx's theory of alienation remains deeply relevant in analysing:

- Modern wage labour (e.g., gig economy, precarious employment).
- Automation and technological alienation, where workers lose control over production.
- Consumer culture, where identity is tied to commodities rather than human activity.
- Psychological consequences of work, including burnout and meaninglessness.

Scholars like Herbert Marcuse and the Frankfurt School expanded Marx's concept, emphasizing alienation in modern bureaucratic and consumerist societies, showing its persistence beyond classical industrial capitalism.

Karl Marx's concept of alienation offers a profound critique of capitalist society, grounded in his view of labour as the essence of human existence. By analysing how capitalism estranges workers from their labour, products, species-being, and fellow humans, Marx uncovers the dehumanizing logic of capitalist production. His vision of communism aims not merely at economic redistribution but at the restoration of human self-realization and social unity, thereby overcoming alienation in all its forms.

10.7 Karl Marx's Views on Human Emancipation

10.7.1. Introduction: Contextualizing Marx's Conception of Emancipation

Karl Marx's theory of human emancipation emerges from his critique of political liberalism, civil society, and capitalist social relations. His views are most explicitly articulated in his early writings, especially “On the Jewish Question” (1843), and evolve throughout his mature works such as “The German Ideology” (1846) and “Capital” (1867). For Marx, emancipation is not merely a legal or political matter but involves a radical restructuring of material social relations, leading to the realization of human essence in a truly communal and classless society.

10.7.2. Political Emancipation vs. Human Emancipation

In “On the Jewish Question,” Marx differentiates between political emancipation (the granting of equal legal rights within the liberal state) and human emancipation (the liberation of humans from alienated socio-economic relations).

- Political emancipation is associated with the rise of liberal democracy, which promises equality and rights but confines them to the formal legal sphere. It liberates individuals only as abstract citizens, while leaving intact the material inequalities of capitalist society.
- Marx critiques this as an incomplete form of liberation:

"Political emancipation is a reduction of man to a member of civil society, to an egoistic, independent individual." (Marx, 1843)

- Human emancipation, in contrast, entails overcoming the alienation and fragmentation of human existence created by capitalist property relations. It involves abolishing the antagonism between the "universal" (political) and the "particular" (civil society) by transforming the social and economic structures themselves.

10.7.3. Alienation and the Basis of Emancipation

In his “Economic and Philosophic Manuscripts of 1844,” Marx grounds his conception of emancipation in the abolition of alienated labor. Alienation occurs when workers are estranged from:

1. The product of their labor (commodities belong to capitalists, not workers).
2. The act of labor itself (labor becomes forced, uncreative, and external to the worker’s essence).
3. Other human beings (competition and private property pit individuals against each other).
4. Their own “species-being” (Gattungswesen)—the human capacity for free, conscious, creative activity.

For Marx, overcoming alienation is synonymous with human emancipation. Thus, he envisions a society where collective ownership of the means of production restores human sociality,

10.7.4. Communism as Human Emancipation

Marx posits that communism represents the concrete realization of human emancipation. It is not merely a redistribution of resources but a qualitative transformation of social relations:

- The abolition of private property dismantles the economic foundation of class domination.
- The end of class divisions eliminates the state as an instrument of coercion.
- The reunion of individual and communal interests transcends the opposition between the private sphere (bourgeois society) and the universal (state).

In "The German Ideology," Marx and Engels famously declare:

"In communist society, where nobody has one exclusive sphere of activity but each can become accomplished in any branch he wishes... society regulates the general production and thus makes it possible for me to do one thing today and another tomorrow... without ever becoming hunter, fisherman, shepherd, or critic."

This vision represents the ultimate emancipation of human potential, unshackled from economic necessity and alienated labor.

10.7.5. The Critique of Rights and Liberalism

Marx critiques the liberal notion of "rights of man" (as found in the French Revolution's Declaration of the Rights of Man and of the Citizen). While liberal rights proclaim freedom and equality, they presuppose a society of atomized individuals, each pursuing private interests within a framework of competition.

- Rights such as property and liberty thus reflect and reinforce bourgeois social relations rather than transcending them.
- For Marx, emancipation requires the transcendence of these rights, not their extension, as they are grounded in the very system that perpetuates alienation.

10.7.6. Historical Materialism and the Path to Emancipation

Through historical materialism, Marx situates human emancipation within the dynamics of class struggle. He rejects utopian socialism's moral appeals and instead argues that emancipation arises from the self-emancipation of the working class.

- The proletariat, as the universal class, embodies the potential to overthrow capitalism since its liberation entails the abolition of all classes.
- Marx asserts:

"The emancipation of the working class must be the act of the workers themselves." (Marx, First International Address, 1864)

This historical process culminates in the "withering away of the state" and the emergence of a classless, stateless, and communal society—the condition of genuine human freedom.

10.7.7. Conclusion: Human Emancipation as the Realization of Species-Being

For Marx, human emancipation is fundamentally social, material, and collective rather than merely political or legal. It entails:

- The abolition of alienation through the transformation of labor and property relations.
- The transcendence of bourgeois rights and civil society's atomization.
- The establishment of a communist society where free, conscious activity and collective cooperation become the essence of human existence.

Ultimately, Marx's conception of emancipation is inseparable from his critique of capitalism and his vision of communism as the "return of man to himself as a social being" (1844 Manuscripts), marking the full realization of human essence and freedom.

10.8 Theory of Surplus value:

Surplus value, the main principal idea of the critique of political economy by Marx, he did not coin the word of surplus value, he established this term from the German word “Mehrwert”, which means ‘value added’ from that notion he developed the idea and used the term ‘surplus value’. Usually, value-added, identical to the total of sum of gross wage income and gross profit income. But Marx used this concept in divergent way, for him, Mehrwert, means the yield, profit or return on the production capital invested. Which means amount of the increase in the value of the capital. Therefore, the word used by him was interpreted as ‘surplus value’ and differentiating it from the ‘value added’. Marx, stated in this theory, the surplus value, identical to the new value generated by workers in addition of their own cost of labour, which assumed by the capitalist as the profit while products have been sold. He thought that from 19th century, the increase in the population and wealth was because of the competitive endeavours to attain maximum surplus value from the employment of the labour, which ensues in the increase in the productivity and capital resources and it was at the level that, gradually the economic surplus exchangeable into money and spoken in the form of money, accrual of wealth, likely on a larger scale.

The cause explains by Friedrich Engels, about the source of surplus value as mentioned below:

“Whence comes this surplus-value? It cannot come either from the buyer buying the commodities under their value, or from the seller selling them above their value. For in both cases the gains and the losses of each individual cancel each other, as each individual is in turn buyer and seller. Nor can it come from cheating, for though cheating can enrich one person at the expense of another, it cannot increase the total sum possessed by both, and therefore cannot augment the sum of the values in circulation. (...) This problem must be solved, and it must be solved in a purely economic way, excluding all cheating and the intervention of any force — the problem being: how is it possible constantly to sell dearer than one has bought, even on the hypothesis that equal values are always exchanged for equal values?”.

The solution by Marx was, to differentiate between the time labour worked and power of the labour. According to him, a worker who, adequately productive and he can produce an output value greater than what it costs to hire him. Though his wage appears to be founded on hours he worked, in an economic sense this wage does not reveal the full value of what the worker produces. Efficiently, not labour which the worker sells, but his capacity to work.

If a worker hired for one hour and paid \$10. When the capitalist employ him, the capitalist asks him operate a boot-making machine and by using which the worker produces \$10 worth of work every fifteen minutes, then in each hour, the capitalist obtains \$40 worth of work and capitalist pays the worker only \$10, and by doing so the capitalist earns the remaining \$30 as gross revenue. When the capitalist, subtracted fixed and variable operating costs for example, say \$20 for leather, depreciation of the machine, etc., still he gets \$10. Therefore, for an expenditure of capital of \$30, the capitalist obtains a surplus value of \$10; his capital has not only been replaced by the operation, but also has increased by \$10. At the same time, the worker unable to get this benefit directly because he has no claim to the means of production, which means he does not have the boot-making machine or to its products, and the capacity of the worker to bargain over wages controlled by laws and the supply and demand for wage labour. Therefore, the rise of trade unions came into existence and they targeted to make a more favourable negotiating position through cooperative act of the workers.

Definition:

The economy is that, the total surplus value, whereas, Marx states to the mass or volume of surplus value, is chiefly identical to the sum of net dispersed and undispersed profit, net interest, net rents, net tax on production and different net receipts connected with royalties, licensing, leasing certain honorariums etc. The kind of basic profit income earned and achieved in social accounting may vary slightly from the approach an individual business does that.

The debate of Marx chiefly, focuses on profit, interest and rent, mostly overlooking taxation and royalty type fees which are equivalently very small modules of the national income when he lived. From the last 150 years, the role of the state in the economy has been increased in almost every country in the world. Around 1850, the average share of government spending in GDP in the advanced capitalist economies was around 5%; in 1870, a bit above 8%; during the World War I, just under 10%; before the outbreak of the World War II, around 20%; by 1950, nearly 30%; and today the average is around 35-40%.

The surplus value can be seen in five ways and it is as follows:

1. As a component of the new value product, to which he defines as identical to the sum of labour costs in respect of capitalistically productive labour (variable capital) and surplus value. In making, he claims, the workers produce a value equal to their wages plus an additional value, the surplus-value. They also transfer part of the value of fixed assets and materials to the new product, identical to economic depreciation (consumption of fixed capital) and intermediate goods used up (constant capital inputs). Labor costs and surplus value are the monetary valuations of what Marx calls the required product and the surplus product or paid labour and unpaid labour.
2. The Surplus-value can also be observed as a flow of net income assumed by the owners of capital in quality of ownership, containing both dispersed individual income and undispersed business income. In the entire economy, this will comprise of both income directly from production and property income.
3. The Surplus value can be observed as the source of the accumulation fund or investment fund of the society; a portion of it, is reinvested, but portion is assumed as individual income, and used for consumption purposes by the owners of capital assets, in extraordinary situations, part of it might also be saved in some way. In this background, surplus value can also be measured as the increase in the value of the stock of the capital possessions done an accounting period, earlier to distribution.
4. The Surplus value can be seen as a social relation of production, or as the monetary valuation of surplus labour - a kind of "index" of the balance of power between social classes or nations in the course of the separation of the social product.
5. The Surplus value can, in a developed capitalist economy, be seen also as a pointer to the level of social productivity that has been touched by the working population, which means, the net amount of the value can produce with its labour in surplus of its own consumption desires.

Absolute VS Relative:

Marx stated that the, absolute surplus value can be attained by the increase in the quantity of time worked per worker in an accounting period. Marx debates mostly about the span of the working day or week, but in modern times the concern is about the number of hours worked per year.

In many parts of the world, where the productivity on rise, the working classes made compulsory to reduce in the workweek, from 60 hours to 50, 40 or 35 hours; but casualization and flexibility of working hours also authorizes higher paid workers to work less. (an element of concern to statesmen who concern about international competitiveness, means if we don't work harder our country will lose business)

The relative surplus value can be attained by:

1. By decreasing wages— this can only go to a definite point, because if wages drop below the capability of workers to obtain their means of existence, they will be incapable to reproduce themselves and the capitalists will not be capable to find adequate labour power.
2. By decreasing the cost of wage-goods by different means, so that the wages upsurge can be restricted.
3. Increasing the productivity and intensity of labour primarily by the help of mechanization and rationalization crops better output per hour worked.

Critique of the political economy of capitalism:

1. The commodity is considered as the basic 'trade unit' or 'cell-form' of the capitalist society, but at the same time capitalism is noted from the other types of production based on commodities here labour becomes a commodity like any other one. Besides, commerce is the activity of the human, and it is also understood that the morality does not play a role in buying and selling of goods and services, the growth of the market system made separate entities of the economic, moral, and legal domains of actions of human in the society; therefore, it would be obvious that the subjective moral values are different from the objective economic values. Consequently, 'political economy' is not 'mere distribution of wealth' and 'political arithmetic' about the taxes but they are three different areas of human activity: Economics, Law and Ethics, politics and economics are separated.
2. 'The procedure of natural history is the formation of economic society', therefore, it is conceivable for a political economist to study the objectives of the scientific laws of capitalism, the growth of market system of commerce has realized human economic relations; to utilize the money (cash nexus) which cancelled the religious and political impressions about economic value and replaced them with 'commodity fetishism', the confidence is that a commodity has natural value. It is due to the fact that, societal economic creation is a historical procedure, any one person unable to direct or control it, by which create a global complex of social connections amongst capitalists; therefore, the economic creation or individual commerce of a society leads the human administration of an economy which is organized economy.
3. The operational or structural ambiguities of a capitalist economy, pronounce about the movements of ambiguities which are rooted from the two-fold character of labour and the 'class struggle' which is between the labour and the capital, the wage labour and the owner of the wealth production. These capitalist economic contradictions operate "behind the backs" of the capitalists and the workers, the outcome of their activities however, persist instant observations as men and women as social classes.
4. The economic crises, known as 'recession; and 'depression' etc., that are embedded in the ambiguity appeal of the economic value of the commodity (cell-unit), of a capitalist society and these are the exact situations that propitiate 'proletarian revolution'; which is the "Communist Manifesto" which is recognized as armament,

counterfeit by capitalists which the working class “turned against the bourgeoisie itself”

5. In a capitalist economy, the development of technology and the following are amplified the production augment the amount of ‘material wealth’ (use value) in the society, whereas, it lessens the economic value of the same wealth at the same time, by doing so, it reduces the rate of profit. A inconsistency characteristic of economy crisis in a capitalist economy is poverty in the midst of plenty consequent to over production and under consumption.

After two decades of economic study and preparatory work, specially related to the theory of surplus value, the first volume came in 1867, as ‘the Production Process of Capital’. In 1883, after the death of Marx, Friedrich Engels familiarized, from the manuscripts and the first volume he developed Volume II; “The Circulation Process of Capital in 1885; and later in 1894, Volume III, “The Overall Process of Capitalist Production”. These three volumes jointly called as “Das Kapital”.

In the Volume I, of Capital (1867), did a deep critical examination of political economy, he discloses the ambiguities of the ‘capital manner of the production’, how it did pioneer of the socialist manner of production and he also dealt with the class struggle embedded in the capitalist social associations of production. On 14th September, 1867, the first of three volumes of Das Kapital, known as Critique of Political Economy, was published and it was dedicated to ‘Wilhelm Wolf’, this was the only volume published in Marx’s time. Political Economy, commonly been satisfied to take, just as they were, the positions of commercial and industrial life, though effortlessly attentive that both profits and rent as sub- divisions, remains of that unpaid part of the product which the labourers has to supply to his employer (its first appropriator, however not its final select proprietor)

The Volume II, was by Friedrich Engels was known as “The Process of Circulation of Capital”, which was published in 1885, from the manuscripts of Karl Marx. It was divided into three parts such as, ‘The Metamorphoses of Capital and Their Circuits’, ‘The Turnover of Capital’, and “The Reproduction and Circulation of the Aggregated Social Capital”. It dealt with the chief views behind the market place, how the value and the surplus can be understood. It did not deals with much about the worker and owner like that of Volume I, but it talks about the money owner and money lender, the wholesale merchant, the trader and entrepreneur or the functioning capitalist’. Besides, in this volumes workers, dealt as purchasers of consumer goods and, hence, as venders of the product labour power, relatively than producers of value and surplus-value. The importance to understand the theoretical edifice of entire deliberation of Karl Marx. Marx had exactly clarified the area in letter sent to Engels on 30th April 1868: he stated it as, “In book I... we content ourselves with the assumption that if in the self-expansion process £100 becomes £110, the latter will find already in existence in the market the elements into which it will change once more. But now we investigate the conditions under which these elements are found at hand, namely the social intertwining of the different capitals, of the component parts of capital and of revenue (= s)”. This linking, considered as an undertaking of commodities and of money, allowed Marx to work out at least the important features, if not the conclusive form of a clear theory of the trade cycle, which is founded upon the predictability of periodic imbalance between supply and demand below the capitalist manner of production (Mandel, 1978, Intro to Vol. II of Capital). Volume II of Capital has certainly been not only a “sealed book”, but also an elapsed one. To a big degree of amount, it rests so to this very day.

Coming to the Volume III of Capital, “The Process of Capitalist Production as a Whole” was arranged by Friedrich Engels from the left over notes of Karl Marx which was published in 1894. It appears in seven parts and they are as follows:

- The Conversion of surplus Value into Profit and Rate of Surplus Value into the rate of Profit
- Conversion of Profit into average Profit
- The Law of the Tendency of the rate of Profit to Fall
- Conversion of Commodity Capital and money Capital into Commercial capital and Money Dealing capital Which is Merchant’s Capital
- Revenues and Their Sources

The best known work of part three, in which summarizes that as organic fixed capital requirements of production rise as a result of advancement primarily and by which the rate of profit inclines to fall.

10.9 Karl Marx's Views on Ideology

10.9.1. Introduction to Marx’s Concept of Ideology

Karl Marx's conception of ideology is rooted in his broader critique of capitalist society and the materialist understanding of history. For Marx, ideology is not merely a set of ideas or beliefs but a system of representations that obscures the material relations of production and legitimizes class domination. His analysis of ideology emerges primarily from his collaboration with Friedrich Engels, particularly in *The German Ideology* (1846), where they argue that ruling ideas are historically conditioned and serve the interests of the dominant class.

Marx’s theory of ideology is therefore not a neutral epistemological framework but a critical socio-political concept that explains how consciousness is shaped by material conditions and used as an instrument of social control.

10.9.2. Materialism and the Basis of Ideology

Marx’s historical materialism provides the foundation for his understanding of ideology. According to Marx, the "base" (economic structure)—comprising the forces and relations of production—determines the "superstructure" (political, legal, cultural institutions and ideologies). This relationship implies that the dominant ideological forms in any epoch arise from, and serve to reinforce, the existing economic order.

He famously stated:

“The ideas of the ruling class are in every epoch the ruling ideas” (*The German Ideology*).

This means ideology functions to naturalize the existing class relations, presenting them as universal, inevitable, and in the "common interest," even when they are deeply exploitative.

10.9.3. Ideology as "False Consciousness"

Although Marx himself did not explicitly use the term "false consciousness," his writings imply that ideology distorts reality in favor of the ruling class. This concept was later

popularized by Marxist theorists to describe how subordinate classes adopt the worldview of the bourgeoisie, thereby failing to recognize their own exploitation.

Under capitalism, ideology manifests in phenomena such as:

- Reification: Treating social relations as natural or objective things (e.g., commodity fetishism).
- Naturalization of class relations: Presenting capitalist social hierarchies as meritocratic or inevitable.
- Mystification of exploitation: Obscuring the exploitative nature of wage labor by framing it as "free labor."

Thus, ideology prevents the proletariat from achieving class consciousness, delaying revolutionary transformation.

10.9.4. Key Texts and Theoretical Development

Marx's critique of ideology can be traced through several of his works:

- In *The German Ideology* (1846): Marx and Engels argue that ideological forms arise from material life and that intellectual production is conditioned by the social relations of production.
- In *Capital* (1867): He expands this through the concept of commodity fetishism, illustrating how capitalist exchange masks the exploitation underlying production.
- In *Critique of Hegel's Philosophy of Right* (1843): Marx critiques religion as the "opium of the people," conceptualizing ideology as both an expression of suffering and a means of pacifying revolutionary impulses.

10.9.5. Ideology, Class Struggle, and Power

For Marx, ideology is inseparable from class struggle. In every class-divided society, the ruling class controls both the means of material production and the means of mental production (education, media, religion, law), shaping dominant ideas in ways that serve their interests.

However, Marx also recognized the contradictory nature of ideology: it is not monolithic. Revolutionary ideologies can arise from oppressed classes, challenging the dominance of ruling-class ideas. For Marx, the proletariat's emergence as a class-for-itself requires breaking through bourgeois ideology to develop a revolutionary consciousness grounded in material realities.

10.9.6. Beyond Determinism: Later Marxist Interpretations

While Marx's base-superstructure model has often been criticized for economic determinism, later Marxists (e.g., Antonio Gramsci, Louis Althusser) expanded upon his framework:

- Gramsci's concept of "hegemony": Ideology is not merely imposed but secured through consent, cultural leadership, and everyday practices.

- Althusser's theory of Ideological State Apparatuses (ISAs): Institutions like schools, media, and churches reproduce capitalist ideology by "interpellating" individuals as subjects.

These developments underscore how Marx's foundational ideas on ideology evolved into a complex theory of cultural and ideological power.

10.9.7. Criticisms of Marx's Theory of Ideology

Scholars have raised several critiques of Marx's theory of ideology:

- **Epistemological Critique:** Some argue that Marx's conception assumes a "true" consciousness exists apart from ideology, which risks a binary view of truth versus illusion.
- **Reductionism:** Others contend that Marx's focus on the economic base underestimates the relative autonomy of ideology and culture.
- **Modern Relevance:** In contemporary capitalist societies, ideology operates less overtly, often through consumer culture and identity politics, complicating Marx's traditional class-based analysis.

Nonetheless, Marx's insights remain foundational for understanding how power operates through culture, knowledge, and representation.

Marx's theory of ideology is both a diagnosis of how ruling ideas perpetuate class domination and a call to action for revolutionary consciousness. Rooted in historical materialism, it reveals that ideology is not a detached realm of ideas but is structurally linked to material relations of production. His critique underscores the necessity of exposing ideological mystifications to enable emancipatory political transformation.

In contemporary contexts—marked by global capitalism, digital media, and cultural hegemony—Marx's analysis remains profoundly relevant, offering critical tools to interrogate how ideas legitimize inequality and obstruct emancipatory politics.

10.10 Revolution:

Marx gave a new look and mainly new interpretation to the word 'revolution', he said in his Theses on Feuerbach, "philosophers have so far interpreted the world, the question is how to change it", Engels said about Marx as, he was revolutionist and that the actual mission of his life was to contribute in one way or another to overthrow the capital society and the organisations of the state and which they had brought into existence, so that, it contribute to the freedom of the modern waged people. It was the Karl Marx for the first time, stressed that the social revolution would occur when the present relations of production have begun to perform as a fetter on the further improvement of the forces of production. Therefore, for Marx, the chief political revolutions of the modern times till the present day are to be clarified as the outcome of long term improvements of social and economy and by which novel types of economic exploitations and property ownership progressively grow. The impact of this stated by Ralph Miliband, as "a political revolution is a social revolution when it involves the conflict of social classes".

The key change in the resources of the production subsequent in the consistent alteration in the relations of production brands a revolution. The end of slave society by the feudal society,

was a revolution. Because of this Marx lauds the beginning of capitalism over the remains of feudalism as a great occurrence for which he said ‘bourgeois revolution’ or otherwise called as ‘middle class revolution’. He also stated that, the bourgeois revolution, contains, “The displacement of one minority class rule by that of another, ‘feudal rule’ by ‘bourgeois rule’: the use of state power to remodel political and legal structures to suit the interests of the new ruling class: while the ruled majority either aids the rising class or remains passive but acquiescent”. Therefore, Marx bursts that the ‘bourgeois revolution’ where it conquered by the middle class that grew inside it and a new state generated as the result of the ‘bourgeois rule’. This class had developed new type processes of production and distribution of goods, which gave rise to the new types of transport and communications, installs units of industry for the sake of the employment for those we can invest their labour power, and invents a novel material for the production of goods and novel markets to distribute those products for the more gains. The workers make use of transport, communication and education and training to get more acquainted, these sort of bonds crop to motivate the waged people (proletariat) to organize and then to conquer the capital system, so that it can free itself from the claim of law of growing unhappiness and deprivation according to him could the reason for the ‘socialist revolution’.

According to him socialist revolution, said to proceeds when waged people seizures state power and pivotal creative forces focused in the hands of proletarians. Not only this, it is also required that the forces of response are by force crushed so that no remains of danger and counter revolution occur. It is also to observe that the views, thoughts, opinions, traditions and the process of life of the people are altered so that to brand them to follow the standards of socialist system. By doing so, a traditional revolution to be launched for the sake of brainwashing the people is an integral part of the socialist revolution exploitation and oppression would go with the establishments of a ‘class society’. Marx in his “The Struggles in France” recognizes the uniqueness of the determination of the revolution and stated as, “The declaration of the permanence of the revolution, the class dictatorship of the proletariat as a necessary intermediate point on the path towards the abolition of class differences in general, the abolition of all social relations which correspond to these relations of production, and the revolutionizing of all ideas which stem from these social relations”.

It is important to note that the ideas about the revolutions by the Marx followed and further developed by adding their own ideas. For example, Lenin followed his ideas and added and developed them according to his own ideas, Lenin’s theory of revolution which created the possible revolution in any of the countries of the globe. If the leadership of the Communist party capable of doing that. Lenin, removed Marxian revolution as a possibility only in advanced capitalist societies and placed it with the realm of possibility for virtually any country provided a revolutionary situation preset and revolutionary party was existed, that would drive the society on the path of socialism. Far more development in the classical theory of revolution of Marx, can also be observed in the views and strategies of the Chinese Communist leader Mao and also followed the revolutionary ideas of Marx and he refined according to his views and perceptions.

10.11 Conclusion:

Karl Marx was born on 5th May 1818, Trier, Kingdom of Prussia in Rhineland, German Confederation, and he died on 14 March, 1883 in London. He was very renowned German philosopher, sociologist, journalist, economist and most importantly was revolutionary socialist. He was born in a rich middle class family, he completed his education in the

universities of Bonn and he got the interest in the philosophical ideas of the “Young Hegelians”. He was educated privately by his father Heinrich Marx until 1830, later he joined in Trier High School the Head master Hugo Wytttenbach was the friend of his father. At the age of 17, in the year 1835, Karl Marx joined in the “University of Bonn” in order to study ‘literature and philosophy’, anyhow, his father claimed to join in law because it is more practical field. Because of his weak chest he was excused from the duty of Army when he became 18. Marx associated with the poets’ club when he was in the Bonn University, the club consisted of group of radicals who were consistently monitored by the police. Marx also joined the Trier Tavern Club drinking society which is known as ‘Landsmannschaft der Treveraner’.

Though he was doing law but he was charmed by philosophy and he searched to combine these two, he said that, “without philosophy nothing could be accomplished”. Karl Marx had been influenced by the German philosopher G.W.F Hegel, the ideas of Hegel were very much discussed in the Europe’s philosophical personalities. In Stralau, during a rehabilitation he joined the Doctor’s Club, where a group of students debated about the views and thoughts of Hegel, in 1837, by then he associated with a group of radical thinkers who are called as “Young Hegelians”. The classic book by Karl Marx in 1867, *Das Kapital*, it is generally known as the “The Bible of the Working Class”, which is a critical analysis of political economy which deals about the patterns of economy which focuses the capitalist way of production. In this he suggests the inspirational force of capitalism is nothing but mistreatment of labour, the surplus value results in profit is mainly because of the unpaid works of the labour, and they have detailed meaning for Karl Marx.

Marx gave a new look and mainly new interpretation to the word ‘revolution’, he said in his *Theses on Feuerbach*, “philosophers have so far interpreted the world, the question is how to change it”, Engels said about Marx as, he was revolutionist and that the actual mission of his life was to contribute in one way or another to overthrow the capital society and the organisations of the state and which they had brought into existence so that it contribute to the freedom of the modern waged people. According to him socialist revolution is said to proceed when waged people seizes state power and pivotal creative forces are focused in the hands of proletarians. Not only this, it is also required that the forces of response are by force crushed so that no remains of danger and counter revolution occur.

It is important to note that the ideas about the revolutions by the Marx, followed and further developed by adding their own ideas. For example, Lenin and Mao followed their ideas and added and developed them according to their own ideas.

10.12 Questions:

1. Write about the Karl Marx early life, early activism and Hegelianism?
2. Discuss about Marx critique of capitalism?
3. Write about the Marx’s revolution theory?
4. Describe Marx Alienation, Human Emancipation and Ideology?

10.13 References:

1. Michael Rosen and Jonathan Wolff, *Political Thought*, Oxford University Press, New York, 1999.

2. R.K. Misra, An Introduction to Political Thought, Pearson, Delhi, 2012.
3. Eric J. Hobsbawm, The History of Marxism, Selectbook Service Syndicate, New Delhi, 1982.
4. Irfan Habib, On Socialism, Aligarh Historians Society, Tulika Books, New Delhi, 2009.
5. Ben Agger, Western Marxism: An Introduction, Goodyear Publishing Co., INC, Santa Monica, California, 1979.
6. J.C. Johari, Contemporary Political Theory, Sterling Publishers Private Limited, New Delhi, 1993.
7. Peter Calvert, Revolution, Macmillan, Great Britain, 1970.
8. Thomas Landon Thorson, A History of Political Theory, Oxford & IBH Publishing Co., New Delhi, 1973.

Dr. C. Vinod Kumar
Lesson Writer