

Lesson-01

INTRODUCTION TO POLITICAL THOUGHT

1.0 Objectives:

1. Student will learn about Western Political Thought.
2. Student will understand about concerns of Political Thought.
3. Student will know about importance of Political Thought.

Structure:

- 1.0 Objectives
- 1.1 Introduction
- 1.2 Political Thought before Plato
- 1.3 Popular Political Discussion
- 1.4 Orders in Nature and Society
- 1.5 Nature and Convention
- 1.6 Socrates
- 1.7 The Central Concern of Political Thought
- 1.8 Origin of Political Thought
- 1.9 Salient Features of Greek Thought
 - 1.9.1 Exclusively Political Character of Treatise
 - 1.9.2 Main Concentration on Nature of State
 - 1.9.3 Social Nature of Man
 - 1.9.4 The City State
 - 1.9.5 Importance of Education
 - 1.9.6 Rationalism
 - 1.9.7 Concept of law
 - 1.9.8 Views on Justice
 - 1.9.9 Views on Citizenship
 - 1.9.10 Belief in Inequality
 - 1.9.11 Individualistic Element
 - 1.9.12 Primacy of Discussions
- 1.10 Impact of Greek Political Philosophy over European Political Philosophy
 - 1.10.1 Concept of Democracy
 - 1.10.2 Religious Tolerance
 - 1.10.3 Concept of Justice
 - 1.10.4 State Regulation of Education
- 1.11 Importance of Western Political Thought
 - 1.11.1 Political Philosophy
 - 1.11.2 Nature of Political Thought
- 1.12 Subject Matter of Political Thought
 - 1.12.1 The State
 - 1.12.2 The Government
 - 1.12.3 Human Nature and its Relation with Universe
 - 1.12.4 Division of Political Thought
- 1.13 Sources of Political Thought

1.14	Conclusion
1.15	Model Questions
1.16	References

1.1 Introduction:

Political Thought is about the State, its structure, nature and purpose. It is nothing but “the moral phenomena of human behavior in Society”. It follows not much explanation of the occurrence of State as a justification of its continuation. The questions which Political Thought is forever stressed to answer are i) what is in the State? And why should I obey it? ii) What are the proper limits of authority and when may I refuse to obey it? iii) How is the authority of state with which I cannot give out to be made well-suited with the liberty without which I am less than a man?

To those questions no one can give certain answers that will persuade everybody. It is very challenging to distinct the purpose of political life from the purpose of life itself that the answers we give to these questions or political theory. In the last, analysis rest on upon our conceptions of right and wrong. And because it is a branch of ethical theory it cannot influence everybody. For science general laws can be applied by the help of which we can get exact results, the student of politics in search of such laws would be like the experiment and examine for the answer that would turn everything into gilt. According to Graham Wallas, no one cannot after twenty generations of education, even two human beings satisfactorily like each other cannot perform alike under same situations, “the lines of politics are not like the lines of mathematics. They have broad and deep as well as long they admit of exceptions; they demand modifications. No lines can be laid down for civil and political wisdom. They are matter incapable of exact definition”.

But, if, to quote Sir Earnest Barker, “each Professor of Political Thought is suitable, to feel about all the Professors, if not about himself. They argue from questionable maxims,(sayings) by a still more questionable process of logic to conclusions that are unquestionably wrong”. What, it may well be asked, is the value of Political Thought? Answers of a thrilling nature have often been given to that question. One is that it has no value, that it and immaterial, that as Bacon says, “Like a virgin consecrated of God, it is barrow”. It is sustained, an undoubted design of that individuality of philosophers which Berkeley noticed, their habit of first jolting up a dirt and then protests that they cannot see.

Nevertheless, the student of Political Thought has met and wide-open the expansive solution, has come across and been made to understand in its true light of the claptrap, sees the awful supremacy of words to clock authenticity, and is aware of the duty that lies upon him of piercing to that reality, in spite of the surge of words which may drum on his ear drum up his sentiments. What is the state and why do men obey it? Have been of two kinds one in that the state is an organism of which men themselves are parts and which is therefore, greater than they are, it is actual and they are merely obstacles. The other is that, it is an instrument which men produce for their own resolutions and which is therefore no other than they are. They are actual and it is just a device. The idea of the state as an organism was knockout by the Greeks. By the Stocis (indifference to pleasure or pain) it was functional to humanity as a whole, it was then taken over by Christianity, and throughout the Middle Ages ruled supreme. It was challenged at the time of scientific

revolutions of the 17th century, which led to the development of the “mechanistic” opinion of state. This view was maintained throughout the enlightenment of the 18th century, and was rejected by Rousseau and by German Romantics, who strained the “organic” view as against the “bloodless” and “soulless” mechanistic doctrine. Once again the swing of pendulum towards organic doctrine came into existence when Adam Muller, and de Maistre. So devotedly embraced the organic doctrine in the hope of using it to block the new liberal forces which they did not liked. The mechanistic view yet again come into favour. Only to be powerfully argued by the organic interpretation and reinforced by 19th century biological theories and by 20th century dictatorial practices. Both views still persevere and still resist for domination over minds of men.

The division of political thinkers into sustains of the organic and mechanistic opinions of the state is not, nevertheless, the only likely classification of such thinkers. Additional classification may ascertain more cooperative, one which pressure the variances as well as knowledge of resemblances between Aristotle and Hegel, Plato and Rousseau. This would assign political thinkers to three different customs. 1) Rational Natural Tradition, according to this society and state can be assumed only when they are related to a complete standard, which be present in nature and which is therefore out of human control, but can be acknowledged by men over the use of their reason. According to this Society, state can be understood only when they are associated to a complete standard, which occurs in nature and which is thus out of human control, but can be known by mean through the use of their reason. According to this, society must duplicate the design presented by nature which reason has detained and if we want to know whether laws and institutions are good, we have only to ask if they are close replicas of the prevailing natural standards. The second is, tradition of will Artifice, according to the society and the state, are artificial and not natural. They are honestly free conceptions of man and not repetition of something that already be present in nature. Hence, according to this tradition it is not reason of man, but the will of man that is obligatory to produce the state, and human will have liberty to modify society. The third is, the tradition of Historical Coherence, according to this, both of the customs are imperfect. Since natural laws have to be altered to suit Civil Society. The balanced natural tradition, it maintains, is really neither rational nor natural. And men’s will is always incomplete by the will of others and by what has been willed earlier the custom of will and artifice. From now, the tradition of historical consistency tries to pool earlier traditions, to fuse reason and will as in Rousseau’s “General Will “ and Hegel’s “Rational will”. It stresses the importance of historical development and challenges that complete standards be present. The state, according to this tradition, is not a replica of the natural world, but to some degree it can be understood as natural because it is the result of an historical development that can be thought of as part of nature. To some degree, it can be observed as artificial, is the outcome of men not ensuing but altering nature. All believers in the state as a machine belong to the will and artifice tradition. Believers in the state as an organism may belong either to Rational-Natural tradition or to the tradition of Historical Coherence.

1.2 Political Thought before Plato:

The pronounced age during the third quarter of fifth century B.C. was the great age of an Athenian public life. Which was the inordinate age of political Philosophy, came only after the downfall of ‘Athens in her struggled with Sparta. As in so several cases in history replication followed accomplishment and principles were conceptually stated only after they had long been denoted. During this age not much was given either to the reading or writing

of books and even if political treatises were written before the time of Plato, were not been well-preserved. But there are clear signs that much dynamic thoughts and discussions were lingering upon political problems and that many of the beginnings found later in Plato and Aristotle had already preserved. The basis and growth of these ideas cannot be appropriately outlined, but the atmosphere of opinion must be recommended in which the more clearly political philosophy of next century could progress.

1.3 Popular Political Discussion:

The Athenians of fifth century were engrossed in the discussion of politics necessity hardly be understood. Public apprehensions and the conduct of public affairs were their great topics of interest. They lived in an atmosphere of verbal discussion and dialogue which is difficult for the modern man to visualize. It is convinced that every sort of thought-provoking political questions were enthusiastically campaigned by the inquisitive and curious minds of Athenian Citizens. Definitely it was more promising to certain political enquiry. The Greek was virtually forced to think of what would be now called comparative government. The Greek of fifth century had formed curiosity about the queen laws and institutions, which filled his world is proved by the fund of anthropological wisdom embodied by Herodotus in his history. The diverse custom's and behaviors of foreign people form a consistent part of trade. Every man favours the customs of his own country, though there may be little difference or superior to other country. Every man must be lived in accord with some standards. There was a proof by the Greek that they had even gone further degree to imagining about government. In Herodotus book III, there was mention that seven persons had debated the relative merits of Monarchy, Aristocracy and Democracy. Most of the argument appears: The Monarch inclines to degenerate into a tyrant, while Democracy makes all men equal before the law. But democracy becomes module and a government by the best men is definitely desirable and nothing can be better than the rule of one best man. This is a genuine Greek touch which Herodotus certainly did not pick up in Persia. This standard classification of the forms of governments then, was a bit of popular theorizing long predating anything known as political philosophy.

In the early stages of political though no doubt unbiased interest about foreign countries counted for something, but was not the main cause.

1.4 Orders in Nature and Society:

It is clear that active thought and discussion of political and social questions headed clear political theory and isolated political ideas of more or less importance among themselves were matters of common knowledge, before Plato tried to combine them in an accomplished philosophy. There were present and convinced general starts, not entirely political, but forming a kind of knowledgeable point of view, with in which political thought established and for first time made clear. The beginnings present and had been uttered before they were stated as philosophical principles. Such conventions are intangible but important, they determine what type of clarifications are felt to be logically satisfying and the direction that later theories will try to take. The essential thought in the Greek idea of the state was the harmony of a life shared in common by all its members. Solon highly praised his legislation as producing a harmony or a balance between rich and poor in which each party received its just due.

The first development of the principle, however, took place in natural philosophy and this development reacted in turn upon its later use in ethical and political thought.

1.5 Nature and Convention:

There is sufficient proof that this great discussion about nature versus convention was spread wide among the Athenians of the fifth century. It might of course, as often it has done, since, form the defense of the rebel, in the name of a higher law, against the standing agreements and the existing laws of the society. The classic example of this theme in Greek literature is the *Antigone* of Sophocles, perhaps the first time that an artist misused the conflict between a duty to human law and a duty to the law of God. Thus when *Antigone* is burdened with having broken that law by performing the law of God and contrast of convention with the truly right was destined to become almost of formula for the criticism of abuses, a role in which the law of nature has appeared again and again in the later history of political thought.

Before the end of the fifth century, the contrast of nature and conventions had begun to develop in two main directions. The one conceived nature as a law of justice and right characteristic in human beings and in the world. This view came to the statement that the order in the world is brainy and benevolent; it could be critical of exploitations but it was basically moralist and in the last option of religion. The other conceived nature non-morally, and as demonstrated on human beings it was self-ascertain or egoism, derive for pleasure or for power. This view might be established as a kind of Nietzschean doctrine of self-expression, or in moderate forms it might become a kind of utilitarianism; the extreme forms could be become theories of a definitely anti-social complexion. In the fifth century there were ideas but not in systematic or abstract manner, which contained suggestions of most of the philosophical systems which were produced in fourth century.

1.6 Socrates:

The personal agency by which expressive ideas were revolved into clear philosophy by Socrates, and curiously enough all the possibilities were equally obliged to him. The intensely exciting quality of his personality influenced men of the most different character and persuaded conclusions which were logically quite unsuited through obviously all imitative from Socrates. It is certain that move of Socrates personality and an entertainer conception of his ideas must have gone into the teachings of his greatest pupil, Plato. But in all of Socrates's pupils were achieved the humanistic reaction which the Sophist began. The great interest of his nature years at least was ethics, in short, the puzzling question about the multitude of local and changeable conventions and true and abiding right.

Unlike Sophists he carried into his humanism the rational tradition of the older physical philosophy. This is the meaning of the doctrine most typically credited to him, the belief that virtue is knowledge and so can be learned and taught, and also of the method by which Aristotle attributes to him the pursuit of precise definition. For given these two the discovery of a valid general rule of action is not impossible, and conveying it by means of education is not unviable. This vision of a rational, demonstrable science of politics, which Plato pursued throughout his life.

What exactly where the conclusions of Socrates about politics is not known. But in general the implications of identifying virtue with knowledge are too clear to be missed. He must have been an honest critic of the Athenian democracy with its assumption that any man can fill any office. This is broadly suggested in the Apology and practically stated by Xenophon in the Memorabilia; and in any case Socrates's trail and conviction are a little hard to understand unless there was "politics" somewhere behind it. The basic political principles developed by Socrates and were learned directly from him by Plato.

1.7 The Central Concern of Political Thought:

"Political Thought begins with Greek. Its origin is associated with the calm and clear rationalism of Greek mind" – Earnest Barker.

'Man is a rational creature, and has shown affinity to understand himself and institutions around him, he has started studying the physics, biological and social environments and indulged theories about them. These speculations like state, its nature, purpose, functions, organization etc., have occupied important position. This speculation about the different problems connected with the state is generally designated as political though it can be said that the study of political thought is as old as the state itself.'

Certain scholars opined that political thought is not related with the problems of the state government but also includes study of the nature of man and his relations with the universe. According to Doyle three important aspects are included in the study of political thought. These include 1) The Nature and Functions of Man; 2) His Relation to the rest of Universe which involves a consideration of the meaning of life as a whole; emerging from the interaction of these two problems of relation of man to his fellowmen. The latter is main concern of political theory in the narrowest sense and involves a discussion on the nature, purpose and function of the state.

1.8 Origin of Political Thought:

Some of the scholars consider the origin of political thought to the ancient Greek, Earnest Barker says "political thought begins with Greek. Its origin connected with calm and clear rationalism of the Greek mind". He came to this conclusion because Greek political thought is one of the most ancient thoughts which was preserved and passed on to next generations in the form of one treatise or other. It has now been recognized that political philosophy is not the exclusive domain of ancient Greeks, but certain countries like India, Babilonia, Egypt etc. also produced political philosophers which are as old as ancient Greek philosophy. They have also made unsettled works of Greeks. However, the Greeks have an edge over them as they could preserved their national heritage and passion to the next generations, while other countries failed to do so. According to Maxey "The closer and fuller acquaintance with the civilization of remote millennium, which we now enjoy reveals an astonishing abundance of the political ideas among the people of those vanished areas and shows how both in thought and practice they anticipated parallel and to some extent laid the foundations for ideas which subsequently appeared in European political consciousness". It was in those ancient political systems that the human mind first come to grips with the problems of government and first attempted to formulate ideas to account for the phenomena of politics and to structure the exercise of political authority.

The opinion conveyed by Maxey is acknowledged, because non-availability of non-Greek works of politics made them insignificant. "Greeks were the first to present the political ideas and concepts in systematic form and their ideas greatly molded the European thought and form the basis of modern political thinking." A reasonable question stand up why the Greeks alone able to laying the foundations of an independent political philosophy? This can have number of factors like the rational character of Greek mind, their secular outlook on life. The incidence of huge number of city states which differed from the states of Babylon, Egypt, India, etc., the Greeks could able to practice verity of political experiments due to existence of different forms of government in those city states. The growth of systematic political thought amongst Greek was due to "the free play of speculative intelligence, the brilliant formulation of vocabulary of thought in language expressive of sublet shades of meaning and purposive Coherence of Greek Ideals".

1.9 Salient Features of Greek Thought:

The Greek political thought have positive significant features which justify our consideration.

1.9.1. Exclusively Political Character of Treatise:

The ancient Greek Political Thought varies from the Political Thought of other ancient countries like Egypt, Bobylonia, Syria, Persia, India, China etc., formed treatise of purely political nature. On the other hand ancient civilizations the political ideas were inter-mixed with mythology and religious literature. For example in India the Ramayana, Mahabharata, Manu Smriti, deal with political problems which are not totally political treatises. They were mainly religious works in which political ideas were inter- mixed with religion and mythology and has to make special efforts to distinguish the politics form religion. In the case of Greek Political Thought the existence of number of independent treatises which are meant to study the political problems.

1.9.2. Main Concentration on Nature of State:

'One of the important feature of the ancient Greek Political Thought was that it related itself mainly with the nature of the state and the concept that man is a political animal. The Greek writers did not reflect themselves with the problems relating to the relations between the State and Church, or State and Industry which was the part of political thought of later thinkers.' When they consider man as a social animal they did not consider him as an isolated and independent individual and tried to understand him in relation to the social whole viz., the state. And the state become the centre of Greek political thinkers. They discussed the origin and end of the state and distinguished between various forms of states like Monarchy, Aristocracy, Oligarchy, Democracy, Tyranny etc. they also highlighted the points that forms of government, determine the order in which the changes take place in governments and the laws governing them.

1.9.3. Social Nature of Man:

'The Greek thinkers were the first to put weight on social nature of man and highlight that an individual could not think as an lonely and independently. He could get perfection only in a healthy state, so they considered state as essential for the sake of life as well as good life.'

1.9.4. The City State:

Another significant feature of Greek political thought was that it is positioned around the city states, in which men shared with community for common life and purpose, it was an ample social organization in which citizens uninterruptedly took part. Greek political thinkers did not identify the state and society. As Barker has observe, “the Greeks were never tried of telling themselves that while in their communities each man counted for what he was worth and exercised his share of influence in the common life. It was place of a common life and the home of a union of classes. Like within common walls drew new natural intimacy. It did not abolish the prestige of wealth and birth and culture, it established a tradition of easy inter course between all classes. The city state was also not different from church. It was be –all and end-all of the actions of its citizens and included the entire cooperative actions of the citizens.

1.9.5. Importance of Education:

Greek thinkers gave top significance to education and stressed its importance in making the people on par with the spirit of constitution. They highlighted on practical system of education which could help in promoting modesty, self- control, patriotism, sociability and other similar qualities. The responsibility to promote education was of state among the citizens and was considered as a moral and political institution but also an educational institution. The Greeks laid main pressure on state to skillful system of education.

1.9.6. Rationalism:

Greek given an important position to rationalism in their thought. They consider that reason is an aspect of the importance and man was free, when he had freedom of reasoning, this made man to identify himself with corporate life, which made to stop his personal and selfish interests and just into the jurisdiction of wider interpretations and higher purposes. Greek thinkers gave advantaged positions to persons who had the rational faculty and demoted those persons who did not have reason, have much low status. ‘They gave much importance to reason and ware against of a thing which was not justified on ground of reason.’

1.9.7. Concept of law:

‘The Greek concept of law was connected with their belief in reason. They measured life-breath of the state was law, because it characterized the cane of the rational being.’ The people who make laws were stimulated by the divine power and was also pronouncement of God. They thought that law and justice as two sides of the same coin, and considered the justice done by the law.

1.9.8. Views on Justice:

‘The Greek political thinkers gave top priority to justice, which enabled a citizen to discharge his duties properly, and contributed towards development of human faculties.’ Justice was implied to mean willing obedience to the laws of state. According to Plato “Justice was the virtue of social and injustice it’s vice”.

1.9.9. Views on Citizenship:

'The Greek thinkers opined that merely payment of taxes and vote did not mean citizenship. It meant the direct contribution in the management of state as a soldier, as judge, as a legislator in person not through Deputy. The Greeks ruled out the concept of representative government, the Greek did not extend rights of citizenship to slaves,' because they felt the slaves could not discharge their duties towards the state. Even they denied working classes the right to rule because they did not have speculative mind. They opined that only the classes which enjoyed leisure and owned lands can actively participate in the affairs of state, because they are free from economic burden, hence, the concept of citizenship was limited.

1.9.10. Belief in Inequality:

'The Greeks considered equality as impracticable unnatural and undesirable they argued that the majority of individuals who were inferior, lazy, unfit for education could be sacrificed at the altar of the minority of excellent and wise.' They measured that disparity is natural and allowed the dominance of Greeks over barbarous, of the free man over the slave; of the gentle man artisan etc., they however acceptable equality with in a class. They opined that equality was not an ideal thing it was something unnatural and hence it is unrealistic and unwanted.

1.9.11. Individualistic Element:

The Greek political thinkers gave a significant position to the individual, their thought and claimed it was the right of individual to articulate his own thoughts and direct these thoughts publicly and act according to the dictator of conscience. Plato highlighted in his laws that society, a group of individuals and the individual was self-determined. Similarly, Epicurus said "there is no such thing as human society. Even man is concerned for himself..... Justice never is anything in itself, but in delays of men with one another in any place whatever and at any time. It is a time of contract not to harm or to be harmed".

1.9.12. Primacy of Discussions:

Another important feature of Greeks was that, they committed great importance to discussion. They approved the method of discussion for present their ideas and philosophy, and truth can be exposed only through proper reasoning and discussion. The novel method adopted by them was between two parties one presenting the issue and other replying to those issues with philosophical ideas. They thought that truth would hide in the absence of discussion. It comes in light with discussion. In fact some of the concepts and ideas discussed by the ancient Greeks were focal point of discussion of political thought even in our times.

1.10 Impact of Greek Political Philosophy over European Political Philosophy:

Of all the political philosophers' only Greek philosophy thrived during ancient Greek times. Greek philosophy was studied extensively and Europeans borrowed it. It is due to easy availability and clearness. Some of the important ideas and concepts which came into European political thought were as follows.

1.10.1 Concept of Democracy:

Democracy was unknown to Europeans and it was borrowed from Greeks because most of the European countries have Monarchical system. As a result they developed a healthy blending of Monarchical system.

1.10.2 Religious Tolerance:

Greeks were religious tolerant when compared to Europeans. Europeans were religious biased which resulted frequent religious strife. They learned tolerance from Greeks. The insignificant position in which religion was attached to politics was due to the impact of Greeks.

1.10.3 Concept of Justice:

The concept of justice founded on the principle of 'virtue in action' by the Greeks also made an influence on the European political philosophers, they made a protruding place to it in their thought, the Europeans had a different meaning to justice earlier to them justice means purely submission to the will of monarch, who was treated as head of justice.

1.10.4 State Regulation of Education:

The impact of Greek on the Europeans thinking is also prominent from the greater regulation of the education by the states. Europeans states did not gave importance to education of its citizens. It was the result of the impact of Greeks, they understood education as an instrument for production of good citizen, and gave importance for education.

1.11 Importance of Western Political Thought:

Political thought is a kind of action which is as old as politics itself, which has many facts of styles and attitudes. Political thinkers have talk about the institutions and practices and advise rulers, defend values and principles or criticize the world in which they live in. They have motivated narrowly on institutions of government, lawmaking, and coercive power but focused broadly on society or people. The assertiveness of people is changed and politics also linked to other areas. The approaches to imagining about politics differ.

Major political thinkers who are in different ways have offered modern concept of scope of politics and its place in social life. Western political thought mainly consist of a single broadminded narrative that explains about "natural law" or some variety liberal constitutional democracy as the ideal form of government. More theoretically sophisticated methods for the study of government bureaucracy and group behavior, why do we need study, almost exclusively made thinkers had to say about politics in the past.

1.11.1 Political Philosophy:

It is about the study of politics, liberty, justice, property rights, law and the implementation of a legal code by authority which makes a government genuine. The term political philosophy often refers to a general view, or specific ethic, political belief and method.

The significance of political thought cannot be over highlighted. The task of thoughtful deeper recommendations of the present situation and further planning can be assisted by a careful study of political thought of the ages. This study in historical prospective leads to nature thinking and permit the political thinkers to solve present-day problems in a much better way. The modern world's political thought was based on western political thought. It prefers to begin the study with Western political thinkers, like Greeks, because not like their Eastern counterpart, their assumptions are mainly contained in independent treatises and do not form part of literature which was dominantly religious and ethical.

Man is a social animal he cannot lead life alone. He is not satisfied living with society because of his rational faculties, which made him to know about himself and surroundings which influences him. Nature has given him curiosity and desire to know about social surroundings and environment.

1.11.2 Nature of Political Thought:

The existence of various sciences like Botany, Zoology, Physics and Chemistry etc., made him to understand himself and social surroundings in which he lives, which gave rise to social sciences like, History, Politics, Economics, Sociology and Psychology etc. The desire to know about the God and universe gave rise to philosophy, religion and astronomy etc., man made progress in all faculties and acquired knowledge into many sciences. The progress of man is not by one country but all the countries contributed to it. As the political thought of modern world is based on the western political thought, which is useful to modern setup and understand the following.

1.12 Subject Matter of Political Thought:

1.12.1 The State:

Politics can be defined as the study of state and Government. It deals with the mechanism in which man can govern himself and the society. The state and its institution comprises very significant part of social setup. Every movement of man in society is measured by the government. The political power is important than the physical and biological forces.

1.12.2 The Government:

The people of the world and all ages have assumption about the government by its nature, function and organization. They tried to understand several institutions of government to attain its purpose and how should be organized to work better. Such things gave rise to political thinking which is as old as the recorded history.

1.12.3 Human Nature and its Relation with Universe.

Political thinking does not limit to state and government, it has reached beyond them. It is connected to nature of man and his relation to universe. The completes cope of political thought was illustrated by great political thinkers such as Plato, Aristotle, St. Thomas Aquinas, Marx, Hegel and Green. Chanakya, and Bruhaspati provided number of examples in ancient India. The chief purpose of political thought is state, they participate in discussion

of its nature, origin, purpose, functions organization etc., then to speculation about the nature of man and his place in universe.

It is significant to ask that, why should Indian student begin their study of political thought with Greeks and why not with ancient Indians, Egyptians, Babylonians, Chinese, Syrians and Persian etc., though they did grow their own political thought. In ancient times Indians produced political thinker like Viduv, Chankya, Bruhaspsti, Sukra and law giver like Manu, who were challengers to their European counter part. Two different reasons are given why we begin our political study with Greek political thought. Firstly, the ideas established by other ancient countries did not become the part of European Civilization as those of ancient Greeks did. Secondly, the results of their assumption of political problems were not completely limited in separate and independent treaties like Greece. They formed part of literature which was mainly religious and ethical. It is true about India where political thought is found in Ramayana, Mahabharata and Buddhist Jataks which are mainly religious books.

Hence, one has to begin his study with Western or European political thought and its growths from its early period in the assumptions of the early Greeks. Political thought do not develop from simple to complex. Political problems present themselves in different ways under different circumstances.

1.12.4 Division of Political Thought:

It can be divided into four periods: 1) Ancient political thought 2) Medieval political thought 3) Modern political thought 4) Contemporary political thought. Political thinkers have generally dealt with the following political problems: 1) The origin of state and its nature 2) Relation of political science with religion and ethics or controversy between the Church and state 3) Function of State 4) The organization of the state and Government 5) Sovereignty 6) Law 7) Justice 8) Classification of Government 9) Utility or justification of the state 10) Relation of political science with other physical and social sciences.

1.13 Sources of Political Thought:

The following sources are the sources of Political Thought.

- 1) Geographical conditions
- 2) contemporary conditions and social setup or social environments
- 3) Individual circumstances and experiences
- 4) Great philosophers and their works
- 5) Official documents are the main sources of political thought.

1.14 Conclusion:

Political Thought about State, its structure, nature and purpose, it is nothing but the moral phenomena of human behaviour in society. The philosophers like Plato, Aristotle, and Socrates have contributed important works of their time which are useful to us. Political Thought begins with Greek. Man is a rational animal, has shown tendency to understand himself and institutions around him. The origin of political thought, some scholars consider the origin to the ancient Greek, this thought is one of the most ancient thoughts which was preserved and passed on to the next generations in the form of one treatise or other. Greek were the first to present the political ideas and concepts in systematic form and their ideas greatly molded the reopen thought and form the basis of modern Political thinking.

1.15 Model Questions:

1. What is political thought? Give a brief introduction?
2. What are the salient features of Greek political thoughts?
3. What is the importance of Western Political thought and Impact of Greek political philosophy on European political philosophy?

1.16 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.

Lesson-02

JUSTICE, IDEAL STATE-PLATO

2.0 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.

Structure:

- 2.0 Objectives
- 2.1 Introduction
- 2.2 Sources of Plato's Political Thought
- 2.3 The Method of Plato:
- 2.4 The Republic or Concerning Justice
- 2.5 Plato's Concept of Justice
- 2.5.0 Grounds on which Plato Rejected Prevailing Theories
 - 2.5.1 Traditional theory
 - 2.5.2 Radicalist Theory
 - 2.5.3 Pragmatic Theory
- 2.6 Concept of Justice by Plato
- 2.7 Criticism of Plato's Concept of Justice
- 2.8 Theory of Education
 - 2.8.1 Education Methods
 - 2.8.2 Features of Platonic System of Education
 - 2.8.3 Education and Curriculum
 - 2.8.4 Critiques of Plato's Scheme of Education
- 2.9 Communism of Wives and Property
 - 2.9.1 Communism on Property
 - 2.9.2 Criticism of Communism of Property
 - 2.9.3 Communism of Wives
 - 2.9.4 Common Reasons on Wives
 - 2.9.5 Criticism
- 2.10 Comparison of Plato's Communism with Modern Communism
 - 2.10.1 Resemblances
 - 2.10.2 Dissimilarities
- 2.11 Origin and Nature of State
- 2.12 The Ideal or Just State
 - 2.12.1 Philosopher King
 - 2.12.2 Plato's Rule of Philosophy and Features
 - 2.12.3 Criticism
- 2.13 Ideal State and Liberty
- 2.14 Ideal State and Equality
- 2.15 The Statesman
- 2.16 The Laws:

- 2.16.1 Differences of Republic and Laws
- 2.16.2 Philosophy Explained in the Laws by Plato
- 2.16.3 Views on Political Aspects
- 2.16.4 Views on Social Structure
- 2.16.5 Views on Education
- 2.17 Conclusion
- 2.18 Model Questions
- 2.19 References

2.1 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., then 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 has 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 at 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, Rothyphora, 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.

2.2 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 of from Pythagoras, Parmenides, Heraclitus and Socrates. In fact no political philosophy is intelligible save in the context of its time, and this is 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 overcome 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 is 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 is 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' is based on Socrates proposal that virtue is knowledge.

2.3 The Method of Plato:

The system adopted by Plato has 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 is established on experience and which be distinguished to the analytic method that divides the ingredients of a phenomenon and studies at in segregation from other related phenomenon. Plato has 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 are 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.

2.4 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 protected 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 have accountability for making and unmaking of the country which is rested on their shoulders. He tried to raise ruling class. To recognize the philosophy of Plato fully, it is suggested to examine his views on justice, education, Rule of Philosopher king and communism of wives and property.

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

2.5.0 Grounds on which Plato Rejected Prevailing Theories:

The following theories of justice were rejected by Plato.

2.5.1 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's handmaid of those in power and gives sufficient scope for misuse.

2.5.2 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 is 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 has no universal application.

2.5.3 Pragmatic Theory

This theory was 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.

2.6 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.

2.7 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 three qualities like, reasons, 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 on 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.

2.8 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.

2.8.1 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.

2.8.2 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.

2.8.3 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.

2.8.4 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 is a lifelong procedure
- 3 The Plato’s suggestion for censorship of art and literature is extremely critical
- 4 The Plato’s education system is not logical there is 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 is opposing to human psychology and conflicting to rich society which depends on the variety of growth.

2.9 Communism of Wives and Property:

An important aspect of Plato's political thought is 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".

2.9.1 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 the 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.

2.9.2 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 is only for the ruling class and workers and peasant are 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.

2.9.3 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 were 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.

2.9.4 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".

2.9.5 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 is 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 is applicable to guardian class only and most of the other sections of people are 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.

2.10 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 of 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.

2.10.1 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 inn 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.

2.10.2 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 is 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, but 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 is mainly aims at Greek city-states but modern communism focuses at the national states and throughout the world and for the sake of workers.

2.11 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.

2.12 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 is not properly fed and needs are 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.

2.12.1 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 will be designated by the draw of lot. Plato's opinion was that, if anyone want to become a carpenter he need 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.

2.12.2 Plato's Rule of Philosophy and Features:

1 Plato did not in support of 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 will 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 are not responsible to public opinion

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

2.12.3 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 has been convicted, he realizes his mistake and agreements 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 is very faulty in nature
- 7 His assertion of no contradiction between the interest of philosopher ruler and public interest is 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 it is criticised of his concept but no one can denied and it is 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 will guarantee liberty to the individuals or not? 2) Second question is whether the society in this state will be based on the principles of equalitarianism – Let's try to answer these questions.

2.13 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 is expressed in an unending series of right actions in accordance with virtue- the supreme virtue that is justice.

2.14 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', it is 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 mean that Plato opposed to all forms of equality. He did appeal for equality within the classes not vis-à-vis them. The philosophers are the governing choice, soldiers are their auxiliaries (helpers). The governing elite possesses knowledge of what is good and virtuous. It is obvious that this class is in a better place to rule, because its members know what is just. Non-elite groups have no objection to submit before the rulers, this submission may lead to freedom and equality.

2.15 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 is contrary to Republic. In Statesman he abandoned 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 is 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 are 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 is 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.

2.16 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.

2.16.1 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 the 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.

2.16.2 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.

2.16.3 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 is to elect 37 Guardians of Law and 360 members of the council, the council members are elected on the basis of classes, whereas Guardians of Law are elected on the basis of the triple ballot. In addition to the election of the Guardians of Law and councilor are expected to do some other functions. The people between the ages of 50 to 70 are to be taken for the Guardians of Law, they hold office for the term of 20 years.

Regarding the judicial organisation, proposes the 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, are 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, are 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.

2.16.4 Views on Social Structure:

Citizens are 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 is valid to all people. Agricultures 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 is 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.

2.16.5 Views on Education:

Education is given a prominent position by Plato in his Laws, though his objective changes. In republic it is 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 is not favour of co-education after the age of six. The education scheme consist 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 will be taught literature, music, astronomy, geometry and arithmetic. He emphasized the military training which is 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.

2.17 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 pervious 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.

2.18 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?

2.19 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.

Lesson-03

THEORY OF THE STATE, REVOLUTIONS- ARISTOTLE

3.0 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.

Structure:

- 3.0 Objectives
- 3.1 Introduction
- 3.2 Early Life
- 3.3 Works of Aristotle
- 3.4 Influences on Aristotle
- 3.5 Theory of State
- 3.6 Aristotle's Views on State
- 3.7 Functions of State
- 3.8 Views of Aristotle on Slavery
- 3.9 Criticism on Aristotle's Views- Slavery
- 3.10 Views on Citizenship
- 3.11 Criticism on Aristotle's Views- Citizenship
- 3.12 Aristotle's Views on Property
- 3.13 Types or Kinds of Property
- 3.14 Views on Justice
- 3.15 classification of constitution
 - 3.15.1 Principles for Classification of Constitutions
 - 3.15.2 Criticism on Classification of Constitution
- 3.16 Ideal State of Aristotle
 - 3.16.1 Features of Ideal State
- 3.17 The Best Attainable/Practicable State or Polity
 - 3.17.1 Justification of Polity by Aristotle
- 3.18 Revolutions
- 3.19 What is Revolution?
 - 3.19.0 Causes of Revolution
 - 3.19.1 General Causes of Revolution
 - 3.19.2 Particular Cause of Revolution
 - 3.19.3 Revolution in a Particular Kind of State
 - 3.19.4 Oligarchic and Democratic Elements
 - 3.19.5 Prevention of Revolution
 - 3.19.6 General Means of Prevention
 - 3.19.7 Particular Methods for Prevention of Revolution
- 3.16 Conclusion
- 3.17 Model Questions
- 3.18 References

3.1 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.

3.2 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.

3.3 Works of Aristotle:

Aristotle wrote on the subjects like metaphysics, psychology, rhetoric, poetry, biology, moral science and politics etc., some of the early writings had 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”.

3.4 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.

3.5 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 was 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.

3.6 Aristotle's Views on State:

Aristotle also rejected the view of Sophists like Plato.

1. Aristotle opined that state was 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.

3.7 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.

3.8 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 does not suggests unqualified explanation of slavery and permitted in certain conditions. First, he preferred the enslavement of those who are mentally not sound, but he does not 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.

3.9 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 mentioned 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.

3.10 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.

3.11 Criticism on Aristotle's Views- Citizenship:

His views on citizenship were severely criticised 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 are 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.

3.12 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 as 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.

3.13 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 was 2000 years back and still it hold good even today.

3.14 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 complete 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 points toward distribution of wealth, honour and goods.

He further divided particular justice into two groups such as, 1. Distributive justice and 2. Corrective justice. The distributive 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.

3.15 CLASSIFICATION OF CONSTITUTION:

Aristotle considers the character of the state was 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.

3.15.1 Principles for Classification of Constitutions:

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

3.15.2 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.

3.16 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 was 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.

3.16.1 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 mentioned 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 which is 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 considered 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.

3.17 The Best Attainable/Practicable State or Polity:

Though Aristotle devised an Ideal state he realized that it was 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 were 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.

3.17.1 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.

3.18 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 does not mean that Aristotle was a champion of those imperfections.

3.19 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 underlying 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.

3.19.0 Causes of Revolution:

The causes of revolution mentioned by Aristotle, are as follows:

3.19.1 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 there is 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.

3.19.2 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 are guilty of doing wrong deeds to cover their actions, create displeasure and dislike among the people when these misdeeds are 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 are 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 are 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 has 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.

3.19.3 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 are 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 are spearheaded by those who are denied honours which are conferred only on the few.

In polity the revolution is 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.

3.19.4 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.

3.19.5 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 these measures show 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.

3.15.6 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 are 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.

3.15.7 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 revolting 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

3.16 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 these notions on slavery. His views on citizenship has 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.

3.17 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?

3.18 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.

Lesson-04**CHURCH AND STATE: ST. AUGUSTINE****4.0 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.

Structure:

- 4.0 Objectives
- 4.1 Introduction
- 4.2 Influences and Basis
- 4.3 Implication of the Christian Doctrines
- 4.4 Contribution of Church Fathers to Political Thought
- 4.5 Early Life and Influence of St. Augustine
- 4.6 Main Ideas of St. Augustine
 - 4.6.1 Political Ideas
 - 4.6.2 Philosophy of History
- 4.7 Views on the State
- 4.8 Views on Justice
- 4.9 Views on Peace
- 4.10 Views on War and Conquest
- 4.11 Views on Slavery
- 4.12 Views on Property
- 4.13 St. Augustine's Evaluation
- 4.14 Conclusion
- 4.15 Model Questions
- 4.16 References

4.1 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.

4.2 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 was 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 is 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 is more preferred to physical salvation.

4.3 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 is an independent organization and it is 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 is according to them was 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 was 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.

4.4 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 was 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.

4.5 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.

4.6 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".

4.6.1 Political Ideas

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

4.6.2 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 horse 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 is 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 thought by exalting the authority of church over the state.

4.7 Views on the State:

Augustine accepted that Christian Doctrine, that state is 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 is 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 is 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 is conflict with spiritual authority. He wanted both the state and church must work together with mutual understanding.

4.8 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..."

4.9 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 was relative peace. He considers that, universal peace was 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 are united with one another by their common love for God. It was different from the peace produced by a system of legal relations as in state."

4.10 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 had given the classification between just and unjust war and he described the wars waged by Christian rulers against pagans as just wards, 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.

4.11 Views on Slavery:

Augustine also defended slavery like Aristotle. He did not considered 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.

4.12 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.

4.13 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 is so much vagueness and variability in his writings and his conclusions are 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 is 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.

4.14 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 understood 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.

4.15 Model Questions:

1. Describe about the church fathers Political Thought.
2. Write about St. Augustine life, Contributions and his Ideas.

1.16 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.

Lesson-05

CHURCH AND STATE: MARSIGLIO DF PADUA**5.0 Objectives:**

1. Students would be able to know about the early life of Marsiglio and his Writings.
2. Students would be able to understand the political Ideas of Marsiglio.

Structure:

- 5.0 Objectives:
- 5.1 Introduction:
- 5.2 Aristotle's Impact on Marsiglio:
- 5.3 Important Political Ideas of Marsiglio:
 - 5.3.1 Views on State
 - 5.3.2 Marsiglio on Theory of Law
 - 5.3.3 Marsiglio on Sovereignty of People
 - 5.3.4 Marsiglio on Representative Government
 - 5.3.5 Marsiglio Views on Church
 - 5.3.6 Relation between State and Church
- 5.4 Estimate of Marsiglio Contributions:
- 5.5 Conclusion:
- 5.6 Model Questions:
- 5.7 References:

5.1 Introduction:

One of the most important medieval political thinker was Marsiglio and his Defuson pacis as the most important and original treatise on political theory. He was one of the strongest champion of secularism. He was born in Padua in the year 1270. He studied Medicine from Padua. He was associated in the church and became Archbishop of Milan. Later he turned against the church under the inspiration from John Jandun Wrote Defenser Pacis in 1324,in which he strongly sentenced the church and held papacy answerable for the prevailed disunion in Italy. At the same time he strongly supported the imperial authority. He condemned the papal imperialism to limit the authority of church with regard to the secular affairs. Marsiglio strive very hard to restore universal peace and suggested that, it could be done by depriving the Clergy of the coercive power and making the church a department of state. According to Doyle, "the purpose of Marsiglio was to destroy the whole system of papal absolutism by providing that the divine appointment of the papacy on which the entire authority of its claims rested was a myth and that the church is unnecessary encumbrance to the state. The whole Europe in general and Italy in particular was full of strife and disorder due to claims of the pope to a supreme power over rulers. It is the remedy for this cause of disorder that Marsiglio proposes to seek".

5.2 Aristotle's Impact on Marsiglio:

He was greatly influenced by the ideas and views of Aristotle in fact the impact of Aristotle was so deep that scholars opined that in his *Defensor Pacis*, completed the work left undone by Aristotle on Marsiglio. In fact, supplemented the rationalism of Aristotle with spiritualism and other Christian faiths. The ideas borrowed from Aristotle are here under.....

1. He borrow the idea of state as a natural and living organism poised of different parts and its important aspect is work for good life. He also lists six such organs of element like Aristotle and they are Agriculturalists, Artisans Warriors, Officials, Priests and Traders. He asserted like him that the health or wealth of the society, would be orderly working of these organs.

2. He borrowed the idea, origin of state from Aristotle and asserted that, state originates in the natural social instinct implant human beings. State originates in a general recognition of common needs.

3. The self-sufficiency of state, this idea is clearly taken from Aristotle. However, he developed this idea further and asserted that self-sufficiency is not mere achievement of rational nature but also civil happiness. He upheld from things for self-sufficiency and they are:

A) The state is composed of classes working for the welfare of the whole community.

B) It should have everything required for its continued existence.

C) The power of directive parts should be conferred in the corporative community itself or its parts.

D) In secular matters the community is absolutely self-sufficient and nominal government can be established to interfere in the affairs of the state.

Sabine pointed out that "The Aristotelian Principle which he followed most closely was that the self-sufficing community was capable of supplying both its physical and its moral needs".

4. The preferences shown by Marsiglio on the city state in his thoughts also shows the clean imprint of Aristotle.

5. He borrowed classification of governments from Aristotle, on the basis of their normal or perverted nature.

6. He followed the idea of Aristotle with regard to end of the state and asserted that the reason of existence of state was to be found in the welfare of the ruled not the rulers.

7. His opinions on law and its highest position in the community were borrowed from him. He asserted that people are bases of all law or at least major part of it. He described sources of law were universal.

8. He borrowed the element of rationalism as well. He asserted that, politics must be founded on reasons not on theology or faith. Hence, he clearly, gave significance to reason over faith in politics.

9. His faith common sense and faith in superiority of collective wisdom of the masses in comparison to brilliance of one or few, are an identical view of Aristotle.

10. The element of positivism is also borrowed from Aristotle. He said that laws must be made by human agencies, God natural reasons or any other supernatural powers had no role in making of laws.

5.3 Important Political Ideas of Marsiglio:

The following are the main political ideas of Marsiglio

5.3.1 Views on State

He also like Aristotle said that man is a social and political animal and natural outcome of this instruct in state. Those who do not live in society or state are either beast or slaves. Men progress state so that they may be able to live well. He stressed that it look after the historical as well as spiritual aspects of life. A state is required to settle the disputes and provide security against enemies and natural elements and supply of needed things to the people. He said that it is the responsibility of state to offer teachers to guide men about supernatural relations from the worship and honour of God and thank him for the benefits given. He said that to continue civil government reason must even for the peace and order. His well thought-out state as an organic whole, needed proper assistance between the various organs. He said “the various things needed by those desiring to live well cannot produce by men of single rank of offices, among the members of community each rank of office backing something which man needs for the sufficiency of life. These various orders or offices of men constitute the multiplicity and diversity of the parts of the state”.

5.3.2 Marsiglio on Theory of Law

The most significant part in his thought was his theory of law. He gave dissimilar foundations of law, kinds of law and sanctions behind law. It was witnessed that like Aquinas, he also classified the law into four categories like, eternal, natural divine and human law. But the views in this regard totally different from Aquinas. He did not admit the disagreement of Aquinas that four categories of law are manifestation of one and the same cosmic reason which comprises negative relation among them. They are related by equivocation as having same but he source is not common. He stated that, if the law was not applied forcibly was not a law. He considers law as enactment by duly established authority, in other words his law was more political and less moral. Marsiglio disallowed Aquinas view that ‘Law’ makes the state, and said that “far from the state being based upon a subsistent moral law, law will rather be based upon the state, and will derive its important features from the qualities which in that context had detailed for the state”. He did not accept the Aquinas’s Human Law, because Human law may disagree with Divine Law. Marsiglio considered human law superior and prevailed in case of conflict with divine law and also possessed coercive power.

Though he talks about four types of law but he talked only about divine law and human law, and he was concerned only about Human Law, he discussed briefly about Divine law as well. He further subordinates Divine law to human law and arises as the extreme secularist among medieval thinkers. Marsiglio defends Human Law as “command of the whole body of citizens or of its prevailed part arising from the deliberation of those empowered to make law, about voluntary acts of human beings to be done or avoided in this world for the sake of attaining the best end or some condition desirable for man in this world”. The central idea of the above definition will highlight the following characteristic of law.

1. He treats law as a forcible command of the legislator enforceable in the courts.
2. The foundation of the law is the will of the community rather than divine providence or natural reason.

3. Law originates from human will as a kind of command to the subjects.
4. Compulsion is the essence of law.
5. It foresees a duly established authority with power to make propagate and enforce the law.
6. He admits the concept of popular sovereignty and asserts that the source of all legal authority always people of its prevailing part.
7. It shows preference for rule of law over Rule of Men and asserts that the laws rightly laid down must be dominated.
8. He highlighted the principle of positivism and asserted that all laws must be made by men. Even the unwritten law of custom must be laid by men.

We note that, Marsiglio in his theory of law he pooled the ideas of Aristotle with medieval tradition and evolved a theory of law around which his whole philosophy revolves.

5.3.3 Marsiglio on Sovereignty of People

He developed a popular concept of sovereignty and said that in a state the people should be sovereign, because it is the combined concern and representation of the community as a whole. He proclaimed that combined wisdom is always better than individual wisdom hence, people are the best judges to enact the right laws, because such laws are of collective group's interest and they can be obeyed. He said that legislative power must be with prince or some other organ of the government, and behind such law, stand of the people who are superior to it and their combined will contains the essence of law. This will be much better for the state. In other words he said that princes do not derive their power from their personal qualities, but mainly from the elected legislators. He said that monarchy owed its power to the people and he should be accountable for the community, he claimed that monarch should do only administrative functions and should not go beyond that, if he surpasses his limits people can remove him. Thus people can make laws; elect and correct the government; establish other parts of state including priesthood; control ex-communication define articles of faith by their elected council; binding all the enactments of the council; elect the bishop pope etc. According to him people are important and they are the source of all political, legal and ecclesiastical authority.

5.3.4 Marsiglio on Representative Government

This is carefully connected with his popular theory of Sovereignty on representative government. He said that, an endorsement behind the government is not knowledge of law, or practical wisdom or moral virtue, but by the election of the whole body of citizens. The body of citizens has the right to correct the government in all aspects and it can overthrow if it becomes practical for the interest of common people. He also justified representative government through theological disagreement. He debated that laws originate by the citizens and the law makers too, develop from the same matter. From this discussion we can understand that it seems conceivable to infer steadily that a ruler who is elected by the people rather than his hereditary is more favored than the rulers who are hereditary.

5.3.5 Marsiglio Views on Church

He strived to switch off the concept of the people sovereignty and he measured church as the social community. He said, dominant situations in Europe like the disorders,

Chaos and anarchy are because of papal brand and he wants to control its powers and authority to check these tendencies.

He requested that the current life is not inferior to the life there after, present life is also respected and he considered worldly life is more true and superior. He said that Christianity and secularism are not well-matched and priest wants to be true Christians, they must not have temporal thing like property, wealth, land, power authority, governmental office etc. They should concern only with eternal Kingdom and the logical virtue. He said that papalist have no rightful share in the authority of the secular government. The clergy should execute to cure the souls and promote faith in men that can lead to salvation in the next life. Thus he reduced the church to the position of a department of the state.

Marsiglio tried to restrain the authority of the pope, by in conflict that the position within the church is not by the pope but the General Council, a body of all faith (both lay and clerical). The authority rest with the General Council to interpret scriptures, regulate the Ceremonials of Christian Worship, fill offices of the government and right to pass sentences of communication, acting through majority vote. He condensed church organization to a position alike to the organization of the state with one change, while in the state organization, he suggested Monarchy is the best form of government. In the interest of unity in the church he rejected the Monarchical type of government. He considered Church as a purely spiritual congregation of believers connected by common faith and common participation in the sacraments.

5.3.6 Relation between State and Church

He allocated a subordinate position to the Church, he rejected to accept the divine origin and divine rights to pope. He said that priestly class ascended in the past by them to control the people and by frightening about the hell. He replaced police and judges to stop the crime. He saw nothing untouchable about religion, clergy and church, he considered religion merely a social phenomenon. He reduced the church to a position of a department in state and clergy merely as a class set to perform religious services. He said that there was no such thing as spiritual offence and every offence was an offence against human law.

He desired the church to be inferior to secular government in regard to unity and peace of civil society. He said that if church was given independent position and jurisdiction then state would suffer hence unity is spirit of state. He said that the two identical and co-ordinate authorities would lead to supremacy over each other. The priest had to preserve the peace, which established the life blood of the state.

He asserted the supremacy of state, over the church by disagreeing its intimidating power, Divine law did be present but could not be enforced. Since divine law did not own any power of coercion in the world. It could only be designated as Divine Doctrine, instead coercion was the necessary feature of Human Law and this power originated from human enactment. Hence, if the Divine law was to be enforced it was only the human legislator who can do so and not the Priest or church. He described the clergymen as physicians of soul and they heal the soul.

5.4 Estimate of Marsiglio Contributions:

Marsiglio has been pronounced as the most innovative thinker of fourteenth century who “pierced the fundamental secrets of statesmanship more deeply than any of his contemporaries”. Sabine describes his theory as “one of the most remarkable creations of the medieval political thought”. Other scholars also approved the original nature of his

thoughts and abysmal political penetration and described his work *Defensor Pacis* as master piece of political thought. The importance of Marsiglio among the medieval political thinkers lies on account of his contribution of the following principles.

1. He communicated to the concept of law as an order of people, he completely freed the medieval law, of the limitations of natural law, reason, and common good and divine law and provided it with a social human footing by asserting that it is derived from human will.
2. He encouraged popular Sovereignty concept and said that, the people or the whole body of citizens or the bigger part thereof was the source of law. This idea was prominently influenced the democrats like Rousseau. The most modern democratic components are based on the principle of popular sovereignty. He also said that people could delegate their powers to their elected representatives who made laws. Thus final political Sovereignty rested with the people.
3. He stressed the principle of accountability of the rulers to the people. He predicted the ruler to witness the law and admire the will of Legislator. The ruler can be removed by Legislator if he is not executed his duties well. He restricted authority of the ruler, also tried to long standing methods by keeping rulers answerable to the entire community.
4. He became the fore-runner of the Regeneration Movement when he said that, worldly values like peace, order health etc. are as significant as eternal salvation. On these lines Renaissance Movement was built up later.
5. He asserted the dominance of the state over church, depressed the clergy of the coercive authority. He, for the first time preserved church as the department of the state in all the matters of earthly concern and destroyed the Papal Sovereignty.
6. He became the fore-runner of the councilor movement of 15th century. He not only provided for the dependence of the Pope upon the General Council, but also of the council upon the congregation and the whole church. He gave the General Council the right to elect the pope and other officials of the church to settle down questions of the whole body of believers.
7. He conferred a predominant position to rationalism in his thought. He not only separated reason from faith but also gave prime position to the former in his philosophy.

5.5 Conclusion:

On account of the above contributions Marsiglio is considered one of the most outstanding philosophies of the middle ages and it contained number of modern elements.

5.6 Model Questions:

1. Describe Marsiglio's early age and his political thinking and his ideas?
2. Write an essay to estimate Marsiglio's contributions?

5.7 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.

Lesson-06

STATE AND STATECRAFT: NICCOLO MACHIAVELLI

6.0 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.

Structure:

6.0	Objectives
6.1	Introduction
6.2	His Early Life
6.3	Influences on Machiavelli
6.3.1	Conditions in Italy
6.3.2	Impact of Republic
6.3.3	Emergence of Strong Monarchies
6.4	Method of Machiavelli
6.5	Machiavelli as a Modern Thinker
6.6	Political Ideas of Machiavelli
6.6.1	Machiavelli on Human Nature
6.6.2	His Views on Morality and Religion
6.6.3	His Theory of State and Its Preservation
6.3.4	Suggestions to the Prince for Retention of Power
6.4	Machiavelli's Political Thought
6.5	Shortcomings in Machiavelli
6.6	Conclusion
6.7	Model Questions
6.8	References

6.1 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 these 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.

6.2 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.

6.3 Influences on Machiavelli:

The factors which influenced the thinking and philosophy are hereunder:

6.3.1 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 has 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.

6.3.2 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.

6.3.3 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.

6.4 Method of Machiavelli:

The approaches assumed by him are 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.

6.5 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 he 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, is a secular institution and church should be subordinate to it.

6.6 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.

6.6.1 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.

6.6.2 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 short comings. 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 Action has said that, "the authentic interpretation of Machiavelli is the whole of later history. We find everybody using Machiavelli and still denouncing him".

6.6.3 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 was be present to check the selfish interests of human beings and it was artificial creation. State was 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 was originated by single man and laws which were 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 was the one in which citizens were faithful and law abiding. They were 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 had 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 Monarchial State. He says "The only way to establish any kind of order there is to found a monarchial 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.

6.3.4 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 price 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 was 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.

6.4 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 were 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 were 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 state 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 thought much praise has been bestowed on Machiavelli.

6.5 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.

6.6 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 Price 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.

6.7 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?

6.8 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.

Lesson-07**HUMAN NATURE SOVEREIGNTY: THOMAS HOBBS****7.0 Objective:**

1. Students would know about Thomas Hobbes and his Political Ideas.
2. Students would learn about human nature, methodology, state and Sovereignty.

Structure:

- 7.0 Objective
- 7.1 Introduction
- 7.2 Works of Hobbes
- 7.3 Hobbes Methodology
- 7.4 Views on Human Nature
- 7.5 Views on Social Contract
- 7.5.1 The features of social contract here under
- 7.6 Views on State on Nature
- 7.7 Views on Sovereignty
- 7.8 Criticism of Sovereignty
- 7.9 Hobbes Individualism and Absolutism
- 7.10 Estimate of Hobbes
- 7.11 Shortcoming of Hobbes
- 7.12 Conclusion
- 7.13 Model Questions
- 7.14 References

7.1 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 from 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 from Grotius, Sovereignty from Bodin and he enhanced it. His philosophy was borrowed from Galileo, for his acquisitive theory and scientific methods from Descartes. Thus the philosophy of Hobbes was a mixture of different influences of his time which left on his mind.

7.2 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.

7.3 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 was 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.

7.4 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 can 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 paintings 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.

7.5 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 were expected, as long as men were 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".

7.5.1 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.

7.6 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 was 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.

7.7 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 is not assured by the opinion and wishes of the people because they have made a complete surrender of their power to the sovereign. It is 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 is 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 was 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.

7.8 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 was the most revolutionary theory, at the time of its beginning and was one of the most significant contribution to the political thought.

7.9 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.

7.10 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".

7.11 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 are 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 is 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.

7.12 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

7.13 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?

7.14 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.

Lesson- 08

THEORY OF PROPERTY, CONSENT AND GOVERNMENT: JOHN LOCKE

8.0 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 property consent and Government.

Structure:

- 8.0 Objectives
- 8.1 Introduction
- 8.2 His Writings
- 8.3 Influences on Locke
- 8.4 Locke on Human Nature
- 8.5 Views on State of Nature
- 8.6 Views on Law of Nature
- 8.8 Views on State
- 8.9 Locke's Theory of Property
 - 8.9.1 Boarder Sense
 - 8.9.2 Narrow Sense
- 8.10 Locke's Consent and Government
- 8.11 Locke on Revolution
- 8.12 Locke as an Individualist
- 8.13 Conclusion
- 8.14 Model Questions
- 8.15 References

8.1 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.

8.2 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, are 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.

8.3 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 are “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.

8.4 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.

8.5 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, 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.

8.6 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.

8.7 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 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. 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.

8.8 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 rest 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.

8.9 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.

8.9.1 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 was 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.

8.9.2 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 Lockeian theory, there would be little cause to worry about his other liberties. He would be amply able to take out for himself".

8.10 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 was 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.

8.11 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 quite 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’.

8.12 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 property 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.

8.13 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.

8.14 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?

8.15 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.

Lesson-09**POPULAR SOVEREIGNTY: ROUSSEAU****9.0 Objectives:**

1. Students would be able to know about the early life of Rousseau
2. Students would be able to describe about Rousseau's popular Sovereignty.

Structure:

- 9.0 Objectives
- 9.1 Introduction
- 9.2 Influences on Rousseau
- 9.3 Views on Human Nature
- 9.4 Views on State of Nature
- 9.5 Views on Social Contract
- 9.6 Views on General Will
 - 9.6.1 Characteristics of General Will
 - 9.6.2 Critiques on the Theory of General Will
- 9.7 Views on Popular Sovereignty
- 9.8 Conclusion
- 9.9 Model Questions
- 9.10 References

9.1 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 though 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 confession, 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 has 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.

9.2 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 of 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 is 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 some 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.

9.3 Views on Human Nature:

According to Rousseau 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. 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”.

9.4 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 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, 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.

9.5 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 is 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.

9.6 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”.

9.6.1 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, to 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.

9.6.2 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.

9.7 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 is 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 had 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.

9.8 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.

9.9 Model Questions:

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

9.10 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.

Lesson-10

ETHICS AND POLITICS: IMMANUEL KANT

10.0 Objectives:

1. Students would be able to know about idealistic theory of Immanuel Kant
2. Students would be able to learn about Immanuel Kant's views.

Structure:

- 10.0 Objectives
- 10.1 Introduction
- 10.2 Thinkers of Idealism
- 10.3 Immanuel Kant
- 10.4 Ethics and Politics
- 10.5 Importance of Individual
- 10.6 Kant Views on Social Contract
- 10.7 Kant Views on Rights and Duties
- 10.8 Kant Views on Sphere of State Activity
- 10.9 Kant on Right to Revolution
- 10.10 Kant Views on Forms of Government
- 10.11 Kant Views on World Peace
- 10.12 Kant Views on Property
- 10.13 Critiques on Immanuel Kant
- 10.14 Conclusion
- 10.15 Model Questions
- 10.16 References

10.1 Introduction:

The idealist theory also recognized as philosophical, metaphysical and absolute theory, which design as a reaction against the useful philosophy which had condensed the state simply to accumulative of individuals who were after in search of pleasure and avoiding pains both in their individual as well as collective capacity. As Barker said that, "the man began to feel the need of a more scientific explanation of the facts, and a more scientific attempt to cure the defects of social life". They figured up ethical theory which starts with moral nature of man and anticipates state as an ethical institution for the welfare of its citizens. They looked upon law as manifestation of pure cause and declared that good life for a man comprises in his performance of his proper duties in the life of the community.

The basis of idealist theory was outlined by the scholars in the philosophy of Plato and Aristotle, who labeled states as an ethical institution and a partnership in the life of virtue. Aristotle says "The state comes into being for the sake of mere life; it continues to exist for the sake of good life". In the modern times the theory can be noted in the writings of Rousseau as collectivist theory of the state and conceived state as a moral organism. The General thinkers like Kant, Fichte, Von Humboldt and Hegel elaborated the theory idealist.

They were greatly influenced by the idea of Rousseau. Bosanquet and Green English idealists developed this philosophy later.

10.2 Thinkers of Idealism:

These thinkers chiefly from German and England and they are professors from Universities. During the second half of 18th century, the idealist thinkers from Germany arose as a reaction against the materialistic rationalism of the enlightenment. Immanuel Kant contributed the lead in this regard. Who often labelled him as “father of idealist school of thought” but some consider this claim rightfully belongs to Wilhelm Friedrich Hegel.

In England idealist philosophy arose because of response against the self-satisfied and a materialistic individualism of the utilitarians. Some of the eminent English idealist thinkers were Carlyle, Green, Bosanquet, Bradly etc. The idealist thinkers fall into two categories. The first category led by Hegel comprised of extremists. They challenged the state and treated it as an end rather than means. They accredited to the state qualities of omnipotence, dependability and an independent will and personality. The second category was led by T.H. Green Consisted of moderates who wanted the state to execute only negative functions like, to remove obstacles in the way of development of individual's personality.

10.3 Immanuel Kant:

He is considered as the father of the idealist thought, was born in a middle class family at Konigsberg in Germany in 1724. His mother left a profound effect on him and she was very religious lady. After completing his studies he joined as instructor first, later he became the professor at the University of Konigsberg. He was greatly influenced by Rousseau and Montesquieu. He was very much fascinated by Rousseau and studied Emile with excessive devotion. He kept a bust of this great philosopher in his study room with great respect. He accepts Rousseau's impact on him and said that, “Rousseau set me right.... I learnt to respect human nature, and I should consider myself for mere useless than the ordinary working man if I did not believe that this view could give worth to all others to establish the right man”.

About the influence of Montesquieu and Rousseau on Kant, Dunning says “His (Kant's) Doctrine as to the basis and the nature of the state is purely Rousseau's put into the grab of Kantian terminology, his analysis of the government follows Montesquieu in the like manner”.

The most important works in which he articulated his ideas which includes, the Critique of Pure Reason in 1781; The Critique of Practical Reason in 1788; Perpetual Peace in 1795; The Principles of Political Rights in 1796, and First Metaphysical Principles of the Theory of Law in 1796. It may be well-known that, Kant exhibited more interest in analysis of the fundamental concepts than questions of practical politics.

10.4 Ethics and Politics:

The Kant's understanding a tendency to conflate virtue and right to read Kant's ethics as moral theory in which we co-legislate virtue, and to read Kant's political philosophy as one, in which we co-legislate principles of justice. Contrary to this, scholars have claimed that Kant's ethics is an ethics of self-legislation, and that his theory of right is a theory of

external legislation. More precisely, are subject to the demands of justice, others lawfully mark upon us whether or not we approve with these demands. Accord and co-legislation are immaterial in Kant's political morality. Political obligation is unconditional, we cannot form political obligation by mutual agreement. We are under obligations of justice concerning one another.

Kant's political morality is of external legislation. This is specified by the removal of reference to 'maxims' from the universal principle of right. A morally good saying reproduces an agent's internal resolve to act in agreement with the necessities of duty. A person so acts, independently and self-ruling person is a person who possesses inner freedom. Kant's political philosophy by contrast, is worried with morality of outer freedom; more specially, with mutual salutation of one another's valid prerogatives of freedom of choice and action. According to universal principle of right, any action is right if it can co-exist with everyone's freedom in agreement with universal law, or if on its maxim the freedom of choice of each can coincide with everyone's freedom in harmony with a universal law.

The relation between the communities can be said or termed as politics, and the pact among the political bodies can be defined as peace and it is utmost needed among the political activities and bodies. Peace presents a severe problem of representation, we have to depend other approaches to deal to get the political good like aesthetics, ethics and religion. These modes can gives itself the creation of political objects.

Ethics helps to exemplify our need for political way and relation in individual human beings. Political leaders grip out to citizens the hope of a strong nation, or of obvious political destiny, but we see them in ethical terms as courageous, honorable, and loving (or in aesthetic terms as charismatic, graceful, and handsome). Factually, communities have been unite to link political organizations, whereas our leaders shake hands, embrace, kiss, and exchange smiles to much fanfare. Ethics comes to liberate and repair the slit in our thoughts of politics. For friendship an ethical image, even though strongly combined into the custom of political science.

The performance of assigning the best conceivable purpose to others is respected because it withstands admiration and self-respect and makes conceivable moral perfection. In the act of approving caring, respecting others, even their faults and mistakes, it turn out to be possible for them to endeavor for their better characters. No one can trusts that these activities of respect are morally required, and admits that care ethics like deontological ethics speaks of obligation. This obligation to assess others' actions in the best conceivable way of concerning and gentle for them and promotion of such action would lead the moral enhancement of others. This compulsion is not exceptional to care ethics; Kant shares the view that there is a need for ethical necessity to esteem others and overseeing their errors and mistakes. These actions would create potential moral development. Kant's ethics, just like Noddings' care ethics, reflects our obligation to assign the best thinkable motivations to others. For both, this action follows from our respect for others and it functions to make possible the moral improvement of others, Kant's ethics is rational.

Kant makes a vital improvement in accepting of the parameters of political representation when he notices the incapability of individuals to realize freedom. It is factual that he defines this limitation as a problem of thought rather than imagination: that is, since reasoning cannot relate to metaphysical objects such as freedom in its own terms, it requires a leap of faith via the imagination to conceptualize a mode of relation beyond itself. But if alike restriction stand up in the case of political imagination, if individual held flops to deliver an

objective representation of community, this would mean that Kant's remarks about liberty—which is after all the concept stimulating in his philosophy with bearing the weight of individualism comparative to the necessities of social presence are in fact a admission that human beings cannot imagine the political relation at all.

The thoughts of ethical goodness would seem to be further difficult, the ethical good objects at the representation of a person in whom we imagine character. He explains that ethics needs aesthetics of morals to make it reachable to human understanding. The artistic part of ethics lies specifically in the enormous gap between our accepting of what character is and our capability to complete the approved actions that will build or isometrics it.

Kant secondary feeling to object, he asserted that only acts done out of duty to carefully logical principle are morally well-intentioned. Love, feeling, and character are all imaginary by Kant to be unreliable. An ethic of care upsets this importance. The favored state is natural caring; ethical caring is raised to bring back it. This reversal of priority is one great difference between Kant's ethics and an ethic of care. Another difference is attached in feminist viewpoints, an ethic of care is methodically interactive...A relational understanding of caring drives us to look not only at moral agents but also at the receivers of their acts and the conditions under which the parties interact.

10.5 Importance of Individual:

Kant devoted great significance to the prominence to the individual in his political thought and declared that an individual was an end in himself and should not be treated as a means to an end. The individual should not aim at specific compensations or satisfactions but at those ends which are of universal application. He should have thirst for individual freedom and equality and should not ready to sacrifice them at the altar of the state. He was in favour of subordination of the individual liberty infavour of the greater requirements of the society.

10.6 Kant Views on Social Contract:

Kant at no time used it to elucidate the basis of the state but acknowledged the concept of social contract. He used social contact to show the requisite nature of relationship between the government and the people. He pronounces by the contract “surrender their eternal freedom in order to receive it immediately back again as members of a common wealth”.

10.7 Kant Views on Rights and Duties:

Kant provided great importance on the rights and duties of individuals. He defined right as “the limitation of the freedom of any individual to the extent of its agreement with the freedom of all other individuals in so far as this is possible by a universal law”. Rights are formed by the state and the only original right have its place to every man in virtue of his humanity is freedom. To him duties of the state are more important than rights.

10.8 Kant Views on Sphere of State Activity:

As an individualist, Kant did not favour allowance of widespread powers to the state. He did not deliberate it, duty of the state to indorse moral freedom and wanted the state purely to hinder the hindrances of freedom and to launch social condition of "outward order in which truly moral acts may gradually evolve a kingdom of Humanity".

10.9 Kant on Right to Revolution:

Kant does not admit to the individual the right to rebellion against the state because the being of the state was essential for the normal growth of the individual takeover and implementation of the sovereign was sin for which men could not be excused in this or the next world.

10.10 Kant Views on Forms of Government:

Kant foresaw three forms of states like autocracy, aristocracy and democracy and two forms of governments like Republican and Despotic. He thought that only representative form government was rational. According to him the king, the dignity of the elected deputies could act as representatives. He separated tasks of the state on the customary pattern as Legislative, Executive and Judicial and he considered that for satisfaction of freedom are need to have legislative and executive functions.

10.11 Kant Views on World Peace:

Kant was an inordinate promoter of universal peace. He said that states like men, are quarrelsome and jealous by nature. They fight for the expansion of boundaries. Even during times of peace, they make arrangements for defense which was as troublesome and damaging of internal welfare as war itself. According to Kant the republican states are more favorable to world peace because the governments rest on, the will of the people and can wage war only with their consent. He said that existence of popular sovereignty in the midst of the family of states is dynamic for world peace because in its absenteeism the nations could make their own pronouncements on peace or war and can jeopardize the world peace. Kant's idea of world peace was not grounded upon Christian love but upon law.

10.12 Kant Views on Property:

Kant measured the institution of private property is important for the development of individual. However, he was not willing to admit the right to property as a natural right. According to him the individual derivative this right from the society, this right was not complete in the sense that individual could obtain anything and everything. The individual has to exercise this right keeping into his mind the interests of his neighbours.

10.13 Critiques on Immanuel Kant:

The philosophers of political science have found many contradictions in the political thought of Kant and have been criticized for those reasons.

1 They have found contradiction in the ideal put forward by him is immaterial and lacking of any content of reference.

2 His concepts of rights and duties are just abstracts and they look impractical to apply in politics

3 When he debates about freedom it is not clear whether he is considering freedom in the ordinary sense of 'being left alone' or in higher sense by only if occasion for the development of man's higher faculties.

4 On authority to legislate the laws he is unable to give a clear picture, on one side he says people are decisive legislatures and on the other he gives this power to the ruler and declares that ruler is above the actual control of laws.

5 On social theory he is unable to give a clear thought whether to accept or to reject this idea.

10.14 Conclusion:

Immanuel Kant was born in 1724, in a middle class family. After completing his studies he joined as instructor later became Professor. He was greatly influenced by Montesquieu and Rousseau. Kant also acknowledges Rousseau's impact on him. He wrote many books on idealist thinking, perpetual Peace, The critiques of pure reason, The principles of Political Rights etc., He gave real importance to the individual in his thought, he said that, an individual is an end in himself, and must not treat him as mean to an end. On social contract he tried to show the binding nature of relationship between government and people. On property he said that, institution of private property is essential for the development of an individual, he is not willing to accept the right to property as natural right.

The philosophers of political science have found many contradictions in the political thought of Kant and have been criticised for those reasons.

They have found contradiction in the ideal put forward by him is immaterial and lacking of any content of reference. His concepts of rights and duties are just abstracts and they look impractical to apply in politics.

In spite of these shortcomings found in Kant's political thought, no one can disagree that he made invaluable contributions to the idealist thought and has been treated as the forerunner of the school of philosophy.

10.15 Model Questions:

1. Write a detail notes about the early life of Immanuel Kant and his works?
2. Write about idealist theory and its origin?
3. Write about Immanuel Kant's Ethics and Politics?

10.16 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.

Lesson-11**STATE AND CIVIL SOCIETY- HEGEL****11.0 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

- 11.0 Objectives
- 11.1 Introduction
- 11.2 Influences on Hegel
- 11.3 Hegel Views on Human Nature
- 11.4 The Nature and Ethics of Civil Society
- 11.5 Civil Society
- 11.6 Need of a System
- 11.7 Administration of Justice
- 11.8 Hegel Views on State
- 11.9 Government Agencies and Private Corporations
- 11.10 Freedom Views of Hegel
- 11.11 Hegel Views on Constitution
- 11.12 Hegel Views on War
- 11.13 Conclusion
- 11.14 Model Questions
- 11.15 References

11.1 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 here 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.

11.2 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.

11.3 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 were 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".

11.4 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 that his. 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.

11.5 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 to 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.

11.6 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 appetite 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 is 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.

11.7 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.

11.8 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 Is 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 had 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.

11.9 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 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.

11.10 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 was 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”.

11.11 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 represented 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 whole, but in actual rehearsal it was 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.

11.12 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.

11.12.1 Hegel on Dialectic:

The one of the significant political philosophy of Hegel is 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”.

11.13 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.

11.14 Model Questions:

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

11.15 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.

Lesson-12

THEORY OF RIGHTS: THOMAS HILL GREEN

12.0 OBJECTIVES:

1. Student would be able to know about the early life of T.H. Green and his influences.
2. Students would be able to understand T.H. Green's political thought.
3. Students would be able to learn about his theory of rights.

Structure:

- 12.0 Objectives
- 12.1 Introduction
- 12.2 Views of Green on State
- 12.3 Views of Green on Sovereignty
- 12.4 Views of Green on Political Obligations
- 12.5 Views of Green on General Will
- 12.6 Views of Green on Freedom
- 12.7 Views of Green on Rights
- 12.8 Views of Green on Property
- 12.9 Views of Green on Natural Law
- 12.10 Views of Green on State and Societies
- 12.11 Views of Green on Universal Brotherhood
- 12.12 Views of Green on War
- 12.13 Views of Green on Punishment
- 12.14 Views of Green on Individualism
- 12.15 Estimate of Green
- 12.16 Conclusion
- 12.17 Model Questions
- 12.18 References

12.1 Introduction:

T.H. Green took great attention in the politics of England, he was an eminent philosopher and also a practical political thinker. He was born on 11th April, 1836, at Yorkshire in a clergyman's family. He educated from Rugby and Balliol College Oxford. He was prominently influenced by Jowett while he was in Oxford. He was appointed as Fellow at Balliol in 1860. Later in 1866 he was become the tutor and promoted as professor of philosophy 1878. He was not only taught at University but also took dynamic involvement in the affairs of the city, was elected to the Oxford Town council. During the relationship with council, he actively operated for other bodies like City of Oxford School for Boys as founder member and Oxford Band of hope Temperance Union as President.

He was encouraged by the four different political thinkers, the Greek tradition, philosophy of Rousseau, German idealism and non-conformism. He specified that for the welfare of individuals in a state is very much essential and it was quite natural to have it, his thoughts were similar like Greek philosophers such as Plato and Aristotle. He also understood from Greek philosophy that life of an individual is fundamental part of life of the community, he was also influenced by Greek about ethics and politics which were similar but their methods were different. He borrowed different ideas from Rousseau on

moral freedom of man, Sovereign characterized the general will which was obeyed by all citizens, and the act of every act of general will was characterized by fair-mindedness.

Green borrowed supreme encouragement from German idealists like Fichte, Hegel and Kant. He sketched the idea of metaphysical from Fichte and Hegel. He accepted ideas from Kant as well in the regard of ethics and politics. He adopted Hegel's object of the state freedom, but to definite restrictions only. According to Green, statement that, inclination to become the living essence of freedom. He opined that, morality would play an important role in the political improvement of man, and final development in the state could be reached only when man sought perfection for its own sake. Green was very much influenced by non-conformists, he recognized their view that freedom was the most significant thing unspiritual as well as in political life. Green's idea on property were clearly shown the impact of non-conformists.

The political and philosophical writing of T.H.Green has number of works, some are published after his death. The most important works of him are Lectures on the Principle of Political Obligation in 1882. Lecturers on liberal legislation and Freedom of Contract, Lecturers on the English Revolution, and Prolegomena to Ethics, it was published after his death.

12.2 Views of Green on State:

Green's opinions are primarily grounded on human nature and stated that the state, as the merchandise of human perception. Barker described it as "the human consciousness postulates liberty', Liberty involves rights; rights demand the state". He never considered as state as an end but mean of individuals moral development. He says that, the aim of man is self-realization and freedom is the primary means to this end. The social life is nothing but one's self, it not only provides to the system of rights. Green thought that rights of the individual are not a product of any contract. These rights are present in them through society they are related to law only. Hence, people will follow the laws of state because, it appear to them that it promotes their common good. Green said that state or sovereign as distinguishing institute of state, does not make rights but rights are already exists in it. It gives exercise of powers to man which influenced in delay with each other for common good. It cannot be called state if it does not do so. The main ideas of state by Green as follows;

1. Green said that state is a natural institution and essential for moral realization of each individual. It must try to protect the individual of his rights and on circumstances related to good life. He said that state must not take any positive steps for the promotion or morality instead it must help for the development of morality.
2. Green declared that it is worthless if the rights are not implemented. So, state must implement or enforce rights even by compulsion, if needed. He justified the use of force by state, because it implements the general will of the people, state absolute and omnipotent.
3. Green said that, the power of state was restricted both within and without. The power of state within is accountable for limited actions and understanding of external actions of man and has nothing to do with his motives. So, the state is answerable to the moral improvement of individual only in an indirect modus, like by elimination of interferences in the growth of individual's personality. He said that under convinced circumstances individual can resist the authority of state. The existence of number of groups within the society also act as a check on the external authority of state.

12.3 Views of Green on Sovereignty:

Sovereignty views of Green can be seen as compromise views of Rousseau and Austin. According to Green "sovereign signifies a determinate person or persons

charged with the supreme coercive function of the state, and the general will does not admit of being vested in a person or persons; yet it is true that the institutions of political society—those by which equal rights are guaranteed to members of such a society—or an expression of, and are maintained by a general will. The sovereign should be regarded, not in abstraction, as the wielder of coercive power, but in connection with the whole complex of institutions or of political society”. He uses the term ‘sovereign’ for the permissible sovereign which enforces laws, but at the same time he is an agent of the general will.

12.4 Views of Green on Political Obligations:

Green deliberates on the problem of why the people submit the state in state or political obligations. He says that man is very much obedient to the state because it is not only natural of man but also because his best self or moral development can be possible by being submissive to the state. The individual has a duty to comply with the laws of state and other civil institutions because the deduction of hindrances and make the way for self-protection. This self-protection should be consonance with social welfare because every one is the internal part of the society and the social system. He must promise that his hunt of good is in his traditional values with the identical good of others and grant others the same opportunities which he permits for himself. He says that an individual has the duty to submit to the law of the state and other civil organizations because through these organizations alone he gets problem detached which stands in the way of self-perfection. He asserts that, the individual’s self-protection should be in consonance with the social welfare because each one is the fundamental part of the social system. To estimate Green, “the value of the institutions of civil life lies in their operation as giving reality to the capacities of will and reason and enabling them to be freely exercised. In their general effect, apart from particular aberrations, they render it possible for a man to be freely determined by the idea of the possible satisfaction of himself of being driven this way and that by external forces, and thus give reality to the capacity called will; and they enable him to realize his reason, i.e., his idea of self-perfection, by acting as a member of a social organization in which each contributes to the better being of all the rest”.

12.5 Views of Green on General Will:

He defers with Rousseau’s concept of general will and his concept is different. He says that general will is the mutual mindfulness for a common good and asserts that all rights, duties and institutions of society, relatively the society itself in the creation of general will, general will is not by the state but for the state to maintain it. According to Barker, “Green’s general will is an assertion that the ultimate moving force which inspires and controls political action is a spiritual force... a common conviction that makes for righteousness a common conscience that alone can arm the ministers and agents of the community with power. That conviction or conscience at once creates rights creates the law, or system of rules by which those rights one maintained and creates the Sovereign whose mission it is to enunciate and enforce that law and to sustain the fall vigor and incomplete harmony with one other, all the living institutions which are the concrete embodiment of rights and law”.

12.6 Views of Green on Freedom:

Green's views on freedom has an inspiration and reflect of Greek political thinkers like Plato, Aristotle and the idealistic thinkers like Kant and Hegel. He favoured liberty and said that, it was the greatest blessing and important condition for the moral development of individual. He says that goal of human's life is not by external ends like pleasure and happiness of the moral development of life. He preferred to eradicate any difficulties which obstruct with the moral development of individual.

Green avoided two extreme opinions of Kant and Hegel navigated through the middle path and observed that, man is free when he is in that "state in which he shall have realized the ideal of himself, shall be at one with the law, which he recognizes as that which he ought to obey, shall have become all that he has it in him to be, and so fulfil the law of his being". We can say that Green's freedom is positive, if the power of doing or enjoying to some degree worth performing or enjoying in common with others. It determines and does not include freedom to do anything and everything.

12.7 Views of Green on Rights:

Green stressed the social side of the rights, to quote him "The capacity, then, on the part of the individual of conceiving a good is the same for himself and others, and of being determined to action by the conception, is the foundation of rights; and rights are the conditions of that capacity being realized. No right is justifiable or should be right except on the ground that directly or indirectly it serves this purpose. Conversely every power should be a right, i.e., society should secure to individual every power that is necessary for realizing this capacity". Hence no one has right only the person who is the member of the society can have the right. Green rejected the concept of natural rights, in so far as it contained the presence of assured rights in pre-social state. He declared that, there may possibly be no right without recognition. Therefore he measured the rights as natural for the understanding of the moral abilities of man. In this background of his natural rights are, both extensive and abysmal than the actual rights decided to the citizen of the state, if the conflict arises between the natural or ideal rights and actual rights, he preferred natural or ideal rights over actual rights. He permitted individual the right to resist the authority only under certain situations of the state.

Green permitted individual the right to fight back against the state, Prof. Barker said that, "his treatment of this question is sober and cautious". Green declares that there cannot be any right to break the rules of the state because, only state is the designer of those rights. To estimate Green, "There can be any right to disobey or evade any particular law on the ground that it interferes with any freedom of action, any right of managing his children or doing what he will with his own". He advises people if any law breaches their concept of common good, asked them to cancel it by the legal or constitutional way. As long as the law stays in the statute book it is the duty of individual to follow it. If the people disobey the state the belief is that possibly they are wrong and state in all probably is right, because the state will be talking with the wisdom of age, and it is undoubtedly superior to the wisdom of individual men. The smooth working of democracy may be hampered because of resistance and it may unleash the anarchy.

He permitted individuals to resist the state under certain exceptional situations only, as a result he says that the individual has the right to disobey the command of the sovereign if the legality of the command is doubtful and when the government system is dictatorial and it conflicting the public interest. Agitating for prevent or amendment of any bad law, resistance becomes not only a right but also a duty of individual. Green holds two

condition to fulfillment before an individual can legitimately resort to resistance like, 1 through the successful opposition he should ensure that definite social good is obtainable and 2 it should be backed and have the support of sizeable quantity of fellow members of the society. Green emphasized this point consequently "That if one must resist, one must, and the choice can be no one else. One may not have the right to resist but one may have the right to resisting. Resistance is justified only on the social grounds".

Green believed that, freedom of self-realization could be possible only by impartial rights which enforced through the state. Thus, he says rights "the claim on the individual to will his own ideal objects and developing his capacities of reason and will". He further says that, rights were not legal recognition but common moral consciousness. He also highlighted that rights were more relative to morality than law and were the essential condition for the fulfillment of man's moral end. He also stressed the need of the social side of the rights society should secure the individual every power, that was necessary for realizing this capacity. He gives the right to individual to resist the state under certain circumstances.

12.8 Views of Green on Property:

Green's views on property were a mixture of idealism, individualism and liberalism. He never supported the rights of private property and at the same time he did not criticize it out. The growth of man's property was requisite. Hence, he defined property as the sum of the instruments required for the free play of the self-realizing principles in man and contribution to the common good. He further said that, as every individual has capacity to take part in common social good, everyone must have the opportunity to acquire property. He did not believe in right to 'equal property'. He said that, more capital can be acquired without depriving others, but more land could not acquire without reducing the share of others.

12.9 Views of Green on Natural Law:

Green's views on natural laws are quite different with the views of social contractarians, who considered natural law as, prevailing self-sufficiently by the social consciousness. According to him natural law is natural because it is obligatory for the realization of the end. A moral being is an individual who, must obey this natural law however it belong to state or not, because it is based on reason. He said that any law which is unreliable with natural law or law of God should be disallowed. He considers natural law is mounting and emerging thing which keeps on growing with the growth of moral consciousness of the society.

12.10 Views of Green on State and Societies:

Green believes that a state is nothing but "a society of societies". The number of societies which were not fashioned by state and retain their own inner system of rights, which came out of them nature as societies. These societies are very much important to individual to accomplish himself. He said that, state is answerable to preserve and withstand the societies which occurred in it. If it fails to do this duty it shall not have the right to exist. Hence, authority of state is advanced upon the nature of state and nature of associations.

12.11 Views of Green on Universal Brotherhood:

This concept of universal brotherhood is most distinct feature of Green's philosophy. He thinks that right to life is an integral right for all human beings which is universally recognized, and the presence of universal society. The good of individual will reflect the good of the humanity.

12.12 Views of Green on War:

His views on war are greatly linked to his views on universal brotherhood and the characteristic right to life conferred on every individual. He said that, war cannot be the absolute right, but a relative right. It is not the characteristic of the state as well, but it is attribute of state in imperfect form. The slighter chances of war will have only to those states who have less imperfect. Green never encouraged war he opposed it because it disturbs rights of the individual and his life. He says that, war could be justified as wrong to correct another wrong, and it always remains a wrong because it really derives the basic right to life of a man.

Green constantly considered war as a moral wrong. He argues that "there is of course no violation of right when a man is killed by a wild beast or stroke of lightning, because there is no right as between a man and a beast, or between man and natural force. But the deaths in a battle are caused distinctly by human agency and international agency". Green argues that no man has the right to surrender his right to free life.

Green agrees that war would grow virtue like patriotism self-sacrifice and heroism and an important means for upholding the social conditions for the development of man, at the same time he declares that the destruction of life caused by war is wrong act. To quote him 'no state of war can make the destruction of man's life by man other than a wrong, though the wrong is not always chargeable upon all the parties to a war'.

12.13 Views of Green on Punishment:

Though Green gives the right to free life to every individual, he also gives state authority to restrict this right through punishments. According to Green the most significant object of punishment is to maintain of rights and duties in the state and to secure freedom of action for the moral development of all the members of the community. Punishment can be said as a force directed against the force of criminals. The main object of punishment is to create a type of terror in the mind of criminals of the state.

12.14 Views of Green on Individualism:

Green's political though has a great importance to the individualism and is pre-dominant. To quote Green "The life of the nation has no real existence except as the life of the individuals composing it... To speak of any progress or improvement or development of a nature or society or mankind except as relative to some greater worth of persons is to use words without meaning".

Green's individualism is also obvious from his concept of freedom. To make the best of life of an individual one must have freedom. Every individual would voluntarily identify himself with laws of the state only if the state was good and not otherwise. In a bad state the individual may not force to challenge the authority of the state.

12.15 Estimate of Green:

Green also faced admiration and criticism by other political thinkers. His was criticized for his faults with his theory of sovereignty. The views of property are also inadequate and unsatisfactory. On the other hand scholars like Barker, Sabine, Wayper and Maxey have greatly admires and highlighted his contributions to political thought.

Like other political thinkers Green too has been criticized for this political thinking, though he is criticised at the same time he has number thinkers who admires him as well. They find faults in his theory of sovereignty. He describes it as supreme power when sustained by general will. Hobhouse says, "in so far as it is will it is not general and so far as it is general, it is not will". Green did not take into consideration of the factors which influences the actions of men in the states. His description about man is pure consciousness and also not real. His views on property are insufficient and unacceptable in so far he only possess the absorption of the landed property in some hands and does not find any danger in the absorption of the capitol. Hence, it is noticed that his views are not logical and not satisfactory.

On the other side scholars like Baker, Sabine, Wayper and Maxey have underlined his contributions to the political thought.

The important contributions of Green to the political thought are as follows:

1. Green tried to mix morality and politics by saying that it is the moral duty of the state to develop social instinct of man and moral improvement leads to development of state.
2. Green mixed the negative and positive functions of the state, theoretically, he gives the state only negative functions but elaborating his scheme he gave positive functions to the state.
3. His thought contains vital components of individualism, he did not treat state as an end but as means for moral development of the individual. Under rare situations he gave permission to individual to resists against the state.
4. He made valuable contributions to the development of liberalism in England.

12.16 Conclusion:

He was born in 1836, in England to the family of clergyman. After the completion of his education he finally became the Professor of Philosophy in 1878. He drew inspiration from four sources like, Greek tradition, Philosophy of Rousseau, German idealism and non-conformism, he was influenced by Plato and Aristotle as well. He contributed political thought by his many writings, Lectures on the principles of Political Obligations, Lectures on Liberal Legislation and Freedom of Contract, Lectures on the English Revolution etc., His views on state are based on human nature and he described the state as the product of human consciousness. On political obligations he said that, man concentrates submission to the state not because it is the natural disposition of man but because he realizes that his best self or moral improvement can be thinkable only by rendering obedience to the state. On General Will he says that, by general will, the common perception of common good and declares all rights, duties and institutions of society, rather product of the will is society. On rights he said that, no one has right only

the person who is the member of the society can have the right. Green rejected the concept of natural rights, in so far as it contained the presence of assured rights in pre-social state. He declared that, there may possibly be no right without recognition.

Like other political thinkers Green too has been criticized for this political thinking, though he is criticized at the same time he has number of thinkers who admires him as well. They find faults in his theory of sovereignty. On the other side scholars like Baker, Sabine, Wayper and Maxey have underlined his contributions to the political thought.

12.17 Model Questions:

1. Write about the early life of Green and his influences and contribution?
2. Write about the Green's views on a) state b) Sovereignty c) Political obligation d) General will e) freedom f) rights g) Property h) natural law i) brotherhood j) war K) punishment l) Individualist.

12.18 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.